# \*\*\*1NC Section\*\*\*

## 1NC Substitution DA

#### Uniqueness - Private ownership of handguns is at an all-time high and is on the rise, but they very rarely actually kill people. Lott et al 2k15:

John R. Lott Jr. John E Whitley. Rebekah C. Riley. “Concealed Carry Permit Holders Across the United States.” Crime Prevention Research Center. 16 July 2015. Accessed 2 December 2015. Web.

**Since** President **Obama’s election the number of concealed handgun permits has soared, growing from 4.6 million in 2007 to** over **12.8 million this year**. Among the findings in our report: ! The number of concealed handgun permits is increasing at an everincreasing rate. **Over the past year, 1.7 million additional new permits have been issued** – a 15.4% increase in just one single year. This is the largest ever single-year increase in the number of concealed handgun permits. ! 5.2% of the total adult population has a permit. ! Five states now have more than 10% of their adult population with concealed handgun permits. ! **In ten states, a permit is no longer required** to carry in all or virtually all of the state. This is a major reason why legal carrying handguns is growing so much faster than the number of permits. ! **Since 2007, permits for women has increased by 270% and for men by 156%**. ! Some evidence suggests that permit holding by minorities is increasing more than twice as fast as for whites. ! **Between 2007 and 2014, murder rates have fallen** from 5.6 to 4.2 (preliminary estimates) per 100,000. This represents a **25%** drop in the murder rate **at the same time** that **the percentage of the adult population with permits soared by 178%**. Overall violent crime also fell by 25 percent over that period of time. ! Regression estimates show that even after accounting for the per capita number of police and people admitted to prison and demographics, the adult population with permits is significantly associated with a drop in murder and violent crime rates. ! **Concealed handgun permit holders are extremely law-abiding**. In Florida and Texas, permit holders are convicted of misdemeanors or felonies at one sixth the rate that police officers are convicted. 5 Background Over the years, more and more states have adopted laws to allow individuals to obtain concealed carry permits. Illinois was the last state to do so, with the first permits issued in March 2014. Even Washington, D.C. started issuing permits earlier this year. Today, permitted concealed handguns are allowed in every jurisdiction in the United States. But the rules vary greatly from state to state. Some states don’t even require permits, with no fees or training required. Some states make it easy and cheap to get a permit. In South Dakota, the fee to obtain the four-year permit is only $10, with no training requirement. Similarly, in Pennsylvania, the permit only costs $19 for five years and there is no training requirement. By contrast, Illinois charges a $150 fee and requires 16 hours of training. With training and range time, it may cost as much as $300, meaning the total dollar costs of getting a permit in Illinois 6 is about $450. Not surprisingly, concealed carry is much more popular in states where permits are relatively inexpensive and easier to obtain. This report will focus on the increase in concealed carry. Obviously, the main focus from a crime prevention point of view is whether people actually do carry guns, not whether they are allowed to do so. Unsurprisingly, the number of permits has grown faster than the number of states that allow concealed carry. This is because in each state, the longer the law is in effect, more and more people have gradually applied and received permits. But there appears to be another factor: President Obama’s election in 2008. Not only did Obama’s election increase gun sales, it also increased the number of concealed handgun permits. Initially the increase in permits was slow, growing from roughly 2.7 million permit holders in 1999 to 4.6 million in 2007. But the number of concealed handgun permits literally exploded during the Obama presidency. For December 2011, the federal Government Accountability Office estimated that there were at least 8 million concealed handgun permits. By the June 2014, it was 11.1 million; in 2015, 12.8 million. In other words, during the eight years from 1999 to 2007, the number of permits increased by about 240,000 per year. During the next four years, the number of permits surged by 850,000 per year. Then from the end of 2011 to 2013 the yearly increase rose by 1,550,000. And during the last year the increase has continued to accelerate to 1,700,000. The rapid increase in concealed carry permits is also mirrored by the rapid increase in gun sales. NICS background checks soared from 11.2 to 21 million between 2007 and 2014. The sale of guns accelerated further over the last two years -- averaging 14 million during 2008 to 2011 and over 20 million during 2012 and 2013. But both polling and NICS checks provide only imperfect measures of gun ownership. Polling relies on people’s willingness to reveal whether they own a gun. And the changing political environment after mass shootings or a growing distrust of government may affect people’s willingness to reveal that they own a gun. 1 NICS checks don’t suffer from trust issues, but the number of checks do not measure the number of people buying guns or how many guns are being sold with 7 each check. Further, NICS background check are not always required for gun purchases, such as in some state for people who have already passed a background check to get a concealed handgun permit. Concealed handgun permit data is a third measure and has the advantage of being hard data. Still the number of permits clearly underestimates the true number of people who can legally carry concealed handguns. There are three reasons for this. 1) Permits are not required in seven states (soon likely eight states) as well as virtually all of Idaho and Montana. Generally, people in those states only obtain permits so that they can carry concealed when travelling outside of their home state. With no fees or other requirements, these seven states undoubtedly can be assumed to be the ones where people most frequently legally carry concealed guns. 2) Data is not readily available for every state. For example, New Hampshire only collects data for permits issued to non-residents. New York simply doesn’t collect this data at the state level, and it is a very cumbersome process to obtain data from a large number of individual counties or cities. 3) For some states, the data is one or more years old and thus misses the recent growth in permits. As more and more states do not require a permit, the number of permits holders will increasingly underestimate the number of people who can legally carry a handgun. Explaining the Number of Permits Issued For states requiring permits, the percent of adults with permits can be easily explained by how costly it is to get permits, how many years concealed carry laws have been in effect, and whether government officials have discretion in issuing permits.2 Among our findings: -- Each $10 increase in fees reduces the percent of adults with permits by about a half a percentage point. -- Each 10 years that the permit law has been in effect increases the 8 percent of adults with permits by 1.5 percentage points. -- Giving government officials discretion in who gets permits, reduces the percent of adults with get permits by more than two-thirds.

#### *[That takes out the aff – there’s a correlative disconnect between handguns and the AC harms. Handgun ownership has a negative correlation with violence so that implies alt causes or that the opposite of your evidence is true. Prefer because it’s more recent than their ev.]*

#### Link and Impact – Banning handguns makes both criminals and citizens switch to other guns which are more fatal, and even if the shooting rate went down, the fatality rate would go up. Kopel 92:

Kopel, David. [Adjunct Professor of Law, New York University, Former Assistant Attorney General for Colorado, B.A. in history with highest honors from Brown University, graduated magna cum laude from the University of Michigan Law School, contributing editor of the Michigan Law Review] "The Long and the Short of the Handgun Debate." The Washington Post [Published secondarily by Cato Institute. (1992): 4. Web. 9 Dec. 2015. <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/long-short-handgun-debate>.

The time has come to eliminate handguns from American society, suggests Rhode Island’s Senator Chafee, sponsor of legislation to confiscate all handguns in private hands. America’s public health epidemic of gun violence proves the need for gun control, he argues. Unfortunately, Senator Chafee’s proposed cure — **the confiscation of all handguns** — **would make** the national disease of **violence even worse**. If the Chafee bill succeeds at wiping out the American handgun supply, **thousands of additional people will die of gunshot wounds every year**. The reason for this counterintuitive result? **The** Chafee **bill eliminates handguns**, but **leaves long guns — which are much deadlier — uncontrolled. Most people who are shot with handguns survive, and most people who are shot with shotguns die**. As the Annals of Surgery put it: “Shotgun injuries have not been compared with other bullet wounds of the abdomen as they are a thing apart…[A]t close range, they are as deadly as a cannon.” **From a criminal’s p**oint **o**f **v**iew, **a sawed-off** long gun **is a good substitute for a handgun**. In five minutes a criminal can hacksaw a rifle or a shotgun down to an 11 inch length; **the new weapon is about as concealable as a** 12 inch TEC-9 **pistol** or a 9 inch Ruger revolver — **and much more lethal. According to a N**ational **I**nstitute of **J**ustice **survey of felony prisoners, 75% of** the “handgun predators” (**those who specialized in handgun crime) said that if handguns became unavailable, they would switch to sawed-off shoulder weapons. Even if only a third** of criminals **switched** from handguns to long guns, **fatalities would** still **increase sharply. Unlike** street **criminals, persons who own guns at home do not care about concealability, and thus would be especially likely to buy long guns if handguns were illegal. Most people fearful enough to think they need a loaded handgun for protection would not give up the idea of armed defense simply because one type of gun became unavailable**. As long guns supplanted handguns in the home, **the death rate from domestic shootings**, firearms **suicides, and** firearms **accidents would skyrocket. Even if the actual number of shootings fell** somewhat, **the net fatality rate would still rise**, because **each shooting would carry a larger risk of death**.

## Purpose Distinction

#### And, people acquire handguns for non-malicious and defensive reasons. Duke 94:

"Ten Myths About Gun Control." NRA Institute for Legislative Action. Duke University, 1994. Web. 20 Dec. 2015. <http://people.duke.edu/~gnsmith/articles/myths.htm>.

MYTH 2: "The only purpose of a handgun is to kill people." This often repeated statement is patently untrue, but to those Americans whose only knowledge of firearms comes from the nightly violence on television, it might seem believable. When anti-gun researcher James Wright, then of the University of Massachusetts, studied all the available literature on firearms, he concluded: "Even the most casual and passing familiarity with this literature is therefore sufficient to believe the contention that handguns have `no legitimate sport or recreational use.' " There are an estimated 65-70 million privately owned handguns in the United States that are used for hunting, target shooting, protection of families and businesses, and other legitimate and lawful purposes. By comparison, handguns were used in an estimated 13,200 homicides in 1992 --less than 0.02% (two hundredths of 1%) of the handguns in America. Many of these reported homicides (1,500-2,800) were self-defense or justifiable and, therefore, not criminal. That fact alone renders the myth about the "only purpose" of handguns absurd, for more than 99% of all handguns are used for no criminal purpose. **By far the most commonly cited reason for owning a handgun is protection** against criminals. At least one-half of handgun owners in America own handguns for protection and security. **A handgun's function is** one of **insurance as well as defense. A handgun** in the home **is a contingency**, based on the knowledge that if there ever comes a time when it is needed, no substitute will do. Certainly **no violent intent is implied, any more than a purchaser of life insurance intends to die soon**.

#### *[But other guns only exist to kill, so handguns are permissible and a shift to long guns is the worst under their framework.*

#### *And, even if handguns are impermissible, long guns are everything wrong with handguns to a greater extent, so that will always turn case and outweigh.]*

## Turns Hypermasculinity

#### Bigger guns turn hypermasculinity –

#### (a) They’re more phallic than other guns – they play more into the masculinity complex behind gun culture

#### (b) Bigger guns are everything handguns are, just more extreme. All of the aggressive and destructive aspects of gun culture are significantly amplified

#### (c) Most of the shootings that make the headlines are with bigger guns that cause more carnage – people being forced to shift from small to big guns is a huge internal link into the sensationalism of gun culture

#### (d) Worst case scenario it’s a solvency takeout

# \*\*\*2NR Section\*\*\*

## Extensions

#### The 1NC evidence estimates a 70 or so percent substitution rate for long guns, but even that was likely lower than the reality. And, only a 30 percent rate would be needed to increase gun deaths, so even if I’m off by 40 percent, I turn and outweigh the aff. Kopel 93:

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

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

#### Thus, I outweigh on probability and magnitude.

#### Dixon assumes too much, and empirics flow neg. Kopel 93:

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

As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [179] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [180] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [181] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [182] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - **Dixon has** explicitly **assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere**. [183] **So why** then **do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws**, and fewer handgun murders**?** One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. **A** sufficiently **large number of Australians and Canadians**, unable to obtain handguns, do their **shoot**ing with **rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived**. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), **the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll**. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [184]

#### And, estimates of the homicide rate increase assumed that the people that switch to knives wouldn’t commit crimes, so the actual homicide rate increase would be even higher than expected. Kopel 93:

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

**Dixon critiques the** Benenson and Kates **estimate of a homicide rate increase** because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [187] **But when calculating expected deaths** resulting **from substitution, Kates and Benenson assumed that none of the persons who switched to knives would kill anyone**; in terms of resulting deaths, **therefore, Kates and Benenson underestimated the** \*330 **deaths that would be caused** by murderers who switched downward to less lethal weapons. Even assuming that none of the persons who switched down killed anyone, the homicide rate would double if half of the handgun-deprived criminals switched "up" to long guns. [188]

## AT: Too Old/Concealability

#### Here’s more recent evidence that substitution will occur, and, statistically, concealability is not a factor in gun crimes. Kleck 2k9:

Kleck, Gary. (Kleck is a criminologist; winner of the Michael J. Hindelang award from the American society of criminology; professor of criminology at Florida State "Mass Shootings in Schools, The Worst Possible Case for Gun Control." American Behavioral Scientist. June 2009. Web. 09 Dec. 2015

http://www15.uta.fi/arkisto/aktk/projects/sta/Kleck\_2009\_Mass\_Shootings\_in\_Schools.pdf

Selective **bans on less lethal** varieties of **guns encourage the substitution of more lethal** types of **guns. The most likely substitute for a** small, cheap **handgun is a** somewhat **larger**, more expensive **one, not a knife** or club. Where the availability of small-caliber, less lethal handguns is reduced, **offenders who otherwise would have used these guns are motivated to substitute larger** caliber, and thus **more lethal**, varieties of hand**guns**. And **if handgun bans succeed**ed in producing handgun scarcity **among violence-prone people, long guns** such as sawed-off shotguns **would be substituted. Surveys of prison inmates confirm** that these are indeed the most likely criminal adaptations to SNS or handgun bans—most offenders who had committed crimes with handguns said that they would substitute a sawed-off long gun if they could not get a handgun and would substitute a larger, better quality handgun if they could not get a small, cheap one (Wright & Rossi, 1986, pp. 215-223). Larger caliber handguns are more lethal than smaller caliber ones, and better quality, more expensive handguns are more reliable and likely to fire when the trigger is pulled than less expensive ones. Likewise, as a class, long guns are more lethal than handguns. Thus, either the substitution of bigger handguns for smaller SNSs, or the substitution of long guns for handguns, is likely to produce an increase in the fraction of gun assaults resulting in death. **Most homicides committed with handguns do not require the concealability of handguns; sawedoff long guns would be sufficiently concealable, so crime circumstances would usually permit these substitutions (Kleck, 1997, pp. 130-139)**. Of course, **in** the **planned** armed **assaults of mass school shootings, concealability** of firearms **is even less relevant**, as is demonstrated by the frequent use of long guns and larger handguns (Table 1).

## AT: Dixon

#### Dixon says that criminals won’t shift to long guns so the aff will still solve. That’s wrong and you prefer the Kopel evidence for 12 reasons:

#### 1. Trench coats and similar attire make concealing long guns easier.

#### 2 People can use cars to conceal long guns.

#### 3. Kopel indicates that a sawed off *can* *easily* be concealed. People have done it well before.

#### 4. It would only take a small push to promote a transition to long guns because they have more of an intimidation factor so there are comparable incentives for criminals to use them if they can’t use handguns.

#### 5. People really like their guns - just because concealing long guns seems hard now doesn’t mean that modifications and other adaptations wouldn’t become commonplace.

#### 6. Kopel cites a National Institute of Justice survey of “handgun predator” felons and 75% of them said they would shift to long guns. It actually asks people instead of just assuming what they want, which is what Dixon does.

#### 7. Dixon just *assumes* that just because people *prefer* smaller guns means they’d rather have no gun at all than at least get a long gun. Only my evidence takes into account that people really like their guns.

#### 8. At best they only respond to the crime impact, but Kopel is in the context of criminals and regular citizens. Even if no crime shift occurs, the citizen shift would still turn case.

#### 9. Kopel says citizens still shift to long guns because homeowners don’t care about concealability for protection. That outweighs because there are more citizens with guns than criminals with guns by a huge amount - Dixon is totally silent on the question of a shift for self-defense purposes instead of crime.

#### 10. Kopel says long guns are much more lethal, which is also intuitive since they have bigger rounds and it’s hard to miss with a sawed off - that means even a risk of a shift is enough to outweigh the aff because more people would die than be saved if the shift occurs.

#### 11. My author wrote a response to yours. The inferiority of long guns doesn’t mean there won’t be a shift - prohibition proves it will occur. Kopel 93:

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

**Another tack taken by Dixon is to argue that high rates of substitution are unlikely because long guns are so inferior for most criminal purposes**. He notes first of all that less than 10% of murders are currently perpetrated with long guns. [189] This is true, but, as Dixon strenuously argues, handguns are widely preferred as murder weapons, and widely available. Thus, **it should not be surprising that more than 6 out of 7 gun murderers chose the "best" tool**, a handgun. **But what people choose when the "best" option is available does not prove how they would behave if only inferior options were available**. Today, virtually **all hard liquor drinkers consume the "best"** hard liquor **available** - namely legally-produced hard liquor whose production is regulated by the government to guarantee standards of safety. Probably less than 5% of American hard liquor consumers drink bathtub gin, moonshine, and other home- brewed liquors whose safety cannot be guaranteed. **Does the fact prove that very few liquor drinkers would, if legal liquor became unavailable, substitute home-brewed liquor?** To the contrary, the experience of alcohol **prohibition showed that a large percentage of liquor consumers, if unable to obtain safe**, legal **liquor, will switch to inferior**, dangerous homemade **liquor**. [190] **That murderers only rarely use long guns today does not prove that murders would eschew long guns if handguns were unavailable**, any more than drinkers of legal liquor would eschew bathtub gin. [191]

#### 12. Err neg - I’m the only one doing any evidence comparison. Don’t allow new 2AR evidence comparison unless it’s a line-by-line on these arguments for 5 reasons:

#### (a) I have no 3NR to respond,

#### (b) them getting to wax poetic justice on any other part of the flow is already an advantage,

#### (c) my evidence was read in the 1NC so their time to respond to it *in full* was the 1AR,

#### (d) each reason why my evidence is better is theoretically terminal on this question because any semblance of a reason why my ev is better is a reason to totally ignore theirs, and

#### (e) they’ll be tempted to misrepresent my args and hype up their evidence in the 2AR - set the bar high to counteract that.

## AT: Loyola Dump

### They say author bias, but

#### 1. Same with your authors since Congress banned funding gun research none of our evidence will be objective.

#### 2. Bias means someone is more likely to reach a conclusion, not that that conclusion is wrong – this is insufficient.

#### 3. Call for my evidence – if you buy the common-sense analytical warrants in it then it’s probably sufficient still.

#### 4. If I tell you the sky is blue, the fact that I like the sky being blue doesn’t automatically make me wrong.

### They say Kopel is based on Kleck and Kleck is flawed, but

#### 1. Not entirely – Kopel gives other warrants that aren’t from Kleck, call for it.

#### 2. Kopel wrote a response to this argument – survey respondents had an incentive to lie to favor the aff, not the neg, and even if only 30 percent were telling the truth that’s sufficient – wide margin of error. Kopel 93:

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

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

#### 3. They cut the wrong part of Dixon indicting Kleck, their card is about Kleck’s surveys related to whether people buy and use guns for self-defense, not whether criminals would switch to sawed-offs.

### They say Kopel is based on Kates and Kates is flawed, but

#### 1. Again, call for it and evaluate the analytical warrants that aren’t

#### 2. Their Kates bad evidence is nonresponsive and isn’t about substitution effects, it’s about what causes gun violence

### They say Maryland proves no substitution, [Vernick et al. 99] but

#### 1. Their evidence is about an incomplete handgun ban, not the aff which would do even more to push people to long guns

#### 2. Their evidence is about substitution to non-banned handguns, not long guns, it’s entirely nonresponsive

#### 3. Empirics flow neg. Kopel 93:

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

As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [179] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [180] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [181] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [182] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - **Dixon has** explicitly **assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere**. [183] **So why** then **do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws**, and fewer handgun murders**?** One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. **A** sufficiently **large number of Australians and Canadians**, unable to obtain handguns, do their **shoot**ing with **rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived**. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), **the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll**. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [184]

### They say Brady proves reverse substitution, [Monroe 2k8] but

#### 1. Their evidence says that was just because of misconceptions about the law, but that’s because Brady wasn’t as clear cut as a blanket handgun ban would be.

#### 2. Brady was background checks, not a ban which would involve confiscation. Brady gave people no incentive to switch currently owned handguns to long guns – their evidence doesn’t prove anything.

#### 3. Turn - It literally says that pre-Brady states had sharper declines in non-handgun homicides, meaning it slowed the squo’s natural decline in shotgun and rifle usage, read the non-underlined text. Monroe:

(Monroe, Jeffrey D. [Jeffrey Monroe’s work centers on criminal justice policy with particular focus on gun violence and gun control. He earned his Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from Temple University. An Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Xavier University, Monroe has written and spoken internationally on gun control initiatives]. Homicide and Gun Control: The Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act and Homicide Rates. New York, NY, USA: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC, 2008. ProQuest ebrary. Web. Copyright © 2008. LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC. All rights reserved. pp. 100-104) [See their evidence for the full card]

Comparing the change in non-handgun homicide rates in Brady states to the change in nonhandgun homicide rates in pre-Brady states reveals that, **while** the **non- handgun homicide** rates **declined in both groups**, the -.2355 **decrease in pre-Brady states was greater** than the -.1193 decline in Brady states. A t test determined that the differences-in-differences estimate (DD = -.1162) is not significant (t = 1.21; df = 47; p =.23). **Although Brady states did not experience the hypothesized increase, the decline in this type of homicide in states that implemented Brady was much slower than the comparable decline identified in pre-Brady states**.