I specifically remember some of the turns on case were given to me by someone else, so I omitted them to be safe.

# 1NC

## 1NC

#### Framework: Use standpoint epistemology to evaluate offense - the voices of those most proximal to these issues outweigh their empiricism – key to accessing a non-ideal perspective. This is their own author – frames links to their framework and clarifies the intent of their ev. Mills 2k5:

Charles W. Mills (John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy) ““Ideal Theory as Ideology” Hypatia vol. 20, no. 3 (Summer 2005)

Moral cognition is no more just a matter of naïve direct perception than empirical cognition is. Unless, as moral intuitionists in the early twentieth century did, one believes in a distinct “moral sense” separate from the more familiar nonmoral !ve senses, then it must be conceded that concepts are necessary to apprehend things, both in the empirical and moral realm. After all, it was Kant, not some anti-Establishment !gure, who said that perceptions without concepts are blind. But once one recognizes (unlike Kant) the huge range of possible conceptual systems, then—unless one is a relativist (and I have already suggested that objectivism should be the ideal)—concern about conceptual adequacy becomes crucial. This will be true even for mainstream theory, where the primary sources of possible distortion will be attributed to simple human failings in our cognitive apparatus. But for the radical oppositional theory of class, race, and gender, of course, the case for such alertness goes through a fortiori. **Instead of the idealized cognitive sphere that ideal theory tends to presuppose**, Marxists, feminists, and **critical** race **theorists all have**, as part of their theoretical **analysis**, elaborate metatheories (theories about theories) **mapping how systems of domination negatively affect the ideational**. (This is a direct consequence, of course, of nonideal theory’s recognition of the centrality of oppression, and its insight that in understanding the social dynamic, a theorization of the ideal-as-descriptive-modeltype is required—it is not just a minor “deviation” from ideal-as-idealized-model that is involved.) The crucial common claim—whether couched in terms of ideology and fetishism, or androcentrism, or white normativity—is that all theorizing, both moral and nonmoral, takes place in an intellectual realm dominated by concepts, assumptions, norms, values, and framing perspectives that re"ect the experience and group interests of the privileged group (whether the bourgeoisie, or men, or whites). So a simple empiricism will not work as a cognitive strategy; one has to be self-conscious about the concepts that “spontaneously” occur to one, since many of these concepts will not arise naturally but as the result of social structures and hegemonic ideational patterns. In particular, it will often be the case that **dominant concepts** will **obscure** certain crucial **realities**, blocking them from sight, or naturalizing them, while on the other hand, concepts necessary for accurately mapping these realities will be absent. Whether in terms of concepts of the self, or of humans in general, or in the cartography of the social, it will be necessary to scrutinize the dominant conceptual tools and the way the boundaries are drawn. This is, of course, the burden of **standpoint theory—**that **certain realities tend to be more visible from the perspective of the subordinated than the privileged** (Harding 2003). The thesis can be put in a strong and implausible form, but weaker versions do have considerable plausibility, as illustrated by the simple fact that for the most part the crucial conceptual innovation necessary to map nonideal realities has not come from the dominant group. **In** its **ignoring** of **oppression, ideal theory** also **ignores the consequences of oppression**. If societies are not oppressive, or if in modeling them we can abstract away from oppression and assume moral cognizers of roughly equal skill, then the paradigmatic moral agent can be featureless. No theory is required about the particular group-based obstacles that may block the vision of a particular group. By contrast, nonideal theory **recognize**s **that people will typically be cognitively affected by their social location**, so that on both the macro and the more local level, **the descriptive concepts arrived at may be misleading**. Think of the original challenge Marxist models of capitalism posed to liberalism’s social ontology: the claim that to focus on relations of apparently equal exchange, free and fair, among equal individuals was illusory, since at the level of the relations of production, the real ontology of worker and capitalist manifested a deep structure of constraint that limited proletarian freedom. Think of the innovation of using patriarchy to force people to recognize, and condemn as political and oppressive, rather than natural, apolitical, and unproblematic, male domination of women. Think of the recent resurrection of the concept of white supremacy to map the reality of a white domination that has continued in more subtle forms past the ending of de jure segregation. These are all global, high-level concepts, undeniable abstractions. But they map accurately (at least arguably) crucial realities that differentiate the statuses of the human beings within the systems they describe; so while they abstract, they do not idealize. Or **consider** conceptual innovation at the more local level: **the challenge to** the traditional way the public/private distinction was drawn, the concept of **sexual harassment**. In the first case, a seemingly neutral and innocuous conceptual divide turned out, once it was viewed from the perspective of gender subordination, as contributing to the reproduction of the gender system by its relegation of “women’s issues” to a seemingly apolitical and naturalized space. In the case of sexual harassment, a familiar reality—**a staple of cartoons in men’s magazines** for years (bosses chasing secretaries around the desk and so on)—**was reconceptualized as negative** (not something funny, but something morally wrong) and a contributor to making the workplace hostile for women. **These realizations**, these recognitions, **did not spontaneously crystallize out of nowhere; they required** conceptual labor, **a different map of** social **reality**, a valorization of the distinctive experience of women. As a result of having these concepts as visual aids, we can now see better: our perceptions are no longer blinded to realities to which we were previously obtuse. In some sense, **an ideal observer should** have **be**en **able to see them—yet** they **did not, as shown by the nonappearance of these realities in male-dominated philosophical literature**. Ideal theory might at least seem to be unproblematic in the realm of the ideals themselves: normative concepts. Here if nowhere else, it might be felt, idealization is completely legitimate. But even here the adequacy of ideal theory can be challenged on at least three dimensions: the legitimacy of the normative concept in the first place; the particular way that the normative concept is applied, or operationalized; and the absence of other normative concepts. Consider purity as an ideal. In abstraction, it sounds innocent enough—surely purity is good, as against impurity. Who could object to that? But consider its historic use in connection with race. For many decades in the United States and elsewhere, racial purity was an ideal, and part of the point of antimiscegenation law was to preserve the “purity” of the white race. Since blackness was defined by the “one-drop rule”—any black ancestry makes you black (Davis 1991)—the idea of black purity would have been a contradiction in terms. So there was a fundamental asymmetry in the way “purity” was applied, and in practice both the law and social custom was primarily on the alert for black male/white female “miscegenation,” not white male/black female “miscegenation,” which was widely winked at. Apart from what we would now, in a more enlightened age, see as its fundamental incoherence—that since races have no biological existence, they are not the kinds of entities that can be either pure or impure—the ideal of purity served to buttress white supremacy. So here a normative concept once accepted by millions was actually totally illegitimate (Alcoff 1995). (Similarly, think of the historic role of “purity” as an invidious standard for evaluating female sexuality, and the corresponding entrenchment of the double standard.) Or consider a (today) far more respectable ideal, that of autonomy. This notion has been central to ethical theory for hundreds of years, and is, of course, famously most developed in Kant’s writings. But recent work in feminist theory has raised questions as to whether it is an attractive ideal at all, or just a re" ection of male privilege. Human beings are dependent upon others for a long time before they can become adult, and if they live to old age, are likely to be dependent upon others for many of their latter years. But traditionally, this work has been done by women, and so it has been invisible or taken for granted, not theorized. Some feminist ethicists have argued for the simple abandonment of autonomy as an attractive value, but others have suggested that it can be redeemed once it is reconceptualized to take account of this necessarily interrelational aspect (MacKenzie and Stoljar, 2000). So the point is that idealization here obfuscates the reality of care giving that makes any achievement of autonomy possible in the ! rst place, and only through nonideal theory are we sensitized to the need to balance this value against other values, and rethink it. Somewhat similarly, think of the traditional left critique of a liberal concept of freedom that focuses simply on the absence of juridical barriers, and ignores the many ways in which economic constraints can make working-class liberties largely nominal rather than substantive. Finally, it may be that **the nonideal perspective of the socially subordinated is necessary to generate** certain **critical evaluative concepts in the first place, since the experience of social reality of the privileged provides no phenomenological basis for them**: Marxist concepts of class alienation and labor exploitation; feminist concepts of sexual alienation and affective exploitation; critical race theory concepts of whiteness as oppressive and “colorblindness” as actually whiteness in disguise. Insofar as concepts crystallize in part from experience, rather than being a priori, and insofar as capturing the perspective of subordination requires advertence to its reality, an ideal theory that ignores these realities will necessarily be handicapped in principle.

#### Additional implications:

#### 1. Answers Mills 1 – non standpoint would be abstraction,

#### 2. Answers Mills 2 – this is how to avoid ignoring social realities,

#### 3. Answers Mills 3 - You would be glossing over structural domination if you ignored the epistemic position of those most affected,

#### 4. Since their standard is justified with Mills, this is the correct way to meet it,

#### 5. Links to Teehan – the debate space needs to include these epistemic viewpoints to allow for recourse against problematic norms,

#### 6. Links to Shaull – Mills says that ignoring standpoint epistemology obscures oppressive structures

#### Here’s evidence from the epistemological standpoint of a survivor. The aff forces people to rely on law enforcement who don’t care, and forces survivors to wonder if they should have risked their college enrollment for their protection. How do you tell this person them obeying the campus handgun ban was the right thing to do? The only people likely to circumvent the aff are rapists. The bottom line is that this person is certain she wouldn’t have to live with her experience if she had carried a gun, but proponents of your aff told her no. Vote neg. Collins:

Amanda Collins. “A rape survivor argues why we need guns on campus.” MSNBC. March 11, 2015. Accessed April 28, 2016. SHSCG

Across the country, legislators are debating the right of law-abiding concealed carry permit holders to legally carry firearms onto university campuses. Just the other day, **I was asked “Why do you need a firearm on campus?** What’s so threatening about becoming educated?” **Here’s my answer: Eight years ago, during my junior year at** the **U**niversity of **N**evada-**R**eno, **I was raped in the parking garage only feet away from the campus police office**. **As this stranger raped me** while holding a pistol to my temple, **I could see the police cruisers** parked for the night, **and I knew no one was coming to help me**. Eventually the man who raped me, James Biela, was caught. **He was tried and convicted for** not only raping me at gun point in a gun-free zone, but also raping two other women and murdering Brianna Denison. So, I ask, “How does rendering me defenseless protect you against a violent crime?” **At the time of my attack, I had obtained my** Concealed Carry Weapons (**CCW) permit** for the personal choice of not wanting to be a defenseless target. **In Nevada, permit holders are not allowed to carry firearms on campuses. As a law-abiding citizen, I left my firearm at home**, which means that the law that is meant to ensure my safety only guaranteed the criminal an unmatched victim. I still wonder what would have been different if I’d been carrying my weapon that night. But here’s the truth: Had I been carrying my firearm, I would have been able to stop the attack. Not only that, but **two other rapes would have been prevented and three young lives would have been saved**, including my own. **Any survivor** of rape **can understand** that the young woman I was walking into the parking garage that night was not the same woman who left. **My life has never been the same after my attack. Legalized campus carry would have saved my family**, who happens to be the collateral damage in my story, **and me a great deal of untold torment**. My case is a perfect example that **despite law enforcement’s best efforts to ensure our safety, they are unable to be everywhere at once.** All I wanted was a chance to effectively defend myself. The choice to participate in **one’s own defense should be left to the individual**. That choice should not be mandated by the government. As a law-abiding citizen, I should not have to hand over my safety to a third party. Laws that prohibit campus carry turn women like me into victims by stripping away our Second Amendment rights. Unfortunately, legislators opposed to campus carry are more intimidated by law-abiding citizens like me sitting in class with a legal firearm, than the rapist waiting for me in the parking garage. Most people are unaware that one in four women will be raped while attending college and one-third of them occur on the campus they attend. Currently, **seven states allow campus carry. Not a single one** of those states **has seen an increase in crimes committed with firearms**. In fact, there has been a decrease in crimes committed on campus property. Still, law-abiding citizens are barred from exercising this fundamental freedom on our publicly funded university campuses, leaving them defenseless against **gun-wielding criminals** who **disregard the laws**. The laws need to change so that those who have a valid concealed carry permit can lawfully bring their firearms onto college campuses, just as they do elsewhere in their daily lives. **I know from my personal experience that threats to personal safety don’t magically disappear in declared “safe-zones**.” Some who oppose campus carry cite research showing that alcohol is involved in most sexual assaults, and that alcohol leads to impaired judgment about gun use. The solution to that is focusing on reducing underage drinking, not denying Second Amendment rights. Perhaps the weakest argument against campus carry was from a professor at Florida’s Eckerd College, who said that “proponents will argue that allowing concealed carry will protect female students from sexual assault. I will point out the obvious; you will be arming the assailants, too.” That statement ignores the fact that **assailants are already armed**, and there is nothing in place to keep them from coming onto our campuses. **My attacker was armed**, and as a law-abiding citizen **I had more to lose than he did that night.** If I’d had my firearm I would have faced expulsion from school, losing my permit and possibly jail time. My attacker was not a student nor did he have a CCW permit. I believe in empowering women with the choice to protect their bodies. Law-abiding concealed carry permit holders should not be denied their fundamental, constitutional right to protect themselves on college campuses.

## Case

#### Any reason the aff causes more material inequalities turns case and means you vote neg.

#### 1. Omitted

#### Omitted

#### 2. Turn - Aff expands the authority of campus police. Campus police are racist and disproportionately target black people. Quinlan 1/25:

Quinlan, Casey, “5 Things That Make It Hard to Be a Black Student at a Mostly White College” Education reporter for ThinkProgress. Previously an editor for U.S. News and World Report. JAN 25, 2016. CHSJL

Being targeted by campus police **The number of armed officers at universities has gone up in the past decade**, a U.S. Department of Justice report shows. **During the 2011-2012 school year, 91 percent of public colleges had armed police officers. There has also been** a recent **uptick in the percentage of private and public colleges that employ officers who carry guns**, from 68 percent in the 2004-2005 school year to 75 percent in 2011-2012. **There is already distrust between safety officers and black college students, who are often profiled** by police officers off campus, and **there has been a record of** safety **officers unnecessarily criminalizing small infractions or stepping outside of their authority when they approach black college students**. For example, **Portland State University students and Black Lives Matter activists protested the introduction of weapons to the campus police force due to concerns about who would be targeted by campus police.** *Black college students are often stopped by officers for very minor issues*. In September, **a black college student who attended H**inds **C**ommunity **C**ollege **in Mississippi was stopped by a campus police officer who said his pants violated the college dress code. When the student refused to show his ID, he was arrested for a failure to comply**. Yet, after the incident, **the college said he had not violated the dress code**.

#### That also magnifies the links to the other turns – any reason these people have to rely on law enforcement is a transgression against their identity and a reason to vote neg – probably links really hard to Teehan – how do you tell these people to let the abusive, problematic law enforcement sort things out? That’s repugnant.

#### Campus police are *worse* than municipal ones – less oversight and transparency. Lee 4/22:

Jason Lee. “Issues of oversight of police on campus.” University of Wisconsin-Madison. April 22, 2016. Accessed April 25, 2016. https://wiscape.wisc.edu/wiscape/home/blog/wiscape-blog/2016/04/22/issues-of-oversight-of-police-on-campus CHSJL

Issues of oversight and transparency for campus police. **The role of police in certain municipalities has come under heightened inquiry from the** general **public as well as the** U.S. **D**epartment **o**f **J**ustice **after several high-profile killings of unarmed black men and women.** Campus-based police operate with an equal amount of authority, but under reporting lines that can appear less vetted and less transparent than their municipal counterparts. Many **campus p**olice **d**epartments **operate** at the bequest of (or **in the interest of) the campus chancellor**, provost, or other senior administrator. For instance, At UW-Madison, the police department reports to the Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance. System-wide, the UW Board of Regents holds the statutory authority to employ campus police departments. **While other campus departments and services​ -- from the arboretum to the library ​-- receive the attention of shared governance bodies on campus, it’s less clear if faculty, students, and staff provide the same kind of oversight for campus police. For example, there is no Faculty Committee on public safety or policing at UW-Madison. If it’s necessary to have a Faculty Senate “Committee on Committees,” doesn’t it seem reasonable to have a shared governance committee (with faculty, students, and staff) that provides at least some oversight of the police department?** Students expect campus police to help keep them safe, but to do so without interfering unnecessarily with their lives as students. **The events at UW-Madison last week raised many questions about the role of police in campus life**​.

#### 3. Omitted

#### 4. Omitted

#### 5. Omitted

# 2NR

## Standpoint Extension

#### Most campus rape survivors want to have private handguns on campus and find the plan unethical. CBS 2k15:

Crime Insider Status. “Women with guns: Is it a solution to rape on campus?”” CBS News. http://www.cbsnews.com/news/women-with-guns-is-the-push-for-concealed-carry-legislation-a-solution-to-rape-on-campus/.

But **colleges are an easier political calculation**, she says. "**They finally got another set of institutions to take heat on this, and the political attention has pivoted toward universities**," Hillman said. One political organization that recently embraced the issue is **the Leadership Institute**, a non-profit that provides training in campaigning and fundraising for young conservatives. The organization **recently posted** to YouTube **an instructional** video **on how to run on-campus "Strong Women Fight Back" concealed carry campaigns**. The video gives tips for **navigating college bureaucracy and running a "highly visible campaign" tied to preventing sexual assault**. "This project will be controversial, so always have a camera ready and be prepared to videotape opposition ... if you catch opposition [to concealed carry] on video, it might even make national headlines," the video notes. **Bryan Bernys the Leadership Institute's Vice President for the Campus Leadership Program, said the organization doesn't have any other initiatives focused on sexual assault.** He argues that **campuses shouldn't be excluded from laws that allow licensed concealed weapons in other public spaces. "*We're seeing a huge push for this. We've talked to a number of students around the country and most students don't feel there's any other way to prevent (sexual assault)***," Bernys said.

## AT: Weighing

Omitted

## AT: Campus Police Good

#### Campus police are violent and exceed their jurisdiction. Anderson 2k15:

Anderson, Melinda, “The Rise of Law Enforcement on College Campuses.” Writer at The Atlantic. SEP 28, 2015 http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/09/college-campus-policing/407659/ CHSJL

**Some 50 years later, campus-police units are as ubiquitous on most college and university campuses as residence halls, libraries, and tenured faculty**. Over 4,000 police departments total operate at public and private postsecondary schools, Taylor told BuzzFeed earlier this year, arguing that campus officers are different from municipal police in that they “do a better job of interacting with the public.” Indeed, the University of Pennsylvania criminologist Emily Owens has found that, collectively, college police departments are more focused on student safety than on local law enforcement, typically **adopting a “harm reduction model of crime control**.” Campus-police units are as ubiquitous on most college campuses as residence halls, libraries, and tenured faculty. A number of recent incidents, however, suggest that **policing in higher education hasn’t evolved much from the violent tactics that were used to suppress Vietnam War and civil-rights activists**. In 2011, **a U**niversity of **C**alifornia **Davis police officer was caught** on film **pepper-spraying a row of passive**, seated **students participating in an Occupy Wall Street protest**—an event that The Atlantic’s Jim Fallows wrote “[rivaled] in symbolic power, if not in actual violence, images from the Kent State shootings more than 40 years ago.” And in another case that gained national notoriety, a University of Cincinnati police officer this past summer was indicted for murder for shooting an unarmed man in a traffic stop off campus. (The 43-year-old victim was not a University of Cincinnati student.) These incidents—and others—are increasingly raising questions about the role of campus officers and to whom they should report as they’re tasked with the undeniably fundamental responsibility of keeping students safe.