# Colleges

### T-Ownership

#### Interpretation: The Business Dictionary defines “ownership” as

“ownership” http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/ownership.html

**The ultimate and exclusive** [**right**](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/right.html) **conferred by a** [**lawful**](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/lawful.html)[**claim**](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/claim.html) **or** [**title**](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/title.html)**, and** [**subject to**](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/subject-to.html) **certain** [**restrictions**](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/restrictions.html) **to enjoy, occupy, possess,** [**rent**](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/rent.html)**,** [**sell**](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/sell.html)**, use, give away, or even destroy an item of property**.

#### Violations:

#### 1] the aff only bans taking your handgun onto college campuses, but individuals can still legally possess handguns. For example, I can own a lit cigarette but still not have the legal right to take it into a restaurant or public place. The aff misconstrues holding and possessing.

#### 2] there’s a difference between possession and ownership that this aff conflates.

Merrill 15

Chapter by Tom Merrill (Columbia law school), from an edited book: "The law and economics of possession" edited by Y. Chang. Published by Cambridge University press in 2015. Page 9.

**One of the enduring mysteries about property is why the law protects both ownership and possession.** In a pre-modern world, with low rates of literacy and no formal method of registering titles, one can understand why the law would protect possession. In such a world, there may be no concept of property beyond the understanding that persons should respect possessory rights established by others. **It is less clear why possession should be protected once property comes to be understood as ownership.** Ownership and possession will commonly overlap, and protecting ownership will protect possession. Nevertheless, even in the most sophisticated legal systems, where digital records and title registries protect ownership, **possession continues to be** legally protected **independent**ly **of ownership.** The objective of this chapter is to explain **the persistence of this dual nature of property law**, whereby the law protects both ownership and possession.

#### Standards:

#### 1. Textual accuracy-any other interp means there is no difference between holding something or owning it-it would justify you not owning your pencil just because it happened to be in the desk at the moment.

#### 1. Accuracy

a. your aff confuses the difference between a replica and it’s corresponding object. Toy handguns are not handguns in the same way that a toy nuclear weapon is not a real nuclear weapon.

b. Merriam Webster definitions are good-they contextualize common usage which determines how society defines different linguistic functions

#### Two impacts:

#### A] Accuracy comes first-the topicality rule is superior and non uniques your offense.

Nebel 15 Jake Nebel (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> JW 2/20/15

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the aff**irmative **must defend the res**olution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see **what is distinctive about** Topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the res**olution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic considerations** for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

B] key to jurisdiction-the ballot asks you to endorse the better debater in the context of the resolution issued by the tournament rules-if you don’t defend the topic then it’s impossible to vote for you, that’s the most important voter.

C) accuracy is key to fairness and education-I can’t engage in the aff since I can’t predict it-there are an infinite amount of incorrect ways to interpret the resolution-that means we can’t go in depth and you’ll always have the prep advantage.

#### 2. Ground:

This aff puts me in a double bind. The counter interp justifies any small restriction on handgun ownership as constituting a ban which means every form of gun control is aff ground. That cuts core neg ground about less extreme measures or defending status quo legislature. But, if I try to defend gun rights, they can just de-link by saying that the NC still gives people a right to own guns, it just places limitations on where you carry that. That gives you super strong defense on my NC and leverage the hyper specific aff offense to give you an auto-win. This is compounded by the fact that your plan has poor negative ground-the only people supporting it right now in the squo are the NRA and it’s getting a lot of crap-plus there aren’t a lot of empirical studies-means I need generic phil NCs to fall back on. Ground is key to fairness-ensures equal access to the ballot.

### Private Security Guard PIC

#### CP: in the United States, private ownership of handguns ought to be banned EXCEPT for private campus security guards who are licensed after adequate training.

Darragh 15 Tim Should campus security have guns? N.J. colleges are split 10-18-15 <http://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2015/10/should_campus_security_have_guns_nj_colleges_are_s.html> JW

And so within the past week, Princeton joined a growing number of institutions of higher learning that are arming their school security squads. The decision to arm college and university security personnel is complex, with administrators having to balance the deterrent effect that armed police may have against the cost of arming and training security team members, law enforcement and researchers say. Liability also is a concern, they said.

#### This exception improves the law a lot—reduces gun violence since security guards are often targeted. Training ensures they won’t misuse weapons.

Dixon 93 Nicholas (Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College) “WHY WE SHOULD BAN HANDGUNS IN THE UNITED STATES” 12 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 243 1993 JW

Private security guards would be allowed to use handguns while on duty and keep them at home, safely locked and unloaded. The justification for distinguishing between ordinary citizens and private security guards is again the nature of their work. Security guards are entrusted with the protection of large amounts of cash or other valuables, and by virtue of their uniforms and their place of work, they are visible targets for attack. Consequently, they need to be at least as well armed as potential attackers. A further distinction between ordinary citizens and private security guards is the training that the guards would undergo. Furthermore, private security companies would have to be licensed, and a condition of such licenses would be precisely that they give adequate training to their employees.

## Case

### Inherency

#### Not inherent—most colleges have already done the aff.

Armed Campuses 13 (“Guns on Campus’ Laws for Public Colleges and Universities,” http://www.armedcampuses.org/)

The overwhelming majority of the 4,400 colleges and universities in the United States prohibit the carrying of firearms on their campuses. These gun-free policies have helped to make our post-secondary education institutions some of the safest places in the country. For example, a 2001 U.S. Department of Education study found that the overall homicide rate at post-secondary education institutions was 0.07 per 100,000 students in 1999.1 By comparison, the criminal homicide rate in the United States as a whole was 5.7 per 100,000 persons overall in 1999, and 14.1 per 100,000 for persons ages 17 to 29. A Department of Justice study found that 93% of violent crimes that victimize college students occur off campus.2

#### Inherency is sufficient to vote neg on the aff- the aff has the prima facie duty of proving the plan is a significant difference from the squo.

### Self Defense Turn

#### Handguns are key to prevent assault and violence through self-defense.

Horman 12 8 Arguments for Concealed Carry on Campus by B. Gil Horman | March 29th, 2012 <http://www.gunsandammo.com/galleries/8-reasons-for-concealed-carry-on-campus/#ixzz3vjTHCEPL>

A common misconception about concealed carry is the idea that those individuals who want a permit are mostly men raised with a hunting or shooting background. However, statistics show that women are choosing to arm themselves more than ever. **No other defensive tool** available, including stun guns and pepper spray, **provides** a woman with **the kind of equalizing power a handgun offers when attacked by a larger, stronger assailant.** It’s perplexing that the same activist groups that work to empower women often strive to keep guns out of their hands. No matter where an armed assailant begins to act out against their intended victims, on a college campus or anywhere else, **it will always take time for law enforcement or security personnel to respond. Add the actual travel time to the minutes needed to relay the message, organize the teams and materials, and evaluate the situation, and it becomes clear that you may be waiting for quite some time.** In the case of the Virginia Tech shooting of 2007, the gunman, Seung-Hui Cho, had the foresight to chain the three main doors of Norris Hall in order to slow first responders even more. Don't forget, state and federal **courts have ruled** on several occasions **that police officers do not have a duty to risk their lives in order to protect another person from harm.** In other words, once they actually arrive, they are under no obligation to take a bullet on your behalf just because they wear a uniform. **This is why legal concealed carry makes sense. The person nearest the threat who can act the most quickly to stop the threat is the person being threatened.**

### Violent Crime Turn

#### Handguns on campus deter violent crime and prevent mass shootings- people with guns solve your impacts so my offense outweighs.

White 15 “OPINION — White: Open carry policy on campus will benefit students” 1-21-15 <http://www.dailytoreador.com/opinion/opinion-white-open-carry-policy-on-campus-will-benefit-students/article_413a0540-a1ee-11e4-9aad-a753b4b7158c.html> JW

The answer to this question is yes, for several reasons. While there are some drawbacks to allowing students to carry guns, they are far outweighed by the multiple benefits. Currently, the Texas Tech residence halls prohibit firearms, and they are also banned in classrooms and other university buildings. The result of these regulations is that if there were to be a major shooting spree, such as the ones seen at other universities in recent years, the only person with a gun would be the shooter. In the time between the first shot and the arrival of armed responders, many students could be injured or killed. On the other hand, if a student or faculty member in the building had a firearm, the casualty count could be limited to a much smaller number. This same logic applies to robbery and assault cases. Current laws found in books regarding self-defense should suffice in regulating the legality of handgun use on a college campus. Furthermore, allowing open carry on campus would represent a deterrent to shooting sprees and other crimes alike. If a potential criminal knew that some people in the area he was targeting might be armed, he might reconsider his actions due to the risk of being endangered. As the situation is now, the would-be criminal does not need to worry about his physical well-being while committing a crime because he/she knows the law will not allow rule-abiding citizens to carry a gun on campus. In short, legalizing campus carry of firearms would likely reduce the number of violent crimes committed on campus. It can be argued that allowing guns on campus will cause conflicts to escalate more quickly, or that there might be some cases of accidental injury or death from misuse of firearms. Taken in a vacuum, it is obvious there will be a slight uptick in accidental injury from guns if there are more of them and that some conflicts might escalate from fistfights to gunfights. However, if more people have guns, these situations will probably be neutralized quickly by other people with guns. Essentially, these effects are very small given the positive impact campus carry will have on students’ ability to defend themselves in violent crime situations since most gun carriers — like most citizens in general — will not misuse their rights.

### A2 Crime

#### Best empirics prove- no increase in violent crime.

SFCC Students for Concealed Carry <http://concealedcampus.org/common-arguments/> JW

Likewise, no state has seen a resulting increase in gun violence as a result of legalizing concealed carry (all 50 states now allow some form of concealed carry), despite the fact that licensed citizens regularly carry concealed handguns in places like office buildings, movie theaters, grocery stores, shopping malls, restaurants, churches, and banks. Virtually every peer-reviewed study on the subject, including studies by the National Academy of Sciences\* and the Harvard Injury Control Research Center\*\*, has concluded that there is no evidence that licensed concealed carry leads to an increase in either violent crime or gun deaths. According to 2002-2006 statistics\*\*\* from the Texas Department of Public Safety, Texas concealed handgun license holders were five and a half times less likely than members of Texas’s general population to commit manslaughter and four times less likely to commit murder.

### A2 Suicide

#### Handgun eligible students live off-campus and most suicides happen in the home- you have little to no impact.

SFCC Students for Concealed Carry <http://concealedcampus.org/common-arguments/> JW

Guns on campus would lead to an increased number of suicides by college students. Studies\* show that 90% of suicides are committed in the home. Because most college students over the age of twenty-one (the minimum age to obtain a concealed handgun license in most states) live off campus, allowing concealed carry on college campuses would have very little impact on the ability of college students to possess firearms in their homes and, therefore, little to no impact on the overall number of suicides by college students. Furthermore, we would caution anyone to be careful when evaluating studies that purport to show ‘prove’ that firearms increase the risk of suicide. Something can only be ‘proven’ if a randomized-controlled trial is completed; such a trial would be impossible to complete in this case.

### A2 can’t learn/debrabander

#### Guns on campus don’t distract from the learning environment.

SFCC Students for Concealed Carry <http://concealedcampus.org/common-arguments/> JW

Ask anyone in a ‘right to carry’ state when he or she last noticed another person carrying a concealed handgun. The word ‘concealed’ is there for a reason. Concealed handguns would no more distract college students from learning than they currently distract moviegoers from enjoying movies or office workers from doing their jobs. In most states with ‘shall-issue’ concealed carry laws, the rate of concealed handgun licensure is between 1% and 3%. Therefore, statistically speaking, a packed 300-seat movie theater contains between three and nine individuals licensed to carry concealed handguns, and a shopping mall crowded with 1,000 shoppers contains between 10 and 30 individuals licensed to carry concealed handguns. Students who aren’t too afraid to attend movies or go shopping and who aren’t distracted from learning by the knowledge that a classmate might be illegally carrying a firearm shouldn’t be distracted from learning by the knowledge that a classmate might be legally carrying a firearm. To emphasize the point once more, these same students carry responsibly and without distracting others when they go to the movies and malls on the weekends. What changes when they step onto a college campus?

# IPV Case Neg

### T-People Spec Bad

#### A. Interpretation: the affirmative must defend a handgun ban on all private ownership, not a specific group of people.

#### B. Violation: they specified a group of people in the plan.

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Accuracy-

The lit makes a very clear distinction between common-sense gun control and total gun bans-your aff is functionally background checks.

Lind 15 Dara Lind, 12-7-2015, "The new Democratic agenda on gun control," Vox, <http://www.vox.com/2015/12/7/9859802/democrats-gun-control> JW

The new Democratic gun control agenda boils down to something the Center for American Progress says: "Dangerous people should not be able to easily acquire guns." That means universal background checks. It means more robust mental health requirements for gun ownership. And it means preventing particular populations of people from buying guns legally — including suspected terrorists and domestic abusers. In the 1990s, the gun control debate was about particularly dangerous guns or forms of ammunition. The "dangerous people" agenda deemphasizes those policies. Instead, it's about the process by which the government decides whether it's okay for someone to own a gun to begin with. It's actually possible to pin down exactly when this shift occurred — or at least when it was formalized. In April 2013, Senate Democrats decided to try to pass a gun control bill after a mass shooting killed 26 people, most of them children, at Sandy Hook Elementary School. But then–Majority Leader Harry Reid deliberately decided not to include an "assault weapons ban" (banning guns with particular "military-style" features from being sold) in the main bill. When sponsor Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) offered it as an amendment, only 40 senators voted for it. (Compare that with 2004, when a similar bill got 52 yes votes in a Republican-controlled Senate.) When Sens. Joe Manchin (D-WV) and Pat Toomey (R-PA) agreed on a proposal to expand background checks, though, Reid and Senate Democrats tried to get it into the existing bill. When the Manchin-Toomey proposal got only 54 votes — not enough to clear the 60-vote threshold required — President Obama gave a Rose Garden speech calling it a "shameful day for America." But the legislative defeat for the Democrats opened up a big political opportunity. Expanded background checks are overwhelmingly popular — 85 percent of Americans support requiring background checks for gun-show purchases, according to the Pew Research Center. That includes 79 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of people who think protecting gun rights is more important than controlling gun ownership. Add that to the fact that a majority of senators had voted for Manchin-Toomey, and it became a no-brainer policy for Democrats to rally around — one they didn't have to worry would alienate moderates. "The trick to winning over moderates is to be the most reasonable person in the room," says Sarah Trumble of Third Way — an organization that pushes for moderation and bipartisanship. "It's not hard to support both the Second Amendment and reasonable restrictions, because the proposals on the table that people are talking about are things that legitimate gun owners do as a matter of course." Former Democratic strategist and current head of the Institute on Politics at Georgetown Mo Elleithee put it another way: "There is no more powerful interest, no more powerful constituency, than suburban moms. And I think you would be hard-pressed to find a suburban mom who doesn't support some form of increased gun safety measure. Even the suburban moms who support the Second Amendment, who like the idea that there should be a gun in the house for safety, still believe that there should be a background check." Of course, in theory, something so broadly supported would simply be passed by Congress — taking it away as a rallying point for one party. But because the NRA and Republican members of Congress are standing firm against any gun restrictions, they have allowed Democrats to seize the issue. "Right now," Trumble says, "the NRA doesn't look even remotely reasonable." And that's opened up an opportunity for Democrats to come off as the adults in the room. The urgency progressives feel has put a damper on civil liberties concerns Expanding background checks is one component of the "dangerous people shouldn't have guns" agenda. The other is who can be barred from buying a gun once the information in that background check comes back. Chelsea Parsons of the Center for American Progress brings up domestic abusers as one example. There's an "increased risk of homicide to women posed by domestic abusers who have easy access to guns," she says. "That is another gap in the law that we spent a lot of time working on, to strengthen the laws and reduce access by that group of known dangerous people." That's also the logic behind tighter restrictions on mentally ill gun buyers, another policy that's overwhelmingly supported by Americans across the ideological spectrum. In fact, it's more popular with Republicans than with Democrats — in part because many liberals feel that conservatives scapegoat the mentally ill after mass shootings to distract from the issue of gun violence. And this is where the "dangerous people" agenda runs into a bit of trouble. The particular groups targeted by restrictions are often either marginalized — like the mentally ill — or intersect with other issues where liberals tend to be much more skeptical of government power, such as national security. After the San Bernardino shooting last week, President Obama and White House officials urged Congress to pass a law barring people on the federal "no-fly list" from buying guns. Obama presented this as another no-brainer issue: "Those same people who we don’t allow to fly can go in to a store right now in the United States and buy a firearm, and there’s nothing that we can do to stop them." But what Senate Democrats actually proposed (unsuccessfully) was a slightly different proposal that dates back to the George W. Bush administration: giving the Department of Justice the power to ban people on the FBI's terrorism watch list, much bigger than the no-fly list, from legally buying a gun. A recent GAO report found that people on the watch list have succeeded in buying guns about 2,000 times between 2004 and 2014. But there are 700,000 people or more on the list. And, as progressives have pointed out throughout the Bush and Obama administrations, it's hard to even know who's on the watch list — and even harder for those wrongfully placed on it to get off. The Senate, ironically, knows better than anyone that the government's terrorism watch lists can be overbroad: Former Sen. Ted Kennedy spent three weeks trying to get his name off the no-fly list in 2004. (This might have been why the Senate went with the FBI watch list instead.) But the FBI watch list is much bigger, and unlikely to be less flawed — especially given reports of FBI profiling and entrapment of Muslims. The awkward politics of the issue are epitomized by who's sponsoring the bill in each chamber: In the Senate, it's centrist Democrat and security hawk Feinstein; in the House, it's Rep. Peter King (R-NY), Congress's most vocal supporter of surveilling American Muslims. Of course, it's not unusual for policies that pose civil liberties concerns to garner broad public support. Progressives are generally more sensitive to those concerns, but when it comes to guns, they're compelled by the sheer obviousness of the "dangerous people shouldn't have guns" logic. Parsons, of CAP, says the answer is to fix the watch list. "We should do both things. We should strive to make the watch list appropriate and accurate and constitutional, and at the same time we should make sure that individuals who are known to the FBI to have ties to terrorism aren't able to buy guns." Both moderates and advocates are cooling on assault weapons bans Though it doesn't look like Democrats will be able to expand background checks, fix what Parsons calls the "terror gap," or enact any other restrictions on gun ownership anytime soon, this could actually be good news. Much like the defeat of Manchin-Toomey in 2013, these failures are an advantage for Democrats: As long as there are policies that are overwhelmingly supported not just by the public but by gun owners themselves, but aren't yet law, there will be a way for Democratic elected officials to talk about guns without alienating gun owners. But it's genuinely hard to tell how deep the consensus on gun control among moderates (including gun owners), liberals, and Democratic elected officials goes. Mo Elleithee assumes that passing expanded background checks will build momentum for further action. "The assault weapons ban, a ban on armor-piercing bullets, a ban on high-capacity clips — that is, I think, the next level of where the fight will go," he says. "Because we don't have those things despite significant public support — it's not as high as the background checks, but there's still more than a bare majority." That significant public support, however, comes with a big asterisk. According to Pew, 57 percent of Americans support a ban on assault-style weapons; in 2013, 53 percent of Americans supported a ban on high-capacity ammunition clips. But unlike the "dangerous people" agenda, bans on these types of weapons divide gun owners from non–gun owners. Of Americans with a gun in the house, 49 percent support an assault weapons ban; in 2013, 43 percent of people who said they owned a gun supported the ban (and only 41 percent of gun owners supported a ban on high-capacity clips). "The place you're most likely to see a policy difference" between moderates and liberals, Trumble explains, "is when you're talking about bans. Liberals are much more likely to support assault weapons bans and high-capacity magazine bans. That's a dog whistle for moderates and people on the right" — talk about banning one thing, and gun owners (and those more sympathetic to them) start getting worried the government will ban more things. That isn't stopping some liberal institutions like the New York Times editorial board from calling for a version of an assault weapons ban. But at the same time the Times is embracing the concept, others in the liberal policy elite are shying away from it — not because it goes too far, but because it doesn't go nearly far enough. For some people, the problem is simply too many guns This is the other thing that makes the "dangerous people" agenda different from the rest of the gun policy debate. Gun policy experts are fairly well convinced that expanding background checks would have a meaningful role in reducing gun violence — not necessarily the spectacular mass shootings that are often the political reason Congress tries to pass gun control, but what CAP's Chelsea Parsons calls "interpersonal violence that happens in communities around the country that ends up becoming fatal because of easy access to firearms." In other words, it's not only good politics but also good (as in effective) policy. The same is true for other planks in the "dangerous people" agenda: mental health screenings, domestic violence restrictions. And while Parsons acknowledges, "I don't think that individuals on the terror watch list are primary drivers of gun violence in this country," she still thinks the "terror gap" is too obvious a hole in the law not to fix. But assault weapons bans don't work as well. As Nick Baumann wrote in the Huffington Post in response to the Times's op-ed, "Assault weapons bans are hard to write and implement, and easy to undermine and circumvent. Even a perfect assault weapons ban wouldn't do anything about most gun violence, because most gun violence involves handguns that aren't forbidden under such laws." And this gets to the heart of the problem: Many of the progressives who are worried about gun violence in its own right are increasingly convinced that the real problem is that there are, in fact, simply too many guns in America. And that means the ultimate policy solution, for them, is to take some of those guns away. There aren't exactly policy proposals for Australian-style mandatory buybacks circulating among the progressive pundit class — largely because it's a nonstarter with the current Supreme Court, which has ruled that there is an individual right to own guns (a premise that many liberals still argue with). Instead it's more of an attitude: the sense that there is not actually any such thing as the "responsible gun owner" Trumble talks about, because it is irresponsible to own something so lethal.

#### AND: private ownership in the context of the resolution is a generic noun- it refers to a category.

Debois 15 Danny (TOC champ) “Topic Analysis” Victory Briefs, January/February 2016 LD Brief December 10th 2015 JW

On the last two topics, I was very receptive to the idea that the resolution was about a principled question about the nature of adolescent rights or how jurors should deal with our imperfect legal system, as opposed to a specific policy proposal. Unfortunately for the people who like to card my topic analyses instead of cutting prep against plans, I do actually think this topic does allow much more room for the aff to run plans. Given that ban generally refers to a legal prohibition, I do think the topic is referring to a state of affairs in which there are laws that seek to end private handgun use. That being said, I do not think this topic requires the aff to defend a plan (especially if they derive offense more from why the U.S. should take a principled stand against handgun ownership as opposed to policy advantages to handgun bans), but I do think this topic permits plans in a way that previous topics have not. There is one instance in which I still think generics apply to this topic. “Private ownership of handguns” seems to be a generic noun, as opposed to referring to handgun ownership for specific agents. Narrowing the topic down to just people on the FBI’s terror watch list1⁶ or domestic violence misdemeanants1⁷ adds a level of specification that means that the aff ’s offense does not prove the topic true.

#### And- historically, handgun bans have applied to all people.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Prohibition Proposals In 1973, Representative Ronald Dellums (D-Calif.) introduced the first federal handgun prohibition bill.5 It aimed to prevent lawless and irresponsible use of firearms by prohibit[ed]ing “the importation, manufacture, sale, (p.157) purchase, transfer, receipt, possession, or transportation of handguns.”\* Because the bill prohibited handgun possession, all handgun owners would have to give up their arms or face the consequences. Dellums's prohibition and disarmament bill proposed a $5,000 fine and/or a prison sentence up to five years for persons convicted of possessing handguns or handgun ammunition. Pistol clubs could store handguns for licensed members, but such clubs themselves would have to be licensed by the secretary of the treasury. Firearms could only be transported with the approval of a law enforcement agency. Under Dellums's proposal, handguns could only be sold by licensed dealers and only to licensed pistol club members, importers, manufacturers, and other dealers. Federal and state law enforcement personnel and state licensed security guards would continue to be lawfully armed. The federal government would offer to purchase all privately owned handguns for either $25 or the market value of the gun, whichever was higher. Only a few days after Dellums introduced his bill, Rep. John Bingham (D-N.Y.) introduced a similar bill to “prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, possession, or transportation of handguns, except for or by members of the armed forces, law enforcement officials, and as authorized by the secretary of the treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers, antique collectors and pistol clubs.”6 Representatives Bingham and Dellums reintroduced their bills several times over the next few years, but neither bill ever made it out of committee. In June 1992, Senators John Chafee (R-R.L), Claiborne Pell (DR. L), and Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) introduced legislation to ban the sale, manufacture, and possession of handguns, with exceptions for law enforcement personnel and licensed target clubs. Senator Chafee exhorted his colleagues: “It is time to act. We cannot go on like this. Ban them!”7 The bill did not provide compensation to those who surrendered their handguns.8 In 1993, Representative Major Robert Owens (D-N.Y.) proposed that it be “unlawful for a person to manufacture, import, export, sell, buy, transfer, receive, own, possess, transport, or use a handgun or handgun ammunition.”9 (p.158) He exempted military personnel, registered security service guards, and licensed handgun clubs and their members. In addition, licensed manufacturers, importers, and dealers “as necessary” were exempted in order to satisfy the limited remaining market. The bill proposed to reimburse gun owners, who voluntarily surrendered their firearms to a law enforcement agency within 180 days. Violators would face a maximum fine of $5,000 and five years imprisonment. Other Disarmament Proposals The Communitarian Network, an organization led by noted sociologist Amitai Etzioni, issued a high profile proposal for handgun prohibition in 1991. “The Case for Domestic Disarmament” condemns “vanilla pale measures that have been taken thus far with regard to firearms” and calls for prohibiting handguns for everyone except military and law enforcement agencies, licensed pistol clubs, security services, and collectors.10 This manifesto was signed by 75 prominent academics, politicians, and other national leaders, including Independent Party presidential candidate John Anderson, former Illinois senator Adlai Stevenson III, former FCC chairman Newton Minow, former San Antonio mayor (and later secretary of housing and urban development) Henry Cisneros, and many prominent academics such as Benjamin Barber (Rutgers), John Coffee (Columbia), John Gardner (Stanford), Mary Ann Glendon (Harvard), Albert O. Hirschman (Princeton), Charles Moskos (Northwestern), Philip Selznick (Berkeley), Lester Thurow (MIT), and dozens of others. If handgun disarmament was once considered a fringe idea, after promulgation of this manifesto, it could no longer be so considered. The Communitarian Network called a ban on handguns “one measure sure to gain monumental benefits in the short run.” It argued that domestic disarmament is the remedy for accidental gun discharges, impulsive uses, and gun violence. According to the manifesto, criminalizing all private possession of handguns will reduce deadly crime simply by making it harder for people to arm themselves. Etzioni and his colleagues would permit very limited exceptions to the disarmament plan. Gun collectors could keep only those weapons that they render nonfunctional, for example, by pouring cement into the barrel. Hunters could have rifles and shotguns, as long as they do not have sights and cannot fire “powerful” bullets. The communitarians, with some sarcasm, encouraged “super-patriots” to join the National Guard. The Communitarian Network urged that disarmament be implemented (p.159) quickly. Acknowledging that it would be costly to buy up all existing firearms, it argued that this would be better and cheaper than devoting more resources to enforcing current legislation. It suggested implementing and testing its plan in the northeast region of the country. The Communitarian Network's proposal leaves many questions about implementation and enforcement unanswered. For example, what punishment would be meted out to handgun owners who do not turn over their handguns? Who would enforce handgun prohibition?

Historicity is a reason to prefer my interp over yours- the fact that all policies called “handgun bans” have prohibited ownership by all people is the tiebreaker and indicates my interp is more probably correct over yours.

#### A few impacts:

#### A] Accuracy comes first-the topicality rule is superior and non uniques your offense.

Nebel 15 Jake Nebel (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> JW 2/20/15

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the aff**irmative **must defend the res**olution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see **what is distinctive about** Topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the res**olution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic considerations** for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

B] key to jurisdiction-the ballot asks you to endorse the better debater in the context of the resolution issued by the tournament rules-if you don’t defend the topic then it’s impossible to vote for you, that’s the most important voter.

#### 2. Limits: they massively underlimit the number of affs—they can cherry pick any group of people in any sector combined with multiple implementation mechanisms and locations-results in a permutation of thousands of affs.

#### Impacts:

A) ground loss-you can pick a specific group that excludes common disads and lets you pick the most desirable slice of the resolution.

B) predictability-I can’t engage in the aff if I can’t predict the specific group you have chosen-you’ll always a have a structural prep advantage over me. Generics don’t solve since you can leverage the specificity of the AC against my generics and you also have infinite prep time. This also precludes all education based offense- even if discussion of the aff is good in the abstract I don’t have the necessary prep. Solvency advocate doesn’t check since the literature has dozens of different groups you can spec- people with mental illnesses, on the terror list, that live in a specific region or district, people without a specific reason for ownership, etc. Disclosure doesn’t solve since these plans are scattered on the wiki AND if disclosure checked then we would just debate the living wage topic again. If you’re not defending the topic then it doesn’t matter if it’s on the wiki.

#### 3. Ground.

I don’t get less extreme gun control ground because you’re not fiating a ban which means I don’t get advantage CPs to coopt aff offense. I also don’t get constitution NCs because the courts have ruled reasonable gun control is permissible. These are core neg generics that check back against infinite aff prep advantage that your plan precludes. Kills fairness because you have easier access to the ballot. This is specifically bad in the context of this aff- I don’t get access to self-defense turns about women using handguns against their abusers- this aff is too small to be able to answer.

Schroeder 15 Kathryn “Democrats Introduce Tougher Domestic Violence Gun Control Legislation” July 23rd 2015 Opposing Views <http://www.opposingviews.com/i/politics/democrats-introduce-tougher-domestic-violence-gun-control-legislation> JW

Although there is currently a federal law that prohibits a person who has been convicted of domestic violence from possessing a firearm, this new proposed legislation closes a so-called “boyfriend loophole” so that anyone convicted of abusing a current or former dating partner would be prohibited from owning a gun. It would also prevent anyone who has been convicted of stalking from obtaining a firearm. Klobuchar and Dingell reportedly view this type of gun control as personal. Klobuchar worked previously as a county prosecutor and helped establish some of the first domestic violence service centers in the country. Dingell experienced a childhood where domestic violence and guns were present. “I understand what a gun in the wrong hands can do and the fear and the anxiety that you live with for a lifetime,” Dingell told Bloomberg in an interview. “No one should assume where I am on guns. This is a very narrow bill. “I don't look at this as a gun bill. I look at this as a domestic violence bill.” Gun control legislation has been a popular topic of late after the Charleston, South Carolina, church shooting claimed nine lives and the Chattanooga, Tennessee, military facility shooting claimed five lives. The difference between gun control legislation of the past and what is being introduced now is that it is now much more focused on specific groups of individuals who may be more likely to become violent.

D. Voters. 1. Vote on fairness, debate’s a competitive activity with wins and losses-if the round is skewed towards once debater you can longer test debate skill. 2. Education is a voter since it’s the end goal of debate and provides portable skills-also why schools fund debate in the first place.

Drop the debater on T: 1. Drop the arg is severance from the position of the 1AC-you can just read new arguments in the 1AR or connect parts of the aff to whole res which is equivalent to kicking the aff and reading a new plan in the 1AR-skews my strat since I don’t know what you’ll argue for. 2. Drop the arg discourages the neg from reading T to check back abusive affs since they will lose the portion of the 1nc they spent arguing T, making it more strategic to let the aff get away with their non-topical affs which kills fairness and education since affs will get away with sketchy positions. 3. I had to spend time reading T to check back abuse-dropping the arg means a portion of my 1nc is moot which kills fairness and education.

Competing interps since 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom where we read increasingly unfair practices that minimally fit the brightline. Competing interps maximizes fairness and education by fostering good norms for the activity. 2. Reasonability collapses to competing interps-you use an offense-defense paradigm to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps-also means your arguments are infinitely regressive since reasons why reasonability is itself reasonable are circular and illogical.

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just because you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, because it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.

### 1NC: Race K

#### Any role of the ballot that espouses anti-oppressive education must allow for an examination of structural racism because modern society focuses on racism as individual acts of prejudice has allowed for racism to be contained within liberal movements.

Davis 97: Race and Criminalization. Angela Y Davis. 1997. Accessed January 31 2016. https://macaulay.cuny.edu/eportfolios/scott12sem2courseblog/files/2012/04/Race-and-Criminalization-Angela-Davis.pdf.

In this post-civil rights era, **as racial barriers** in high economic and political realms **are apparently shattered with predictable regularity, race itself becomes an increasingly proscribed subject**. **In the dominant political discourse it is no longer acknowledged as a pervasive structural phenomenon**, requiring the continuation of such strategies as affirmative action, **but** rather is **represented primarily as a complex of prejudicial attitudes**, which carry equal weigh across all racial boundaries. **Black leadership is thus often discredited and the identification of race as a** public, **political issue itself called into question through the invocation of**, and application of **the epithet “black racist”** to, such figures as Louis Farrakhan and Khalid Abdul Muhammad. **Public debates about the role of the state that once focused** very sharply and openly **on** issues of “race” and **racism are now expected to unfold in the absence of** any **direct acknowledgment of** the persistence—and indeed **further entrenchment—of racially structured power relationships**. **Because race is ostracized from some of the most impassioned political debates of this period, their racialized character becomes increasingly difficult to identify**, especially by those who are unable—or do not want—to decipher the encoded language. **This means that** hidden racist arguments **can be mobilized readily across racial boundaries and political alignments**. Political positions once easily defined as conservative, liberal, and sometimes even radical therefore have a tendency to lose their distinctiveness in the face of the seductions of this camouflaged racism.

#### Laudable causes such as addressing the serious problem of rape culture in the US has a long and tortured history with race relations. Protecting white womanhood was a primary justification for lynching throughout this country’s history. We’re not saying you can’t talk about IPV, but when you push out race from the discussion you allow atrocities to happen by ignoring structural problems.

Smith 06: White Womanhood, Lynching, and the War in Iraq. Shawn Michelle Smith. 2006. Accessed January 31 2016. http://www.saic.edu/media/saic/profiles/faculty/shawnsmith/Shawn-Smith\_Afterimages\_White-Womanhood-Lynching-and-the-War-in-Iraq.pdf

**In the history of lynching, white womanhood served as the symbolic banner under which the murder of men and women of color was condoned**. **In this white nationalist form of terrorism, the fury of a white mob was** most often **raised with the call to protect white women from the advances of African American men, depicted as rapists.** Indeed, as antilynching activist **Ida B. Wells demonstrated** in the 1890s, **the rhetoric of rape and revenge was so widespread**, and so effective **in converting murder into a form of "justified" retribution** in the eyes of legal authorities and a wider (white) public, **that the cry of rape eventually could simply be assumed as the explanation for lynching.**

#### This turns case:

#### 1] Racism legitimizes all forms of violence, it must be included in all political discussions.

Memmi 2k MEMMI Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ Unv. Of Paris Albert-; RACISM, translated by Steve Martinot, pp.163-165

**The struggle against racism** will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved, yet for this very reason, **it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism.** One cannot even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. **To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and** in other people which is **to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence.** It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which [person] man is not [themself] himself an outsider relative to someone else?). **Racism illustrates** in sum, **the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated**; that is it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, **we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge.** However, it remains true that one’s moral conduct only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism because **racism signifies the exclusion of the other and** his or **her subjection to violence** and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is “the truly capital sin.”fn22 It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. But no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall,” says the bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming once again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal – indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, **the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality.** Because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice. **A just society must be a society accepted by all.** If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

#### 2] Basing a feminist theory solely on the concept of gender ignores the experiences of women of different intersections who experience different types of oppression.

**WORELL & JOHNSON 97** Judith and Norine, *Shaping the Future of Feminist Psychology: Education, Research and Practice* 1997.

McIntosh (1988) attributed the restricted lens from which gender expression is viewed in the presence of white skin privilege. Espin (1995) expanded the definition of privilege and argued that privileged individuals have the luxury of not seeing anything that does not have to do directly with themselves and tend to define whatever they see as the universal truth. In Espin’s view, this myopic tendency ultimately restricts a person’s capacity to view reality in an unobstructed matter. Both Espin (1995) and McIntosh (1988) asserted that **[C]urrent feminist theory reflects** the white skin privilege of its creators and, equally important, their subsequent **ignorance of** that **[white skin] privilege.** Espin warned that **any theory is limited when it is shaped primarily by members of a society’s dominant group. Feminist theory** is no exception in that it **has both ignored and silenced the experiences of women of color, disabled women** (Fine, 1992; Fine & Asch, 1988; Hall & Greene, 1986; Solomon, 1993; Wilmuth & Holcomb, 1993), **older women** (Davis, Cole & Rothblum 1993; Hall & Greene, 1996), **lesbians** (Rothblum & Cole, 1988), **religious women** (Ochshorn & Cole, 1995; Rayburn, 1982, 1984), **poor and working class women** (Daniel, 1994; Reid, 1993), **and others** just as men, as dominant cultural beings, silence and ignore experiences of women. Whereas **Women of color** may represent a more visibly ignored group and **are often a greater focus** of attention **in examples of exclusions in** the **fem**inist **literature [but],** they **are** by no means **[not] the only women** who are not **fully represented in** the **shaping and implementation of feminism and psychology. Such omissions adversely affect the nature of our knowledge base, leaving it incomplete and faulty** (Espin, 1995). **Just as the experience of heterosexism, racism, ablebodiedism, and poverty influence the experience of gender and** of **gender oppression of those** **who [do and do not] endure them,** they also shape, albeit differently the experience of gender oppression of those women who do not endure them. For example, **When White women presume that their primary experience of gender and gender oppression is a function of their gender alone and not their race, they may incorrectly presume that characteristics of White middle-class women are core to the psychology of all women** (Espin & Gawelek, 1992). **In such a context, they may not consider that some of these characteristics are actually defense mechanisms used by a specific group of women to negotiate their oppression.**

#### 

#### 3] Non-intersectional identity violently marginalizes the people it claims to defend, reinscribing anti-feminist oppression.

BUTLER 99 [Judith, prof. of rhetoric at UC Berkeley, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity,* New York: Routledge, 1999, 7-8//wfi-ajl]

My suggestion is that **[T]he presumed** universality and **unity of the subject of feminism is** effectively **undermined by the constraints of the representational discourse** in which it functions. Indeed, **[T]he premature insistence on a stable subject of feminism**, understood as a seamless category of women, **inevitably generates** multiple **refusals to accept the category. These domains of exclusion reveal the coercive and regulatory consequences of that construction, even when the construction has been elaborated for emancipatory purposes**. Indeed, the fragmentation within feminism and the paradoxical opposition to feminism from “women” whom feminism claims to represent suggest the necessary limits of identity politics. The suggestion that feminism can seek wider representation for a subject that it itself consturcts has the ironic consequence that **[F]eminist goals risk failure by refusing to take account of the constitutive powers of their own representational claims. This problem is not ameliorated through an appeal to the category of women for merely “strategic” purposes** for which they are intended. In this case, **[E]xclusion itself might qualify as such an unintended yet consequential meaning. By conforming to a requirement of representational politics that feminism articulate a stable subject, feminism thus opens itself to charges of gross misrepresentation.**

#### Next, the aff is the EPITOME of a color blind approach. Their method is to write more criminal laws which just puts more minorities in prison and subject to police brutality.

Gourevitch 15 Alex (assistant professor of political science at Brown University) “Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power” Salon June 24th 2015 <http://www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun_controls_racist_reality_the_liberal_argument_against_giving_police_more_power/> JW

It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of gun control means writing more criminal laws, creating new crimes, and therefore creating more criminals or more reasons for police to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice. As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority. While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence. This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.” In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following: “I had an [assistant U.S. attorney who] wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant [in a case which] there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.” This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. No matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the policing involved would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations. Once individuals find themselves arrested gun control reappears as a reason for increasing punishment. Gun possession can be used to enhance sentences for other crimes and even functions as a kind of double punishment when that possession becomes the reason for also tacking on an extra criminal charge. Gun charges are also a part of the excessive and racially unequal over-charging practices that not only contribute to rising incarceration rates but also ends force numerous individuals away from trial and into plea bargains. Poor Blacks and Latinos are easily intimidated by charge-happy prosecutors into accepting plea deals, meaning they never see their day in court. Some even end up admitting to crimes they did not commit just to avoid the possibility of more severe punishments. More criminal gun laws would only feed this deeply unjust system. There is an unrecognized gap between the justification for gun control and its most likely effect. There is no reason to expect fair enforcement of gun control laws, or even that they will mainly be used to someone prevent these massacres. That is because how our society polices depends not on the laws themselves but on how the police – and prosecutors and courts – decide to enforce the law. Especially given how many guns there are in the U.S., gun law enforcement will be selective. That is to say, they will be unfairly enforced, only deepening the injustices daily committed against poor minorities in the name of law and order. It is hard to imagine any feasible gun control laws doing much to decrease mass shootings. But it is easy to see how they will become part of the system of social control of mostly black, mostly poor people. There are already too many crimes, there is too much criminal law, and there is far too much incarceration — especially of black people. To the degree that all that is part of the “dark chapter in our history,” given the deep injustice of our society, and especially its policing practices, the actual practice of gun control will continue that dark chapter, not resolve it.

#### This turns case-handgun bans target people who try to express their gender identities. You cause the very oppression that you try to eradicate.

Arkles 13 Gabriel (Associate Academic Specialist at Northeastern University School of Law) “GUN CONTROL, MENTAL ILLNESS, AND BLACK TRANS AND LESBIAN SURVIVAL” Southwestern Law Review Vol. 42 2013 <http://www.swlaw.edu/pdfs/lr/42_4_arkles.pdf> JW

Further, criminal gun control laws are not neutrally applied. In New York City, people charged with unlawful possession of a firearm are almost all people of color.98 Less than 4% of people charged with this crime are white, while nearly 70% are Black.99 Like illicit drugs, illicit guns can easily be detected through searches—lawful or otherwise.100 Because of racial profiling, people of color are overwhelmingly the targets for “stop and frisks” and other such searches.101 Gender nonconformity, as well as race, can incite suspicion and lead to searches. Not long after the Virginia Tech shooting, a parent reported seeing a white man wearing women’s clothing walking near a school.102 In response, school officials locked down the school, contacted the authorities, and conducted a search for the “suspicious” person.103 A Black trans woman in Oklahoma recently sued after people reported her for walking in the park while wearing women’s clothing and the police arrested her for disorderly conduct.104 A Black trans man whose power wheelchair got stuck in the snow described how the only help any passerby would offer was calling the police, rather than offering to take a minute to help him with a push.105 Trans women of color are routinely stopped and arrested as presumed sex workers, simply because of their gender expression and race.106 Poverty and homelessness also dramatically increase vulnerability to police surveillance and are more prevalent among queer women of color and trans people of color.107 This increased surveillance and suspicion can make queer women of color and trans people of color far more likely to get caught with guns than identically armed white, straight, cisgender men. Gun licensing laws also have been and still are applied discriminatorily. In fact, in many cases, they were originally established specifically for the purpose of depriving Black people of guns.108 According to the amicus brief filed by the Congress on Racial Equality, in St. Louis people perceived as gay, as well as women without the permission of a husband, are routinely denied licenses for guns.109 Gun laws also make guns more expensive. Many gun control laws have prohibited the selling of handguns or other cheaper guns specifically to make them less accessible to communities of color.110 The cost of running background checks and other requirements of and restrictions on manufacturers and retailers can also be passed on to consumers, again making guns less accessible to poor people and to the groups who are more likely to be poor (such as disabled people, people of color, women, trans people, and immigrants).111

#### The alternative is grassroots movements designed to reduce structural racism.

#### The alt is inclusive of all different movements for social justice and can create real national change.

Teuscher 15 Amanda “The Inclusive Strength of #BlackLivesMatter” The American Prospect August 2 2015 <http://prospect.org/article/inclusive-strength-blacklivesmatter> JW

“This movement has completely transformed how police brutality is understood, that it’s not isolated, it’s systemic,” said Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, a professor of African American studies at Princeton University, during a discussion of the 2016 election at the conference. She added that the movement’s campaign “has been a lot more effective than all the candidates who are now running to catch up. And I would include Obama in that.” Conference activists also stressed the effectiveness of small-scale organizing and grassroots strategies. Founded by three women (Patrisse Cullors, Alicia Garza, and Opal Tometi), Black Lives Matter is a fast-growing, decentralized network of about 30 chapters, and includes small activist organizations and even individuals across the country who embrace its message. Activists at the convening used the weekend to learn from other attendees what was working in their communities, and the organization’s dispersed leadership is seen as a virtue by its members. “I don’t think it presents challenges,” said Waltrina Middleton of Cleveland Action, who helped organize the M4BL convening, “because we’re here.” The diffuse organizational structure of Black Lives Matter is reflective of the fact that so many progressive victories are happening on the local or state level, from paid sick leave and drug policy reform to universal pre-K—and, of course, raised minimum wages. Indeed, the 2016 election discussion centered on local efforts rather than national campaigns. Joining Forces Police brutality aimed at blacks and other people of color is, of course, nothing new. The attention it has received in recent years can be traced to the 2012 killing of teenager Trayvon Martin, and the 2014 shooting of Michael Brown lent renewed urgency to the protests. But the rise of Black Lives Matters has also coincided with the rise of other campaigns for economic justice—primarily led by people of color, too—and those campaigns have frequently come together. Indeed, the Fight-for-15 effort that has demanded better pay for low-wage workers across the country has been intertwined with the Black Lives Matter from the beginning. Indeed, the Fight-for-15 effort that has demanded better pay for low-wage workers across the country has been intertwined with the Black Lives Matter from the beginning. In September 2014, Ferguson activists joined fast-food workers in New York City for a protest; in April of this year, Fight for 15 staged a die-in in front of a McDonald’s to protest racial injustice. “It’s impossible to organize fast-food and low-wage workers without grappling with the massive movement happening around the murder of black men and women across the country at the hands of police,” said Jonathan Westin, the executive director of New York Communities for Change (NYCC). NYCC, along with other groups such as the Service Employees International Union, was one of the organizers of the first Fast-Food Forward strike in November 2012. “The majority of workers at these jobs are people of color,” he added. “It cannot be separated; it’s their everyday lives.” Multiple workshops and panel discussions at the M4BL convening emphasized workers’ rights and economic justice. The black activists involved in the struggle for higher wages and a stronger labor movement hope that the larger labor and economic justice organizations place more of an emphasis on the fact that the beneficiaries of minimum-wage hikes and paid-sick-day legislation are disproportionately women and people of color. “Black women [are] sitting at the nexus of almost every social ill that exists in our country, particularly economically,” said Kimberly Freeman Brown, president of the KFB Consulting firm. “If black women and their economic well-being isn’t at the center of our strategy, you’re not serious about economic justice. It has to be the litmus test by which we not only measure how well our economy is doing, but how well our work on economic justice is going.” Brown was the author of the report “And Still I Rise,” which profiled 27 black women labor leaders, including Black Lives Matter co-founder Alicia Garza of the National Domestic Workers Alliance. Brown says that those women, and other leaders like them, “need to be a part of the labor movement’s decision-making on how it allocates its resources and organizes itself.” She co-led a discussion on economic justice with Marc Bayard of the Institute for Policy Studies, who was project director for the report, and with Sean Thomas-Breitfeld of the Building Movement Project. Bayard and Thomas-Breitfeld also contributed to a report called “Black Workers Matter.” “I think that we, black people, know that we aren’t going to be able to have economic and racial equality and justice without a strong organizing structure and organizing capacity,” said Thomas-Breitfeld. The first step, said Bayard, is to understand that an issue doesn’t have to apply to white men for it to be considered an economic injustice. The first step, said Bayard, is to understand that an issue doesn’t have to apply to white men for it to be considered an economic injustice. Fees for traffic violations and other minor citations that target the wallets of black citizens, discrimination against former felons—these are just some examples that were outlined in another conference workshop. The success of Fight for 15 illustrates the power of mobilizing black workers, said Bayard, but this is not sufficiently acknowledged. “What’s missing in these conversations about the Fight for 15 is obvious in all these photographs. It’s black and brown and primarily women in any photograph you see, whether it be in Milwaukee, New York City, or South Carolina. … It seems as if black people are hiding in plain sight.” Bayard added that elevating black leaders and voices is not just right—it’s strategic. “When [labor] is talked about in the context of race, like in North Carolina where Reverend [William] Barber is really active in the Fight for 15, it gets even more momentum,” he said. “It’s even more fuel. I think in some ways we’re also trying to push our own progressive allies to really acknowledge the racial elements of these issues. Because you’re not going to win without doing it.” One Rule: Inclusion In terms of strategy, Black Lives Matter organizers also recognize the importance of an intersectional approach with issues of immigrant rights. According to the Economic Policy Institute, an increase in the minimum wage would disproportionately benefit people of color, especially Latino workers, and Opal Tometi emphasizes the need to work closely with immigrant-rights groups and avoid being pitted against such communities in a “fight for pennies.” “I see the immigrant-rights movement and the Black Lives Matter movement as joining forces,” said Tometi, who is also the executive director of the Black Alliance for Just Immigration (BAJI). “At the same time, I think there are people like black immigrants who live at the intersection of both. I ultimately see there being an incredible opportunity for people of color more broadly having fair wages and a dignified living that doesn’t undermine or undercut any of the communities.” Jonathan Westin, of NYCC, cited prison reform as one example of the connection between racial justice and immigrant rights. “The detention of undocumented folks is seen as the same unjust incarceration of people of color all across the country.” By working with other local, grassroots groups, the network of racial justice advocates can elevate their issues to the national level. BAJI works closely with immigrant-rights groups like Puente Arizona and Families for Freedom. “We’ve been working with them for over a decade,” Tometi said, “so we have very real relationships with people in these other movements.”

#### No risk of a permutation-your method is indicative of a colorblind starting point where criminal law is seen as the only solution.

Gourevitch 15 Alex (assistant professor of political science at Brown University) “Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power” Salon June 24th 2015 <http://www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun_controls_racist_reality_the_liberal_argument_against_giving_police_more_power/> JW

Of course, a reasonable gun control regime is logically possible. We can imagine one in our heads. But it is not politically possible in the United States right now. And it is a great error to think that gun control is the path to racial justice. More likely, it is the other way around. Racial justice is a precondition for any reasonable gun control regime. That, perhaps, is why the demands that have emerged from the #blacklivesmatter movement focus not on gun control but instead on demilitarizing the police and investing in “jobs, housing, and schools” for those “black communities most devastated by poverty.” What happened in Charleston is a horrific tragedy. The criminal law will not solve it. I wish I had a better solution ready at hand. I don’t, though I think it would start by freeing our political imagination from instinctively reaching for the criminal law.

#### Discourse analysis precedes normative and political discussion.

Bleiker Roland Bleiker (Professor of International Relations at the University of Queensland) “Discourse and Human Agency” Contemporary Political Theory 2003

‘It is within discourse,’ one of Foucault’s much rehearsed passages (1976, 133) notes, ‘that power and knowledge articulate each other.’ The work of the French historian and philosopher epitomizes what is at stake in questions of discourse and agency. For Foucault, discourses are subtle mechanisms that frame our thinking process. They determine the limits of what can be though, talked and written in a normal and rational way. In every society the production of discourses is controlled, slected, organized, and diffused by certain procedures. This processs creates systems of exclusion in which one group of discourses is elevated to a hegemonic status, while others are condemned to exile. Discourses give rise to social rules that decide which statements most people recognize as valid, as debatable or as undoubtedly false. They guide the selection process that ascertains which propositions from previous periods or foreign cultures are retained, imported, valued, and which are forgotten or neglected (see Foucault, 1969, 1971, 1991, 59-60). Not everything is discourse, but everything is in discourse. Things exist independently of discourses, but we can only assess them through the lenses of discourse, through the practices of knowing, perceiving and sensing, which we have acquired over time. Discourses render social practices intelligible and rations – and by doing so mask the ways in which they have been constituted and framed. Systems of domination gradually become accepted as normal and silently penetrate every aspect of society. They cling to the most remote corners of our mind, for, as Nietzsche (1983, 17) once expressed it, ‘all things that live long are gradually so saturated with reason that their emergence out of unreason thereby becomes improbable.’

### IPV Statism

#### The affirmative places faith in the CJS to resolve IPV. This blind subscription to the state subjects survivors to structural violence which outweighs any benefit that prosecution could have.

Goodmark 11 Leigh (Professor of Law, Director of Clinical Education, and Co-Director of the Center on Applied Feminism at the University of Baltimore) “Legal system fails abused women” The Baltimore Sun October 20th 2011 <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-10-20/news/bs-ed-domestic-violence-20111020_1_violence-statute-domestic-violence-dixie-shanahan> JW

After learning that Topeka, Kan., District Attorney Chad Taylor planned to stop prosecuting misdemeanor domestic violence cases in response to county budget cuts, the Topeka City Council this month repealed its misdemeanor [IPV] domestic violence statute — effectively decriminalizing some domestic violence offenses in Topeka. Abuse survivor Claudine Dombrowski responded to the city's action by hurling a pair of dice at the City Council, arguing that they were rolling the dice with women's lives. Relying on the criminal justice system to keep women safe from [IPV] domestic violence may, however, be an even bigger gamble. The decision to decriminalize domestic violence in response to budgetary shortfalls sends a horrible message to women subjected to abuse — that the state is not particularly concerned about their safety or the punishment of their abusers. It is hardly surprising that women like Ms. Dombrowski are outraged at the state's seeming callousness toward their plight. In response to the public outcry, Mr. Taylor has since announced that he will resume prosecution; the city has pledged to help him seek additional funding. But this incident provides us with an opportunity to think about how well the legal response to domestic violence is achieving its goals of keeping women safe and holding men who abuse accountable for their actions. Despite the dedication of millions of federal dollars to police, prosecutors and judges since the passage of the Violence Against Women Act in 1994, rates of [IPV] domestic violence in the United States have not appreciably declined, instead keeping pace with decreases in the crime rate generally. Studies suggest that relatively few women report [IPV] domestic violence to police; that most of those arrested for domestic violence are not convicted; and that when abusers are convicted, jail time is rare and minimal. Sociologist Evan Stark has argued that the odds of serving jail time for [IPV] domestic violence are only slightly better than the odds of winning the lottery. There is no proof that prosecution deters abusers. The story of Dixie Shanahan illustrates the failure of the criminal justice system to deter abusive behavior. Residents of Defiance, Iowa, were aware that Scott Shanahan regularly and brutally abused his wife. Mr. Shanahan was convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence after punching Ms. Shanahan, and he served two days in jail. Undeterred, three months later, Mr. Shanahan was convicted of another assault and served four days in jail. After his release, Scott Shanahan redoubled his abuse — so much so, that when he was arrested and charged with felony domestic violence, Dixie Shanahan fled rather than testify against him. His abuse did not end until Dixie Shanahan fatally shot her husband to prevent him from killing her and their unborn child. She is serving a sentence of 10 years to life in prison. **The criminal justice system** undoubtedly meets the needs of some women; successful prosecutions do happen. Some abusers are sent to jail, and some stop their abuse, particularly when they are closely monitored following their release. But for women, the costs of engagement with the criminal justice system can be high: exposure to increased danger at the hands of abusers and, more problematic, the potential for violence from the state. Women who express reluctance to testify against their abusers are sometimes threatened with arrest if they fail to participate in prosecution; some are even told that the state will remove their children if they fail to appear for trial. Some women of color are understandably reluctant to increase the reach of the criminal justice system into their families and communities. Undocumented immigrant women who reach out to the criminal justice system for assistance have sometimes found themselves targeted for deportation instead. Criminal justice system reform could solve some of these problems. But the time has come to broaden our thinking about how best to address [IPV] domestic violence. For too long, the legal system has been the default response to [IPV] domestic violence in the United States. Such a narrowly crafted response denies justice to women who are unable or unwilling to engage that system. Criminal prosecution cannot heal the injuries that some women experience. A small but growing voice is coalescing around the idea that criminal justice intervention is not the best way to prevent and respond to [IPV] domestic violence.

#### Two implications:

1] Turns case-exposure to the CJS puts women at an increased risk of danger from intimate partners and causes state violence and threat of coercion. This outweighs on strength of link—the chances of being convicted for IPV related crimes are tiny and the aff has no deterrent effect. People will still abuse their partners in the world of the plan, the only difference is that the state is intrusive in yours.

2] It’s a question of your political method-proving the aff is good in this specific instance doesn’t answer the K because it’s the way you frame state action as sufficient to solve harms that triggers the link.

#### The alternative is community-based methods of reform for IPV. Only the alt solves case-permutation is not beneficial.

Goodmark 11 Leigh (Professor of Law, Director of Clinical Education, and Co-Director of the Center on Applied Feminism at the University of Baltimore) “Legal system fails abused women” The Baltimore Sun October 20th 2011 <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2011-10-20/news/bs-ed-domestic-violence-20111020_1_violence-statute-domestic-violence-dixie-shanahan> JW

Abused women and their advocates are searching for ways to achieve justice without invoking the criminal justice system. Community accountability projects enable women to craft their own responses to [IPV] domestic violence — responses that give them the validation and vindication they seek. Asian and Pacific Islander groups in the United States have used public shaming to expose men's abuse of their partners, picketing the homes of abusive men in the hope of developing community support for women subjected to abuse. Other programs focus on changing men's behavior, using male peer facilitators to help men develop empathy for their partners and confront others engaging in abusive behavior. These efforts have the potential to create real change in men who abuse — change that the criminal justice system has yet to deliver.

#### Community based IPV reforms solve the root cause of domination- the aff makes things worse by sending people to prison. Using the state in the current political climate causes more violence- it’s a sequencing question.

Huang Vanessa “transforming communities: community-based responses to partner abuse” The Revolution Starts at Home pp. 58-63 <https://lgbt.wisc.edu/documents/Revolution-starts-at-home.pdf> JW

Those of us targeted by policing and imprisonment— communities of color, immigrant, poor and working-class, queer and trans, and disability communities—have long had reason to not turn to these systems for support around the violence and harm we face, and to instead create our own interventions. This need has become all the more urgent with the increased surveillance and policing after 9/11. In Atlanta, Georgia, the South Asian anti family violence organization Raksha launched Breaking the Silence after the PATRIOT Act and increased deportations targeting the immigrant and refugee communities. “We have to think about the impact law enforcement has had in our communities,” said Priyanka Sinha, community education director at Raksha. “People don’t feel safe; our families have been broken up.” In recent memory, our movements have amplified our collective analysis and articulation of this need, answering Angela Davis’ call on The We That Sets Us Free to “begin to think about the state as a perpetrator of violence against women, and understand the connections between intimate violence, private violence, state violence, prison violence, and military violence.” Since organizers working with the prison abolition organization Critical Resistance and INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence collaborated five years or so ago to write the joint statement, “Gender Violence and the Prison Industrial Complex,” the prison abolition and prisoner rights’ movements have amplified our analysis of how gender oppression and state violence intersect, and seen a proliferation of organizing with and advocacy for people in women’s prisons and a marked growth in this work with trans and gender variant people in men’s and women’s prisons. We’ve taken seriously the task of engaging in dialogue and work with the anti-violence movements to end interpersonal violence. And radical and progressive networks within the anti-domestic and sexual violence movements today commonly acknowledge the ways in which pushing for legislation criminalizing “violence against women”—while effectively contributing to public understanding of this violence as harm that demands accountability—has helped to expand the harmful reach of the policing and imprisonment on our communities. We actively are organizing ourselves towards non-policing, non-prison responses to partner abuse and other forms of interpersonal violence: Generation Five (G5), a San-Francisco-based project that works to end child sexual abuse, has worked to build our movements’ understanding of “transformative justice” responses to interpersonal violence, premised on the understanding that our work is not only about intervention in individual incidences of harm, but also about transforming “the conditions of oppression and domination that allow that violence to happen” in the first place. G5 trains communities to support transformative justice approaches to child sexual abuse. One participant, a psychologist in a children’s agency, contacted the survivor’s extended family to create a plan to support the child, hold the aggressor accountable and support the aggressor’s process. Afterwards, she called CPS to report what happened, since child psychologists are “mandated reporters”–but also pitched the plan she and the community had created. CPS found it acceptable and stayed out; so did the criminal legal system. Sara Kershnar, G5’s director, said of the last several years that “what we’ve been able to do put child sexual abuse, intimate and community violence more on the map as a political project” and to articulate their vision for transformative justice. Most recently, G5 distributed its document, “Towards Transformative Justice: A Liberatory Approach to Child Sexual Abuse” at the United States Social Forum. A call for people to engage in developing transformative justice responses to violence, the document offers several principles in developing transformative justice responses; these include a commitment to liberation amongst those involved; shifting power relations; developing safety; seeking accountability; building collective action; honoring where we all come from; and making the process sustainable. Sara said G5’s goal over the next several years is to “find the right partners with clear politics, clear principles, and clear practices” to help create models, develop skills, and facilitate strategic thinking. Over the past several years, Communities Against Rape and Abuse (CARA) in Seattle has actively supported people and networks in developing community accountability strategies. In one situation, CARA supported a group of young women organizers who had been sexually assaulted by a male co-organizer. Because of the women’s demands, the group removed him from his position and he entered counseling with support from friends. The group also began sponsoring trainings on sexual violence throughout its national chapters. Drawing from this work, CARA for the past few years has been developing “Taking Risks: Implementing Grassroots Community Accountability Strategies,” which they contributed to the 2006 INCITE! Color of Violence Anthology. In this document, CARA shares a number of principles as a resource for people people to consider in organizing community accountability strategies: recognizing the humanity of everyone involved; prioritize the self-determination of the survivor; identify a simultaneous plan for safety and support for the survivor and community members; carefully consider the potential consequences of the strategy; organize collectively; make sure everyone involved in the group seeking accountability shares a political analysis of sexual violence; be clear and specific about what you want from the aggressor in terms of accountability; let the aggressor know your analysis and demands; consider help from the aggressor’s community; and prepare to be engaged in the process for the long haul. And Mimi Kim, who has worked to end domestic violence and sexual assault for over 15 years, launched Creative Interventions in 2004 to create space for “the people closest to and most impacted by violence to envision and create ways to make it stop” and to collect and analyze stories stories of responses to harm that don’t rely on the criminal legal system. Since 2004, Kim said, “the projects and vision remain remarkably similar, though we’re still on the frontiers of what this all means in 2007. In a lot of ways, we are building a long, long history of everyday people trying to end violence in ways that don’t play into oppressive structures.” Simultaneously, Kim said the work has been about explicitly naming leadership in women and trans folks, people of color, queer folks, poor folks, and people with disabilities and creating collective leadership. “The point of opening up and creating these alternatives,” Kim reflects, “means creating a world that is very different from this one. If kids grow up seeing that abuse gets stopped by someone right next to them, if we create subsystems where people know that if they’re violent, it’s not going to be tolerated– we’re going to create a whole different way of living in this world.” Practicing Community “We need to shift toward an underlying culture of partnership and trust and away from a culture of domination,” said Jane Dorotik, currently imprisoned at California Institution for Women, on The We That Sets Us Free. Domination underlies every single relationship, from relationships between parents and children, between governments and citizens, us and nature. In contrast, a partnership-, trust-oriented model supports mutually respectful, caring relationships. There can be hierarchies as would be necessary in all social structure, but power would be used not to constrict and control, but to elicit from ourselves and others our highest potential.” While our communities have made movement since 2004 towards community accountability strategies, this is hard work and we have a long ways to go–especially when we don’t tend to have many support systems for the kind of accountable relationships Dorotik is calling for. “The notion of accountable communities is both parallel to and contrasting from, a precursor to community accountability,” said Connie Burke of the Northwest Network of Bi, Trans, Lesbian, and Gay Survivors of Abuse in Seattle. Since we aren’t generally skilled at being accountable to each other, and this is something that perpetuates patterns of abuse, she explained, the Network sees its work as “creating the conditions necessary to create loving and equitable relationships” as a building block towards accountable communities. And rather than continue to single out people who harm as a distinct group, the Network has collaborated with survivors to develop relationship skills classes for anyone interested in building the skills to engage in the process of accountability. Burke explained that “when something dramatic and traumatic happens, if we haven’t practiced, we don’t just all rise to the occasion. We tend to do what we’ve always done.” Another project the Network has developed is Friends Are Reaching Out (FAR OUT), which supports survivors in breaking isolation and reconnecting with friends and family and to ask for the kinds of support they need. The project also supports people’s networks to come together when there isn’t imminent harm on the table to come to agreements on ways of approaching problems for when they arise. “We moved from there to people in more dangerous situations,” said Burke. The Network also has supported identitybased networks in constructing accountable communities. For instance, the community Seattle has supported femmes in constructing positive femme culture, art, and writing spaces that are “anti-racist and classaware”– not constructed in ways that exploit other women’s work. Similarly, the Network has sponsored a project called Intentional Masculinities to support trans men, masculine- identified women, people on the FTM spectrum, and some queer non-trans men in constructing accountable, “pro-feminist… loving, kind, strong, and hot” masculinities. Transforming Justice While we’ve seen some movement towards community-based responses to harms we face within our homes and networks, we have a lot more learning and growing to do. As we continue this work, it’s important that we continue to make the connections among “intimate violence, private violence, state violence, prison violence, and military violence,” as Angela Davis calls for on The We That Sets Us Free, and to make new connections with other forms of violence, like hate violence, as well. This is one area we also have much learning and growth to do in terms of responding to harms directed at us from outside of our immediate networks: How do we hold people accountable for the harm they do when we don’t have interpersonal relationships? In this moment, we have few, if any options for responses to racist, sexist, queerphobic and/or transphobic violence from people we don’t know. But in a political moment where liberals and moderates are beginning to locate hate violence on their radar, and engage with the state in responding, it’s critical that we examine our choice in language, strategy, and its impacts on our communities and the work of transformation. For instance, from the well- and less-publicized cases of Vincent Chin to Gwen Araujo and Sakia Gunn to the more recent Jersey Four–all survivors and victims of hate violence– what’s the impact when commentators, organizers, and/or cultural workers lead with the language of “hate crimes”? Defining hate violence as a crime, thus criminalizing it, enables people to be convicted of the crime and thrown into prison. We can ask similar questions of ourselves about this response as we do now of the impact of criminalizing domestic violence: What was the impact of pushing for a criminal legal response to this form of partner abuse? Did sending partners to prison, an environment and structure rooted in abuse, exploitation, and misogyny fostered by the state, make sense as a strategy to stop patterns of abuse and exploitation at home? We now know that this approach didn’t work, and that it did play a role in growing the use and justification for policing and imprisonment and expanding their harmful impact on our communities. Similarly, what is the impact of efforts to enact “hate crime” legislation and other policy efforts to limit the use of the “gay panic defense”? While such defenses are clearly absurd, efforts to limit their use ultimately are about being able to criminalize people. And when we’re facing the challenge of ending hate violence, does it make sense to respond to hate violence by calling for people to be sent into an institution that plays such an integral role in maintaining and strengthening white supremacy, the gender binary, and heteronormativity? When the only response put before us is to look for “justice” via the criminal legal system, when the enormity of what we’re facing seems as insurmountable as they do, it’s extremely hard to imagine another way. But tapping into our collective courage to dare to dream the world we want to live in is our fundamental task in the work of transformation. It’s organizing against imprisonment with people in women’s prisons and formerly imprisoned trans women–many of whom are survivors of violence at the hands of the state, and at home and/or on the streets prior to their imprisonment, many of whom are queer and/or trans people of color–that’s shown me more and more each day that investing any more of our collective “ideas, lives, and spirits” into the criminal legal system is futile–they will only continue to be “squashed by the bureaucracy and…total abuse and dehumanization,” as Misty Rojo said on The We That Sets Us Free. “It’s time we learned to stand up.” While we have a long ways to go, people have begun to take leadership. In 2005, members of the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), INCITE!, Justice Now, the Transgender, Gender Variant, and Intersex Justice Project (TGJIP), and others convened and participated in a conversation about community-based responses to harm at Creating Change. Our intent was to push ourselves and the broader LGBT movement to be accountable to all parts of our queer and trans networks, including folks directly impacted by intersecting forms of violence. And the AFSC published and distributed the pamphlet “Close to Home: Developing In novative, Community-Based Responses to Anti-LGBT Violence,” in which they wrote, “Violence against LGBT people and other targeted groups is an explosive symptom of already shattered social, economic, cultural, and religious relationships in our communities, and of the fear, rage, and resentment that is the result of those shattered relationships. The problem isn’t ‘out there,’ located only in the beliefs and actions of the pathological few; it exists much closer to home.”

#### Impacts:

1] the aff is trying to fix a cultural problem with a legal solution- that furthers state violence and can never solve root cause which turns case and causes serial policy failure

2] it’s not a question of mutual exclusivity- rather the way we sequence our discussions. The state should be the last resort and come AFTER we’ve changed cultural problems.

#### Discourse analysis precedes normative and political discussion.

Bleiker Roland Bleiker (Professor of International Relations at the University of Queensland) “Discourse and Human Agency” Contemporary Political Theory 2003

‘It is within discourse,’ one of Foucault’s much rehearsed passages (1976, 133) notes, ‘that power and knowledge articulate each other.’ The work of the French historian and philosopher epitomizes what is at stake in questions of discourse and agency. For Foucault, discourses are subtle mechanisms that frame our thinking process. They determine the limits of what can be though, talked and written in a normal and rational way. In every society the production of discourses is controlled, slected, organized, and diffused by certain procedures. This processs creates systems of exclusion in which one group of discourses is elevated to a hegemonic status, while others are condemned to exile. Discourses give rise to social rules that decide which statements most people recognize as valid, as debatable or as undoubtedly false. They guide the selection process that ascertains which propositions from previous periods or foreign cultures are retained, imported, valued, and which are forgotten or neglected (see Foucault, 1969, 1971, 1991, 59-60). Not everything is discourse, but everything is in discourse. Things exist independently of discourses, but we can only assess them through the lenses of discourse, through the practices of knowing, perceiving and sensing, which we have acquired over time. Discourses render social practices intelligible and rations – and by doing so mask the ways in which they have been constituted and framed. Systems of domination gradually become accepted as normal and silently penetrate every aspect of society. They cling to the most remote corners of our mind, for, as Nietzsche (1983, 17) once expressed it, ‘all things that live long are gradually so saturated with reason that their emergence out of unreason thereby becomes improbable.’

### Arm Survivors/Smartguns CP

#### Counterplan: The United States federal government will arm IPV survivors with smart guns.

#### No disads to the CP-smart guns mean only the survivors can use the guns.

**Cohen 09** Randy (he writes The Ethicist for The New York Times Magazine) “Give Women Guns” NY Times June 2 2009 <http://ethicist.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/06/02/give-women-guns/>

Inspired by his example, I propose curbing gun violence not by further restricting the availability of guns but by expanding and reorienting it. Men would still be forbidden to walk the streets armed, in accordance with current laws, but women would be required to carry pistols in plain sight whenever they are out and about. Were I to board the subway late at night, around Lincoln Center perhaps, and find it filled with women openly carrying Metropolitan Opera programs and Glock automatics, I’d feel snug and secure. A train packed with armed men would not produce the same comforting sensation. Maybe that’s because men have a disconcerting tendency to shoot people, while women display admirable restraint. Department of Justice figures show that between 1976 and 2005, 91.3 percent of gun homicides were committed by men, 8.7 percent by women. Many pro-gun advocates assert that armed and honest citizens deter crime. My plan would expand the ranks of those worthies. And those who are anti-gun can embrace the plan as a noble experiment in gender equality. Gun violence — most violence — is primarily something perpetrated by men, mostly upon other men, but it is also true that men shoot women far more often than the other way around. The mutual appeal to red and blue states would ensure ratification of any necessary constitutional amendment, should The Armament Equality Act (Guns for Gals) be challenged as unconstitutional gender bias. Given women’s splendid record of seldom shooting at, for example, me, they’ve earned a provisional chance to serve the public good in this way. Even if some women prove imprudent with firearms — that is, act like men — feminizing gun ownership could ultimately reduce its appeal to men, making gun-toting as unmasculine as carrying a purse. There are occupations whose status (and pay) declined once they were taken up by women: secretaries, telephone operators, teachers. We already endure the mischief of such sexism; why not harness it for good? And while some argue that keeping a gun for protection actually makes you statistically less safe, is that true if you factor in gender? I’m skeptical. But let’s find out empirically. Surely ethics compels a respect for truth, for mustering actual facts. There is the risk that some women’s guns will fall into the wrong hands: a pistol might be wrested away by a husband or boyfriend. Fortunately, “smart gun” technology is being developed that can recognize a gun’s authorized user by fingerprint or grip, or that takes other approaches altogether. A thief would be unable to fire such a gun. If fingerprints, why not a testosterone-detecting trigger-lock, a pistol no man can fire? That’s American ingenuity — oddly applied, perhaps, but no less ingenious for that. If nothing else, my plan would compel both factions, pro- and anti-gun, to reconsider their positions. If its adoption strews the streets with bullet-riddled bodies, then the pro-gun forces will have to abandon the idea that increased gun ownership decreases crime. If my plan actually does reduce gun violence, then gun-control partisans (including me) will have to reexamine their own assumptions. Regardless of the outcome, my plan will bring light and learning — actual evidence — to a debate largely characterized by squabbling and bluster. The only one who should fear it is some squirrel in Yosemite with criminal intent. But thanks to the credit card reform act, that varmint is already a walking ghost.

**The CP forces authorities to pay attention and reduce IPV.**

Charles ’11 (Chalres, Lindsay. "FEMINISTS AND FIREARMS: WHY ARE SO MANY WOMEN ANTI-CHOICE?" CARDOZO JOURNAL OF LAW & GENDER 17.197 (n.d.): n. pag. 2011. Web. 2 Dec. 2015. <http://www.cardozolawandgender.com/uploads/2/7/7/6/2776881/17-2_charles_ws.pdf>)

Professor MacKinnon said it best: **“[w]hat [women] need is change: for men to stop hurting them and using them because they are women**, and for everyone to stop letting them do it because they are men.”34 **Feminists have worked for reforms aimed at recognizing women as people worthy of equality and respect**, and this endeavor has been quite successful in some areas,35 but there is still much work to be done.36 **Changing hearts and minds is the ultimate goal. However, until that dream becomes a reality, women’s armed self-defense may be both a strategy for achieving the goal**, and a stopgap measure to prevent violence by men who refuse to see all women as fully human. Rape is tolerated, in part, because most of the time only women are hurt and no one dies. **If women began defending themselves with firepower, the authorities might sit up and take notice**. **This strategy provided some benefits for Ku Klux Klan victims in the 1930s: [A]rmed self-defense brought police intervention which martyrdom would not have done. African-Americans, Catholics, Jews, immigrants, and radicals were neither popular nor powerful in the areas in which the KKK thrived.** Public authorities and influential private citizens might well have been content to see unarmed victims brutalized or slain, if the violence could have been so confined. **When victims arm themselves**, however, **authorities are compelled to act lest incidents lead to widespread bloodshed and disorder**.37 The point is simple: while protecting the powerless may not be a high priority for public authorities, preserving order is. **Police are likely to pay more attention to a man’s death than a woman’s rape; perhaps society would care more about the latter if it had the potential to impact the former**.

#### Handgun self-defense solves IPV.

Pesta 12 (Abigail, “Do American Women Need Guns? Self-Defense Pro Paxton Quigley Says Yes,” The Daily Beast, 7/25) OS

Paxton Quigley remembers the moment she decided to get a gun. It was more than two decades ago, when a female friend in Los Angeles called her late one night with some terrible news. A stranger had broken into her home through a bathroom window. She had called 911, but the police had arrived too late—a half hour after a brutal rape.¶ “I asked my friend, ‘If you’d had a gun, do you think you could have stopped the attacker?’” Quigley recalls. “She said yes.”¶ Quigley took a gun course soon after. “I had never shot a gun. I had never touched a gun. I was actually antigun,” says Quigley, who was working in public relations in Los Angeles at the time. “But I thought, ‘This is never going to happen to me.’”¶ That first gun course gave her a headache. “I didn’t like the noise; I didn’t like the kick of the gun. I got home and fell into a deep sleep,” she says. “When I woke up, I felt so good—I knew how to shoot a gun.” Quigley bought a handgun and took a range of shooting and self-defense courses. Since then, she has taught more than 7,000 women how to shoot, has written four books on why she feels women should arm themselves, and has even designed a handbag with a holster. For her most recent book, Armed and Female: Taking Control, she talked to dozens of survivors of violence and sexual assault. “Almost all said they could have stopped the attack with a gun,” she says.¶ She is quick to say that she is not advocating assault weapons. Following the recent tragedy in Colorado, in which the shooter reportedly bought 6,000 rounds of ammunition on the Internet, then used weapons including a shotgun, a pistol, and a semiautomatic rifle to kill 12 people and injure dozens more, Quigley says she believes assault weapons should be banned and that ammunition should not be sold online.¶ “We all feel terrible about what happened,” she says. “I think it will be interesting if we can ever find out what motivated this young man to do this terrible thing. It’s emblematic of what’s happening in our society today—more people are irresponsible; more people are selfish. There’s less feeling about other human beings.” However, she says, banning all guns is not the answer.¶ “Every 2 minutes, a woman is sexually assaulted in the U.S. There are 207,754 victims of sexual assault each year. Eighty percent are under the age of 30,” she says, citing statistics from the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network, or RAINN. “That’s a lot of women walking around who are targets. They’re talking on their cellphones or texting, totally unaware of what’s going on. It’s part of the reason why people get themselves into trouble.”¶ It’s also why, she argues, women need a handgun. “There just aren’t many good weapons to protect yourself other than a handgun. If you want to stop an attacker, you have to think about the best means of stopping an attacker.” She adds, “It would be nice to live in a world of utopia, but that’s not the case. I’m a liberal. I’m pro-choice. I’ve never voted for a Republican. I just believe guns protect women.”¶ And what if the rapist also has a gun? “Then you better shoot first,” Quigley says. “If you feel that you can’t use the gun, don’t own it. You have to be ready to stop the attacker. Don’t hesitate. If you want to have a handgun, you have to be trained—I’m not just talking a course for an hour or two, but an all-day course at least. Then go to the range afterward and practice.”¶ An estimated 250 million guns are in private circulation in the U.S., according to the University of Chicago Crime Lab. There were 8,775 homicides from firearms in 2010, according to the latest data from the FBI, with 6,009 of those homicides coming from handguns.¶ Quigley argues that “a large number of gun homicides are among young men, and a high percentage of these homicides are gang-related. This is not to say that these homicides are OK—far from it, but rather that these statistics reflect a subset of the American population and do not represent the broad-based population.”¶ Banning all guns is not realistic, she says, because “there’s a huge black market out there. You know who would be getting the guns? The bad guys. In Norway, they have very, very strict gun laws, and yet a man was able to get a gun and shoot a lot of people last year.”¶ She also argues that alternate weapons such as Tasers, pepper spray, and knives are not the best defense.¶ Tasers, which fire off a jolt of electrodes, incapacitating an attacker, can be a risky bet, she claims, because “you just get one shot” before you have to reload. “If it doesn’t hit, you’ve got a problem.” (If you miss, you can still use the Taser to shock the assailant by pressing the tip of the weapon directly against the person's body, according to Taser.)¶ As for pepper spray, she says, “It can be hard to use out of doors. It comes out as a long stream, and if there’s any wind, it won’t necessarily hit the attacker—and it could blow back and hit you. You also have to hit the skin, so it means spraying to the face at a fairly close range.”¶ Of knives, she says, “I don’t recommend knives unless you’ve been highly trained, because they can easily be taken away from you.”¶ She disagrees with the argument that having guns in homes means children will get shot. “Rarely do you hear about a kid getting hold of a gun and shooting it. Three-year-olds can’t pull the trigger,” she says. “Most law-abiding citizens have their guns in a safe.” She adds, “I get a lot of flak for my position. I try to explain it to people. Some will hear it; some won’t. So many women out there are now living alone or are heads of households. They have to learn to protect themselves, protect their families. I can tell you this: a woman will be antigun, but then once she’s assaulted, she wants a gun.”

#### **Empirically proven—guns massively reduce rape**

Johnson 13 (Nicholas Johnson is professor of Law at Fordham Law School, “Firearms Policy and the Black Community: An Assessment of the Modern Orthodoxy,” Connecticut Law Review Vol. 45 No. 5 July 2013, <http://connecticutlawreview.org/files/2013/10/6-Johnson.pdf>) OS

There is other evidence of firearms benefits in the consequences of targeted firearms policy. In October 1966, the Orlando, Florida Police Department started a highly publicized firearms safety training for women.621 Women in the city had been buying guns at an increased rate after a dramatic increase in sexual assaults.622 The police department did not discourage them, but wanted to help them be safe and proficient. Over the next year, the incidence of rape dropped by 88%.623 Burglary fell by 22%.624 There is no evidence that any of the women in the program was involved in a shooting. Researchers concluded “[i]t cannot be claimed that this was merely part of a general downward trend in rape, since the national rate was increasing at the time. No other U.S. city with a population over 100,000 experienced so large a percentage decrease in the number of rapes from 1966 to 1967 . . . .”625 That same year, rape increased by 5% in Florida and by 7% nationally.626

#### Handguns are key—other weapons fail

Hunt 11 (Lester, philosophy prof @ UWisconsin Madison, “THE RIGHT TO ARMS AS A MEANS-RIGHT”, *Public Affairs Quarterly* April 2011) OS

For our purposes, a means of doing a particular type of act is effective only if it affords the agent with a substantial assurance of achieving the goal that is internal to that act-type or, if that level of assurance is not possible, it affords the agent with as close to that level of assurance as can be achieved. The internal goal of an act-type is one that is mentioned or implied in any proper definition of that type of act. Alternatively, one can think of it as a goal that is necessarily ascribed to an agent whenever one regards the agent as performing or attempting that type of act. The internal goal, in this sense, of voting is successfully casting a vote. That of self-defense is avoiding violent injury and death. If I am undertaking to defend myself, this is what I am necessarily trying to achieve. Thus:¶ The Principle of Effective Means: An option-right includes, as an essential com ponent, a right to acquire and use an effective means of exercising it (provided this means is acquired and used without wrongdoing), where "effective means" is understood as one that affords the agent a substantial assurance of achieving the goal that is internal to the act-type that the option-right entitles one to perform or, failing that, comes as close to that level of assurance as can be achieved.¶ Clearly, this last qualification is important as far as the issue of self-defense is concerned. It means that, for the right of self-defense, the Principle of Effective Means is equivalent, in terms of what means it requires as a right, to the Principle of Best Means. The reason is that attempts at self-defense, unlike many other human endeavors, are typically very far from assured of success. Attempts to cast¶ a vote, on the other hand, can often be assured of success by means of transpor tation that are quite rudimentary. In the case of my own polling place, a church¶ at the other end of a bicycle path, my own legs suffice. Typically, similar things are true of the right to freedom of religion. The internal goal of the acts to which¶ this option-right entitles one is to practice one's religion (or none at all, if one so¶ chooses). For this, fairly rudimentary means will typically suffice. Even if you¶ worship in a cramped and ugly temple, you have still succeeded in worshiping. With self-defense, on the other hand, matters are quite different. The end that is internal to self-defense, as I have said, is the avoidance of death and injury.¶ There are, unfortunately, a great many cases in which this cannot be substantially assured of success. This means that, under the Principle of Effective Means, the option-right includes the right to acquire means that come as close as possible to assuring success (provided this is done without wrongdoing). This, of course, would be the best means available (subject to the same proviso).¶ This raises rather obviously the question of what the best means is. Though I hope there is no need to deal with the empirical issues this question raises in great detail here, it is on the face of it extremely plausible that the best means in many cases (though not in all) is a handgun. There are other, more ancient means of self-defense—such as skilled use of various pointed or edged weap ons, or hand-to-hand martial arts—that can be remarkably effective in specific circumstances, but it is common knowledge that if such methods are to be fairly effective in a variety of circumstances they require years of study and, in many cases, innate talent or physical strength. Handguns are effective in an enormous variety of situations. For instance, they are useful in close quarters (unlike long guns) but (unlike knives) do not require one's target to be very close (a fact that was very important in Mr. Lee's case). The needed skills, and the all-important safety rules, are easy to learn and can be mastered by any adult of normal intel ligence who has the use of one intact hand.

### “Violence” K

#### The term “domestic violence” obscures non-physical forms of abuse and marginalizes women whose abuse isn’t primarily from violence-turns case.

Ashcraft 2k Ashcraft, Catherine. “Naming Knowledge: A Language For Reconstructing Domestic Violence And Systemic Gender Inequity.” Women & Language 23.1 (2000): 3. Literary Reference Center. Web. 10 Apr. 2012. Catherine Ashcraft (M.A. Communication, 1997 University of Colorado, Denver) formerly served as the Director of Community Education at SafeHouse Denver and is now a doctoral student in the Education Department at the University of Colorado, Boulder. Her scholarly work focuses on gender, communication, and violence, primarily within education contexts.

Instead of effectively challenging the traditional definition of violence, classification of all oppressive behaviors as violent actually accepts the dominant construction that violent behavior is more damaging than nonviolent. Because feminists attempted to frame oppressive behavior and its effects within this dominant paradigm-where violent forms of behavior are always more devastating than nonviolent forms-their only available rhetorical strategy for highlighting the seriousness of these often ignored behaviors was to define them also as violence. However, **when** abuse or **violence [is]** are brandished as **the only acceptable** or the preferred **way**s **to describe** any form of **domestic** **injustice, the terms are** in jeopardy of being **rendered meaningless.** If everything is violence, then nothing is. Thus, **relying** solely **on the term**s **violence** and abuse **make[s] depictions of different levels of domestic** **inequality** nearly **impossible. This**, combined with the use of extreme cases to capture public attention, **has solidified the public perception that domestic** **violence primarily entails physical violence**. As a result, the current discourse leaves the abusive/normal distinction unchallenged, thereby **masking the pervasive nature of domestic inequality.** In addition, **it has silenced many women who experience lesser degrees of domestic injustice. Countless women acknowledge that “something is wrong” with their marriages**, particularly that varying levels of inequality prevail, **but they do not feel comfortable defining the problem as abuse or themselves as battered women.**

#### Instead, we must use the word “domestic domination.” This recognizes power relations that cause abuse.

Ashcraft 2 Ashcraft, Catherine. “Naming Knowledge: A Language For Reconstructing Domestic Violence And Systemic Gender Inequity.” Women & Language 23.1 (2000): 3. Literary Reference Center. Web. 10 Apr. 2012. Catherine Ashcraft (M.A. Communication, 1997 University of Colorado, Denver) formerly served as the Director of Community Education at SafeHouse Denver and is now a doctoral student in the Education Department at the University of Colorado, Boulder. Her scholarly work focuses on gender, communication, and violence, primarily within education contexts.

The term **domestic domination incorporates much of what currently is defined as domestic** **violence.** Although, the use of **the term domestic violence has** successfully increased recognition of the seriousness of the nature of the problem, the term also has been coopted by dominant society and has **been used to focus attention only on** the traditionally **violent behaviors** associated with this problem. In so doing, **domestic** **violence is seen** as most violence is traditionally seen-**as the result of excessive anger or** a pathological **inability to deal with** anger, **rage, or jealousy. Such a definition masks the power relations and need for control that**, in fact, determine and **shape the violent behavior. Thus, the new** domain **term, domestic domination,** is intended to **highlight[s] the underlying element of control** present i**n these relationships.**

#### A few reasons you vote negative:

#### 1) Debate is a speech act – debaters should be held accountable for their discourse in round.

Chris Vincent 13, Re-Conceptualizing our Performances: Accountability in Lincoln Douglas Debate, Vbriefly, 2013. N

question then becomes how does our discourse justify what we believe? For many debaters it is the gaming aspect of debate that allows us to assume that our speech can be disconnected from the speech act. The speech can be defined as the arguments that are placed on the flow, and is evaluated in the context of what is the most logical and rational argument to win the round. The critical distinction is the speech act, which is the performance of that discourse. It’s not what you say, but what you justify. Understanding the speech act requires critically assessing the ramifications of the debaters discourse. Debate is in and of itself a performance. To claim that it is not is to be divorced from the reality of what we do. We must evaluate what a debaters performance does and justifies. For white debaters it is easy to view the discourse as detached from the body. For those with privilege in debate, they are never forced to have their performance attached to them but instead their arguments are viewed as words on paper. They are taught to separate themselves from any ideologies and beliefs, and feel that there is no consequence to what they say. It becomes the way in which they justify what is deemed as “rational” and “logical” thought. The argument sounds like it will be competitive so it is read but it is deemed as just an argument. Judges evaluate this as just a speech. This becomes what I deem as a performance by the body, rather than a performance of the body. Performances by the body allow debaters to not be held accountable to the words they say. Words are seen as divorced from any meaning outside of the flow, versus the performance of the body where the words are attached to the body itself. Debaters often insert the performance by the body, when they make arguments that they claim that they do not believe, but think it is the best strategy for the round. This is a false assumption, since for black debaters meaning is always connected to their bodies. The best strategy should never be one that at the same time justifies acts of racism.

#### 2) prerequisite to evaluating the aff offense-the Stanley 02 evidence in the AC says we can’t start to address the patriarchy without an understanding of how gendered politics is-the K is an epistemic prerequisite to the aff offense.

#### 3) you should reject harmful discourses-this is uniquely key in the debate space.

Shanahan 93 William Shanahan (Ft. Hays State University, Kansas) “kritik of thinking” Debater's Research Guide, Health Care Policy, 1993 <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Shanahan1993HealthCare.htm> JW

Policy has a stranglehold on debate worthy of any NYC transit cop. Argument must conform to rigid policy prescriptions - not only are particular types of arguments deemed unacceptable, whole ways of thinking are excluded also. A caveat must follow on the heels of these seemingly scathing denunciations of current debate practices: debate is excellent! Debate opens paths of thinking that compulsory statist education maliciously denies. Intellectual obedience to authority is schooled, beginning in kindergarten and continuing throughout the remainder of the students' captivity (3). Debate teaches students to question the dogma spewed forth daily in their classrooms, to inquire into the matter at hand rather than simply accept the intellectual authority of their teachers. Students initially are protected from the stultifying effects of educational institutionalization by the argument and thinking skills learned in and brought from debate. Unfortunately, debate cannot resist its own calls to "face reality," cannot resist its own dogma. In debate though, those calls rally around the policy pole, demanding allegiance to the real world. Debate has opened many paths for its participants and helped them to travel extraordinarily far. This article attempts to open additional pathways for debaters, not shut down the current ones.

#### 4) Kritik turns case-the language associated with domestic injustice is crucial to solving abuse and ensuring people are protected.

Fountain et al 08 Kim Fountain et al [PH.D, Deputy Director New York City Anti-Violence Project], "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer Domestic violence in the united states in 2008" The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs www.avp.org/documents/2008NCAVPLGBTQDVReportFINAL.pdf FD

Definitions are important because without a clear understanding of what domestic violence is, it can be difficult for survivors to determine if they are experiencing domestic violence. **Providers who do not share a definition of domestic violence may refuse to recognize this violence in LGBTQ relationships and opt to deny services**. Further, **without a nuanced understanding of the unique aspects of LGBTQ domestic [domination] violence, providers may choose to adopt a „one size fits all‟ mentality where they claim to deliver services to all equally when LGBTQ survivors are not actually receiving culturally competent or equal services**. Despite dilemmas regarding **definitions**, they **are important as they help to frame and name acts of violence and to hold perpetrators of such violence accountable**.

#### 5. Discourse shapes reality, so proving your discourse is good is a prerequisite to cross-applying the aff.. Hill 02

Hill (Cheryl Lynn Wofford Hill, "Restating International Jurisprudence in Inclusive Terms: Language as Method in Creating a Hospitable Worldview," 27 Okla. City U.L. Rev. 297, Spring, 2002, LexisNexis)

**“Language is a method that has been used to achieve a more inclusive worldview. Many** feminists, people who discern that male-centered societies devalue women and create a hostile environment for women by overvaluing the power of men, **recognize the importance of thoughts, images, and symbols in creating a worldview.** Anne Streaty Wimberly and Edward Powell Wimberly created a workbook to helppeople in the United [\*322] Methodist Church realize the importance of language in multicultural relationships. "**Language has shaping qualities. We cannot escape the influence of language. Language conveys the images we develop of ourselves**. It **[and] shapes our relationships with one another.** It shapes life stories. **Through language we learn about images and expectations of one another."** Thoughts, images and symbols are communicated through language. "**Language is power, in ways more literal than most people think. When we speak, we exercise the power of language to transform reality." Language** **converts ideas, images, and symbols into communication.** Language itself is largely symbolic, and it is an imperfect way to communicate thought. Languages serve to organize thought and create categories of ideas that can be communicated from one person to another. "Categories are supremely important in controlling the behavior of human beings."

## Case

### Substitution

#### Handgun ban makes criminals to switch to deadlier weapons-empirics prove.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some gun misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. \*327 Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [177] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [178] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [179] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [180] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [181] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [182] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [183] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [184] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [185] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [186] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose. Accordingly, the 72% substitution figure might be too high. True enough. But at the same time, at least some criminals may be highly suspicious and mistrustful of authority. Although the National Institute of Justice polling, conducted through written response to written questions, offered the respondents anonymity, some of the prisoners might have believed that their responses would not in fact be anonymous; the polling might be a "setup" to discern their plans after release, and provide a reason for denying parole. Thus, some handgun criminals might have falsely said that they would not substitute sawed-off shotguns for unavailable handguns. Do the number of braggart criminals who falsely said that they would use sawed-off shotguns outnumber the number of mistrustful criminals who falsely said they would not? It is difficult to say with certainty. But since 72% of the criminals said they would substitute, and since only 30% substitution is needed to increase substantially the homicide rate, there is a wide margin for error to assume that bragging criminals outnumber suspicious ones. Dixon critiques the Benenson and Kates estimate of a homicide rate increase because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [187]

### Illicit Markets

#### Handgun bans foster a huge illicit market—that increases gun availability.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

Dixon expects the "fact that such guns are inaccurate and dangerous to the user will also act as a restraint to illegal gun production." [129] How much of a restraint may be open to doubt. While homemade guns will not win target- shooting contests, target shooters will have their own guns (kept at shooting ranges under the Dixon proposal), and homemade guns may suffice for robbery purposes. And most homicides, like most robberies, are perpetrated at very close range where accuracy is not an issue. The risk that a homemade gun could explode in a shooter's hand may deter some otherwise law-abiding citizens who would want to own an illegal handgun for protection. On the other hand, if the person believes that the threats to his or her life and family are serious enough to commit the serious crime of buying an illegal handgun, the additional risk posed by potentially defective handgun may seem small. In addition, newfound popularity for bootleg guns might result in handguns becoming cheaper than they are now, just as in alcohol prohibition days, bootleg gin often cost less than legal alcohol had. If handguns were cheaper, they might become more available to small-time teenage criminals and other low-end miscreants; criminals might end up more widely armed than ever before. The inevitable [illicit] black market in homemade and imported illegal handguns would provide a major new revenue source to organized crime. As the black market in alcohol helped create and enrich organized crime in the United States, the new black market in handguns would fund and strengthen organized crime all the more. Dixon also acknowledges that illegal handguns would also flow in across American borders. [130] Indeed, if small handguns were imported in the same physical volume as marijuana, 20 million would enter the country annually. (Current legal demand for new handguns is about 2.5 million a year). [131]

#### Illicit markets magnifies all of the aff impacts-in the squo-batterers can’t get their hands on guns legitimately.

**Wolf 14** Supreme Court upholds gun ban for domestic violence Richard Wolf, USA TODAY*4:35 p.m. EDT March 26, 2014* <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/03/26/supreme-court-guns-domestic-violence/6918457/> Richard Wolf has reported on the Supreme Court, the White House and Congress in a Washington career spanning a quarter century (and $16 trillion in government debt.)

WASHINGTON — **The Supreme Court ruled Wednesday that a federal law intended to keep guns away from domestic violence offenders can apply even if their crime was nothing more than "offensive touching." The decision was a victory for gun control advocates and groups that work to protect battered spouses and children, and a defeat for gun rights organizations that argued the federal law goes too far.**

#### This means domestic violence offenders have to turn to illegal means to get guns to use. If you increase illicit markets then you make their access way easier.

## 2NR T Extensions

### Accuracy

Extend Lind 15- the lit makes a very clear distinction between gun control that aims to not let dangerous people have guns and gun control that aims to prevent all people from having ownership- that’s a ban. You’re clearly not in the domain of the topic.

Extend that private ownership is a generic noun- that’s Debois 15. It’s not a question of specific private ownership, but rather for all people.

Extend Jacobs 04- handgun bans that have been proposed applies to all people and attempt universal disarmament. Extend that historicity means I’m more accurate- it’s happened in the past and been my interp, NOT the counter interp.

Extend Nebel 15- topicality is good because it provides a stasis point for argumentation about anything. Think of this like rule util in a util debate- even if it there are certain exceptions to the topicality rule, for example the counter interp being good, it’s overall beneficial to stick to the rules because it minimizes the chances people will be abusive.

Extend that T is key to jurisdiction- the ballot asks you the better debater in the context of the res. If the aff advocacy isn’t the topic then there is no way that you can vote for them and you have to vote neg. Extend that that outweighs literally everything else because it’s a question of the judges highest and first obligations.

### Limits

Extend that they underlimit the amount of affs because they can just pick literally any group of people.

Extend the A point- this causes ground loss since you get to pick a specific group that excludes common disads. That’s empirically confirmed and proves generics DO NOT SOLVE. They have 1AR evidence against politics, substitution, and basically every core neg arg about why the plan specifically excludes them.

Extend the B point- I can’t predict the aff so you have a structural prep advantage over me which kills fairness and education. *Extend that means generics don’t solve because you can leverage the specificity of the aff against them.*

*Also extend that this precludes all education based offense- even if clash is good, I COULDN’T ENGAGE and have clash with you.*

### Ground

Literally so much ground less- whenever they say “generics solve,” they need to actually explain what ground I get. 1. I don’t get less extreme gun control CPs since the aff is already not extreme, 2. I don’t get constitution NCs or DAs because courts have ruled reasonable gun controls good, 3. You tag evidence in the aff as empirically denying substitution effect and proving empirical solvency, 4. You guys read 1AR evidence that is quote unquote GAME OVER on politics. 5. I don’t get self-defense turns about women using handguns against abusers because you only spec abusers. What am I supposed to read against this?

The Schroeder 15 is good here- the aff is framed in the lit as less of a gun control bill and more of a domestic violence bill. It’s super narrow and doesn’t even apply to the topic.

# Militarism

### Prisons DA

#### The plan results mass incarceration making the war on drugs pale in comparison.

Kopel 92 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “Banning Handguns?” Washington Post http://www.davekopel.org/2A/OpEds/OpEdBanGun.htm JW

But while homicides of all types would increase, America would find itself increasingly short of the prison space in which to confine the additional murderers. The drug war (which Senator Chafee enthusiastically supports) is overwhelming the nation's prisons, making it increasingly difficult to confine violent criminals for lengthy terms. In many large cities, the criminal justice system is collapsing under the immense volume of drug prosecutions. The Chafee war on handguns would make the war on drugs look small time. In California, only 20% of gun-owners obeyed a requirement that they register their semi-automatics. In New Jersey, fewer than 2% of owners of "assault weapons" have complied with the legal mandate to surrender their guns. While there are only a few million "assault weapon" owners, about a quarter of all households in the United States contain a handgun. Under the most optimistic compliance scenarios, 15-20% of American households would ignore the handgun ban. Possessing newly-illegal handguns, tens of millions of Americans would now be defined as felons, eligible for Senator Chafee's five-year federal prison term[s]. The number of new "gun criminals" would be at least as large as the current number of "drug criminals."

#### Incarceration is vicious form of structural violence.

McLeod 15 Allegra (Associate Professor of Law at Georgetown) “Prison Abolition and Grounded Justice” UCLA Law Review 1156 (2015) <http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2502&context=facpub> JW

Prisons are places of intense brutality, violence, and dehumanization.70 In his seminal study of the New Jersey State Prison, The Society of Captives, sociologist Gresham M. Sykes carefully exposed how the fundamental structure of the modern U.S. prison degrades the inmate’s basic humanity and sense of selfworth. 71 Caged or confined and stripped of his freedom, the prisoner is forced to submit to an existence without the ability to exercise the basic capacities that define personhood in a liberal society.72 The inmate’s movement is tightly controlled, sometimes by chains and shackles, and always by orders backed with the threat of force;73 his body is subject to invasive cavity searches on command;74 he is denied nearly all personal possessions; his routines of eating, sleeping, and bodily maintenance are minutely managed; he may communicate and interact with others only on limited terms strictly dictated by his jailers; and he is reduced to an identifying number, deprived of all that constitutes his individuality.75 Sykes’s account of “the pains of imprisonment”76 attends not only to the dehumanizing effects of this basic structure of imprisonment—which remains relatively unchanged from the New Jersey penitentiary of 1958 to the U.S. jails and prisons that abound today77—but also to its violent effects on the personhood of the prisoner: [H]owever painful these frustrations or deprivations may be in the immediate terms of thwarted goals, discomfort, boredom, and loneliness, they carry a more profound hurt as a set of threats or attacks which are directed against the very foundations of the prisoner’s being. The individual’s picture of himself as a person of value . . . begins to waver and grow dim.78 In addition to routines of minute bodily control, thousands of persons are increasingly subject to long-term and near-complete isolation in prison. The Bureau of Justice Statistics has estimated that 80,000 persons are caged in solitary confinement in the United States, many enduring isolation for years.79

#### The role of the judge is to adopt the best strategy for prison abolition. You have a pedagogical obligation to break away from the prison-industrial-complex.

Rodriguez 10 Dylan (Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside) “The Disorientation of the Teaching Act: Abolition as Pedagogical Position” Radical Teacher, Number 88, Summer 2010, pp. 7-19 University of Illinois Press, Project Muse

Finally, the horizon of the possible is only constrained by one’s pedagogical willingness to locate a particular political struggle (here, prison abolition) within the long and living history of liberation movements. In this context, “prison abolition” can be understood as one important strain within a continuously unfurling fabric of liberationist political horizons, in which the imagination of the possible and the practical is shaped but not limited by the specific material and institutional conditions within which one lives. It is useful to continually ask: on whose shoulders does one sit, when undertaking the audacious identifications and political practices endemic to an abolitionist pedagogy? There is something profoundly indelible and emboldening in realizing that one’s “own” political struggle is deeply connected to a vibrant, robust, creative, and beautiful legacy of collective imagination and creative social labor (and of course, there are crucial ways of comprehending historical liberation struggles in all their forms, from guerilla warfare to dance). While I do not expect to arrive at a wholly satisfactory pedagogical endpoint anytime soon, and am therefore hesitant to offer prescriptive examples of “how to teach” within an abolitionist framework, I also believe that rigorous experimentation and creative pedagogical radicalism is the very soul of this praxis. There is, in the end, no teaching formula or pedagogical system that finally fulfills the abolitionist social vision, there is only a political desire that understands the immediacy of struggling for human liberation from precisely those forms of systemic violence and institutionalized dehumanization that are most culturally and politically sanctioned, valorized, and taken for granted within one’s own pedagogical moment. To refuse or resist this desire is to be unaccountable to the historical truth of our moment, in which the structural logic and physiological technologies of social liquidation (removal from or effective neutralization within civil society) have merged with history’s greatest experiment in punitive human captivity, a linkage that increasingly lays bare racism’s logical outcome in genocide.18 Abolitionist Position and Praxis Given the historical context I have briefly outlined, and the practical-theoretical need for situating an abolitionist praxis within a longer tradition of freedom struggle, I contend that there can be no liberatory teaching act, nor can there be an adequately critical pedagogical practice, that does not also attempt to become an abolitionist one. Provisionally, I am conceptualizing abolition as a praxis of liberation that is creative and experimental rather than formulaic and rigidly programmatic. Abolition is a “radical” political position, as well as a perpetually creative and experimental pedagogy, because formulaic approaches cannot adequately apprehend the biopolitics, dynamic statecraft, and internalized violence of genocidal and proto-genocidal systems of human domination. As a productive and creative praxis, this conception of abolition posits the material possibility and historical necessity of a social capacity for human freedom based on a cultural-economic infrastructure that supports the transformation of oppressive relations that are the legacy of genocidal conquest, settler colonialism, racial slavery/capitalism,19 compulsory hetero-patriarchies, and global white supremacy. In this sense, abolitionist praxis does notsingularly concern itself with the “abolition of the prison industrial complex,” although it fundamentally and strategically prioritizes the prison as a central site for catalyzing broader, radical social transformations. In significant part, this suggests envisioning and ultimately constructing “a constellation of alternative strategies and institutions, with the ultimate aim of removing the prison from the social and ideological landscape of our society.”20 In locating abolitionist praxis within a longer political genealogy that anticipates the task of remaking the world under transformed material circumstances, this position refracts the most radical and revolutionary dimensions of a historical Black freedom struggle that positioned the abolition of “slavery” as the condition of possibility for Black—hence “human”—freedom. To situate contemporary abolitionism as such is also to recall the U.S. racist state’s (and its liberal allies’) displacement and effective political criminalization of Black radical abolitionism through the 13th Amendment’s 1865 recodification of the slave relation through the juridical reinvention of a racial-carceral relation: Given the institutional elaborations of racial criminalization, policing, and massive imprisonment that have prevailed on the 13th Amendment’s essential authorization to replace a regime of racist chattel slavery with racist carceral state violence, it is incumbent on the radical teacher to assess the density of her/his entanglement in this historically layered condition of [End Page 15] violence, immobilization, and capture. Prior to the work of formulating an effective curriculum and teaching strategy for critically engaging the prison industrial complex, in other words, is the even more difficult work of examining the assumptive limitations of any “radical pedagogy” that does not attempt to displace an epistemological and cultural common sense in which the relative order and peace of the classroom is perpetually reproduced by the systemic disorder and deep violence of the prison regime. In relation to the radical challenging of common sense discussed above, another critical analytical tool for building an abolitionist pedagogy entails the rigorous, scholarly dismantling of the “presentist” and deeply ahistorical understanding of policing and prisons. Students (and many teachers) frequently enter such dialogues with an utterly mystified conception of the policing and prison apparatus, and do not generally understand that 1) these apparatuses in their current form are very recent creations, and have not been around “forever”; and 2) the rise of these institutional forms of criminalization, domestic war, and mass-scale imprisonment forms one link in a historical chain of genocidal and proto-genocidal mobilizations of the racist state that regularly take place as part of the deadly global process of U.S. nation-building. In other words, not only is the prison regime a very recent invention of the state (and therefore is neither a “permanent” nor indestructible institutional assemblage), but it is institutionally and historically inseparable from the precedent and contemporaneous structures of large-scale racist state violence. Asserting the above as part of the core analytical framework of the pedagogical structure can greatly enable a discussion of abolitionist possibility that thinks of the critical dialogue as a necessary continuation of long historical struggles against land conquest, slavery, racial colonialism, and imperialist war. This also means that our discussions take place within a longer temporal community with those liberation struggles, such that we are neither “crazy” nor “isolated.” I have seen students and teachers speak radical truth to power under difficult and vulnerable circumstances based on this understanding that they are part of a historical record. I have had little trouble “convincing” most students—across distinctions of race, class, gender, age, sexuality, and geography—of the gravity and emergency of our historical moment. It is the analytical, political, and practical move toward an abolitionist positionality that is (perhaps predictably) far more challenging. This is in part due to the fraudulent and stubborn default position of centrist-to-progressive liberalism/reformism (including assertions of “civil” and “human” rights) as the only feasible or legible response to reactionary, violent, racist forms of state power. Perhaps more troublesome, however, is that this resistance to engaging with abolitionist praxis seems to also derive from a deep and broad epistemological and cultural disciplining of the political imagination that makes liberationist dreams unspeakable. This disciplining is most overtly produced through hegemonic state and cultural apparatuses and their representatives (including elected officials, popular political pundits and public intellectuals, schools, family units, religious institutions, etc.), but is also compounded through the pragmatic imperatives of many liberal and progressive nonprofit organizations and social movements that reproduce the political limitations of the [End Page 16] nonprofit industrial complex.22 In this context, the liberationist historical identifications hailed by an abolitionist social imagination also require that such repression of political-intellectual imagination be fought, demystified, and displaced. Perhaps, then, there is no viable or defensible pedagogical position other than an abolitionist one. To live and work, learn and teach, and survive and thrive in a time defined by the capacity and political willingness to eliminate and neutralize populations through a culturally valorized, state sanctioned nexus of institutional violence, is to better understand why abolitionist praxis in this historical moment is primarily pedagogical, within and against the “system” in which it occurs. While it is conceivable that in future moments, abolitionist praxis can focus more centrally on matters of (creating and not simply opposing) public policy, infrastructure building, and economic reorganization, the present moment clearly demands a convening of radical pedagogical energies that can build the collective human power, epistemic and knowledge apparatuses, and material sites of learning that are the precondition of authentic and liberatory social transformations. The prison regime is the institutionalization and systemic expansion of massive human misery. It is the production of bodily and psychic disarticulation on multiple scales, across different physiological capacities. The prison industrial complex is, in its logic of organization and its production of common sense, at least proto-genocidal. Finally, the prison regime is inseparable from—that is, present in—the schooling regime in which teachers are entangled. Prison is not simply a place to which one is displaced and where one’s physiological being is disarticulated, at the rule and whim of the state and its designated representatives (police, parole officers, school teachers). The prison regime is the assumptive premise of classroom teaching generally. While many of us must live in labored denial of this fact in order to teach as we must about “American democracy,” “freedom,” and “(civil) rights,” there are opportune moments in which it is useful to come clean: the vast majority of what occurs in U.S. classrooms—from preschool to graduate school—cannot accommodate the bare truth of the proto-genocidal prison regime as a violent ordering of the world, a primary component of civil society/school, and a material presence in our everyday teaching acts. As teachers, we are institutionally hailed to the service of genocide management, in which our pedagogical labor is variously engaged in mitigating, valorizing, critiquing, redeeming, justifying, lamenting, and otherwise reproducing or tolerating the profound and systemic violence of the global-historical U.S. nation building project. As “radical” teachers, we are politically hailed to betray genocide management in order to embrace the urgent challenge of genocide abolition. The short-term survival of those populations rendered most immediately vulnerable to the mundane and spectacular violence of this system, and the long-term survival of most of the planet’s human population (particularly those descended from survivors of enslavement, colonization, conquest, and economic exploitation), is significantly dependent on our willingness to embrace this form of pedagogical audacity.

#### Incarceration causes recidivism- that turns case.

Lipsey 7 Mark (Director of the Center for Evaluation Research and Methodology and Research Professor at the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies) and Francis T. Cullen (Distinguished Research Professor of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati). “The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: A Review of Systematic Reviews.” Annual Review of Law and Social Science (2007): 297-320. DL

A second area of research has examined the impact of prison sentences on recidivism. As Levitt (2002, p. 443) noted, “it is critical to the deterrence hypothesis that longer prison sentences be associated with reductions in crime.” However, the results are not supportive of the view that incarceration dissuades offenders from reoffending after they are released. Sampson & [Laub's (1993)](javascript:void(0);) longitudinal study using the Gluecks’ Boston-area data showed that imprisonment increased recidivism by weakening social bonds (e.g., decreased job stability). Using a matched sample of felony offenders in California, [Petersilia et al. (1986)](javascript:void(0);) found that those sent to prison had higher recidivism rates than those placed on probation. More recently, [Spohn & Holleran (2002)](javascript:void(0);) found a similar result for a sample from Jackson County, Missouri. Studies from Canada ([Smith 2006](javascript:void(0);)) aand the Netherlands ([Nieuwbeerta et al. 2006](javascript:void(0);)) also show a criminogenic effect of imprisonment. As might be anticipated, none of the meta-analyses of studies of this sort (summarized in [Table 1](javascript:popRef('t1'))) found mean recidivism reductions for correctional confinement. The two meta-analyses that found essentially zero effects focused on boot camps, which feature relatively short-term custodial care. Those summarizing studies of incarceration compared with community supervision, or longer prison terms compared with shorter ones, all found that the average effect was increased recidivism. Methodologically rigorous studies of the effects of incarceration are especially difficult to conduct—random assignment of convicted offenders to either prison or a nonprison alternative is not generally viewed as an acceptable sentencing procedure. The quasi-experimental studies that address this issue, however, **use** varied methods with different strengths and weaknesses. It is notable that no systematic synthesis of research finds generally favorable effects on recidivism.

#### The prison industrial complex reinforces militarism- vote neg to acknowledge that any resistance for militarism must reject the prison system.

Sudbury 4, Julia. (JULIA SUDBURY (e-mail: jsudbury@mills.edu) is a Canada Research Council Chair in Social Justice, Equity and Diversity in social work at the University of Toronto. She is the author of Other Kinds of Dreams: Black Womenʼs Organisations and the Politics of Transformation (Routledge, 1998) and editor of Global Lockdown: Race, Gender and the Prison-Industrial Complex (Routledge, forthcoming). She is a founding member of Critical Resistance, a U.S.-based organization that seeks to abolish prisons, a board member of Incite! Women of Color Against Violence, and a member of the Social Justice Editorial Board.) A World Without Prisons: Resisting Militarism, Globalized Punishment, and Empire1. www.antoniocasella.eu/nume/Sudbury\_2004.pdf Social Justice Vol. 31, Nos. 1-2 (2004).

Finally, due to its roots in Eisenhowerʼs military-industrial complex, the concept provides a framework within which to identify connections between military aggression and mass incarceration. Arguing that “we are witnessing the consolidation of a powerful military-security-prison-industrial complex that is driving an agenda of policing and aggression at home and abroad,” activists in A World Without Prisons 17 Arizona have highlighted the connections between militarism and prisons, from the use of prison sentences to undermine peace activism to the deployment of technology and weaponry developed by the arms industry inside prisons (Arizona Prison Moratorium Coalition, 2003). Angela Davis suggests further that the two systems share important structural features, producing vast profits out of immense social destruction and transforming public funds into private profits (Davis and Shaylor, 2001: 3). An analysis of the connections between militarism and prisons is critical if we are to build an effective anti-imperialist movement to oppose U.S. military aggressio**n** and occupation. At the same time, for the prison abolitionist movement to maintain its momentum at a time of brutal and unjust wars, we must develop an integrated analysis of war, imperialism, and mass incarceration. In the following section, I consider Iraq as a case study of the synergy between the military and prison-industrial complex.

#### Turns case- the logic of the prison furthers US military aggression.

Sudbury 4, Julia. (JULIA SUDBURY (e-mail: jsudbury@mills.edu) is a Canada Research Council Chair in Social Justice, Equity and Diversity in social work at the University of Toronto. She is the author of Other Kinds of Dreams: Black Womenʼs Organisations and the Politics of Transformation (Routledge, 1998) and editor of Global Lockdown: Race, Gender and the Prison-Industrial Complex (Routledge, forthcoming). She is a founding member of Critical Resistance, a U.S.-based organization that seeks to abolish prisons, a board member of Incite! Women of Color Against Violence, and a member of the Social Justice Editorial Board.) A World Without Prisons: Resisting Militarism, Globalized Punishment, and Empire1. www.antoniocasella.eu/nume/Sudbury\_2004.pdf Social Justice Vol. 31, Nos. 1-2 (2004).

The failure to locate weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and indications that British and U.S. politicians knowingly exaggerated intelligence reports about the potential threat posed by the Hussein regime, have demonstrated that the “war on terror” is not driven primarily by the desire to rid the world of the threat of terrorism. Though antiwar posters that read “No Blood for Oil” accurately identi- fied U.S. corporate and state interests in controlling Iraqi oil deposits, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were not waged simply to feed the U.S. addiction to fossil fuels. Rather, contemporary U.S. military interventions have the sweeping goal of establishing a new world order based on neoliberal globalization. In 2001, two years after the battle for Seattle brought the anti-globalization movement into the spotlight, the imperial project of remaking the global economy for U.S. corporate interests was on shaky footing. The anti-globalization movement was at a highpoint, leading world economic and political elites to meet in ever more secluded locations. Argentina, the Washington Consensus poster child, was in the midst of an economic crisis that would ultimately lead to a popular uprising and the resignation of neoliberal President Fernando de la Rúa. The failure of IMF-led economic restructuring to bring stability or prosperity to global South nations, combined with popular insurgencies against free trade and neoliberal economic prescriptions, presaged the possible collapse of the Washington Consensus and with it, U.S. global political and economic hegemony. Between the Seattle uprisings and September 11, 2001, the G8 and corporate elites were on the defensive, forced into the position of trying to put a kinder face on free trade and repackaging the World Trade Organization and IMF as agencies dedicated to poverty reduction and debt relief for highly indebted nations. However, the bloody attacks of September 11 provided the ideological fodder for a new aggressive stance. Reinterpreted as an offensive against the people of the United States, rather than one against the symbols of U.S. capitalism and militarism, 18 SUDBURY the September 11 attacks turned “average Americans” against their counterparts outside U.S. borders. With popular support at home for violent retribution and repression around the world, the Bush administration was given free reign to replace any regime hostile to the vision of a world dominated by U.S. economic interests with puppet regimes. Bushʼs National Security Strategy spells out these military goals. The U.S. military, it declares, will “ignite a new era of global economic growth through free markets and free trade” (U.S. National Security Council, 2002: Section VI). Indeed, as the reconstruction of Iraq continues, “Operation Iraqi Freedom” will perhaps be relabeled “Operation Iraqi Free Trade.” For as Naomi Klein (2003) points out, Iraq has become “a blank slate on which the most ideological Washington neoliberals can design their dream economy: fully privatized, foreign-owned, and open for business.” The elimination of regulations limiting foreign ownership of Iraqi companies and infrastructure, ostensibly to encourage foreign investors to assist with reconstruction efforts, is the first step in the radical opening of Iraq to the global economy. U.S. administrators are pursuing this radical economic surgery, despite the fact that the same process in the former Soviet Union resulted in rampant poverty, social instability, and the rise of organized crime. Iraqi protestors taking to the streets shortly after the fall of Baghdad were more succinct. Their slogan, “We will not sell out our country,” suggested that the Iraqi people were at risk of being “sold out” and “sold off.” U.S. corporations, many with senior political connections to the Bush administration, are the major beneficiaries of the reconstruction effort. Just as the war itself boosted the stock of the U.S. arms industry and private military companies, the rebuilding of Iraq has generated multimillion-dollar contracts for U.S. oil and manufacturing companies. The Bush administration has rejected the idea of a permanent colonial presence in Iraq, but this is hardly necessary for the neoliberal transformation of Iraq. With U.S.-headquartered multinationals receiving a monopoly on rebuilding roads, bridges, water and sewage plants, communications systems, and other infrastructure, it is clear that Iraq will have become a neocolonial outpost long before the last U.S. troops are withdrawn (Ridgeway, 2003). The war against Iraq, and the war on terror in general, reflects a Bush administration decision to use military force to do what the Clinton regime and IMF did through diplomacy, free trade agreements, and the carrot and stick of Third World debt — creating new markets for the U.S. capitalist elite. In this sense, regime change in Iraq is the first step toward establishing a free trade area sympathetic to the U.S. in the region. This “U.S.-Middle East Free Trade Area” would join NAFTA, NEPAD, and the much-contested FTAA in remaking the world for U.S. multinational capital (U.S. Department of State, 2003). A little noted aspect of the Iraqi occupation has been the centrality of images of crime in generating the aura of legitimacy for U.S. intervention. **During the invasion** and in the immediate aftermath, while U.S. troops were posing for photo opportunities with “grateful” liberated Iraqis, **looters were raiding hospitals,** A World Without Prisons 19 museums, and libraries and removing priceless antiquities. Although the U.S. authorities in Iraq turned a blind eye during the worst of the looting, suggesting that a repressed people were “letting off steam,” this attitude swiftly hardened when U.S. troops, allies, and infrastructure became a target. When a plethora of groups opposing the occupation — from Baʼathists to Sunni and Shia religious followers — began to take violent direct action, paternalism was replaced with a tough, punitive attitude toward these “criminals and terrorists.” Blaming the violence on “criminals” released by Hussein from Iraqi prisons during the invasion, the U.S. administration sought to mask the extent to which gun violence, armed militias, and a pandemic of violence against women w[as]ere a direct consequence of the vacuum created by an occupying power with little legitimacy on the streets. At the same time, the focus on “terrorists” and foreign opportunists distracted attention from a growing resistance movement (Ali, 2003). The criminalization of dissent in Iraq has proceeded so rapidly that Paul Bremerʼs $87 billion dollar reconstruction budget announced in September 2003, just four months after the official end of the war, included $400 million for two 4,000-bed prisons. The replacement of the dilapidated prisons of the Hussein era with U.S.-style multimillion-dollar high-tech superjails will inevitably bring U.S. headquartered private prison corporations into the lucrative reconstruction business. Facilities housing thousands of prisoners, known as “superjails,” are common in the U.S., yet most other nations have not traditionally constructed these massive structures. The architecture of the superjail is indicative of a particular philosophy of crime and punishment. In the past 20 years, three principles have underpinned penal expansion in the U.S.: penal incapacitation, deterrence, and fiscal efficiency. Rather than conceptualize prisons as places where rehabilitation should take place to prepare a prisoner for reentry into society, the workplace, and family life, “new generation” prisons were designed to meet three goals. First, they should permit the removal from society and warehousing of large numbers of population groups that are considered to be at high risk of committing crime — working-class black and Latino young men and women in particular. Conservative criminologists suggested that the U.S. would need to increase its prison population dramatically to make crime-ridden cities safe (Zimring and Hawkins, 1991: 89–115). Sentencing models like three-strikes-and-youʼre-out and mandatory minimum sentences were premised on the idea that the criminal justice system should incapacitate “career criminals,” taking them off the streets before they committed a(nother) crime. Second, new generation of prisons was designed to offer a harsh environment that would act as a deterrent to those considering “a life of crime.” Prisons providing educational programs, recreation activities, a decent diet, and adequate healthcare were considered to be “hotels” that did little to scare the inmate straight. Instead, the new prisons were to be austere environments with “no frills.” Sheriff Jo Arpaioʼs Maricopa county jail, where inmates are kept in tents in the 110-degree Arizona desert heat and made to work on chain gangs, is 20 SUDBURY the ultimate “no frills” jail. New generation prisons mirrored this philosophy with austere concrete, steel, and glass environments designed to facilitate control and surveillance rather than meaningful activity or social interaction. Third, these new prisons should cost as little as possible to incarcerate the maximum number of prisoners possible. Thus, savings were made in the design of prisons, with embedded technology such as video surveillance that permitted reduction in staffing ratios. This appearance of cost efficiency served to mask the real cost to the public of punitive penal policies, enabling legislators who otherwise favored low taxes and small government to appear fiscally responsible while spending millions of dollars to incarcerate nonviolent offenders and drug addicts. The construction of two 4,000-bed prisons in Iraq is an indication that the Bush administration plans to remake the countryʼs criminal justice system in the image of the U.S. gulag, using incapacitation and deterrence to enforce compliance by a devastated and insurgent population. Given the role of U.S. prisons in warehousing disenfranchised populations and generating corporate profits, it should come as little surprise that the U.S. quasi-colonial administration would need superjails as an integral part of the new “open for business” Iraq. Prison construction and the construction and management of “crime” are thus central to U.S. militarism and empire building.

#### The aff’s assumption of sending people to prison causes all of their impacts by justifying social control in other countries.

**Rodriguez 7** Dylan Rodriguez, University of California, Riverside .AMERICAN GLOBALITY AND THE U. S. PRISON REGIME: STATE VIOLENCE AND WHITE SUPREMACY FROM ABU GHRAIB TO STOCKTON TO BAGONG DIWA. Kritika Kultura, Issue 9, November 2007 49

Further, in offering this initial attempt at such a framing, I am suggesting a genealogy of U.S. state violence that can more sufficiently conceptualize the logical continuities and material articulations between a) the ongoing projects of domestic warfare organic to the white supremacist U.S. racial state, and b) the array of “global” (or extra- domestic) technologies of violence that form the premises of possibility for those social formations and hegemonies integral to the contemporary moment of U.S. global dominance. In this sense, I am amplifying the capacity of the U.S. prison to inaugurate technologies of power that exceed its nominal relegation to the domain of the criminal-juridical. **Consider imprisonment, then, as a practice of social ordering and geopolitical power,** rather than as a self-contained or foreclosed jurisprudential practice: therein, it is possible to reconceptualize the significance of the Abu Ghraib spectacle as only one signification of a regime of dominance that is neither (simply) local nor (erratically) exceptional, but is simultaneously mobilized, proliferating, and global. The overarching concern animating this essay revolves around the peculiarity of U.S. global dominance in the historical present: that is, given the geopolitical dispersals and dislocations, as well as the differently formed social relations generated by U.S. hegemonies across sites and historical contexts, what modalities of “rule” and statecraft give form and coherence to the (spatial-temporal) transitions, (institutional-discursive) rearticulations, and (apparent) novelties of “War on Terror” neoliberalism? Put differently, what technologies and institutionalities thread between forms of state and state-sanctioned dominance that are nominally autonomous of the U.S. state, but are no less implicated in the global reach of U.S. state formation? The intent of this initial foray into a theoretical project that admittedly exceeds the strictures of a self-contained journal article is primarily suggestive: on the one hand, I wish to examine how the institutional matrix and technological module of the U.S. prison regime (a concept I will develop in the next section of the essay) is a programmatic (that is, strategic and structural rather than conspiratorial or fleeting) condensation of specific formations of racial and white supremacist state violence and is produced by the twinned, simultaneous Kritika Kultura, Issue 9, November 2007 51 logics of social ordering/disruption (e.g. the prison as both and at once the exemplar of effective “criminal justice” law-and-order and culprit in the mass-based familial and community disruption of criminalized populations). On the other hand, I am interested in considering how **the visceral** and institutionally abstracted logic of **bodily domination** that materially forms and reproduces the regime **of the** American **prison is fundamental**, not ancillary, **to U.S.** state-mediated, state-influenced, and state-sanctioned methods of legitimated **“local” state violence across the global horizon**. To put a finer edge on this latter point, it is worth noting that given the plethora of scholarly and activist engagements with U.S. global dominance that has emerged in recent times, and the subsequent theoretical nuance and critical care provided to treatments of (for example) U.S. corporate capital, military/warmaking capacity, and mass culture, relatively little attention has been devoted to the constitutive role of the U.S. prison in articulating the techniques, meanings, and pragmatic forms of state-building within post- 1990s social formations, including those of the U.S.’s ostensible peer states, as well as places wherein militarized occupation, postcolonial subjection, and proto-colonial relations overdetermine the ruling order. In place of considering the U.S. prison as a dynamic, internally complex mobilization of state power and punitive social ordering, such engagements tend to treat the prison as if it were, for the most part, a self-evident outcome or exterior symptom of domination rather than a central, interior facet of how domination is itself conceptualized and produced. In this meditation I am concerned with the integral role of the U.S. prison regime in Kritika Kultura, Issue 9, November 2007 52 the material/cultural production of “American globality.” In using this phrase **I am suggesting a process** and module **of state power** that works, moves, and deploys in ways **distinct from** (though fundamentally in concert with) American (global) **“hegemony,”** and inaugurates a geography of biopolitical power more focused than common scholarly cartographies of American “empire.” For my purposes, American **globality refers to the postmodern production of** U.S. state and state-sanctioned technologies of human and ecological **domination**—most frequently formed **through** overlapping and interacting regimes of profound bodily violence, including **genocidal** and protogenocidal **violence, warmaking,** racist and white supremacist state violence, **and mass-scaled imprisonment**—and the capacity of these forms of domination to be mobilized across political geographies all over the world, including by governments and states that are nominally autonomous of the United States. **American globality is** simultaneously a vernacular of institutional power, an active and accessible iteration of violent human domination as the cohering of sociality (and civil society) writ large, and **a grammar of pragmatic** immediacy (in fact, **urgency**) **that orders and influences statecraft across** various **geographies** of jurisdiction and influence. It is in this sense of globality as (common) vernacular, (dynamic, present tense) iteration, and (disciplining) grammar that the current formation of global order is constituted (obviously) by the direct interventions of the U.S. state and (not as obviously) by the lexicon (as in the principles governing the organization of a vocabulary) of U.S. statecraft. American globality infers how the U.S. state conceptualizes its own power, as well as how these conceptualizations of power and American state formation become immediately useful to—and frequently, structurally and politically overbearing on—other state formations and hegemonies. The prison regime, in other words, is indisputably organic to the lexicon of the U.S. state, and is thus productive of American globality, not a by-product or reified outcome of it. In the remainder of this essay, I raise the possibility that the **U.S. conceptualization of the prison** as a peculiar mobilization of power and domination **is**, in the historical present, **central to how states**, governments, and social orderings **all over the world are formulating their own responses to** the political, ecological, and **social crises** of neoliberalism, **warfare, and global white supremacy.**

### NRA DA

#### The NRA is dying- demographics will favor gun control.

Winkler 15 Adam (professor at UCLA School of Law and the author of "Gunfight: The Battle over the Right to Bear Arms in America.") “The NRA will fall. It’s inevitable.” 10-19-15 WashPost <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/10/19/the-nra-will-fall-its-inevitable/> JW

The recent deadly shooting at an Oregon community college, like so many before it, isn’t likely to lead to new federal laws designed to curb dangerous people’s access to guns. While this understandably frustrates supporters of gun safety legislation, there is reason for them to be hopeful. The National Rifle Association’s days of being a political powerhouse may be numbered. Why? The answer is in the numbers. Support for, and opposition to, gun control is closely associated with several demographic characteristics, including race, level of education and whether one lives in a city. Nearly all are trending forcefully against the NRA. The core of the NRA’s support comes from white, rural and relatively less educated voters. This demographic is currently influential in politics but clearly on the wane. While the decline of white, rural, less educated Americans is generally well known, less often recognized is what this means for gun legislation. Polls show that whites tend to favor gun rights over gun control by a significant margin (57 percent to 40 percent). Yet whites, who comprise 63 percent of the population today, won’t be in the majority for long. Racial minorities are soon to be a majority, and they are the nation’s strongest supporters of strict gun laws. An overwhelming majority of African Americans say that gun control is more important than gun rights (72 percent to 24 percent). While the African American population shows signs of slow growth, other racial minority groups are growing more rapidly — and report even greater support for gun control. The fastest-growing minority group in America is Latinos. Between 2000 and 2010, the nation’s Latino population grew by 43 percent. Hispanics, which make up 17 percent of the population today, are expected to grow to 30 percent of the population in the coming decades. Gun control is extremely popular among Hispanics, with 75 percent favoring gun safety over gun rights. Asian Americans also represent a growing anti-gun demographic. Although only about 5 percent of the population today, the Asian American population is predicted to triple over the next few decades. A recent poll of Asian American registered voters found that 80 percent supported stricter gun laws. After the 2012 election, Republican officials said the party needed to do more to appeal to the growing population of racial minorities. Yet the party’s refusal to bend on gun legislation highlights the difficulty of such efforts. If the GOP compromises on guns to appeal to minorities, it might lose support among its core of white voters. Rural Americans tend to oppose gun control, with 63 percent saying that gun rights are more important than gun control. The country, however, is becoming less rural and more urban. Recent years have witnessed a significant increase in the number of people living in cities, with big metropolitan areas experiencing double-digit growth. This shift, like that on race, is a boon for gun control. Urban residents strongly prefer gun control to gun rights (60 percent to 38 percent), for reasons that aren’t hard to understand. When gun violence is on your television news every night and police are commonplace, people may come to view guns more as a threat than a savior. Support for gun control is correlated, too, with levels of education. Gun rights are favored by a slim majority of those who attended only high school (50 percent to 47 percent). Among those with a college degree, however, 58 percent favor gun control, compared with 38 percent for gun rights. This demographic is also trending in a favorable direction for gun control advocates. Between 2002 and 2012, enrollment in degree-granting institutions increased by 24 percent. Other changes occurring in the United States further complicate matters for the nation’s leading gun rights organization. For years, the NRA focused on the interests of hunters and recreational shooters. As hunting declined precipitously after 1970 (when over 40 million Americans had hunting licenses, compared with 14 million today), the NRA’s justification for gun ownership shifted toward self-defense. During the 1970s and ’80s, when crime rates were skyrocketing, the self-defense argument easily found an audience. Yet recent years have seen a drastic reduction in crime; today the crime rate is half of what it was in 1980. Given that this drop coincided with a serious economic downturn, which is usually a predictor of an increase in crime, it is not unreasonable to predict that crime rates aren’t likely to climb significantly anytime soon. There is one demographic change that helps the NRA. Americans are aging, and older people tend to favor gun rights over gun control by a slim margin (48 percent to 47 percent). Yet these numbers aren’t radically different from young people (48 percent to 50 percent), so even an aging population won’t be nearly enough to counter the other, stronger demographic shifts. Of course, the NRA will continue to fight, and fight hard, against gun control. But the heart of the organization’s power is the voters it can turn out to vote, and they are likely to decline in number. Unless the organization begins to soften its no-compromises stance on gun safety legislation, it’s likely to become increasingly marginalized in a changing America.

#### Prohibition proves the plan will fail.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Who would enforce handgun disarmament and with what degree of vigor? National Alcohol Prohibition was enforced by a small number of U.S. Treasury Department agents and by state and local police departments. Criminal justice and organized crime scholar Humbert S. Nelli writes that “Prohibition overburdened the criminal justice system and undermined respect for the nation's law.” Another author recalled that “organization and methods…were hopelessly inadequate.”20 Professor McBain of Columbia Law School wrote in 1928 that “the large-liquor drinking public has been indifferent to, if not positively in favor of, the corruption that helps to keep the stimulating stream flowing without interruption…the [police] force from the beginning has been thoroughly spoils-ridden.”21 In many cities, the police were contemptuous of alcohol prohibition and did not enforce it; corruption flourished. History has repeated itself with the contemporary drug war. After the Supreme Court's decision in Printz, rejecting federal authority to order state and local officials to conduct background checks, National Handgun Prohibition might have to be a completely federal program.22 What kind of a federal enforcement agency would be needed to investigate and deter unlawful handgun possession? Currently, most illegal handguns are seized as a consequence of street or car stops made by local law enforcement agents; a frisk reveals the gun.23 Routine car and street stops are (p.164) not the province of federal agents, who lack general street-level policing authority and experience. Perhaps BATF could be expanded into a super nationwide street-level police agency with tens of thousands of new agents? Such a move would have to overcome the opposition of the NRA, gun owners, some members of Congress, and others who excoriate BATF agents as “jack-booted minions.”\* It would also have to overcome those who oppose expanding federal power and expending a great deal of federal funds. Undoubtedly, there would be opposition and resistance from fringe elements, who for years have warned of a colossal and despotic federal government. The number of militia groups would probably grow, with the potential for Waco-type standoffs and shootouts.24

#### Prosecutors will refuse to enforce the aff.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Some prosecutors, for political or practical reasons, would hesitate to prosecute unlawful possession cases, just as prosecutors today do not prosecute every drug possession case. They would face serious difficulties convicting defendants with no criminal record who claim to possess a gun for self-defense or sport. Currently, federal prosecutors decline to prosecute a high percentage of charges even against persons with felony records when, though possessing firearms illegally, the arrested person has committed no other crime.25 It would be much more difficult to convince federal or state prosecutors to bring charges against otherwise lawabiding persons for merely violating National Handgun Prohibition. Even if prosecutors brought charges, it would be difficult to get unanimous guilty verdicts from jurors who, in many states, would be inclined to nullify the unpopular law.

#### Most people who own handguns and would nullify the plan in court- kills enforcement.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Impediments to More Gun Controls” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

U.S. federalism, a large and entrenched gun subculture, the lobbying strength of the NRA, and the widespread belief of millions of Americans that the Constitution guarantees their right to keep and bear arms pose major political obstacles to the passage of federal gun controls, other than those directed at punishing criminal use of guns. Beyond that, the fervent belief by a large percentage of gun owners that gun controllers ultimately intend to confiscate all personal firearms means that if any strong gun controls were enacted, they would encounter widespread noncompliance and resistance, including jury nullification. Since approximately 45% of American households contain a firearm, there is nearly a 100% chance that every 12-person jury will contain at least one gun owner, which is all that would be needed to prevent conviction.

#### The plan will just be implemented on minority communities leaving other areas unaffected.

Gourevitch 15 Alex (assistant professor of political science at Brown University) “Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power” Salon June 24th 2015 <http://www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun_controls_racist_reality_the_liberal_argument_against_giving_police_more_power/> JW

It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of gun control means writing more criminal laws, creating new crimes, and therefore creating more criminals or more reasons for police to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice. As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority. While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence. This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.” In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following: “I had an [assistant U.S. attorney who] wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant [in a case which] there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.” This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. No matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the policing involved would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations.

#### The plan creates a “war on handguns” which would be a decades-long civil war against a majority of American citizens.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Impediments to More Gun Controls” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

“Prohibition” is a slogan. What it means and how it would be implemented and enforced are questions that have hardly begun to be addressed. The devil is in the details. What groups and individuals would (p.169) be exempted from the prohibition? Would all firearms be prohibited or just handguns? National Handgun Prohibition could apply to manufacture, importation, sale, or possession. Ending manufacture of new guns would be easiest to implement, but more than 100 million handguns would by then be in private hands, augmented by imports and the production of small clandestine shops. Prohibiting possession would require disarming the citizenry; whether done quickly or over a long period, it would be a monumental challenge, fraught with danger. Millions of citizens would not surrender their handguns. If black market activity in connection with the drug laws is any indication, a decades-long “war on handguns” might resemble a low-grade civil war more than a law enforcement initiative.

#### This turns case: ineffective disarmament makes future gun control impossible and alienates the citizenry.

Mauser 3 Gary A. “The Failed Experiment Gun Control and Public Safety in Canada, Australia, England and Wales” Number 71 / November 2003. PUBLIC POLICY SOURCES. [www.gunsandcrime.org/faildxprmt.pdf NP 2/6/16](http://www.gunsandcrime.org/faildxprmt.pdf%20NP%202/6/16)

The demonization of average people who happen to own a gun lays the foundation for a massive increase in governmental intrusiveness in the lives of ordinary citizens. Firearm registration and owner licensing threatens long-standing Canadian liberties and freedoms. The type of gun control Canada has enacted is not consistent with many democratic principles and the protection of civil liberties. Nevertheless, Canada is spearheading a move in the United Nations to impose a similar regime of draconian restrictions around the world. Disarming the public greatly increases cynicism about government among much of the population and it diminishes their willingness to comply with other, future regulations that might even be more sensible. The sense of alienation grows with the severity of the restrictions and with the ineffectiveness of their result. Unfortunately, policy dictates that the current directions will continue and, more important, will not be examined critically. This last is a guarantee of the increase of that future alienation. It will only worsen as the mass media become slowly aware that their bias towards the banning of guns has been misdirected and begin shifting their attention to the large quantities of money that have been wasted in pursuit of a dream of social engineering that was doomed from the start. Only the United States has witnessed a dramatic drop in criminal violence over the past decade. The justice system in the United States differs in many ways from those in the Commonwealth but one of the important reasons for the drop in violent crime may be that responsible citizens are increasingly carrying concealed handguns (Lott 2000). In contrast, authorities in the PUBLIC POLICY SOURCES, NUMBER 71 The Failed Experiment 20 The Fraser Institute Commonwealth insist upon a monopoly of force. If the goal is deterring criminal violence, perhaps it is time for Commonwealth countries to encourage more individual self-reliance. Gun laws may not reduce violent crime but criminal violence causes gun laws—at least, well-publicized crimes do. The only winner in this drama is bureaucracy. The rest of us lose liberty as well as safety. It is an illusion that further tinkering with the law will protect the public since no law, no matter how restrictive, can protect us from people who decide to commit violent crimes. There have always been criminals, and there have always been deranged people. Murder has been illegal for thousands of years: we need only remember the saga of Cain and Abel. The mass media find gun crimes more newsworthy but multiple civilian murders by arson have historically claimed more lives than incidents involving firearms.

## Case

### Overview

#### 1. Their advocacy merely eliminates a symptom of militarism rather than the system of militarism itself. Broader market structures cause all of the aff harms and guns are one particular and ugly way in which this is manifested. NONE of the aff evidence says that guns cause our society to be militaristic so they can never solve for the broader problem. In order to win, they would have to prove that the aff causes a replacement of the global neoliberal economic order, which is absurd.

#### 2. Things can get worse- gun violence can multiply as it’s happened in the past, and society can become more militarized like Europe in World War 2- try or die is fallacious because the aff has linear impacts. That also means the aff is consequentialist since your harms are instrumentally bad and can be aggregated. You need solvency to win the round.

#### 3. I control uniqueness: gun culture is declining in the squo- 6 warrants.

D’Amora 15 Delphine 12-10-15 “6 Signs the NRA Is Losing Its Stranglehold on Gun Policy” Mother Jones <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/12/nra-losing-stranglehold-gun-policy> JW

For gun control advocates, this year's doom has been compounded by an ample dose of gloom. Even after a series of high-profile mass shootings and a reported death toll from gun violence topping 12,000 last year, Congress remains deadlocked and unlikely to pass any laws aimed at reducing gun deaths. But beneath the morass of bad news are glimpses of progress. In schools, communities, states, and even in the federal government, people are taking action to curb the gun violence epidemic. Here are six areas in which gun control is actually advancing in America. 1. The Supreme Court opted not to expand Second Amendment protections. On Monday, the Supreme Court declined to hear a case that could have cemented an even wider interpretation of the Second Amendment into national law. The decision came less than a week after shooters in San Bernardino, California, used semi-automatic weapons to slaughter 14 people at an office party in what the FBI is now investigating as an act of terrorism. In the case, the Illinois branch of the National Rifle Association argued that a Chicago suburb’s ban on semi-automatic weapons and high-capacity magazines violated the Second Amendment. Although there was no official ruling, the court's decision to turn down the case effectively affirmed the lower court's decision not to expand Second Amendment protections—thereby opening the door to further local regulation. In its last two gun cases, in 2008 and 2010, the Supreme Court had significantly expanded the reach of the Second Amendment. In 2008, the court overturned a ban on handguns in the District of Columbia; in 2010, it did the same for a handgun ban in Chicago. Now, by contrast, the court may be indicating that the much-contested right to bear arms should have its limitations. 2. States are taking action. The court’s decision looks even more significant in light of the fact that state governments are already taking many of the steps that Congress won’t. In the year following the tragic 2012 shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary in Newtown, Connecticut, eight states passed major gun reform laws. The momentum has continued: Voters in Washington state last year resoundingly approved universal background checks for gun purchases, and several states have moved to restrict domestic abusers' access to firearms this year.\* Next November, Nevada residents will also vote on a background-check initiative, which made it onto the state ballot with the support of Michael Bloomberg’s gun control group Everytown for Gun Safety. In California, which already has some of the most stringent gun control laws in the country, a gubernatorial candidate is working to put even tighter legislation on the ballot. Want to see how your own state ranks on gun control? The Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence has created this handy scorecard. 3. Most Americans, including gun owners, support some degree of gun control. Congress may not be able to come to a productive compromise, but Americans do agree on some key gun control policies. A survey last month found that a striking 83 percent of gun owners, including many NRA members, support requiring all prospective gun buyers to undergo a background check. A Gallup poll released in October—after the shootings at Umpqua Community College in Oregon but before last week's attack in Sen Bernardino—found that 55 percent of Americans favored stricter control of gun sales. Support for gun control has traditionally peaked following mass shootings, only to subside later. Recent polls suggest that fear of terrorism has edged out fear of guns in the popular psyche—despite the fact that jihadist terrorists have killed just 45 people in the United States since September 11, 2001, compared with the more than 12,000 people killed last year alone by gun violence. 4. More and more people say gun violence should be researched as a public health issue. Last Wednesday, mere hours before the attack in San Bernardino, 2,000 doctors publicly urged Congress to repeal an amendment that has blocked government research on gun violence for nearly two decades. The so-called Dickey Amendment was propelled through Congress by Republican legislators in 1996 under pressure from the NRA. Due to the provision, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health have been unable to put any federal funds toward gun violence research, leaving attempts to curb gun violence hogtied by a lack of information. But opposition to the amendment is growing. Democratic lawmakers in both the House and the Senate have appealed for a return to federal gun violence research in recent months. Even the amendment's author, former Rep. Jay Dickey (R-Ark.), has publicly called for it to be overturned. 5. Schools across the country are talking to their students about guns. Tens of thousands of students across the country have signed their names to an anti-gun-violence pledge this year, promising not to bear arms at school and to resolve conflicts by nonviolent means. The pledge was born in the mid-1990s, when creator Mary Lewis Grow realized that the conversation about gun violence rarely reached the nation's youth. Determined to change that, she founded the Student Pledge Against Gun Violence in 1996. It enjoyed a decade of popularity before fading from public view. Widespread dismay at the lack of government action following the massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary rekindled interest in the pledge, Grow told gun news website The Trace. "I think [people] started looking for other ways to address gun violence," she said. Students in at least five states have taken the pledge this year, including 59,000 in Georgia and 21,000 in Louisiana. The pledge goes as follows: "I will never bring a gun to school. I will never use a gun to settle a personal problem or dispute. I will use my influence with friends to keep them from using guns to settle disputes. My individual choices and actions, when multiplied by those of young people throughout the country, will make a difference. Together, by honoring this pledge, we can reverse the violence and grow up in safety." 6. Gun control is now firmly part of our national debate. President Barack Obama now calls for gun control legislation after every major shooting. The New York Times last week published a pro-gun-control editorial on its front page—its first page-one editorial since 1920. And while she shied away from the issue eight years ago, Democratic presidential hopeful Hillary Clinton has made curbing gun violence a central plank in her 2016 platform. America's gun violence crisis has clearly made its way into the highest levels of our national debate. What comes of that debate remains to be seen, but a whopping $229 billion a year—and, more important, thousands of lives—depend on it.

#### 4. Neoliberalism is inevitable- it gets reformed and fixed.

STEZLER 09 [Irwin Stelzer is a business adviser and director of economic policy studies at the Hudson Institute, “Death of capitalism exaggerated,” http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,26174260-5013479,00.html]

A FUNNY thing happened on the way to the collapse of market capitalism in the face of the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. It didn't. Indeed, in Germany voters relieved Chancellor Angela Merkel of the necessity of cohabiting with a left-wing party, allowing her to form a coalition with a party favouring lower taxes and free markets. And in Pittsburgh leaders representing more than 90 per cent of the world's GDP convened to figure out how to make markets work better, rather than to hoist the red flag. The workers are to be relieved, not of their chains but of credit-card terms that are excessively onerous, and helped to retain their private property - their homes. All of this is contrary to expectations. The communist spectre that Karl Marx confidently predicted would be haunting Europe is instead haunting Europe's left-wing parties, with even Vladimir Putin seeking to attract investment by re-privatising the firms he snatched. Which raises an interesting question: why haven't the economic turmoil and rising unemployment led workers to the barricades, instead of to their bankers to renegotiate their mortgages? It might be because Spain's leftish government has proved less able to cope with economic collapse than countries with more centrist governments. Or because Britain, with a leftish government, is now the sick man of Europe, its financial sector in intensive care, its recovery likely to be the slowest in Europe, its prime credit rating threatened. Or it might be because left-wing trade unions, greedily demanding their public-sector members be exempted from the pain they want others to share, have lost their credibility and ability to lead a leftward lurch. All of those factors contribute to the unexpected strength of the Right in a world in which a record number of families are being tossed out of their homes, and jobs have been disappearing by the million. But even more important in promoting reform over revolution are three factors: the existence of democratic institutions; the condition of the unemployed; and the set of policies developed to cope with the recession. Democratic institutions give the aggrieved an outlet for their discontent, and hope they can change conditions they deem unsatisfactory. Don't like the way George W. Bush has skewed income distribution? Toss the Republicans out and elect a man who promises to tax the rich more heavily. Don't like Gordon Brown's tax increases? Toss him out and hope the Tories mean it when they promise at least to try to lower taxes. Result: angry voters but no rioters, unless one counts the nutters who break windows at McDonald's or storm banks in the City. Contrast that with China, where the disaffected have no choice but to take to the streets. Result: an estimated 10,000 riots this year protesting against job losses, arbitrary taxes and corruption. A second factor explaining the Left's inability to profit from economic suffering is capitalism's ability to adapt, demonstrated in the Great Depression of the 1930s. While a gaggle of bankers and fiscal conservatives held out for the status quo, Franklin D. Roosevelt and his experimenters began to weave a social safety net. In Britain, William Beveridge produced a report setting the stage for a similar, indeed stronger, net. Continental countries recovering from World War II did the same. So unemployment no longer dooms a worker to close-to-starvation. Yes, civic institutions were able to soften the blow for the unemployed before the safety net was put in place, but they could not cope with pervasive protracted lay-offs. Also, during this and other recessions, when prices for many items are coming down, the real living standard of those in work actually improves. In the US, somewhere between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of workers have kept their jobs, and now see their living costs declining as rents and other prices come down. So the impetus to take to the streets is limited. Then there are the steps taken by capitalist governments to limit the depth and duration of the downturn. As the economies of most of the big industrial countries imploded, policy went through two phases. The first was triage - do what is necessary to prevent the financial system from collapse. Spend. Guarantee deposits to prevent runs on banks and money funds, bail out big banks, force relatively healthier institutions to take over sicker ones, mix all of this with rhetorical attacks on greedy bankers - the populist spoonful of sugar that made the bailouts go down with the voters - and stop the rot. Meanwhile, have the central banks dust off their dog-eared copies of Bagehot and inject lots of liquidity by whatever means comes to mind. John Maynard Keynes, meet Milton Friedman for a cordial handshake. Then came more permanent reform, another round of adapting capitalism to new realities, in this case the malfunctioning of the financial markets. Even Barack Obama's left-wing administration decided not to scupper the markets but instead to develop rules to relate bankers' pay more closely to long-term performance; to reduce the chance of implosions by increasing the capital banks must hold, cutting their profits and dividends, but leaving them in private hands; and to channel most stimulus spending through private-sector companies. This leaves the anti-market crowd little room for manoeuvre as voters seem satisfied with the changes to make capitalism and markets work better and more equitably. At least so far. There are exceptions. Australia moved a bit to the left in the last election, but more out of unhappiness with a tired incumbent's environmental and foreign policy. Americans chose Obama, but he had promised to govern from the centre before swinging left. And for all his rhetorical attacks on greedy bankers and other malefactors of great wealth, he sticks to reform of markets rather than their replacement, with healthcare a possible exception. Even in these countries, so far, so good for reformed capitalism. No substitutes accepted.

### Solvency Turns

#### 1. TURN- the plan increases gun culture by spurring backlash- empirically confirmed.

Esposito and Finley 14 Luigi Esposito (Associate Professor of Sociology and Criminology at Barry University) and Laura Finley (Assistant professor of Sociology and Criminology at Barry University) “Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States” Theory in Action, Vol. 7, No. 2, April (© 2014) <http://transformativestudies.org/wp-content/uploads/10.3798tia.1937-0237.14011.pdf> JW

NEOLIBERALISM AND THE SECOND AMENDMENT According to various commentators, the modem Second Amendment/Pro-gun Movement gained momentum in the mid-20th century as a backlash against the advances made by the Feminist and Civil Rights Movements (e.g., Burbick 2006; Connel 2005; Ansell 2001). Specifically, the Second Amendment became a tool to defend White male privilege against the threat of an activist government (what by the 1980s become widely known as the "nanny state") that supported feminist ideals and coddled racial minorities and other presumably "undeserving" groups. These fears, combined with laws such as the Gun Control Act of 1968, are also what, at least in part, prompted the radicalization of the National Rifle Association (NRA). Indeed, by the 1970s, the NRA "underwent a political revolution" and went from being primarily a sports organization to a far right pro-gun lobby (e.g., Melzer 2009). By the early 1980s, neoliberalism gained prominence under the Reagan administration. Interestingly, it was during the Reagan administration's neoliberal restructuring of the "American political, economic, and cultural landscape" that this country witnessed an increase in gun violence and especially a rise in mass shootings.5 As Reagan's neoliberal reforms gutted the welfare state and the idea of self-reliance became promulgated as synonymous with a free society, success became increasingly "defined in terms of power, economic attainment, and social status" (Klein 2012, p. 156). All these measures, according to various critics, promoted an apathetic society where social bonds became increasingly eroded and replaced by hedonistic materialism, rabid individualism, extreme competition, and narcissism (e.g., Klein 2012, see also Hall, Winlow, and Ancram 2005). To a large extent, this trend continues to this day. As has been widely documented, since the Reagan era, there has been a dismantling of community in favor of a hyperindividualized type of liberty in which the unrestrained pursuit of selfgain is valued over everything else (e.g., Giroux 2008; Esposito, 2011). In recent years, millions of Americans who embrace the neoliberal emphasis on individual liberty over everything else have become particularly suspicious about the U.S. government under President Obama. Because the president has, to some extent, shown more willingness than many previous presidents to deploy the power of the state to promote a variety of social and economic objectives-e.g., signing the Recovery Act, passing Healthcare Reform, strengthening the nation's safety net for the needy, etc.- millions of Americans regard this as a shift to "socialism." Consistent with neoliberal philosophy, a large segment of the American electorate believes that Obama's presumably interventionist policies signify the onset of a growing state apparatus (an unprecedented "big government") whose influence will gradually seep into every facet of social life and undermine personal liberty, self-reliance, and the free market. In short, millions of Americans believe that Obama's policies are paving the "road to serfdom" feared by Hayek (1944). In recent months, calls for tighter gun control among President Obama and other people in government (e.g., Senator Dianne Feinstein's proposal to re-instate a federal ban on assault weapons) have further reinforced fears of tyranny and government intrusion on Americans' "private lives."6 Stated simply, the Second Amendment, which is often regarded by the pro-gun/anti-gun control community as a requisite for freedom and the primary basis for all other individual rights, is believed by millions of Americans to be currently under attack. Even a cursory reading of some of the statements put out by the NRA and other pro-gun groups-particularly against President Obamaclearly reveals this sentiment. For example, in his recent book titled America Disarmed, Wayne LaPierre (2011), CEO of the NRA, argues that President Obama is the most anti-Second Amendment president the country has ever seen. LaPierre associates the president's presumably anti-gun zealotry to allegations that Obama has been profoundly influenced by supporters of communism such as Frank Marshall Davis and other alleged sympathizers of totalitarian governments. LaPierre even suggests that Obama's own fatheran alleged "anti-Western Communist"- might have shaped his presumably fanatical anti-gun/anti-Second Amendment stance, as Obama Sr. "favored the kind of oppressive discriminatory government that almost necessarily requires a disarmed populace" (LaPierre, 2011, p. 265). Important to note is that this fear of tyranny promoted by LaPierre and the NRA in general has undoubtedly benefitted the gun industry. As Fang (2012) notes: Fear that the government will disallow guns has resulted in Americans flocking to stores to stock up on weapons-lots of them. From Alaska to Florida, gun sales across the country are going through the roof...In Tennessee, officials say gun purchases likely hit an all-time high. Walmart has reportedly run out of semiautomatic rifles in five states. Interestingly, the NRA itself benefits financially from gun and ammunition sales, a fact not widely known by the public. As suggested by Dreier (2013): On its website, the National Rifle Association claims that it is not affiliated with any firearm or ammunition manufacturers or with any businesses that deal in guns and ammunition. This is a lie, as a number of recent reports have documented. In fact, the NRA is primarily a front group for the nation's gun manufacturers. The NRA receives a dollar for every gun or package of ammunition sold at participating stores. Other NRA corporate fundraising initiatives also allow customers to make donations to the NRA at the time of purchase. Some, like Sturm, Roger & Co., even mandate contributions for every purchase. And, importantly, since these deals are part of the NRA's 501(c)4 affiliate, not its' 501(c)3 status, the funds can be spent on political advertisements and for lobbying for gun-friendly legislation (Fang, 2012). Sugarmann (2012), for example, notes that between 2005 and 2010, the NRA received somewhere between $19.8 and $52.6 million in contributions from corporate partners, most of which (74%) are gun or ammunitions manufacturers or producers of other shootingrelated products. Considering all this, the argument can be made that the fear tactics used by the NRA are consistent with what Naomi Klein describes in her book The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism. Namely, by encouraging fear that "Obama will take our guns," the NRA manipulates public opinion to push a neoliberal agenda associated with de-regulation that benefits the gun industry. The NRA, of course, is not alone in promoting this sort of fear mongering. Similar arguments about Obama's and other politicians' proposed gun controls being an attempt to disarm Americans in an effort to institute a tyrannical "big government" have been made in recent months by various public officials, media pundits, and at anti-gun control rallies, which are overwhelmingly attended by White men.7 According to various writers, this fear of disarmament and tyranny are also typically racialized in that they are often expressions of "anxieties associated with White men's declining status" (Carlson, 2012, p. 1113). On this point, Tom Diaz, author of several books about the gun industry, recently noted the following in an interview: If you look at where these guns are sold, this is primarily a Red State phenomenon. People are driven by a fear of the other. NRA President Wayne LaPierre talks often in terms of race and ethnicity. The gun industry's consumers are afraid, the world is changing around them, and they think guns will protect their way of life (Winston & Graham, 2013). These fears, however, also go beyond a racial issue. Indeed, what is at stake, according to many gun supporters, is not simply a threat to White privilege and gun ownership but the future offreedom itself Referring to the alleged menace of gun control, Forbes magazine's Lawrence Hunter (2012) recently wrote: It's not really about the guns; it is about the government's ability to demand submission of the people. Gun control is part and parcel of the ongoing collectivist effort to eviscerate individual sovereignty and replace it with dependence upon and allegiance to the state. Another related narrative used among gun supporters to oppose gun controls is that such measures leave responsible, law abiding citizens without any viable means of protecting themselves against criminals and/or violent predators. Consistent with the neoliberal claim that government is inept, this common argument is predicated on the idea that the state (this includes the police and other law enforcement agencies) is inefficient and thus largely incapable of protecting citizens (see Carlson 2012). Disarming the public is thus akin to a proverbial "throwing the lambs to the wolves" scenario. This distrust of government, along with the fact that fear of crime in the U.S. is out of proportion to actual crime rates (e.g., Shelden, 2010), encourages an insistence among millions of Americans to want easy access to guns as a way to protect themselves, their families, and their property. This logic fits perfectly with (and is reinforced by) neoliberal ideology and its emphasis on private solutions to all problems. This same ideology is also what has encouraged and glamorized the sort of rugged individualism that is at the heart of pro-gun politics.

#### 2. TURN-Gun control is unenforceable- people can make them with computers.

Rosenwald 13 Michael S. (reporter) “Weapons made with 3-D printers could test gun-control efforts” February 18th 2013 The Washington Post <https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/weapons-made-with-3-d-printers-could-test-gun-control-efforts/2013/02/18/9ad8b45e-779b-11e2-95e4-6148e45d7adb_story.html?hpid=z1> JW

[Brackets in original] Three-dimensional printers offer a potentially easy way around restrictions and registrations — a source of growing consternation among gun-control advocates and some allies in Congress. “There’s really no one controlling what you do in your own home,” Lerol said. Though printing guns is a craft still in its infancy — Lerol hasn’t tested his parts yet at a gun range — technology experts, gun rights proponents and gun safety advocates say the specter of printable firearms and ammunition magazines poses a challenge for Obama and lawmakers as they craft sweeping gun-control legislation. One controversial idea, pushed by Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), is to outlaw high-capacity magazines. But some proponents of 3-D printed guns have already made high-grade plastic replicas. “Obviously, that has to be one of her nightmares,” said Larry Pratt, executive director of Gun Owners of America, a lobbying group opposed to additional restrictions. “If her ban was to pass and this technology moves beyond its infancy, Dianne Feinstein is going to have a bit of a challenge.” Feinstein’s proposed legislation, which would also ban AR-15s, restricts manufacturing of such items by anyone in the country, said a spokesman for the senator. But 3D-printing experts say that logic is dated and misses the point of the technology. Making guns for personal use has been legal for decades, but doing so has required machining know-how and a variety of parts. With 3-D printers, users download blueprints from the Internet, feed them into the machine, wait several hours and voila. “Restrictions are difficult to enforce in a world where anybody can make anything,” said Hod Lipson, a 3-D printing expert at Cornell University and co-author of the new book, “Fabricated: The New World of 3D Printing.” “Talking about old-fashioned control will be very ineffective.” It is unclear how many people are trying to print their own gun parts and magazines. But Cody Wilson, a University of Texas law student who is leading the ideological and technical campaign for 3-D printed guns through an organization called Defense Distributed, said blueprints have been downloaded hundreds of thousands of times from his group’s Web site. “People all over the world are downloading this stuff all the time — way more people than actually have 3-D printers,” he said. “This is hot stuff on the Internet now.” Wilson and a friend founded Defense Distributed last February while looking for a “post-political” project to challenge governmental scrutiny and regulations. He speaks of “prohibitionist regimes” and anarchistic urges and challenging “democratic control.” Though he shot guns as a Boy Scout, Wilson doesn’t consider himself a gun person. He doesn’t consider himself a tech geek either. His motivations, he said, are ideological and go way beyond the Second Amendment. “This is a symbolic challenge to a system that says we can see everything, regulate everything,” he said. “I say, ‘Oh really?’ My challenge is: Regulate this. I hope with that challenge we create such an insurmountable problem that the mere effort of trying to regulate this explodes any regulatory regime.” Wilson’s group has posted several videos to YouTube of AR-15s firing rounds with 3-D printed high-capacity magazines and lower receivers, the part that includes the firing mechanism and is the only regulated portion of the gun if it’s bought over the counter. Wilson’s parts are made from high-grade polymer and retrofitted to the bodies of existing weapons. The receivers are made able to fire by adding over-the-counter springs, pins and a trigger. In one recent video, Wilson fires dozens of rounds from an M-16 using a 3-D printed high-capacity magazine. “How’s that national conversation going?” he asks. Defense Distributed also runs a Web site called Defcad, where anyone can download gun designs and trade tips. The other day, a user posted this question to a discussion board on the site: “I know nothing of 3d printers. I can tell there are a few different types of materials to print and some appear to be easier to break than others. What printer and material is the best for printing a receiver and mags?” Lerol, working in his spare bedroom, is using a $1,300 machine called the Cube, which is made by a division of 3D Systems, a large publicly traded manufacturer of consumer and industrial 3-D printing machines. The cheaper, consumer versions of 3-D printers like the one Lerol uses are only capable of printing with plastics, while more expensive, industrial-scale machines can print sturdier materials such as high-grade polymers. Experts expect printer prices to fall as part of the normal technology curve. (Think about the price of flat screen TVs five years ago. Or a computer two decades ago.) And that makes Lipson, the Cornell expert, nervous because cheaper machines could help people make cheap guns for one-time use. “The threat is not of 3-D printing military-grade weapon components from standard blueprints on industrial 3-D printers,” Lipson said. “The challenge is that [do-it-yourself] 3D printers can be used by anyone to print rogue, disposable and shoddy guns that could be used to fire a few rounds, then be recycled into a flower vase.” Though Lerol acknowledges how easy these machines make it to get around regulations, his motivations, he said, are benign. He is a tinkerer, he likes guns and he likes messing around the house. He insists he has no interest in flouting whatever restrictions might win approval, but gun-control advocates and some legislators worry that not everyone’s motivations will be so pure. “It’s not necessarily the technology, it’s the ideology,” said Joshua Horwitz, the executive director of Coalition to Stop Gun Violence. “If this insurrectionist philosophy was to gain traction, people will normalize this behavior.”

#### This outweighs and turns the aff. A. magnitude- even if they win that the status quo is bad, the aff decreases the amount of regulations by fostering an anti-regulatory sentiment among citizens. This turns the aff really well because gun culture is about people’s relationships with guns and the government. The aff makes guns cheaper, easier to access, and less dependent on the government to get.

#### B. probability- my evidence is recent and makes future predictions about tech curves whereas the aff evidence is all based on things that have happened in the past.

#### 3. TURN-the plan pushes people to the illicit market where guns are cheaper- that increases gun ownership.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

Dixon expects the "fact that such guns are inaccurate and dangerous to the user will also act as a restraint to illegal gun production." [129] How much of a restraint may be open to doubt. While homemade guns will not win target- shooting contests, target shooters will have their own guns (kept at shooting ranges under the Dixon proposal), and homemade guns may suffice for robbery purposes. And most homicides, like most robberies, are perpetrated at very close range where accuracy is not an issue. The risk that a homemade gun could explode in a shooter's hand may deter some otherwise law-abiding citizens who would want to own an illegal handgun for protection. On the other hand, if the person believes that the threats to his or her life and family are serious enough to commit the serious crime of buying an illegal handgun, the additional risk posed by potentially defective handgun may seem small. In addition, newfound popularity for bootleg guns might result in handguns becoming cheaper than they are now, just as in alcohol prohibition days, bootleg gin often cost less than legal alcohol had. If handguns were cheaper, they might become more available to small-time teenage criminals and other low-end miscreants; criminals might end up more widely armed than ever before. The inevitable [illicit] black market in homemade and imported illegal handguns would provide a major new revenue source to organized crime. As the black market in alcohol helped create and enrich organized crime in the United States, the new black market in handguns would fund and strengthen organized crime all the more. Dixon also acknowledges that illegal handguns would also flow in across American borders. [130] Indeed, if small handguns were imported in the same physical volume as marijuana, 20 million would enter the country annually. (Current legal demand for new handguns is about 2.5 million a year). [131]

#### This outweighs: A. magnitude—they’ll say the plan increases gun prices but my evidence proves that illicit market guns are cheaper which means once people realize they can access them through the plan, they’ll be more widely armed. B. probability—it happened during prohibition.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Closing down legitimate manufacturers would be a boon to black market (p.161) producers. Clandestine handgun manufacturers would spring up, just as thousands of illegal stills operated during alcohol prohibition, and hundreds or thousands of clandestine labs now produce unlawful mood and mind-altering drugs like amphetamine and ecstasy. Even today, “zip guns” are produced or assembled in small workshops within the United States.\* These black market manufacturers, already illegal, operate outside any regulatory scheme for recordkeeping, serial numbers, safety locks, or taxation.

#### 4. TURN-A handgun ban makes criminals to switch to deadlier weapons-empirics prove.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some gun misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. \*327 Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [177] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [178] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [179] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [180] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [181] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [182] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [183] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [184] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [185] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [186] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose. Accordingly, the 72% substitution figure might be too high. True enough. But at the same time, at least some criminals may be highly suspicious and mistrustful of authority. Although the National Institute of Justice polling, conducted through written response to written questions, offered the respondents anonymity, some of the prisoners might have believed that their responses would not in fact be anonymous; the polling might be a "setup" to discern their plans after release, and provide a reason for denying parole. Thus, some handgun criminals might have falsely said that they would not substitute sawed-off shotguns for unavailable handguns. Do the number of braggart criminals who falsely said that they would use sawed-off shotguns outnumber the number of mistrustful criminals who falsely said they would not? It is difficult to say with certainty. But since 72% of the criminals said they would substitute, and since only 30% substitution is needed to increase substantially the homicide rate, there is a wide margin for error to assume that bragging criminals outnumber suspicious ones. Dixon critiques the Benenson and Kates estimate of a homicide rate increase because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [187]

#### 5. TURN- the aff strengthens state power.

#### Capitalism is close to collapse-only a violent revolution will solve. Gun control prevents the working class from achieving the necessary weaponry.

LRP 94 League for the Revolutionary Party “Gun Control Is No Answer to Crime” Proletarian Revolution No. 46 (Spring 1994) <https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/socialistvoice/guncontrol.html>

For months the ruling class has subjected the American people to an unrelenting propaganda barrage about the dangers of crime and especially guns in U.S. cities. Right-wing politicians and tabloid media have been in the forefront—not surprisingly, since a major purpose of the campaign is to scapegoat Blacks for the ills of the system and justify increasing repression. But liberal leaders, starting from Bill Clinton with his vindictive crime legislation, have gone along, as have Black spokesmen from Jackson to Farrakhan. Stop Gun Control! Crime in the cities is indeed mounting, bred by the miseries of decaying capitalism. The ruling class, society’s biggest criminals, foster misery and the plagues of drugs and violent crime in poor communities. The favorite panaceas of liberals of all hues is gun control: take weapons away from everyone but the cops and the military, plus a handful of “respectable” (i.e., upper middle-class) types. At the time of its revolutionary origins, the U.S. had to grant its citizens the right to bear arms. Now in its epoch of imperialist decay, it tries to remove that right. By using the crime campaign to hide its own, far greater violence, it denies the right of the oppressed masses to defend themselves. In the absence of proletarian leadership that provides a real answer, the initiative has been handed to reactionaries. The National Rifle Association, a right-wing outfit, takes the lead in defending the Second Amendment, while left, union, and Black leaders go along with the gun-control mania. Working-class revolutionaries recognize the need for measures of self-defense—not only against crime in the streets but also against the violence of the ruling class. It will take revolution to achieve a socialist world, the only answer to capitalism’s horrors. Yet the working class needs to survive today to fight in the mass struggles on the horizon. For starters, we say to working people: defend your constitutional right to bear arms! The NRA says that individual gun ownership is the answer. But what’s needed is organized, mass, self-defense. Another article in this issue, “Black Struggle Arms Itself,” sketches the history of Black self-defense efforts and details the reasons why a class-based strategy is crucial. At the moment the U.S. ruling class is trying to build support for a major attack against the working class at home. But unable to take on the whole class frontally yet, it uses the old divide-and-conquer tool of racism. It first heats up its crusade against Blacks and Latinos who have fought capitalist immiseration through rebellions against capitalist police and property from Los Angeles to Washington Heights. Anti-Gun Campaign It is no surprise that the anti-gun campaign in New York originated against the rebellious Dominican neighborhood of Washington Heights and then moved to the seething Black community in Brooklyn. The media hero of the day is a Dominican businessman, Fernando Mateo, who started the “Toys for Guns” program. Owners of illegal guns were encouraged to bring them in to the local police station in exchange for a $100 gift certificate at their local “Toys ’R’ Us” store. That program has become a permanent “Goods for Guns” program across the country. A few facts show that the program is pure deception. The $100 incentive will obviously not persuade big-time criminals to throw down their guns and adopt pacifism. Nor will it attract the drug gangs who shoot bystanders in the streets. Sure, some will turn in a spare peashooter or two, but they know the value of real weapons. According to the New York press, many gun traders admitted to owning other guns; some even planned to use the cash reward toward the purchase of better weapons! Even Mateo, the founder of Goods for Guns, said that he had no intention of giving up his gun. People with legal connections can get guns; people with illegal connections can, too. But not if you are a working woman or man liable to be mugged on the street, robbed at home or subject to unprovoked attacks by the cops (see our article on the James Frazier case). The media won’t admit that many people who are not criminals need to keep guns for self-protection. At the other end of the scale, Clinton, accurately described by the Boston Globe as the “Earth’s top pusher of arms,” has no intention of surrendering his guns. Those he needs for future mass slaughters, as in Panama and Iraq. Nor do the capitalists’ cops and National Guard ever disarm themselves. The gun-control program is not about protecting the honest working person. Clinton and his cops and phony programs like “Toys for Guns” do nothing to deter the petty criminals who plague us. That is not their intention. The aim[s] is to reinforce the lie that working and oppressed people must rely not on themselves but on the cops to protect them. That way we will be deluded into supporting a further buildup of the state’s armed forces. The cops say they will protect us. But as the ruling class has itself documented, cops more often than not protect (and join) the drug dealers and do nothing to protect ordinary people, especially Blacks and Latinos, from petty criminals. (See “Race, Class and Cop Brutality,” PR 45.) Armed Self-Defense: A Working-Class Policy The capitalist classes of all countries defend their power through their states, institutions holding a legal monopoly of armed force. The liberal’s remedy for crime is to rely on the state to prevent it. Most working people know that doesn’t work--especially Blacks and Latinos, who more often than not see the state’s agents, the cops, fighting against them. The far right-wingers have a different answer. They see Blacks, Latinos and other militant workers as the real (or at best potential) criminals and don’t trust even the bosses’ state to keep them down. They will look to armies of fascists when the time is ripe. Even with gun-control laws, these thugs will get weapons (plus quite a few members) from the cops. This has always been the case when fascism rises. For all sections of the bourgeois class, the notion of working people, especially Blacks and Latinos, arming themselves is a great threat. Capitalism wouldn’t last a moment if working people were armed and organized. That is why the right to armed self-defense today is a working-class demand. Certainly the working class is concerned to get rid of the criminal elements in our communities once and for all. We will stop these elements most effectively through a mass struggle to build a revolutionary movement and leadership to do away with the criminal system altogether.

#### The state exists to perpetuate capitalist exploitation; the aff’s use of legal measures will always be skewed in favor of the rich.

Organise 10 Organise! (an organization that spoke out against the 2010 Australian election). “Capitalist Democracy: The Illusion of Choice.” Libcom. August 15th, 2010. https://libcom.org/library/capitalist-democracy-illusion-choice

Consider the following facts: 1. Capitalist society is class society. Despite the claims made by the most powerful people in our society—who, we might add, have vested interests in doing so—**the unity of the** nation-**state is** an **illusory** one, **because capitalist society is divided into** economic **classes**. On the one hand we have those who own and control social resources, and who enjoy the economic and social privileges that accompanies such ownership and control, and on the other those who lack such ownership and control and are obliged by the circumstances of their birth to sell their labour for a wage, which is generally most of us. 2. **Exploitation is inherent to class society.**The foundation of meaningful freedom is economic independence, and economic independence on a social level derives from the ability of each of us to control the fruits of our labour. This is a basic human right. In capitalist society the propertied classes own and control the tools of production, the places where we work and the things we work with, which means that those of us who don't own and control the tools of production are forced to work for those who do. Needless to say, this situation deprives us of our economic independence and forces us into a position of submission and subservience. But it gets worse. **The capitalist class generates profits from the wage system by paying workers less in wages than the value of the product of our labour**, which they take for themselves. This is exploitation, period, and any sort of exploitation is inconceivable in a free society, because as long as one person can be exploited none of us are free. The only difference between chattel slaves and wage workers is that the former were owned, whereas the latter are rented. Seen in the cold hard light of day, wage labour is really wage-slavery. Suffice it to say that the economic and social privileges that the propertied classes enjoy in our society depends for their existence on the denial of elementary human rights to the vast majority of society. 3. The exploitation inherent to capitalist society is protected by the state. The denial of the basic human right of economic independence to the working class is protected by the institutionalied violence of the state, by the police, military and judiciary. **The primary function of the state is to protect** and defend **the** social and economic **privileges of the propertied classes**. It is an institution of class domination which lords over the whole of society and imposes economic dependence and servitude on the great mass of humanity in the service of an opulent minority. (Some will argue in the defense of the state that it 1) maintains order and 2) protects us from violent crime. To this we pose the counter-arguments as follows: 1) what sort of order and in whose interests, and 2) that being 'protected' against 'crime' by the state is like being 'protected' against 'crime' by the mafia, and that as the state bequeaths its 'protection' to the working classes, facilitating the theft of the wealth it produces, so too does it perpetuate crime in the name of stopping it. Since the system of deterrence has failed to stop violent crime, we suggest alternative strategies such as addressing the causes). 4. The primary function of the state as a defender of privilege and injustice is reflected in capitalist law. The character of the state as an institution of class domination and the nature of its basic function (to protect the privileges of the propertied classes from the rest of us) forms the basis of capitalist law. The golden rule is that those with the gold make the rules. **The basic fraud behind** the doctrine of **equality before the law, the foundation for capitalist democracy, derives** then **from the fact that the laws are made by and for the rich**. The fact then that, in applying the same law to all, capitalist law has overcome the arbitrariness of kingly despotism is ultimately irrelevant for those of us in a state of economic servitude, since **the law itself is unjust;** being **grounded as it is in** the **protection of elite privilege** and the perpetuation of the master-slave relationship at the core of the wage system, it perpetuates the arbitrary rule—the despotism—of a class.

### AT Australia

#### Australia’s different- political support, buyback, registration, and licensing.

Leigh and Neill 10 Andrew Leigh, Research School of Economics, Australian National University and Christine Neill, Department of Economics , Wilfrid Laurier University. Do Gun Buybacks Save Lives? Evidence from Panel Data Author(s): Andrew Leigh and Christine Neill Source: American Law and Economics Review, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Fall 2010), pp. 509-557 Published by: Oxford University Press Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/42705584

Several factors are important in assessing the extent to which the results from the Australian buyback can be extrapolated to other countries. **Australian borders are more easily controlled than in countries that have land borders.** In addition, Australia's government in general and its policing and customs services in particular are highly organized and effective. The NFA also had an extremely high degree of political support and was quite competently executed. And the buyback was accompanied by a uniform national system for licensing and registration of firearms. These factors should be borne in mind in considering the extent to which the results from the Australian NFA might generalize to other countries.

#### Your evidence is about a long gun ban, not a handgun ban; not relevant.

#### Australia has no domestic gun manufacturers and unlike the US they are geographically isolated.

Leigh and Neill 10 Andrew Leigh, Research School of Economics, Australian National University and Christine Neill, Department of Economics , Wilfrid Laurier University. Do Gun Buybacks Save Lives? Evidence from Panel Data Author(s): Andrew Leigh and Christine Neill Source: American Law and Economics Review, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Fall 2010), pp. 509-557 Published by: Oxford University Press Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/42705584

It is extremely unlikely that this withdrawal of firearms could have been quickly reversed in Australia. There are no domestic firearms manufacturers, so that all firearms must be imported into the country. Records from the Australian Customs Service show that in the 3 years prior to 1996, Australian firearms imports averaged around 50,000 per year, of which about 25,000 were rifles. After the buyback, average imports fell to about 30,000 per year, of which 10,000 were rifles. Thus, if anything, there appears to have been a slowdown in imports after 1997. Although the available data are incomplete, it appears that law enforcement agencies were responsible for a large percentage of overall purchases. For example, one source indicates that more than one quarter of all handguns purchases in the period 1999-2002 were by law enforcement. Even if we made the extreme assumption that all imported firearms were added to the civilian firearm stock and no firearms were ever destroyed, at current import levels of 30,000 per year it would take around 20 years for the civilian firearm stock to recover to pre-buyback levels. Publicly available data on imports by state suggest there may have been a slight negative relationship between subsequent imports of firearms per capita and the buyback rate - that is, states with a high buyback rate also saw somewhat lower growth in firearm imports. This relationship is not, however, statistically significant, and we do not have information that allows us to separate out civilian purchases from law enforcement and military purchases, so we cannot be sure that this reflects primarily civilian purchases.

### AT Kahan

1. Consequentialism tells us how to resolve gun control debates, not just risk calculation. Kahan says econometrics don’t tell us the correct attitudes- I agree- that’s what our moral framework does. Util best meets Kahan’s standard of a respectful framework because it respects the inherent equal moral worth of all people best. Regardless, they have no alternative framework so you have to accept util to evaluate the gun debate.

2. This just pushes us back a layer- finding the correct gun control empirics is still possible, we just shed our evaluative biases. For example, if I’m a judge that really hates a debater I can still vote for them if they’re winning arguments; the bias goes away.

3. I agree with the aff’s cultural orientation. A lot of times, guns are bad. That means I solve the top layer- the relevant question is whether the aff is good or bad for this. There is no intrinsic connection between banning handguns and guns being bad- you NEED TO WIN SOLVENCY.

### AT Giroux

1. Giroux just says we need to embrace critical thinking and social responsibility- that’s a necessary but insufficient description of the judge’s obligation—the judge should determine who best argues for their side of the resolution while doing what Giroux says.

2. If I win neolib inevitable- that takes out Giroux- the only point of what Giroux says is to push back against neoliberalism, but if we can’t stop neoliberalism this doesn’t matter.

3. All of their impacts are utilitarian—gun violence by white males against other people. None of their framework arguments prove a non-utilitarian reason for the immorality of gun violence.

# Toy Guns

### T-Handgun

#### A. Interpretation: **Merriam Webster** “defines handgun”

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/handgun

: a small gun (such as a revolver or a pistol) designed to be held and shot with one hand

And- Merriam Webster defines “gun”

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/gun>

a weapon that shoots bullets or shells

#### B. Violations:

Collins English Dictionary defines toy guns“toy gun” http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/toy-gun

toy gun (tɔɪ ɡʌn) Definitions noun a miniature nonfunctioning replica of a gun, esp one that children play with

First, handguns are designed to be shot, but toy guns are explicitly non-functioning

Second, guns shoot bullets but toy guns don’t actually propel metal objects out of their barrels.

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Accuracy

a. your aff confuses the difference between a replica and it’s corresponding object. Toy handguns are not handguns in the same way that a toy nuclear weapon is not a real nuclear weapon.

b. Merriam Webster definitions are good-they contextualize common usage which determines how society defines different linguistic functions

#### Two impacts:

#### A] Accuracy comes first-the topicality rule is superior and non uniques your offense.

Nebel 15 Jake Nebel (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> JW 2/20/15

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the aff**irmative **must defend the res**olution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see **what is distinctive about** Topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the res**olution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic considerations** for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

B] key to jurisdiction-the ballot asks you to endorse the better debater in the context of the resolution issued by the tournament rules-if you don’t defend the topic then it’s impossible to vote for you, that’s the most important voter.

2. Limits-toy handguns means any object that is shaped like or even resembles a handgun becomes aff ground-that explodes the amount of possible affirmatives since it doesn’t have to be a real gun, it can just be a gun-shaped item. Two impacts: A) they can pick an object that gives them the best quality ground and excludes most neg offense, kills fairness since you have easier access to the ballot, B) them getting to pick the plan gives them infinite prep on an issue I can’t predict, they’ll have a structural prep advantage and I can’t have an educational discussion because I haven’t cut any cards.

### Self-Regulation DA

#### Playing with toy guns reduces violence in the real world.

Moyer 15 Melinda 7-2-15 It’s Fine for Kids to Play With Pretend Guns <http://www.slate.com/articles/life/the_kids/2015/07/should_you_let_your_kids_play_with_toy_guns_yes_but_keep_them_away_from.2.html> JW

Firearms were the second leading cause of death in 2014 for American children between the ages of 1 and 19. On average, eight kids were shot every day. Most children who are killed by firearms die in their homes, having been shot by their parents’ guns. Worse, research suggests that no matter how adamantly parents talk to their kids about staying away from any real guns, most will jump at a chance to play with them anyway. Regardless of where we live or how safe we feel, parents need to take steps to protect their kids from gun violence. But the good news is that it is perfectly normal for kids to pretend to play with guns from time to time. Aggressive play is not just part of growing up—research suggests that it can even help kids self-regulate better in real life. “Researchers speculate that when kids act violent during pretend play, they may learn to control real violent impulses.” Let’s start with real guns, which are the true threat to your child’s safety. If you keep a gun in your home, store it in a locked place, unloaded, with the ammunition stored in a separate location. That’s because more than three-quarters of kids—even young ones under the age of 10—know where parents keep their guns, even when parents don’t think they do. If you’re thinking, But the whole point of having a gun is to keep it loaded and easily accessible in the event of a home invasion, consider that for every one time a gun in the home is successfully used for self-defense, guns in the home will have caused four unintentional shootings, seven criminal assaults or homicides, and 11 attempted or completed suicides. In other words, a gun kept unlocked and loaded for self-defense is much, much more likely to hurt family members than protect them. (For more on how guns kept in the home threaten children, read Evan DeFilippis and Devin Hughes 2014 Slate piece.) Even if you don’t own a gun, you still need to take steps to protect your kids while they’re in other people’s homes. Certainly, talking to them about guns—how dangerous they are, why they should never be played with—is not a bad idea, but it’s simply not enough. Marjorie Sanfilippo, a psychologist at Eckerd College in Florida, has conducted a series of terrifying experiments illustrating that boys and girls simply don’t listen when you warn them about guns. In her first study, published in 1996, she let pairs of 4- to 6-year-old children play in a room with various toys including real and toy guns. Then she and a local police officer spent 30 minutes educating one of the children in each pair about the dangers of guns—among other things, that they are never to be touched without a parent’s permission and that kids should always find an adult if they come across one. A week later, she put the pair of children back together in the same room again to play. “What we found is that the children who had the lessons played with the guns just as much as the children who didn’t—and they didn’t leave the area to get an adult, and they didn’t stop the friend from playing with it. It was as if they’d gotten no lessons whatsoever,” she recalls. In a subsequent experiment, she enrolled one group of preschool children in a weeklong firearm-education session while another group of kids had no training. Again, the intervention had no effect on the children’s likelihood of playing with guns. “There’s no amount of teaching that can overcome that natural curiosity about guns,” she concludes. So if you don’t want your kids to play with guns, you have to make sure they don’t find any. And this means that when your child goes into another person’s home, you need to ask whether any guns they have are stored safely. If the thought of posing this question makes you uneasy—maybe you worry about offending the other person—consider that “people who own guns are often more comfortable having these conversations than people who don’t,” says Jennie Lintz, director of public health and safety at the nonprofit Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence. If you still feel weird, try it this way: “Call the parent and say, ‘My son is fascinated with guns—he’s going through a phase—so I just want to make sure that you don’t have any real guns accessible.’ Because then you’re saying, ‘I want to protect your child, too,’ ” Sanfilippo says. If guns aren’t stored in a way that makes you comfortable, invite the child over to your home instead. Let’s move on to how kids play. Although both boys and girls display aggression in their play, the fact is that boys do it much more, particularly when they’re playing with other boys. (The causes for these differences are debated.) Most of the time, this kind of play is normal and may even be useful. In a 2013 study, researchers observed how preschoolers played by themselves with various objects and then watched these same children in their classrooms. They found that the more oral aggression the kids displayed—for example, pretending that stuffed animals bit or ate each other—the less aggressive their behavior was in the classroom. The researchers speculate that when kids incorporate violence into their pretend play, they may learn how to control real violent impulses and regulate their emotions. Another recent paper penned by academic psychologists went so far as to argue that preventing kids from play fighting could interfere with their social, emotional, physical, cognitive, and communicative development. Although we can't be certain that this relationship is causal—it’s possible that kids who are more socially mature simply tend to play more aggressively—one thing is clear: “Aggressive behavior in pretend play is different than actual aggressive behavior in real life,” says co-author and Case Western Reserve University child psychologist Sandra Russ. Certainly, though, not all aggressive play is normal or healthy. If your child actually hurts other kids when he plays, that might be a sign of an impulse-control problem and may be worth discussing with a pediatrician. It also matters whether your child uses his imagination. If he simply takes one toy and uses it to bash another toy for five minutes straight, and there doesn’t seem to be any kind of narrative, then that could be a cause for concern, too. Indeed, the more creative a child’s pretend play is, the better—so it’s not necessarily good for your child to play out the same scripted scene from The Lego Movie over and over again. Instead, encourage her to improvise. Ask her questions and prompt her to create new stories. “Imitation is not really play, and when it’s not really play, children are not really working on the things they need to work on,” says Diane Levin, an early education specialist at Wheelock College in Boston and the author of The War Play Dilemma. Levin adds that if there are aspects of your child’s play that make you uncomfortable—maybe your kid is always talking about “killing” bad guys and that makes you cringe—try to engage and perhaps even redirect your child, although it may not always work. “Say, ‘It sounds like [the bad guy] did something really bad—what did he do?’ Or ‘Is there anything else you can do besides killing?’ Or ‘Is there anything we can do to help the bad guy become good?’ Take the lead from your child, but if he dismisses you, then accept it.” As for gun play specifically: “Kids are going to make guns out of sticks and clay and that's fine—that’s pretend,” Russ says. It’s best not to stop them, because doing so might shame them. Plus, Sanfilippo says, “if you make it too big of a deal about it, they’re going to want to do it more, and they’re going to do it behind your back.” And while most experts say that toy and squirt guns are fine, Russ points out that for the small subset of children who have difficulty separating play from reality, or who have impulse-control problems, realistic-looking toy and squirt guns may not be such a good idea. So pretend gun play is generally A-OK and might even make kids less violent—hooray, one less gun-related thing to worry about. And in fact, it might be something to celebrate for another reason. When your kid is fighting “bad guys,” he’s probably pretending to be a good guy, even a superhero, and that’s empowering and heroic. “It's the way boys deal with being in a group and deal with the anxiety of being little boys,” says child psychologist Michael Thompson, co-author of Raising Cain: Protecting the Emotional Life of Boys. “They want to be strong and big, and they want to do it with a stick or a sword.” Or, obviously, a gun.

#### Playing with toy guns is key to self-regulation and success in school.

Gross-Loh 13 Christine Gross-Loh, CHRISTINE GROSS-LOH is the author of Parenting Without Borders: Surprising Lessons Parents Around the World Can Teach Us (Avery, 2013), 8-9-2013, "Keeping Kids From Toy Guns: How One Mother Changed Her Mind," Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2013/08/keeping-kids-from-toy-guns-how-one-mother-changed-her-mind/278518/, accessed 1-27-2016. NP

Although many of us in America worry that gun play desensitizes kids to violence, the research doesn't bear this out. In fact, it can actually help teach children to read each other's facial cues and body language, figure out their place in a group, and learn how to adjust their behavior in social settings. Play helps children learn how to signal each other: this is fantasy. As Mechling explains, using the theories of anthropologist Gregory Bateson, when children are playing with toy guns, they do so within a play frame they have created, one in which "a shooting is not a shooting." Children don't see their own play through the lens that adults do. To children, gun play is play, while to American adults--especially in the post-Columbine or Newtown era--gun play is violence. When children are engaged in play they choose, they are more engaged and motivated to sustain it for longer. Imaginary play hones self-regulation, which is essential for school success but has declined in recent decades. (Today's five year olds have the self-regulation skills of a three year old 60 years ago). Research has found that incorporating preschool boys' interest in weapon play rather than banning it entirely leads them to play longer, more elaborate games that go beyond mere weapon play. The British government, in fact, concerned by a pattern of preschool boys falling behind girls in part due to zero-tolerance policies that had led teachers to curb any hint of boisterous play, advised preschools to allow boys to play with toy weapons and other play of their choosing, since the research suggests that acknowledging their interests will help them feel more engaged in school and improve their academic performance.

### Body camera CP

#### CP Text: The United States federal government should mandate that police wear body cameras.

#### Solves the aff-studies prove that equipping police with body cameras reduces the use of force.

WING 10/13 [Nick Wing, Senior editor at the Huffington Post, “Study Shows Less Violence, Fewer Complaints When Cops Wear Body Cameras”, Huffington Post, October 13th, 2015]

Equipping police with body cameras may be an effective way to improve the behavior of officers and the public with which they interact, a new study finds.¶ Last week, researchers at the University of South Florida released their report on a yearlong body-worn camera pilot program at the Orlando Police Department, in which they randomly selected 46 officers to wear the devices and compared them against 43 officers who did not.¶ In the 12 months from March 2014 through February 2015, use-of-force incidents -- also known as "response to resistance" incidents -- dropped 53 percent among officers with the cameras. Civilian complaints against those officers also saw a 65 percent decline.¶ The study also showed significant reductions in the number of civilian injuries by officers wearing body cameras, and of injuries to the officers themselves.¶ Officers who didn't wear body cameras in the study also used force fewer times over the year, though the drop-off was less substantial.¶ The study comes amid a nationwide effort to outfit more police forces with body cameras following high-profile police killings and instances of misconduct, which have spurred calls for improved transparency and accountability. Body cameras have emerged as a rare point of agreement between reform advocates and law enforcement officials, and in December, President Barack Obama announced a $75 million initiative to help departments cover the costs of expanding their programs.¶ Dr. Wesley G. Jennings, principal investigator for the study and associate chair in USF’s Department of Criminology, said officers in Orlando were initially skeptical about the equipment, with some claiming that body cameras wouldn't change their willingness to use force during an arrest. The statistics appear to tell a different story, even though only one in four officers in the study agreed that wearing the devices had any impact on their behavior in the field.¶ Many officers reported that the equipment changed citizen behavior and helped to de-escalate confrontations between civilians and police. They also said body cameras improved evidence collection, and helped them more accurately recollect events and fill out reports. According to Jennings, most officers didn't feel burdened by the body cameras.¶ “The BWC officers overwhelmingly reported that the BWCs would not reduce their willingness to respond to calls, nor would it reduce their self-initiated subject contacts when a crime had been committed,” Jennings said in a statement. “Most felt that the BWCs made them better officers."¶ After the conclusion of the study, two in three officers who wore the cameras said they'd want to continue wearing them in the future. A majority also said the agency should adopt body cameras for all front-line officers.¶ Orlando Police Chief John Mina supports this push, and he's getting help in the form of a roughly $500,000 federal grant for the equipment.¶ “BWCs will also improve accountability and transparency, protect our officers from false complaints, and provide valuable evidence for prosecutors,” said Mina in a statement.¶ Other studies have pointed to similar drops in use of force and civilian complaints after the implementation of body cameras. In Rialto, California, a study of a yearlong program that concluded in 2013 showed a 59 percent reduction in use-of-force incidents by officers wearing cameras, along with an 87 percent drop in civilian complaints, compared to the previous year’s totals.

# \*\*AT Util Advs.\*\*

# A2 Gun Violence Adv.

## Self-Defense

### 1NC: Self-Defense

#### Law-abiding citizens will give up their guns but criminals WON’T-this increases violence because the public has no means of self-defense.

Cook 02 Clint “Should Handguns Be Banned?” Keep and Bear Arms February 1st 2002 <http://www.keepandbeararms.com/information/XcIBViewItem.asp?ID=1753> JW

How are all of these handguns to be removed from the public? If the government insists that private owners must turn in their handguns, I have no doubt that law abiding citizens would do just that, but would the people using guns to commit crimes be as willing to hand their weapons over? One could argue that the remaining handguns could be confiscated as the criminals using them were apprehended. How long would this take? How long should the American public go unarmed while the criminal population remained armed? 1 year, 2 years, 5 years? In the meantime, who or how does the now unarmed public, protect itself? The police are not responsible to protect the individuals; in fact their real charge is to investigate crime, apprehend suspects, and act as a general crime deterrent. The police are not meant to act as personal bodyguards. For argument 's sake, let's assume that the government is very aggressive in getting all of the illegal handguns off the streets. Will the criminal element remain unarmed? My guess is no. The government has been battling the illegal drug market for years, yet drugs still pour over our borders. Why should Americans believe that the government could prevent illegal handguns from entering America? A successful handgun ban would reduce violence. In order to reduce violence all guns must be removed from the criminal hands, and the guns cannot be allowed to return. I have very little confidence that this could happen, due to the number of guns out there, and the difficultly in preventing more guns from entering America. One final thought on this point, before I move on. It is currently illegal for felons to own handguns, yet most criminals are repeat offenders - laws and bans have not prevented criminals from using guns. I know the argument is that because handguns are so prevalent in our society that criminals have no problems obtaining them. I don't believe that removing handguns from the law-abiding public will prevent criminal from obtaining a firearm. Keep in mind that some of the countries with the highest murder rates have the strictest guns laws. In other words, gun bans in other countries have not stopped the violence. Even in America, some of the areas with the fewest guns have the highest violent crime rates. In the last 30 years gun ownership in America has increased, but the violent crime rate has dropped. Not only is the violent crime rate dropping, but also the number of murders in which firearms are used is dropping (FBI's 1998 Uniform Crime Report, Oct 1998) -- proof that crime can be reduced without preventing responsible citizens from owning guns. And in fact some legitimate, scientifically sound studies indicate that private gun ownership actually helps reduce violent crimes. Are handguns too easily concealed? I don't believe handguns should be banned for the very reason they are easy to conceal. I will readily concede that the bad guys use this to their advantage. Any way you look at it, criminals are going to be armed, so why shouldn't responsible adults be allowed to arm themselves. Statistics prove that concealed carry permit holders are far less likely to commit a crime than the average citizen, so giving people the right to carry a concealed handgun only poses a risk to an attacker. I'm not a criminologist, but I believe most of those who commit crime are looking for the "easy score"; while committing the crime they do not want attention, resistance, or the risk of personal harm. If criminals see the potential of any of these, most will move on. Allowing the public to legally carry concealed weapons ups the odds of attention, resistance, and harm. States that have allowed their citizens to be armed have seen a drop in violent crime. I believe that in these states the bad guys no longer view the general public an "easy score". Easy concealment is an important factor when choosing a weapon for personal defense, and Americans have the right to protect themselves! Concealment of the firearm is the only socially acceptable means of public carry, and responsible citizens that choose to carry are not a public threat, do not cause more violence, and do not adopt a Dodge City, and the O.K Corral attitude! Do handguns cause more harm than good? I have no doubt that if ALL guns in America were eliminated, that the number of murders would drop. However I believe that the total elimination of guns is an impossibility in today's world, and that violence would continue. Like it or not, handguns are a part of America's society, and are here to stay. Let's look at how handguns are being used in today's society, and investigate if in fact they do more harm than good. According to the FBI a full 2/3 of the instances in which a gun was fired, it was fired by a criminal at another criminal. The drug dealers and gang bangers are killing each other. Why aren't these people in jail? No gun restriction is going stop a criminal from committing a crime, but gun restrictions may prevent the victim having any feasible means of defense. Murders, rapist, muggers, these people have no respect for human life, so why would they respect the law? If these people were in prison where they belong, gun crimes would instantly drop 66%. A study conducted by The Department of Justice, the F.B.I, and other law enforcement agencies, and Prof. Gary Kleck from the School of Criminology, Florida State University says that handguns are used 1 to 1.5 million times a year, to prevent a crime from occurring. In most of these cases, no shots are ever fired. These 1 million plus instances are perfect examples of handguns doing more good than harm. No one was hurt, and quite possibly the handgun stopped someone from being hurt or murdered. Prof. Gary Kleck went on to do a study that showed victims who defended themselves with a gun suffered lower rates of injury than did those who resisted without a gun, or even those who did not resist at all but instead complied with to the attackers demands. Here is another example of handguns doing good. So while guns are often used to commit crimes and acts of violence, they are far more often the only means of preventing violence.

#### This outweighs:

#### A) magnitude- studies prove harms to self-defense are worse than homicide and suicide combined.

Huemer 03 Michael Huemer “Is There a Right to Own a Gun?” Social Theory and Practice, Vol. 29, No. 2 (April 2003), pp. 297-324 <http://www.owl232.net/guncontrol.htm> JW

Guns are used surprisingly often by private citizens in the United States for self-defense purposes. Fifteen surveys, excluding the one discussed in the following paragraph, have been conducted since 1976, yielding estimates of between 760,000 and 3.6 million defensive gun uses per year, the average estimate being 1.8 million.Footnote Probably among the more reliable is Kleck and Gertz’ 1993 national survey, which obtained an estimate of 2.5 million annual defensive gun uses, excluding military and police uses and excluding uses against animals. Gun users in 400,000 of these cases believe that the [313] gun certainly or almost certainly saved a life.Footnote While survey respondents almost certainly overestimated their danger,Footnote if even one tenth of them were correct, the number of lives saved by guns each year would exceed the number of gun homicides and suicides. For the purposes of Kleck and Gertz’ study, a “defensive gun use” requires respondents to have actually seen a person (as opposed, for example, to merely hearing a suspicious noise in the yard) whom they believed was committing or attempting to commit a crime against them, and to have at a minimum threatened the person with a gun, but not necessarily to have fired the gun. Kleck’s statistics imply that defensive gun uses outnumber crimes committed with guns by a ratio of about 3:1.Footnote While Kleck’s statistics could be an overestimate, one should bear three points in mind before relying on such a hypothesis to discount the defensive value of guns. First, Kleck’s figures would have to be very large overestimates in order for the harms of guns to exceed their benefits. Second, one would have to suppose that all fifteen of the surveys alluded to have contained overestimates. Third, it is not clear prima facie that an overestimate is more likely than an underestimate; perhaps some respondents either invent or misdescribe incidents, but perhaps also some respondents either forget or prefer not to discuss their defensive gun uses with a stranger on the telephone.Footnote [314]

#### B) takes out aff solvency- law abiding citizens aren’t the ones committing the crimes anyway-it’s just criminals which means there is only a risk of a turn.

### A2 43:1 ratio

#### The 43-1 self-defense statistic is BS for so many reasons.

Huemer 03 Michael Huemer “Is There a Right to Own a Gun?” Social Theory and Practice, Vol. 29, No. 2 (April 2003), pp. 297-324 <http://www.owl232.net/guncontrol.htm> JW

One prominent argument claims that a gun kept in the home is 43 times more likely to be used in a suicide, criminal homicide, or accidental death than it is to kill an intruder in self-defense.Footnote This statistic is commonly repeated with various modifications; for instance, LaFollette mischaracterizes the statistic as follows: For every case where someone in a gun-owning household uses a gun to successfully stop a life-threatening attack, nearly forty-three people in similar households will die from a gunshot.Footnote The problem with LaFollette’s characterization, which evinces the statistic’s tendency to mislead, is that Kellerman and Reay made no estimate of the frequency with which guns are used to stop attacks, life-threatening or otherwise; they only considered cases in which someone was killed.Footnote Survey data indicate that only a tiny minority of defensive gun uses involve shooting, let alone killing, the criminal; normally, threatening a criminal with a gun is sufficient. To assess the benefits of guns, one would have to examine the frequency with which guns prevent crimes, rather than the frequency with which they kill criminals.Footnote [311] A second problem is that 37 of Kellerman and Reay’s 43 deaths were suicides. Available evidence is unclear on whether reduced availability of guns would reduce the suicide rate or whether it would only result in substitution into different methods.Footnote In addition, philosophically, it is doubtful that the restriction of gun ownership for the purpose of preventing suicides would fall within the prerogatives of a liberal state, even if such a policy would be effective. One cause for doubt is that such policies infringe upon the rights of gun-owners (both the suicidal ones and the non-suicidal majority) without protecting anyone else’s rights.Footnote Another cause for doubt, from a utilitarian perspective, is that one cannot assume that individuals who decide to kill themselves have overall happy or pleasant lives; therefore, one should not assume that the prevention of suicide, through means other than improving would-be victims’ level of happiness, increases utility, rather than decreasing it. For these reasons, the suicides should be omitted from the figures. A third problem is that Kellerman and Reay only counted as “self-defense” cases that were so labeled by the police and the local prosecutor’s office; they ignored the possibility of cases that were later found in court to be self-defense. The latter kind of self-defense cases were probably more numerous.Footnote

### Handguns K2 Self-Defense

#### Handguns are key:

#### A) you can’t conceal a rifle

#### B) cheaper than larger guns

#### C) most people use handguns for self-defense.

Cook and Ludwig 97 Philip J. Cook and Jens Ludwig “Guns in America: National Survey on Private Ownership and Use of Firearms” National Institute of Justice May 1997 <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/165476.pdf> JW

Another reason cited for firearm ownership was self-protection. Overall, 46 percent of gun owners possessed firearms (usually handguns) primarily for protection against crime (41 percent for males; 67 percent for females). Almost three-quarters of those who owned only handguns kept them primarily for self-protection. Of course, some people seek the protection of a gun because they may be disproportionately likely to lead risky lives or associate with violent people.6 Those who had been arrested for nontraffic offenses were more likely to own firearms (37 percent compared to 25 percent in the general population).

## Background Checks Solve

#### Obama’s just passed universal background checks.

Parsons 1-4 Christi “Obama to announce expanded background checks as he aims to limit gun deaths” Jan 4 2016 <http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-obama-gun-actions-20160104-story.html> JW

President Obama will announce Tuesday that he’ll act on his own authority to expand background checks for would-be gun buyers and increase enforcement of existing laws, a culmination of his effort to curb gun violence that nonetheless falls short of sweeping change he had long sought.

#### Empirics prove-universal background checks massively reduce gun violence.

Horwitz 13 Joshua (Executive Director of the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence) “It's Easy to Understand: Background Checks Save Lives” US News April 9th 2013 <http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/should-congress-support-universal-background-checks-for-gun-purchases/its-easy-to-understand-background-checks-save-lives> JW

It is patently clear that background checks save lives. Background checks conducted by federally licensed firearms dealers (FFLs) have prevented more than two million prohibited purchasers—convicted felons, wife beaters, and other dangerous individuals—from buying guns. Additionally, studies show that in the 14 states that currently require background checks for handgun sales, there are 49 percent fewer gun suicides, 38percent fewer women are shot to death by an intimate partner and the firearms trafficking rate is 48percent lower.

## A2 Accidents

#### Gun accidents are really rare

Mauser 3. Gary A. Mauser. The Failed Experiment Gun Control and Public Safety in Canada, Australia, England and Wales. Number 71 / November 2003. PUBLIC POLICY SOURCES. [www.gunsandcrime.org/faildxprmt.pdf](http://www.gunsandcrime.org/faildxprmt.pdf) NP 2/6/16.

**Accidents involving guns,** despite the media coverage they seem to generate, **are quite rare. Typically, guns account for less than 1% of accidental deaths in any developed country.** Perhaps this rarity is why they receive such emotional media attention. **Vehicle accidents are far more common and pose a far greater risk to the public than do gun accidents, yet car accidents receive little or no interest from the mainstream media.** This is yet another example that media coverage does not indicate the seriousness of a threat.

## A2 Crime/Homicide

### Meta-Analyses

#### Your evidence doesn’t account for confounding variables—the best studies more guns less crime.

Bernstein 15 C'Zar (Oriel College, Oxford University) “Gun Violence Agnosticism” Essays in Philosophy Volume 16 Issue 2 Philosophy & Gun Control Article 6 July 7th 2015 JW

It is very clear that the evidence does not support CIH. Of the 90 findings generated by the 41 studies reviewed, only 26 (~29%) support CIH, whereas 64 (~71%) found against CIH. None of the findings of studies for which more than one of (1) – (3) are true supported CIH. The same trend holds with respect to HIH. Only 36% of studies for which (1) is true support [homicide-increasing hypothesis] HIH compared to 62% of studies for which (1) is false. Of the studies for which (3) is false, 57% support HIH; no studies for which (3) is true found in favour of HIH. Of the studies for which (2) is false, that is, of the studies that controlled for fewer than five significant control variables, 59% found in favour of HIH. This drops to just 17% for studies that controlled for more than five significant control variables. Remarkably, 14 of the 41 studies reviewed by Kleck did not control for a single confounder and these were the studies that were most likely to find in favour of CIH and HIH. Importantly, only six studies controlled for more than five statistically significant control variables and all of them failed to support CIH and 83% found against HIH (they found either that there is no discernible effect or a slight crime-decreasing effect). Finally, there were only three studies for which all of (1) – (3) are true and none of them supported CIH or HIH. On the contrary, Kovandzic et al. (2013), who controlled for ten confounding variables, found that increases in noncriminal gun prevalence would moderately decrease both gun and total homicide rates. Of the studies for which all of (1) – (3) are false (23 of the 41 reviewed), 65% found in favour of HIH.ii Kleck concludes: ‘The overall pattern is very clear—the more methodologically adequate research is, the less likely it is to support the more guns-more crime hypothesis.’ Kleck’s conclusion, if correct, strongly supports GVA.

#### Meta analyses determine the legitimacy of your initial evidence- isolated studies could be flawed for a number of reasons but showing overall patterns of rigorous research shows empirics are on my side.

### Empirics

#### Gun ownership is inversely correlated to gun deaths-empirically disproves their solvency.

McMaken 15 Ryan “Gun Sales Boom...Homicides Tank” October 28th 2015 Ron Paul Liberty Report <http://www.ronpaullibertyreport.com/archives/gun-sales-boomhomicides-tank> JW

The Pew Research Center reported last week that the murder rate was cut nearly in half from 7 per 100,000 in 1993 to 3.6 per 100,000 in 2013. Over the same period, overall gun deaths (including accidents and suicides) have fallen by one-third from 15.2 to 10.6 per 100,000. In spite of this, Pew reports, the American public believes that homicides and gun deaths are increasing in the United States. Those who think violence is getting worse should probably watch less television and look around them instead. The murder rate in the US is currently similar to 1950s levels. Meanwhile, the number of privately owned guns (and gun commerce in general) in the United States has increased substantially in recent decades.

#### So, aff has a proactive burden to prove that they handgun ownership causes more death- handgun ownership has increased drastically and murder rates have fallen, they need to explain legitimate alt causes or else vote neg.

#### And- case studies of handgun bans in the US prove they increase homicide rates.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

Finished with international comparisons, Dixon turns to interstate analysis. If gun controls reduced crime, then it would be expected that states with stricter gun laws would have lower gun crime rates. But as Dixon acknowledges, states with stricter gun laws have higher crime rates. [113] There are several possible explanations. First, the states which enacted the strict gun laws had high crime to begin with; that it why the stricter laws were enacted. A second, not inconsistent explanation, is that gun control itself causes higher crime, making the already high-crime states even worse than they would otherwise be. Dixon deals with the explanation by dismissing it as "perverse." [114] Argument by epithet is not persuasive, and (as will be discussed below), there are plausible reasons to believe that some gun controls may increase crime, and that Dixon's proposed handgun ban would substantially aggravate crime. [115] Dixon admits that at least sometimes handguns prevent crime, [116] so it is hardly "perverse" to suggest that it could be possible that states which weaken the deterrent effect of civilian handgun ownership suffer increased crime. A third explanation for why states with stern gun laws have more crime than other states is that guns from other states, with looser laws, are smuggled into the high crime states, thus reducing or eliminating the crime-reductive effect of the strict state's law. This explanation is not inconsistent with the first two explanations. Dixon devotes the rest of his interstate discussion to arguing for this third explanation. Even if Dixon's explanation about leakage is generally true, it remains difficult to account for the dismal performance of many gun controls. For example, in 1976 the Washington, D.C. murder rate stood at 26.9 per 100,000 population, according to FBI statistics. The city council enacted a handgun ban which went into effect in February \*316 1977, and since then the Washington rate has always been higher than 26.9 (except in 1985). [117] Today, the rate is three times higher than it was before the ban was enacted. [118] If handgun bans work, why would the homicide rate rise after 1977 (which was years before the "war on drugs" made Washington's homicide problem even worse)? Smuggling guns into Washington, D.C. from other states was no easier in 1980 than it was in 1976. The ban on possession by law-abiding citizens should have reduced the supply of handguns available for Washington, D.C. criminals to steal, and should have prevented law-abiding citizens from shooting each other with handguns in heat-of-passion homicides. The D.C. handgun ban's impact on law-abiding citizens would not be defeated by interstate smuggling, since law- abiding citizens would, be definition, not buy an illegal gun. And yet the Washington homicide rate rose. Similar increases in gun crime in other jurisdictions, such as Chicago after its own handgun ban, [119] and New York City after its severe "Sullivan" handgun licensing law, [120] at least raise doubt about the complete sufficiency of interstate gun smuggling as an explanation for the failure of the gun laws. If interstate smuggling were the whole story, then it would not be expected that crime rates would rise immediately after gun laws were enacted.

#### Case studies from within the US and of handgun bans specifically are uniquely key-cultural values change country to country that make laws more or less successful and bans are an especially extreme form of control, default to studies that account for both of these complexities.

### A2 Dixon 11/Killias/Hemenway

#### Dixon uses terrible studies.

Bernstein 15, C'Zar (7-7-2015) "Gun Violence Agnosticism," Essays in Philosophy: Vol. 16: Iss. 2, Article 6. http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/ 1526-0569.1534 (Bernsteinis a professor at *Oriel College, Oxford University)* NP 12/20/15.

One implication of the above is that many of the arguments endorsed by anti-gun philosophers fail. Dixon (2011), for example, appeals to Killias (1993), Hemenway and Miller (2000), and Killias et al. (2001) in support of CIH and HIH. But, according to Kleck (2015), these were among the studies that controlled for no significant control variables and did not take into account the causal order problem. In other words, the studies to which Dixon appealed in support of his argument from net harms are among the methodologically worst studies available. The best studies cannot be used to support CIH or HIH in an argument for gun bans.

# A2 Soft Power Adv.

### A2 Winkates (Kyoto CP)

#### Counterplan: the United States will sign the Kyoto environmental treaty.

#### Solves soft power-your evidence.

Winkates 7 James Winkates (Research Professor at International Affairs Air War College) "Soft Power Contributions to U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association 48th Annual Convention, Hilton Chicago, CHICAGO, IL, USA, Feb 28, 2007 http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p181547\_index.html

External perceptions of policy legitimacy directly enhance a nation’s soft power. Because of domestic and foreign policy choices made by the U.S. government and even private business, America starts out disadvantaged in terms of perceived illegitimacy. The cutting difference is not the “rightness” or “wrongness” of the policy choices; rather it is that U.S. public and private decision selections are often at variance with the larger international community. National policy on capital punishment and gun ownership, for example, put America in a minority of governments on those issues. 15 With only 3% of world population, the U.S. uses nearly 25% of global petroleum supplies and we appear more self-indulgent in refusing to limit production of gas-guzzling vehicles. The U.S. has rejected the scientific validity of global warming, choosing not to sign the Kyoto environmental treaty.

Impacts: A) we solve case more than you do since this is an international issue that directly affects other countries, not just a domestic issue. B) your evidence says that multiple things erode soft power-we solve one and the aff solves one which non uniques your advantage, C) dozens of alt causes listed- low minimum wages, death penalty, etc. The aff can’t possibly solve enough to prevent a nuclear terror attack.

### A2 Freedland 13

#### 1. This just talks about one thing that erodes soft power but that’s a drop in the bucket compared to things like the international war on terror and global pollution we contribute to. Trump proves we’re way behind now

#### 2. Freedland says that mass shootings like Newtown or Sandy Hook are what make us look like a basket case, but the aff can’t solve since those are usually committed with assault rifles AND devoted criminals will get their hands on one no matter what.

## Impact Level

### Soft Power Imp. D

#### No impact and single issues aren’t key. Data proves.

Christopher Fettweis, professor of political science at Tulane, Credibility and the War on Terror, Winter 2008, Political Science Quarterly, Ingenta.

There is actually scant evidence that other states ever learn the right lessons. ColdWar history contains little reason to believe that the credibility of the superpowers had very much effect on their ability to influence others. Over the last decade, a series of major scholarly studies have cast further doubt upon the fundamental assumption of interdependence across foreign policy actions. Employing methods borrowed from social psychology rather than the economics-based models commonly employed by deterrence theorists, Jonathan Mercer argued that threats are far more independent than is commonly believed and, therefore, that reputations are not likely to be formed on the basis of individual actions. While policymakers may feel that their decisions send messages about their basic dispositions to others, most of the evidence from social psychology suggests otherwise. Groups tend to interpret the actions of their rivals as situational, dependent upon the constraints of place and time. Therefore, they are not likely to form lasting impressions of irresolution from single, independent events. Mercer argued that the interdependence assumption had been accepted on faith, and rarely put to a coherent test; when it was, **it almost inevitably failed**.

#### States don’t have feelings – soft power doesn’t work

**Fan 7** (Ying, Senior Lecturer in Marketing at Brunel Business School, Brunel University in London, “Soft power: Power of attraction or confusion?”, November 14)

The whole concept of soft power — power of attraction — is based on the assumption that there is a link between attractiveness and the ability to influence others in international relations, that is, such a power of attraction does have the ability to shape the preferences of others. This may be the case at the personal or individual level. It is questionable whether attraction power works at the nation level. Wang (2006) identifies two problems. First, a country has many different actors. Some of them like the attraction and others do not. Whether the attraction will lead to the ability to influence the policy of the target country depends on which groups in that country find it attractive (eg the political elite, the general public or a marginal group), and how much control they have on policymaking. For example, soft power by Country A may have positive influence on the political elite but negative influence on the general public in Country B, or vice versa. Secondly, policy making at the state level is far more complicated than at the personal level; and has different dynamics that emphasise the rational considerations. This leaves little room for emotional elements, thus significantly reducing the effect of soft power. Even Nye (2004a) has to admit, what soft power can influence is not the policy making itself but only the ‘environment for policy’. Soft power may be counterproductive because societies react differently to American culture, the working of which is extremely complex, not least because of the diversity

#### Legitimacy is inevitable and isn’t key to cooperation anyway

**Wohlforth 9** — Daniel Webster Professor of Government, Dartmouth. BA in IR, MA in IR and MPhil and PhD in pol sci, Yale (William and Stephen Brooks, Reshaping the World Order, March / April 2009, Foreign Affairs Vol. 88, Iss. 2; pg. 49, 15 pgs)

FOR ANALYSTS such as Zbigniew Brzezinski and Henry Kissinger, the key reason for skepticism about the United States' ability to spearhead global institutional change is not a lack of power but a lack of legitimacy. Other states may simply refuse to follow a leader whose legitimacy has been squandered under the Bush administration; in this view, the legitimacy to lead is a fixed resource that can be obtained only under special circumstances. The political scientist G. John Ikenberry argues in After Victory that states have been well positioned to reshape the institutional order only after emerging victorious from some titanic struggle, such as the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, or World War I or II. For the neoconservative Robert Kagan, the legitimacy to lead came naturally to the United States during the Cold War, when it was providing the signal service of balancing the Soviet Union. The implication is that today, in the absence of such salient sources of legitimacy, the wellsprings of support for U.S. leadership have dried up for good. But this view is mistaken. For one thing, it overstates how accepted U.S. leadership was during the Cold War: anyone who recalls the Euromissile crisis of the 1980s, for example, will recognize that mass opposition to U.S. policy (in that case, over stationing intermediaterange nuclear missiles in Europe) is not a recent phenomenon. For another, it understates how dynamic and malleable legitimacy is. Legitimacy is based on the belief that an action, an actor, or a political order is proper, acceptable, or natural. An action - such as the Vietnam War or the invasion of Iraq - may come to be seen as illegitimate without sparking an irreversible crisis of legitimacy for the actor or the order. When the actor concerned has disproportionately more material resources than other states, the sources of its legitimacy can be refreshed repeatedly. After all, this is hardly the first time Americans have worried about a crisis of legitimacy. Tides of skepticism concerning U.S. leadership arguably rose as high or higher after the fall of Saigon in 1975 and during Ronald Reagan's first term, when he called the Soviet Union an "evil empire." Even George W. Bush, a globally unpopular U.S. president with deeply controversial policies, oversaw a marked improvement in relations with France, Germany, and India in recent years - even before the elections of Chancellor Angela Merkel in Germany and President Nicolas Sarkozy in France. Of course, the ability of the United States to weather such crises of legitimacy in the past hardly guarantees that it can lead the system in the future. But there are reasons for optimism. Some of the apparent damage to U.S. legitimacy might merely be the result of the Bush administration's approach to diplomacy and international institutions. Key underlying conditions remain particularly favorable for sustaining and even enhancing U.S. legitimacy in the years ahead. The United States continues to have a far larger share of the human and material resources for shaping global perceptions than any other state, as well as the unrivaled wherewithal to produce public goods that reinforce the benefits of its global role. No other state has any claim to leadership commensurate with Washington's. And largely because of the power position the United States still occupies, there is no prospect of a counterbalancing coalition emerging anytime soon to challenge it. In the end, the legitimacy of a system's leader hinges on whether the system's members see the leader as acceptable or at least preferable to realistic alternatives. Legitimacy is not necessarily about normative approval: one may dislike the United States but think its leadership is natural under the circumstances or the best that can be expected. Moreover, history provides abundant evidence that past leading states - such as Spain, France, and the United Kingdom - were able to revise the international institutions of their day without the special circumstances Ikenberry and Kagan cite. Spain fashioned both normative and positive laws to legitimize its conquest of indigenous Americans in the early seventeenth century; France instituted modern concepts of state borders to meet its needs as Europe's preeminent land power in the eighteenth century; and the United Kingdom fostered rules on piracy, neutral shipping, and colonialism to suit its interests as a developing maritime empire in the nineteenth century. As Wilhelm Grewe documents in his magisterial The Epochs of International Law, these states accomplished such feats partly through the unsubtle use of power: bribes, coercion, and the allure oflucrative long-term cooperation. Less obvious but often more important, the bargaining hands of the leading states were often strengthened by the general perception that they could pursue their interests in even less palatable ways - notably, through the naked use of force. Invariably, too, leading states have had the power to set the international agenda, indirectly affecting the development of new rules by defining the problems they were developed to address. Given its naval primacy and global trading interests, the United Kingdom was able to propel the slave trade to the forefront of the world's agenda for several decades after it had itself abolished slavery at home, in 1833. The bottom line is that the United States today has the necessary legitimacy to shepherd reform of the international system.

### Soft Power Imp. Turn

#### Soft power is bad—they’re missing an internal link; soft power kills hard power which destroys our legitimacy and ability to effect global change. Matalin 09

#### John Matalin (CNN Commentator) 2009 “Matalin: Obama’s ’soft power’ makes us weak”, CNN's American Morning

John Roberts: The former vice president has said several times that the Obama administration’s policies are making America less safe. Where’s the evidence for that? Mary Matalin: Common sense and history… It’s one thing to say all of the things Obama said on the campaign trail but within hours of being the actual commander in chief, he was suggesting the previous seven years marked by no attacks were policies that were ineffective, were immoral, were illegal. That broadcast to our enemies a weakness. Weakness invites provocation. Secondly, as he was clear in his speech yesterday, he wants to return to a 9/10 law enforcement policy rather than a prevention policy. Three, the threshold and key tool for fighting this enemy is gathering intelligence. And he’s clearly demoralized and undermined those intelligence gatherers. Four, Gitmo, releasing the hardest of the hardened terrorists into some system, whatever system that might be, either would divulge classified material… if they put them in the prison population, they can hatch plots as was the case in New York. So I could go on and on. But some of these policies, by virtue of the former vice president speaking out, were stopped as in the release of the detainee photos. Roberts: But is there any empirical evidence that America is less safe today? Has anything happened around the world to suggest that we are less safe? There are many people who believe that this administration’s policy of engagement, in fact, will make this country more safe. Matalin: Well there’s no evidence of that either. In fact there’s evidence to the contrary. This so-called “soft power” has resulted in Iran being more verbose, launching a missile this week. North Korea’s pulled out of any negotiating posture. Soft power isn’t working. There’s no evidence for that. And there’s plenty of evidence to the contrary that weakness invites provocation. During the ’90s, when we did not respond to six attacks in six years, the ranks of al Qaeda swelled by some 20,000. That was the recruitment tool. Weakness and successful attacks is the recruitment tool. Roberts: Just to go back to what you said about Iran and North Korea — both of those countries did exactly the same thing during the Bush administration. Matalin: This supposedly “let’s sit down and talk,” was supposed to make them come to the table and talk. In fact, they’ve gotten more aggressive. So, he’s doing what he said he would do, which would render them putty in his hands as he thinks is the case as sometimes appears to be the case in America in his own party. That’s not what’s happening. That’s not real politics. So he’s been in there a couple of 16 weeks, three months, whatever it’s been. But if he were allowed to pursue un-debated, these sorts of policies that he’s put on the table and heretofore, they have been un-debated, it’s been a one-sided argument, there’s no doubt, and history shows and common sense would dictate that we would be a less safe country than we were for the past seven or eight years. Roberts: The president said yesterday he believes America is less safe because of the very existence of Guantanamo Bay, that it’s probably created more terrorists worldwide than it’s ever detained. Do you agree with that statement? Because the Bush administration, President Bush said he would like to close Guantanamo and just has to figure out how to do it. Matalin: Yeah, John, I’ll go to your construct. He offered no evidence for that. And it’s a tautological argument, as I just noted. The ranks of al Qaeda were absolutely exponentially swollen during the ’90s when we did not respond… This enemy existed way before Guantanamo. It makes no sense to say that fighting the terrorists makes the terrorist. That’s a tautological argument. Yes, President Bush wanted to close it. Some of us disagreed with that. For the very reasons we’re disagreeing with President Obama right now.vWhat are you going to do with these detainees? Even the ones that have been released, which were supposed to be the ones that could have been released, the D.O.D. and some suspect this is an under-estimate – one out of seven go back to the battlefield. The top operatives in Yemen, which is the new hot grounds, the top operatives in Waziristan, were released from Gitmo. It’s not good to close it down or release these into our population, certainly, or any population.

Prefer my evidence- **1.** My evidence post-dates—with the quickly shifting policy scenarios, recency is key to capturing the most important factors of the squo. **2.** Their evidence cites examples about US soft power being able to fix things, but this is empirically denied- ISIS is expanding, Russia is becoming even more extreme, and disaster in congress means soft power is useless to prevent terrorism.

### Nuclear Terror Imp. D

#### 1 in 3.5 billion chance of nuclear terrorism.

**Schneidmiller 9** (Chris, Experts Debate Threat of Nuclear, Biological Terrorism, 13 January 2009, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20090113\_7105.php, AMiles)

There is an "almost **vanishingly small" likelihood** that terrorists would ever be able to acquire and detonate a nuclear weapon, one expert said here yesterday (see GSN, Dec. 2, 2008). In even the most likely scenario of nuclear terrorism, there are 20 barriers between extremists and a successful nuclear strike on a major city, said John Mueller, a political science professor at Ohio State University. The process itself is seemingly straightforward but exceedingly difficult -- buy or steal highly enriched uranium, manufacture a weapon, take the bomb to the target site and blow it up. Meanwhile, variables strewn across the path to an attack would increase the complexity of the effort, Mueller argued. Terrorists would have to bribe officials in a state nuclear program to acquire the material, while avoiding a sting by authorities or a scam by the sellers. The material itself could also turn out to be bad. "Once the purloined material is purloined, [police are] going to be chasing after you. They are also going to put on a high reward, extremely high reward, on getting the weapon back or getting the fissile material back," Mueller said during a panel discussion at a two-day Cato Institute conference on counterterrorism issues facing the incoming Obama administration. Smuggling the material out of a country would mean relying on criminals who "are very good at extortion" and might have to be killed to avoid a double-cross, Mueller said. The terrorists would then have to find scientists and engineers willing to give up their normal lives to manufacture a bomb, which would require an expensive and sophisticated machine shop. Finally, further technological expertise would be needed to sneak the weapon across national borders to its destination point and conduct a successful detonation, Mueller said. Every obstacle is "difficult but not impossible" to overcome, Mueller said, putting the chance of success at no less than one in three for each. The likelihood of successfully passing through each obstacle, in sequence, would be roughly one in 3 1/2 billion, he said, but for argument's sake dropped it to 3 1/2 million. "It's a total gamble. This is a very expensive and difficult thing to do," said Mueller, who addresses the issue at greater length in an upcoming book, Atomic Obsession. "So unlike buying a ticket to the lottery ... you're basically putting everything, including your life, at stake for a gamble that's maybe one in 3 1/2 million or 3 1/2 billion." Other scenarios are even less probable, Mueller said. A nuclear-armed state is "exceedingly unlikely" to hand a weapon to a terrorist group, he argued: "States just simply won't give it to somebody they can't control." Terrorists are also not likely to be able to steal a whole weapon, Mueller asserted, dismissing the idea of "loose nukes." Even Pakistan, which today is perhaps the nation of greatest concern regarding nuclear security, keeps its bombs in two segments that are stored at different locations, he said (see GSN, Jan. 12). Fear of an "extremely improbable event" such as nuclear terrorism produces support for a wide range of homeland security activities, Mueller said. He argued that there has been a major and costly overreaction to the terrorism threat -- noting that the Sept. 11 attacks helped to precipitate the invasion of Iraq, which has led to far more deaths than the original event. Panel moderator Benjamin Friedman, a research fellow at the Cato Institute, said academic and governmental discussions of acts of nuclear or biological terrorism have tended to focus on "worst-case assumptions about terrorists' ability to use these weapons to kill us." There is need for consideration for what is probable rather than simply what is possible, he said. Friedman took issue with the finding late last year of an experts' report that an act of WMD terrorism would "more likely than not" occur in the next half decade unless the international community takes greater action. "I would say that the report, if you read it, actually offers no analysis to justify that claim, which seems to have been made to change policy by generating alarm in headlines." One panel speaker offered a partial rebuttal to Mueller's presentation. Jim Walsh, principal research scientist for the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said he agreed that nations would almost certainly not give a nuclear weapon to a nonstate group, that most terrorist organizations have no interest in seeking out the bomb, and that it would be difficult to build a weapon or use one that has been stolen.

#### There’s no interest in WMDs

**Mueller 10**—Professor of Political Science and International Relations @ Ohio State. Widely-recognized expert on terrorism threats in foreign policy. AB from U Chicago, MA in pol sci from UCLA and PhD in pol sci from UCLA (John, “Calming Our Nuclear Jitters”, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Winter 2010, Vol. 26, Issue 2, EBSCO, RBatra)

The al Qaeda factor The degree to which al Qaeda, the only terrorist group that seems to want to target the United States, has pursued or even has much interest in a nuclear weapon may have been exaggerated. The 9/11 Commission stated that "al Qaeda has tried to acquire or make nuclear weapons for at least ten years," but the only substantial evidence it supplies comes from an episode that is supposed to have taken place about 1993 in Sudan, when al Qaeda members may have sought to purchase some uranium that turned out to be bogus. Information about this supposed venture apparently comes entirely from Jamal al Fadl, who defected from al Qaeda in 1996 after being caught stealing $110,000 from the organization. Others, including the man who allegedly purchased the uranium, assert that although there were various other scams taking place at the time that may have served as grist for Fadl, the uranium episode never happened. As a key indication of al Qaeda's desire to obtain atomic weapons, many have focused on a set of conversations in Afghanistan in August 2001 that two Pakistani nuclear scientists reportedly had with Osama bin Laden and three other al Qaeda officials. Pakistani intelligence officers characterize the discussions as "academic" in nature. It seems that the discussion was wide-ranging and rudimentary and that the scientists provided no material or specific plans. Moreover, the scientists probably were incapable of providing truly helpful information because their expertise was not in bomb design but in the processing of fissile material, which is almost certainly beyond the capacities of a nonstate group. Kalid Sheikh Mohammed, the apparent planner of the 9/11 attacks, reportedly says that al Qaeda's bomb efforts never went beyond searching the Internet. After the fall of the Taliban in 2001, technical experts from the CIA and the Department of Energy examined documents and other information that were uncovered by intelligence agencies and the media in Afghanistan. They uncovered no credible information that al Qaeda had obtained fissile material or acquired a nuclear weapon. Moreover, they found no evidence of any radioactive material suitable for weapons. They did uncover, however, a "nuclear-related" document discussing "openly available concepts about the nuclear fuel cycle and some weapons-related issues." Just a day or two before al Qaeda was to flee from Afghanistan in 2001, bin Laden supposedly told a Pakistani journalist, "If the United States uses chemical or nuclear weapons against us, we might respond with chemical and nuclear weapons. We possess these weapons as a deterrent." Given the military pressure that they were then under and taking into account the evidence of the primitive or more probably nonexistent nature of al Qaedas nuclear program, the reported assertions, although unsettling, appear at best to be a desperate bluff. Bin Laden has made statements about nuclear weapons a few other times. Some of these pronouncements can be seen to be threatening, but they are rather coy and indirect, indicating perhaps something of an interest, but not acknowledging a capability. And as terrorism specialist Louise Richardson observes, "Statements claiming a right to possess nuclear weapons have been misinterpreted as expressing a determination to use them. This in turn has fed the exaggeration of the threat we face." Norwegian researcher Anne Stenersen concluded after an exhaustive study of available materials that, although "it is likely that al Qaeda central has considered the option of using non-conventional weapons," there is "little evidence that such ideas ever developed into actual plans, or that they were given any kind of priority at the expense of more traditional types of terrorist attacks." She also notes that information on an al Qaeda computer left behind in Afghanistan in 2001 indicates that only $2,000 to $4,000 was earmarked for weapons of mass destruction research and that the money was mainly for very crude work on chemical weapons. Today, the key portions of al Qaeda central may well total only a few hundred people, apparently assisting the Taliban's distinctly separate, far larger, and very troublesome insurgency in Afghanistan. Beyond this tiny band, there are thousands of sympathizers and would-be jihadists spread around the globe. They mainly connect in Internet chat rooms, engage in radicalizing conversations, and variously dare each other to actually do something. Any "threat," particularly to the West, appears, then, principally to derive from self-selected people, often isolated from each other, who fantasize about performing dire deeds. From time to time some of these people, or ones closer to al Qaeda central, actually manage to do some harm. And occasionally, they may even be able to pull off something large, such as 9/11. But in most cases, their capacities and schemes, or alleged schemes, seem to be far less dangerous than initial press reports vividly, even hysterically, suggest. Most important for present purposes, however, is that any notion that al Qaeda has the capacity to acquire nuclear weapons, even if it wanted to, looks farfetched in the extreme. It is also noteworthy that, although there have been plenty of terrorist attacks in the world since 2001, all have relied on conventional destructive methods. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in a memo on an al Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan in 2004: "Make use of that which is available … rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your reach." In fact, history consistently demonstrates that terrorists prefer weapons that they know and understand, not new, exotic ones.

### Russia Impact Turn

BEWARE OF DOUBLE TURN WITH KYOTO CP

#### Russia-US relations are strained now—increased cooperation is key.

RT 13, (Russia Today, Albright, Ivanov praise Russia-US cooperation, urge work on Mideast settlement, November 22, 2013, http://rt.com/politics/albright-ivanov-reset-cooperation-140/)

Former foreign relations bosses of Russia and United States published an article together saying the two nations must join forces to resolve various international issues, such as the current crises in Syria and Iran.¶ In the joint statement published by the Foreign Policy magazine, Igor Ivanov and Madeleine Albright note that though Moscow and Washington still have a number of disagreements in international politics, the peoples of the two countries must concentrate more on examples of successive cooperation and apply this experience to future goals.¶ According to recent research by Russia’s Levada Center, the attitude of Russians towards the US as a nation is gradually deteriorating. The share of those who hold that the US play a negative role in the international politics has risen from 43 to 50 percent over the past year. The number Russians who said that the US themselves are not living by the international laws they want to impose on others has grown from 67 to 71 percent. Only 10 percent of those polled said they saw some positive aspects in the US foreign policy.

#### Terrorist attacks prompt increased US-Russia cooperation—Boston bombings prove.

Suslov 13, (Dmitry Suslov, Deputy Director for Research at the Council on Foreign and Defense Policy, “A New Start for Russian-US Counter-Terrorism Cooperation,” 09/07/13, http://valdaiclub.com/usa/60020.html)

The idea that Russia and the United States should work together to combat international terrorism is not new, and has already become a banality. But experience confirms time and time again that this cooperation is a must. The latest striking evidence of this has been provided by acts of terror in Boston and Makhachkala last spring. For all the differences between them, both are rooted in radical Islamism and Jihadism, and are a consequence of the existence of international terrorism. At a summit in Northern Ireland, Russian and American leaders emphasized the increasing importance of cooperation in combating international terrorism, and adopted a joint statement on this score. This creates grounds for certain optimism.

#### That’s key to prevent accidental nuclear war.

**Newsweek** – 9/1/**08** (“How to Manage Moscow”, http://www.newsweek.com/id/154906/page/1)

Or take existing nuclear weapons. U.S. and Russian stockpiles remain dangerously high, as does the chance of accidental or un-authorized use. We want to move to a world of fewer nuclear weapons in fewer hands. Bilateral negotiations between the United States and Russia remain the best and only way to get from here to there. The Bush administration has said that so long as Russia occupies parts of Georgia there will be no return to "business as usual" in U.S.–Russian relations. This suggests a form of linkage, a policy from the cold war, where bilateral ties across the board are adversely affected because of disagreement over a particular issue, in this case Georgia. This is a questionable strategy for the United States at a time when so much else on our agenda involves Russia. Instead, U.S. policy ought to be for the two countries to cooperate where they can—and to disagree and compete within constraints where they must.

#### US-Russian nuclear war ensures planetary extinction

Helen Caldicott, Founder of Physicians for Social Responsibility, 2002 (The new nuclear danger, p. 7-12)

If launched from Russia, nuclear weapons would explode over American cities thirty minutes after takeoff. (China's twenty missiles are liquidfueled, not solid-fueled. They take many hours to fuel and could not be used in a surprise attack, but they would produce similar damage if launched. Other nuclear-armed nations, such as India and Pakistan, do not have the missile technology to attack the U.S.) It is assumed that most cities with a population over 100,000 people are targeted by Russia. During these thirty minutes, the U.S. early-warning infrared satellite detectors signal the attack to the strategic air command in Colorado. They in turn notify the president, who has approximately three minutes to decide whether or not to launch a counterattack. In the counterforce scenario the US. government currently embraces, he does [the U.S.] launch[es], the missiles pass mid-space, and the whole operation is over within one hour. Landing at 20 times the speed of sound, nuclear weapons explode over cities, with heat equal to that inside the center of the sun. There is practically no warning, except the emergency broadcast system on radio or TV, which gives the public only minutes to reach the nearest fallout shelter, assuming there is one. There is no time to collect children or immediate family members. The bomb, or bombs-because most major cities will be hit with more than one explosion-will gouge out craters 200 feet deep and 1000 feet in diameter if they explode at ground level. Most, however, are programmed to produce an air burst, which increases the diameter of destruction, but creates a shallower crater. Half a mile from the epicenter all buildings will be destroyed, and at 1.7 miles only reinforced concrete buildings will remain. At 2.7 miles bare skeletons of buildings still stand, single-family residences have disappeared, 50 percent are dead and 40 percent severely injured.' Bricks and mortar are converted to missiles traveling at hundreds of miles an hour. Bodies have been sucked out of buildings and converted to missiles themselves, flying through the air at loo miles per hour. Severe overpressures (pressure many times greater than normal atmospheric have popcorned windows, producing millions of shards of flying glass, causing decapitations and shocking lacerations. Overpressures have also entered the nose, mouth, and ears, inducing rupture of lungs and rupture of the tympanic membranes or eardrums. Most people will suffer severe burns. In Hiroshima, which was devastated by a very small bomb-13 kilotons compared to the current iooo kilotons-a child actually disappeared, vaporized, leaving his shadow on the concrete pavement behind him. A mother was running, holding her baby, and both she and the baby were converted to a charcoal statue. The heat will be so intense that dry objects-furniture, clothes, and dry wood-will spontaneously ignite. Humans will become walking, flaming torches. Forty or fifty miles from the explosion people will instantly be blinded from retinal burns if they glance at the flash. Huge firestorms will engulf thousands of square miles, fanned by winds from the explosion that transiently exceed 1000 miles per hour. People in fallout shelters will be asphyxiated as fire sucks oxygen from the shelters. (This happened in Hamburg after the Allied bombing in WWII when temperatures within the shelters, caused by conventional bombs, reached 1472 degrees Fahrenheit.)" Most of the city and its people will be converted to radioactive dust shot up in the mushroom cloud. The area of lethal fallout from this cloud will depend upon the prevailing wind and weather conditions; it could cover thousands of square miles. Doses of 5000 rads (a rad is a measure of radiation dose) or more experienced by people close to the explosion-if they are still aliv-will produce acute encephalopathic syndrome. The cells of the brain will become so damaged that they would swell. Because the brain is enclosed in a fixed bony space, there is no room for swelling, so the pressure inside the skull rises, inducing symptoms of excitability, acute nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, severe headache, and seizures, followed by coma and death within twenty-four hours. A lower dose of 1000 rads causes death from gastrointestinal symptoms. The lining cells of the gut die, as do the cells in the bone marrow that fight infection and that cause blood clotting. Mouth ulcers, loss of appetite, severe colicky abdominal pain, nausea, vomiting, and bloody diarrhea occur within seven to fourteen days. Death follows severe fluid loss, infection, hemorrhage, and starvation. At 450 rads, 50 percent of the population dies. Hair drops out, vomiting and bloody diarrhea occurs, accompanied by bleeding under the skin and from the gums. Death occurs from internal hemorrhage, generalized septicemia, and infection. Severe trauma and injuries exacerbate the fallout symptoms, so patients die more readily from lower doses of radiation. Infants, children, and old people are more sensitive to radiation than healthy adults. Within bombed areas, fatalities will occur from a combination of trauma, burns, radiation sickness, and starvation. There will be virtually no medical care, even for the relief of pain, because most physicians work within The United States owns 103 nuclear power plants, plus many other dangerous radioactive facilities related to past activities of the cold war. A 1000- kiloton bomb (1 megaton) landing on a standard iooo megawatt reactor and its cooling pools, which contain intensely radioactive spent nuclear fuel, would permanently contaminate an .' area the size of western Germany3 The International Atomic Energy Agency now considers these facilities to be attractive terrorist targets, ' post-September 11,2001. Millions of decaying bodies-human and animal alike-will rot, infected with viruses and bacteria that will mutate in the radioactive-environment to become more lethal. Trillions of insects, naturally ' resistant to radiation-flies, fleas, cockroaches, and lice--will transmit disease from the dead to the living**,** to people whose immune mechanisms have been severely compromised by the high levels of background radiation. Rodents will multiply by the millions among the corpses and shattered sewerage systems. Epidemics of diseases now controlled by immunization and good hygiene will reappear: such as measles, polio, typhoid, cholera, whooping cough, diphtheria, smallpox, plague, tuberculosis, meningitis, malaria, and hepatitis. Anyone who makes it to a fallout shelter and is not asphyxiated in it, will need to stay there for at least six months until the radiation decays sufficiently so outside survival is possible. It has been postulated that perhaps older people should be sent outside to scavenge for food because they will not live long enough to develop malignancies from the fallout (cancer and leukemia have long incubation periods ranging from five to sixty But any food that manages to grow will be toxicbecause plants concentrate radioactive elements.\*/ Finally, we must examine the systemic global effects of a nuclear . , war. Firestorms will consume oil wells, chemical facilities, cities, and forests, covering the earth with a blanket of thick, black, radioactive , I I ' smoke, reducing sunlight to 17 percent of normal. One year or more ' ) , will be required for light and temperature to return to normalper- "r haps supranormal values, as sunlight would return to more than its , , usual intensity, enhanced in the ultraviolet spectrum by depletion of the stratospheric ozone layer. Subfreezing temperatures could destroy the biological support system for civilization, resulting in massive starvation, thirst, and hypothermia.5 To quote a 1985 SCOPE document published by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, "the total loss of human agricultural and societal support systems would result in the loss of almost all humans on Earth**,** essentially equally among combatant and noncombatant countries alike . . . this vulnerability is an aspect not currently a part of the understanding of nuclear war; not only are the major combatant countries in danger, but virtually the entire human population is being held hostage to the large-scale use of nuclear weapons. . . .",! i The proposed START I11 treaty between Russia and America, even if it were implemented, would still allow 3000 to 5000 hydrogen bombs to be maintained on alert."he threshold for nuclear winter? One thousand loo-kiloton bombs blowing up loo cities7-a I c distinct possibility given current capabilities and targeting plans. On January 25,1995, military technicians at radar stations in northern Russia detected signals from an American missile that had just been launched off the coast of Norway carrying a US. scientific probe. Although the Russians had been previously notified of this launch, the alert had been forgotten or ignored. Aware that US. submarines could launch a missile containing eight deadly hydrogen bombs fifteen minutes from Moscow, Russian officials assumed that America had initiated a nuclear war. For the first time in history, the Russian computer containing nuclear launch codes was opened. President Boris Yeltsin, sitting at that computer being advised on how to launch a nuclear war by his military officers, had only a threeminute interval to make a decision. At the last moment, the US. missile veered off course. He realized that Russia was not under attack.' If Russia had launched its missiles, the US. early-warning satellites would immediately have detected them, and radioed back to Cheyenne Mountain. This would have led to the notification of the president, who also would have had three minutes to make his launch decision, and America's missiles would then have been fired from their silos. We were thus within minutes of global annihilation that day. ,' Today, Russia's early-warning and nuclear command systems are deteriorating. Russia's early-warning system fails to operate up to seven hours a day because only one-third of its radars are functional, and two of the nine global geographical areas covered by its missilewarning satellites are not under surveillance for missile detection.9 TO make matters worse, the equipment controlling nuclear weapons malfunctions frequently, and critical electronic devices and computers sometimes switch to combat mode for no apparent reason. According to the CIA, seven times during the fall of 1996 operations at some Russian nuclear weapons facilities were severely disrupted when robbers tried to "mine" critical communications cables for their copper!'" This vulnerable Russian system could easily be stressed by an internal or international political crisis, when the danger of accidental or indeed intentional nuclear war would become very real. And the U.S. itself is not invulnerable to error. In August 1999, for example, when the National Imagery and Mapping Agency was installing a new computer system to deal with potential Y2K problems, this operation triggered a computer malfunction which rendered the agency "blind" for days; it took more than eight months for the defect to be fully repaired. As the New York Times reported, part of America's nuclear early-warning system was rendered incompetent for almost a year." (At that time I was sitting at a meeting in the west wing of the White House discussing potentially dangerous Y2K nuclear weapons glitches. Several Pentagon officials blithely reassured me that everything would function normally during the roll-over. But in fact, their intelligence system had already been disabled.) Such a situation has the potential for catastrophe. If America cannot observe what the Russians are doing with their nuclear weapons-or vice versa-especially during a serious international crisis they are likely to err on the side of "caution," which could mean that something as benign as the launch of a weather satellite could actually trigger annihilation of the planet*.* This situation became even more significant after the September 11 attack.

# A2 Latin American Relations Adv.

### A2 Sweig 13/Sweig CP

Counterplan: the United States federal government will

-expand multiple-sale reporting requirements on assault weapons

-open dialogue with Brazil about gun control

-exclude firearms and ammunition from the ECRI

-apply a sporting test standards to gun imports

And -ban assault rifles and high capacity magazines

#### Counterplan solves case just as much- your author.

Sweig 13 Julia E. Sweig (Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies) “A Strategy to Reduce Gun Trafficking and Violence in the Americas” Council on Foreign Relations, Policy Innovation Memorandum No. 36 July 2013 <http://www.cfr.org/arms-industries-and-trade/strategy-reduce-gun-trafficking-violence-americas/p31155> JW

Recommendations In the absence of major legislative action, the Obama administration should pursue the following executive and diplomatic actions—consistent with the Second Amendment—to reduce the trafficking of firearms that contribute to crime and violence across the Americas: Expand nationwide the state-level multiple-sale reporting requirement for assault weapons. In 2011, the Obama administration adopted a federal rule that requires gun dealers in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico to report sales of more than two semiautomatic rifles to the same person within a five-day period. Unintentionally, the rule shifted gun sales to states not covered by the requirement, prompting the need for improved oversight of all suspicious semiautomatic firearm sales. Incorporate strategies to reduce existing stocks of illegal firearms into U.S.-Brazil dialogue on defense and security. As home to the two largest firearms industries in the hemisphere, the United States and Brazil have a mutual interest in incorporating this topic into their ongoing bilateral policy dialogues. For example, sharing best practices regarding gun buyback programs in border regions on the U.S.-Mexican and Brazilian-Bolivian borders will build mutual confidence between the two largest Hemispheric powers. Exclude firearms and ammunition products from the Export Control Reform Initiative. As currently crafted, President Barack Obama's reform initiative may make it easier for U.S. manufacturers to export military-style weapons to allies. Liberalizing export restrictions on firearms poses a serious security risk to the Americas; potential reexport of firearms without U.S. oversight could jeopardize local law enforcement efforts to keep weapons from criminal groups and rogue security forces in the region. Apply the "sporting test" standards of the 1968 Gun Control Act. This provision prohibits the import of weapons not "suitable or readily adaptable for sporting purposes," including but not limited to military-style firearms. Throughout the 1990s, under Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton, the ATF adhered to the sporting test guidelines, preventing thousands of assault weapons from entering the U.S. firearms market. Enforcement of the test lapsed under President George W. Bush and has not been reestablished under President Obama. Continue to support federal, state, and local initiatives to improve regulation of the U.S. civilian firearms market. As grassroots organizations prepare their long-term legislative strategies, the White House should back state and local legislation, based on reforms in Maryland and Connecticut, which bans the sale of assault rifles and high-capacity magazines, broadens existing background check requirements for firearm purchases, and modernizes gun-owner registries by requiring, among others, that buyers submit their fingerprints when applying for a gun license. While piecemeal regulation of the U.S. civilian firearms market does not represent a comprehensive solution, passage of state and local measures, including gun buyback programs, will reduce the number of weapons in circulation and available for smuggling and generate momentum for a broader federal approach over the long run. Conclusion Strengthening U.S. gun laws will not eliminate gun violence in Latin America, where weak judiciaries and police forces, the proliferation of gangs and black markets, and deep inequality exacerbate violent conflict. Nonetheless, lax U.S. gun regulations do enable international trafficking. While the effects of tighter regulation will not be felt overnight, such steps will offset widespread regional views that the United States remains indifferent to its own role in exacerbating one of Latin America's most significant challenges. Although recent federal gun control measures have run aground on congressional opposition, the Obama administration retains considerable leeway in the foreign policy arena, where concerted action can help U.S. allies in Latin America make the case to their constituents and to other skeptical governments that the United States can be a legitimate partner in combating transnational crime. At a juncture in U.S.-Latin American relations that again features both tension and opportunity, these actions will demonstrate that the United States is prepared, if imperfectly, to fulfill its shared responsibility for regional security and enhance American standing and positive influence in Latin America.

Impacts: A) independent disad to the aff- you’re targeted at handguns only but the problem is with assault rifles, that makes Latin American think we’re not crafting our policy proposals correctly so the CP alone is preferable, B) we solve just as much as you do- there’s no warrant for why a maximally tight and blanket policy will make latin America happy- a comprehensive regulation system solves just as much.

### Relations Imp. D

**Latin-America relies on the US for trade; even if they hate us it doesn’t harm relations.**

**Hakim 8**— President of the Inter-American Dialogue (Peter, “Latin America: the next U.S. President’s agenda”, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/Peter%20Hakim%20-%20Great%20Decisions%202008.pdf)

Most countries have made clear they want strong trade links and other economic ties with the U.S. Eleven of Latin America’s 19 nations have signed bilateral free-trade pacts with Washington, although two of them still await U.S. congressional approval. Even governments that reject free-trade negotiations with the U.S.—Bolivia and Ecuador, for instance—have lobbied Washington hard for trade preferences to keep U.S. tariffs low. The most vitriolic critic of U.S.-Latin America trade deals, Venezuela, sends most of its oil to the U.S. duty-free. The U.S., however, is not merely a huge market and capital reserve for Latin America. For better or worse, the U.S. continues to play an important political role throughout the region. No other country was prepared to assist Colombia’s battle for survival against illicit drug trafficking and guerrilla violence. Mexico is now turning to the U.S. to help contain its burgeoning wave of criminal violence. It was the U.S. that took the controversial step of pressing Rev. Jean-Bertrand Aristide to give up power in Haiti in 2004, and that subsequently prodded Brazil to lead a peacekeeping mission in the country. In 2006, Washington helped to stop the constitutionally suspect ouster of Nicaraguan President Enrique Bolaños Geyer. It also clumsily (and unsuccessfully) intervened to prevent the reelection of its old nemesis, President Daniel Ortega. Even Brazil, which pursues the region’s most stubbornly independent and diverse foreign policy, has made plain how much it values good relations with the U.S. Top foreign policy officials in Brazil’s left-leaning government publicly insist the U.S.-Brazilian relationship has never been stronger. Brazil knows that its international and regional ambitions require amiable ties with the U.S.—and that an adversarial relationship would be costly in multiple ways. Many in Latin America deeply resent and mistrust the U.S., and take pride in resisting Washington’s pressures and inducements. They are sometimes delighted when Chávez or Cuba’s Fidel Castro vilifies Washington, even if they would never do so themselves. But most Latin American governments, whatever their feelings about the U.S. and its policies, resist the anti-American temptation. They know, often from experience, that alienating Washington can carry a high price—and therefore usually try to maintain cordial relationships with the world’s superpower.

#### Laundry list of alt causes

**Weisbrot 9/19**

(Mark, an economist and co-director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research. Published originally in the Guardian, source obtained from CounterPunch, an independent new source. Published September 19, 2013. <http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/09/19/a-new-low-for-uslatin-american-relations/> )

Yesterday’s cancellation of Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff’s state visit to the White House, scheduled for next month, came as little surprise. Documents leaked by Edward Snowden, and reported by Glenn Greenwald and TV Globo, had caused an uproar in Brazil. According to the documents and reports, the U.S. government had spied on Dilma’s personal communications, and had targeted the computer systems of Brazil’s Petrobras, the big oil company that is majority-owned by the state. TV Globo’s [report](http://g1.globo.com/fantastico/noticia/2013/09/nsa-documents-show-united-states-spied-brazilian-oil-giant.html) indicated that there was information in the targeted Petrobas computer network that could be very valuable to foreign oil companies. Former President Lula da Silva said that Obama should “personally apologize to the world,” and Dilma also demanded a full public apology – which was not forthcoming. The rift with Brazil comes at a time of worsening U.S. relations with Latin America, and especially South America. It is indicative of a much deeper problem. The administration’s [refusal to recognize](http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/venezuelas-post-election-campaign-pots-and-pans-and-uncle-sam-werent-enough-this-time) the results of the Venezuelan elections in April of this year, [despite](http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/what-probability-and-statistics-have-to-say-about-an-election-in-venezuela) the lack of doubt about the results and in stark opposition to the rest of the region, displayed an aggressiveness that Washington hadn’t shown since it aided the 2002 Venezuelan coup. It brought a sharp rebuke from South America,[including](http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/venezuelas-post-election-campaign-pots-and-pans-and-uncle-sam-werent-enough-this-time) Lula and Dilma. Less than two months later U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry launched a new “détente,” meeting with his Venezuelan counterpart Elías Jaua in the first such high-level meeting in memory, and implicitly recognizing the election results. But new hopes were quickly dashed when several European governments, clearly acting on behalf of the United States, forced down President Evo Morales’ plane in July. “They´ve definitely gone crazy,” President Cristina Kirchner tweeted, and UNASUR (the Union of South American Nations) issued a strong denunciation. The gross violation of international law and diplomatic norms was another flamboyant display of Washington’s lack of respect for the region. It seems that every month there is another indication of how little the Obama administration cares about improving relations. On July 24 the IMF, at the direction of the U.S. Treasury Department, abandoned its plan to support the Argentine government in its legal battle with “vulture funds.” The IMF had previously committed to filing a brief with the U.S. Supreme Court supporting the Argentine government. This was not out of love for Argentina, but because the lower court’s decision – which would try to prevent Argentina from paying 92 percent of its creditors in order to satisfy the vulture funds – was seen as a [threat](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/argentina-s-debt-and-american-courts-by-joseph-e--stiglitz) to future debt restructurings and therefore to the world financial system. But anti-Argentina lobbyists were allowed to prevail, even against the Treasury Department’s legitimate concern for international financial stability. There are structural reasons for the Obama administration’s repeated failures to accept the new reality of independent governments in the region. Although President Obama may want better relations, he is willing to spend about $2 in political capital to accomplish this. And that is not enough. When he tried to appoint an ambassador to Venezuela in 2010, for example, Republicans (including the office of then-Senator Richard Lugar) [successfully scuttled it](http://www.cepr.net/index.php/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/does-washington-want-normal-diplomatic-relations-with-venezuela). For President Obama, there are generally no electoral consequences from having bad relations with Latin America. Unlike Afghanistan, Pakistan, Syria, or other areas of armed conflict or potential war, there is no imminent danger that something could blow up in his face, and cause political harm to his administration or party. The main electoral pressure comes from those who want to more aggressively oppose the left governments – e.g. right-wing Florida Cuban-Americans and their allies in Congress, who currently prevail in the House. Most of the foreign policy establishment doesn’t care about the region at all, and the ones who do mainly share the view that the leftward shift is a temporary thing that can and should be reversed. In the meantime Washington is expanding its military presence where it has control (e.g. Honduras), and is ready to support the overthrow of left governments when the opportunity arises ([Honduras in 2009](http://www.cepr.net/op-eds-&-columns/op-eds-&-columns/top-ten-ways), and [Paraguay last year](http://wrongkindofgreen.org/2013/04/13/usaids-dubious-allies-in-paraguay/)). Back in 1972, President Richard Nixon made a historic visit to China, which opened a new era of U.S.-China relations. He expressed a number of reasons for the shift in policy: “We’re doing the China thing to screw the Russians and help us in Vietnam and to keep the Japanese in line,” he told his national security adviser Henry Kissinger. But he had also recognized something important, some 22 years after the Chinese revolution: that country’s independence was not going to be reversed. Unfortunately, Washington has not yet reached the same conclusion about Latin America, and especially South America, whose “second independence” is perhaps one of the most important geopolitical changes in the world over the past 15 years. There is virtually no recognition among the foreign policy establishment here – both inside and outside of government – that something important has changed, and that the U.S. government must accept these changes and alter its policy accordingly. Until that happens, don’t expect U.S.–Latin American relations to get much warmer

# A2 HR Cred Adv.

### Stand your Ground CP (Newman)

Counterplan: the United States federal government will repeal all Stand Your Ground laws.

Alex Newman '14, New American "UN “Human Rights” Report Attacks U.S. Gun Rights, Constitution" [www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/17998-un-human-rights-report-attacks-u-s-gun-rights-constitution](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/17998-un-human-rights-report-attacks-u-s-gun-rights-constitution)

Separately, the UN report called for the federal government to launch an attack on states’ Stand Your Ground laws. Those laws, adopted by about half of American states so far, protect the self-defense rights of all people in those jurisdictions, ensuring that they do not have to flee from potentially murderous attackers. Despite UN demands, the federal government, of course, has no legitimate authority over state self-defense laws. Obviously the UN has no power in that area either, although it is seeking it. The UN, for example, recently helped the murderous socialist regime in Venezuela disarm law-abiding civilians (sparking even more violence and murder) while pushing global gun control via the UN “Arms Trade Treaty.” In September of last year, meanwhile, the dictator-dominated UN came under massive criticism after further illustrating its bizarre ignorance of, or more likely, hostility to the U.S. Constitution and state-level protections for self-defense and other human rights. In a press release, multiple UN “human rights” bureaucrats even called on the Obama administration “nullify” state laws that the globalist outfit believes are “discriminatory” — taking particular aim at “Stand Your Ground” protections. Of course, neither the UN nor the U.S. government has the power to “nullify” anything; nullification is what the Founding Fathers promoted as a tool of state governments to stop federal abuses and usurpations.

### A2 Newman 14

1. Newman says the UN recommends we curb gun violence, not that it would build our HR cred or get modeled

2. Way powertagged- this just says we need to expand background checks and repeal stand-your ground. It says nothing about a gun ban.

Alex Newman '14, New American "UN “Human Rights” Report Attacks U.S. Gun Rights, Constitution" [www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/17998-un-human-rights-report-attacks-u-s-gun-rights-constitution](http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/17998-un-human-rights-report-attacks-u-s-gun-rights-constitution)

“The State Party [the U.S. government] should take all necessary measures to abide by its obligation to effectively protect the right to life,” the report continues, despite the fact that studies show widespread gun ownership protects lives. “In particular, it should: (a) continue its efforts to effectively curb gun violence, including through the continued pursuit of legislation requiring background checks for all private firearm transfers … and (b) review Stand Your Ground Laws to remove far-reaching immunity and ensure strict adherence to the principles of necessity and proportionality when using deadly force in self-defence.”

Obama’s passed universal background checks which solves 50% of the impact.

Parsons 1-4 Christi “Obama to announce expanded background checks as he aims to limit gun deaths” Jan 4 2016 <http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-obama-gun-actions-20160104-story.html> JW

President Obama will announce Tuesday that he’ll act on his own authority to expand background checks for would-be gun buyers and increase enforcement of existing laws, a culmination of his effort to curb gun violence that nonetheless falls short of sweeping change he had long sought.

### Impact D.

#### Legitimacy isn’t key to human rights pressure

Michael Ignatieff 2, Carr professor of human rights, Kennedy School of Government @ Harvard, “NO EXCEPTIONS?” *Legal Affairs*, May/June

This defense of the United States does not, however, address the charge of hypocrisy. If America wants to be a human rights leader, the argument goes, it must obey the rules it seeks to champion. Leadership depends on legitimacy, and legitimacy requires consistency. But it's not clear that the effective use of American power in fact depends on being consistent, or on being seen by others as legitimate. Perceived legitimacy eases but it isn't essential to the exercise of power. Being seen as hypocritical or double-dealing may impose some costs on a superpower, but these costs are rarely prohibitive. America has faced a storm of protest about its treatment of the Guantanamo Bay prisoners—a storm that has led the Bush Administration to concede that the Geneva Convention should determine which protections Taliban prisoners (though not Al Qaeda ones) receive. At the same time, the prisoners remain, and are likely to remain, in American custody and subject to American justice. In another example, Slobodan Milosevic is in detention in The Hague, thanks in large measure to the pressure of the United States on the Serbian government. America could exert that pressure despite resisting the creation of a permanent criminal court with the power to try American citizens. (Milosevic will make much of this resistance to demonstrate that he is the casualty of victor's justice.) And again, as a matter of equity and ethics, it may be undesirable for the United States to support international tribunals for others but not for its own citizens. It is less clear, however, that this prevents American support for these tribunals from being effective.

#### Human Rights Cred is irrelevant — public opinion, global norms, and NGO networks outweigh US policy

Moravcsik 5

Andrew Moravcsik, 2005, PhD and a Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton, 2005, "The Paradox of U.S. Human Rights Policy," American Exceptionalism and Human Rights, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/paradox.pdf

It is natural to ask: What are the consequences of U.S. "exemptionalism” and noncompliance? International lawyers and human rights activists regularly issue **dire warnings** about the ways in which the apparent hypocrisy of the United States encourages foreign governments to violate human rights, ignore international pressure, and undermine international human rights institutions. In Patricia Derian's oft-cited statement before the Senate in I979: "Ratification by the United States significantly will enhance the legitimacy and acceptance of these standards. It will encourage other countries to join those which have already accepted the treaties. And, in countries where human rights generally are not respected, it will aid citizens in raising human rights issues.""' One constantly hears this refrain. **Yet there is little empirical reason to accept it.** Human rights norms have in fact **spread widely** without much attention to U.S. domestic policy. In the wake of the "third wave" democratization in Eastern Europe, East Asia, and Latin America, government after government moved ahead toward more active domestic and international human rights policies without attending to U.S. domestic or international practice." The human rights movement has firmly embedded itself in public opinion and NGO networks, in the United States as well as elsewhere, **despite the dubious legal status of international norms in the United States**. One reads occasional quotations from recalcitrant governments citing American noncompliance in their own defense-most recently Israel and Australia-but there is little evidence that this was more than a **redundant justification for policies made on other grounds**. Other governments adhere or do not adhere to global norms, comply or do not comply with judgments of tribunals, for reasons that seem to have little to do with U.S. multilateral policy.

#### Authoritarian states don’t follow norms

John O. McGinnis 7, Professor of Law, Northwestern University School of Law. \*\* Ilya Somin \*\* Assistant Professor of Law, George Mason University School of Law. GLOBAL CONSTITUTIONALISM: GLOBAL INFLUENCE ON U.S. JURISPRUDENCE: Should International Law Be Part of Our Law? 59 Stan. L. Rev. 1175

The second benefit to foreigners of distinctive U.S. legal norms is information. The costs and benefits of our norms will be visible for all to see. n268 Particularly in an era of increased empirical social science testing, over time we will be able to analyze and identify the effects of differences in norms between the United States and other nations. n269 Such diversity benefits foreigners as foreign nations can decide to **adopt our good norms and avoid our bad ones**. The only noteworthy counterargument is the claim that U.S. norms will have more harmful effects than those of raw international law, yet other nations will still copy them. But both parts of this proposition seem doubtful. First, U.S. law emerges from a democratic process that creates a likelihood that it will cause less harm than rules that emerge from the nondemocratic processes [\*1235] that create international law. Second, other democratic nations can use their own political processes to **screen out** American norms that might cause harm if copied. Of course, many nations remain authoritarian. n270 But our norms are not likely to have much influence on their choice of norms. Authoritarian states are likely to select norms that serve the interests of those in power, **regardless of the norms we adopt**. It is true that **sometimes they might cite our norms as cover for their decisions. But the crucial word here is "cover."** **They would have adopted the same rules, anyway.** The cover may bamboozle some and thus be counted a cost. But this would seem marginal compared to the harm of allowing raw international law to trump domestic law.

#### No Impact. Alt causes overwhelm and the US won’t exercise its influence

Mariam 8/18

Alemayehu Mariam 13, 8/18/13 PhD, JD, teaches political science at California State University, San Bernardino “Is America Disinventing Human Rights?,” http://www.ethiopianreview.us/48632

In a New York Times op-ed piece in June 2012, Carter cautioned, “At a time when popular revolutions are sweeping the globe, the United States should be strengthening, not weakening, basic rules of law and principles of justice enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But instead of making the world safer, America’s violation of international human rights abets our enemies and alienates our friends.” Carter also raised a number of important questions: Has the U.S. abdicated its moral leadership in the arena of international human rights? Has the U.S. betrayed its core values by maintaining a detention facility at Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, and subjecting dozens of prisoners to “cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment” and leaving them without the “prospect of ever obtaining their freedom”? Does the arbitrary killing of a person suspected to be an enemy terrorist in a drone strike along with women and children who happen to be nearby comport with America’s professed commitment to the rule of law and human rights? In 1948, the U.S. played a central leadership role in “inventing” the principal instrument which today serves as the bedrock foundation of modern human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), adopted by the UN General Assembly in December 1948, set a “common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations” in terms of equality, dignity and rights. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the widow of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, chaired the committee that drafted the UDHR. Eleanor remains an unsung heroine even though she was the mother of the modern global human rights movement. Without her, there would have been no UDHR; and without the UDHR, it is doubtful that the plethora of subsequent human rights conventions and regimes would have come into existence. Remarkably, she managed to mobilize, organize and proselytize human rights even though she had no legal training, diplomatic experience or bureaucratic expertise. She used her skills as political activist and advocate in the cause of freedom, justice and civil rights to work for global human rights. Is America disinventing human rights? It seems the U.S. is “disinventing” human rights through the pursuit of double (triple, quadruple) standard of human rights policy wrapped in a cover of diplocrisy. In Africa, the U.S. has one set of standards for Robert Mugabe’s Zimbabwe and Omar al-Bashir’s Sudan. Mugabe and Bashir are classified as the nasty hombres of human rights in Africa. The U.S. has targeted both regimes for crippling economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure. The U.S. has frozen the assets of Mugabe’s family and henchmen because the “Mugabe regime rules through politically motivated violence and intimidation and has triggered the collapse of the rule of law in Zimbabwe.” The U.S. calls “partners” equally brutal regimes in Africa which serve as its proxies. Paul Kagame of Rwanda, Yuweri Museveni of Uganda and the deceased leader of the regime in Ethiopia are lauded as the “new breed of African leaders” and crowned “partners”. Uhuru Kenyatta, recently elected president of Kenya and a suspect under indictment by the International Criminal Court (ICC) for crimes against humanity is said to be different than Bashir who faces similar ICC charges. In 2009, Ambassador Susan E. Rice, then-U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, demanded Bashir’s arrest and prosecution: “The people of Sudan have suffered too much for too long, and an end to their anguish will not come easily. Those who committed atrocities in Sudan, including genocide, should be brought to justice.” No official U.S. statement on Uhuru’s ICC prosecution was issued. The U.S. maintains excellent relations with Teodoro Obiang Nguema Mbasogo of Equatorial Guinea who has been in power since 1979 because of that country’s oil reserves; but all of the oil revenues are looted by Obiang and his cronies. In 2011, the U.S. brought legal action in federal court against Obiang’s son to seize corruptly obtained assets including a $40 million estate in Malibu, California overlooking the Pacific Ocean, a luxury plane and a dozen super-sports cars worth millions of dollars. The U.S. has not touched any of the other African Ali Babas and their forty dozen thieving cronies who have stolen billions and stashed their cash in U.S. and other banks. Despite lofty rhetoric in support of the advancement of democracy and protection of human rights in Africa, the United States continues to subsidize and coddle African dictatorships that are as bad as or even worse than Mugabe’s. The U.S. currently provides substantial economic aid, loans, technical and security assistance to the repressive regimes in Ethiopia, Congo (DRC), Uganda, Rwanda and elsewhere. None of these countries holds free elections, allow the operation of an independent press or free expression or abide by the rule of law. All of them are corrupt to the core, keep thousands of political prisoners, use torture and ruthlessly persecute their opposition. Yet they are deemed U.S. “partners”. “Principled disengagement” as a way of reinventing an American human rights policy? If the Obama Administration indeed has a global or African human rights policy, **it must be a well-kept secret**. In March 2013, Michael Posner, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor said American human rights policy is based on “principled engagement”: “We are going to go to the United Nations and join the Human Rights Council and we’re going to be part of it even though we recognize it doesn’t work… We’re going to engage with governments that are allies but we are also going to engage with governments with tough relationships and human rights are going to be part of those discussions.” Second, the U.S. will follow “a single standard for human rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and it applies to all including ourselves…” Third, consistent with President “Obama’s personality”, the Administration believes “change occurs from within and so a lot of the emphasis… [will be] on how we can help local actors, change agents, civil society, labor activists, religious leaders trying to change their societies from within and amplify their own voices and give them the support they need…” On August 14, according to Egyptian government sources, 525 protesters, mostly members of the Muslim Brotherhood, were killed and 3,717 injured at the hands of Egyptian military and security forces. It was an unspeakably horrifying massacre of protesters exercising their right to peaceful expression of grievances. On August 15, President Obama criticized the heavy-handed crackdown on peaceful protesters with **the usual platitudes**. “The United States strongly condemns the steps that have been taken by Egypt’s interim government and security forces. We deplore violence against civilians.” His message to the Egyptian people was somewhat disconcerting in light of the massacre. “America cannot determine the future of Egypt. We do not take sides with any particular party or political figure. I know it’s tempting inside Egypt to blame the United States.” In July 2009, in Ghana, President Obama told Africa’s “strongmen”, “History offers a clear verdict: governments that respect the will of their own people are more prosperous, more stable, and more successful than governments that do not…. No person wants to live in a society where the rule of law gives way to the rule of brutality… Make no mistake: history is on the side of these brave Africans [citizens and their communities driving change], and not with those who use coups or change Constitutions to stay in power. Africa doesn’t need strongmen, it needs strong institutions.” President Obama has a clear choice in Egypt between “those who use coups to stay in power” and the people of Egypt peacefully protesting in the streets. Now he says, “We don’t take sides…” By “not taking sides”, it seems he has taken sides with Egypt’s strongmen who “use coups to stay in power”. So much for “principled engagement”! Obama reassured the Egyptian military that the U.S. does not intend to end or suspend its decades-old partnership with them. He cautioned the military that “While we want to sustain our relationship with Egypt, our traditional cooperation cannot continue as usual while civilians are being killed in the streets.” He indicated his disapproval of the imposition of “martial law” but made no mention of the manifest military coup that had ousted Morsy. He obliquely referred to it as a “military intervention”. He made a gesture of “action” cancelling a symbolic military exercise with the Egyptian army. There will be no suspension of U.S. military aid to Egypt and no other sanctions will be imposed on the Egyptian military or government. I am not clear what Obama’s human rights policy of “principled engagement” actually means. But I have a lot of questions about it: Does it mean moral complacency and tolerance of the crimes against humanity of African dictators for the sake of the war on terror and oil? Is it a euphemism for abdication of American ideals on the altar of political expediency? Does it mean overlooking and excusing the crimes of ruthless dictators and turning a blind eye to their bottomless corruption? Does “principled engagement” mean allowing dictators to suck at the teats of American taxpayers to satisfy their insatiable aid addiction while they brutalize their people? The facts of Obama’s “principled engagement” tell a different story. In May 2010, after the ruling party in Ethiopia declared it had won 99.6 percent of the seats in parliament, the U.S. demonstrated its “principled engagement” by issuing a Statement expressing “concern that international observers found that the elections fell short of international commitments” and promised to “work diligently with Ethiopia to ensure that strengthened democratic institutions and open political dialogue become a reality for the Ethiopian people.” There is no evidence that the U.S. did anything to “strengthen democratic institutions and open political dialogue to become a reality for the Ethiopian people.” When two ICC indicted suspects in Kenya (Kenyatta and Ruto) won the presidency in Kenya a few months ago, the U.S. applied its “principled engagement” in the form of a robust defense of the suspects. Johnnie Carson, the former United States Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, said the ICC indictments of Bashir and Uhuru/Ruto are different. “I don’t want to make a comparison with Sudan in its totality because Sudan is a special case in many ways.” What makes Bashir and Sudan different, according to Carson, is the fact that Sudan is on the list of countries that support terrorism and Bashir and his co-defendants are under indictment for the genocide in Darfur. Since “none of that applies to Kenya,” according to Carson, it appears the U.S. will follow a different policy. President Obama says the U.S. will maintain its traditional partnership with Egypt’s military, Egypt’s “strongmen”. At the onset of the Egyptian Revolution in 2011, Obama and his foreign policy team froze in stunned silence, flat-footed and twiddling their thumbs and scratching their heads for days before staking out a position on that popular uprising. They could not bring themselves to use the “D” word (dictator as in Hosni Mubarak) to describe events in Egypt then. Today Obama cannot bring himself to say the “C” word (as in Egyptian military coup). Obama is in an extraordinary historical position as a person of color to advance American ideals and values throughout the world in convincing and creative ways. But he cannot advance these ideals and values through a hollow notion of “principled engagement.” Rather, he must adopt a policy of “principled disengagement” with African dictators. That does not mean isolationism or a hands off approach to human rights. By “principled disengagement” I mean a policy and policy outcome that is based on measurable human rights metrics. Under a policy of “principled disengagement”, the U.S. would establish clear, attainable and measurable human rights policy objectives in its relations with African dictatorships. The policy would establish minimum conditions of human rights compliance. For instance, the U.S. could set some basic criteria for the conduct of free and fair elections, press and individual freedoms, limits on arbitrary arrests and detentions, prevention of extrajudicial punishments, etc. Using its annual human rights assessments, the U.S. could make factual determinations on the extent to which it will engage or disengage with a particular regime. “Partnership” status and the benefits that come with it will be reserved to those regimes that have good and improving records on specific human rights measures. Regimes that steal elections, win elections by 99.6 percent, engage in arbitrary arrests and detentions and other human rights violations would be denied “partnership” status and denied aid, loans and technical assistance. Persistent violators of human rights would be given a compliance timetable to improve their records and provided appropriate assistance to achieve specific human rights goals. If regimes persist in a pattern and practice of human rights violations, the U.S. could raise the stakes and impose economic and diplomatic sanctions. The ‘‘Ethiopia Democracy and Accountability Act of 2007’’ contained many important statutory provisions that could serve as a foundation for “principled disengagement”. Obama’s “principled engagement” seems to be a justification for expediency at the cost of American ideals. Until he decides to stand for principle, instead of standing behind the rhetoric of “principled engagement”, he will continue to find himself on a tightrope of moral, legal and political ambiguity. The U.S. cannot “condemn” and “deplore” its way out of its human rights obligations or global leadership role. Yes, **the U.S. must take sides!** It must take a stand either with the victims of human rights abuses throughout the world or the human rights abusers of the world. If Obama wants to save the world from strongmen with boots and in designer suits with briefcases full of cash, he should pursue a policy of “principled disengagement”. But he should start by reflecting on the words he spoke during his first inauguration speech:

# A2 Cartels Adv.

### Legalization CP

#### Counterplan: the United States federal government ought to legalize all drugs.

Miron 14 Jeffrey Miron (Senior Lecturer and Director of Undergraduate Studies in the Department of Economics at Harvard University) “Why all drugs should be legal. (Yes, even heroin.)” The Week July 28th 2014 <http://theweek.com/articles/445005/why-all-drugs-should-legal-yes-even-heroin> NP

We've come a long way since Reefer Madness. Over the past two decades, 16 states have de-criminalized possession of small amounts of marijuana, and 22 have legalized it for medical purposes. In November 2012, Colorado and Washington went further, legalizing marijuana under state law for recreational purposes. Public attitudes toward marijuana have also changed; in a November 2013 Gallup Poll, 58 percent of Americans supported marijuana legalization. Yet amidst these cultural and political shifts, American attitudes and U.S. policy toward other drugs have remained static. No state has decriminalized, medicalized, or legalized cocaine, heroin, or methamphetamine. And a recent poll suggests only about 10 percent of Americans favor legalization of cocaine or heroin. Many who advocate marijuana legalization draw a sharp distinction between marijuana and "hard drugs." That's understandable: Different drugs do carry different risks, and the potential for serious harm from marijuana is less than for cocaine, heroin, or methamphetamine. Marijuana, for example, appears incapable of causing a lethal overdose, but cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamine can kill if taken in excess or under the wrong circumstances. But if the goal is to minimize harm — to people here and abroad — the right policy is to legalize all drugs, not just marijuana. In fact, many legal goods cause serious harm, including death. In recent years, about 40 people per year have died from skiing or snowboarding accidents; almost 800 from bicycle accidents; several thousand from drowning in swimming pools; more than 20,000 per year frompharmaceuticals; more than 30,000 annually from auto accidents; and at least 38,000 from excessive alcohol use. Few people want to ban these goods, mainly because while harmful when misused, they provide substantial benefit to most people in most circumstances. The same condition holds for hard drugs. Media accounts focus on users who experience bad outcomes, since these are dramatic or newsworthy. Yet millions risk arrest, elevated prices, impurities, and the vagaries of black markets to purchase these goods, suggesting people do derive benefits from use. That means even if prohibition could eliminate drug use, at no cost, it would probably do more harm than good. Numerous moderate and responsible drug users would be worse off, while only a few abusive users would be better off. And prohibition does, in fact, have huge costs, regardless of how harmful drugs might be. First, a few Economics 101 basics: Prohibiting a good does not eliminate the market for that good. Prohibition may shrink the market, by raising costs and therefore price, but even under strongly enforced prohibitions, a substantial black market emerges in which production and use continue.

#### Competes on net benefits-turns to the aff are disads to the perm.

#### Empirics prove-legalizing marijuana kills drug cartels.

Bennett 15 Jonah (reporter) “Legal US Weed Is Killing Drug Cartels” The Daily Caller February 9th 2015 <http://dailycaller.com/2015/02/09/legal-marijuana-drug-cartels/> JW

The growth of the U.S. marijuana industry has devastated drug cartels in Mexico, evidenced by fewer seizures of cannabis at the border and, according to Mexican security forces, a drop in total homicides and domestic marijuana production rates. Mexican drug cartels are finding it difficult to compete in the cannabis market not only in terms of price, but also quality, given that the U.S. industry is starting to label products according to THC content, CNBC reports. According to The ArcView Group, a cannabis research firm, the marijuana industry in the U.S. grew 74 percent in just one year, up from $1.5 billion in 2013 to $2.7 billion in 2014. Marijuana from Mexico, on the other hand, is often mass-produced in less than ideal conditions, with no guarantee as to the safety of the product. Advocates who initially pushed for legalization in Washington and Colorado have argued strenuously in the past that increased access to marijuana in the U.S. would mean a decline in drug-related violence and revenue for the cartels in Mexico. Homicides in Mexico have dropped from 22,852 in 2011 to 15,649 as of 2014, which tracks relatively closely with the legalization of marijuana in Colorado and Washington, although the link between the two events is not conclusive. Last year, agents from the U.S. Border Patrol seized just 1.9 million pounds of marijuana. While that may seem like a large amount, it actually constitutes a 24 percent reduction from the 2.5 million pounds seized in 2011. On the domestic side, Mexican authorities in 2013 seized just 1,070 tons, which marks the lowest amount since 2000. “Two or three years ago, a kilogram [2.2 pounds] of marijuana was worth $60 to $90,” Nabor, a 24-year-old pot grower in the northwestern Mexican state of Sinaloa, told NPR. “But now they’re paying us $30 to $40 a kilo. It’s a big difference. If the U.S. continues to legalize pot, they’ll run us into the ground.” Another nail in the coffin for drug cartels is the gradual trend of leniency towards marijuana in Mexico. As of 2009, the country decriminalized the possession of small amounts of marijuana. But cartels have adapted and shifted to the U.S. side of the border, bringing in high-quality marijuana to Mexico, rather than producing the crop themselves before exporting for illicit sale to U.S. consumers. “Traffickers who are operating in the U.S. are securing marijuana in the U.S. that is much higher quality and more expensive for the purpose of smuggling back into Mexico for sale and distribution,” DEA spokesman Lawrence Payne told U.S. News back in December. Cartels have also diversified by moving into illegal mining and sex trafficking, as well as harder drugs like meth. “In the long run, it looks like the US market for illegal Mexican marijuana will keep shrinking,” said Mexico drug expert Alejandro Hope. “The logic of the legal marijuana market is that it will force prices down. This would take out the big profits from the illegal market. A good way to make some money could be to short the prices of marijuana.”

### Cartels K

#### The 1AC’s fear of Mexican violence is xenophobic exhibitionism---it contributes to a narrative of criminality that produces structural violence

Weissman 14 - Distinguished Professor of Law University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Law (Deborah, “The Politics of Narrative: Law and the Representation of Mexican Criminality,” SSRN)//BB

Not perhaps since the 1910 Mexican revolution have conditions of violence and¶ criminality in Mexico so preoccupied the United States. Pages of American newspapers fill almost daily with graphic accounts of horrific crimes throughout Mexico, each more gruesome than the other: decapitations, execution-style mass murders, corpses in barrels of lye.1 Official U.S. governmental accounts attribute these acts variously to escalating warfare among drug cartels, a militarized response by the Mexican government to drug-cartel violence, and corruption.2 In its most sensational depiction, Mexico has been portrayed as a lawless country; violence has been represented as a full-scale drug war at our “doorstep.”3 Most recently, the crisis of arriving Central American children has been attributed to Mexico’s “very porous¶ border,” its “smuggling corridors,”4 and the “widespread and well-documented involvement of Mexican authorities with human smugglers and organized crime.”5¶ Accounts of Mexico have become familiar and formulaic. Any totalizing characterization that serves to flatten the Mexican landscape is not only inaccurate, but suggests a type of “Mexico-bashing” that finds sustenance into the dark interior of American nativism and xenophobia. Reports of the threat posed by drug-related violence to national security, fear for public safety posed by Mexican migration, and the depiction of the country as a pathway for human trafficking, have assumed distorted proportions.6 Certainly, the death toll, fear, and suffering have sharply risen since the Mexican government militarized its response to drug cartel violence.7 As a matter of geography, the tens of thousands of Central Americans fleeing gang- related violence born of failed drug-war policies, trade agreements, and corruption, travel the same corridors that traffickers often use to supply the drugs to meet an almost insatiable demand in the United States. In fact, the crime rate in most of Mexico is unexceptional and the overall¶ murder rate is lower than other countries in the region, and similar to the United States.8 Moreover, the crime rate generally throughout the country has declined.9¶ Mindful of the consequences of the distortions and the misinformation that leads to the misrepresentation of a people, Mexican civil rights groups have attempted to provide a more nuanced view of conditions in Mexico.10 Paradoxically, U.S. officials repeatedly state that the border is presently as secure as it has ever been.11 FBI reports and recent data indicate that accounts of “spillover violence” are unfounded.12 The United States describes the Mexican government as cooperative and working to “‘prioritize the safe and humane treatment of individuals’” who are deported to Mexico.13 This is not to minimize the violence that has cost Mexicans dearly. Rather, the seriousness of the situation requires an analysis of the drug-related violence that goes beyond the sensationalist descriptions which may chronicle the current turmoil¶ but reveals little about the political and socio-economic circumstances that give rise to the conditions of a drug war and to the “Mexican-as-criminal” narrative that pervades social relations and legal constructions in the United States.14¶ The construct of the Mexican as a menace is not new. It is possessed of a proper history with origins in the nineteenth century.15 Mexicans have been described as “‘earless and heartless creatures’, ‘semi-barbarians’, who were ‘only interested in satisfying their animal wants’”16 and as “uneducated and grossly ignorant, highly excitable, and given to spasmodic outbursts of passion, outlawry and violence.”17 They have been lynched for being “‘too Mexican,’” and harassed for speaking their native language or otherwise expressing their culture.18 They have long been considered the “prototypical illegal alien.”19¶ The discourse has served to rationalize social and legal policies and practices of exclusion. However, it is important to note that the master narrative of Mexican criminality has also been adopted by well-meaning legal advocates who have availed themselves of the drug violence narrative for humanitarian purposes and deployed to enhance an immigrant’s chance of remaining lawfully in the United States through various forms of immigration relief.20 Still others have used the specter of drug cartel violence to advocate for reformed, humane drug laws throughout the hemisphere.21

#### Turns the case---their representation of spillover violence and terrorism creates the ideal impetus for a militarized response

Correa-Cabrera 14 - Associate Professor and Chair of the Government Department of the Uni- versity of Texas at Brownsville. Her areas of expertise are Mexico-U.S. relations, border security, immigration, and organized crime. Her teaching fields include comparative politics, Latin American politics, U.S.-Mexico relations, U.S.-Mexico border policy, comparative public policy and public administration, and American Hispanic politics. Guadalupe’s most recent book is entitled Democracy in ‘Two Mexicos’: Political Institutions in Oa- xaca and Nuevo León (Guadalupe, w/ Terence Garrett, and Michelle Keck, “Administrative Surveillance and Fear: Implications for U.S.-Mexico Border Relations and Governance,” European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 96)//BB

The fear of spill-over violence¶ There is no doubt that drug violence in Mexico has multiplied since the year 2006 when former Mexican president Calderón declared ‘war’ on drugs. It is also true that this strategy didn’t produce the desired results. In fact, some have even claimed that Mexico is on a path to becoming a ‘failed state’. According to Nicholas Casey and José de Córdoba of the Wall Street Journal, ‘some parts of Mexico are caught in the grip of vio- lence so profound that government seems almost beside the point’. They mentioned, for example, the cases of ‘Ciudad Mier and surrounding Ta- maulipas state’ (Casey and De Córdoba 2010, para. 22).5 What is more, mass killings in different parts of Mexico demonstrate just how little con- trol the federal government exerts over some Mexican states.¶ However, we do not believe that Mexico’s problems of drug violence pose a grave threat to the U.S. as some U.S media and politicians have charged. Clearly, rising violence is a threat to Mexico. But so-called spillover violence has so far been almost non-existent. Almost all the violence perpetrated by Mexican organized crime groups has remained south of the border (Correa-Cabrera 2012). ‘We have the occasional incident, (but) it is a very tiny fraction compared to what is going on the other side of the bor- der’ (Ybarra 2011, para. 21), wrote Tony Payan, an associate professor of political science at the University of Texas El Paso (UTEP).¶ Notwithstanding this fact, many Americans are deeply worried about a potential escalation of this phenomenon. Their worries give some U.S. politicians the opportunity to create a media spectacle about Mexico’s growing violence. Using their access to mass media, these politicians present a spectacular view of violence spiralling out of control in Mexico and threatening U.S. national security. The politicians see the violence the product of a so- called ‘narco-insurgency’ by Mexican TCOs whose habits of carrying out beheadings, mass killings, and bombings ‘are drawing comparisons to mur- ders by Muslim extremists’ (Aguilar 2010, para. 1).¶ Narco-terrorism and the politics of fear¶ Some top-level U.S. government officials – including Joseph W. Westphal, the former Under Secretary of the Army, and former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton – have suggested Mexico is under siege by a narco- insurgency or narco-terrorists.6 During a U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, a top adviser to President Obama said ‘terrorists seek- ing to unleash havoc in the United States could use Texas’ porous border with Mexico to enter this country’ (Aguilar 2011a, para. 1). James Clapper, former Director of National Intelligence agreed and said that Mexico’s ex- treme drug violence ‘could pose a significant threat to the U.S’. (para. 2) (see Correa-Cabrera 2012, 207-8).¶ These officials are not alone. Former U.S. Rep. Silvestre Reyes (D-El Paso) has repeatedly charged that Mexican TCOs frequently commit acts of narco-terrorism. Reyes is in step with U.S. Rep. Michael McCaul, who, as already mentioned, has been seeking to designate seven of the top Mexican cartels as ‘foreign terrorist organizations’. According to Reyes, ‘such a des- ignation would provide additional tools to help combat drug cartels and the threat they pose to the security of the United States, Mexico, and Central and South America’ (Aguilar 2010, para. 9).¶ Many have suggested that troops be sent to the U.S. border to fight the alleged narco-insurgency and keep Mexico’s mayhem from spilling over the border. U.S. intelligence and security officials have suggested the exist- ence of ties between the major drug cartels operating in Mexico (such as the Zetas) and Hezbollah, Al Qaeda, or Al Qaeda affiliates. For example, Department of Homeland Security Secretary, Janet Napolitano, mentioned this possibility in testimony before a congressional committee in February of 2011. In particular, she expressed Washington’s concern because of an ‘eventual alliance between Al-Qaeda and the Zetas’ (Wilkinson 2011). But the spectacular form in which media has presented the risks of escalating spillover violence and alleged narco-insurgency – and even narco-terrorism – seems to depict an inaccurate and unrealistic panorama (Correa-Cabrera 2012, 208).¶ An alliance between the terrorists of Al Qaeda and the Mexican Zetas is unrealistic if one takes a close look at the goals and characteristics of these two organizations. Mexican TCOs ‘are not ideologically motivated and the Mexican government is trying to make a strong distinction between those things’, according to Eric Olson, a senior associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Aguilar 2010, para. 11). Carlos Pascual, former U.S. ambassador to Mexico, has also ar- gued that there is no evidence the cartels have ‘a political ideology or a re- ligious ideology, and we need to make that distinction’. Pascual insists that ‘the lines should not be blurred to link the cartels with terrorist activities with an ideology’ (Aguilar 2010, para. 8).¶ But the idea that Mexican TCOs could ally themselves with terrorists has become a part of public discourse because of groups whose aim might be ‘to promote fear among the U.S. public in order to further their political and economic agendas’ (Correa-Cabrera 2012, 209). This fear has been used to justify draconian immigration laws and the deployment, in some cases, of troops to the border. Unfortunately, these types of actions are mis- guided and could seriously damage the relationship between Mexico and the U.S. In many cases, the politics of fear appear to respond to specific political, ideological and economic interests while closing off channels of cooperation and communication between the U.S. and its southern neighbour.

#### Focus on Cartel violence masks structural factors that devastate Mexican people---causes inequality, poverty and violence

Carlos 14 – PhD Candidate in the Department of Political Science at the University of California, Irvine (Alfredo, “Mexico “Under Siege” Drug Cartels or U.S. Imperialism?,” Latin American Perspectives March 2014 vol. 41 no. 2, 10.1177/0094582X13509069)//BB

The dominant discourse about Mexico in the United States has a long history and has affected the way Mexicans, Mexican-Americans, and Chicanos are viewed and treated. While much has changed since the 1800s, the current discourse about Mexico serves the same basic purpose. The United States legitimizes its expansionist economic foreign policy in terms of the burden of civilizing, uplifting, and promoting development in less developed countries, beginning with its neighbor to the south (Gonzalez, 2004: 185). It employs a foreign policy that advances its imperialist interests. U.S. government and media agencies generate a representation of Mexico that has provided avenues for very specific courses of action. Promoting a discourse of a “chaotic,” “unruly,” “failing state” has provided justification for direct U.S. military intervention, especially along the border, now potentially with armed drones (O’Reilly, 2013), and legitimized the penetration of U.S. capital interests in Mexico at the expense of Mexico’s own economy and, more important, its people. Even at its most basic level, we can only call this imperialism.¶ While Mexico has an ineffective justice system, government corruption, and crime and drug-related violence, these are problems that most modern nation-states also face. In fact, the United States is itself heavily implicated in the drug trade, holding by far the largest stocks of cocaine in the world and being Mexico’s primary market (INCB, 2008). It is also the largest supplier of arms not just to Mexico but to all of Latin America (Chomsky, 2012). Latin American countries are working together toward the decriminalization of drugs, which has produced very promising results in Portugal, while, in stark contrast, ”the coercive procedures of the 40-year U.S. drug war have had virtually no effect . . . while creating havoc through the continent” (Chomsky, 2012). But the conversation doesn’t revolve around what the United States can do to clean up its own act; it **is about “**othering**” Mexico.**¶ The United States has had a tremendous impact on Mexico’s internal dynamics regarding migration, unemployment, poverty, and crime. Its economic imperialism has contributed to the weakness of Mexico’s economy and as a result its internal politics. NAFTA has stunted Mexican economic growth and led to the mass displacement of workers, forcing them into job markets that they would not have considered had they had access to jobs with dignity. For many it has led to migration to the United States, while for others it has meant lives of crime and violence. But no one discusses this, and it gets no media coverage because the focus is not on the failed U.S.-imposed neoliberal economy but on drug-related violence. This is done purposefully, since the story does specific work and is perpetuated because it benefits U.S. economic interests and works as a mechanism of justification for continued U.S. imperialism [and].¶ For the most part, the concerns that the vast majority of people experience the vast majority of the time on a daily basis are not about these drug-violence outrages. Instead they are economic—how they will pay their bills and clothe, shelter, and feed their families. Even in the conversation about immigration reform, no one discusses the fundamental right that people have to live and grow in the place they consider home. No one discusses that people choose to migrate only when they have no other options. U.S. imperialism has led to people’s having no other option. Representing Mexico as a “failing state” allows the United States to evade responsibility for creating many of these problems in Mexico while also providing a powerful story to convince American citizens and Mexican politicians that U.S. economic intervention in Mexico is necessary.¶ The irony of it all is that NAFTA continues to be justified through a narrative of a chaotic and violent Mexico needing economic programs of development to solve its social problems, when in fact it is the penetration of U.S. capital that has caused many of those problems. The meta-narrative helps to perpetuate an asymmetrical power relationship between Mexico and the United States. The dominant discourse provides the veil for this “imperial encounter” to become a mission of salvation rather than of economic conquest. In the end, the way Mexico is represented in the United States has little to do with its actual internal political or social dynamics, instead it is a means to expand and maintain U.S. imperialism in Mexico. Over the past 150 years, one thing that has stayed the same is Mexico’s position as an economic colony of the United States, a place to go for cheap labor, raw materials, and cheap manufactures for consumption at home. Focusing on drugs and violence obscures this. While Mexico does have serious issues of drug-related crime, this crime is not the most severe of Mexico’s problems. Those problems are poverty and unemployment and the country’s inability, for the first time in its history, to feed its own people. Mexico is indeed “under siege”—not by drug lords but by U.S. economic interests—and this has had disastrous social costs for the Mexican people. This is not, however, the discourse we engage in. That discourse is purposefully absent.

#### The alternative is to reject narrative of Mexican violence---this criticism disrupts racism and serves as a focal point for broader reorientation of our relationship to Mexico

Weissman 14 - Distinguished Professor of Law University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Law

(Deborah, “The Politics of Narrative: Law and the Representation of Mexican Criminality,” SSRN)//BB

Insofar as narratives are formed as socially-constructed and culturally-contingent artifacts, they provide insight into a larger “truths” about U.S.-Mexico relations. Narratives are not only an expression of social attitudes and nativist sentiments. They also develop in tandem with and within the law and legal discourse. They are both cause and consequence of a public mood.¶ This Article seeks to contribute to the scholarship that has examined the way that Latin Americans in general and Mexicans in particular have been subordinated through narratives in ways that bear on public policy, national interest, and law. It demonstrates that the discourse has implications that extend beyond U.S. borders into Mexico while reaching deep into local¶ neighborhoods and towns in the United States. It then considers whether alternative uses of the narratives and newly emerging characterizations are sufficiently disruptive of dominant discursive devices used to subordinate Mexicans.24¶ Part II examines the construction of the prevailing political narrative of the Mexican-as criminal at the transnational, national, and local level. It considers how the discursive uses of such stereotypes act to construct law that is, in turn, constitutive of the narrative. At the transnational, national, and state and local level, legal developments respond to and reinforce the construction of the Mexican as super-predator with dire consequences for communities on both sides of the border. At the transnational level, Mexicans perceived to be a danger to the United States are inscribed into the larger national angst of terrorism to which transnational policing in the form of a military response is deemed necessary. At the national level, the depiction of the criminal Mexican immigrant contributes to xenophobic excesses and is exploited as political scape-goading and often serves to divert attention away from the material reality of the political economic circumstances of migration that might otherwise inform immigration reform.25 At the state and local level, particularly in communities with histories of nativist sentiments and racial animus, the depiction of the Mexican criminal in their midst, in their schools, on their roads, and at their worksites, is used to justify policies of exclusion and community stratification.26 Racist tendencies are refueled and reinvigorated as a matter of social practices, particularly in the South.27¶ Part III then considers alternative uses of the dominant narrative of Mexico and Mexicans. It reviews the Mexican-as-criminal narrative as used by well-meaning immigration advocates who discern in the discourse of Mexico as a nation of criminality and lawlessness as a means to assist Mexican immigrants who wish to remain in the United States via asylum claims and other immigration remedies that require a showing of hardship upon returning.28 It then examines contesting narratives and shifting paradigms: from “Mexican-as-criminal” (bad neighbor) to “Mexican-as-economic partner” (good neighbor)—articulated either as a means to maintain U.S. dominance in the economic affairs in Mexico or as a remedial description that more accurately depicts changes effected by Mexican immigration.29¶ Narratives serve a purpose that can be discerned through an examination of the social circumstances in which specific discourses flourish. They are best understood when analyzed in the context of the political economic goals they seek to achieve, and by ascertaining who benefits and who is harmed.30 This Article concludes by suggesting the need to reexamine narratives in order to determine who benefits and who is harmed, and ultimately whether the narrative produces a usable framework to understanding and resolve the political economic structures that produce violence in Mexico.¶ II. Narratives at Work: The Mexican-as-Criminal¶ Narratives often function in the realm of contingency, as a matter of national interests and security requirements, shaped through the interaction of foreign policy needs with domestic political requirements. The current “Mexican-as-criminal” narrative provides a discursive¶ framework with which to shape the rationale of a foreign policy designed to expand U.S economic interests, even as it provides local power contenders the rhetoric to exploit racist attitudes and nativist sentiment for political ends. Indeed, control of the drug cartel violence discourse is critical to regulation of trade, labor, drug policy, gun control, immigration, and politics at all levels.31¶ The law, too, is complicit with the “logic” of the discourse of the violent Mexican as it is constitutive of the narrative. Clifford Geertz has elucidated this relationship, positing that legal thought is “constructive of social realities rather than merely reflective of them.32 Transnational legal processes compare similarly with the laws and legal policy at the federal, state and local level. Each tends to rely on strategies of escalating fear, militarization, and criminalization to address underlying political and socio-economic problems, many of which have structural dimensions and historical antecedents. These legal developments help to construct the phenomenon of the Mexican-as-criminal just as they regulate the day-to-day lives of Mexicans on both sides of the border.33

Discursive hyperbole has tangible consequences---it feeds the for-profit war machine and ensures subsequent policies are grounded in xenophobia

Schack, 11 – Assistant Professor, Department of Journalism at Ithaca College, PhD in Media Studies from the University of Colorado (Todd, “Twenty-first-century drug warriors: the press, privateers and the for-profit waging of the war on drugs,” Media, War & Conflict, Vol. 4 No. 2, pg. 142-161, August 2011, Sage Journals)//BI

Here we come to the heart of the matter: the media hype, hyperbole and moral panic have actual consequences, and it is worthwhile asking the cui bono question: who, exactly, is benefitting, because there are billions of dollars at stake, and the question of funding or not funding certain contracts explains more about what’s really happening than all the sensational reports based on exaggeration, un-sourced claims, and lack of statistics. Crucial to understanding this question of funding is one final point: that politicians in favor of the militarized response to the ‘drug war’ (which includes privatizing the effort) must hold at all times the simultaneously contradictory position that, while the problem is worse than ever, they are actually succeeding in their goals. Carlsen (2009: 1) points out that: Through late February and early March, a blitzkrieg of declarations from U.S. government and military officials and pundits hit the media, claiming that Mexico was alternately at risk of being a ‘Failed State,’ a ‘Narco-state’, on the verge of ‘Civil War’, and as posing a direct threat to US National Security through ‘spill-over’ … In the same breath, we’re told that President Calderon with the aid of the US Government is winning the war on drugs, significantly weakening organized crime, and restoring order and legality. None of these claims are true. In fact, this rhetorical double-bind is not only stock-in-trade for the entire drug control establishment, and has been for years, but is familiar to a variety of what Howard S Becker (1963: 157) famously termed ‘moral entrepreneurs’: Enforcement organizations, particularly when they are seeking funds, typically oscillate between two kinds of claims. First, they say that by reason of their efforts the problem they deal with is approaching solution. But, in the same breath, they say the problem is perhaps worse than ever (though through no fault of their own) and requires renewed and increased effort to keep it under control. This rhetorical situation has defined the war on drugs since at least Nixon, and the enforcement organizations – the drug control establishment – have grown into what Reeves and Campbell (1994) call the ‘narco-carceral complex’ which, with the rise of privatization, has become the for-profit industrialization of the drug war. In other words, there is nothing new regarding the rhetorical situation whereby this industry justifies itself, only pages taken out of a well-worn playbook and applied to the newest chapter in the continuing saga that is the drug war. What is new, however, is the fact that the private security contractors stand to benefit most – and that is precisely the point of this article: The motivations behind the recent hype vary. Alarmist cries of a Mexican collapse help clinch the passage of measures to further militarize the southern border and obtain juicy contracts for private defense and security firms. Local politicians are finding they can be a cash cow for federal aid. (Carlsen, 2009: 2) So too are the five firms who won the $15 billion dollar Pentagon contract in 2007, and aiding the effort was every breathless, over-hyped report of Mexico as a ‘failed state’, or of ‘spill-over’ violence, reports that are especially useful during yearly funding cycles, as happened in 2009: The formation of local, state and national budgets at the beginning of the year provides an opportunity for politicians to exaggerate the threat posed by Mexican drug cartels and thereby receive more funding for local police forces … Indeed, Texas Homeland Security Director Steve McCraw stressed that the spillover had already occurred in asking state lawmakers to approve a $135 million increase in funding requested by Texas Governor Rick Perry. (Arana, 2009) Therefore this is not simply a matter of press hype and sensationalism – if it were it would be a matter of cultural relevance perhaps, but not political and economic. Using Becker’s term ‘moral entrepreneurs’, Reeves and Campbell (1994: 150) write that this synergy between the press and those who profit from a crisis is a well-established tactic in war profiteering: In the political economy of drug control, journalism is a market force that often raises the stock of moral entrepreneurs who profit from escalations in the war on drugs … Like the merchants of war devoted to perpetuating the power of the military-industrial complex, the moral entrepreneurs … – and their journalistic comrades – are in the hysteria business. This is precisely where moral panic theory and the concept of disaster capitalism converge, in the advancing of the three aligning interests: the press, which is perpetuating – and profiting from – the notion that the situation is at ‘crisis’ levels; the private security contracting industry, which is financially self-interested in perpetuating the ‘crisis’; and government, which is seeking methods of absolving itself from public accountability for carrying out unpopular policy, and plausible deniability for when things go wrong. What is crucia**l**, and what moral panics have proved to be so proficient at doing, is the creation and maintenance of the notion of ‘crisis’, and the creation of an inextinguishable source of renewable enemies that justify the existence of these moral entrepreneurs-turned-industrialists. Writing about the crack cocaine scare in the 1980s, but relevant here, Reeves and Campbell (1994: 20) conclude that: Consequently, with nothing to gain and everything to lose from declaring a victory in the war on drugs, the drug control establishment’s networks of power, knowledge, and discipline have a vested interest in maintaining a perpetual sense of urgency, even a sense of hysteria, about cocaine pollution. It is in this way that the increasing use of private contractors, and the re-conceptualization of the wars on terror and drugs as for-profit endeavors can be likened to an addiction: ‘Our military outsourcing has become an addiction, and we’re headed straight for a crash’ (Singer, 2007). It is an addiction of policy that – if recent history in Colombia, Iraq, Afghanistan, and now Mexico are any guide – will result in impunity, plausible deniability, will make the 21st-century drug warriors very wealthy, and will not in any measurable manner result in gains made against the global flow of drugs.

### Econ DA

#### The gun industry is thriving in the squo and the plan kills it. Guns are key to the economic growth.

Murphy 15 Jason, news.com.au “Why the gun industry has US over a barrel” December 10, 2015 <http://www.news.com.au/finance/business/why-the-gun-industry-has-us-over-a-barrel/news-story/e4b72289e90b5ceda7778208410d1d99>

THE United States is probably stuck with its guns. They are such a big part of its economy, the country simply can’t afford to give them up. Australia can be very proud and very happy we have not allowed our country to go down the American path, where a mass shooting happens every few days. If you were designing a system to make it impossible to get rid of guns, you’d probably just copy the US. But the American gun industry is thriving. There are already 300 million guns in US and the nation makes another 10 million a year — from the smallest pistols to the beefiest shotguns. America is also a big market for foreign makers. Each year 3 million guns are imported from around the world to be fired — or just admired — in the US. The gun industry is rich. It provides good jobs paying good money in factories and firing ranges all over the country. It grew like a weed — even during the global financial crisis and the subsequent economic bust. So it is no surprise the share price of gun makers, such as the famed Smith & Wesson company, are in rude health. Plenty of those riches made by the industry end up in the hands of two organisations: the National Rifle Association and the National Shooting Sports Foundation. Money makes them powerful. The NRA has an annual budget of about $US250 million. It spends $15 for every $1 spent by the gun control lobby and has them on the run. The NRA rates US politicians for how strongly they are committed to the right to own guns, and politicians fear a bad rating. Idaho Governor Butch Otter jokes that “Our idea of gun control in Idaho is to use two hands”. Republican presidential candidate Ben Carson said, “I never saw a body with bullet holes that was more devastating than taking the right to arm ourselves away”. Dr Carson, mind you, is a medical doctor. US gun culture depends on the second amendment to its constitution, which says “the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed”. The idea back in 1791 was that people could rise up and overthrow the government if necessary. Warplanes and tanks hadn’t been invented then but, when they were, people did not get access to them. So the idea that owning guns keeps the government in line is way out of date. The fight now is about which guns to make available to the public. Former US president Bill Clinton banned military-style assault weapons in 1994, but the ban expired in 2004. Barack Obama has had little success in tightening gun access so far. Some say he is on the brink of a breakthrough now. But the history of the gun lobby suggests he is probably not. Gun bans are not good for the gun industry, but fear of gun bans is. After every example of a mass shooting, gun sales go up. People want them for protection and fear they won’t be able to get them.

#### US is key to global economy; growth solves multiple existential threats.

Haass 13 Richard (President of the Council on Foreign Relations) “The World Without America” April 30th 2013 <http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/repairing-the-roots-of-american-power-by-richard-n--haass>

Let me posit a radical idea: The most critical threat facing the United States now and for the foreseeable future is not a rising China, a reckless North Korea, a nuclear Iran, modern terrorism, or climate change. Although all of these constitute potential or actual threats, the biggest challenges facing the US are its burgeoning debt, crumbling infrastructure, second-rate primary and secondary schools, outdated immigration system, and slow economic growth – in short, the domestic foundations of American power. Readers in other countries may be tempted to react to this judgment with a dose of schadenfreude, finding more than a little satisfaction in America’s difficulties. Such a response should not be surprising. The US and those representing it have been guilty of hubris (the US may often be the indispensable nation, but it would be better if others pointed this out), and examples of inconsistency between America’s practices and its principles understandably provoke charges of hypocrisy. When America does not adhere to the principles that it preaches to others, it breeds resentment. But, like most temptations, the urge to gloat at America’s imperfections and struggles ought to be resisted. People around the globe should be careful what they wish for. America’s failure to deal with its internal challenges would come at a steep price. Indeed, the rest of the world’s stake in American success is nearly as large as that of the US itself. Part of the reason is economic. The US economy still accounts for about one-quarter of global output. If US growth accelerates, America’s capacity to consume other countries’ goods and services will increase, thereby boosting growth around the world. At a time when Europe is drifting and Asia is slowing, only the US (or, more broadly, North America) has the potential to drive global economic recovery. The US remains a unique source of innovation. Most of the world’s citizens communicate with mobile devices based on technology developed in Silicon Valley; likewise, the Internet was made in America. More recently, new technologies developed in the US greatly increase the ability to extract oil and natural gas from underground formations. This technology is now making its way around the globe, allowing other societies to increase their energy production and decrease both their reliance on costly imports and their carbon emissions. The US is also an invaluable source of ideas. Its world-class universities educate a significant percentage of future world leaders. More fundamentally, the US has long been a leading example of what market economies and democratic politics can accomplish. People and governments around the world are far more likely to become more open if the American model is perceived to be succeeding. Finally, the world faces many serious challenges, ranging from the need to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction, fight climate change, and maintain a functioning world economic order that promotes trade and investment to regulating practices in cyberspace, improving global health, and preventing armed conflicts. These problems will not simply go away or sort themselves out. While Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” may ensure the success of free markets, it is powerless in the world of geopolitics. Order requires the visible hand of leadership to formulate and realize global responses to global challenges. Don’t get me wrong: None of this is meant to suggest that the US can deal effectively with the world’s problems on its own. Unilateralism rarely works. It is not just that the US lacks the means; the very nature of contemporary global problems suggests that only collective responses stand a good chance of succeeding. But multilateralism is much easier to advocate than to design and implement. Right now there is only one candidate for this role: the US. No other country has the necessary combination of capability and outlook. This brings me back to the argument that the US must put its house in order – economically, physically, socially, and politically – if it is to have the resources needed to promote order in the world. Everyone should hope that it does: The alternative to a world led by the US is not a world led by China, Europe, Russia, Japan, India, or any other country, but rather a world that is not led at all. Such a world would almost certainly be characterized by chronic crisis and conflict. That would be bad not just for Americans, but for the vast majority of the planet’s inhabitants.

#### US economic collapse means Mexican economic collapse.

Villarreal 10

The Mexican Economy After the Global Financial Crisis M. Angeles Villarreal Specialist in International Trade and Finance September 16, 2010 Congressional Research Service https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41402.pdf

The state of Mexico’s economy is important for U.S. policymakers for many reasons, most significantly because a prosperous and democratic neighboring country is in the best interest of the United States. **The two countries have strong economic, political, and social ties, which have direct policy implications** related to bilateral trade, economic competitiveness, migration, and border security. In May 2010, President Barack Obama hosted Mexican President Felipe Calderón at a meeting in the White House in which the two leaders discussed key issues affecting the two countries. They agreed to continue and reinforce cooperation on creating jobs, promoting economic recovery and expansion, and encouraging inclusive prosperity across all levels of society in both countries. The 111th Congress is likely to maintain an active interest in Mexico on issues related to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and other trade issues, economic conditions in Mexico, migration, border security issues, and counter-narcotics. **The global financial crisis that began in 2008 and the U.S. economic downturn had strong adverse effects on the Mexican economy, largely due to its economic ties and dependence on the U.S. market**. Mexico’s gross domestic product (GDP) contracted by 6.6% in 2009, the sharpest decline of any Latin American economy. **Mexico’s reliance on the United States as an export market and the relative importance of exports to its overall economic performance make it highly susceptible to fluctuations in the U.S. economy**. Most other Latin American countries are not as dependent on the United States as an export market. Economic reforms over the past 20 years and the government’s responses to the effects of the global financial crisis have helped Mexico weather the economic downturn and improve conditions in 2010. However, sustained economic recovery will likely depend on the U.S. economic recovery and the ability to sustain this growth.

#### Mexican economic decline is the root cause of cartel violence—it’s what drives the cartel industry and participation in it.

Ramsey 11

[Poverty a Recruitment Tool for Mexico's Criminal Gangs](http://www.insightcrime.org/news-analysis/poverty-a-recruitment-tool-for-mexicos-criminal-gangs) Written by Geoffrey Ramsey Wednesday, 20 July 2011 InSight Crime <http://www.insightcrime.org/news-analysis/poverty-a-recruitment-tool-for-mexicos-criminal-gangs>

**Poverty and lack of opportunity are supplying** [**Mexico**](http://www.insightcrime.org/mexico-organized-crime-news)**'s drug trafficking organizations with waves of fresh recruits**. However, the government has shown little interest in addressing social issues in its assault on crime Although many Mexicans have grown somewhat accustomed to reports of violence in the media, some in the country were shocked last month by the capture of six teenage recruits during a June 15 raid on a [Zetas](http://www.insightcrime.org/mexico-organized-crime-news/zetas) training camp. Especially alarming was the testimony by sixteen year-old Maria Celeste Mendoza, who -- during one of Mexico’s routine post-arrest press conferences in which the suspects are presented to the media -- cheerfully said, “I’m a hit woman for the [Zetas](http://www.insightcrime.org/mexico-organized-crime-news/zetas). I spent two months in training and I’ve only been one for three or four days." According to Mexico’s [El Universal](http://ar.noticias.yahoo.com/mujeres-ven-redituable-delincuencia-050745921.html), Celeste and the five other adolescents who attended the camp (four of whom are women) were paid 12,000 pesos a month, an amount which is more than three times as much as most Mexicans make in the same period. Officials have arrested a number of these “youth assassins” in recent months, indicating that **this phenomenon is on the rise.** In March, a court in Aguascalientes sentenced a fifteen year-old who allegedly worked as a foot soldier for the [Gulf Cartel](http://www.insightcrime.org/mexico-organized-crime-news/gulf-cartel) in Quintana Roo to [a year in prison.](http://elcuartopoder.com.mx/?p=3387) Last December, the country was captivated by the case of “El Ponchis,” a fourteen year-old boy who authorities say is responsible for killing and beheading at least four enemies of the Beltran Leyva Organization in the state of Morelos. The boy’s trial began this week in Cuernavaca, and AFP reports that [more than 60 witnesses](http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5hZ_s91LCYZ5Doc6F6OZ0cv4ISENg?docId=CNG.832a4bd5d343e4861527751b5e0d9c50.1001) are expected to testify against him in the case. Although there are no official statistics on the number of youths working for Mexico’s cartels, the Mexican newspaper [Reforma](http://www.terra.com.mx/noticias/articulo/1095917/Se+dispara+la+detencion+de+los+narcomenores.htm) reported in April that officials have charged 214 minors with involvement in organized crime in 2010, up from only eight in 2007, according to data from the attorney general’s office. In total, 1,107 adolescents have been detained by Mexican police in the past six years, and 339 of them were formally accused of belonging to criminal groups. While there are several likely explanations for this phenomenon, most analysts agree that **Mexico’s abysmal youth unemployment rate is a major contributing factor.** As Victor Clark-Alfaro, director of the Binational Center for Human Rights in Tijuana, recently told [Reuters](http://ca.news.yahoo.com/mexican-teenage-girls-train-drug-cartel-killers-195149695.html), organized crime has become a “job provider” for those in the country with little alternative means of employment. According to Clark-Alfaro, "Since 2000, the age at which people start getting mixed up in organized crime has fallen, and in the last few years, the age has dropped to about 17 or 18." Recently, Mexico’s Assistant Secretary of Education Rodolfo Tuiran claimed that there are an estimated 7.3 million Mexicans between the ages of 12 and 29 who are unemployed and are not in school, which amounts to more than 20 percent of the country’s youth population. Despite the fact that these “ni-nis” (so labeled because they neither study or work, "ni estudian ni trabajan") are widely dismissed as simply lazy by many in [Mexico](http://www.insightcrime.org/mexico-organized-crime-news), evidence suggests that **this trend is due to a serious lack of investment in social programs at the state level.** Diana Carbajosa Martínez, a researcher at the National Autonomous University of Mexico’s (Universidad Nacional Autonomo de [Mexico](http://www.insightcrime.org/mexico-organized-crime-news)) Research Institute on Universities and Education, told [El Universal](http://www.eluniversal.com.mx/notas/779886.html) that only five states offer social programs specifically targeting this issue: Chihuahua, Baja California, Tlaxcala, Guerrero and Hidalgo. Meanwhile, the two states with the highest numbers of jobless youths are Chiapas and Michoacan, and the complete lack of such programs there puts youth unemployment at more than 25 percent. As InSight Crime [has reported,](http://www.insightcrime.org/news-analysis/mexico-defense-of-kingpin-strategy-falls-short) Mexican President Felipe **Calderon has been repeatedly criticized for his security strategy**, which many believe prioritizes capturing and killing cartel leaders, known as “high value targets.” Instead**, these critics**, who have largely joined under the banner of Mexico’s [“peace movement,”](http://www.insightcrime.org/news-analysis/can-mexicos-peace-movement-alter-calderons-strategy) **argue for a more comprehensive approach to Mexico’s security crisis, with an emphasis on the socioeconomic factors which influence crime.** This argument has largely fallen on deaf ears, as Calderon and others have pointed out that addressing poverty and inequality will do nothing to impact the illicit narcotics industry, which is estimated to rake in around $40 billion a year. While this may be true, it is difficult to make the case that Calderon’s strategy has actually resulted in increased security in the country, considering that [killings related to organized crime are up by 16 percent this year.](http://www.insightcrime.org/news-briefs/mexico-organized-crime-killings-up-16-in-2011)

## Solvency

### Illicit Markets TURN

#### Plan strengthens cartels through creating a large illicit market.

Tuccille 12 https://reason.com/archives/2012/12/22/gun-restrictions-have-always-bred-defian/4 Gun Restrictions Have Always Bred Defiance, Black Markets For reasons of their own, most people, in many countries, defy anti-gun laws [J.D. Tuccille](https://reason.com/people/jd-tuccille/all) | December 22, 2012 Contributing Editor, Reason.com

Such connections can be found elsewhere in the world, too. Flush with money made satisfying Americans’ appetite for intoxicants out of favor with U.S. government officials, Mexico’s drug gangs have eagerly armed themselves, the better to squabble with one another—and to battle the police and even the army. While popular mythology blames the flow of guns to Mexico on purchases in America’s legal weapons markets (Mexico has tight restrictions on private firearms ownership, including outright bans on guns in calibers used by the military), the gangs have increasingly fielded grenades, rockets and machine guns—firepower unavailable in the average Texas gun shop. But such weaponry is available from underground dealers. [Says](http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-mexico-arms-race15-2009mar15,0,7497626,full.story) the Los Angeles Times: These groups appear to be taking advantage of a robust global black [illicit] market and porous borders, especially between Mexico and Guatemala. Some of the weapons are left over from the wars that the United States helped fight in Central America, U.S. officials said. "There is an arms race between the cartels," said Alberto Islas, a security consultant who advises the Mexican government. "One group gets rocket-propelled grenades, the other has to have them." That the black market in guns flows freely into the black market for drugs—or other illicit goods and services—should come as no surprise. Csaszar emphasizes that this convergence between illegal markets is to be expected. [I]nterconnections between the black market in arms and other, more general black markets should be taken very seriously. Viewed from the side of the illegal arms buyers this integration of markets will happen only with a very tiny fraction, namely those individuals already involved in other criminal business. For the great majority it will remain an isolated breach of a gun law only. However, viewed at a general level from the provider side there can be no doubt of the worldwide integration of drugs and arms markets. So, by imposing restrictions on one type of product, governments have driven people to the black market where all forbidden products and services are available, and likely increased the wealth and power of active sellers in that market.

#### Plan pushes people to the illicit market where guns are cheaper and more available-increases gun use.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

Dixon expects the "fact that such guns are inaccurate and dangerous to the user will also act as a restraint to illegal gun production." [129] How much of a restraint may be open to doubt. While homemade guns will not win target- shooting contests, target shooters will have their own guns (kept at shooting ranges under the Dixon proposal), and homemade guns may suffice for robbery purposes. And most homicides, like most robberies, are perpetrated at very close range where accuracy is not an issue. The risk that a homemade gun could explode in a shooter's hand may deter some otherwise law-abiding citizens who would want to own an illegal handgun for protection. On the other hand, if the person believes that the threats to his or her life and family are serious enough to commit the serious crime of buying an illegal handgun, the additional risk posed by potentially defective handgun may seem small. In addition, newfound popularity for bootleg guns might result in handguns becoming cheaper than they are now, just as in alcohol prohibition days, bootleg gin often cost less than legal alcohol had. If handguns were cheaper, they might become more available to small-time teenage criminals and other low-end miscreants; criminals might end up more widely armed than ever before. The inevitable [illicit] black market in homemade and imported illegal handguns would provide a major new revenue source to organized crime. As the black market in alcohol helped create and enrich organized crime in the United States, the new black market in handguns would fund and strengthen organized crime all the more. Dixon also acknowledges that illegal handguns would also flow in across American borders. [130] Indeed, if small handguns were imported in the same physical volume as marijuana, 20 million would enter the country annually. (Current legal demand for new handguns is about 2.5 million a year). [131]

#### This outweighs:

A) they’ll say the plan increases gun prices but my evidence proves that illicit market guns are cheaper than guns in the squo which means once people realize they can access them, people will be more widely armed

B) turns back all your internal links- there are at least some regulations on guns in the status quo but the illicit market is by definition unregulatable so we always solve case better. Also outweighs on probability- it happened during prohibition.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Closing down legitimate manufacturers would be a boon to black market (p.161) producers. Clandestine handgun manufacturers would spring up, just as thousands of illegal stills operated during alcohol prohibition, and hundreds or thousands of clandestine labs now produce unlawful mood and mind-altering drugs like amphetamine and ecstasy. Even today, “zip guns” are produced or assembled in small workshops within the United States.\* These black market manufacturers, already illegal, operate outside any regulatory scheme for recordkeeping, serial numbers, safety locks, or taxation.

### Solvency

#### 1. Aff doesn’t solve enough to prevent the impact-if you win solvency all you’re taking away is pistols and revolvers, but most organized crime groups use assault rifles which the aff does nothing to.

#### 2. Only 17% of guns come from America.

Mauro 11 “WHERE DRUG CARTELS REALLY GET THEIR ARMS” Frontpage Mag April 18th 2011 <http://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/90583/where-drug-cartels-really-get-their-arms-ryan-mauro> JW

When all is said and done, only 17 percent of the guns seized by the Mexican authorities from the drug lords were actually traced back to the U.S. The incorrect assumption that 90 percent of the cartels’ guns come from the U.S., though, continues to be regularly cited by the media and officials. The highly-respected STRATFOR intelligence company agrees that the statistic is incorrect. The group likewise explained that only 3,480 guns were traced back to the U.S., which equals 12 percent of the total arms seized by the Mexican authorities in 2008 and less than 48 percent of those sent for tracing. “According to the figures presented by the GAO [Government Accountability Office], there is no evidence to support the assertion that 90 percent of the guns used by the Mexican cartels come from the United States—especially when not even 50 percent of those that were submitted for tracing were ultimately found to be of U.S. origin,” STRATFOR concluded. In addition, it simply doesn’t make sense for the Mexican drug cartels to make the U.S. their primary point of gun acquisition. As Howard Nemerov writes, “Why would cartels spend over $1,000 -- plus a background check and smuggling risks — for a decent American semi-automatic rifle, when they can buy 4-5 fully automatic AK-47s for the same price on the [illicit] black market?”

3. Other countries are an alt cause the aff can’t solve.

Aguilar 13

Gun Control Debate Takes Mexico Into Account by [Julián Aguilar](http://www.texastribune.org/about/staff/julian-aguilar/) Jan. 20, 2013 The Texas Tribune <http://www.texastribune.org/2013/01/20/will-new-gun-laws-curb-weapons-smuggling-mexico/> Julián Aguilar reports on politics and border affairs from the Texas-Mexico border. His focuses include immigration reform and enforcement, voter ID, international trade, border security, and the drug trade. His political coverage has included local, legislative and congressional races in Texas, as well as local and national elections in Mexico. Before joining the Tribune, he was a freelance writer for the Fort Worth Weekly; a government and crime reporter for the Laredo Morning Times; and a political writer for the Rio Grande Guardian. A native of El Paso, he has a bachelor's degree in English from the University of Texas and a master's degree in journalism from the Frank W. Mayborn Graduate Institute of Journalism at the University of North Texas.

But U.S. Rep. [Michael McCaul](http://www.texastribune.org/directory/michael-mccaul/), R-Austin and the chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security, said **the data is misleading and that changing gun laws in the United States would not change gun behavior in Mexico.** “The fact is, **guns are illegal to possess in Mexico,**” McCaul said, “**and that certainly hasn’t had any effects on the drug cartels.”** He said he understood that **the debate is fueled by emotion**, which he said was inevitable after years of bloodshed in Mexico and the murder of 20 schoolchildren in Connecticut. But he also said **the public is not aware that many of the weapons favored by cartels** like the Zetas **come from other countries and are often not traceable, which inevitably leads to data that reflects poorly on the U.S.** “We all feel for what happened recently with the shooting in a very emotional way, but the fact is, a lot of their AK-47s, which is the Zetas’ gun of choice, **those are coming from China and Russia**,” McCaul said. “**We could make guns in the United States illegal altogether and I don’t think it’s going to stop the drug cartels from getting weapons.”**

## Instability

### UQ-Cartels Low Now

#### Mexico drug cartels are losing in the squo.

Gomez 15 Alan, USA today “After years of drug wars, murders decline in Mexico” April 30, 2015 <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2015/04/30/mexico-drug-war-homicides-decline/26574309/> JW

Murders in Mexico fell for a third straight year in 2014 — the most pronounced declines occurring along the U.S. border — a sign the country is slowly stabilizing after gruesome drug wars. There were 15,649 people murdered in Mexico in 2014, a 13.8% reduction from the previous year and down from a peak of 22,480 in 2011, according to a report set to be released Thursday by the University of San Diego's Justice in Mexico Project. The reductions were steeper along the U.S.-Mexican border. Five of the six Mexican states that border the USA reported a combined drop of 17.7% in the number of homicides. "These data really help to underscore that we're talking about a sea change in violence," said David Shirk, co-author of the report and director of the Justice in Mexico Project, a U.S.-based initiative to protect human rights south of the border. "You still have elevated levels of crime, so we still have a long way to go. But there is improvement, and we have to acknowledge that improvement and understand why it's happening so we can try to further it." JUSTICE IN MEXICO 2015 "Drug Violence in Mexico" Justice in Mexico Report The reduction in homicides does not mean Mexico has completely solved its security problems. Maureen Meyer, senior associate for Mexico at the Washington Office on Latin America, said Mexicans still face extremely high levels of kidnappings, extortion and other violent crimes. American travelers have also been attacked. The U.S. State Department issued a warning April 13 that said U.S. citizens continue to be victims of carjackings, robberies and other violent crimes. Meyer said the overall reduction in murders is an encouraging trend that allows Mexican officials time to cement improvements in the judicial system, anti-corruption programs and police practices. She said the government must "make sure that the space opened by having less violence leads to structural changes to Mexico's institutions to guarantee a strong rule of law in the future." Mexico became home to a bloody, nationwide drug war after then-President Felipe Calderón announced in December 2006 that the government would crack down on drug cartels and go after its leaders. The United States agreed to help, and Congress has sent $2.3 billion to Mexico since 2008 to train police and buy new aircraft, scanners, X-Ray machines and nearly 400 canines that can detect drugs, weapons and explosives. The strategy seemed to work. Calderón's administration boasted several high-profile successes, capturing or killing the heads of different cartels. But the unexpected consequence was an explosion of violence throughout the country as lower-level cartel members fought to fill the power vacuum. At least 138,000 people have been murdered in Mexico since the end of 2006, according to the report. USA TODAY Notorious Mexican drug cartel leader arrested When President Enrique Peña Nieto took office in December 2012, he continued going after cartel leaders, most notably capturing Joaquín "El Chapo" Guzmán, the biggest drug supplier to the USA, last year. Shirk said the violence that usually follows such high-profile arrests has not materialized in recent years. Meyer said some cartels appear to have negotiated deals to split up the lucrative smuggling routes into the USA. Shirk said the gradual degradation of cartels could play a role. The Sinaloa Cartel reigns over northwestern Mexico, and Shirk said it may have become so entrenched in its position that rivals are no longer trying to overtake it. "It could be that this conflict between organized crime groups has burned itself out," Shirk said. "There's really not too many people left to fight." Other findings in the report: • The number of Mexican mayors and ex-mayors killed was down to six in 2014, compared with 12 the previous year and as high as 17 in 2010. • Violence increased against journalists. There were 17 murders in 2014, up from seven in 2013. The worst year for journalists came in 2011, when 19 were murdered. • For the second straight year, no individual city reached 1,000 murders. Cities such as Juárez and Acapulco regularly topped 1,000 murders a year during the peak of the drug wars. Acapulco had the highest tally of any city in 2014, with 590 murders. The report is based on a collection of data from the Mexic[o]an government, private companies and media organizations that track homicides in Mexico.

#### Cartels are crumbling and legislation is working—cartels are no longer a credible threat. No impact to the aff and uniqueness flows neg.

Reed 15

Mexico's Disorganized Crime [**Security Weekly**](https://www.stratfor.com/security-weekly) SEPTEMBER 17, 2015 | 08:00 GMT Stratfor Global Intelligence <https://www.stratfor.com/weekly/mexicos-disorganized-crime> Tristan Reed As the lead analyst on Mexico's security issues, Tristan Reed focuses on the broad geographic trends of organized crime and tactical movements of individual criminal groups. He is an expert on Mexico's criminal cartels and the ways they impact security throughout Mexico and neighboring countries. He also assists in the analysis of security-related topics around the world, including jihadist and criminal trends in Pakistan and political violence in Afghanistan.

The breakdown of the Sinaloa Federation and decline of Los Zetas have pushed the Cartel de Jalisco Nueva Generacion into the national spotlight. **In 2015, Mexico City renewed its** [**largely ineffective efforts to combat the criminal organization**](https://www.stratfor.com/analysis/mexico-cartels-rise-and-inevitable-fall)**.** But the government has been distracted by social unrest in country's south and southwest, spurred by the Sept. 26 abduction of normalistas in Iguala, Guerrero state, and organized by militant teacher unions protesting against education reform. Since Mexico's June 7 national elections, however, **unrest has fallen drastically** while protesting teacher unions at the moment appear to have lost their capabilities to organize massive demonstrations that could overwhelm security forces. Federal troops will likely have more freedom to target Cartel de Jalisco Nueva Generacion leadership. Balkanization Continues The continued fighting among the various crime groups, albeit occurring at lower and more localized levels, has resulted in levels of homicides in 2015 comparable to those seen in 2014. There were 9,601 intentional homicides nationwide from January to July 2015, compared with 9,317 during the same time period of 2014. Overall, violence is not likely to substantially decline by the end of 2015. While each year Mexico's organized crime as a whole breaks down further, its sources of revenue are actually expanding. As a result, even lower-level crime groups still enjoy wealth to carry out turf wars with rivals, to evade targeted operations by federal troops and to expand despite rising competition. As with each year since 2012, **all evidence indicates that the Balkanization of organized crime in Mexico will carry on. Mexico's two most powerful crime groups**, Los Zetas and the Sinaloa Federation, **will continue to fragment, possibly facing their inevitable demise.** Meanwhile, the Cartel de Jalisco Nueva Generacion will seemingly expand and consolidate territory — as did Los Zetas until 2013. However, as with its Tierra Caliente rivals such as La Familia Michoacana and the Knights Templar, this expansion will still attract the attention of the Mexican government, and **the ensuring crackdowns will likely further fracture the drug trade in the country.**

### UQ-Mexican Econ

#### Their internal link relies on the Mexican economy reeling now, leaving it vulnerable to cartels—newest evidence proves the Mexican economy is steadily growing.

WORLD BANK 15 [World Bank, “Mexico Overview”, 2015]

The Mexican economy continues to expand at a moderate annual rate of growth of 2.4 percent as the economic recovery lost steam during the first half of 2015. Moderate growth during the first semester of 2015 in Mexico has been attributed to weakness in industrial production in the U.S., a further drop in the volume of oil production reducing annual GDP growth by about 0.4 percentage points and financial market volatility. A gradual recovery of economic activity is expected to continue, with economic growth strengthening from 2.3 percent in 2015 to 3.0 percent in 2017. The expansion of economic activity will rely on growth of private consumption and investment, with an increase in manufacturing exports following the significant real exchange rate adjustment and robust growth in the U.S. eventually providing additional support.

## Oil Shocks

### Impact D

#### Empirics prove no impact to oil shocks

**Kahn, 11** – Journalist, formerly a Pew International Journalism Fellow at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (Jeremy, “Crude Reality”, 2/13/11, http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2011/02/13/crude\_reality/?page=full)

Among those asking this tough question are two young professors, Eugene **Gholz, at the University of Texas, and** Daryl **Press, at Dartmouth College**. To find out what actually happens when the world’s petroleum supply is interrupted, the duo **analyzed every major oil disruption since 1973.** The results, published in a recent issue of the journal Strategic Studies, showed that **in almost all cases, the ensuing rise in prices, while sometimes steep, was short-lived and had little lasting economic impact**. When there have been prolonged price rises, they found **the cause to be panic on the part of oil purchasers rather than a supply shortage. When oil runs short**, in other words, **the market is usually adept at filling the gap**. One striking example was the height of the Iran-Iraq War in the 1980s. If anything was likely to produce an oil shock, it was this: two major Persian Gulf producers directly targeting each other’s oil facilities. And indeed, prices surged 25 percent in the first months of the conflict. But within 18 months of the war’s start they had fallen back to their prewar levels, and they stayed there even though the fighting continued to rage for six more years. Surprisingly, **during the** 1984 “**Tanker War**” phase of that conflict — **when Iraq tried to sink oil tankers** carrying Iranian crude and Iran retaliated by targeting ships carrying oil from Iraq and its Persian Gulf allies — **the price of oil continued to drop steadily**. Gholz and Press found just one case after 1973 in which the market mechanisms failed: the 1979-1980 Iranian oil strike which followed the overthrow of the Shah, during which Saudi Arabia, perhaps hoping to appease Islamists within the country, also led OPEC to cut production, exacerbating the supply shortage. In their paper, Gholz and Press ultimately conclude that the **market’s adaptive mechanisms** function independently of the US military presence in the Persian Gulf, and that they largely **protect the American economy from being damaged by oil shocks**. “To the extent that the United States faces a national security challenge related to Persian Gulf oil, it is not ‘how to protect the oil we need’ but ‘how to assure consumers that there is nothing to fear,’ ” the two write. “That is a thorny policy problem, but it does not require large military deployments and costly military operations.” There’s no denying the importance of Middle Eastern oil to the US economy. Although only 15 percent of imported US oil comes directly from the Persian Gulf, the region is responsible for nearly a third of the world’s production and the majority of its known reserves. But the oil market is also elastic: **Many key producing countries have spare capacity, so if oil is cut off from one country, others tend to increase their output rapidly to compensate**. Today, **regions outside the Middle East, such as** the **west** coast of **Africa, make up an increasingly important share of worldwide production**. Private companies also hold large stockpiles of oil to smooth over shortages — amounting to a few billion barrels in the United States alone — as does the US government, with 700 million barrels in its strategic petroleum reserve. And the market can largely work around shipping disruptions by using alternative routes; though they are more expensive, transportation costs account for only tiny fraction of the price of oil. **Compared to the 1970s**, too, **the structure of the US economy offers better insulation from oil price shocks**. Today, **the country uses half as much energy per dollar** of gross domestic product as it did in 1973, **according to** data from the **US Energy Information Administration**. Remarkably, the economy consumed less total energy in 2009 than in 1997, even though its GDP rose and the population grew. When it comes time to fill up at the pump, the average US consumer today spends less than 4 percent of his or her disposable income on gasoline, compared with more than 6 percent in 1980. **Oil**, though crucial, **is** simply **a smaller part of the economy** than it once was. There is no denying that the 1973 oil shock was bad — the stock market crashed in response to the sudden spike in oil prices, inflation jumped, and unemployment hit levels not seen since the Great Depression. The 1979 oil shock also had deep and lasting economic effects. **Economists now argue**, however, **that the economic damage was more directly attributable to bad government policy than to the actual supply shortage. Among those who have studied past oil shocks is Ben Bernanke**, the current chairman of the Federal Reserve. In 1997, **Bernanke analyzed the effects of a sharp rise in fuel prices during three different oil shocks** — 1973-75, 1980-82, and 1990-91. He concluded that **the major economic damage was caused not by the oil price increases but by the Federal Reserve overreacting and sharply increasing interest rates** to head off what it wrongly feared would be a wave of inflation. Today, his view is accepted by most mainstream economists. **Gholz and Press are hardly the only researchers who have concluded that we are far too worried about oil shocks. The economy** also **faced a large increase in prices** in the mid-2000s, largely as the result of surging demand from emerging markets, **with no ill effects**. “If you take any economics textbook written before 2000, it would talk about what a calamitous effect a doubling in oil prices would have,” said Philip Auerswald, an associate professor at George Mason University’s School of Public Policy who has written about oil shocks and their implications for US foreign policy. “Well, **we had a price quadrupling** from 2003 and 2007 **and nothing bad happened**.” (The recession of 2008-9 was triggered by factors unrelated to oil prices.) Auerswald also points out that when **Hurricane Katrina** slammed into the Gulf Coast in 2005, it **did tremendous damage to offshore oil rigs**, refineries, and pipelines, as well as the rail lines and roads that transport petroleum to the rest of the country. The United States gets about 12 percent of its oil from the Gulf of Mexico region, and, more significantly, 40 percent of its refining capacity is located there. “Al Qaeda times 1,000 could not deliver this sort of blow to the oil industry’s physical infrastructure,” Auerswald said. And **yet the only impact was about five days of gas lines** in Georgia, and unusually high prices at the pump for a few weeks.

#### No impact to shocks – US has huge oil reserves which means there’s no dependency on imports and denies their Lendman impact.

WEISS ’12 – Senior Fellow and Director of Climate Strategy at the Center for American Progress (Weiss, Daniel J.. “Preparing for the Next Oil Price Shock” May 18, 2012. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/05/spr\_g8.html)

Some argue there should be no sale of reserve oil unless there is actually a severe supply disruption, rather than selling in response to high oil prices driven up by Wall Street speculators in anticipation that there might be a Persian Gulf supply interruption. But the United States and its allies have ample oil reserves that could be used in the event of another huge price spike or a supply disruption so as to pop the speculative bubble and provide economic relief. The United States has significant oil reserves. The Strategic Petroleum Reserve is 96 percent full with nearly 700 million barrels of oil. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development nations had more than 800 million barrels of oil reserves at the end of 2011. Selling 30 million barrels from each reserve would reduce total reserves by less than 4 percent. In addition, U.S. reserve oil has been sold under every president beginning with George H.W. Bush. He sold 17.2 million barrels of reserve oil in advance of the 1991 Gulf War in anticipation of supply disruption that did not occur. In 1996 the Republican Congress led by Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich (R-GA) sold 23 million barrels of oil to reduce the federal budget deficit at a time when it was less than 80 percent full. In other words, the oil in the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve is not some sacred oil supply only to be used during an oil embargo or pipeline destruction.

#### No impact to shocks – newest empirical study proves

Khadduri ’11 - Former Middle East Economic Survey Editor-in-Chief (Walid, "The impact of rising oil prices on the economies of importing nations", http://english.alarabiya.net/views/2011/08/23/163590.html)

What is the impact of oil price shocks on the economies of importing nations? At first glance, there appears to be large-scale and extremely adverse repercussions for rising oil prices. However, a study published this month by researchers in the IMF Working Paper group suggests a different picture altogether (it is worth mentioning that the IMF has not endorsed its findings.) The study (Tobias N. Rasmussen & Agustin Roitman, "Oil Shocks in a Global Perspective: Are They Really That Bad?", IMF Working Paper, August 2011) mentions that “Using a comprehensive global dataset […] we find that the impact of higher oil prices on oil-importing economies is generally small: a 25 percent increase in oil prices typically causes GDP to fall by about half of one percent or less.” The study elaborates on this by stating that this impact differs from one country to another, depending on the size of oil-imports, as “oil price shocks are not always costly for oil-importing countries: although higher oil prices increase the import bill, there are partly offsetting increases in external receipts [represented in new and additional expenditures borne by both oil-exporting and oil-importing countries]”. In other words, the more oil prices increase, benefiting exporting countries, the more these new revenues are recycled, for example through the growth in demand for new services, labor, and commodity imports. The researchers argue that the series of oil price rallies (in 1983, 1996, 2005, and 2009) have played an important role in recessions in the United States. However, Rasmussen and Roitman state at the same time that significant changes in the U.S. economy in the previous period (the appearance of combined elements, such as improvements in monetary policy, the institution of a labor market more flexible than before and a relatively smaller usage of oil in the U.S. economy) has gre y mitigated the negative effects of oil prices on the U.S. economy.

# A2 Coordination Adv.

### Regulation CP

#### Counterplan: the United States federal government in a coordinated effort with the fifty states will expand background checks, enforce safe storage requirements, and regulate concealed handgun permits.

#### We solve case just as much as you do.

Harwood 02 William (attorney in Portland, Maine. He is President of Maine Citizens Against Handgun Violence and a member of the American Bar Association Coordinating Committee on Gun Violence) “Gun Control: State Versus Federal Regulation of Firearms” Maine Policy Review Volume 11 | Issue 1 <http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1256&context=mpr> JW

Background Checks for Purchasers The federal government requires a Federal Firearms License (FFL) from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) in order to engage in the commercial sale of firearms. Under the 1994 Brady Act, these licensed dealers are currently required to perform background checks on all purchasers to determine whether the purchaser is qualified to own a firearm or is disqualified because he or she is a convicted felon, mentally incompetent or a domestic abuser. However, those who do not sell firearms commercially do not need an FFL to do so. This is sometimes referred to as the “gun-show loophole” in recognition of the large number of guns sold each year at gun shows by nonlicensed sellers. In essence, the federal government has only been willing to regulate those who sell guns out of commercial establishments, such as a hunting or sporting goods store. All other gun sellers are unregulated by the federal government. The obvious problem with this is that anyone who is not legally permitted to purchase from an FFL can simply purchase from an unregulated non-FFL. This creates both the need and the opportunity for states to experiment with closing the loophole by regulating the sale of firearms by those not licensed by ATF.29 In the 2000 election, proposals were passed by referendum in Colorado and Oregon to close the gun-show loopholes in those states. In essence, those states now require the equivalent of a Brady background check, similar to that required by the Brady Act of FFLs, for all sales at gun shows. If enough states enact such laws and they appear to be effective in keeping firearms out of the wrong hands, Congress could then close the loophole for the entire country. It should be pointed out that it is not as important where the line between federal and state requirements for background checks is set, as it is that both the federal government and the states understand and accept the responsibility to require background checks for all sales on their side of that line. It matters less whether Congress or the states close the gun-show loophole. Much more important is that one of them do so. If neither of them act, the existing federal regulation of commercial dealers will be significantly undermined because those who cannot buy from an FFL dealer will simply buy it at an unregulated gun show. In the end, it may make more sense for the federal government to regulate large gun shows and for the states to regulate small gun shows. However, no matter where the line is drawn, someone must close the loophole for the Brady background check to be effective. Background checks of buyers are a good example of where the federal government and state governments can work cooperatively to stop the illegal flow of guns to criminals and others. If the ATF continues to require FFLs to perform Brady background checks, and the states do the same for non-FFLs, the two levels of government can create a seamless web preventing the sale of guns to criminals, mental incompetents and domestic abusers. Safe Storage Once a firearm is purchased, one of the most important questions becomes how that owner stores the gun when he or she is not using it and should the government impose regulations mandating safe storage. Although the NRA and gun owners have attempted to use self-defense as a justification for having a loaded gun readily accessible, an unlocked and loaded firearm presents a significant risk of harm to members of the household and visitors. The presence of a gun in the house is four times more likely to be involved in an accidental shooting, seven times more likely to be used in a criminal assault or homicide, and eleven times more likely to be used to commit or attempt suicide, than to be used in selfdefense. These statistics are especially troubling when one recognizes that in many states, such as Maine, there is at least one gun in half of all households. Given the risk to the safety of all those who reside or visit homes with guns, it is not surprising that many states have enacted laws requiring firearms to be safely stored in a locked box or with a trigger lock. For example, in 2000 the state of New Hampshire made gun owners criminally responsible for any injuries or harm resulting from the use of their guns by their children where the gun was left accessible to the children. This is an area of regulation where states can experiment by weighing the competing interests of the rights of gun owners to use their gun in self-defense with the rights of others to be protected from firearms being too accessible to curious children, angry spouses, distraught teenagers, and others. Because this involves regulating the owner of a gun inside his or her home, there is less of a compelling need for nationally uniform regulations. Therefore, regulating the safe storage of firearms by individual owners is a good candidate for state regulation. Concealed Weapons Permit One of the areas of firearms regulation that has been traditionally left to the states are limitations on the right to carry concealed weapons. In most states, a gun owner is required to obtain a concealed weapons permit from the local police in order to carry a concealed handgun. The state laws vary on the criteria to be applied in issuing such a permit. In some states, there is little or no clearly defined justification for withholding a permit. In others, the local police has been given clear authority to deny an application for a permit. In some states, the law prohibits permit holders from carrying their weapon into certain institutions, such as churches and schools. Some may argue that this should be subject to federal regulation because gun owners carry concealed guns across state lines and may inadvertently violate a concealed weapons law of which they were unaware. To address this, states can exempt gun owners who temporarily enter their state with a concealed weapons permit from another state. Alternatively, states can educate the public that before they carry a firearm across state lines, they should know the laws of the state they are entering. Overall, concealed weapons laws are another good example of where states can try different approaches to prevent the wrong people from carrying a concealed weapon and thereby threatening public safety.

### Court Clog DA

#### Courts are overworked in the squo—judges are at the edge and one big push collapses the judiciary.

Gersham 15 Jacob Gershman “Federal Judge Says His Overworked Colleagues Bench Close to Burnout” Wall Street Journal November 12th 2015

Judges in federal trial courts have for some time expressed concern about the ever-growing backlog of civil cases. The workload complaint from the judiciary appears to be getting more urgent. The chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California says he fears his colleagues are reaching a breaking point. In an interview with a local news channel, Chief U.S. District Judge Morrison England said he and the five other judges on his bench are sometimes working more than 80 hours a week trying to make a dent in the pile of pending cases. “The active judges that I’ve spoken to are starting to say, ‘I don’t want to do this anymore,’ or they’re leaving the bench, because it’s just too much,” Judge England told KCRA 3 in Sacramento. “We’re doing everything we possibly can to try to come up with new and inventive ways to get the cases out. But, we’re at a crisis point.” The number of cases filed per judge in California’s Eastern District has been almost twice the national average, according to recent statistics. The court has 5,880 civil cases pending as of the end of 2014, according to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. That’s a slight increase over the year before and works out to just under a thousand pending cases per judge. Judge England told The Wall Street Journal earlier this year that some of his cases are nearly a decade old, including a suit that’s imperiled because a key witness recently died. The California district isn’t the only jurisdiction stretched thin. WSJ reported that a combination of factors are contributing to a backlog in federal trial courts across the nation. The reasons include population shifts, politics and a surge in the number of federal prisoners. The article noted that only Congress can create new judge positions (or move them from slower-growing regions to faster-growing ones), but efforts to hire more judges have met political resistance.

#### Two links:

#### 1] Jury nullification: most people own handguns and would nullify strong gun control-also terminal defense to aff solvency.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Impediments to More Gun Controls” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

U.S. federalism, a large and entrenched gun subculture, the lobbying strength of the NRA, and the widespread belief of millions of Americans that the Constitution guarantees their right to keep and bear arms pose major political obstacles to the passage of federal gun controls, other than those directed at punishing criminal use of guns. Beyond that, the fervent belief by a large percentage of gun owners that gun controllers ultimately intend to confiscate all personal firearms means that if any strong gun controls were enacted, they would encounter widespread noncompliance and resistance, including jury nullification. Since approximately 45% of American households contain a firearm, there is nearly a 100% chance that every 12-person jury will contain at least one gun owner, which is all that would be needed to prevent conviction.

#### Jury nullification causes court clog-turns trials into legislative debates.

Frothingham 10 Stephen Frothingham (Associated Press) “Allowing juries to judge law ?disastrous?” posted May 21st 2003, updated December 17th 2010 http://www.seacoastonline.com/article/20030521/News/305219985

New Hampshire would become the only state with jury instructions allowing so-called jury nullification, which also is banned in federal courts. The Senate judiciary committee voted 3-2 on Tuesday to not support passage of the bill, which has passed the House. Judges would have to give the jury instruction if the defense requested it, which legal experts said would be almost every time. Proponents said empowering juries would keep the three branches of government in check. "The people are the ultimate source of our operation as a government," the bill's sponsor, Rep. Richard Marple, R-Hooksett, told a state Senate committee on Tuesday. However, prosecutors, police and court officials said the bill would tip the scales of justice too far toward the defendant and clog the court system with more trials, longer trials, and mistrials. "The practical application of this bill would be disastrous upon our criminal justice system," Attorney General Peter Heed told the committee. Heed said the bill would turn trials into "mini-referendums" on laws. He noted that while the Legislature passes laws by a simple majority, prosecutors would have to get the unanimous support of the jury to convict someone under the law.

#### 2] Litigation: people will sue the government over 2nd amendment rights.

Jacobs 04 James (Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice New York University School of Law) Can Gun Control Work? “Prohibition and Disarmament” 2004 Oxford Scholarship Online JW

Prohibition would face constitutional litigation all over the country. Most gun owners (rightly or wrongly) believe that they are exercising a constitutional right.19 Even a Supreme Court decision, rejecting the contention that the Second Amendment guarantees law-abiding individuals the right to keep and bear arms, would not shake millions of citizens’ belief that gun ownership is a right of American citizenship.

#### Federal court clog collapses the federal judiciary – overburdens dockets, expansion can't keep pace

Oakley 96 ~John B. Oakley, Distinguished Professor of Law Emeritus US Davis School of Law, 1996 The Myth of Cost-Free Jurisdictional Reallocation~

￼Personal effects: The hidden costs of greater workloads. The hallmark of federal justice traditionally has been the searching analysis and thoughtful opinion of a highly competent judge, endowed with the time as well as the intelligence to grasp and resolve the most nuanced issues of fact and law. Swollen dockets create assembly-line conditions, which threaten the ability of the modern federal judge to meet this high standard of quality in federal adjudication. No one expects a federal judge to function without an adequate level of available tangible resources: sufficient courtroom and chambers space, competent administrative and research staff, a good library, and a comfortable salary that relieves the judge from personal financial pressure. Although salary levels have lagged—encouraging judges to engage in the limited teaching and publication activities that are their sole means of meeting such newly pressing financial obligations as the historically high mortgage expenses and college tuitions of the present decade—in the main, federal judges have received a generous allocation of tangible resources. It is unlikely that there is any further significant gain to be realized in the productivity of individual federal judges through increased levels of tangible resources,13 other than by redressing the pressure to earn supplemental income.14 On a personal level, the most important resource available to the federal judge is time.15 Caseload pressures secondary to the indiscriminate federalization of state law are stealing time from federal judges, shrinking the increments available for each case. Federal judges have been forced to compensate by operating more like executives and less like judges. They cannot read their briefs as carefully as they would like, and they are driven to rely unduly on law clerks for research and writing that they would prefer to do themselves.16 If federal judges need more time to hear and decide each case, an obvious and easy solution is to spread the work by the appointment of more and more federal judges. Congress has been generous in the recent creation of new judgeships,17 and enlargement of the federal judiciary is likely to continue to be the default response, albeit a more grudging one, to judicial concern over the caseload consequences of jurisdictional reallocation. Systemic effects: The hidden costs of adding more judges. Increasing the size of the federal judiciary creates institutional strains that reduce and must ultimately rule out its continued acceptability as a countermeasure to caseload growth. While the dilution of workload through the addition of judges is always incrementally attractive, in the long run it will cause the present system to collapse. I am not persuaded by arguments that the problem lies in the declining quality of the pool of lawyers willing to assume the federal bench18 or in the greater risk that, as the ranks of federal judges expand, there will be more frequent lapses of judgment by the president and the Senate in seating the mediocre on the federal bench.19 In my view, the diminished desirability of federal judicial office is more than offset by the rampant dissatisfaction of modern lawyers with the excessive commercialization of the practice of law. There is no shortage of sound judicial prospects will￼ing and able to serve, and no sign that the selection process—never the perfect meritocracy—is becoming less effective in screening out the unfit or undistinguished. Far more serious are other institutional effects of continuously compounding the number of federal judges. Collegiality among judges, consistency of decision, and coherence of doctrine across courts are all imperiled by the growth of federal courts to cattle-car proportions. Yet the ability of the system to tolerate proliferation of courts proportional to the proliferation of judges is limited, and while collapse is not imminent, it cannot be postponed indefinitely. Congress could restructure the federal trial and appellate courts without imperiling the core functions, but the limiting factor is the capacity of the Supreme Court to maintain overall uniformity in the administration and application of federal law. That Court is not only the crown but the crowning jewel of a 200-year-old system of the rule of law within a constitutional democracy, and any tinkering with its size or jurisdiction would raise the most serious questions of the future course of the nation.

#### Separation of power solves unaccountable decisions to go to war – causes extinction.

Adler 96

(David, professor of political science at Idaho State, The Constitution and Conduct of American Foreign Policy, p. 23-25)

The structure of shared powers in foreign relations serves to deter the abuse of power, misguided policies, irrational action, and unaccountable behavior. As a fundamental structural matter, the emphasis on joint policymaking permits the airing of sundry political, social, and economic values and concerns. In any event, the structure wisely ensures that the ultimate policies will not reflect merely the private preferences or the short-term political interests of the president. Of course this arrangement has come under fire in the postwar period on a number of policy grounds. Some critics have argued, for example, that fundamental political and technological changes in the character of international relations and the position of the United States in the world have rendered obsolete an eighteenth-century document designed for a peripheral, small state in the European system of diplomatic relations. Moreover, it has been asserted that quick action and a single, authoritative voice are necessary to deal with an increasingly complex, interdependent, and technologically linked world capable of massive destruction in a very short period of time. Extollers of presidential dominance have also contended that only the president has the qualitative information, the expertise, and the capacity to act with the necessary dispatch to conduct U.S. foreign policy. These policy arguments have been reviewed, and discredited, elsewhere; space limitations here permit only a brief commentary. Above all else, the implications of U.S. power and action in the twentieth century have brought about an even greater need for institutional accountability and collective judgment that existed 200 years ago. The devastating, incomprehensible destruction of nuclear war and the possible extermination of the human race demonstrate the need for joint participation, as opposed to the opinion of one person, in the decision to initiate war. Moreover, most of the disputes at stake between the executive and legislative branches in foreign affairs, including the issues discussed in this chapter, have virtually nothing to do with the need for rapid response to crisis. Rather, they are concerned only with routine policy formulation and execution, a classic example of the authority exercised under the separation of powers doctrine. But these functions have been fused by the executive branch and have become increasingly unilateral, secretive, insulated from public debate, and hence unaccountable. In the wake of Vietnam, Watergate, and the Iran-Contra scandal, unilateral executive behavior has become even more difficult to defend. Scholarly appraisals have exploded arguments about intrinsic executive expertise and wisdom on foreign affairs and the alleged superiority of information available to the president. Moreover, the inattentiveness of presidents to important details and the effects of “group-think” that have dramatized and exacerbated the relative inexperience of various presidents in international relations have also devalued the extollers arguments. Finally, foreign policies, like domestic policies, are a reflection of values. Against the strength of democratic principles, recent occupants of the White House have failed to demonstrate the superiority of their values in comparison to those of the American people and their representatives in Congress

### Recreation DA

#### Gun control reduces recreational use of guns-this causes decreases in happiness which outweighs gun violence.

Huemer 03 Michael Huemer “Is There a Right to Own a Gun?” Social Theory and Practice, Vol. 29, No. 2 (April 2003), pp. 297-324 <http://www.owl232.net/guncontrol.htm> JW

The recreational uses of guns include target shooting, various sorts of shooting competitions, and hunting. In debates over gun control, participants almost never attach any weight to this recreational valueFootnote —perhaps because that value initially appears minor compared with the deaths caused or prevented by guns. The insistence that individuals have a right to engage in their chosen forms of recreation may seem frivolous in this context. But it is not. Consider two forms that the charge of frivolousness might take. First: One might think life is lexically superior to (roughly, of infinitely greater value than) recreation, such that no amount of recreational value could counterbalance even one premature death.Footnote This cannot be [305] taken to imply that risks to life should never be accepted, since it is impossible to eliminate all such risks. Instead, I will assume that those who affirm the infinite value of life would favor maximizing life expectancy.Footnote This position is implausible, since recreation is a major source of enjoyment, and enjoyment is (at least) a major part of what gives life value. Consider the range of activities whose primary value is recreational or, more broadly, pleasure-enhancing: non-reproductive sexual activity, reading fiction, watching television or movies, talking with friends, listening to music, eating dessert, going out to eat, playing games, and so on. Would it be rational to give up all those activities if by doing so one could increase one’s life expectancy by, say, five minutes? Or suppose that a drive to the park slightly reduces one’s life expectancy (due to the risks of traffic accidents, passing criminals, airborne germs, and so on). Would it be irrational to make the trip—no matter how much one enjoys the park? Second, and more plausibly: one might claim that the value of the lives that could be saved by anti-gun laws is simply much greater than the recreational value of firearms. It is not obvious that this is correct, even if gun control would significantly reduce annual gun-related deaths. Many gun owners appear to derive enormous satisfaction from the recreational use of firearms, and it is no exaggeration to say that for many, recreational shooting is a way of life.Footnote Furthermore, there are a great many gun owners. At a rough estimate, the number of gun owners is two thousand times greater than the number of annual firearms-related deaths.Footnote Even if we assume optimistically that a substantial proportion [306] of recreational gun users could and would substitute other forms of recreation, we should conclude that the net utility of gun control legislation is greatly overestimated by those who discount the recreational value of guns. For obvious reasons, the utility resulting from recreational use of firearms is not easy to quantify, nor to compare with the value of the lives lost to firearms violence. Yet this is no reason for ignoring the former, as partisans in the gun control debate often do.

## Case

### Ice Age Turn

#### Sun activity proves an ice age is coming very soon.

Hurd 14 Dale (Reported extensively from Western Europe, as well as China, Russia, and Central and South America) “Global Cooling: Is an Ice Age Coming?” CBN News http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/healthscience/2014/January/Cover-Up-Mounting-Evidence-Belies-Global-Warming/

Global Cooling The fact that Arctic ice is growing may not be the good news that it seems to be. There are signs that the Earth is entering a very unpleasant cooling period. Sunspot activity remains very low. "The sun has been very unusual for almost 15 years now," Jens Pedersen, senior scientist at the Denmark's Technical University, said. Pedersen said the sun recently reached solar maximum and that there should be a lot of sunspot activity, but there isn't. "We have to go back 100 years to find a solar maximum that was as weak as the one we are in right now," he told CBN News. "And the recent solar minimum…one has to go back 200 years to find one that was as weak." The last time the sun was this quiet, North America and Europe suffered through a weather event from the 1600s to the 1800s known as "Little Ice Age," when the Thames River in London regularly froze solid, and North America saw terrible winters. Crops failed and people starved.

#### Global warming prevents this ice age.

The National 13 (English-language daily newspaper published in Abu Dhabi.) “The choice may be global warming or a new Ice Age, say scientists” The National November 13th 2013 http://www.thenational.ae/uae/science/the-choice-may-be-global-warming-or-a-new-ice-age-say-scientists#page1

Once again, however, climate science is revealing a more complex reality. Evidence increasingly suggests that man-made global warming may actually be preventing a worldwide calamity, in the form of a new Ice Age. Despite its pejorative image, the “greenhouse effect” of our atmosphere is all that stands between us and our being plunged into the bitter cold of the space around the Earth. It keeps us warm by trapping the sun’s heat using molecules of certain gases – notably carbon dioxide and methane – in the atmosphere. The heat we get from the sun ebbs and flows over millennia according to changes in the Earth’s orbit and orientation in space. And calculations suggest we should have been heading back into a terrible Ice Age for the past few thousand years. Fortunately this hasn’t happened – but why not? Around a decade ago, a team of climate scientists led by Prof William Ruddiman of the [at the] University of Virginia suggested that humans may have been holding off the next Ice Age through our wilful production of greenhouse gases. These are usually thought of as products of the Industrial Revolution. But Prof Ruddiman and his colleagues pointed out that basic agricultural practices, such as crop planting and deforestation, generate hefty amounts of carbon dioxide and methane – and perhaps even enough to cancel out the Big Chill that should have set in over the past few thousand years. The idea has received a predictably frosty reception from environmentalists. But studies have since shown that greenhouse gases did indeed rise about 5,000 to 8,000 years ago – in line with the origins of large-scale agriculture in Asia and extensive deforestation in Europe. Now fresh evidence that we humans are holding off an Ice Age has emerged. The journal Science has just published research by a team led by geochemist Prof Logan Mitchell at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, who have compared methane levels trapped in ancient ice cores from Greenland and Antarctica. The significance of the two locations is that human population growth has been different over the northern and southern hemisphere. So if methane levels have risen as the result of human activity – as Prof Ruddiman originally claimed – the ice cores from each hemisphere should show a different rate of increase in methane levels. The team has now confirmed a substantial rise in methane in ice-core samples dating back up to 2,800 years. Crucially, however, the rise was bigger in the northern hemisphere, and could only be explained by including human activity – such as rice cultivation. All this serves to underline the dangers of simplistic thinking in our approach to climate change. Trying to prevent [climate change] it through drastic reduction of greenhouse gases may have disastrous consequences. The cause of the calamities that have struck the Philippines is no more certain.

#### Ice age causes death in the millions and outweighs warming.

Chapman 08 Phil (geophysicist and astronautical engineer, bachelor of science degree in Physics and Mathematics from Sydney University, a master of science degree in Aeronautics and Astronautics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) “Sorry to ruin the fun, but an ice age cometh,” April 23rd 2008 The Australian http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/sorry-to-ruin-the-fun-but-an-ice-age-cometh/story-e6frg73o-1111116134873

There is no doubt that the next little ice age would be much worse than the previous one and much more harmful than anything warming may do. There are many more people now and we have become dependent on a few temperate agricultural areas, especially in the US and Canada. Global warming would increase agricultural output, but global cooling will decrease it. Millions will starve if we do nothing to prepare for it (such as planning changes in agriculture to compensate), and millions more will die from cold-related diseases. There is also another possibility, remote but much more serious. The Greenland and Antarctic ice cores and other evidence show that for the past several million years, severe glaciation has almost always afflicted our planet. The bleak truth is that, under normal conditions, most of North America and Europe are buried under about 1.5km of ice. This bitterly frigid climate is interrupted occasionally by brief warm interglacials, typically lasting less than 10,000 years. The interglacial we have enjoyed throughout recorded human history, called the Holocene, began 11,000 years ago, so the ice is overdue. We also know that glaciation can occur quickly: the required decline in global temperature is about 12C and it can happen in 20 years. The next descent into an ice age is inevitable but may not happen for another 1000 years. On the other hand, it must be noted that the cooling in 2007 was even faster than in typical glacial transitions. If it continued for 20 years, the temperature would be 14C cooler in 2027. By then, most of the advanced nations would have ceased to exist, vanishing under the ice, and the rest of the world would be faced with a catastrophe beyond imagining. Australia may escape total annihilation but would surely be overrun by millions of refugees. Once the glaciation starts, it will last 1000 centuries, an incomprehensible stretch of time. If the ice age is coming, there is a small chance that we could prevent or at least delay the transition, if we are prepared to take action soon enough and on a large enough scale. For example: We could gather all the bulldozers in the world and use them to dirty the snow in Canada and Siberia in the hope of reducing the reflectance so as to absorb more warmth from the sun. We also may be able to release enormous floods of methane (a potent greenhouse gas) from the hydrates under the Arctic permafrost and on the continental shelves, perhaps using nuclear weapons to destabilise the deposits. We cannot really know, but my guess is that the odds are at least 50-50 that we will see significant cooling rather than warming in coming decades. The probability that we are witnessing the onset of a real ice age is much less, perhaps one in 500, but not totally negligible. All those urging action to curb global warming need to take off the blinkers and give some thought to what we should do if we are facing global cooling instead. It will be difficult for people to face the truth when their reputations, careers, government grants or hopes for social change depend on global warming, but the fate of civilisation may be at stake. In the famous words of Oliver Cromwell, "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken."

#### Ice age comparatively worse than warming—we have an obligation to heat the planet.

Brock 11 Chris (staff writer for the Watertown Daily Times Chris) "Taking long, long view on climate change" Watertown Daily Times March 19 2011 http://www.watertowndailytimes.com/article/20110319/CURR04/303199998/?loc=interstitialskip

AUL SMITHS — Chalk one up for the humans: we staved off an ice age. That's one conclusion ecologist and paleoclimatalogist Curt Stager makes in his book "Deep Future: The Next 100,000 Years of Life on Earth," released Tuesday by St. Martin's Press. And we have it in our power to prevent another ice age, which, compared to global warming, would be much worse for humans. "An ice age is to global warming as thermonuclear war is to a bar brawl," Mr. Stager writes in "Deep Future." Most of the scholarly studies about humans and global warming deal with the issue within the next century or so. But Mr. Stager looks ahead dozens of centuries. Mr. Stager takes a deep look at climate and its long-term patterns. "I try to make the point that we have a whole lot of power as to what the future holds," said Mr. Stager, a professor at Paul Smith's College and a research associate at the University of Maine's Climate Change Institute. In "Deep Future," he looks at the bright and dark sides of what is at stake on Earth thousands of years from now. The book has received a starred review in the journal Kirkus Reviews, which called it "essential reading." One of the bottom lines in "Deep Future" is that each generation should realize what we're doing to Earth and pay attention to the cumulative effect. "Along with power comes responsibility," Mr. Stager said in a phone interview from Paul Smith's campus, located near Saranac Lake. "Without sounding like a preacher and 'Thou shalt do this,' I think it's important for people to realize the consequences of our actions are going to last a lot longer than folks had anticipated." He writes in "Deep Future": "Our very existence at this pivotal moment in history gives us the amazing ability — some might say the honor — to set the world's thermostat for hundreds of thousands of years."

### Warming not even that bad!

#### History proves biotic communities are resilient to warmer climates.

**NIPCC 11** <Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change. Surviving the unprecedented climate change of the IPCC. 8 March 2011. http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)." On the other hand, they indicate that some **biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change** (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), **and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient** (Mayle and Power, 2008) **and in some cases thrived** (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing **studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity."** And **what emerges** from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

#### Qualified scientists agree no impact.

**Hsu 10** <Jeremy Hsu, Live Science Staff, July 19 2010, pg. http://www.livescience.com/culture/can-humans-survive-extinction-doomsday-100719.html>

His views deviate sharply from those of **most experts**, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the **worst-case scenarios** discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change **don't foresee** human **extinction.** "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, **a** geochemist and **renowned climate scientist** at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker **remained skeptical** that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The **rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many** people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

#### New technology means humans Can Adapt

Moore, 2008: (Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, Stanford, Thomas Gale 7/9/12 “Global warming; the good, the bad and the ugly and the efficient” EMBO reports http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3317379/?tool=pmcentrez)

Even if the pessimists are correct and future climate change reduces food production, wicked storms lash much of the planet, summers are plagued by terrible heat waves, and floods and droughts inundate large areas of the world and reduce the availability of clean water, human beings will be better able to handle such terrible conditions than they are now because technology will advance and people will become richer over the next century. Evidence of an increasing rate of technological advancement comes from patents; the number of patents issued for inventions has continued to rise at an increasing rate since 1790 ([Fig 2](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3317379/figure/f2/)). Although patented inventions are only a crude measure of technological growth, they do indicate that technology will continue to change the world in which we live. Consider the world 200 years ago when the fastest means of communication was by horseback, or just 100 years ago when telephones were only slowly spreading and radio, much less TV or the internet, were almost undreamed of. **Thus progress will allow our descendants to deal with almost any difficulties that climate change brings**.

#### Humans can adapt-5 warrants.

Hsu 12 Jeremy Hsu (InnovationNewsDaily) “6 ways humans can adapt to climate change” August 8th 2012 Mother Nature Network http://www.mnn.com/earth-matters/wilderness-resources/stories/6-ways-humans-can-adapt-to-climate-change

[First,] Waterworld homes: When the waters rise, tomorrow's buildings may rise with them as floating structures. Koen Olthuis, head of Waterstudio.NL, has begun working on projects ranging from floating apartments in the Netherlands to a floating mosque in the United Arab Emirates. The Netherlands firm has also designed a series of floating hotels, conference centers and other buildings for the Maldives, an island country in the Indian Ocean that faces complete submersion by 2080. Another pioneering Dutch firm, Dura Vermeer, has already made floating buildings such as a greenhouse and an entire amphibious village in the Netherlands — all using many layers of plastic foam arranged into floating grids that are able to support concrete structures. Such technologies provide a new twist to the ancient human practice of building homes on stilts in perennially flooded countries such as Bangladesh. [Second,] Underground cities: Mucking about like imaginary mole people may sound unappealing, but moving more cities underground could offer added protection from the harsher extremes of climate change. Putting power lines underground has already made the difference for many cities between having electricity and seeing the lights go out in the aftermath of severe storms — and megacities such as Hong Kong also see the added bonus of saving on space by moving power stations and water reservoirs below the surface. Life underground could even resemble more of a pastoral paradise rather than a grim dystopian film. One group of U.S. entrepreneurs has proposed building a "LowLine" park in an abandoned trolley station in New York City. A fiber optic cable could not only direct sunlight into the underground area to help trees and plants grow, but also screen out harmful ultraviolet rays — and electric lighting could help out during cloudy days or at night. [5 Skyscrapers for a Greener Future] [Third,] Floating farms: Bangladesh's 140 million people have already learned to live with climate change the hard way in a country where much of the land is less than 16 feet above sea level. Floods cover one-fourth of the country in an average year, and as much as 60 percent every four or five years. That has forced Bangladesh's farmers to create a homegrown adaptation to live in a world of rising seas and worse flooding — floating agriculture. Farmers build floating rafts out of straw, rice stubble and a weed called water hyacinth, before adding upper layers of decaying waterworts to act as manure. The rafts become moveable floating surfaces that replace flooded agricultural land and can actually produce much more crops than traditional fields — an idea other countries might adapt with their own local twists. [Fourth,] Smart energy: A warming planet means many homes and businesses will use more energy and spend more on electricity bills to keep cool. Tomorrow's power grids must not only connect to new sources of clean energy — such as renewable solar, wind, tidal or geothermal power — but also become smarter to juggle the mix of old and new energy sources and respond quickly to changing energy demands at different times of day. Some smart grids may represent more intelligent versions of the huge, central power grids that dominate industrialized countries. Others may pop up as smaller microgrids based on local energy sources such as solar or wind power, but are still capable of networking together to send energy to where it's needed. [Fifth,] Vertical farms: Many farmers can expect more severe droughts and a growing swarm of crop-damaging pests in a warmer climate. One possible solution comes from a formerly fringe idea that has begun to catch on across the world — vertical farms that consist of many levels reaching skyward (or even underground). The vertical farms provide an indoor, controlled climate to grow crops in a space-saving setup that can prove more efficient than growing crops in open fields, said Dickson Despommier, a microbiologist and ecologist at Columbia University who helped pioneer the vertical farm movement. Countries such as the U.S., Sweden, the Netherlands, Japan, South Korea and Singapore have all begun experimenting with their own vertical farms. Climate-adapted crops: Crops don't have to move indoors to survive if they can adapt to the droughts and temperature shifts of climate change. Drought-resistant corn that is able to grow with less water has already debuted in different versions from companies such as Monsanto, DuPont and Sygenta. The agribusiness giants have begun investing billions of dollars in genetically engineering "climate-ready" crops to resist drought, flooding, heat, cold and salt — an effort spanning 1,633 patents as of 2010, according to a report by the ETC Group. Climate-adaptation can also come from identifying ideal traits in existing crops without genetic engineering, changing breeding tactics for crops, and planting a more diverse range of resilient crops. The International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) and the University of California-Davis used marker-assisted selection to identify a flood-tolerant gene in an Indian rice variety and move it to other rice crops. In another case, the African Rice Center has cross-bred Asian and African rice species to create more heat- and drought-tolerant crops.

# A2 ATT Adv.

### Security DA

ATT means we can’t arm our allies. **Feulner 13**

The Problem with the Arms Trade Treaty By [Ed Feulner](http://www.cnsnews.com/author/ed-feulner) | October 14, 2013 | 4:31 AM EDT CNS News <http://www.cnsnews.com/commentary/ed-feulner/problem-arms-trade-treaty> Ed Feulner is the former president of The Heritage Foundation, a Washington-based public policy research institute.

Moreover, **the ATT may compromise the ability of the U.S. to arm the opponents of tyrannical regimes worldwide.** When the violence in Syria broke out, for example, some (including President Obama) called for arming certain groups among the Syrian rebels. But ATT supporters were quick to argue that **such activity is “arguably unlawful” under the treaty.** As Inhofe and Moran write: “Our constitutional rights are too important to be entrusted to a dangerous treaty drafted by nations hostile to the ownership of firearms by private citizens.” Let’s hope the next administration “unsigns” this pernicious pact.

If the US can’t help its allies, that creates an arms race. **Kausner 14**

Conventional Arms Transfer Policy: Advancing American National Security Through Security Cooperation Remarks Gregory M. Kausner Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs Remarks to IISS Washington, DC April 23, 2014 <http://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/rm/2014/225118.htm> US Department of State: Diplomacy in Action

Fourth, **encouraging the maintenance and expansion of U.S. security partnerships** with those who share our objectives, and regional access in areas critical to U.S. interests. The relationships we forge through security assistance are not only government-to-government – they are commercial, institutional, and personal. Think about the scope of a major arms sale, and the range of cooperation it often entails – from companies that collaborate on co-production, to technicians who team to maintain a common platform, to soldiers who train in shared tactics. But for such cooperation to take root, **we must ensure that we team with stable partners.** Fifth, promoting regional stability, peaceful conflict resolution, and arms control. We are committed to nonproliferation and to the furtherance of peace. **When we make the decision to transfer a capability to a foreign nation we do so mindful of the impact it could have on regional balance.** So, we consider if **capabilities that project** **power**, provide for anti-access and area denial, or that are new introductions into a region, **could foster increased tension or contribute to an arms race.** We weigh the human rights, democratization, counterterrorism, counter proliferation, and nonproliferation record of the recipient, and the potential for misuse of the export in question. **We also must consider if a country could procure arms from another source. The arms industry is a competitive market.** Just because another exporter is willing to sell to a potential recipient, however, does not mean we should. But **the influence that comes with an arms sale should not be underestimated,** and **we should** be careful **not** to **cede such influence to others.**

Nuclear proliferation and arms race cause war – inexperience, military pressure, perception. Horowitz **09**

Horowitz, professor of poli sci, —Professor of Political Science at University of Pennsylvania (Michael Horowitz, “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons and International Conflict: Does Experience Matter?” Journal of Conflict Resolution, Volume 53 Number 2, April 2009 pg. 234-257)

This section focuses on how acquiring nuclear weapons influences both the new nuclear state and potential adversaries. In theory, systemwide perceptions of nuclear danger could allow new nuclear states to partially skip the early Cold War learning process concerning the risks of nuclear war and enter a proliferated world more cognizant of nuclear brinksmanship and bargaining than their predecessors. However, each new nuclear state has to resolve its own particular civil–military issues surrounding operational control and plan its national strategy in light of its new capabilities. Empirical research by Sagan (1993), Feaver (1992), and Blair (1993) suggests that viewing the behavior of other states does not create the necessary tacit knowledge; there is no substitute for experience when it comes to handling a nuclear arsenal, even if experience itself cannot totally prevent accidents. Sagan contends that civil–military instability in many likely new proliferators and pressures generated by the requirements to handle the responsibility of dealing with nuclear weapons will skew decision making toward more offensive strategies (Sagan 1995). The questions surrounding Pakistan’s nuclear command and control suggest there is no magic bullet when it comes to new nuclear powers’ making control and delegation decisions (Bowen and Wolvén 1999). Sagan and others focus on inexperience on the part of new nuclear states as a key behavioral driver. Inexperienced operators and the bureaucratic desire to “justify” the costs spent developing nuclear weapons, combined with organizational biases that may favor escalation to avoid decapitation—the “use it or lose it” mind-set— may cause new nuclear states to adopt riskier launch postures, such as launch on warning, or at least be perceived that way by other states (Blair 1993; Feaver 1992; Sagan 1995). 3 Acquiring nuclear weapons could alter state preferences and make states more likely to escalate disputes once they start, given their new capabilities. 4 But their general lack of experience at leveraging their nuclear arsenal and effectively communicating nuclear threats could mean new nuclear states will be more likely to select adversaries poorly and to find themselves in disputes with resolved adversaries that will reciprocate militarized challenges. The “nuclear experience” logic also suggests that more experienced nuclear states should gain knowledge over time from nuclearized interactions that helps leaders effectively identify the situations in which their nuclear arsenals are likely to make a difference. Experienced nuclear states learn to select into cases in which their comparative advantage, nuclear weapons, is more likely to be effective, increasing the probability that an adversary will not reciprocate.

### Genocide DA

ATT legitimates dictatorships and genocide. **Bromund 12**

5 Fundamental Flaws in the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty [Ted Bromund](http://dailysignal.com/author/tbromund/) / [@Bromund](http://twitter.com/Bromund) / July 23, 2012 / The Daily Signal <http://dailysignal.com/2012/07/23/5-fundamental-flaws-in-the-u-n-arms-trade-treaty/> Ted R. Bromund, Ph.D., is the Margaret Thatcher senior research fellow at The Heritage Foundation.

Any conceivable **ATT**, simply b**ecause it is being negotiated through the U.N., will be based on recognizing that all members of the U.N. are equal and sovereign states and thus have equal rights. The inevitable result of this**, in the context of the ATT, **will be a treaty stating that Iran and Venezuela have the same rights to buy, sell, and transfer weapons as do the U.S. and Japan. The U.N. already contains far too many dictatorships; negotiating a treaty that enshrines their equality of status in the realm of arms transfers is inherently a bad and dangerous idea.**

ATT allows for genocide against a now defenseless population. **Payne 13**

Morning Bell: 3 Reasons the U.N.’s Arms Treaty Is Useless [Amy Payne](http://dailysignal.com/author/apayne/) / April 01, 2013 <http://dailysignal.com/2013/04/01/3-reasons-un-arms-trade-treaty-is-useless/> The Daily Signal Member of the Heritage Foundation

**1. Bad guys won’t play by the rules.** **Dictators have no interest whatsoever in being responsible exporters of arms. Instead, they want to protect their rights as importers. That means that they want a treaty that guarantees them the right to buy guns while decreasing the possibility of armed rebellion by their own oppressed people.** The idea that **having a treaty would stop dictators, terrorists, and others bent on violence is wishful thinking. But U.N. treaties**[**treat democracies and dictatorships equally**](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/03/the-us-cannot-fix-the-un-arms-trade-treaty)**.**

We must resist genocide in all instances. **Adorno**

Adorno, Theodor. Education After Auschwitz. <http://ada.evergreen.edu/~arunc/texts/frankfurt/auschwitz/AdornoEducation.pdf>

**The premier demand upon all education is that Auschwitz not happen again.** Its priority before any other requirement is such that I believe I need not and should not justify it. I cannot understand why it has been given so little concern until now. To justify it would be monstrous in the face of the monstrosity that took place. Yet the fact that one is so barely conscious of this demand and the questions it raises shows that the monstrosity has not penetrated people’s minds deeply, itself a symptom of the continuing potential for its recurrence as far as peoples’ conscious and unconscious is concerned. **Every debate about the ideals of education is trivial** and inconsequential **compared to this single ideal: never again Auschwitz. It was the barbarism all education strives against. One speaks of the threat of a relapse into barbarism.** But it is not a threat—**Auschwitz was this relapse, and barbarism continues as long as the** fundamental **conditions that favored that relapse continue** largely unchanged. **That is the whole horror.** The societal pressure still bears down, although **the danger remains invisible nowadays. It drives people toward the unspeakable,** which culminated on a world-historical scale in Auschwitz. Among the insights of Freud that truly extend even into culture and sociology, one of the most profound seems to me to be that civilization itself produces anti-civilization and increasingly reinforces it. His writings Civilization and its Discontents and Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego deserve the widest possible diffusion, especially in connection with Auschwitz.1 **If barbarism** itself **is inscribed within** the principle of **civilization, then there is something desperate in the attempt to rise up against it**.

### Heg DA

ATT kills US heg. **Bromund 12**

5 Fundamental Flaws in the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty [Ted Bromund](http://dailysignal.com/author/tbromund/) / [@Bromund](http://twitter.com/Bromund) / July 23, 2012 / The Daily Signal <http://dailysignal.com/2012/07/23/5-fundamental-flaws-in-the-u-n-arms-trade-treaty/> Ted R. Bromund, Ph.D., is the Margaret Thatcher senior research fellow at The Heritage Foundation.

**The ATT** is a classic aspirational treaty: It **will require many nations to do things that they do not currently do and have no intention of doing. Treaties like this are inherently a bad deal for the U.S., because we have a well-developed administrative system and are basically law-abiding**. Unlike a lot of other nations, we have the ability and the intention of living up to our word. Given the fact that the treaty criteria will be vague, open-ended, and ill-defined, that is extremely dangerous, because **it will subject the U.S., U.S. allies, and U.S. companies to the perpetual risk of lawfare—the use of law as a continuation of war by other means—**based on legal criteria that we are not responsible for defining. **A treaty based on such criteria will end up constraining the U.S. in ways that** we cannot now foresee but **cannot be in our national interest.**

#### Heg solves every impact. Decline causes extinction.

Barnett 11 Thomas (Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense) “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 2011 World Politics Review http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

### Terrorism DA

ATT causes terrorism. **Bromund 12**

**Arms Trade Treaty Risks Increasing the Threat of Armed Terrorism** *By* [*Ted R. Bromund, Ph.D.*](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/b/theodore-bromund) *Senior Research Fellow in Anglo-American Relations The Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom* *http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/06/arms-trade-treaty-risks-increasing-the-threat-of-armed-terrorism*

An **ATT** that contains this clause **would give any nation that wishes to assist a terrorist organization a “get out of jail free” card.** If confronted by the U.S. with the claim that their supply of weapons to terrorists constituted a violation of the ATT, **they could simply reply that the ATT had recognized the right of all peoples to realize their self-determination, and that the terrorists in question represented peoples who were engaged in an armed struggle with a nation that did not respect this right.** This is why the U.N. has never been able to define terrorism: Too many U.N. member states argue that what the U.S. describes as terrorism is a legitimate struggle for self-determination. **Efforts to define terrorism have been blocked by the members of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation**, which contains 56 U.N. member states and has successfully prevented the development of any definition that would apply, for example, to the terrorist organizations that attack Israel. The OIC Charter, adopted in 2008, notes that it is dedicated to supporting “the struggle of the Palestinian people, who are presently under foreign occupation.”[[5]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/06/arms-trade-treaty-risks-increasing-the-threat-of-armed-terrorism" \l "_ftn5) This is the same phrase that appears regularly in U.N. declarations. Since the ATT is centrally concerned with the transfer of conventional arms, it is particularly important that it does not legitimate the supply of weapons to terrorists. This will be difficult to achieve: The ATT’s supporters want it to be a universal treaty, i.e., one signed and ratified by all U.N. member states, but is unlikely that the OIC members will agree to any ATT that does not include this clause.

ATT drives terror underground where it will prosper and be harder to prevent. **Dillon 14**

John Dillon The Arms Trade: A Critical Look “Discoveries” http://www.arts.cornell.edu/knight\_institute/publicationsprizes/discoveries/discoveriesspring2014/13.%20Dillon.pdf

Regulations may be able to change the situation “on the ground” when they are specifically targeted, but can wider changes in smallarms policy have global impacts on terrorism? The arguments supplied above, i.e., imposing a set of stronger regulations on sales, may also apply generally to all countries and thereby, in theory, reduce global terrorism. For example, if weapons and ammo suddenly became either prohibitively expensive or outright impossible to get, the drug-fueled paramilitary conflict in Colombia might suddenly lose momentum. Alternatively, if the US were to impose stricter arms export controls and reduce the ease with which private buyers could evade inspections, it might theoretically be able to reduce armed terrorism (Nasaw 2009). However, **to reduce terrorism on a global scale one would need to prohibit sales to a significant number of high-risk buyers**, a move that would entail an effective ban or at least a strong sanction on some countries. **This type of global and coordinated action is**, however, **unlikely to happen**, and even if it should happen **it is unlikely to be effective in controlling the gun supplies** to developing countries, the areas most likely to host terrorism (Hall, Markowski, & Brauer 2011). Firstly, countries like the United States, Russia, and France—all of whom benefit from large sales of weapons—are likely to oppose any stringent global restrictions. Such bans require global cooperation, or else the countries that follow the charter will be hurt economically by the countries that do not. This kind of **asymmetric competition would punish the “moral” sellers to the benefit of the “economically” motivated sellers. The result would be an increase in the number of economically motivated sellers in the market. This development**, in turn, **might actually increase the odds that weapons could be sold to bad actors, because the economically-motivated sellers are less concerned with the identity or motivations of their buyers.** The opposition to a categorical small-arms reduction is not based solely on economic harms; it also claims that such policies lack both short- and long-term efficacy. **A small-arms ban would disproportionately affect legitimate buyers while leaving bad buyers relatively unhindered.** Unlike legitimate buyers, **terrorists are already committing criminal actions and are unlikely to be deterred by additional laws.** Even if a policy were 100% effective in preventing legitimate arms sales from entering into the hands of terrorists, **it would only motivate them to turn to the black market, where their actions would be almost untraceable.** Even in the status quo, **most legitimate dealers will not sell to terrorists because they understand the economic and moral liabilities** (Department of Justice 2011). To fill their demands, terrorists and illegitimate armies rely heavily on the transfer of illegally-procured weapons from an old conflict area. Effectively, terrorist groups buy weapons that were bought (or stolen) by another organization, terrorist or otherwise, and in so doing the organization bypasses the “legitimate” arms process (Hall, Markowski, & Brauer 2011). And unlike the Syrian government, **terrorists can accomplish their objectives even with the more limited arms supply in the black market—one missile** in the hands of a political terrorist can do more damage than in the hands of a Syrian soldier. Therefore a generalized small-arms reduction policy, while well intentioned, would fail to stem the illegal arms supply that most terrorists rely upon, and might even make it harder to catch terrorists by forcing them entirely underground.

Terrorism will lead to extinction. **Sid-Ahmed 04**

Sid-Ahmed in 2004 (Mohamed, staff writer, Al-Ahram, Sept. 1, issue number 705, “Extinction!”, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm

We have reached a point in human history where the phenomenon of terrorism has to be completely uprooted, not through persecution and oppression, but by removing the reasons that make particular sections of the world population resort to terrorism. This means that fundamental changes must be brought to the world system itself. The phenomenon of terrorism is even more dangerous than is generally believed. We are in for surprises no less serious than 9/11 and with far more devastating consequences. A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagazaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harboring WMD, proved to be unfounded. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilizations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is [I]f the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, [T]his war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

## Solvency

#### ATT won’t solve weapons trade.

Bromund 13

**Top 10 Reasons Why the U.S. Should Not Sign the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty** *By* [*Ted R. Bromund, Ph.D.*](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/b/theodore-bromund) *Senior Research Fellow in Anglo-American Relations The Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom* [*http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/08/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-should-not-sign-the-un-arms-trade-treaty*](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/08/top-10-reasons-why-the-us-should-not-sign-the-un-arms-trade-treaty)

It will not work. **The ATT nominally seeks to control the illicit international trade in arms. This makes as much sense as trying to control crime by outlawing it. Terrorists and dictators around the world are regularly armed directly by, or with the tacit acquiescence of, members of the U.N., frequently in violation of U.N. Security Council arms embargoes.** The treaty was negotiated by the same nations that are responsible for these violations. Another serious problem is that **many nations are unable or unwilling to control their own borders, secure their own stockpiles, or even keep members of their armed forces and police departments from selling their firearms. The treaty will not transform these incompetent nations into well-governed and law-abiding ones.**

#### ATT can’t regulate gun flow.

Feulner 13

The Problem with the Arms Trade Treaty By [Ed Feulner](http://www.cnsnews.com/author/ed-feulner) | October 14, 2013 | 4:31 AM EDT CNS News <http://www.cnsnews.com/commentary/ed-feulner/problem-arms-trade-treaty> Ed Feulner is the former president of The Heritage Foundation, a Washington-based public policy research institute.

The ATT has numerous flaws. Start with the most obvious: the fact that it won’t do what it sets out to do -- regulate the flow of arms to and from rogue states. **Major arms exporters such as China and Russia don’t support it**, and the idea that it will stop, say, Cuba from continuing to arm North Korea (to name two other notable non-signers) is a joke. “Like gun-control laws, even with the Arms Trade Treaty, **bad actors will continue to act accordingl**y,” write Sens. James M. Inhofe (R-Okla.) and Jerry Moran (R-Kan.) in a recent op-ed for The Washington Times. Three years ago, **the Obama administration made it quite clear that** unanimous global adoption of the ATT was crucial, going so far as to say that “**not getting a universal agreement would make any agreement less than useless.**”

## Militarism Adv.

### Ice Age Turn

#### Sun activity proves an ice age is coming very soon.

Hurd 14 Dale (Reported extensively from Western Europe, as well as China, Russia, and Central and South America) “Global Cooling: Is an Ice Age Coming?” CBN News http://www.cbn.com/cbnnews/healthscience/2014/January/Cover-Up-Mounting-Evidence-Belies-Global-Warming/

Global Cooling The fact that Arctic ice is growing may not be the good news that it seems to be. There are signs that the Earth is entering a very unpleasant cooling period. Sunspot activity remains very low. "The sun has been very unusual for almost 15 years now," Jens Pedersen, senior scientist at the Denmark's Technical University, said. Pedersen said the sun recently reached solar maximum and that there should be a lot of sunspot activity, but there isn't. "We have to go back 100 years to find a solar maximum that was as weak as the one we are in right now," he told CBN News. "And the recent solar minimum…one has to go back 200 years to find one that was as weak." The last time the sun was this quiet, North America and Europe suffered through a weather event from the 1600s to the 1800s known as "Little Ice Age," when the Thames River in London regularly froze solid, and North America saw terrible winters. Crops failed and people starved.

#### Global warming prevents this ice age.

The National 13 (English-language daily newspaper published in Abu Dhabi.) “The choice may be global warming or a new Ice Age, say scientists” The National November 13th 2013 http://www.thenational.ae/uae/science/the-choice-may-be-global-warming-or-a-new-ice-age-say-scientists#page1

Once again, however, climate science is revealing a more complex reality. Evidence increasingly suggests that man-made global warming may actually be preventing a worldwide calamity, in the form of a new Ice Age. Despite its pejorative image, the “greenhouse effect” of our atmosphere is all that stands between us and our being plunged into the bitter cold of the space around the Earth. It keeps us warm by trapping the sun’s heat using molecules of certain gases – notably carbon dioxide and methane – in the atmosphere. The heat we get from the sun ebbs and flows over millennia according to changes in the Earth’s orbit and orientation in space. And calculations suggest we should have been heading back into a terrible Ice Age for the past few thousand years. Fortunately this hasn’t happened – but why not? Around a decade ago, a team of climate scientists led by Prof William Ruddiman of the [at the] University of Virginia suggested that humans may have been holding off the next Ice Age through our wilful production of greenhouse gases. These are usually thought of as products of the Industrial Revolution. But Prof Ruddiman and his colleagues pointed out that basic agricultural practices, such as crop planting and deforestation, generate hefty amounts of carbon dioxide and methane – and perhaps even enough to cancel out the Big Chill that should have set in over the past few thousand years. The idea has received a predictably frosty reception from environmentalists. But studies have since shown that greenhouse gases did indeed rise about 5,000 to 8,000 years ago – in line with the origins of large-scale agriculture in Asia and extensive deforestation in Europe. Now fresh evidence that we humans are holding off an Ice Age has emerged. The journal Science has just published research by a team led by geochemist Prof Logan Mitchell at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, who have compared methane levels trapped in ancient ice cores from Greenland and Antarctica. The significance of the two locations is that human population growth has been different over the northern and southern hemisphere. So if methane levels have risen as the result of human activity – as Prof Ruddiman originally claimed – the ice cores from each hemisphere should show a different rate of increase in methane levels. The team has now confirmed a substantial rise in methane in ice-core samples dating back up to 2,800 years. Crucially, however, the rise was bigger in the northern hemisphere, and could only be explained by including human activity – such as rice cultivation. All this serves to underline the dangers of simplistic thinking in our approach to climate change. Trying to prevent [climate change] it through drastic reduction of greenhouse gases may have disastrous consequences. The cause of the calamities that have struck the Philippines is no more certain.

#### Ice age causes death in the millions and outweighs warming.

Chapman 08 Phil (geophysicist and astronautical engineer, bachelor of science degree in Physics and Mathematics from Sydney University, a master of science degree in Aeronautics and Astronautics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) “Sorry to ruin the fun, but an ice age cometh,” April 23rd 2008 The Australian http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/sorry-to-ruin-the-fun-but-an-ice-age-cometh/story-e6frg73o-1111116134873

There is no doubt that the next little ice age would be much worse than the previous one and much more harmful than anything warming may do. There are many more people now and we have become dependent on a few temperate agricultural areas, especially in the US and Canada. Global warming would increase agricultural output, but global cooling will decrease it. Millions will starve if we do nothing to prepare for it (such as planning changes in agriculture to compensate), and millions more will die from cold-related diseases. There is also another possibility, remote but much more serious. The Greenland and Antarctic ice cores and other evidence show that for the past several million years, severe glaciation has almost always afflicted our planet. The bleak truth is that, under normal conditions, most of North America and Europe are buried under about 1.5km of ice. This bitterly frigid climate is interrupted occasionally by brief warm interglacials, typically lasting less than 10,000 years. The interglacial we have enjoyed throughout recorded human history, called the Holocene, began 11,000 years ago, so the ice is overdue. We also know that glaciation can occur quickly: the required decline in global temperature is about 12C and it can happen in 20 years. The next descent into an ice age is inevitable but may not happen for another 1000 years. On the other hand, it must be noted that the cooling in 2007 was even faster than in typical glacial transitions. If it continued for 20 years, the temperature would be 14C cooler in 2027. By then, most of the advanced nations would have ceased to exist, vanishing under the ice, and the rest of the world would be faced with a catastrophe beyond imagining. Australia may escape total annihilation but would surely be overrun by millions of refugees. Once the glaciation starts, it will last 1000 centuries, an incomprehensible stretch of time. If the ice age is coming, there is a small chance that we could prevent or at least delay the transition, if we are prepared to take action soon enough and on a large enough scale. For example: We could gather all the bulldozers in the world and use them to dirty the snow in Canada and Siberia in the hope of reducing the reflectance so as to absorb more warmth from the sun. We also may be able to release enormous floods of methane (a potent greenhouse gas) from the hydrates under the Arctic permafrost and on the continental shelves, perhaps using nuclear weapons to destabilise the deposits. We cannot really know, but my guess is that the odds are at least 50-50 that we will see significant cooling rather than warming in coming decades. The probability that we are witnessing the onset of a real ice age is much less, perhaps one in 500, but not totally negligible. All those urging action to curb global warming need to take off the blinkers and give some thought to what we should do if we are facing global cooling instead. It will be difficult for people to face the truth when their reputations, careers, government grants or hopes for social change depend on global warming, but the fate of civilisation may be at stake. In the famous words of Oliver Cromwell, "I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken."

#### Ice age comparatively worse than warming—we have an obligation to heat the planet.

Brock 11 Chris (staff writer for the Watertown Daily Times Chris) "Taking long, long view on climate change" Watertown Daily Times March 19 2011 http://www.watertowndailytimes.com/article/20110319/CURR04/303199998/?loc=interstitialskip

AUL SMITHS — Chalk one up for the humans: we staved off an ice age. That's one conclusion ecologist and paleoclimatalogist Curt Stager makes in his book "Deep Future: The Next 100,000 Years of Life on Earth," released Tuesday by St. Martin's Press. And we have it in our power to prevent another ice age, which, compared to global warming, would be much worse for humans. "An ice age is to global warming as thermonuclear war is to a bar brawl," Mr. Stager writes in "Deep Future." Most of the scholarly studies about humans and global warming deal with the issue within the next century or so. But Mr. Stager looks ahead dozens of centuries. Mr. Stager takes a deep look at climate and its long-term patterns. "I try to make the point that we have a whole lot of power as to what the future holds," said Mr. Stager, a professor at Paul Smith's College and a research associate at the University of Maine's Climate Change Institute. In "Deep Future," he looks at the bright and dark sides of what is at stake on Earth thousands of years from now. The book has received a starred review in the journal Kirkus Reviews, which called it "essential reading." One of the bottom lines in "Deep Future" is that each generation should realize what we're doing to Earth and pay attention to the cumulative effect. "Along with power comes responsibility," Mr. Stager said in a phone interview from Paul Smith's campus, located near Saranac Lake. "Without sounding like a preacher and 'Thou shalt do this,' I think it's important for people to realize the consequences of our actions are going to last a lot longer than folks had anticipated." He writes in "Deep Future": "Our very existence at this pivotal moment in history gives us the amazing ability — some might say the honor — to set the world's thermostat for hundreds of thousands of years."

### Warming not even that bad!

#### History proves biotic communities are resilient to warmer climates.

**NIPCC 11** <Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change. Surviving the unprecedented climate change of the IPCC. 8 March 2011. http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)." On the other hand, they indicate that some **biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change** (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), **and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient** (Mayle and Power, 2008) **and in some cases thrived** (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing **studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity."** And **what emerges** from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

#### Qualified scientists agree no impact.

**Hsu 10** <Jeremy Hsu, Live Science Staff, July 19 2010, pg. http://www.livescience.com/culture/can-humans-survive-extinction-doomsday-100719.html>

His views deviate sharply from those of **most experts**, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the **worst-case scenarios** discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change **don't foresee** human **extinction.** "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, **a** geochemist and **renowned climate scientist** at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker **remained skeptical** that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The **rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many** people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

#### New technology means humans Can Adapt

Moore, 2008: (Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, Stanford, Thomas Gale 7/9/12 “Global warming; the good, the bad and the ugly and the efficient” EMBO reports http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3317379/?tool=pmcentrez)

Even if the pessimists are correct and future climate change reduces food production, wicked storms lash much of the planet, summers are plagued by terrible heat waves, and floods and droughts inundate large areas of the world and reduce the availability of clean water, human beings will be better able to handle such terrible conditions than they are now because technology will advance and people will become richer over the next century. Evidence of an increasing rate of technological advancement comes from patents; the number of patents issued for inventions has continued to rise at an increasing rate since 1790 ([Fig 2](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3317379/figure/f2/)). Although patented inventions are only a crude measure of technological growth, they do indicate that technology will continue to change the world in which we live. Consider the world 200 years ago when the fastest means of communication was by horseback, or just 100 years ago when telephones were only slowly spreading and radio, much less TV or the internet, were almost undreamed of. **Thus progress will allow our descendants to deal with almost any difficulties that climate change brings**.

#### Humans can adapt-5 warrants.

Hsu 12 Jeremy Hsu (InnovationNewsDaily) “6 ways humans can adapt to climate change” August 8th 2012 Mother Nature Network http://www.mnn.com/earth-matters/wilderness-resources/stories/6-ways-humans-can-adapt-to-climate-change

[First,] Waterworld homes: When the waters rise, tomorrow's buildings may rise with them as floating structures. Koen Olthuis, head of Waterstudio.NL, has begun working on projects ranging from floating apartments in the Netherlands to a floating mosque in the United Arab Emirates. The Netherlands firm has also designed a series of floating hotels, conference centers and other buildings for the Maldives, an island country in the Indian Ocean that faces complete submersion by 2080. Another pioneering Dutch firm, Dura Vermeer, has already made floating buildings such as a greenhouse and an entire amphibious village in the Netherlands — all using many layers of plastic foam arranged into floating grids that are able to support concrete structures. Such technologies provide a new twist to the ancient human practice of building homes on stilts in perennially flooded countries such as Bangladesh. [Second,] Underground cities: Mucking about like imaginary mole people may sound unappealing, but moving more cities underground could offer added protection from the harsher extremes of climate change. Putting power lines underground has already made the difference for many cities between having electricity and seeing the lights go out in the aftermath of severe storms — and megacities such as Hong Kong also see the added bonus of saving on space by moving power stations and water reservoirs below the surface. Life underground could even resemble more of a pastoral paradise rather than a grim dystopian film. One group of U.S. entrepreneurs has proposed building a "LowLine" park in an abandoned trolley station in New York City. A fiber optic cable could not only direct sunlight into the underground area to help trees and plants grow, but also screen out harmful ultraviolet rays — and electric lighting could help out during cloudy days or at night. [5 Skyscrapers for a Greener Future] [Third,] Floating farms: Bangladesh's 140 million people have already learned to live with climate change the hard way in a country where much of the land is less than 16 feet above sea level. Floods cover one-fourth of the country in an average year, and as much as 60 percent every four or five years. That has forced Bangladesh's farmers to create a homegrown adaptation to live in a world of rising seas and worse flooding — floating agriculture. Farmers build floating rafts out of straw, rice stubble and a weed called water hyacinth, before adding upper layers of decaying waterworts to act as manure. The rafts become moveable floating surfaces that replace flooded agricultural land and can actually produce much more crops than traditional fields — an idea other countries might adapt with their own local twists. [Fourth,] Smart energy: A warming planet means many homes and businesses will use more energy and spend more on electricity bills to keep cool. Tomorrow's power grids must not only connect to new sources of clean energy — such as renewable solar, wind, tidal or geothermal power — but also become smarter to juggle the mix of old and new energy sources and respond quickly to changing energy demands at different times of day. Some smart grids may represent more intelligent versions of the huge, central power grids that dominate industrialized countries. Others may pop up as smaller microgrids based on local energy sources such as solar or wind power, but are still capable of networking together to send energy to where it's needed. [Fifth,] Vertical farms: Many farmers can expect more severe droughts and a growing swarm of crop-damaging pests in a warmer climate. One possible solution comes from a formerly fringe idea that has begun to catch on across the world — vertical farms that consist of many levels reaching skyward (or even underground). The vertical farms provide an indoor, controlled climate to grow crops in a space-saving setup that can prove more efficient than growing crops in open fields, said Dickson Despommier, a microbiologist and ecologist at Columbia University who helped pioneer the vertical farm movement. Countries such as the U.S., Sweden, the Netherlands, Japan, South Korea and Singapore have all begun experimenting with their own vertical farms. Climate-adapted crops: Crops don't have to move indoors to survive if they can adapt to the droughts and temperature shifts of climate change. Drought-resistant corn that is able to grow with less water has already debuted in different versions from companies such as Monsanto, DuPont and Sygenta. The agribusiness giants have begun investing billions of dollars in genetically engineering "climate-ready" crops to resist drought, flooding, heat, cold and salt — an effort spanning 1,633 patents as of 2010, according to a report by the ETC Group. Climate-adaptation can also come from identifying ideal traits in existing crops without genetic engineering, changing breeding tactics for crops, and planting a more diverse range of resilient crops. The International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) and the University of California-Davis used marker-assisted selection to identify a flood-tolerant gene in an Indian rice variety and move it to other rice crops. In another case, the African Rice Center has cross-bred Asian and African rice species to create more heat- and drought-tolerant crops.