# TOC 16 – Urban Violence Aff

## 1AC (4:44)

### Intro

Forgive me for growing weary of this debate but while the rhetoric flies, my guys are getting shot. Disputes are being settled with barbarism.

Hunting is a sport in the inner-city and the prey is young men.

Sensitive young men — same inside as my son and his friends and your sons and their friends.

 Some of the shooters are too.

Just boys with guns.

#### In this passage from *Tired of the Violence*, Larry Strauss, high school basketball coach in Los Angeles, shares the reality of inner city crime – Many are just boys with guns.

(Larry Strauss, Veteran high school teacher and basketball coach, “Tired of the Violence.” Huffington Post. 01/31/2014//FT)

### Part I (2:20/3:00)

#### By focusing on “the thug” instead of “the gun” White America neglects the state’s role in creating violence – vote aff to reject the anti-black framing that blacks are doomed to criminality.

Frum ’13: (David Frum, “America's gun problem is not a race problem.” CNN. January 16, 2013//FT) \*Emphasis added for ridicule\*

The typical murder has one victim, not many. The typical murder is committed with a handgun, not a rifle. ~~And in the typical murder, both the perpetrator and the victim are young black men.~~ Blacks are six times as likely as whites to be the victim of a homicide. Blacks are seven times as likely to commit a homicide. The horrifying toll of gun violence on black America explains why black[s] Americans are so much more likely than whites to favor gun control. Conversely, fears of being victimized by violence explain why so many white Americans -- especially older and more conservative white Americans -- insist on the right to bear arms in self-protection. They see gun violence as something that impinges on them from the outside. They don't blame guns for gun violence. They blame [but] a particular subset of the population. And they don't see why they should lose their right because some subset of the population abuses theirs. A writer I greatly admire, Rod Dreher, an independent-minded conservative, gives voice to such feelings in an article posted this weekend on the American Conservative website. Dreher expresses himself forcefully and frankly. That frankness should be welcomed, because the more clearly a mistaken idea is put, the faster we can reach a better understanding. Dreher wrote: "Yesterday the Baton Rouge Advocate published a lengthy analysis of the 2012 murder stats in the city. Take a look at this PDF of one of the inside pages. Last year, 83 people died by homicide in Baton Rouge. Of that number, 87% were black, and 87% were male. Two-thirds had been in trouble with the law before, and one-third had been in trouble with the law for drugs. The median age of victims: 26. "Of the perpetrators, the median age was 22. Get this: 96% of them were black, and 90% were male. Almost two-thirds had previous arrests. One out of four had a drug record. "Most of the murders took place in the poorest parts of the city. "What can we learn from these statistics? That murder in Baton Rouge is almost entirely about young black men from the poor part of town killing other young black men from the poor part of town. *[“]It's mostly a matter of thugs killing thugs."* If you look at the world that way, [Thus,] gun control must seem[s] a pointless diversion from the *real problem*: not guns, but one particular group of gun owners. Somebody else's problem. But life is not so neatly separated. Guns offer equal opportunity tragedies. More than 8,000 white Americans had to be treated for nonfatal gun injuries in 2008. Eighty percent of those who commit suicide with a gun are white males. The gun that the suburban family buys to protect itself from "thugs killing thugs" ends up killing its own: One important new study finds that a gun kept in the house is 43 times more likely to kill a household member than to be used in self-defense. Thugs killing thugs? Maybe. But many of those seeming [“]thugs[“] are carrying guns for the same reason[:] that people who consider themselves respectable carry them : in a futile quest to protect themselves with greater firepower. One person can find safety that way. But if two people carry firearms, a confrontation that might otherwise have ended in words or blows ends instead with one man dead, and the other man on his way to prison for life. Louisiana sends more people to prison than any other state, at a total cost of almost 7% of its state budget. Prison is always expensive, but the incarceration of murderers costs the most, because they remain in prison to the end. The oldest of Louisiana's prisoners cost the state almost $80,000 a year, including their health care. Widespread gun ownership means not only more gun killings, but also more gun maimings and cripplings. The National Rifle Association's Wayne LaPierre hailed the ability of a "good guy" with a gun to stop a "bad guy" with a gun. Sixty seconds later, however, that bad guy may need a wheelchair for life. We can't dismiss these human costs as pertaining to only somebody else. They are all part of us. Yet the urge to subdivide runs strong among Americans. Monday on Fox News, the popular conservative commentator Ann Coulter claimed that the murder rate among white Americans is as low as the murder rate in Belgium. "So perhaps it's not a gun problem," she concluded. "Perhaps it's a demographic problem." But countries cannot dismiss the sufferings of great blocks of their people by dismissing some "demographics" as unworthy of attention. If you ignore America's poor, you can make all kinds of problems disappear from view. Not counting the poor and minorities, the country does not have an obesity epidemic. Not counting the poor and minorities, the United States has perfectly adequate schools. Not counting the poor and minorities, America would have a higher average income. Likewise, not counting hurricanes, America would not have so many natural disasters. Not counting divorces, America would have more intact families. Not counting wars, America would have a smaller public debt. But what's the point of this exercise? The people who make up America count as Americans, and their problems count as America's problems. Their problems do not occur in isolation, but are manifestations of failures [of society.] to which all Americans contributed together. Those young men in Baton Rouge who are killing each other in such horrific numbers do not manufacture their own guns. They did not [or] organize the gun trade that brings the guns to their town. They did not write the laws that prevent their town government from acting against guns. They carry guns -- and misuse guns -- thanks to a national system of gun regulation that makes guns easily accessible to those least likely to use guns responsibly. The gun laws intended to put guns into the hands of "good guys" are the laws that also multiply guns in the hands of "bad guys" -- bad guys who might not have become such bad guys if the guns had not been available to their hands. The price of redefining gun violence as an issue pertaining only to "those people" -- of casting and recasting the gun statistics to make them less grisly if only "those people" are toted under some different heading in some different ledger -- the price of that redefinition is to lose[s] our ability to think about the problem at all.

#### Evidence is on our side

DeFilippis ’14: (Evan DeFilippis, Data Analyst, Writer. “Do We Have a Gang Problem or a Gun Problem?” Huffington Post. June 3, 2014//FT)

In a scathing critique of ABC’s recent report “Young Guns,” Dana Loesch stated that most gun deaths were the result of gang violence; therefore, America has a gang problem, not a gun problem. Her claim appears to be supported by sites positing that “a staggering 80 percent of gun homicides are gang-related.” As it turns out though, not only is her statement factually incorrect, as the majority of gun deaths are suicides, but there is not a shred of evidence to support her characterization that gangs are the driving force behind firearm violence. Unfortunately, Dana Loesch’s [her] sentiment is shared by many gun advocates, including the Executive Vice President of the National Rifle Association, Wayne LaPierre, who, when opposing firearm background checks said, “President Obama should be as committed to dealing with the gang problem that is tormenting honest people in his hometown as he is to blaming law-abiding gun owners for the acts of psychopathic murderers.” So, do we have a gang problem or a gun problem? Data collected by the National Gang Center, the government agency responsible for cataloging gang violence, makes clear that it’s [a gun problem] the latter. There were [eighteen hundred] 1,824 gang-related killings in 2011. This total includes deaths by means other than a gun. The Bureau of Justice Statistics finds this number to be even lower, identifying a little more than 1,000 gang-related homicides in 2008. In comparison, there were 11,101 [11 thousand] homicides and 19,766 suicides committed with firearms in 2011. According to the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the number of gangs and gang members has been on the rise for some time now, increasing by more than one-third in the past decade. Between 2010 and 2011, for example, there was a 3 percent increase in the number of gangs, but an 8 percent decrease in gang-related homicides. If gang violence was truly driving the gun homicide rate, we should not see gang membership and gun homicide rates moving in opposite directions. The most recent Centers for Disease Control study on this subject lends further credence to our claim. It examined five cities that met the criterion for having [had] a high prevalence of gang homicides: Los Angeles, California; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Long Beach, California; Oakland, California; and Newark, New Jersey. In these cities, a total of 856 gang and 2,077 non-gang homicides were identified and included in the analyses. So, even when examining cities with the largest gang problems, gang homicides only accounted for 29 percent of the total for the period under consideration (2003-2008). For the nation as a whole it would be much smaller. The 80 percent of gang-related gun homicides figure purporting to support Loesch’s claim, then, is not only false, but off by nearly a factor of five. The direct opposite is necessarily true: more than 80 percent of gun homicides are non-gang related. While gang violence is still a serious problem that needs to be addressed, it is disingenuous to assert that the vast majority of our gun problem (even excluding suicides) is caused by gangs. In spite of this, LaPierre’s proposed solution to gun violence is to “contact every U.S. Attorney and ask them to bring at least 10 cases per month against drug dealers, gang members and other violent felons caught illegally possessing firearms.” That same CDC study, however, also refutes LaPierre’s claim that the drug trade is fueling gun-violence, saying [also found] “the proportion of gang homicides resulting from drug trade/use or with other crimes in progress was consistently low in the five cities, ranging from zero to 25 percent.” Furthermore, a 2005 study done by Cook, Ludwig and Braga found that nearly three in five homicide offenders in Illinois in 2001 did not have a felony conviction within the 10 years prior to the homicide. Looking at just violent felons excludes a huge subset of potential criminals that become violent in the presence of a firearm. Gun advocates’ blind focus on gangs, drugs and violent felons overlooks the larger gun problem facing America. It is irresponsible and disingenuous for some of us to brush off our staggering death toll from firearms merely as the product of gangs or even violent criminals. Recognizing America’s high homicide rate for what it is — a gun problem — is the first step in solving it.

#### Guns create crime – Omnipresence of guns in cities torn apart by discrimination and poverty creates an ecology of danger. This fuels an arms race for “self-protection” and dominates social interactions – guaranteeing a fragmented community stuck in a cycle of violence.

Fagan and Wilkinson ’98: (Jeffrey Fagan, Former Chair, American Society of Criminology, Joined Columbia as director of Center for Violence Research and Prevention, serves on editorial boards of number of Criminology research Journals and Deanna L. Wilkinson. “Guns, Youth Violence, and Social Identity in Inner Cities.” Crime and Justice, Vol. 24, Youth Violence (1998), pp. 105-188//FT)

First, we examine normative social processes that influence cultural norms, the effects of omnipresent guns on these norms, and expectan- cies about one's own and others' behaviors. As illustrated by Anderson (1994, 1997), street codes have evolved in socially and economically isolated areas. These codes establish what is important in social rela- tions among teenagers, and the methods for redressing grievances and disputes arising from violations of the code. The street code deter- mines not only what is important but also appropriate means for re- solving grievances and disputes. It also places values on "toughness" and violent identities. In an ecology of "danger," where actors presume that guns are present, conflicts and disputes arising from street codes may be potentially deadly. These beliefs have shaped the methods for resolving conflicts and have been conflated with the means for self-preservation and maintaining identity. ||1. Dangerousness and Need for Guns. Young men often characterized their neighborhood as a "war zone." The street is described as dangerous and unpredictable. Violence is expected and can erupt out of a variety of situations. Public behavior on the streets is regulated by a general knowledge that life could be taken away at any moment (by guns, primarily). Interviewer (DT):4 "How would you describe your neighborhood in terms of safety? Is it safe compared to other New York areas?" Respondent (ENYN13): "It depends. Safe how? Your mother try to make it safe for you or does the community?" (DT): "Generally." (ENYN13): "Nope. Anything could happen. That's what-that's the thing that really gets people. Like, you come outside, you don't know if you comin back in. You know, that could be your last day walkin' or somethin', so I really can't say it's too safe, you know. It depends you-if you goin' to school, you in school, that when they try keep you safe there. But, once you outside ..." An almost daily exposure to injurious or lethal violence has had lasting effects on the young men in these areas. This stark reality shapes attitudes, perceptions, behavior, and social identity. One respondent had this to say about his South Bronx neighborhood: Interviewer (JM): "Tell me a little bit about that. How was it up there? Your experiences up there [referring to a block in the neighbor- hood]?" Respondent (SBN18): "Very rough. People stabbing you, shooting at you. You can't trust nobody there. You get cut and stuff like that. People always bothering you, you know. They don't fight one on one, just straight up jump you. There is all drugs. People making money on the drugs. Lot of fights. Sometimes, no heat, you gotta watch your back. It is not a safe place to be." (JM): "Was it rough for you, you couldn't handle it?" (SBN18): "It was rough, I could handle it." (JM): "What was hardest for you?" (SBN18): "Everything." Interviewer (JM): "How would you describe your neighborhood in terms of safety? You know what's safe out there to be out there?" Respondent (SBN26): "Safe? If you ain't in your house, you ain't safe. And even when you in your house you know, something could happen." (JM): "Like what?" (SBN26): "Like you be you could be in the living room watching T.V. and next thing you know, 'bow' 'bow,' gunshots through the win- dows. They might not be for you, but, you know. Bullets, bullets have no, you know, no names." [Thus] Guns play a big part in feelings of personal safety within this context. Another subject explained [that] why he felt young males in his neighborhood had guns: Interviewer (DT): "So who's carrying the guns out there? Like what age?" Respondent (G-67): "You got you got you got everybody carrying guns. You got the girls carrying guns, you got the shortys (young teens)." (DT): "You don't know what reason they carrying guns?" (G-67): "They just want to be down with everybody else you know. And the one thing is another thing is a lot a people dropping in the hood you know." (DT): "Yeah." (G-67): "People [are] dropping, so everybody walking around they ain't safe, they don't trust nobody you know that's why they got another reason for for a lot a homicides. The reason about trust you know trust, don't nobody trust nobody. Everybody growing up, everybody trying to get that money, everybody try to knock each off. So everybody say just ah fuck it ..., everybody just grab[s] the ghat (gun), you know, just be walking around. So it[‘s] just be a jungle out there." || 2. Guns Dominate Social Interactions. Gun carrying in this group varied from daily carrying to carrying only when there was an ongoing "beef" or conflict with others. When a respondent knew he had a "beef" with someone, he tried to be prepared for the moment when this beef would heat up into gun violence. It was understood that using a gun to harm his opponent was the best way to handle the situation both in terms of what was expected on the street and what an individual had to do to maintain a "positive" (respected) identity. Most often, respondents reported having a gun close by in case it would be needed during a spontaneous conflict or retaliatory situation. They described many instances where they had time to prepare for a potential attack by going inside their building to get their guns or by sending others to get them. Individuals actively involved in drug selling, for example, either carried a firearm or stashed it in the drug spot in case of possible robbery or territorial attack. The ready availability of guns in the inner city has undoubtedly shaped and skewed street codes toward the expectation of lethal violence. It also sets the value of violent behaviors in the social currency of the neighborhood and, as in the past (e.g., Cohen 1955), is the principal source of social status. "Nerve," "toughness," and being a "punk" take on new meanings within a climate regulated by lethally armed actors. Openly displaying a "willingness" to take [another’s] the life of an- other when the situation "calls for it" is part of this process. The prevalence of guns, coupled with the rapid social diffusion of episodes of gun violence, helps shape these perceptions of danger. Respondents report that "most" young males (i.e., fourteen to thirty years old) can and do have guns in these inner-city neighborhoods. Guns are available on the street to just about anyone who has the means to purchase, share, borrow, or [can] steal them. Even people with less powerful identities can get access to firearms [or] through associates, family members, or local drug dealers. Respondents reported that their own experiences with the world of guns began as early as eight and as late as sixteen and were central to their socialization. Having a powerful gun was and is valued both for intrinsic and extrinsic reasons. Guns may fulfill a variety of personal needs for adolescents, including power, status, protection, and recre- ation. These processes begin at a young age, often before adolescence, as boys are being socialized into gun use on the street. These younger gun users were described as ruthless, heartless, unpredictable actors who were attempting to make impressions on older, more powerful characters on the street. The presence of guns also has shaped the rules of fighting among teenagers. Fair fights have been described repeatedly in tales of inner- city street corner life (see, e.g., Cohen 1955; Cloward and Ohlin 1960; Anderson 1978, 1990; Moore 1978). "Fair ones" are defined as physi- cal fights involving two parties of nearly equivalent size and strength who would fight each other one-on-one using their fists (with no weapons or additional guys). Fair ones, according to our sample, are not now the dominant type of violent events for young men aged sixteen to twenty- four. Examples of fair fights here included altercations between friends or associates over seemingly trivial disputes, fights with family members, fights by younger boys (six to eleven years old) and sometimes older men (thirty-five years and up), fights inside jail or prison, and fights on the block by people who are known to each other. However, most respondents explained that "fair ones" no longer dominate conflict resolution in the inner-city neighborhood street life, especially in face-offs with strangers, whose willingness to abide by time-honored values is unproven. Many situations that start out as fair fights typically involve some type of "gun play" as the "beef" escalates over time. Thus the potential for an attack to involve guns is nearly certain for the young men in our sample. Guns raise the stakes in a variety of ways, and in many instances, firearms trump all other logic. || 3. Guns Change Decisions within Violent Events. Guns have symbolic as well as strategic meaning. Gibbs and Merighi (1994) suggest that guns are symbols of both masculinity and identity. Respondents in this study say that showing a gun (threatening someone) is a disrespect, a violation of one's social and physical space. Guns also change the calculus of a dispute, raising the stakes both in terms of status and strategy. Once a gun is introduced into a conflict situation, it is perceived as a life-or-death situation. Following this type of disrespect, the oppo- nent is expected to retaliate by getting a gun and shooting the other person. In a gun face-off situation, the main strategic move reported was to take the first shot in anticipation of the opponent using his weapon first if given the opportunity. Some respondents reported about gun events from both sides of an attack (events where they initiated an attack and events where others initiated attacks against them). From these descriptions we are able to piece together some of the contingencies which affect an actor's deci- sion-making process when faced with a gun threat. a. Intensity of the Threat (Level of Arousal). Pulling a gun automatically increases the intensity of the conflict and limits the number of choices available to all parties. Certain actions or words warrant a violent response; if guns are available, guns are used in reply to a transgression. Actors within this context know when and where pulling out and using a gun is socially acceptable. Those who do not follow the code are either eliminated or extremely stigmatized. If either actor displays a gun in a conflict situation, the event is described as going to the next level (the gun level). b. Prior Relationship with/Knowledge of Opponent. Prior knowledge and situational impressions of the opponent are important for shaping decisions about future action. Actors use this information. Gun threats by individuals with "large identities" are taken very seriously. Idle threats are not welcome and may result in serious violence. The idea of "fronting" or faking a threat is a big mistake. Therefore, in the neighborhood individuals who have and are carrying guns must be willing to use them if the situation calls for it. c. Perception of Risk and Cost. Guns play an important part in actors' decisions about the risk and cost of violent actions. One of the first and most important decisions is the extent to which one's identity would be improved or damaged by engaging or avoiding gun violence. The actor's original social identity factors heavily into how the stages of a gun event would unfold. Some respondents have more to gain or lose than others. Most "lost" or unsuccessful gun events are considered damaging to the image and reputation of the loser, especially if that response involves retreat. A "successful" gun event is described as identity-enhancing. Inflicting harm on others or gaining total compli- ance over others are valued outcomes which are publicly reinforced through verbal and nonverbal displays of respect commonly referred to as "props." Retreat could also have positive ramifications for social identity if used strategically. In some situations, retreat is used as a strategic tech- nique when a respondent is caught off-guard (without his gun or peo- ple). In certain situations, respondents describe using their communi- cation skills to talk their way out of getting shot or employ some other neutralization strategy in order to buy some time to arm themselves and get their people for back up. Once the subjects are "on point," they frequently go looking for their opponent. d. Peer Influences: Co-offending, Instigation, and Torch Taking. Gun use often involved multiple shooters on both sides of a conflict. Sixty- six percent of gun events involved cooffenders, compared with only 33 percent of nongun situations. Many of the gun events reflected ongoing "beefs" between groups or networks of young men, which often- times meant the shooting of numerous members of rival cliques over a single dispute. Often, the reason for the original dispute seemed minor; however, once gun play came into the situation future violence was motivated by revenge or getting justice. Avenging the shooting of one's close friends is considered honorable and necessary for future re- lations on the street. According to the code, the shooting of one of a young man's street family becomes personal, it becomes a disrespect, even though it may have little or nothing to do with the respondent. These uses of violence suggest a self-help dimension that illustrates Black's (1983) "quantity of law" dynamic. e. Perception of Event by Bystanders (The Status and Identity of Observ- ers). The influence of third parties in violent conflicts has been well documented in the literature (see, e.g., Felson and Steadman 1983; Ol- iver 1994; and Decker 1995). The importance of observers is most crit- ical during the period of adolescence where young males are devel- oping and testing their personal and social identities (Kinney 1993; Eder 1995). Verbal and nonverbal expressions by others, as well as the respondent's internalized "other," will have a strong impact on his de- cision-making process. These cues help the actor decide how best to respond and what actions to anticipate from others. Others may play a central role in shaping the actor's definition of the situation and the outcome of events. The actor is concerned about how each situation will make him look to others. The "audience" as amplifier of the social identity won through violence helps to perpetuate the street code. f Absence of Social Controls. Many of the "squashed" (avoided) events resulted from interventions (real or anticipated) by parties not directly involved in the violent situation such as police, school officials, or other clique members. Some violent situations were dissolved sim- ply because the risks of legal (and nonlegal) sanctions were too great. Interrupted conflicts could dissolve temporarily or permanently de- pending on the street identity of the mediator, intensity of the issue sparking the situation, future opportunities to continue or respark an event, or resolution of the conflict through alternative means. Overall, within these gun events the thought of dying is always present. However, this cost competes with other costs and returns from gun violence: achieving or maintaining social identity and status bounded in that situation or moment may hold more value than life itself. It appears that more thought is given to what others may think of the actor and the actor's attempt to match his behavior to his self- image (mythical or actual) than to the possibility of one's own death or serious injury. Losing respect can be damaging to one's personal safety, economic livelihood, and associations with peers (and some- times family members). This is not simply bravado, since losing respect in one arena marks a person for future victimizations until he reestablishes his identity through a display of toughness or violence.

#### Wide-scale availability of handguns creates a stigma – black-death and thus criminality is normalized.

Kairys ’08: (David Kairys, “Ch 15: Why Are Handguns So Accessible on Urban Streets?” AGAINST THE WALL: POOR, YOUNG, BLACK, AND MALE, Elijah Anderson, ed., Penn Press, 2008//FT)

Why are handguns so accessible on urban streets? Why is it easier for young black men to obtain a handgun[s] than an up-to-date school textbook[s] or a regular job? This question has two components: How does the gun market work to make a product designed to kill so easily available? And why do we allow it to function this way? The answers differ significantly from conventional wisdom. The common image of an underground, illegal market is largely fictional. Most of what goes on is the predictable result of simple distribution and marketing choices, and is surprisingly legal. The statistics on handguns are familiar. There are about 60 handgun deaths each day in the United States, with a yearly total of about 24,000. About three times that many people are injured but not killed each day. This level of non-war-related handgun deaths is among the highest in the world, and many times greater than in other countries of comparable development and wealth. Handguns have been the biggest and most consistent threat to urban safety and public health in the United States for the last several decades. Research has shown that bringing a gun into your home increases the probability that someone in the home will be the victim of a gun homicide by three times and increases the probability of a suicide in your home by five times. If there is a teenager in the household, the suicide risk is multiplied by ten. The toll of these grim statistics falls hardest on poor and black communities, particularly black young men. Black males aged twenty to twenty-four have the highest homicide rate of all groups, and homicide— about 90 percent of which is by guns—is the leading cause of death for black youth. The introduction of easily available handguns into communities that are deprived and struggling has created a daily disaster, fed false stereotypes (only a small proportion of black young men shoot people), provided a rationalization for the failure to deal with poverty or discrimination, and sapped efforts to reform and regain hope.1 Yet most Americans seem oddly immune to concern about the gun problem, unable to take it seriously. The dominant public attitude toward handgun homicide is “regrettably normal.” Every day on television, news anchors, reporters, pundits, and politicians express sadness about the latest deaths, but there is a pervasive acceptance, a strange sense that this extraordinary level of death and killing is a normal or inevitable aspect of life in urban America.

#### Surrounded by gunshots, children are doomed to a cycle of poverty and violence.

Reich et al. ’02: (Kathleen Reich, M.P.P., Patti L. Culross, M.D., M.P.H., and Richard E. Behrman, M.D. “Children, Youth, and Gun Violence: Analysis and Recommendations.” The Future of Children. Children, Youth, and Gun Violence. Volume 12 – Number 2 Summer/Fall 2002//FT)

Just as the economic costs of gun violence are substantial, so are the psychological costs. Children exposed to gun violence, whether they are victims, perpetrators, or witnesses, can experience negative psychological effects over the short and long terms. Psychological trauma also is common among children who are exposed to high levels of violence in their communities or through the media. The article by Garbarino, Bradshaw, and Vorrasi in this journal issue details common effects associated with exposure to gun violence, including sleep disturbance, anger, withdrawal, posttraumatic stress, poor school performance, lower career aspirations, increased delinquency, risky sexual behaviors, substance abuse, and desensitization to violence. All of these effects can make children and youth more prone to violence themselves, feeding a continuing cycle of violence within some families, peer groups, and communities. Arguably, every child in the United States is exposed to gun violence through media coverage of shootings, films and television shows, and violent video games that allow young people to shoot lifelike targets on the screen. More than 1,000 studies have documented a link between violent media and aggressive behavior. Children exposed to media violence have been shown in experimental studies to become more aggressive, to view more favorably the use of aggression to resolve conflicts, to become desensitized to violence, and to develop a belief that the world around them is a frightening place.47 However, the children and youth at highest risk for psychological trauma from gun violence are those exposed to it directly: children who are injured, who witness gun violence at close proximity, or who are exposed to high levels of gun violence in their homes, schools, or communities.48 School and community violence are particularly worrisome because they can affect large numbers of children at one time. A December 2001 study of 119 African American seven-year-olds living in inner-city Philadelphia, for example, found that three-quarters had heard gunfire, one-third had seen someone shot, and one-tenth had someone in their own family or household who had been shot or stabbed. Among children in the study, exposure to higher levels of violence was correlated with more anxiety, greater likelihood of depression, lower self-esteem, lower [GPA] grade point average, and more absences from school. More than 60% of the children worried that they might be killed or die, and 19% sometimes wished they were dead.4

#### AND Gun violence is a structural cause of inequality

Schuman ’15: (Jacob Schuman, Criminal defense attorney, “The Equality Argument For Gun Control,” Huffington Post, 11/04/2015//FT)

The fact is, the widespread availability of guns is a significant, but often overlooked, cause of persistent inequality in the United States. Focusing on the relationship between guns and inequality will allow gun control advocates to argue that ~~restricting firearm access is an essential step towards achieving social justice and economic empowerment. The first~~ way that guns drive inequality is by mak[e]ing life more violent and less stable for people living in economically disadvantaged communities. Crime rates, especially violent crime rates, are higher in poorer neighborhoods. While this is true across the world, and is likely to remain so, open access to firearms in the United States makes these crimes easier to commit, more lethal, and more destructive of community life. Most people think of violent crime as the result of poverty, but in fact it is also a cause. Over the July 4th weekend this year, for instance, 82 people were shot in Chicago, most of them in the city's struggling South Side, where crime rates are ten times higher than wealthier areas of the city. For residents of these neighborhoods, who are striving to make ends meet and improve their economic lot, the chaos and destruction wrought by gun violence is an enormous obstacle. And it is one that richer communities do not have to face. Given the racial aspect of socio-economic inequality in the United States, the negative impact of gun violence is borne especially by minority communities. The nonfatal gunshot injury rate in Chicago, for instance, is about 6.5 per 100,000 people. Divided by race, however, it's 1.62 per 100,000 for whites, 28.72 for Latinos, and 112.83 for blacks. For all males, the gunshot injury rate is 44.68 per 100,000, yet for black males it's 239.77, and for black males aged 18-34 it's a staggering 599.65 (about 1 in 200). In other words, a young black man in Chicago has a 38,000 percent greater chance of being shot than a white person. This is a blatant form of racial inequality. Those fighting gun restrictions would [Some] argue that [this] these figures merely demonstrate[s] the need for residents of poorer neighborhoods to arm themselves for their own protection. But firearms are far more often used for community-destroying crime than they are for individual self-defense. Gun violence, in short, is a structural impediment to true equality for high-crime, low-income areas.

#### More than 13,000 gun injuries for black teens alone

Lee ’12: (Hatty Lee. “Thousands of Young Black Men Die in Gun Crimes Every Year.” Color Lines. MAR 28, 2012//FT)

Last week, the Children's Defense Fund released their Protect Children, Not Guns 2012 report that highlights national and state data on how gun violence affects children and teens in America. According to the report, the children and teens killed by guns in 2008 and 2009, would fill more than 229 classroom of 25 students each. Gun homicide is the number one cause of death for black teens. Below, Hatty Lee paints the grim picture. 5,740 children and teens died from gunfire in the U.S in 2008 and 2009. 3,892 were victims of homicide (68%). 2,320 [deaths and] were Black (60%). The Leading Cause of Death Among Black Teens Ages 15 to 19 In 2008 and 2009 was Gun Homicide. .... Guns are injuring thousands of U.S. Children Every Year. 34,387 children and teens suffered nonfatal gun injuries in 2008 and 2009. 26,225 were injured in gun assaults (76%). [found] 13,471 [injuries] were Black (51%). The Rate of gun injuries was 10 times higher for black children and teens than it was for white children and teens.

#### Gun violence kills – in 2010 it was 6,000.

Pew Research ‘13: (Pew Research. “Blacks Suffer Disproportionate Share of Firearm Homicide Deaths.” MAY 21, 2013//FT)

In 2010, there were 31,672 deaths in the U.S. from firearm injuries, mainly through suicide (19,392) and homicide (11,078 [homicides from firearm injuries]), according to CDC compilation of data from death certificates. Among racial and ethnic groups, blacks are over-represented among gun homicide victims; blacks were 55% of shooting homicide victims in 2010, but 13% of the population.

#### A Study has literally found prisons are safer than the cities.

Clair ’11: (Matthew Clair. “Black Men Live Longer Behind Bars.” Policy Mic. July 19, 2011//FT)

According to a recent study published in the Annals of Epidemiology, black men in North Carolina’s prisons have a significantly lower chance of death in prison than out of it. The study, as reported by Reuters, also found that white men "were slightly more likely" to die inside the prison cell than outside.

#### Guns ravage black communities –they’re criminogenic and a structural barrier that virtually guarantees violence. It’s try or die – outweighs disads

DeFilippis 2: [Evan DeFilippis and Devin Hughes, founders of [ArmedWithReason.com](http://armedwithreason.com/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) and writers for the gun violence magazine [The Trace,](http://www.thetrace.org/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) “How America’s Lax Gun Laws Help Criminals and Cripple Minority Communities”, VICE News, 7/6/2015]

And as federal prosecutors decide whether to file hate-crime charges against the shooter— [21-year-old white supremacist Dylann Roof,](http://www.vice.com/read/everything-we-know-so-far-about-the-21-year-old-who-allegedly-killed-nine-people-at-a-church-in-south-carolina-618%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) whose [manifesto](https://news.vice.com/article/website-surfaces-with-disturbing-photos-and-manifesto-purportedly-written-by-dylann-roof%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) lays out his plans to start a "race war"—[some gun-rights advocates](http://www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun_controls_racist_reality_the_liberal_argument_against_giving_police_more_power/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) [have argued](https://www.vice.com/read/gun-control-will-not-save-america-from-racism-622%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) that new gun control laws would disproportionately hurt black Americans and other minorities, claiming that similar laws have disproportionately targeted these communities and contributed to the already-massive racial disparities in the US prison system. But these arguments also tend to ignore the devastating consequences that weak gun laws have had for minority communities. According to [data from the Centers for Disease Control](http://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/4/9/e005628.full.pdf%2Bhtml%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank), black Americans are twice as likely as whites to be victims of gun homicide. According to [a report](http://d35t5xl2jgocwh.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/CAP-Youth-Gun-Violence-report-FINAL.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) from the Center for American Progress, in 2010, 65 percent of gun murder victims between the ages of 15 and 24 were black, despite making up just 13 percent of the population. Gun homicide is also [the leading cause](http://www.blackyouthproject.com/2012/03/report-gun-homicide-is-the-leading-cause-of-death-among-black-teens/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) of death for black teens in the US, a group that also suffers gun injuries 10 times more frequently than their white counterparts . The numbers may help explain why an overwhelming majority of black[s] Americans—75 percent according to a 2013 [Washington Post/ABC News poll](http://www.washingtonpost.com/page/2010-2019/WashingtonPost/2013/03/12/National-Politics/Polling/release_217.xml%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)—support stronger gun control laws. Yet even in areas where local governments have enacted gun control measures, lax regulations elsewhere have sustained a robust network of unregulated private transactions that allow gun dealers to look the other way while supplying gangs and other criminals with a vast assortment of weapons. This network leaves a place like Chicago, which remains crippled [destroyed] by violence despite relatively strict gun laws, hard-pressed to keep weapons off the street—as [this New York Times map illustrates](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2013/01/29/us/where-50000-guns-in-chicago-came-from.html?_r=0" \t "_blank), anybody in the city who wants a gun need only take a short drive outside Cook County to get to a jurisdiction with much weaker regulations.

### Advocacy (1:30)

#### Thus, I affirm: The state governments of the United States ought to ban the private ownership of handguns.

Kleck 86 (Gary Kleck, criminologist and is the David J. Bordua Professor of Criminology at Florida State University, “POLICY LESSONS FROM RECENT GUN CONTROL RESEARCH.” 1986//FT)

Yet, many advocates of federal controls go far beyond such measures. In their report to the National Violence Commission, Newton and Zimring recommended a federal restrictive licensing standard amounting to a virtual ban on private ownership of handguns. 67 Rather than simply supplementing state measures and thus making it possible for states effectively to apply whatever gun control measures they regard as necessary, such a far-reaching proposal is a substitute for state controls, a way of overriding state legislatures' unwillingness to pass more restrictive laws of their own. There are several good reasons to reject this approach. First, the concept of federalism implies that the states should have as much autonomy as possible in drafting their criminal law and other statutes. Second, federal controls are less satisfactory because traditionally there has been a very limited federal law enforcement apparatus in the area of ordinary crime. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) regards itself more as an investigatory than a law enforcement agency. Nothing at the federal level corresponds to a street police force, and local police agencies, where most law enforcement personnel are concentrated, have generally been reluctant to devote their limited resources to the enforcement of federal laws. Third, the need for gun control differs sharply from one state to another. Some states have almost no violent crime, with or without guns, while others have a great deal. For example, in 1981 South Dakota had only twelve murders and nonnegligent manslaughters and 122 robberies (1.8 and 17.8 per 100,000 population, respectively), while Nevada, with only twenty-three percent more people, had 148 homicides and 3,867 robberies (17.5 and 64.9 per 100,000, respectively) 68

#### To clarify, a ban entails the following:

**Etzioni ’92:** [Amitai Etzioni and Steven Hellend, “The Case for Domestic Disarmament”, The Communitarian Network, 1992] VM

PROPOSED HANDGUN LEGISLATION Prohibits the importation, exportation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, possession, or transportation of handguns. Establishes a "grace period" during which time handguns may be turned into any law enforcement agency with impunity and for reimbursement at the greater of either $25 or the fair market value of the gun.

#### Reducing availability will decrease lethal youth violence.

Fagan and Wilkinson 2: (Jeffrey Fagan and Deanna L. Wilkinson. “Guns, Youth Violence, and Social Identity in Inner Cities.” Crime and Justice, Vol. 24, Youth Violence (1998), pp. 105-188//FT)

While youth violence has always been with us, the modern version of it seems distinctly different: the epidemic of adolescent violence is more lethal, in large part due to the rise of gun violence by adolescents. In this essay, we provide perspective and data on the role of guns in shaping the current epidemic of youth violence. At the descriptive level, the answer is clear: Adolescents in cities are possessing and carrying guns on a large scale, guns often are at the scene of youth violence, and guns often are being used. This is historically unique in the United States, with significant impacts on an entire generation of adolescents. The impacts are most seriously felt among African American youths in the nation's inner cities. It is logical and important to ask whether an exogenous increase in gun availability fueled the increase in youth violence. If this were true, then, regardless of its initial role in causing the epidemic, reducing the availability of guns to kids would in turn reduce the levels and seriousness of youth violence. However, we know little about changes in gun availability to adolescents; estimating supply-side effects is diffi- cult. Ethnographic reports show a steadily increasing possession of guns by youths, but little insight into how guns were obtained. Instead, we consider competing hypotheses that see a less central (but not insignificant) role of guns in initiating, sustaining, or elevating the epidemic of youth violence. These include the idea that the demand for guns among youth was driven up by the development of an "ecology of danger," with behavioral norms that reinforce if not call for violence, and in which popular styles of gun possession and carrying fuel beliefs that violence will be lethal. These shifts in demand, occurring in the context of widespread availability of weapons, led to increased possession, carrying, and use. Concurrently, guns became symbols of respect, power, and manhood in an emerging youth culture that sustained a continuing demand and supply side of weapons, reciprocally increasing the overall level of gun possession and the desire to use them. This essay offers a framework to explain how the supply and demand for guns has had an impact on the overall level and seriousness of youth violence, presenting evidence both from existing literature and from original sources to help understand the complex relationship be- tween guns and youth violence. Guns play an important role in the recent epidemic of lethal youth violence. However, the relationship is a complex one in which the effects of guns are mediated by structural factors that increase the youth demand for guns, the available supply, and culture and scripts which teach kids lethal ways to use guns. These effects appear to be large enough to justify intensive efforts to reduce availability, possession, and use of guns by American adolescents.

#### A ban reduces availability of guns – supply side approaches are key

LaFollette 2k (Hugh, USF St. Petersburg Philosophy Professor, “Gun Control,” Ethics 110 (January 2000): pp. 263–281) PO

1. The connection between availability of guns and murder.—Perhaps the most well-established statistic is this: the more widely available guns (especially handguns) are, the more people are murdered. The figures are duplicated time and again in country after country. Here is the bottom line: ‘‘The correlation between any gun-prevalence and the overall murder rate is .67, while it is .84 between handgun prevalence and overall murder rate.’’ 11 These figures are significant to the .01 level; that is, the chance that these correlations could occur merely by chance is less than one out of 100. This correlation meets the statisticians’ gold standard. But this does not resolve the issue, for it does not establish what gun control advocates claim it shows, namely, that gun control is an effective way of substantially lessening the murder rate. First, a statistical correlation shows that two things are linked, but it does not tell us if the first caused the second, the second caused the first, or if there is some third factor which caused both. Second, even if the items are causally related, we do not know that changing the cause will automatically and straightforwardly change the effect since another factor might intervene to sustain the effect. Gun advocates proffer their own armchair explanation for the correlations: These correlations reflect the character of the respective social and political systems. The European countries where murder rates are lower have more social solidarity and are more heterogeneous than the United States. Whether these social factors explain all the correlation is debatable, but I am confident they explain some of it. Were the United States to regulate guns as tightly as most European countries, our murder rates would arguably fall, but they would not immediately plummet to their levels. We might settle the issue if we conducted controlled experiments, randomly dividing our population in half, giving half of them guns, removing all the guns from the other half, and then monitoring the murder rate. Of course, that would be morally unacceptable, politically unrealistic, and probably even scientifically unachievable. Before we had enough time to exclude all possible intervening causes, sufficient time might have elapsed so that new intervening causes could have emerged. But we are not in the dark. We have empirical evidence that helps adjudicate between competing explanations of the correlation. First, we have empirical evidence, bolstered by armchair arguments, that guns are more lethal than other weapons. Some claim the ratio is 5:1; no estimates are lower than 2:1 (Reiss, A. J., Jr. and Roth, J. A. 1993: 260). This partly explains the strong correlation between guns and homicides. If people get angry the same number of times, those using the most lethal weapons are more likely to kill their victims. Second, the nature of secondary gun markets helps explain how the widespread availability of guns increases crime in general, and homicides in specific. Various opponents of gun control claim that "If we outlaw guns, only outlaws will have guns." Armchair arguments suggest why this is a silly claim. Where, one might ask, do criminals get their guns? They often steal them or buy them from those who purchased them legally. Even guns obtained from other criminals are usually traceable to people who purchased them legally. Empirical evidence supports this armchair supposition. Most criminals report having stolen their guns, received them from a friend or family member, or purchased them from someone who had stolen it. At least half a million guns are stolen each year (Cook, P. J. et al. 1995: 81), and these swell the numbers of guns available illegally. Not only does the primary (legal) market effect the availability of guns on secondary markets, it also affects the price of guns on those markets, much "like the analogous markets for motor vehicles or prescription drugs" (Cook, P. J. et al. 1995: 71). As we restrict availability of guns in the primary market, the supply of guns in the secondary markets decreases and their cost increases (Cook, P. J. et al. 1995: 73). This increase in cost will diminish teenagers' ability to obtain guns, since they are least able to afford hefty prices. Since teenagers commit most deadly crimes, decreasing the availability of legal guns will thereby decrease the number of homicides. Conversely, having huge numbers of legally available guns increases the number of guns on secondary markets and typically lowers their price. This makes it easier for prospective criminals, including teenagers, to obtain guns. Third, having a gun around the house (or on the person) - even for self-protection - apparently increases the chance that someone in the family will kill themselves with the gun, or will be the victim of a homicide or an accident. One study found that "for every time a gun in the home was involved in a self-protection homicide, they noted 1.3 unintentional deaths, 4.5 criminal homicides, and 37 firearm suicides" (Reiss, A. J., Jr. and Roth, J. A. 1993: 267). This implies that for every case where someone in a gun-owning household kills an intruder to thwart a life-threatening attack, nearly 43 people in similar households will die from a gunshot. Taken together the evidence does not prove that widespread availability of guns increases the number of homicides. However, that empirical evidence, bolstered by earlier armchair arguments, makes the claim highly plausible.

#### ???? And Gun ban kills the illicit market – new guns are key

Braga 12 Braga, Anthony A., et al. "Interpreting the empirical evidence on illegal gun market dynamics." Journal of Urban Health 89.5 (2012): 779-793.

It is important to note that the empirical data used in this article to refute wrongheaded claims by Kleck and Wang on illegal gun market dynamics have some noteworthy limitations. As described earlier, ATF firearms trace data may not be representative of firearms possessed and used by criminals; furthermore, a substantial proportion of recovered firearms cannot be traced to the first known retail sale.7 ATF gun trafficking investigation data only provide information on gun trafficking investigations that come to the attention of ATF agents.12 These gun trafficking enterprises may not be representative of broader gun trafficking pathways at work in the USA. The trace- and investigation-based information that results is biased to an unknown degree by these factors. These concerns certainly apply to the trace and investigation data used in the empirical analyses presented here. However, as suggested by the National Research Council’s Committee to Improve Research Information and Data on Firearms, these data can provide policy relevant insights on illegal gun market dynamics when conclusions are based on careful analyses that are coupled with clear acknowledgments of the data limitations.23 The research presented here identifies three important points about how criminals acquire guns. First, they rely on a diverse **set of illegal pathways, including corrupt licensed dealers, unlicensed sellers, straw purchasers, residential theft, and theft from licensed dealers, common carriers, and firearm manufacturers. Organized, largescale trafficking exists, but it** is not predominant. Where they occur, **high-volume gun trafficking operations are** attractive targets **for regulatory and enforcement efforts**. (Certain trafficking routes, such as those supplying firearms to large criminal organizations in Mexico, may behave differently.) Second, new **guns are disproportionately recovered in crime, suggesting** an important role for close-to-retail diversion of guns **in arming ~~criminals~~. Third, given the diversity of channels through which criminals can acquire guns, law enforcement agencies need to consider a variety of gun trafficking indicators that go well beyond whether a crime gun is recovered with an obliterated serial number or not.** Our findings refute three key arguments against the proposition that interventions aimed at curtailing illegal transfers of firearms could be used to good effect in reducing gun availability to criminals and gun crime. **The case for a supply-side approach to gun violence is well supported by the empirical evidence on illegal gun market dynamics.** To date, however, there is little empirical evidence that such an approach reduces rates of gun crime. We believe that it is time to develop experimental evidence on whether interventions designed to limit illegal transfers of firearms can reduce gun violence.

#### Handguns are the source of the problem

Kollmorgen ’16: (SARAH KOLLMORGEN. “Chicago Criminals’ Favorite Gunmakers: A Visual Ranking.” The Trace. January 6, 2016//FT)

By early December of last year, the Chicago [PD] Police Department had confiscated 6,521 illegal guns in 2015. That total meant the department was seizing about 19 guns a day — or about one gun every 74 minutes. For the city’s police department, the remarkable haul wasn’t unusual. In 2014, it recovered 6,429. In 2013, it seized 6,815. Indeed, officers in Chicago recover more guns than their counterparts in New York and Los Angeles — two cities with larger populations — combined. In 2012, Los Angeles police seized 122 illegal guns for every 100,000 residents, while New York cops confiscated 39. In Chicago, the rate was 277. Despite having some of the toughest gun regulations of any city in the country, Chicago continues to record thousands of shootings per year. As President Obama has pointed out, that isn’t a failing of the city’s gun laws. The problem is that most of the guns used in crimes in Chicago come from neighboring states with lax gun laws. A study released last year by the city found that almost 60 percent of firearms recovered at Chicago crime scenes were first bought in states that do not require background checks for Internet or gun show sales, like neighboring Indiana and Wisconsin. Of the remaining crime guns, nearly half were purchased at three gun shops just outside the city. Research by the Chicago police and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives paints a detailed picture of how crime guns flow into the city. But less has been known about what kinds of firearms, specifically, are favored by the city’s criminals. In an effort to learn more, The Trace filed an information request with the CPD’s Research and Development Division, asking for the make, model, and caliber of all the crime guns collected in Chicago in 2014. The CPD data includes guns used in violent crimes and murders, as well as guns confiscated during traffic stops. For our analysis, we excluded the 17 firearms collected by airport law enforcement, since those might not have involved illegal possession. The total also eliminates guns associated with a suicide or firearms turned into police through gun buybacks or other means. Guns turned in by the public accounted for more than 2,000 of the firearms recovered in 2014. In all, the CPD inventoried 4,505 guns in 2014 that were associated with criminal incidents — or events in which an officer determined that a crime had taken place. Narrowing the focus to groupings of guns by manufacturer and caliber produces the following popularity index of Chicago crime guns: http://www.thetrace.org/2016/01/chicago-crime-guns-chart/ [Chart displays: ] From that hierarchy, a few patterns emerge. The city’s ~~criminals~~, for instance, prefer semiautomatic pistols to revolvers and generally seek out cheap junk guns. What’s also notable is the type of gun that doesn’t appear among the top models seized. In 2014, Chicago police recovered only three assault weapons associated with criminal incidents. “Often there’s a misimpression about the importance of assault guns and assault weapons, and it’s important to point out how rare that is,” says Phillip Cook, an economist at Duke University who studies underground gun markets. “The guns being used in Chicago for crime and murder are by and large very ordinary pistols.”

#### Most comprehensive study ever conducted flows aff – verifies causality.

**MacDonald 3/2:** [Fiona MacDonald, “Largest study to date finds powerful evidence that gun control actually works”, references “What Do We Know About the Association Between Firearm Legislation and Firearm-Related Injuries?’ by Julian Santaella-Tenorio\*, Magdalena Cerdá, Andrés Villaveces, and Sandro Galea, Science Alert, March 2 2016.//VM]

As the US continues to stall on gun control talks, the largest study ever conducted on the topic [has found a clear link](https://epirev.oxfordjournals.org/content/38/1/140.full) between firearm regulation and fewer gun-related deaths around the world. Until now, studies on gun laws have been limited to just one city or country, and have failed to reach consistent conclusions. But the new research took a broader view - the team reviewed 130 high-quality studies conducted in 10 countries over the past 60 years. And while they stopped short of saying [they've conclusively proved](http://www.vox.com/2016/2/29/11120184/gun-control-study-international-evidence) that gun restrictions equal fewer deaths, the research provides pretty powerful evidence to suggest that it's the case. "Across countries, instead of seeing an increase in the homicide rate, we saw a reduction," lead researcher Julian Santaella-Tenorio from Columbia University[told Zack Beauchamp over at Vox](http://www.vox.com/2016/2/29/11120184/gun-control-study-international-evidence). To figure this out, Santaella-Tenorio and his team systematically analysed 130 studies that had been conducted across 10 different countries, including the US, Australia, Brazil, South Africa, and Austria. Each of the studies looked at some kind of specific gun legislation change, and its impact on gun-related homicides, suicides, and/or unintentional injuries or deaths, and was carefully selected for the quality of its research. After analysing all of these studies, the researchers [came up with three conclusions](https://epirev.oxfordjournals.org/content/38/1/140.full.pdf%2Bhtml): It usually takes major legislation overhaul - not just one new law - to see significant change. Restricting access to guns and their purchase is associated with reductions in firearm deaths. Individual studies need to be better executed and planned in future to get more convincing results.

#### No substitution effect

Dixon 93: (Nicholas Dixon [Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College, Alma, Michigan], “SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY PUBLIC LAW REVIEW”, 12 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 243, 1993//FT)

One has to doubt the reliability of the statements of prisoners as to what firearms they would carry in certain circumstances. Macho bragging and outright lying are very likely in such situations, and relegate Kleck's projections to the status of unsupported conjecture. In view of the fact that such a small percentage of the actual murders in the United States in 1990 were committed with long guns,' the burden on Kleck to prove his hypothetical speculation is even heavier. As for Kates and Benenson, their projections are based on the unsupported assertion that the 70% of handgun killers who do not turn to long guns would instead use knives, the most lethal weapon other than firearms. It is more probable that at least some potential murderers would turn to less lethal weapons or their bare hands, and that some would be deterred from assaults altogether. Since Kates and Benenson ignore these probable scenarios, and since their substitution predictions are in any case purely speculative, it is safe to conclude that their estimate of the increase in the homicide rate in the event of a handgun-only ban is inflated. The conjectures offered in support of the substitution hypothesis are inadequate and fail to meet the burden of proof encumbent on opponents of my proposal.¶ Another reason to doubt that long guns would be used in great numbers to replace handguns in robberies, assaults, and homi- cides is that long guns are obviously much more difficult to conceal. A potential mugger roaming the streets wielding a long gun will cause everyone in sight to flee, and is likely to be quickly arrested¶ when alarmed people call the police. Similarly, a bank robber car-¶ rying a long gun will be immediately detected by security guards,¶ alarm systems will be triggered, and the chances of a successful¶ robbery greatly diminished. Handguns are obviously much more convenient for the commission of such crimes. Kates and Benenson¶ point out that most homicides occur in the home, where¶ concealability is "irrelevant."95 However, concealability would seem¶ to be an important factor even in the home. Since the victim may¶ well be unaware that the killer is carrying a concealed weapon, the "surprise factor" which is peculiar to handguns can still apply even¶ in the home. In contrast, people can hardly be unaware that the person they are with is carrying a shotgun or rifle. Moreover, in any argument or domestic quarrel, regardless of whether the potential victim knows that the assaulter is carrying a handgun, the ease of pulling out the gun and shooting makes such arguments more likely to spill over into murder. In contrast, by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their long gun and loaded it, the potential victim has crucial seconds in which to escape.

### Framing A2 Politics (1:00)

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debate who best methodologically challenges structural violence.

Smith ’13: (Elijah Smith. “A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate.” Vbriefly. September 6, 2013//FT)

At every tournament you attend this year look around the cafeteria and take note of which students are not sitting amongst you and your peers. Despite being some of the best and the brightest in the nation, many students are alienated from and choose to not participate in an activity I like to think of as homeplace. In addition to the heavy financial burden associated with national competition, the exclusionary atmosphere of a debate tournament discourages black students from participating. Widespread awareness of the same lack of participation in policy debate has led to a growing movement towards alternative styles and methods of engaging the gatekeepers of the policy community, (Reid-Brinkley 08) while little work has been done to address or even acknowledge the same concern in Lincoln Douglas debate. Unfortunately students of color are not only forced to cope with a reality of structural violence outside of debate, but within an activity they may have joined to escape it in the first place. We are facing more than a simple trend towards marginalization occurring in Lincoln Douglas, but a culture of exclusion that locks minority participants out of the ranks of competition. It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. Like all systems of social control, the reality of racism in debate is constituted by the singular choices that institutions, coaches, and students make on a weekly basis. I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to abstractions to distance the conversation [away] from the material reality that black debaters are forced to deal with every day. One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. Community norms would have competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations but as someone who understands that experience, the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, and then find strategies to deal with the issues at hand. It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment with liberatory potential. Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape.

#### This does not mean real-politik consequentialism – To say that the “aff is a bad idea” because it causes white people to backlash and vote for trump deflects blame and locks us into the status quo. You should drop them for an anti-black gesture of “just wait”. – Shorten.

King ’63: (Martin Luther King Jr. "Letter from a Birmingham Jail [King, Jr.]" April 1963 AFRICAN STUDIES CENTER - UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA//FT)

I must make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First, I must confess that over the past few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in his stride toward [of] freedom is not the White Citizen's Counciler or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate, who is more devoted to "order" than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says: "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I cannot agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically believes he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by a mythical concept of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait for a "more convenient season." Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection. "I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice and that when they fail in this purpose they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress. I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension in the South is a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, in which the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substantive and positive peace, in which all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality. Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured so long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured." "In your statement you assert that our actions, even though peaceful, must be condemned because they precipitate violence. But is this a logical assertion? Isn't this like condemning a robbed man because his possession of money precipitated the evil act of robbery? Isn't this like condemning Socrates because his unswerving commitment to truth and his philosophical inquiries precipitated the act by the misguided populace in which they made him drink hemlock? Isn't this like condemning Jesus because his unique God consciousness and never ceasing devotion to God's will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? We must come to see that, as the federal courts have consistently affirmed, it is wrong to urge an individual to cease his efforts to gain his basic constitutional rights because the quest may precipitate violence. Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber. I had also hoped that the white moderate would reject the myth concerning [of] time in relation to the struggle for freedom. I have just received a letter from a white brother in Texas. He writes: [stating] "All Christians know that the colored people will receive equal rights eventually, but it is possible that you are in too great a religious hurry. It has taken Christianity almost two thousand years to accomplish what it has. The teachings of Christ take time to come to earth." Such an attitude stems from a tragic misconception of time, from the strangely irrational notion that there is something in the very flow of time that will inevitably cure all ills. Actually, time itself is neutral; it can be used either destructively or constructively. More and more I feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than have the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the hateful words and actions of the bad people but for the appalling silence of the good people. Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be co workers with God, and without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation. We must use time creatively, in the knowledge that the time is always ripe to do right. Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy and transform our pending national elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. Now is the time to lift our national policy from the quicksand of racial injustice to the solid rock of human dignity."

#### Future narratives are a link—predictions are not value neutral— their link conflation and hyperboles obscure violence and preserves the squo – hold them responsible.

Jackson ’12: (Richard, Director of the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, the University of Otago. Former. Professor of International Politics at Aberystwyth University, “The Great Con of National Security,” 8/5/12 http://richardjacksonterrorismblog.wordpress.com/2012/08/05/the-great-con-of-national-security/)

It may have once been the case that being attacked by another country was a major threat to the lives of ordinary people. It may also be true that there are still some pretty serious dangers out there associated with the spread of nuclear weapons. For the most part, however, most of what you’ve been told about national security and all the big threats which can supposedly kill you is one big con designed to distract you from the things that can really hurt you, such as the poverty, inequality and structural violence of capitalism, global warming, and the manufacture and proliferation of weapons – among others.¶ The facts are simple and irrefutable: you’re far more likely to die from lack of health care provision than you are from terrorism; from stress and overwork than Iranian or North Korean nuclear missiles; from lack of road safety than from illegal immigrants; from mental illness and suicide than from computer hackers; from domestic violence than from asylum seekers; from the misuse of legal medicines and alcohol abuse than from international drug lords. And yet, politicians and the servile media spend most of their time talking about the threats posed by terrorism, immigration, asylum seekers, the international drug trade, the nuclear programmes of Iran and North Korea, computer hackers, animal rights activism, the threat of China, and a host of other issues which are all about as equally unlikely to affect the health and well-being of you and your family. Along with this obsessive and perennial discussion of so-called ‘national security issues’, the state spends truly vast sums on security measures which have virtually no impact on the actual risk of dying from these threats, and then engages in massive displays of ‘security theatre’ designed to show just how seriously the state takes these threats – such as the x-ray machines and security measures in every public building, surveillance cameras everywhere, missile launchers in urban areas, drones in Afghanistan, armed police in airports, and a thousand other things. This display is meant to convince you that these threats are really, really serious.¶ And while all this is going on, the rulers of society are hoping that you won’t notice that increasing social and economic inequality in society leads to increased ill health for a growing underclass; that suicide and crime always rise when unemployment rises; that workplaces remain highly dangerous and kill and maim hundreds of people per year; that there are preventable diseases which plague the poorer sections of society; that domestic violence kills and injures thousands of women and children annually; and that globally, poverty and preventable disease kills tens of millions of people needlessly every year. In other words, they are hoping that you won’t notice how much structural violence there is in the world.¶ More than this, they are hoping that you won’t notice that while literally trillions of dollars are spent on military weapons, foreign wars and security theatre (which also arguably do nothing to make any us any safer, and may even make us marginally less safe), that domestic violence programmes struggle to provide even minimal support for women and children at risk of serious harm from their partners; that underfunded mental health programmes mean long waiting lists to receive basic care for at-risk individuals; that drug and alcohol rehabilitation programmes lack the funding to match the demand for help; that welfare measures aimed at reducing inequality have been inadequate for decades; that health and safety measures at many workplaces remain insufficiently resourced; and that measures to tackle global warming and developing alternative energy remain hopelessly inadequate.¶ Of course, none of this is surprising. Politicians are a part of the system; they don’t want to change it. For them, all the insecurity, death and ill-health caused by capitalist inequality are a price worth paying to keep the basic social structures as they are. A more egalitarian society based on equality, solidarity, and other non-materialist values would not suit their interests, or the special interests of the lobby groups they are indebted to. It is also true that dealing with economic and social inequality, improving public health, changing international structures of inequality, restructuring the military-industrial complex, and making the necessary economic and political changes to deal with global warming will be extremely difficult and will require long-term commitment and determination. For politicians looking towards the next election, it is clearly much easier to paint immigrants as a threat to social order or pontificate about the ongoing danger of terrorists. It is also more exciting for the media than stories about how poor people and people of colour are discriminated against and suffer worse health as a consequence.¶ Viewed from this vantage point, national security is one massive confidence trick – misdirection on an epic scale. Its primary function is to distract you from the structures and inequalities in society which are the real threat to the health and wellbeing of you and your family, and to convince you to be permanently afraid so that you will acquiesce to all the security measures which keep you under state control and keep the military-industrial complex ticking along.¶ Keep this in mind next time you hear a politician talking about the threat of uncontrolled immigration, the risk posed by asylum seekers or the threat of Iran, or the need to expand counter-terrorism powers. The question is: when politicians are talking about national security, what is that they don’t want you to think and talk about? What exactly is the misdirection they are engaged in? The truth is, if you think that terrorists or immigrants or asylum seekers or Iran are a greater threat to your safety than the capitalist system, you have been well and truly conned, my friend. Don’t believe the hype: you’re much more likely to die from any one of several forms of structural violence in society than you are from immigrants or terrorism. Somehow, we need to challenge the politicians on this fact.

### K underview

#### Demanding state action doesn’t align with it. There is no “outside” from which to work - Lives are being lost daily, urgency demands actions within the context of uncertainty. When there isn’t an “outside”

#### Demanding action from the state does not mean you believe it—it can be helpful within and outside of state action. We operate within the context of uncertainty – action can be taken in conjunction.

Smith ’10: (Andrea Smith, Ph.D., co-founder of Incite! Women of Color Against Violence, UC Riverside Associate Professor, 2010, Building Unlikely Alliances: An Interview with Andrea Smith, uppingtheanti.org/journal/article/10-building-unlikely-alliances-an-interview-with-andrea-smith//FT)

You’ve said that you saw the Obama election as a moment for social movements to build themselves. What are your thoughts about electoral politics and the role of the state in terms of the question of power?

Until you have an alternative system, then there is no “outside” of the current system. I don’t think there is a pure place in which to work, so you can work in many places, including inside the state. I think there is no reason not to engage in electoral politics or any other thing. But it would probably be a lot more effective if, while we are doing that, we are also building alternatives. If we build the alternatives, we have movements to hold us accountable when we work within the system and we also have more negotiating power. It can actually be helpful.

In terms of, say, state repression, if we have some critical people within the state then we might be able to do something about it. We might think about them as a way to relieve some of the pressure while trying to build the alternatives. I don’t think it is un-strategic to think about it like that. I am just not the kind of person who ever says, “never do ‘x’.” You always have to be open-minded and creative. It may not work out. You may get co-opted or something bad might happen. But if we really knew the correct way to do something we would have done it by now.

#### Progress is possible – reject pessimistic claims

#### Particularity framing key.

### Framing

#### Kahan – debate should be about the world views

#### Debates should work backwards from a vision of the future. Incrementalism defines culture – otherwise, we continue to cede social ontology to the right. This entails visualizing a future that is a paradigm shift away from anti-black violence.

Connolly 08 Connolly, William E. Capitalism and christianity, American style. Duke University Press, 2008. (a political theorist known for his work on democracy and pluralism. He is the Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. His 1974 work The Terms of Political Discourse won the 1999 Benjamin Lippincott Award)

I concur with the John of the Book of Revelation in one respect. It is necessary today to visualize an interim future that departs signiﬁcantly from the shape of the present, and then to work back from that image to see what changes are needed and possible today. To do less is to allow those who implicitly visualize a continuation of the present into the future to control the terms of debate. It also concedes too much to a signiﬁcant minority of Americans who look forward to the collapse of the world in a ﬁery cataclysm of divine justice. It even concedes too much to a smaller minority who contend that nothing positive can be accomplished until capitalism collapses of its own weight. A counter image, linked to contemporary practices by interim proposals to action, is a step on the way to renegotiating the contemporary capital-state-Christian assemblage. Would success, were it to occur, set the stage for a world beyond capitalism? That question stretches my powers of imagination too far, though the decision to treat ‘‘capitalism’’ as a speciﬁc historical assemblage does leave it open. There are several things this book does not do. I do not examine how neoliberal theory has penetrated international institutions such as the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund, though I am in debted to those who have.Ω My prime focus is on a set of Christian-capital- state imbrications in the United States, imbrications that affect the priorities of international institutions too. An advantage of this focus, amid its obvious limitation, is that it points to the stickiness and braking power of large states in the global economy and to their corollary ability to accelerate some global tendencies. Both things are present in spades of the United States, even as it spends down the capital that made it a world power. Some trends and tenden cies commonly identiﬁed as global receive much of their impetus from the priorities of the United States. A more extensive account of spiritual elements in American capitalism would address relations between the major world religions. But I am not qualiﬁed for that task. The assignment I have accepted is already big enough. Weber, were he alive, might undertake such a large investigation again. Today he would need to collaborate with people in postcolonial studies, anthropol ogy, regional studies, comparative religion, and comparative political theory.∞≠ I have tried to proﬁt from such studies but am not expert in them. The more limited operation pursued here may have some utility, however, in its efforts to cross lines of division between theological, political, ethical, and economic analyses, to gauge the power-infused ethos of economic life in one state inﬂuential throughout the world, and to craft concepts appropriate to those tasks. The concluding chapter of this book draws together elements discussed in earlier chapters to identify a potential resonance machine of the democratic left. Critical to its consolidation is a negotiation of alliances between Chris tians, Jews, Muslims, nontheists, and secularists who resist the destructive ethos of the evangelical-capitalist resonance machine. Equally critical is re capture of a segment of the white working and middle classes neglected by the otherwise noble movements of pluralization in the 1970s and 1980s. We cannot promote equality and defend advances in cultural diversiﬁcation with out them, and they cannot reverse the effects of the evangelical-cowboy juggernaut without us. It is important to translate demands for ‘‘solidarity’’ and ‘‘unity’’ on the democratic left into the agenda of constructing a complex, multi-tiered assemblage. The demand for unity too often issued in authoritarian tendencies in the 1970s, making its own contribution to the demoralization of the left. It is also pertinent to see that one or two electoral defeats will not succeed to roll back the power of the evangelical-capitalist resonance machine. A counter machine must be forged. We need a political assemblage composed of multiple constituencies whose diverse experiences resonate together, ﬁnding ex pression in churches, schools, factories, neighborhoods, the media, occupa tional groups, the electorate, a segment of the capitalist class, state policy, and cross-state citizen movements. Is the academic, media, church, and think tank machine of the right correct on a critical point? I think it is. For at least forty years its theorists, publicists, religious ﬁgures, and media cheerleaders have insisted that the ethos embedded in individual habits, family dynamics, economic priorities, work practices, consumption decisions, tv dramas, constitutional decisions, electoral politics, media news reports, and governmental policy helps to deﬁne an entire civilization. They have worked in numerous venues, with considerable effect, to change that ethos. It is just that they pursue a bellicose, unitary culture, disconnected from responsibility to future generations, stingy about diversity, uncaring about urban poverty, and supportive of a system of extreme economic inequality. I concur that an ethos is important, even as I contest the ethos that they support. A counter-ethos too must ﬁnd expression in the work that we do upon ourselves as individuals and in a variety of collective processes such as state policies, inventive ﬁlms, media life, church sermons, investment movements, work life, family life, con sumption habits, modes of advertising, state laws, judicial appointments, electoral politics, and constitutional decisions. It must secure a foothold in several venues to establish a solid grip in any. The struggle today is thus partly existential and partly institutional. Better, it is both in their relations of imbrication, infusion, and interdetermination. For example, the state-funded infrastructure of consumption and the ethos of consumption must be reconstituted together, and that goes for the institu tions of investment, income distribution, market competition, and the orga nization of work life as well. To participate together in an a≈rmative ethos of economic life does not mean that we must all adopt the same creedal beliefs. It involves, as will become abundantly clear, crafting an ethos of egalitarianism, diversity, and care for future generations from diverse creedal beliefs, class perspectives, and generational experiences. Those who continue to think that the existential dimension of life is merely personal, or only private, or unsusceptible to cultural dissemination, or irrele vant to economic life, or wholly determined by other forces, still don’t get it.

#### Thus the mere existence of long guns is not a reason to reject the aff – at best the substitution effect demonstrates

### Underview v. Ghill

#### 1] Systemic impacts first

#### 2] Elections Disad is bad

#### 3] Some Time Skew thing for 1AR theory/No rvi, etc.

#### 4] We need to make decisions based on the world we exist in. (Uncertainty)

#### 5]

# 1AR

## Case

### Extensions

#### Gun violence kills 6000 black American yearly and locks them into cycles of violence – that’s Pew, Reich, and Schuman. // Outweighs their impacts//

#### Guns are a CAUSE –

#### They create an arms race for protection that socializes adolescents into lethal violence – that’s Fagan

OR

#### Countless reports, surveys and interviews show they create an arms race for protection, shoot first mentality, retaliation, and socializes adolescents into lethal violence – that’s Fagan

#### Defillipis verifies this – actual gang crimes count for less than a third.

#### Bans Solve

#### 1] Our MacDonald ev is bomb– Comprehensive study concludes significant gun regulations decrease homicides – answers ­­­­\_\_Humer\_\_\_\_ – they focus on minor policies, like RTC laws, that aren’t reflective of the aff

#### 2] Fagan 1 and 2 prove prevalence of guns creates crime, so removing them is reverse causal.

#### 3] Bans cut off supply for illicit exchanges – the few guns that exist too expensive for youth which solves our impact – That’s Lafollete – that also answers substitution.

#### 4] Empirically, new guns are mainly recovered in crime - unrecovered guns become obsolete – so compliance is irrelevant – That’s Braga

#### Moreover perception is sufficient – bans shape youth’s expectations of gun prevalence – Fagan proves those expectations are what cause crime.

#### Also solvency turns both Gourevitch + illicit markets – there’s no guns to trade or police.

#### They say substitution

#### 1] Fagan proves our Dixon evidence is better on substitution

#### a] They own guns for self-defense and won’t replace with bulky, inconvenient long guns–

#### b] Prison surveys don’t reflect inner city youth – and aren’t reliable

* **c] Empirically - overwhelming majority of homicides are by handguns.**

#### 2] Aff outweighs, our impacts multiplicative - exposure has psychological effects that lock children into crime – even if substitution causes more fatalities, less shootings outweigh. [do on top]

#### 3] If it’s true, demand goes up and prices increase so youth still can’t access.

#### Next, their ev on self defense isn’t specific to inner cities – doesn’t apply.

#### 1] Fagan proves the expectation of death means flashing a gun is an invitation to shoot quicker – also “gun play” initiates retaliation which outweighs

#### 2] Frum impact turns this – self-defense just kills one and sends the other to prison since we criminalize blacks

#### They say illicit market

#### Braga wrecks this – empirically, organized trade is an easy target, no wide scale production or trafficking is possible. And, bans limit channels for gun access which strengthen regulation b/c right now its spread too thin. –

#### No uniqueness – existing gun regulations already mean guns are obtained illegally by inner city youth – that’s Fagan

### Extensions

#### A2: Substitution (15S)

- It just means we should ban long guns, not lock ourselves into the squo

- **Reich** proves aff outweighs – exposure has psychological effects that lock children into a crime. – Thus we outweigh substitution – even if there are more fatalities, there are drastically less shootings.

- **Fagan** proves they own guns for self-defense – they won’t replace with long guns – they’re too bulky and inconvenient – That’s **Dixon** – and their surveys are unreliable – **Kollmorgen** verifies

- It’ll be too expensive – aff increase gun prices in the illicit “market” – that’s **lafollte**

#### A2 Illicit Market (15s)

* No Uniqueness – it happens now, guns in the inner city are already stolen or accessed through informal exchanges – legal avenues just offer a supply. – That’s Fagan and Lafollete
* Braga proves, there’s no organized market for guns – they’re too easy to target. Illegal guns are largely accessed through a network of different avenues that justify a supply side approach.
* Case solves – no guns to traffic with after a few years – we stop production, and old guns become obsolete – that’s Braga.

#### Self Defense (14s)

#### Non compliance (9s)

Rephrase as much as possible as outweighs.

#### ------------Criminogenic------------

They’ve misunderstood the case -

#### [Frum] It’s easy to think guns aren’t the problem since it’s rooted in anti-black representations – but blacks are not inherently criminal – they too own guns for “self-defense” – but self-defense is destructive – it leaves one dead and the other in prison – That’s Frum

#### Defillipis answers their crime inevitable claims – gangs are not the root of the problem but hostile confrontations on the street that Fagan depicts

#### Extend Fagan – Guns are criminogenic, they create an arms race for self protection that socialize adolescents into lethal violence. Each event of “gun play” is diffused through gossip making it an expectation– so guns create crime.

#### Answers substitution - they own guns for self-defense and won’t replace with long guns– they’re too bulky and inconvenient – Also be skeptical of prisoner surveys - that’s the Dixon evidence

#### Also Answers self-defense – the expectation of death means flashing a gun is an invitation to shoot quicker – also spawns future retaliation –

#### Moreover, defensive gun use doesn’t imply a life was saved.

#### Also, Over-reporting is highly plausible, gun owners want to meet the expectation.

#### ------------Impacts------------

#### Gun violence kills thousands and lock communities into cycles of poverty and crime – that’s

#### Next, Reich- magnifies our impact – exposure has psychological effects that lock children into a crime. – Thus we outweigh substitution – even if there are more fatalities, there are drastically less shootings.

#### ------------Solvency------------

#### Fagan proves guns cause crime, so removing them decreases death – it is reverse causal.

#### Lafollete shows– banning legal production is key – illicit exchanges are supplied by legal sources. Also prevents youth access b/c less supplies increase prices– which also prevents substitution

####

[13s]

#### Braga answers organized crime - they’re easy targets, no wide scale production or trafficking is possible. And, bans limit channels for gun access which strengthen regulation b/c right now its spread too thin. –

#### And there’s no impact uniqueness – existing gun regulations already mean guns are obtained illegally by inner city youth – that’s Fagan

#### Obviously case solves, there are few guns to even traffic with.

[3s]

#### Also won’t be same as drugs– gangs want to keep a monopoly on arms, so there won’t be an elaborate illegal market.

[9s]

#### Braga answers no compliance – new guns are mainly recovered in crimes. Unrecovered guns will quickly become obsolete – Moreover, perception is sufficient – bans mean they’re harder to purchase or steal, which shapes youth’s expectations of gun prevalence – Fagan proves those expectations are what cause crime.

#### Our MacDonald ev is better – Comprehensive study concludes significant gun regulations decrease homicides – answers your studies – they focus on minor policies, like RTC laws, that aren’t reflective of the aff.

**Kollmorgen verifies Dixon – they caused virtually 99% of gun violence in Chicago.**

### A2: Higher Murder Overall

#### 1] Not specific to inner cities

#### 2] Not descriptive of a national gun ban which has never happened before

#### 3] Your ev is highly suspect

#### 4] Prefer Causal warrants.

### A2: Gourevitch

#### We solve the root cause \_\_\_ % of black inner city youth will end up in prison anyways.

#### This misses the point – your pessimism locks us in the squo.

NAACP 08: ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE THE NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE & EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC. IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS THEODORE M. SHAW, DIRECTOR COUNSEL JACQUELINE A. BERRIEN \*VICTOR A. BOLDEN DEBO P. ADEGBILE MARC K. BATTLE NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE & EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC. MICHAEL B. DE LEEUW DARCY M. GODDARD DALE E. HO FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publishing/preview/publiced\_preview\_briefs\_pdfs\_07\_08\_07\_290\_PetitionerAmCuNAACPFund.authcheckdam.pdf

Concerns about this nation’s past or present-day problems with racial discrimination do not provide a basis for invalidating the District’s handgun regulations. The solution to discriminatory enforcement of firearm laws is not to reinterpret the Second Amendment to protect an individual right to “keep and bear Arms” for purely private purposes, but rather to employ, as necessary, this Court’s traditional vehicle for rooting out racial discrimination: the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, or, where the actions of the federal government are at issue, the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. See United States v. Armstrong, 517 U.S. 456, 464-65 (1996) (administration of a criminal law may be “directed so exclusively against a particular class of persons . . . with a mind so unequal and oppressive” that the system of enforcement and prosecution amounts to “a practical denial” of equal protection of the laws) (quoting Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 373 (1886)); see also Vasquez v. Hillery, 474 U.S. 254 (1986) (racial discrimination in the selection of the grand jury violates Equal Protection); Batson v. Kentucky, 476 U.S. 79 (1986) (invalidating the use of race as a factor in the exercise of peremptory challenges).25 To the extent the history surrounding the adoption of early gun control laws, or even the Second Amendment itself, is tainted by racial discrimination, see Carl T. Bogus, The Hidden History of the Second Amendment, 31 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 309 (1998) (arguing that a major function of the “well regulated militia” of the Second Amendment during colonial and post-revolutionary times was the maintenance of slavery in the South and the suppression of slave rebellion); Robert J. Cottrol & Raymond T. Diamond, The Second Amendment: Toward an Afro-Americanist Reconsideration, 80 Geo. L.J. 309 (1991) (tracing the discriminatory intent of early firearms restrictions), then the Fourteenth Amendment is the appropriate vehicle for that bias to be ferreted out and eliminated. Contrary to the assertions of some, the modern firearm regulations at issue in this case should not be confused with the Black Codes, other discriminatory laws that the Fourteenth Amendment invalidated, or more recent cases where Fourteenth Amendment protections have been implicated. The Fourteenth Amendment’s protections rightly extend in the face of a colorable assertion that the District’s firearm regulations (or those of any other jurisdiction) are racially discriminatory in origin or application, but such a showing has not been made here or even alleged by Respondents.

#### 1] Case outweighs – gun violence kills thousands every year and contributes to a cycle of crime which accesses your impact – my impacts long term and exponential – more people die a day in inner cities than would be prosecuted.

--- Blacks are more disproportionately killed by gun violence than prosecuted.

We solve root cause

#### 2] If I win case solvency overtime handguns are not commonplace and there’s nothing to enforce

#### 3] Non-unique -the impact isn’t linear but logarithmic- since the internal link is limited enforcement resources which is a threshold question – gun control alone give police the excuse they need for selective enforcement like stop and frisk

5] but mass incarceration still super powerful – already whole network.

6] inner city kids that get frisked for guns – frisked for drugs or other things. --- marginal.

#### 4] No uniqueness – many guns inner city youth own are already illegal – that’s Fagan.

#### 4] Impact isn’t big - even in the squo only 2% are prosecuted and most are in conjunction with another crime.

Kopan 16: (Tal Kopan, CNN “Why even the gun laws that exist don't always get enforced,” January 9, 2016//FT)

But gun-control groups argue that even the 2004 mark wasn't much of a peak. A 2003 study by Americans for Gun Safety, which is now a part of Third Way, found that over three years, roughly 2% of federal gun crimes were prosecuted. Further, they found that 85% of prosecutions were under two laws -- possession of a firearm by a felon and possession of a firearm while committing another federal crime -- and that President George W. Bush focused on those two statutes in increasing gun prosecutions. That left 20 federal gun laws virtually unused, per their analysis.

#### 4] Guns bans won’t be enforced by harsh incarceration – squo going other way

#### Horwitz 12/18: Horwitz, Sari. “President Obama commutes sentences of 95 federal drug offenders.” Washington Post. 2015. PESH AK

President Obama commuted the sentences of 95 drug offenders Friday, more than double the number he granted this summer, in an effort to give relief to drug offenders who were harshly sentenced in the nation’s war on drugs.¶ It is the third time this year that the president has used his unique clemency power to release federal drug offenders, whose harsh sentences have contributed to the phenomenon of mass incarceration.¶ The commutations are a centerpiece of the president’s effort to make the most significant changes in the nation’s criminal justice system in decades.

#### Guns increase risk of police militarization—turns and outweighs the disad.

DeBrabander 5/12 (FIRMIN DEBRABANDER, “The NRA’s sinister project: Turn America into a “shoot first” society,” The Salon, MAY 12, 2015//FT)

In sum, [The idea that] police are either absent or overwhelmed, or they are part of the problem of violence, in which case it makes good sense for citizens to be armed. Both arguments suit the NRA just fine. The gun lobby works tirelessly to arm ever more Americans, expand the laws that enable us to carry guns in public spaces, and drum up extreme levels of fear that support its radical agenda. But more armed citizens will not make police work any easier—if anything, they will only make it more challenging. There is good reason to believe that police shootings owe a lot to the fact that so many of the citizens they “serve and protect” are already armed. With more than 300 million privately owned guns in America, police must presume that the citizens they pull over, even for routine traffic stops, could have a gun. They must always be on edge, always fear the worst. This was borne out in the killing of Tamir Rice in a Cleveland playground earlier this year. Police had been summoned on reports of a man with a weapon; when they spied 12-year old Rice with his toy gun in hand, they opened fire, killing him. In a similar incident, on the other side of Ohio, police shot and killed John Crawford in a Wal-Mart, when he was walking the aisles—talking on his cell phone—with an air rifle in hand. It was reported afterwards that the officers involved in this incident had only just been trained for responding to “active shooters”—i.e., mass shooters, like at Columbine and Sandy Hook—and “were taught to be aggressive,” according to the prosecuting attorney. This is not to say that race wasn’t a factor in either case; it likely was. (Rice and Crawford were both African American.) But police error in similar incidents is compounded by the fact that they must fear [of] armed citizens all the time.

### A2: Women Self Defense (20s)

#### Their defense of guns is gendered

Chemaly: (Chemaly, Soraya. Media Critic and Activist “Why Don’t We Talk About the Gender Safety Gap in the U.S.?” Ms. Magazine Blog, April 24, 2015//FT)

This safety gap is routinely ignored in attempts to find solutions to violent crime. Consider, for example, the recent argument made by the gun lobby and its supporters that “hot young girls” should carry guns to class to protect themselves against rape. This suggestion reflects a profound and dangerous ignorance about the nature of sexual assault and intimate partner violence. First, women being raped are unlikely to shoot the person assaulting them, often because that person is known to them, including relatives, intimate partners and friends (73 percent of sexual assaults are committed by someone known to the survivor). Studies indicate that guns are used defensively in sexual assaults in 0.1 percent of cases. Second, there are marked gender difference in considerations regarding the efficacy of guns. Pro-gun legislation is a gendered affair, particularly when linked to Stand Your Ground laws, which repeatedly fail women in their own homes. Gallup’s “Guns in the Home: Safer or Not?” survey, published in November 2014, found that about “six in 10 Americans say guns make home safer.” However, that number is 67 percent of men, compared to 58 percent of women; 65 percent whites to 56 percent non-whites. Women are almost a third more likely to say that a gun in the home makes it a more dangerous place—and for good reason: Unlike a man, a woman in the United States is more than twice as likely to be killed by a man she knows than by a stranger, and she is often shot to death. Forty percent of women killed by partners are shot to death and a woman is more than 3.5 times more likely to be killed by an intimate partner than a man is.

#### Your argument is just empirically false.

NRCDV: (NRCDV “Talking Points,” http://www.nrcdv.org//FT)

A woman is far more likely to be the victim of a handgun homicide than to use a handgun in a justifiable homicide. Source: Violence Policy Center. (2001). A Deadly Myth: Women, Handguns, and Self-Defense. Washington, DC. • A study found that for every time a woman used a handgun to kill an intimate partner in self-defense, 83 women were murdered by an intimate partner with a handgun. Source: Violence Policy Center. (2001). A Deadly Myth: Women, Handguns, and Self-Defense. Washington, DC. • In general, firearms are rarely used in self-defense by victims of violent crimes. From 2007 to 2011, crime victims engaged in self-protective behaviors that involved a firearm in only 0.8% of the cases. Source: Violence Policy Center. (2013, April). Firearm Justifiable Homicides and Non-Fatal Self-Defense Gun Use: An Analysis of Federal Bureau of Investigation and National Crime Victimization Survey Data. Washington, DC.

### A2: War on Guns DA

#### Case outweighs

#### Prohibition created organized crime – so yes that ban led to a huge hike in crime – but organized crime already takes the lives of thousands, be it because of drugs, gun filled tension environment, or turf wars - which means there’s no impact uniqueness, and the difference would be marginal so aff outweighs.

#### Slowly the aff will decrease the perception that a gun is necessary – you assume everyone wants a gun so they can commit a crime – but it’s for protection from the gun filled environment – of course this is a slow process – and there might be an initial increase in crime – but years after – we open up black communities the possibility for empowerment and being free from bullets – so there’s no demand for the market.

### A2: Smuggling

#### US gun control is key—most guns in the illegal trade come from the US—takes out your internal links—we cut off the source.

Laura Mehalko 12 [Executive Comments Editor for the Boston College International & Comparative Law Review], “The International Implications of U.S. Gun Control Policy”, Boston College International & Comparative Law Review, Vol. 35, 2012, BE

Abstract: Mexican drug trafficking organizations are the largest providers of illicit drugs to the United States. They have also grown to rely on ad- vanced, high-power weaponry and to use their nearly military-grade ar- mament to maintain control over smuggling corridors, and local drug production areas. Cartels are also linked to nearly 40,000 deaths over the last five years, many of which were committed with guns originating in the United States. The United States is likely the most prevalent source of weapons for the increasingly violent cartels. The U.S. government esti- mates that nearly ninety percent of all weapons used in the drug war orig- inate in the United States. An analysis of current gun control policy in the United States and Mexico suggests this is likely the case; Mexico has par- ticularly strict gun control laws in contrast to the relatively lenient gun control regulation in the United States. Both countries have implemented domestic policies aimed at reducing the southward flow of arms into Mex- ico, yet so far have had little success. This Note argues that arms trafficking has been facilitated by current U.S. gun control policy, and it will likely continue without a foundational shift in either U.S. or international policy.

### A2: War on Guns

#### A] This is about Chafee’s bill

#### B] Ev is about incarceration of privileged white families – this is no different then standard gourevitch argument.

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

The only way to prevent the Chafee bill from swamping the criminal justice system would be to enforce the handgun ban sporadically, making the law a mockery, and creating serious risks of selective prosecution against minorities.

### A2: 3-D Printing

#### It’ll be regulated

Greenberg ’15: (ANDY GREENBERG, “Feds Tighten Restrictions on 3-D Printed Gun Files Online,” WIRED, June 11, 2015//FT)

THE NOTION OF a 3-D printable gun has become the perfect flashpoint in a new conflict between digital arms control and free speech. Should Americans be allowed to say and share whatever they want online, even if that “speech” is a blueprint for a gun? The State Department has now answered that question with a resounding “no.” In the last few days, the State Department has issued two new statements confirming [confirmed] its intention to act as gatekeeper for when Americans can legally publish online data that could allow someone to digitally fabricate a gun. And those statements outline how it plans to restrict those publications as a controlled “foreign export” of munitions. Earlier this week, the State Department sent a letter to the controversial gun access group Defense Distributed, confirming that it will require the group to get specific permission from the government before publishing its 3-D printable gun files online. That warning comes more than two years after the State Department sent Defense Distributed an initial letter telling it to take its gun files off its website pending a decision about their legality. The State Department intends to require prior approval for the online publication of any 'technical data' that, vaguely defined, would allow for the creation of weapons. And in a separate filing to the federal register last week, the State Department also wrote that it intends to require prior approval for the online publication of any “technical data” that, vaguely defined, would allow for the creation of weapons, an even broader swathe of files. The agency’s statement warns that publishing those weapon files to the Internet, with its global connections, could amount to violating the International Trade in Arms Regulations (ITAR) by exporting controlled weapons data to a foreign country—hardly different, by its definition, from sending missile schematics to Iran. “Before posting information to the Internet, you should determine whether the information is ‘technical data.’ You should review the [United State Munitions List], and if there is doubt about whether the information is ‘technical data,’ you may request a commodity jurisdiction determination from the Department,” reads the State Department’s filing. “Posting ‘technical data’ to the Internet without a Department or other authorization is a violation of the ITAR even absent specific knowledge that a foreign national will read the ‘technical data.’” The State Department’s renewed attempt to control the spread of gun files online comes just as the conflict between the control of digital weapons “exports” and free speech is coming to a head: A month ago, Defense Distributed sued the State Department on First Amendment grounds, arguing that its right to free speech is being violated by the State Department’s demand for prior approval of its printable gun file uploads. “Just because information can be used for some bad purpose doesn’t make it illegal to publish it,” says Matthew Goldstein, an export control lawyer representing Defense Distributed. “This isn’t just a firearms case, even though it deals with firearms. It’s really a free speech case.” But Defense Distributed’s lawsuit also includes the argument that the group’s second amendment rights—its access to firearms—were trampled by the State Department’s export control restrictions. Cody Wilson, the group’s founder, argues that the State Department’s new declaration of its control over online gun files only makes that violation clearer. “It’s a land grab,” Wilson says. “With this instituted set of powers, you have a first and second amendment in name only.” A State Department spokesperson, who was authorized to speak to WIRED only on background, said that the notice in the federal register wasn’t intended to target specifically 3-D printed guns, and that its timing with Defense Distributed’s lawsuit was an “unfortunate coincidence.” He pointed out that the filing isn’t yet final, and that it remains open to public review and comment until August. He also argued that the restrictions wouldn’t limit the publication of discussion or illustrations of guns, only “technical data” for fabricating arms. It's not about free speech. This is about securing defense technology. STATE DEPARTMENT SPOKESPERSON “Let’s be clear: general descriptions, public discussions, and imagery of defense articles, including firearms, have never been subject to these regulations and will remain unaffected under these proposed revisions,” he wrote in a followup email. As for the letter to Defense Distributed, the State Department spokesperson confirmed that it was intended to counter the publication of 3-D printed gun blueprints. The spokesperson was unpersuaded by Defense Distributed’s free speech argument. “For us, it’s not about free speech. This is about securing defense technology,” he said. “If two US citizens want to email each other CAD files, that’s not our concern. But they need to follow the International Trade in Arms Regulations. ITAR compliance is ITAR compliance.” Defense Distributed’s attorney Matthew Goldstein, meanwhile, argues that the State Department’s moves only bolster his client’s free speech case. “It means there’s no doubt as to the scope of their prior restraint against this company,” says Goldstein, using the legal term “prior restraint” to mean a legal restriction against speech before it’s published, which has long been considered unconstitutional. “It’s a tremendous help to the case.” Other lawyers have taken a different view of that free speech claim, arguing that it may not so clearly apply when the information in question is an actual weapon file, ready to be 3-D printed into a lethal firearm. “The State Department’s takedown demand probably qualifies as a prior restraint, to which courts are incredibly hostile,” intellectual property lawyer Ansel Halliburton wrote in an op-ed for Techcrunch after the State Department’s original letter demanded Defense Distributed remove its gun files from the internet. “But the ability to download a file, press ‘Print,’ and have gun parts come out could also tip some judges toward calling gun CAD files functional things and allowing the government to regulate them.” The new State Department restrictions come as Congress also begins to re-examine potential regulations on 3-D printed weapons. New York Representative Steve Israel on Tuesday re-introduced a bill to ban any firearm whose core components are undetectable in a metal detector, which would effectively outlaw many 3-D printed guns. “When I started talking about the issue of completely plastic firearms, I was told the idea of a plastic gun is science-fiction,” Israel wrote in a statement to WIRED last April. “That science-fiction is now a dangerous reality.” The controversy over 3-D printable gun files isn’t the first time the State Department’s export controls have clashed with new digital technologies. In the 1990s, the same list of export-restricted munitions included encryption software; Cryptographer Dan Bernstein sued the State Department on first amendment grounds and won his case. But the government appealed, and control of encryption software was moved to the Commerce Department and then granted a special exception. Defense Distributed’s lawsuit could represent the biggest clash since then between the federal government’s export control of digital weapons and free speech. And rather than back down, the State Department seems to be raising the stakes.

#### They exist in the squo – if it was really that easy, transition would’ve already occurred.

#### Inner city youth don’t’ have access to 3-D printers – common.

#### [Braga takes it out]

### Private Ownership

http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/private-ownership

the fact of being owned by a private individual or organization, rather than by the state or a public body

## K – Black Self Defense

### A2 cotrrol

#### And, racist-over criminalization exists, but that is a problem with enforcement, not the desirability of gun laws by black communities. Rather than abandoning any measure to stop crime, priorities simply need to change to dealing with enforcement. This only happens when we implement gun bans in combination with the community and their values and concerns that work together to get gun laws passed and deal with criminalization.

De Leeuw 2: De Leeuw, Michael B., et al. "Ready, Aim, Fire? District Of Columbia V. Heller And Communities Of Color." Harvard Blackletter Law Journal 25.(2009): 133-179. Academic Search Premier. Web. 22 Apr. 2016.

Although Cottrol and Diamond add an important perspective to the debate over gun control, the fact that early firearms regulations grew in part out of racist motives is simply not relevant to contemporary gun control laws, for several reasons. First, the context surrounding gun control laws has changed dramatically—early firearms restrictions were often adopted within the context of de jure segregation as a means of reinforcing racial inequality; contemporary gun control laws, by contrast, have typically been enacted with the participation and support of minority communities. Second, the proposition that a greater prevalence of firearms would improve public safety in minority communities is dubious at best. While there is admittedly mixed data on the effectiveness of gun control laws at reducing firearms-related violence, there is absolutely no reliable data showing an inverse relationship between rates of gun ownership and incidence of violent crime in urban areas. And finally, although we take seriously Cottrol and Diamond’s argument about racially disparate enforcement of facially neutral firearms laws, this point speaks more to the way that existing criminal firearms laws are enforced and the penalties that are sought by prosecutors, rather than to the per se desirability of such laws. A change in priorities with respect to the enforcement of criminal firearms laws, rather than the wholesale abandonment of such laws, is the proper response to concerns about racially disproportionate enforcement. Each of these points is discussed in further detail below.

De Leeuw 2: De Leeuw, Michael B., et al. "Ready, Aim, Fire? District Of Columbia V. Heller And Communities Of Color." Harvard Blackletter Law Journal 25.(2009): 133-179. Academic Search Premier. Web. 22 Apr. 2016.

In being tarnished by racism, nineteenth century gun control laws were not in any sense unique—the nineteenth century in America was, after all, a period of slavery for sixty years, followed almost immediately by four decades of segregation. Racism infected many if not most of the institutions of the time. The 1870s, for instance, saw the birth of the labor movement in the U.S., and the earliest labor unions restricted membership on the basis of race and supported discriminatory government policies such as the Chinese Exclusion Act.179 But the racist history of nineteenth century gun laws does not justify the conclusion that contemporary firearms regulations are therefore also racist in origin or intent, any more than the racist history of the early American labor movement compels the conclusion that contemporary trade unions are a tool of white supremacy. The historical context has changed. The firearms regulations at issue in Heller, for instance, were enacted and enforced under different circumstances and for different purposes than the nineteenth century gun laws discussed by Cottrol and Diamond. Simply put, there is absolutely no evidence of similar discriminatory intent in the enactment of the District’s firearms laws. White terrorism of the sort inflicted by the Klan or lynch mobs no longer constitutes the primary form of violence committed against African Americans nationally or in the District.180 And the District’s demographics and history belie the suggestion that its municipal firearms regulations are tools of white oppression or are motivated by irrational white prejudice.

### williams

#### Read the lit – Williams concludes BSD b/c the south was a jungle

Williams’s answer to this question posed to him by the women of his race inspired him to create the philosophy he takes with him to his death. The consistent failure of the courts to protect Black people and arrest the tyranny of state actors like police, and extra-state terrorists like the Klan, made clear to Williams that “in a civilized society the law is a deterrent against the strong who would take advantage of the weak, but the South is not a civilized society; the South is a social jungle, so in cases like that we had to revert to the law of the jungle; that it had become necessary for us to create our own deterrent. And I said that in the future we would defend our women and children, our homes and ourselves with our arms. That we would meet violence with violence.”45 This trial was critical for Williams. This trial meant much more than one woman not receiving due justice, but was rather a symbolic struggle for something much bigger. Williams felt that “the force of these complex racial and sexual dynamics” was what was at stake.46 He understood that white violence against Black women was not just an attack on women but an attack upon the race; a demonstration of their women’s debasement and their men’s inability to confront violence. Like Ida B. Wells-Barnett and T.Thomas Fortune the century before him, Williams understood that the rape of our women, the death of our men, and the criminalization of our Black boys was part of the racist architecture designed to keep the entire race subservient and dehumanized. Many scholars married to the disciplinary arrangement of knowledge will likely resist the historical contextualization of Williams’s position, choosing only to see the objectification of women, rather than the at large strategy to destroy the race; a tactic of racist whites to not only objectify Black women, and target them in hopes of emasculating the Black men and deterring any concrete action against white violence or white life. This was a reformulation of Black masculinity, where these Black men were protecting friends and wives, sisters and daughters, while racist whites were attempting to use these women as tools for the dehumanization of the Black community as a whole.

#### Your alt is not revolution

Because violence is ubiquitous in the American South, Williams asserts when the law fails to protect the rights of Blacks, Blacks must take up arms to protect themselves (their homes, their wives, and their children). Rather than being a revolutionary sentiment aimed at overthrowing the government, in toto, Williams asserts “the right of Negroes to meet the violence of the Ku Klux Klan by armed self-defense. . . . It has always been an accepted right of Americans, as the history of our Western states proves, that where the law is unable, or unwilling to enforce order, the citizens can, and must act in self-defense against lawless violence. I believe this right holds for Black Americans as well as whites.”73 Williams illustrates the stance vividly in his chapter entitled “Self-Defense Prevents Bloodshed.” In 1961, the NAACP chapter of Monroe, North Carolina picketed the town’s swimming pool demanding integration of this public space. When the demonstrators would break for lunch in a picnic area reserved for white people only, an area that should not exist five years after desegregation, groups of whites formed aiming to intimidate the Black protestors by firing rifles at the trees above their heads. When the police was asked to stop the whites from shooting at the protestors, his reply was “Oh, I don’t hear anything.”74 Williams appealed to the Justice Department to protect the Black picketers; they replied this was a matter for the local police. A few days later, an attempt on Williams’s life was made. A 1955 Desoto sedan tried to run him off a cliff. When he presented his damaged vehicle to the police chief, the police chief laughed and said “I don’t see anything. I don’t see anything at all.”75 As the white dissenters and police presence grew around the Black protestors, so did the violence. In what could have certainly been the end of Robert F. Williams, a white driver rammed his car into a ditch. The police saw the incident and chose not to intervene. The white driver exited his car with a baseball bat yelling “Nigger, what did you hit me for?”76 This happened while the observing white crowd screamed “Kill the niggers! Kill the niggers! Pour gasoline on the niggers! Burn the niggers!”77 Williams had two pistols and a rifle in his car. It was these weapons that saved his life and prevented him from being lynched. K needs to win a few things

#### William’s solvency is predicated on a psychological claim that has been empirically nullified

Some find it fanciful to believe violence against whites is ever necessary to address racism, but these individual also lack knowledge of what racism truly is: the unrelenting violence and genocidal logics producing endless Black deaths with little recourse for the loss of those lives. Williams believes he survived that day for the operation of one maxim: “When an oppressed people show a willingness to defend themselves, the enemy, who is a moral weakling and coward is more willing to grant concessions and work for a respectable compromise. Psychologically, moreover, racists consider themselves superior beings and they are not willing to exchange their superior lives for our inferior ones. They are most vicious and violent when they can practice violence with impunity.”78 Similar to the charge against lynch mobs advanced by Ida B. Wells-Barnett, the reason every Black home should have a special place for a Winchester rifle, Williams recognized that challenging white life was ultimately the key to Black survival. Because racist orders cannot see Black people as human beings, there is not any regard for the suffering, pain or even death of Blacks. Such logics can only be uprooted; they cannot be persuaded. This is where one begins to grasp the meaning of his pre-emptive program.

#### 1] Integrationism is impossible

#### 2] Liberation Requires Bloodshed

#### Progress is possible – this means no try or die for the neg and they have to weigh alt solvency against the progress of history and the aff.

#### Only way to make a “no progress claim” is to make some vtl/ontological claim – but should be a question of lived experiences.

### ROB

#### Cannot just be about scholarship –

#### A] Aff is a combination of scholarship

#### B] take action without

### Case Outweighs

#### Liberation may require bloodshed – but the only blood being shed absent the aff are blacks.

#### We’ve isolated how guns tear apart inner cities – Guns destroy solidarity and fuel arms races against each other, not the white supremacist or the state. The alt can’t bridge this gap and is doomed to failure.

#### Of course white police and vigilantes still shoot blacks, but racism is now predominately covert not OVERT. The issue isn’t the KKK, but how white supremacists structure societal conditions to guarantee black failure and criminality – only the aff deals with that.

#### Empirically - Gun violence towards blacks stem from within the community

DOJ ’11: (Alexia Cooper and Erica L. Smith, BJS Statisticians. “Homicide Trends in the United States, 1980-2008.” U.S Department of Justice, November 2011//FT)

Most murders were intraracial From 1980 through 2008—

 84% of white victims were killed by whites (­ gure 19).

 93% of black victims were killed by blacks.

#### Their positions stems from privilege – we conclude their impact outweighs b/c the media focuses on white on black violence.

McWhirter ’12: (CAMERON MCWHIRTER and GARY FIELDS. “Communities Struggle to Break a Grim Cycle of Killing.” WSJ. Aug 18 2012//FT)

There is little national attention from policy makers. "I have not seen any federal legislation which would tackle the huge problem" of crime among black Americans, said Mr. Gale, a captain in the Denver County sheriff's department. "I am not even sure what such a bill would look like," he added. Because black-on-black violence tends to stay[s] concentrated within poorer, inner-city areas, there is a lack of wider awareness of the depth of the problem, said Jack Levin of the Brudnick Center on Violence and Conflict at Northeastern University in Boston. "Nobody in this room would even know the name Trayvon Martin if it had been a black kid who shot [him] Trayvon Martin," said Philadelphia Police Commissioner Charles Ramsey, an African American, speaking at a gun-violence research forum.

### Alt

#### 1] We live within the system – black people live within the system – they can’t just put their life on hold as you theorize about violent black revolution – How will you feed the revolution, how will you pay the hospital bills of someone who was shot? – interim steps are necessary

#### You need to articulate

### Perm

#### Perm: Do Both – Black Self Defense requires solidarity

#### Perm: Do the aff and non-mutually exclusive parts of the alt --- your offense derives from challenging integrationist politics – the aff isn’t integrationist – just that the state should correct for the bullshit it’s doen.

#### Long Guns –

#### Perm Do both – would reduce restrictions on long guns b/c it affirms black self-defense. --- CX is clear – no gun control in the world of alt.

#### Perm resolves the gourevitch net benefit – if it solves then it has to solve the racist apparatus – if it can’t solve with the inclusion of a gun ban – the fact there is war on drugs, etc – proves no alt solvency.

### Links

If it’s about the scholarship – there’s nothing in the aff that affirms integrationst scholarship, or says black self defense is inherently bad – we say that guns are criminogenic b.c of the complex situation black inner city youth are in – and if gun ownership didn’t cause an arms race towards violence that fractured black communities, we’d be fine with them.

### Violent Revolution Unnecessary

## K – Agamben

#### 1] Case Outweighs –

#### 2] We’ll isolate two disads to the alt – it might seem good in theory, but in reality it recreates more violence.

#### A] You create the sovereign citizen – violence of the state is enacted through individuals.

Young 15 (Alex Trimble, Dornsife Preceptor Postdoctoral Teaching Fellowship at the University of Southern California, “The Settler Unchained Constituent Power and Settler Violence,” September 2015, http://www.academia.edu/16407736/The\_Settler\_Unchained\_Constituent\_Power\_and\_Settler\_Violence\_)//ghs-VA

As the steady rollback of gun control measures and the proliferation of “stand your ground” laws attest, in **the** United States this conception of the sovereign citizen is gaining ground against liberal advocacy for a state “monopoly of violence” (a phrase Beck spuriously attributes to the founding fathers).5 This being the case, and given that people of color and indigenous peoples bear the brunt of gun violence in overwhelmingly disproportionate numbers, it is necessary to ask whether this conception of the Weberian state adequately accounts for the endemic violence against racialized and indigenous populations in the United States. The drafting of the Second Amendment, while inspired in part by settler colonists’ fear of centralized state power, was also profoundly motivated by a fear of slave uprisings and of what the Declaration of Independence calls “the inhabitants of our frontiers . . . the merciless Indian savages.” 6 Anglo-American settlers enshrined the right to bear arms in the constitution in large part because they believed the federal government — like the British imperial government before it — would be too cumbersome and centralized a bureaucracy to facilitate the violence necessary to sustain the process of indigenous dispossession and the institution of chattel slavery. Beck argues for the Second Amendment’s role in preserving constituent power as a check on racial and anti-indigenous violence. This decoupling of necropolitical violence from the state however serves as vital means of perpetuating the very forms of oppression and dispossession that Beck claims the right to bear arms might prevent. My purpose in this article is to argue that the mode of resistance to the state’s “monopoly of violence” exemplified by Beck’s gun politics is indicative of a specifically settler colonial conception of sovereignty. In his essay “Necropolitics,” Achille Mbembe employs an expansive definition of sovereignty to capture the fluid nature of sovereign power in a colonial African context in which “the generalization of insecurity has deepened the societal distinction between those who bear weapons (armes) and those who do not.”7 For Mbembe, “the ultimate expression of sovereignty resides, to a large degree, in the power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die. . . . To exercise sovereignty is to exercise control over mortality and to define life as the deployment and manifestation of power.”8 Such an understanding of sovereignty is equally important for understanding the irregular nature of the exercise of sovereign power on the settler colonial frontier and the peculiar situation in the contemporary United States, where an increasing power to “dictate who may live and who must die” is granted to individual citizens. This mode of sovereignty distributes the capacity for necropolitical violence throughout the settler polity, allowing it to be unleashed by individuals operating independently of, and occasionally in defiance of, the constituted power of the state. In Mbembe’s analysis, Europe stands as a stronghold of the jus publicum in which the power to kill is “civilized” by its accrual to the state, whereas “the colonies are like the frontiers. They are inhabited by ‘savages.’ The colonies are not organized into a state form and have not created a human world.”9 The postfrontier settler colony stands as an anomaly in this spacialization of sovereign power. There is no doubt that these societies share with Europe a juridical order shaped by the extreme violence of the state.10 Settler colonies never succeed, however, in overcoming indigenous resistance or in shedding their own frontier self-images. As a result, the settler colony never relegates the category of the “savage” to a space beyond its borders or entirely suppresses the anomic violence employed against indigenous and racialized bodies by the settler polity within the sovereign territory of the settler state. The contemporary United States — with its proliferation of violent right-wing terrorist groups operating with near impunity in defiance of the liberal state — stands as the extreme example of this phenomenon. While suggesting that the gun politics of Glenn Beck and his followers constitutes a mode of settler violence might seem an obvious enough point to make, the parallels in his rhetoric to that of the academic Left is not an accident. A romanticization of settler sovereignty also haunts many leftist theorizations that imagine liberation struggles as a Manichean showdown between constituent power and the state’s monopoly of violence. Such formulations celebrate constituent power as a mode of popular sovereignty that predates and exceeds the constituted power of the state.11 In so doing, these formulations either elide or, in extreme examples such as the one considered below, celebrate the anti-indigenous violence that underwrites popular sovereignty in European political philosophy’s favorite example of the space of constituent power: the American frontier.

#### 2] We’ll a state phobia disad to the alt – proves you get coopted for neoliberal agendas.

Esposito 14: (Luigi, Prof Sociology @Barry, Laura, Asst. Prof Sociology and Criminology @Barry, Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States, Theory in Action, Vol. 7, No. 2, April ) Esposito and Finley, PhDs, 14//FT)

In a 2003 article, Yale legal scholar and psychologist Dan M. Kahan argues that the ongoing debate about gun control in the U.S. has been dominated by what he calls the “tyranny of econometrics” (i.e., debates revolve around whether or not “more guns” produce more or less crime and violence). Kahan suggests this focus on quantitative outcomes either ignores or trivializes how both sides of this debate are predicated on fundamentally different worldviews that shape and give coherence to their respective interpretations of “what America is and ought to be” (Kahan, 2003, p. 6). Specifically, a focus on econometrics downplays how the majority of those who support gun control base their position on an egalitarian and solidaristic view of the world, while a majority of those who oppose gun control base their arguments on a more hierarchical and individualistic vision. Without taking these opposing visions into account, the debate ignores the crucial relevance of culture in shaping people’s attitudes about gun control. Consistent with Kahan’s analysis, one might also argue that both sides of the gun control debate have very different understandings about the role of government in a free and democratic society. Among those who support gun control, a majority tends to embrace a progressive understanding of government. Stated simply, they believe that people— through activism and direct participation—can harness the power of government to advance human freedom, challenge societal injustices, and protect the common good (Esposito and Finley 2012). Government, in this sense, can be a potentially benevolent mechanism that works to create a better society for all. This position stands in sharp contrast to the vision espoused by a majority [For those] who oppose gun control. Among many of those in this latter camp, government is invariably the enemy and can therefore never be trusted to promote the well-being of the populace. Self-reliant individuals competing in a free market, as opposed to a central authority, is what promotes an optimal society. According to this viewpoint, hierarchy is simply a natural product of freedom and it is really up to individuals to look after their own interests—including their personal safety. Having unrestricted (or minimally restricted) access to firearms as a way to protect oneself and one’s family should thus be a fundamental right. For over three decades, this latter position—which has dominated social, political, and cultural discourse in the United States—has been bolstered and reinforced by the market ideology often referred to as neoliberalism. At its most basic, neoliberalism is typically associated with pro-market policies such as de-regulation, privatization, and liberalization. Neoliberalism, however, is far more than simply a body of policy prescriptions. Developed in opposition to Keynesianism and similar theories calling for a regulated economy and a strong welfare state, the architects of neoliberalism, which include economists such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, understand the free market as a quasi-infallible mechanism for organizing social life (e.g., Harvey 2005; Klein 2007; Giroux 2008; Esposito 2011). Centralized state planning, according to neoliberals, is burdened by a series of bureaucratic restraints that compromise efficiency, particularly within the social and economic realms (Harvey 2005) . Therefore, rather than relying on the state, most social or economic objectives are best achieved by individuals operating within the private realm (e.g., Friedman and Friedman 1980; Friedman 1982). It is within the private realm that persons have the freedom to act in their self-interest as they “see fit.” Neoliberalism, in this respect, draws from classical liberal principles and emphasizes that, under conditions of freedom, individuals are rational actors who constantly makes calculations of what will serve them best. Minimizing government and handing over as much of the economy and society in general to the private sector is thus a central objective in the neoliberal agenda. This shift presumably promotes an efficient order of autonomous individuals who, by freely pursuing their preferences, are able to meet their own needs and control their own destinies.

#### Perm Do Both:

#### Perm Do the Alt then the Aff:

#### Perm Do the aff then the alt:

#### Sequencing the two are fine – since competition is a question if there’s an opportunity cost – if the alt can be done after , then it’s not an OC.

#### There’s no link – we challenge the state’s violence through the conditions it creates – alt has to be able to include this kind of violence or its focus is myopic and can’t solve.

### Bare Life False

### State Phobia DA

#### We’ll a state phobia disad to the alt – proves you get coopted for neoliberal agendas.

Esposito 14: (Luigi, Prof Sociology @Barry, Laura, Asst. Prof Sociology and Criminology @Barry, Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States, Theory in Action, Vol. 7, No. 2, April ) Esposito and Finley, PhDs, 14//FT)

In a 2003 article, Yale legal scholar and psychologist Dan M. Kahan argues that the ongoing debate about gun control in the U.S. has been dominated by what he calls the “tyranny of econometrics” (i.e., debates revolve around whether or not “more guns” produce more or less crime and violence). Kahan suggests this focus on quantitative outcomes either ignores or trivializes how both sides of this debate are predicated on fundamentally different worldviews that shape and give coherence to their respective interpretations of “what America is and ought to be” (Kahan, 2003, p. 6). Specifically, a focus on econometrics downplays how the majority of those who support gun control base their position on an egalitarian and solidaristic view of the world, while a majority of those who oppose gun control base their arguments on a more hierarchical and individualistic vision. Without taking these opposing visions into account, the debate ignores the crucial relevance of culture in shaping people’s attitudes about gun control. Consistent with Kahan’s analysis, one might also argue that both sides of the gun control debate have very different understandings about the role of government in a free and democratic society. Among those who support gun control, a majority tends to embrace a progressive understanding of government. Stated simply, they believe that people— through activism and direct participation—can harness the power of government to advance human freedom, challenge societal injustices, and protect the common good (Esposito and Finley 2012). Government, in this sense, can be a potentially benevolent mechanism that works to create a better society for all. This position stands in sharp contrast to the vision espoused by a majority [For those] who oppose gun control. Among many of those in this latter camp, government is invariably the enemy and can therefore never be trusted to promote the well-being of the populace. Self-reliant individuals competing in a free market, as opposed to a central authority, is what promotes an optimal society. According to this viewpoint, hierarchy is simply a natural product of freedom and it is really up to individuals to look after their own interests—including their personal safety. Having unrestricted (or minimally restricted) access to firearms as a way to protect oneself and one’s family should thus be a fundamental right. For over three decades, this latter position—which has dominated social, political, and cultural discourse in the United States—has been bolstered and reinforced by the market ideology often referred to as neoliberalism. At its most basic, neoliberalism is typically associated with pro-market policies such as de-regulation, privatization, and liberalization. Neoliberalism, however, is far more than simply a body of policy prescriptions. Developed in opposition to Keynesianism and similar theories calling for a regulated economy and a strong welfare state, the architects of neoliberalism, which include economists such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, understand the free market as a quasi-infallible mechanism for organizing social life (e.g., Harvey 2005; Klein 2007; Giroux 2008; Esposito 2011). Centralized state planning, according to neoliberals, is burdened by a series of bureaucratic restraints that compromise efficiency, particularly within the social and economic realms (Harvey 2005) . Therefore, rather than relying on the state, most social or economic objectives are best achieved by individuals operating within the private realm (e.g., Friedman and Friedman 1980; Friedman 1982). It is within the private realm that persons have the freedom to act in their self-interest as they “see fit.” Neoliberalism, in this respect, draws from classical liberal principles and emphasizes that, under conditions of freedom, individuals are rational actors who constantly makes calculations of what will serve them best. Minimizing government and handing over as much of the economy and society in general to the private sector is thus a central objective in the neoliberal agenda. This shift presumably promotes an efficient order of autonomous individuals who, by freely pursuing their preferences, are able to meet their own needs and control their own destinies.

### Settler Colonialism DA

#### You create the sovereign citizen – violence of the state is enacted through individuals.

Young 15 (Alex Trimble, Dornsife Preceptor Postdoctoral Teaching Fellowship at the University of Southern California, “The Settler Unchained Constituent Power and Settler Violence,” September 2015, http://www.academia.edu/16407736/The\_Settler\_Unchained\_Constituent\_Power\_and\_Settler\_Violence\_)//ghs-VA

As the steady rollback of gun control measures and the proliferation of “stand your ground” laws attest, in **the** United States this conception of the sovereign citizen is gaining ground against liberal advocacy for a state “monopoly of violence” (a phrase Beck spuriously attributes to the founding fathers).5 This being the case, and given that people of color and indigenous peoples bear the brunt of gun violence in overwhelmingly disproportionate numbers, it is necessary to ask whether this conception of the Weberian state adequately accounts for the endemic violence against racialized and indigenous populations in the United States. The drafting of the Second Amendment, while inspired in part by settler colonists’ fear of centralized state power, was also profoundly motivated by a fear of slave uprisings and of what the Declaration of Independence calls “the inhabitants of our frontiers . . . the merciless Indian savages.” 6 Anglo-American settlers enshrined the right to bear arms in the constitution in large part because they believed the federal government — like the British imperial government before it — would be too cumbersome and centralized a bureaucracy to facilitate the violence necessary to sustain the process of indigenous dispossession and the institution of chattel slavery. Beck argues for the Second Amendment’s role in preserving constituent power as a check on racial and anti-indigenous violence. This decoupling of necropolitical violence from the state however serves as vital means of perpetuating the very forms of oppression and dispossession that Beck claims the right to bear arms might prevent. My purpose in this article is to argue that the mode of resistance to the state’s “monopoly of violence” exemplified by Beck’s gun politics is indicative of a specifically settler colonial conception of sovereignty. In his essay “Necropolitics,” Achille Mbembe employs an expansive definition of sovereignty to capture the fluid nature of sovereign power in a colonial African context in which “the generalization of insecurity has deepened the societal distinction between those who bear weapons (armes) and those who do not.”7 For Mbembe, “the ultimate expression of sovereignty resides, to a large degree, in the power and the capacity to dictate who may live and who must die. . . . To exercise sovereignty is to exercise control over mortality and to define life as the deployment and manifestation of power.”8 Such an understanding of sovereignty is equally important for understanding the irregular nature of the exercise of sovereign power on the settler colonial frontier and the peculiar situation in the contemporary United States, where an increasing power to “dictate who may live and who must die” is granted to individual citizens. This mode of sovereignty distributes the capacity for necropolitical violence throughout the settler polity, allowing it to be unleashed by individuals operating independently of, and occasionally in defiance of, the constituted power of the state. In Mbembe’s analysis, Europe stands as a stronghold of the jus publicum in which the power to kill is “civilized” by its accrual to the state, whereas “the colonies are like the frontiers. They are inhabited by ‘savages.’ The colonies are not organized into a state form and have not created a human world.”9 The postfrontier settler colony stands as an anomaly in this spacialization of sovereign power. There is no doubt that these societies share with Europe a juridical order shaped by the extreme violence of the state.10 Settler colonies never succeed, however, in overcoming indigenous resistance or in shedding their own frontier self-images. As a result, the settler colony never relegates the category of the “savage” to a space beyond its borders or entirely suppresses the anomic violence employed against indigenous and racialized bodies by the settler polity within the sovereign territory of the settler state. The contemporary United States — with its proliferation of violent right-wing terrorist groups operating with near impunity in defiance of the liberal state — stands as the extreme example of this phenomenon. While suggesting that the gun politics of Glenn Beck and his followers constitutes a mode of settler violence might seem an obvious enough point to make, the parallels in his rhetoric to that of the academic Left is not an accident. A romanticization of settler sovereignty also haunts many leftist theorizations that imagine liberation struggles as a Manichean showdown between constituent power and the state’s monopoly of violence. Such formulations celebrate constituent power as a mode of popular sovereignty that predates and exceeds the constituted power of the state.11 In so doing, these formulations either elide or, in extreme examples such as the one considered below, celebrate the anti-indigenous violence that underwrites popular sovereignty in European political philosophy’s favorite example of the space of constituent power: the American frontier.

## DA – Elections

### Real Politik bad

#### Tension is inevitable – empirically there’s always been a politics, elections, or mid-terms disad that’s “more important than the aff” – We must first engage in a debate about justice, absent these concerns, to ever challenge the squo.

King ’63: (Martin Luther King Jr. "Letter from a Birmingham Jail [King, Jr.]" April 1963 AFRICAN STUDIES CENTER - UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA//FT)

I must make two honest confessions to you, my Christian and Jewish brothers. First, I must confess that over the past few years I have been gravely disappointed with the white moderate. I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro's great stumbling block in his stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen's Counciler or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white moderate, who is more devoted to "order" than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says: "I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I cannot agree with your methods of direct action"; who paternalistically believes he can set the timetable for another man's freedom; who lives by a mythical concept of time and who constantly advises the Negro to wait for a "more convenient season." Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.

"I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that law and order exist for the purpose of establishing justice and that when they fail in this purpose they become the dangerously structured dams that block the flow of social progress. I had hoped that the white moderate would understand that the present tension in the South is a necessary phase of the transition from an obnoxious negative peace, in which the Negro passively accepted his unjust plight, to a substantive and positive peace, in which all men will respect the dignity and worth of human personality. Actually, we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured so long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured."

"In your statement you assert that our actions, even though peaceful, must be condemned because they precipitate violence. But is this a logical assertion? Isn't this like condemning a robbed man because his possession of money precipitated the evil act of robbery? Isn't this like condemning Socrates because his unswerving commitment to truth and his philosophical inquiries precipitated the act by the misguided populace in which they made him drink hemlock? Isn't this like condemning Jesus because his unique God consciousness and never ceasing devotion to God's will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? We must come to see that, as the federal courts have consistently affirmed, it is wrong to urge an individual to cease his efforts to gain his basic constitutional rights because the quest may precipitate violence. Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber. I had also hoped that the white moderate would reject the myth concerning [of] time in relation to the struggle for freedom. I have just received a letter from a white brother in Texas. He writes: [stating] "All Christians know that the colored people will receive equal rights eventually, but it is possible that you are in too great a religious hurry. It has taken Christianity almost two thousand years to accomplish what it has. The teachings of Christ take time to come to earth." Such an attitude stems from a tragic misconception of time, from the strangely irrational notion that there is something in the very flow of time that will inevitably cure all ills. Actually, time itself is neutral; it can be used either destructively or constructively. More and more I feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than have the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the hateful words and actions of the bad people but for the appalling silence of the good people. Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be co workers with God, and without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation. We must use time creatively, in the knowledge that the time is always ripe to do right. Now is the time to make real the promise of democracy and transform our pending national elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. Now is the time to lift our national policy from the quicksand of racial injustice to the solid rock of human dignity."

### Trump

## DA – Sentencing Reform

### --- AT: Sentencing Reform

#### Bill is too weak.

Hunter 4/27: (Dee Hunter/Urban News Service, “Criminal justice reform snagged in campaign politics.” District Chronicles. April 27, 2016//FT)

Grassley’s measure addresses several stringent sentencing provisions that have helped swell the federal prison population over the past 30 years. It would repeal the “three strikes” law that requires a mandatory life sentence without parole for anyone with a third conviction on drug or violent-felony charges. Instead, the bill creates a mandatory 25-year sentence. This legislation retroactively applies a 2010 sentencing-reform provision that reduced the disparity between crack and powder cocaine penalties. This change alone would let about 6,500 prisoners petition the courts for release or reduced sentences. Grassley’s bill also includes juvenile justice reforms and language to help former prisoners transition back into society. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Kentucky), facing pressure from tough-on-crime Republicans, has not said whether he will allow a vote on Grassley’s proposal. “Our system of justice is not broken,” former U.S. attorney general John Ashcroft wrote last month in a letter to McConnell, signed by 40 high-ranking former law enforcement officials. “Mandatory minimums have caused a dramatic reduction in crime.” Reform advocates do not consider Grassley’s legislation the major overhaul of mandatory minimum sentences for which they long have fought, saying his bill does not go far enough. “It’s a Goldilocks reform bill. It’s not too much. It’s not too little. But it’s better than nothing,” said Nkechi Taifa of the Open Society Policy Center. “There was a time when this looked like a slam dunk … It was the right issue at the right time. Now it is not so clear.”

#### Impact is marginal – only federal justice system

Hunter 4/27: (Dee Hunter/Urban News Service, “Criminal justice reform snagged in campaign politics.” District Chronicles. April 27, 2016//FT)

This bill only applies to the federal justice system, where about 200,000 inmates are held. This is just 8 percent of the 2.5 million Americans confined to state prisons and local jails.

#### Obama poll cap is not key – bipartisan support is wide-spread and reforms have been in the works before Obama entered

Blade 15: Rachel Blade. (Blade covers Congress. She joined POLITICO in September 2012 as a tax reporter, covering the IRS tea party targeting scandal, the tax reform "unicorn" on Capitol Hill, nationwide tax policy trends and areas where taxes intersect with other policies, such as Obamacare tax credits. She also founded the Pro Report and Morning Tax, two daily Pro policy briefings.)"Criminal Justice Reform Gains Bipartisan Momentum." POLITICO. N.p., 15 July 2015. Web. 19 Dec. 2015. http3A2F2Fwww.politico.com2Fstory2F20152F072Fcriminal-justice-reform-gains-bipartisan-momentum-120125.

As President Barack Obama on Tuesday evening called on Congress to take up criminal justice reform, a bipartisan group on Capitol Hill was putting the final touches on a sentencing overhaul deal to be announced as soon as next week. Their message to the president: You’re preaching to the choir. “We’ve actually been working on it for quite a while,” said Senate Majority Whip John Cornyn (R-Texas), one of the key negotiators of a package being hashed by members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. “You may see some legislation here in the next week or so. This is active. … [W]e’re close.” Obama told a crowd of 3,300 at the NAACP convention in Philadelphia that he’s “feeling more hopeful today” about the prospects of legislation because Republicans and Democrats never agree on anything but “a lot of them agree on this.” “Republican senators from Utah and Texas are joining Democratic senators from New Jersey and Rhode Island to talk about how Congress can pass meaningful criminal justice reform this year,” Obama said. “We should pass a sentencing reform bill through Congress this year.” Right now, the prospects for such legislation seem good, given that lawmakers from both parties have been wrangling with a reform bill for months. Tuesday, for example, the House Oversight Committee became at least the third congressional panel to highlight problems in the justice system, inviting two governors, a handful of senators, House members and experts to discuss a path forward for reducing the number of inmates in federal prisons. Hours later, the House officially formed the Congressional Criminal Justice and Public Safety Caucus, which will include justice reform supporters. And across the Capitol, Cornyn joined Sens. Mike Lee (R-Utah), Cory Booker (D-N.J.) and Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I) for a public dialogue that emphasized the importance of reform. The biggest announcement is just around the corner: Senate Judiciary Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-Iowa) told POLITICO on Tuesday that his panel is close to announcing a deal on the bipartisan package his panel has been working on for months. Only about four outstanding issues remain, he said, predicting the package will be unveiled before August recess.

#### The uniqueness on this is just too good - it will happen sooner or later

Lennard 1/11: (Natasha Lennard, “ELECTION YEAR ANTI-CRIME POSTURING COULD DERAIL EVEN LIMITED SENTENCING REFORM,” the Intercept, Jan. 11 2016, 12:08 p.m.//FT)

Such was the landscape of allegedly historic shifts and realpolitikal compromise on criminal justice reform in 2015. All Democratic presidential candidates and most Republicans called for it, specifically but ambiguously citing the need to end mass incarceration. In December, the general counsel of Koch Industries met for the fourth time with White House officials to discuss support for bipartisan reform bills advancing through the House and Senate. The House bill, the Sentencing Reform Act, and the Senate bill, the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act, have passed their respective judiciary committees. Both reduce federal mandatory minimums for nonviolent drug offenses, lower the sentence for three-strike drug felons from life to 25 years and (importantly) would apply retroactively — so would be applicable to current prisoners to seek early release. That such legislation might reach the president’s desk does signal a shift in contemporary U.S. politics. Consensus support for any reform of this sort on Capitol Hill is significant in recent history, but that speaks mainly to decades of political intransigence on the issue. The legislation has limited reach, reducing harsh penalties for a select subset of drug offenders, and is also flawed; both bills introduce new mandatory minimums.

#### Sentencing reform has become a priority for key republican leaders --- they can’t just ditch it. --- this is an inevitable trend – state action is also possible – Minnesota proves

Dennis ’15: (Tom Dennis, “OUR OPINION: Watch for sentencing reform in 2016,” Grand Forks Herald, Dec 31, 2015 at 10:02 p.m//FT)

Then take a look at sentencing reform, which is turning out to be a surprising issue on which Republicans and Democrats are finding common ground. And if partisans can shake hands across the aisle on sensitive criminal-justice issues, maybe there's hope for compromise and moderation in American politics yet. Sentencing reform is coming about because of the convergence of several trends. Some of these have been documented in the Herald's series on poverty, which the newspaper has been printing this week. For example, the "three strikes, you're out" policy and other tough-on-crime initiatives of the 1980s and 90s "caused the number of incarcerated and supervised adults to more than triple," the Herald reported. As a result, about one in 31 American adults is in jail or on probation or parole, and one in eight American men has a felony criminal record. Don't misunderstand. This mass incarceration likely helped bring about a very positive trend: namely, the astounding drop in America's crime rate over the past 15 or 20 years. But that was then, and the bottom lines in 2015 are these: The good news is that the national crime rate now is lower than it has been in decades. The bad news is that thanks to Baby Boomers' retiring and other factors, communities across America—including Grand Forks—are facing serious labor shortages. So, are there ways to turn the large population of ex-cons into a labor pool, but to do so in ways that don't jeopardize public safety? That's what sentencing reform is all about. In Minnesota, this trend showed up as recently as Wednesday. "State leaders have signed off on a plan, years in the making, to reduce the time spent behind bars for first-time drug offenders and better distinguish addicts from potentially violent drug dealers," the Star Tribune reported. "The Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission voted 7-3 to overhaul the state's drug sentencing guidelines, reducing recommended prison sentences for first-time offenders. ... Unless the Legislature intervenes to stop or otherwise alter the changes, they will take effect in August. Analysts say that the changes could save 523 prison beds in Minnesota by 2028." One key, supporters say, is "to enable treatment for addicts rather than let them languish behind bars." In Congress, meanwhile, "the Senate Judiciary Committee passed a bill by a vote of 15-5 that would reduce some federal mandatory minimum drug and gun sentences in October," National Public Radio reported Wednesday. "Committee Chairman Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, recently ranked it as one of his priorities for the coming year. ... Republican House Speaker Paul Ryan has been sounding a hopeful note, too, telling an audience recently: 'I do believe that there are things where we can find common ground on next; criminal justice reform is a good example.'" Meanwhile, here's a quote that stood out from one of the Herald stories on this topic: "Research finds that people with low-level non-violent convictions are no more likely to reoffend than a person in the general population once they've remained crime-free for just three to four years." As the quote suggests, reintegrating ex-cons into the workforce doesn't have to be a foolish or naive reform. It's something that society can do with its eyes wide open, with sensible policies crafted after careful study of the odds. That's a reasonable and workable goal in 2016.

#### Your impact is marginal

Lennard 1/11: (Natasha Lennard, “ELECTION YEAR ANTI-CRIME POSTURING COULD DERAIL EVEN LIMITED SENTENCING REFORM,” the Intercept, Jan. 11 2016, 12:08 p.m.//FT)

That such legislation might reach the president’s desk does signal a shift in contemporary U.S. politics. Consensus support for any reform of this sort on Capitol Hill is significant in recent history, but that speaks mainly to decades of political intransigence on the issue. The legislation has limited reach, reducing harsh penalties for a select subset of drug offenders, and is also flawed; both bills introduce new mandatory minimums. Credit for the modest progress the bills represent certainly belongs to a popular resistance movement powerfully asserting that U.S. criminal justice systematically decimates black life. In June, Politico published an article titled “Riots spur Senate look at sentencing reform.” It was a causal stretch for which I’ll blame the vagaries of clickbait, but it conveyed a kernel of truth. Riots have historically prompted placation-aimed reforms. At the same time, decarceration efforts are now more palatable for tough-on-crime politicians, thanks to the existence of a vast nexus of technologies to surveil and control those deemed criminal, offering grim assurance that the carceral state is well-established beyond prison walls.

## DA – State Politics

### Cali

#### Brown’s politics are literally framed through fear.

Nazaryan ’16: (ALEXANDER NAZARYAN “HOW JERRY BROWN QUIETLY PULLED CALIFORNIA BACK FROM THE BRINK.” Newsweek. 4/14/16//FT)

Those trying to make sense of Brown’s pessimistic view of the state’s future note his friendship with the Stanford philosopher Jean-Pierre Dupuy, a theorist of the apocalypse who believes that telling people about the worst thing that could happen might actually make them act in a way that prevents it: instead of the audacity of hope, the efficacy of despair. In a recent op-ed, close California watcher Joe Mathews wrote that “ Brown’s famous skepticism of new programs makes sense if you believe, as Dupuy argues, that man is blind to the consequences of his own progress. Brown’s focus on avoiding catastrophes—including his rainy-day fund and his crusade on climate change—reflects Dupuy’s ‘prophet-of-doom’ calls.”

#### No Uniqueness

Walters ’16: (Dan Walters “California scores lowest on Moody’s fiscal ‘stress test’.” The Sacramento Bee. April 22, 2016//FT)

In addition to revenue volatility, the Moody’s report also cites California’s relative inflexibility on the spending side of the budget ledger and the fact that a the Legislature needs two-thirds vote to raise taxes, both of which expose it to greater peril if recession strikes

#### Your internal links are shoddy af

#### 1] Rainy day funds are important to keep gov budgets – but not for the private sector and its economy as a whole.

#### 2] Even if Cali is a big economy – there are hundreds of big economies and cali alone can’t trigger the link – empirically proven in 2008.

## CP – Ceasefire

#### CP alone is insufficient to solve -

Beckett ’15: (Lois Beckett. “How the Gun Control Debate Ignores Black Lives.” ProPublica. Novemeber 24, 2015//FT)

Other cities have tried Ceasefire, or half-tried it, and then abandoned it. The strategy requires resources, political buy-in, and ongoing trust between unlikely partners. The effort in Boston had “black and Latin and Cape Verdean clergy working with white Irish Catholic cops in a city that had a history of race relations leading up to that point that was abysmal,” Brown said. “It was really a shift in behavior, in the way we did business.” These partnerships can be fragile. Boston’s own Ceasefire effort fell apart in 2000, researchers said. There was infighting and the police official who led it got another assignment. In subsequent years, homicides of young men crept up again. An endless number of variables can affect crime, making it hard to know how much a particular effort works. Daniel Webster, director of the Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research, noted that the current research only evaluates the short-term effects of the program, so it’s still unclear how well it works over the long term.

#### Aff helps resolves root cause of violent environment – this does not

#### Aff ev proves lot of violence is caused by heightened aggression and tension filled environment which reachout programs can’t prevent – that’s why its only 40-70% --- wihc is is not enough –

#### Kairys proves that aff is key to bolster CP solvency – you can’t have police cooperation when there is widescale stigma of “black on black crime” b/c of race

## CP – Gun Control

### Can’t Solve

#### Lafollete proves illicit guns are accessed through a legal supply –

#### Most inner city youth already get guns from informal means – like stealing, family, associates, and dealers – so it can’t solve.

#### There’s just no accountability

Willis ’16: (Willis, Tiffany. "Better Gun Control Would Reduce Gang-Related Violence." Organized Crime. Ed. David Haugen, Susan Musser, and Michael Chaney. Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2014. Opposing Viewpoints. Rpt. from "Who Arms America's Gangs?: Responsible Gun Owners." LiberalAmerica.org. 2013. Opposing Viewpoints in Context. Web. 9 Jan. 2016//FT)

We have to face the facts that criminals don't buy retail. They steal guns, they buy stolen guns, they buy [and] perfectly legal guns from "responsible" gun owners at gun shows, they use straw purchasers to buy guns, and they buy from federally licensed dealers who know that the chance of the ATF [Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives] inspecting them is near zero because of ATF budgets. They know the weaknesses in the system and they exploit them. And we as a nation pay dearly for that in loss of life, in costs for emergency rooms, and in law enforcement costs associated with the thousands of deaths and injuries each and every year because of illegal guns.

### Links to NB

## CP – USFG

#### A] Interp – neg may not read a conditional alt agent CP

#### A] Interp – Alternative actor bad

#### USFG impositions doesn’t solve - nullification

McDaniel et al 14 (McDaniel, Justine; Korth, Robby; Boehm, Jessica. "Eight states have passed laws voiding federal firearms regulations," News21. 8-16-2014. http://gunwars.news21.com/2014/eight-states-have-passed-laws-voiding-federal-firearms-regulations)

Across the country, a thriving dissatisfaction with the U.S. government is prompting a growing spate of bills in state legislatures aimed at defying federal control over firearms - more than 200 during the last decade, a News21 investigation found. Particularly in Western and Southern states, where individual liberty intersects with increasing skepticism among gun owners, firearms are a political vehicle in efforts to ensure states’ rights and void U.S. gun laws within their borders. State legislators are attempting to declare that only they have the right to interpret the Second Amendment, a movement that recalls the anti-federal spirit of the Civil War and civil-rights eras. “I think the president and the majority of Congress, both in the House and Senate, are just completely out of touch with how people feel about Second Amendment rights,” said Missouri state Sen. Brian Nieves, who has fought for bills to weaken the federal government’s authority over firearms in his state. Share this story Over 200 bills to void federal control over guns were proposed in states in the last decade. #gunwars Culture, libertarian politics woven into movement to make federal gun laws unenforceable in states. #gunwars GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU In Idaho, the Legislature unanimously passed a law to keep any future federal gun measures from being enforced in the state. In Kansas, a law passed last year says federal regulation doesn’t apply to guns manufactured in the state. Wyoming, South Dakota and Arizona have had laws protecting “firearms freedom” from the U.S. government since 2010. A News21 analysis shows 14 such bills were passed by legislators in 11 states, mainly in Western states, along with Kansas, Tennessee and Alaska. Of those, 11 were signed into law, though one was later struck down in court. In Montana, Missouri and Oklahoma, three others were vetoed. More than three-quarters of U.S. states have proposed nullification laws since 2008. More than half of those bills have come in the last two years after the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut. All but three have been introduced since President Barack Obama took office. Underneath the policy jargon lies a culture of firearms woven into the heritage and politics of states whose histories were shaped by guns. “(The federal government) is diving off into areas unchecked that they’re not supposed to be involved in,” said Montana state Rep. Krayton Kerns, who introduced a bill in 2013 to limit the ability of local police to help enforce federal laws. “Not only is it our right in state legislatures to do this, it’s our obligation to do it. Somebody’s got to put a ‘whoa’ on it.”

#### Doesn’t solve—ATF is too limited.

William S. Harwood 2 [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, 2002, BE

The federal agency with primary responsibility for firearm regulation is the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF). Despite having been in existence for many years, ATF’s powers are mostly limited to the licensing and taxation of firearm dealers. Because of its limited jurisdiction, ATF has a relatively small workforce; less than ten agents are assigned to the¶ state of Maine. With this limited workforce, it is hard to imagine how ATF can effectively regulate the 1.3 million firearms in a state covering an area larger than the other five New England states combined. Although the federal government could expand the ATF workforce and investigatory powers, ATF does not¶ currently have the resources to take on the primary responsibility for regulation of firearms.

#### Perm Do both

#### A] There’s no local federal enforcement – actors know this and exploit the lack of accountability - so state cooperation is key

William S. Harwood 2 [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, 2002, BE

Finally, the coordinated federal-state approach would include a coordination of enforcement activities by the two levels of government. For example, if the federal government decided for reasons of fiscal prudence not to devote enough resources to properly enforce federal regulations, the states would step in. If there were not enough ATF agents to inspect the records of the federally licensed gun dealers in a particular state to ensure compliance with federal regulations, the state police or some other state law enforcement agency would begin doing so.¶ Perhaps the biggest drawback to such a coordi- nated approach is the risk that the two sets of regulations will not be well coordinated. Rather than complementing each other, there is a risk that significant activity contributing to the level of gun violence may “fall through the cracks” between state and federal regulation and thereby frustrate the combined ability of either level of government to successfully combat the problem. This drawback should be manageable if there is a true spirit of cooperation between state and federal policymakers. Obviously, constant vigilance will be necessary to prevent gaps from developing that frustrate the goal of effectively regulating firearms.¶ In summary, rather than picking one or the other, both the state and federal government should regulate— but in a well coordinated manner that produces a better regulatory program than either could produce alone. The states should concentrate on individual responsi- bility of gun owners and serve as the laboratory for experimentation and comparison, while the federal government should concentrate on manufacture and commercial distribution of firearms and provide a strong minimum base of regulations upon which the states can build if they choose. By adopting such a coordinated approach the chances of significantly reducing gun violence in the United States are greatly improved.

#### The counterplan is unconstitutional – the federal government would get the shit sued out of it

Anderson 14 (Jon E, writer @ Britannica, “United States v. Lopez,” 10-31-14, http://www.britannica.com/topic/United-States-v-Lopez)//ghs-VA

United States v. Lopez, case in which the U.S. Supreme Court on April 26, 1995, ruled (5–4) that the Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990 was unconstitutional because the U.S. Congress, in enacting the legislation, had exceeded its authority under the commerce clause. In March 1992 Alfonso Lopez, Jr., a 12th-grade student in San Antonio, Texas, took a concealed .38-calibre handgun and five bullets to his high school. School officials, after receiving an anonymous tip, confronted Lopez, and he admitted that he had a gun. Lopez was charged with violating a Texas statute prohibiting the carrying of a firearm on school grounds. The state charge was quickly dropped, however, and Lopez was charged with violating the Gun-Free School Zones Act, which made it unlawful for a person to possess a firearm in a school zone. The maximum penalty was five years of imprisonment. Lopez entered a plea of not guilty, and his attorneys moved to dismiss the charge on the grounds that Congress had exceeded its authority by passing the act. A federal district court denied the motion to dismiss, stating that the act was a constitutional exercise of the well-defined power of Congress “to regulate activities in and affecting commerce, and the ‘business’ of elementary, middle and high schools…affects interstate commerce.” Lopez, who waived his right to a jury trial, was convicted and sentenced to six months in prison and two years of supervised release. Lopez appealed his conviction to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, which reversed on the issue of congressional authority. It ruled that the law was invalid because it went beyond the powers of Congress under the commerce clause. On November 8, 1994, the case was argued before the Supreme Court, which affirmed the order of the Fifth Circuit. Writing for the majority, Chief Justice William Rehnquist explained that the Gun-Free School Zones Act was neither a regulation of the channels of interstate commerce nor an attempt to prohibit interstate transportation of a commodity through those channels. Consequently, he determined that if the act were to withstand judicial scrutiny, it would have to substantially affect interstate commerce.

#### B]

#### Politics is anti-black

#### Politics is securitization

#### Impact defense – case outweighs.

## CP – Manufacturing

#### This is silly

Jacobs ‘02: James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002. Can Gun Control Work? James B. Jacobs OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Proponents of handgun prohibition ought to see little point in banning the manufacture and sale of handguns without also banning possession. Failure to ban possession would leave the existing private sector stock of handguns intact. Moreover, if handgun possession was undisturbed, fol-lowing the model of National Alcohol Prohibition, there would be a tre-mendous opportunity for blackmarketeers to meet the demand for hand-guns with weapons imported from abroad or produced in clandestine workshops. The new handguns and handgun possessors would blend in with the existing handguns and their possessors. The moral coherence of this form of prohibition would be weak; tens of millions of owners would be allowed lawfully to possess guns, while younger people would be treated as criminals for doing the same thing.

## CP – Vice Model

#### CP is worse for police militarization – since they must regulate sale instead of ownership they must catch you in the act.

Kaplan 81. The Wisdom of Gun Prohibition Author(s): John Kaplan Source: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 455, Gun Control (May, 1981), pp. 11-23 Published by: Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science. NP 4/5/16.

The means that the police would have to use to enforce such laws are already familiar to us because of their use in the drug area. Preventing a sale between a willing buyer and a willing seller requires intrusive techniques. Indeed, even to inadequately enforce such laws, the police must use informants, undercover agents, methods that border on entrapment, searches and seizures, wiretapping, and a whole panoply of enforcement techniques that not only often transcend the borders of constitutionality, but that, even where they are legally permissible, tend to bring the police into disrepute. Use of such means against relatively small numbers of serious criminals may be worth this kind of cost. However, where the police are asked to enforce laws by such methods against large numbers of people who have public support, the consequences can be more serious.

#### Moreover, largely non-unique for inner city youth – ac proves black youth are viewed from a frame of criminality such that their ownership can easily be construed as “transfer”.

#### Can’t solve – millions of guns already in place

#### Can’t solve – huge incentivez to have illegal trafficking – b/c guns are a one time thing.

#### This is silly

Jacobs ‘02: James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002. Can Gun Control Work? James B. Jacobs OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Proponents of handgun prohibition ought to see little point in banning the manufacture and sale of handguns without also banning possession. Failure to ban possession would leave the existing private sector stock of handguns intact. Moreover, if handgun possession was undisturbed, fol-lowing the model of National Alcohol Prohibition, there would be a tremendous opportunity for blackmarketeers to meet the demand for hand-guns with weapons imported from abroad or produced in clandestine workshops. The new handguns and handgun possessors would blend in with the existing handguns and their possessors. The moral coherence of this form of prohibition would be weak; tens of millions of owners would be allowed lawfully to possess guns, while younger people would be treated as criminals for doing the same thing.

## CP – Ban Bullets

#### Can’t solve

Kaplan 81. The Wisdom of Gun Prohibition Author(s): John Kaplan Source: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 455, Gun Control (May, 1981), pp. 11-23 Published by: Sage Publications, Inc. in association with the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

In this respect, the best analogy to alcohol would be prohibiting the sale of ammunition, which is moderately perishable, rather than the sale of guns. The problem here, however, is technical. First, handgun ammunition is basically the same as long-gun ammunition, so any attempt to control handguns by this method would involve the more difficult, costly, and stubborn problem of long-gun regulation as well. Second, serviceable ammunition is simpler to make than any of the illegal drugs being manufactured in the laboratories all over the United States. The difficulty of manufacturing ammunition lies somewhat closer to distilling liquor than to making phenyl-cyclohexyl-piperidine (PCP) or amphetamines.20 In other words, the likelihood is that by forbidding the sale or manufacture of handgun ammunition, we would be adding yet another major substance-abuse problem to our already crowded inventory.

## CP – States

#### USFG Avoids Gourevitch DA

Only 2% actually prosecuted – that’s because resources are thin – but we can still solve aff – b.c all that’s required is to ban shops.

#### USFG just doesn’t solve – state nullification

McDaniel et al 14 (McDaniel, Justine; Korth, Robby; Boehm, Jessica. "Eight states have passed laws voiding federal firearms regulations," News21. 8-16-2014. http://gunwars.news21.com/2014/eight-states-have-passed-laws-voiding-federal-firearms-regulations)

Across the country, a thriving dissatisfaction with the U.S. government is prompting a growing spate of bills in state legislatures aimed at defying federal control over firearms - more than 200 during the last decade, a News21 investigation found. Particularly in Western and Southern states, where individual liberty intersects with increasing skepticism among gun owners, firearms are a political vehicle in efforts to ensure states’ rights and void U.S. gun laws within their borders. State legislators are attempting to declare that only they have the right to interpret the Second Amendment, a movement that recalls the anti-federal spirit of the Civil War and civil-rights eras. “I think the president and the majority of Congress, both in the House and Senate, are just completely out of touch with how people feel about Second Amendment rights,” said Missouri state Sen. Brian Nieves, who has fought for bills to weaken the federal government’s authority over firearms in his state. Share this story Over 200 bills to void federal control over guns were proposed in states in the last decade. #gunwars Culture, libertarian politics woven into movement to make federal gun laws unenforceable in states. #gunwars GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU In Idaho, the Legislature unanimously passed a law to keep any future federal gun measures from being enforced in the state. In Kansas, a law passed last year says federal regulation doesn’t apply to guns manufactured in the state. Wyoming, South Dakota and Arizona have had laws protecting “firearms freedom” from the U.S. government since 2010. A News21 analysis shows 14 such bills were passed by legislators in 11 states, mainly in Western states, along with Kansas, Tennessee and Alaska. Of those, 11 were signed into law, though one was later struck down in court. In Montana, Missouri and Oklahoma, three others were vetoed. More than three-quarters of U.S. states have proposed nullification laws since 2008. More than half of those bills have come in the last two years after the shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut. All but three have been introduced since President Barack Obama took office. Underneath the policy jargon lies a culture of firearms woven into the heritage and politics of states whose histories were shaped by guns. “(The federal government) is diving off into areas unchecked that they’re not supposed to be involved in,” said Montana state Rep. Krayton Kerns, who introduced a bill in 2013 to limit the ability of local police to help enforce federal laws. “Not only is it our right in state legislatures to do this, it’s our obligation to do it. Somebody’s got to put a ‘whoa’ on it.”

## T – 50 States Good

#### Aff can choose 50 states as the actor

#### Net benefits

#### 1] Topicality - Rez doesn’t specify an actor – so it’s a question of what’s normal means – that’s the states.

BRIEF FOR NEW YORK, HAWAII, MARYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW JERSEY, AND PUERTO RICO, January, 11, 2008, DC. V Heller

Amici states file this brief in support of their Traditional authority to protect the safety of their Residents by enacting laws governing the possession and Use of firearms. The amici states do not defend The specific handgun ban at issue in this case and do not As a matter of public policy endorse it, preserving state Sovereignty in this area is of paramount importance to The states. For more than two centuries, as contemplated By the ¢onstitution’s framers, the states have been the Primary regulators of firearms. Preserving that role was a fundamental purpose of the second amendment. Accordingly, this court has consistently held that the Second amendment limits only the authority of the Federal government to regulate weapons in the states. If that rule were now called into question[ed], the states would confront federal litigation over every detail of their Statutory schemes, depriving them of authority over policy decisions that have always been reserved to them.

#### 2] Debate about actor is key part of literature –we should get to pick an actor, research, and defend it. You can’t force me to defend a sub-par actor because you can’t win without the federalism disad. Moreover, our ev proves states conclusively win, and USFG has crap solvency - which means we’d always lose to the States CP.

#### 3] Fiat abuse is non-unique – congress working together to pass a gun ban is equally implausible. There’s also no impact to this arg – this debate is about the desirability of the rez. --- empirically we don’t claim any advantages to coordination separate from the rez.

## T – Buybacks Good

## DA’s – Impact Defense

### Econ

#### Economic impact of gun violence is huge.

Daniel W. Webster et al. 12 and Jon S. Vernick and Katherine Vittes and Emma McGinty and Stephen Teret and Shannon Frattaroli [all MPH except McGinty. Vernick and Teret have JD’s, Vittes and Frattaroli have PhDs. Tl;dr these people are all very qualified], “The Case for Gun Policy Reforms in America”, John Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research, October 2012, BE

There are enormous economic costs associated with gun violence in the U.S. Firearm- related deaths and injuries resulted in medical and lost productivity expenses of about $32 billion in 2005.6 But the overall cost of gun violence goes well beyond these figures. When lost quality of life, psychological and emotional trauma, decline in property values, and other legal and societal consequences are included, the cost of gun violence in the U.S. was estimated to be about $100 billion annually in 1998.7 A new study has examined the direct and indirect costs of violent crime in eight geographically-diverse U.S. cities, and estimated the average annual cost of violent crime was more than $1,300 for every adult and child. Because much of these costs are due to lowering residential property values, violent crime greatly reduces tax revenues that local governments need to address a broad array of citizens’ needs. The direct annual cost of violent crime to all levels of government was estimated to be $325 per resident.8

### ?

## 1AR Supplements

### Yes – Fagan

#### Fagan

* Former Chair, American Society of Criminology
* Joined Columbia as director of Center for Violence Research and Prevention.
* Serves on editorial boards of number of Criminology research Journals: Criminology and Public Policy, the Journal of Quantitative Criminology, Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, and Family Law Abstracts.

#### Fagan’s research is sound – It’s a complex framework developed from sociological theories, research data, surveys and interviews with real inner city youth.

Fagan: (Jeffrey Fagan and Deanna L. Wilkinson. “Guns, Youth Violence, and Social Identity in Inner Cities.” Crime and Justice, Vol. 24, Youth Violence (1998), pp. 105-188//FT)

In Section II, we assess contemporary theories and explanations of gun violence, leading to a framework that integrates motivations and explanations for gun violence. We use an event-based approach to un- derstand the dynamics of adolescent gun violence. This approach does not deny the importance of the individual attributes that bring people to situations but recognizes that, once there, other processes shape the outcomes of these events. Instead, we view gun violence as "situated transactions," including rules that develop within specific contexts, the situations and contexts where weapons are used, the motivations for carrying and using weapons, and the personality "sets" of groups in which weapons are used. There are "rules" that govern how disputes are settled, when and where firearms are used, and the significance of firearms within a broader adolescent culture. Because violence gener- ally is a highly contextualized event (Luckenbill and Doyle 1989; Fa- gan 1993a, 1993b; Tedeschi and Felson 1994), we focus on how spe- cific contexts and situations shape decisions by adolescents to carry or use weapons. In Section III we present a dynamic framework that contextualizes adolescent violence within individuals, situations, and neighborhoods and discusses how the presence of weapons creates additional contin- gencies that shape the outcomes of disputes and other transactions. Gun violence among adolescents requires several levels of analysis: the sources of weapons, the nature of everyday life that gives rise to con- flicts that turn lethal, the "scripts" of adolescent life that lead to escal tion (and the factors that underlie those scripts), the motivations for carrying/using weapons, and the role of weapons in the decision pro- cesses of adolescents when they engage in disputes or even predatory violence. The presence of firearms is not an outcome of other pro- cesses, but part of a dynamic and interactive social process in which the anticipation or reality of firearms alters the decisions leading to vi- olence and the outcomes of violent events. In Section IV, we analyze data from recent research on violence among adolescents to illustrate three dimensions of this framework: how normative rules and regulatory processes within networks and neighborhoods shape decisions to engage in violence and shape the course of violent events, the motivations and sources of arousal that lead to disputes where violence is used strategically or defensively, and situational contexts that introduce additional contingencies that influ- ence the occurrence and outcomes of violent and "near-violent" en- counters. Specifically, we examine the "ecology of danger" in which violence and gun events unfold in two inner-city neighborhoods. Sec- ond, we explore the establishment and maintenance of social and situa- tional identities among adolescent males. We also analyze the role of drugs and alcohol on violent events. In each of these sections, we ex- amine the influence of guns on these dynamics.

In this section, we use this framework to identify how the presence of guns among adolescents creates unique contingencies that shape the course of violent events, decisions within them, and their outcomes. We illustrate the social processes of gun violence among adolescent males in three areas: the development of norms and expectations for the use of lethal or gun violence, the role of guns in the development of "violent identities" and how this identity contributes to gun vio- lence, and the impact of violent identities and guns on events involving drugs and alcohol. These illustrations come from analyses of data on violent events involving male adolescents in two inner-city neighbor- hoods in New York City (see Fagan and Wilkinson 1995; Wilkinson and Fagan 1996a; Wilkinson 1997a, 1997b). Interviews were con- ducted with 125 young men aged sixteen to twenty-four from the East New York and Mott Haven neighborhoods, areas with high concentra- tions of injury violence and homicide since 1990. Respondents were asked to provide background information on themselves, their family, their school, and their neighborhood in a narrative interview protocol. Respondents were then asked to reconstruct up to four events involv- ing violent or near violent situations, including events where guns were present or absent. Interviews were tape recorded and transcribed, and text analysis programs were used to identify recurring themes and do- mains (for details about the methods, see Wilkinson, McClain, and Fa- gan [1996]; Wilkinson [1997b]).

#### Creds

http://www.law.columbia.edu/fac/Jeffrey\_Fagan

B.E., New York University, 1968; Ph.D., University at Buffalo, 1975. Conducted research on law and social policy since 1976. Taught at the School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University, 1989-95. Editor of the Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1990-96. Joined the faculty of the Columbia School of Public Health in 1995 as professor and director of the Center for Violence Research and Prevention. Visiting professor, Columbia Law School, 1998-2001; professor, Columbia Law School, since 2001. Named the Isidor and Seville Sulzbacher Professor of Law in 2011. Director of J.S.D. Program at Columbia Law School and Chair of Graduate Legal Studies, 2003-present. Elected to University Senate from School of Public Health in 2003. Elected as fellow of the American Society of Criminology, 2002. Member of the Committee on Law and Justice of the National Research Council (Vice-Chair); the MacArthur Foundation Research Program on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice; and the National Consortium on Violence Research of the National Science Foundation. Former Chair, National Policy Committee, American Society of Criminology, 2003-04. Serves on the editorial boards of Criminology and Public Policy, the Journal of Quantitative Criminology; Crime and Justice: A Review of Research; the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology; and Family Law Abstracts. Recent publications include: Legitimacy, Criminal Justice, and the State in Comparative Perspective (with T. Tyler and T.L.Meares), Russell Foundation Press; Executions and Homicide: A Tale of Two Cities (with F. Zimring and D. Jonhson), in Journal of Empirical Legal Studies; Crime and Neighborhood Change, in Understanding Crime Trends, National Academies Press; Juvinile Crime and Criminal Justice: Resolving Border Disputes, in Future of Children; Punishment, Deterrence and Social Control: The Paradox of Punishment in Minority Communities (with T.L. Meares, in Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law; Legitimacy, Complicance and Cooperation: Procedural Justice and Citizen Ties wo the Law (with T.R. Tyler), in Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law; Rational Choice and Development Influences on Recidivism among Adolescent Felony Offenders (with A. Piquero) in Journal of Empirical Legal Studies; An Analysis of the NYPD's Stop-and-Frisk Policy in the Context of Claims of Racial Bias (with A. Gelman and A. Kiss) in Journal of the american Statistical Association; The Paradox of the Drug Elimination Program in New York City Public Housing (with G. Davies) in Georgetown Journal of Poverty, Law & Policy; "Death and Deterrence Redux: Science, Law and Causal Reasoning on Capital Punishment, in Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law; Attention Felons: Evaluating Project Safe Neighborhoods in Chicago (with A. Papachristos and T.L. Meares) in Journal of Empirical Legal Studies; Capital Hominice and Capital Punishment: A Market Share Theory of Deterrence (with F. Zimring and A. Geller) in Texas law Review; Legal Socialization of Children and Adolescents (with T. Tyler) in Social Justice Research; Neighborhood, Crime, and Incarceration in New York City (with V. West and J. Holland) in Columbia Human Right Law Review; Theorizing Community Justice Through Community Courts (with V. Malkin) in Fordham Urban Law Journal; Street Stops and Broken Windows: Terry, Race and Disorder in New York City (with G. Davies) in Fordham Urban Law Journal; Social Contagion of Violence (with D. Wilkinson and G. Davies) in the Cambridge Handbook of Violence Research.

### Yes – Self Defense

#### Yes it’s for self-protection.

Bieler ’14: (SAM BIELER. “Raising the Voices of Gun Violence.” Urban Institute 2014//FT)

The Cycle of Violence Many times, witnessing—or worse, being directly involved in—that first shooting is only the beginning of a cycle of violence. “I got the concept,” one survivor explained. “You know, I’d rather get caught with [a gun] than without it . . . I was willing to hurt somebody if they tried to hurt me. Nobody was going to do that to me again.” That’s a far too common conclusion. Young people who are exposed to gun violence or hear secondhand reports about violence have been known to obtain guns for self-defense. In areas where gun violence has become a normal part of social interactions, youth sometimes choose to acquire firearms for the power and prestige the weapons provide. The problem compounds as young people obtain guns to protect themselves from their armed peers. Adding to this volatile mix, research suggests that youth who are exposed to gun violence—the same group likely to arm themselves—are also more likely to resort to violence. Retaliation also contributes to the cycle. Retaliatory shootings for previous acts of violence can be a significant component of neighborhood gun violence. Victims of gun violence who are engaged in illegal activities are particularly likely to retaliate with violence, and this violence often reaches innocent community members. Retaliatory shootings sometimes target relatives of the original shooters, leaving innocent family members caught in the crossfire. In this way, gun violence can affect communities far beyond one original incident, spreading through social networks much like the blood-borne disease HIV.

## Cards to Review

### More Offense

#### Empirically confirmed – Gun availability correlates significantly with overall crime.

Altheimer ’10: (Irshad Altheimer [Wayne State University], “an exploratory analysis of Guns and Violent Crime in a Cross-national Sample of Cities”, Guns and Crime, 2010//FT)

This study was the first to examine the relationship between gun availability and crime in a cross-national sample of cities. Three competing hypotheses concerning this relationship were tested using LIML regression. The results lend some support to the weapon facilitation and instrumentality hypotheses. Gun availability significantly influenced the assault, gun assault, rob- bery, and gun robbery rates in these cities. Notably, no support was found for Lott’s (2000; see also Lott & Mustard, 1997) hypothesis that increasing gun availability reduces rates of crime.¶ These results suggest that cities with high levels of gun availability will be characterized by more assaults and robberies. The fact that gun availability was found to influence total violent crime rates is surprising because it contradicts what has been found in previous research (Cook, 1991). Apparently, for the cities sampled here, increasing gun availability provides an incen- tive for city residents to commit crime that they normally would not commit if guns were not available. Perhaps citizens in cities with high levels of gun availability feel emboldened by the power advantage afforded to them by the possession of a firearm.¶ The significant results between gun availability and gun assault and gun robbery lend sup- port to the weapon instrumentality hypothesis. The availability of guns seems to increase the likelihood that city residents will substitute a gun for another weapon or use a gun rather than no weapon at all. Under such circumstances, assaults and robberies that occur in cities with high levels of gun availability may be more serious or deadlier than assaults or robberies carried out in cities with lower levels of gun availability. In addition, these gun assaults and gun rob- beries may be more likely to involve multiple victims. Although not directly tested here, these findings may also suggest that cities with higher levels of gun availability will be characterized by higher levels of homicide. This assertion seems plausible if one considers Zimring’s (1968; 1972) argument that many violent altercations involve parties whose intentions are somewhat ambiguous, but where the introduction of a gun into the equation increases the likelihood that a violent dispute leads to death rather than injury (see also Phillips & Maume, 2007). When one considers the fact that gun availability was the most important predictor of both gun assault and gun robbery levels, it seems that Zimring’s (1968; 1972) hypothesis is applicable here. Although this study did not control for the intentions of the individual aggressors, the city level controls such as unemployment account for the factors that motivate people to commit crime. The fact that most of these controls were insignificant, while gun availability was significant, suggests that for this sample of cities the primary factor that determines whether a gun is used in a violent crime is the availability of guns.¶ Perhaps the most important finding here is that all of the processes discussed above were occurring in a diverse cross-national sample of cities. This study analyzed data from 39 cit- ies located in nations in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and South America. It is likely that the culture of each city in the sample was somewhat distinct. That is, the cultures of the cities included in the sample were different from one another and differed with the culture of most cities in Western Developed nations. Despite the cultural variation among cities, the find- ings reported here are similar to those of similar studies that have examined the relationship between guns and crime in the United States and cross-nationally (Bordua, 1986; Bordua & Lizotte, 1979; Clotfelter, 1981; Hoskin, 2001; Killias et al., 2001; Kleck, 1979; Krug et al., 1998; Lester, 1974; McDonald, 1999; McDowall & Loftin, 1983; Southwick Jr., 1997). This suggests that the relationship between guns and crime operates in a similar fashion across space and time, even in dramatically different cultures. The findings would be further sup- ported if future research examining the relationship between gun availability and homicide in a cross-national sample of cities generated results that mirrored those of studies examining this relationship in the United States.¶ The results from this study have numerous policy implications. First, these results suggest that the availability of guns has serious implications for levels of assault and gun assault in this sample of cities. These results suggest that serious discussions about the reduction of crime in these cities must consider methods to reduce levels of gun availability. Second, the results also show that, although guns are important, violence cannot be reduced unless other social problems, such as family disruption, are addressed. Therefore, policies should be developed to strengthen families or moderate the effect that family disruption has on violent crime.

#### Despite all evidence pointing the opposite way, push back against firm gun regulations are rooted in apathy and distain for black folk. Obrien 13:

O'Brien ‘13, Forrest, Lynott and Daly—2013 ~~~Kerry, Walter, Dermot, Michael, "Racism, Gun Ownership and Gun Control: Biased Attitudes in US Whites May Influence Policy Decisions," PLOS One 8.10 (2013): 1-10, 9~~~

Notwithstanding these limitations, the results indicate that symbolic racism is associated with gun-related attitudes and behaviours in US whites. The statistics on firearm-related suicides and homicides in the US might reasonably be expected to convince US citizens that action on reducing gun ownership and use would be beneficial to their health. Yet, US whites oppose strong gun reform more than all other racial groups, despite a much greater likelihood that whites will kill themselves with their guns (suicide), than be killed by someone else [1]. Black-on-black homicide rates would benefit most from gun reform, and, quite logically, blacks support these reforms even if whites do not [3], [47]. Symbolic racism appears to play a role in explaining gun ownership and paradoxical attitudes to gun control in US whites. In other words, despite certain policy changes potentially benefitting whites, anti-black prejudice leads people to oppose their implementation. This finding is consistent with previous research showing that symbolic racism is associated with opposition to US policies that may benefit blacks, and support for policies that disadvantage blacks, and critically, goes beyond what is explained by other important confounders.

Gun-related deaths in the US are a significant public health concern, representing a leading cause of death, and are particularly prevalent from ages 15–54. Attitudes towards guns in many US whites appear to be influenced, like other policy preferences, by illogical racial biases. The present results suggest that gun control policies may need to be implemented independent of public opinion. The implementation of initially unpopular public health initiatives has proven effective for other public health threats (e.g., tobacco taxation, bans on smoking in public places, seatbelt use) that initially did not have widespread public and political support, but have eventually proven popular and have led to changes in attitudes [48], [49].

#### And the aff challenges the NRA. – Harrison Ev

### Framing

#### 3] Debate should deal with real-world consequences—ideal theories ignore the concrete nature of the world and legitimize oppression.

Curry ’14, (Dr. Tommy J. Curry, “The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century”, Victory Briefs, 2014, FT)

**Despite the pronouncement of debate as an activity and intellectual exercise pointing to the real world consequences of dialogue**, thinking, and (personal) politics when addressing issues of racism, sexism, economic disparity, global conflicts, and death, many of the discussions concerning these ongoing challenges to humanity are fixed to a paradigm which sees the adjudication of material disparities and sociological realities as the conquest of one ideal theory over the other. In “Ideal Theory as Ideology,” Charles Mills outlines the problem contemporary theoretical-performance styles in policy debate and value-weighing in Lincoln-Douglass are confronted with in their attempts to get at the concrete problems in our societies. At the outset, Mills concedes that “ideal theory applies to moral theory as a whole (at least to normative ethics as against metaethics); [s]ince ethics deals by definition with normative/prescriptive/evaluative issues, [it is set] against factual/descriptive issues.” At the most general level, the conceptual chasm between what emerges as actual problems in the world (e.g.: racism, sexism, poverty, disease, etc.) and how we frame such problems theoretically—the assumptions and shared ideologies we depend upon for our problems to be heard and accepted as a worthy “problem” by an audience—is the most obvious call for an anti-ethical paradigm, since such a paradigm insists on the actual as the basis of what can be considered normatively. Mills, however, describes this chasm as a problem of an ideal-as-descriptive model which argues that for any actual-empirical-observable social phenomenon (P), an ideal of (P) is necessarily a representation of that phenomenon. In the idealization of a social phenomenon (P), one “necessarily has to abstract away from certain features” of (P) that is observed before abstraction occurs. ¶ This gap between what is actual (in the world), and what is represented by theories and politics of debaters proposed in rounds threatens any real discussions about the concrete nature of oppression and the racist economic structures which necessitate tangible policies and reorienting changes in our value orientations. As Mills states: “What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual,” so what we are seeking to resolve on the basis of “thought” is in fact incomplete, incorrect, or ultimately irrelevant to the actual problems which our “theories” seek to address. Our attempts to situate social disparity cannot simply appeal to the ontologization of social phenomenon—meaning we cannot suggest that the various complexities of social problems (which are constantly emerging and undisclosed beyond the effects we observe) are totalizable by any one set of theories within an ideological frame be it our most cherished notions of Afro-pessimism, feminism, Marxism, or the like. At best, theoretical endorsements make us aware of sets of actions to address ever developing problems in our empirical world, but even this awareness does not command us to only do X, but rather do X and the other ideas which compliment the material conditions addressed by the action X. As a whole, debate (policy and LD) neglects the need to do X in order to remedy our cast-away-ness among our ideological tendencies and politics. How then do we pull ourselves from this seeming ir-recoverability of thought in general and in our endorsement of socially actualizable values like that of the living wage? It is my position that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s thinking about the need for a living wage was a unique, and remains an underappreciated, resource in our attempts to impose value reorientation (be it through critique or normative gestures) upon the actual world. In other words, King aims to reformulate the values which deny the legitimacy of the living wage, and those values predicated on the flawed views of the worker, Blacks, and the colonized (dignity, justice, fairness, rights, etc.) used to currently justify the living wages in under our contemporary moral parameters.

#### Don’t view the debate through the frame of real-politik consequentialism --- it locks us into the status quo --- rather it should be a comparison of world views.

Dixon 99: (Nicholas Dixon 99---1999 (“Handguns, Violent Crime, and Self-Defense,” International Journal of Applied Philosophy, 13.2 (1999):239-260)

To allow considerations of realpolitik to influence our judgments about the morality of a practice or policy would effectively lock us into the status quo, and sabotage the role of applied ethics as a vehicle for proposing social change. Absurd consequences are easy to find. For instance, when the abolitionist movement first began, little doubt exists that it had no realistic chance at that time of persuading Congress to abolish slavery. Does this mean that its members were wrong to morally condemn slavery and call for its abolition? Similar comments apply to the suffragette movement in its early days. Worse still, if applied ethicists are to confine themselves to defending positions that have a realistic chance of currently being legally enacted, prolife philosophers will have to stop writing papers in which they condemn abortion, since, given the current composition of the Supreme Court, legislation banning¶ "regular" abortion is virtually impossible to enact and defend against constitutional challenges. ¶ Granted, the abolitionist movement did indeed take heed of political realities and worked incrementally to restrict slavery to certain states before finally pushing for its complete abolition. This is because it, like the suffragette movement, was a political movement, whose goal was to bring about concrete social change. Nonetheless, underlying both movements were moral arguments that made no compromise for political realities in their condemnation of slavery and the oppression of women. And this is precisely the role that applied ethicists should play in discussing handgun control: providing a moral vision of the handgun policy that would best reduce violence and respect rights. How to realize that moral vision is an important question, but a secondary one, and one that is best left to political organizations that are more knowledgeable about political realities. It may well tum out that Handgun Control, Inc.'s strategy of proposing moderate restrictions on handgun ownership is a shrewd first step that is a necessary prelude to the more radical proposal advanced here. But moral arguments for handgun prohibition are needed to guide and motivate even incremental change to achieve that goal. Nor is guiding and motivating those who already share a movement's goal the only role for applied ethicists. Even more important is the ability of cogent moral arguments to convince opponents and the uncommitted of the desirability of social change. The abolitionist, suffragette, and civil rights movements all illustrate this phenomenon. So another error made by those who reject as unrealistic my proposal to ban handguns is to regard one of the realities that do indeed make it difficult to achieve at present-i.e., the widespread belief that handguns make law-abiding citizens safer against crime as engraved in stone. They overlook the power of striking empirical evidence and clearly presented arguments to persuade the American public that the widespread ownership of handguns is a major cause of violent crime. We need to continue to present this evidence and these arguments until we convince enough people that handgun prohibition is desirable that it will eventually become eminently attainable (256-257).

#### Handguns might be used more for crime and self-defense – but they’re only a small amount of the arms in the U.S

LaFollette 2k (Hugh, USF St. Petersburg Philosophy Professor, “Gun Control,” Ethics 110 (January 2000): pp. 263–281) PO

The central debate concerns handguns. The evidence we have shows that handguns are disproportionately used in homicides and in robberies. Although ‘‘there are approximately three times as many long guns as handguns in the US, more than 80 percent of gun homicides and 90 percent of gun robberies involve handguns.’’ 26 The experience in Canada suggests that criminals will not switch to long guns if handguns are unavailable. Given the special role handguns play in causing harm, we have compelling reasons to extensively control, or perhaps even abolish, handguns. But policy considerations, mentioned earlier, should give us pause.

# 1AC – More Impacts

## 1AC - Rhetoric

#### Gun violence is not an issue for white America.

**Yglesias ’14:** [Matthew Yglesias, "We shouldn't talk about Ferguson without talking about guns”, Vox, November 26, 2014]

America's culture of widespread gun ownership and strong gun rights is devastating to black America. African-Americans suffer disproportionately from gun crime, and then suffer all over again from disproportionate police killings. It's no coincidence that if public policy were made by black Americans or their elected representatives, gun ownership rules would be radically different. But it isn't. Policy is made by mostly white elected officials responding to a mostly white electorate, in which gun rights enthusiasts are the people who care most about the issue. Among the general public and the political mainstream, gun regulation tends to arise in the context of mass shootings. These rare events are politically convenient due to their high salience and the thought that small changes to the rules could cut down on these outlier events. But mass shootings are a tiny fraction of all gun homicides in America. Small, narrowly tailored legislation to address them would do little about the big problems in American crime control policy and nothing at all about the plague of systematically biased police shootings. But there's no political support in America for drastic disarming of the civilian population. People like owning guns, there's a deep cultural tradition of gun ownership, violent crime is not a big problem for most people, and murder rates are falling. That's another way of saying the white majority and its children don't need to worry much about this problem.

## 1AC – Impacts

### Cycle of Crime

Bieler ’14: (SAM BIELER. “Raising the Voices of Gun Violence.” Urban Institute 2014//FT)

It’s a valid concern. In one study of urban youth, 42 percent reported having seen someone shot or knifed and 22 percent reported having seen someone killed. Indirect exposure through the sound of gunfire is only now being explored. In DC, a small number of schools were within earshot of a disproportionate volume of gunfire, which may have important implications for the amount of violence students are exposed to outside of school. What kind of damage does this do to young people? Exposure to gun violence has been linked to a variety of psychological challenges like anger and dissociation, anxiety and depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). It can also affect youth in the classroom, making it difficult for them to concentrate in class and damaging their academic performance and educational or career aspirations.

### Fagan Stuff

#### Guns precede Crime

Fagan and Wilkinson ’98: (Jeffrey Fagan and Deanna L. Wilkinson. “Guns, Youth Violence, and Social Identity in Inner Cities.” Crime and Justice, Vol. 24, Youth Violence (1998), pp. 105-188//FT)

 3. The Rochester Youth Development Study. Two studies from the Rochester Youth Development Study reported on gun possession among adolescents using a prospective longitudinal design. Samples were 987 students interviewed at six-month intervals for nine waves beginning when they were in grades seven and eight in the 1987-88 school year. Data also were collected from police, school, and other agency records, as well as parent or caretaker interviews. Lizotte et al. (1994) and Bjerregard and Lizotte (1995) report on data from waves 9 and 10, when respondents were aged fourteen or fifteen. However, data are reported only for boys since "girls rarely own guns, whether for sport or protection" (Bjerregard and Lizotte 1995, p. 43). About 8 percent of the boys reported carrying a gun "regularly," and 4 percent reported using a gun in the past year (either wave 8 or wave 9). One in three respondents said that one of their peers "owned" a gun for protection, 10 percent said their parent(s) owned a gun for sport, and 6 percent said their parent(s) owned a gun for protection. Although gun ownership is illegal for juveniles, the motives for having a gun in the home can be attributed to the youth: children who report "owning a gun for sport" are extending their parents' ownership mo- tives to themselves, and not unreasonably (Lizotte et al. 1994, p. 64). These motives turn out to be important: rates of gun crimes are nearly nine times higher for youths who "own" guns for protection, com- pared with sport gun owners. Rates of "street crimes" such as robbery are nearly four times higher for "protection" owners compared with sport owners, and five times higher compared with nongun owners. Crime rates for nongun owners are consistently lower than for "sport" gun owners, whose rates in turn are lower than "protection" gun own- ers. Extending this analysis to gang members, Bjerregard and Lizotte (1995) show that rates of "protection" gun ownership are far higher for gang members, but "sport ownership" is more common among nongang members. Peers have a substantial impact on "protection" gun ownership among adolescents, especially among gang members, providing an ex- ample of the type of contagion model suggested by Wright and Rossi (1986). Moreover, "protection" gun ownership often precedes gang involvement, suggesting processes of social or self-selection that anticipate higher rates of delinquency once in the gang (Thornberry et al. 1993). And, gangs appear to recruit those youths who already are involved in "protection" gun ownership. However, it is unclear whether this contagion is borne by fear or by simple peer pressure. Whatever the motive, the results suggest that guns spread quickly within specific social networks by age fifteen, contributing to the perception of danger in adolescents' social worlds

#### People own guns b.c they think they need it for protection

Fagan and Wilkinson ’98: (Jeffrey Fagan and Deanna L. Wilkinson. “Guns, Youth Violence, and Social Identity in Inner Cities.” Crime and Justice, Vol. 24, Youth Violence (1998), pp. 105-188//FT)

 2. The Sheley and Wright Survey. Some of the limitations in the LH survey were addressed in research by Sheley, Wright, and Smith (1993) and reanalyzed in Sheley and Wright (1995). They interviewed 835 male inmates in juvenile correctional institutions in three states, complemented by surveys of 758 male high school students from ten inner-city public schools in the largest cities in each state. Both student and inmate samples were voluntary, and nonincarcerated dropouts were not included. Most (84 percent) of the inmate sample reported that they had been threatened with a gun or shot at, and 83 percent owned a gun prior to incarceration. Over one in three inmates (38 per- cent) reported shooting a gun at someone. Over half owned three or more guns, and the age of first acquisition was fourteen years old. The preferred type of gun among respondents was a "well-made handgun" of large caliber (the 9 mm was the most popular). Both the inmate and student samples described in more detail the ecology of guns within the social organization of their neighborhoods. They claimed that firearms were widely available at low cost in their neighborhoods. Distribution was informal, with guns bought and sold through family, friends, and street sources. Among incarcerated young males, 45 percent reported that they "had bought, sold, or traded 'lots' of guns." Stealing guns and using surrogate buyers in gun shops were common sources for obtaining guns. Motivation for owning and carrying guns was reported to be more for self-protection than for status. The drug business was a critical context for gun possession: 89 percent of inmate drug dealers and 75 percent of student dealers had carried guns. So too was gang membership: 68 percent of inmates and 22 per- cent of students were affiliated with a gang or quasi-gang, and 72 per- cent of inmates were involved in the instrumental use of guns.

 Although the Sheley, Wright, and Smith (1993) study focused on inner cities, the voluntary samples raise concerns regarding selection bias and other measurement error. The study sampled disproportion- ately from states and cities with concentrations of gang activity, per- haps overstating the importance of gangs as a context for gun use. Like the LH survey, this study did not focus on events where guns were used, only on individuals and their patterns of gun possession and gun use.

#### Guns are a cue for violence

Fagan and Wilkinson ’98: (Jeffrey Fagan and Deanna L. Wilkinson. “Guns, Youth Violence, and Social Identity in Inner Cities.” Crime and Justice, Vol. 24, Youth Violence (1998), pp. 105-188//FT)

The development of an ecology of danger reflects the confluence and interaction of several sources of contagion. First is the contagion of fear. Weapons serve as an environmental cue that in turn may increase aggressiveness (Slaby and Roedell 1982). Adolescents presume that their counterparts are armed and, if not, could easily become armed. They also assume that other adolescents are willing to use guns, often at a low threshold of provocation. Second is the contagion of gun behaviors themselves. The use of guns has instrumental value that is communicated through urban "myths" and also through the incorporation of gun violence into the social discourse of everyday life among preadolescents and adolescents. Guns are widely available and frequently displayed. They are salient symbols of power and status, and strategic means of gaining status, domination, or material goods. Third is the contagion of violent identities, and the eclipsing or de- valuation of other identities in increasingly socially isolated neighbor- hoods. These identities reinforce the dominance hierarchy built on "toughness" and violence, and its salience devalues other identities. Those unwilling to adopt at least some dimensions of this identity are vulnerable to physical attack. Accordingly, violent identities are not simply affective styles and social choices, but strategic necessities to navigate through everyday dangers. The complexities of developing positive social and personal identities among inner-city minority males is both structurally and situationally determined. Our data and previ- ous research suggests that for inner-city males, prestige is granted to those who are tough, who have gained respect by proving their tough- ness, and who reenact their appropriate role in public. Majors and Bill- son (1992) explain the structural difficulties young African American males encounter in identity development. They state: "Masculine at- tainment refers to the persistent quest for gender identity among all American males. Being a male means to be responsible and a good pro- vider for self and family. For black males, this is not a straightforward achievement. Outlets for achieving masculine pride and identity, espe- cially in political, economic, and educational systems, are more fully available to white males than to black males. . . . The black male's path toward manhood is lined with pitfalls of racism and discrimination, negative self-image, guilt, shame, and fear" (Majors and Billson 1992, p. 31). One important development is a breakdown in the age grading of behaviors, where traditional segmentation of younger adolescents from older ones, and behavioral transitions from one developmental stage to the next, are short-circuited by the strategic presence of weapons. The street environment provides the "classroom" for violent "schooling" and learning about manhood. Elsewhere we present a conceptual model for understanding the relationship between age and violence in this context (see Wilkinson 1997b). Mixed age interactions play an important role in this process. Older adolescents and young adults provide modeling influences as well as more direct effects. We found that they exert downward pressure on others their own age and younger through identity challenges which, in part, shape the social identities for both parties. At younger ages, boys are pushing upward for status by challenging boys a few years older. The social meanings of violent events reach a broader audience than those immediately present in a situation. Each violent event or poten- tially violent interaction provides a lesson for the participants, firsthand observers, vicarious observers, and others influenced by the communi- cation of stories about the situation which may follow. Children learn from both personal experience and observing others using violence to "make" their social identity or "break" someone else's identity on the street. In addition, we have attempted to illustrate what happens when an identity challenge occurs for both primary actors in the situation. We describe three different types of performance that may be given in a violent event: poor, successful, and extraordinary performance. Again, guns define what constitutes each class of violent performance uniquely compared to a nongun performance (see Wilkinson 1997b). Gun use may involve "crossing a line" or giving what we call an ex- traordinary performance that shifts one's view of oneself from a "punk" or even "cool/holding your own" to "crazy" or "wild." Guns were used by many as a resource for improving performance. We hy- pothesize that the abundance of guns in these neighborhoods have in- creased the severity for violent performances. For the majority of our sample, guns became relevant for conflict resolution around the age of fourteen.

### Fagan 2002

Throughout the course of the recent, tragic epidemic of youth gun violence, we had a limited, narrow view of the contexts of and motivations for gun violence among adolescent males. Our research suggests that there was an increase in the prevalence of situations and contexts where conflicts arose that may escalate to lethal violence. The use of guns may reflect both an apparent lowering of the thresholds for using weapons to resolve conflicts, and increasing motivations arising from "angry aggression" (Bernard, 1990; Anderson, 1994). The infusion of guns and the diffusion to teenagers has had broad impacts on fear of victimization, motivating gun acquisition as a form of self-defense. This was observed both in this research as well as in numerous surveys of adolescents in schools and in the courts (Wilkinson and Fagan, 2000). While traditional themes of toughness and identity continued to shape adolescent development in inner cities, these processes were also skewed by the diffusion of guns into the hands of adolescents who reached their teenage years in communities that increasingly were socially and economically isolated. The ways in which guns altered the processes of achieving masculine identities, in economic contexts with attenuated routes to adult roles, coupled with the perception of fear and hostile intent among their peers, contributed to a significant shift in the rules of fighting and the processual dynamics among adolescents (see Fagan and Wilkinson, 1998b; Wilkinson, 1998). 0 For a generation of adolescents, gun violence had instrumental value that was integrated into the social discourse of everyday life among pre-adolescents and adolescents. Guns were widely available and frequently displayed. They were, and remain, salient symbols of power and status, and strategic means of gaining status, domination, or material goods. The current cohort of young men in their late adolescent years grew up during a time of alarmingly high rates of violence (again mostly gun) in their neighborhoods. Self-protection and personal safety became increasingly dependent on firearm possession and often use. In this final chapter, we review the implications of this epidemic, and suggest a framework for integrating legal and and informal social controls to contain the spread of future epidemics. A. Understanding the Epidemic of Adolescent Gun Violence

While youth violence has always been with us, the modern version of it seems distinctly different: the epidemic of adolescent violence is more lethal, in large part due to the rise of gun violence by adolescents. In this research, we provide perspective and data on the role of guns in shaping the current epidemic of youth violence. At the descriptive level, the answer is clear: Adolescents in cities are possessing and carrying guns on a large scale, guns often are at the scene of youth violence, and guns often are being used. This is historically unique in the U.S., with significant impacts on an entire generation of adolescents. The impacts are most seriously felt among African American youths in the nation’s inner cities. It is logical and important to ask whether an exogenous increase in gun availability fueled the increase in youth violence. If this were true, then, regardless of its initial role in causing the epidemic, reducing the availability of guns to kids would in turn reduce the levels and seriousness of youth violence. However, we know little about changes in gun availability to adolescents; estimating supply-side effects is difficult. Ethnographic reports show a steadily increasing possession of guns by youths, but little insight on how guns were obtained. a Instead, we consider competing hypotheses that see a less central (but not insignificant) role of guns in initiating, sustaining, or elevating the epidemic of youth violence. These include the idea that the demand for guns among youth was driven up by the development of an “ecology of danger,” with behavioral norms that reinforce if not call for violence, and where popular styles of gun possession and carrying fuel beliefs that violence will be lethal. These shifts in demand, occurring in the context of widespread availability of weapons, that led to increased possession, carrying, and use. Concurrently, guns became symbols of respect, power, and manhood in an emerging youth culture that sustained a continuing demand and supply side of weapons, reciprocally increasing the overall level of gun possession and the desire to use them. Beyond their direct contributions to adolescent mortality, guns, then, have an indirect influence on adolescent violence through their eEects on socialization and development. For many adolescents in urban areas, violence has had a pervasive influence on their social and cognitive development (Richters and Martinez, 1993). Coupled with high adolescent mortality and firearm injury rates, the prevalence of violence in their immediate social contexts objectifies a and symbolizes their perceptions of risk and danger in the most common activities of everyday life. The absence or weakness of ordinary social controls means that there are no buffers between their internalized sense of danger and the situations they deal with daily. Even when violence and danger are not immediately present, the constant emphasis on them in popular culture and urban “legends” enhances the perception of personal risk. Rituals of mourning and burial, whether real or mythologized, have become cultural touchstones that are reinforced and internalized in normative beliefs and attitudes about the inevitability of violence. Violence has become an important part of the discourse of social interactions, with both functional (status and identity), material, and symbolic meaning (power and control), as well as strategic importance in everyday social dangers. The development of violence “scripts” and violent identities reflects processes of anticipatory socialization based on the perceived likelihood of victimization from violence and the perceived necessity to deter violent attacks by projecting an aura of toughness and danger. The result is a developmental “ecology of violence,” where beliefs about violence and the dangers of everyday life are internalized in early childhood and shape the cognitive frameworks for interpreting events and actions during adolescence. In turn, this context of danger creates, shapes, and highly values scripts skewed toward violence and underscores the central, instrumental role of violence in achieving the goals of aggressive actions or defensive violence in specific social contexts.

#### They’re expensive

Moser ’13: (WHET MOSER. “How Gun Control (and Isolation) Makes Illegal Guns More Expensive.” Chicago Magazine. February 18, 2013//FT)

The path is interesting, but so are the prices. There’s no information on the original price of the guns as sold by Individual A, the original Indiana gun seller, but by the time they make it to Chicago, we get some numbers: first, $2,300 for three .45-caliber Glock pistols sold to a government agent on the 6800 block of South Langley Avenue. That’s about $770 per gun. The article doesn’t say whether the guns are new or used, but a brand-new .45 Glock at Cabela’s is $650. Of course, that’s if you’re paying retail. You can save $100 at GlockStore.com, and another hundred by going used, if not more. $770 represents a big markup, anywhere from 15 to 100 percent depending on how you figure it. The informant then bought four more guns: two FNH 5.7x28 guns (“a 20-round pistol that fires a 5.7mm bullet that will defeat most body armor“), another .45 Glock, and a Velocity Firearms 9mm pistol. The last of these is an intimidating-looking gun in the MAC-10 family, but comparatively inexpensive, in the $350-$400 range. The FNH is considerably more expensive, over $1000—but those four went for $5,300 a piece, or $1,325 per gun. Again, a big markup on the black market. Which turns out to be pretty typical. In 2007, four academics—Philip J. Cook of Duke, Jens Ludwig of the University of Chicago, Sudhir Venkatesh (now of Columbia) and Anthony Braga (now of Rutgers)—studied Chicago’s underground gun market and found that “the illegality of the gun market increases search costs for prospective trading partners” (PDF): Interviews by SV with 116 gun-owning non-gang affiliated youths (age 18–21) reveal prices paid that range between $250 and $400. Interviews with 11 local gun brokers, who handle a large share of retail transactions on behalf of importers, suggest most of their guns are sold for between $150 and $350. These prices are typically for guns of low quality, manufactured by companies such as Lorcin, Raven and Bryco. These names were often mentioned to SV in interviews and as noted above also show up frequently in administrative data on confiscated crime guns maintained by ATF. While SV’s inter- views do not include information on the condition of the gun, it is noteworthy that most pistols from these manufacturers listed on websites (such as gunsamerica.com) sell for between $50 and $100 (with a $10 mailing/transaction fee), even for those used guns that are reported to be in ‘excellent condition’. Of course, people are still able to obtain guns; they’re just expensive and more difficult to find.