# 1AC – Normal

## Inherency:

#### Current approaches to accidental child death are insufficient – less than 20 states have legislation and the squo. Disregard neg ev it’s tainted by the NRA. LUO and McINTIRE 13:

Children and Guns: The Hidden Toll By MICHAEL LUO and MIKE McINTIRE SEPTEMBER 28, 2013

Cases like these are among the most gut-wrenching of gun deaths. **Children shot accidentally** — usually by other children — **are collateral casualties of the accessibility of guns in America**, **their deaths all the more devastating for being** eminently **preventable**. They die in the households of police officers and drug dealers, in broken homes and close-knit families, on rural farms and in city apartments. Some adults whose guns were used had tried to store them safely; others were grossly negligent. Still others pulled the trigger themselves, accidentally fracturing their own families while cleaning a pistol or hunting. **And there are far more of these** innocent **victims than** official **records show**. A New York Times review of hundreds of child firearm deaths found that accidental shootings occurred roughly twice as often as the records indicate, because of idiosyncrasies in how such deaths are classified by the authorities. The killings of Lucas, Cassie and Alex, for instance, were not recorded as accidents. Nor were more than half of the 259 accidental firearm deaths of children under age 15 identified by The Times in eight states where records were available. The National Rifle Association cited the lower official numbers this year in a fact sheet opposing “safe storage” laws, saying children were more likely to be killed by falls, poisoning or environmental [other] factors — an incorrect assertion if the actual number of accidental firearm deaths is significantly higher. In all, fewer than 20 states have enacted laws to hold adults criminally liable [for] if they fail to store guns safely, enabling children to access them. Legislative and other efforts to promote the development of childproof weapons using “smart gun” technology have similarly stalled. Technical issues have been an obstacle, but so have N.R.A. arguments that the problem is relatively insignificant and the technology unneeded. As a result, scores of accidental killings are not reflected in the official statistics that have framed the debate over how to protect children from guns. Because of maneuvering in Congress by the gun lobby and its allies, firearms have also been exempted from regulation by the Consumer Product Safety Commission since its inception. Even with a proper count, intentional shooting deaths of children — including gang shootings and murder-suicides by family members — far exceed accidental gun deaths. But accidents, more than the other firearm-related deaths, come with endless hypotheticals about what could have been done differently. The rifle association’s lobbying arm recently posted on its Web site a claim that adult criminals who mishandle firearms — as opposed to law-abiding gun owners — are responsible for most fatal accidents involving children. But The Times’s review found that a vast majority of cases revolved around children’s access to firearms, with the shooting either self-inflicted or done by another child.

#### Accidental death is high now – presence of gun makes probability of death too high. LIDGETT 16:

Accidental Gun Deaths Involving Children Are A Major Problem In The US BY ADAM LIDGETT

**By the end of 2015, about 265 children under 18 picked up a firearm and shot someone by accident**, and **83** of those shootings **were fatal**, [according](http://everytownresearch.org/notanaccident/)to research compiled by the gun control group Everytown for Gun Safety. Some **41** of those deaths **involved the shooters themselves**, **and most** of **the shootings involved** **toddlers or teens**who were playing recklessly with the guns. Nearly **1.7 million children live in households** **where guns are stored** either loaded **or not locked away**, [according](http://smartgunlaws.org/law-center-and-americans-for-responsible-solutions-release-commonsense-solutions-toolkit-on-protecting-kids-from-unintended-shootings/) to the San Francisco-based Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. **This makes American children 16 times more likely to be unintentionally killed by** **a** **gun**, compared with similar countries. There have been efforts to stop these unintentional deaths. Everytown for Gun Safety, which is backed by media mogul and former New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg, reported in 2014 that 28 [states](http://everytownresearch.org/documents/2015/04/innocents-lost.pdf#page=14) and Washington, D.C., had laws that held firearm owners liable if their guns were accessed by children. While mass shootings marred the U.S. during the past year, Obama has said he was moved to push for more gun regulations in the wake of the 2012 attack on Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, in which more than 20 children were killed by [shooter](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/01/05/president-obamas-amazingly-emotional-speech-on-gun-control-annotated/) Adam Lanza.

## Plan:

#### Thus the plan – resolved: The United States Federal Government ought to ban the private ownership handguns for households with at least one person under 18 years of age. I reserve the right to clarify unanswered advocacy questions in CX – ensures substantive discussion since it avoids unnecessary theory. THE AAP 12:

November 2012, VOLUME 130 / ISSUE 5 From the American Academy of Pediatrics Policy Statement Firearm-Related Injuries Affecting the Pediatric Population COUNCIL ON INJURY, VIOLENCE, AND POISON PREVENTION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The absence of guns from children’s homes and communities is the most reliable and effective measure to prevent firearm-related injuries in children and adolescents. Adolescent suicide risk is strongly associated with firearm availability. Safe gun storage (guns unloaded and locked, ammunition locked separately) reduces children’s risk of injury. Physician counseling of parents about firearm safety appears to be effective, but firearm safety education programs directed at children are ineffective. The American Academy of Pediatrics continues to support[s] a number of specific measures to reduce the destructive effects of guns in the lives of children and adolescents, including the regulation of the manufacture, sale, purchase, ownership, and use of firearms; a ban on semiautomatic assault weapons; and the strongest possible regulations of handguns for civilian use. [they continue] Firearm-related injury to children is associated with death and severe morbidity and is a significant public health problem. Child health care professionals can and should provide effective leadership in efforts to prevent gun violence, injury, and death. The AAP recognizes the importance of a variety of countermeasures (educational, environmental, engineering, enactment, enforcement, economic incentives, and evaluation) to dramatically curb the number of firearm-related injuries to children. The AAP makes the following recommendations, which reaffirm and expand on the 1992 and 2000 policy statements65,66: The AAP affirms that the most effective measure to prevent suicide, homicide, and unintentional firearm-related injuries to children and adolescents is the absence of guns from homes and communities. Although the US Supreme Court ruling in the case of McDonald v City of Chicago struck down comprehensive local and statewide firearm bans, pediatricians should continue to advocate for the strongest possible legislative and regulatory approaches to prevent firearm injuries and deaths. Health information for parents: Pediatricians and other child health care professionals are urged to counsel parents about the dangers of allowing children and adolescents to have access to guns inside and outside the home. The AAP recommends that pediatricians incorporate questions about the presence and availability of firearms into their patient history taking and urge parents who possess guns to prevent access to these guns by children. Safer storage of guns reduces injuries, and physician counseling linked with distribution of cable locks appear to increase safer storage. Nevertheless, the safest home for a child or adolescent is one without firearms. The presence of guns in the home increases the risk of lethal suicidal acts among adolescents. Health care professionals should counsel the parents of all adolescents to remove guns from the home or restrict access to them. This advice should be reiterated and reinforced for patients with mood disorders, substance abuse problems (including alcohol), or a history of suicide attempts. The AAP urges that guns be subject to consumer product regulations regarding child access, safety, and design. In addition, the AAP continues to support law enforcement activities that trace the origins of firearms used in the commission of crimes and that these data be used to enforce regulations aimed at preventing illegal sales to minors. Evidence supports the effectiveness of regulation that limits child access to firearms. The AAP supports efforts to reduce the destructive power of handguns [through] and handgun ammunition via regulation of the manufacture and importation of classes of guns. Engineering efforts (eg, personalized safety mechanisms and trigger locks) may be of benefit and need further study. Trigger locks, lock boxes, gun safes, and safe storage legislation are encouraged by the AAP. Other measures aimed at regulating access of guns should include legislative actions, such as mandatory waiting periods, closure of the gun show loophole, mental health restrictions for gun purchases, and background checks. The AAP recommends restoration of the ban on the sale of assault weapons to the general public.

#### And, harms to society are marginal with a ban only on households with children, but a ban on these groups goes a long way for children. HARE 11:

The Changing Child Population of the United States: Analysis of Data from the 2010 Census Dr. William O’Hare is a demographer and Senior Consultant to the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Over the last 30 years he has used statistical analysis to elevate the needs of disadvantaged populations, such as children, the poor and racial minorities, on the public agenda. He was the Director of the National KIDS COUNT project from 1993 to 2006.

Children accounted for 40 percent of the population in 1900, but [now] they account for only 24 percent today. Much of the decline in the relative size of the population under age 18 occurred during the second half of the last century. In 1960, near the height of the baby boom, 36 percent of the population was under age 18. Just 50 years later, children’s share of the U.S. population had dropped almost 12 percentage points. This is the result of two demographic trends. First, the movement toward smaller families over the past century meant fewer children were being born late in the century compared to early in the century. Second, increases in life expectancy led to a larger adult population in 2010— because more Americans now survive to older ages, children are a smaller share of the total. The percentage of households with at least one child fell steeply over the past 50 years. The 1960 census revealed that more than half (51 percent) of all households had at least one child, compared with only 34 percent in 2009.5 One has to wonder how the steep decline in children as a share of our total population has affected our society and our public policy priorities over the past half century. For example, has the reduced percentage of households with children diminished the public resources that go to children? Studies show that the federal government provides $23,500 for each elderly person, but only $3,348 for each child.6 The growing fiscal pressures brought on by the retiring baby-boom generation and the relatively small share of households with children is likely to lead to political pressures that will make this imbalance grow rather than shrink. Such sociopolitical change based on changing demographics was predicted by demographers almost 30 years ago.7 Moreover, while the share of the population who are children is projected to remain at the current level (24 percent), the share of the population who are elderly (age 65+) is projected to increase from 13 percent to 19 percent from 2010 to 2030.8

## Advantage 1: Accidental Death

#### Handguns in the home are responsible for unintentional child death. It’s the go to choice for teens and turns self-defense since it harms youth more. THE AAP 07:

The American Academy of Pediatrics, et al., Amicus Brief, DC v. Heller, 2007, 2008 U.S. S. Ct Briefs, LEXIS 39, p. 8-11

A study conducted in 2005 revealed that over 1.69 million children under age 18 are living in homes with loaded and unlocked firearms. Catherine A. Okoro et al., Prevalence of Household Firearms and Firearm-Storage Practices in the 50 States and the District of Columbia: Findings from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2002, 116 Pediatrics e370, e371-72 (2005), available at http://pediatrics.aappublications.org.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/ cgi/content/full/116/3/e370. In fact, an estimated one out of three handguns is kept loaded and unlocked. Cook & Ludwig, supra, at 7. n7 In one 2006 study, 73 percent of children under age 10 reported knowing the location of their parents' firearms and 36 percent admitted that they had handled the weapons. Frances Baxley & Matthew Miller, Parental Misperceptions About Children and Firearms, 160 Archives of Pediatric & Adolescent Med. 542, 544-45 (2006), available at http://archpedi.ama-assn.org/cgi/reprint/160/5/542.pdf. Accordingly, it is not surprising that 89 percent of childhood unintentional shooting deaths occur in the home, or that most of these deaths occur when children are playing with a loaded gun in their parents' absence. Guohua Li et al., Factors Associated with the Intent of Firearm-Related Injuries in Pediatric Trauma Patients, 150 Archives of Pediatric & Adolescent Med. 1160, 1162 (1996).Moreover, contrary to the popular myth that guns are necessary in the home for self-defense, one study found that there are four unintentional shootings, seven criminal assaults or homicides, and 11 attempted or completed suicides for every time a gun kept in the home is used in self-defense. See Arthur L. Kellermann et al., Injuries and Deaths Due to Firearms in the Home, 45 J. Trauma, Infection, [\*\*19] & Critical Care 263 (1998). It is simply undeniable that access to firearms in the home increases the risk of both accidental injuries as well as intentional shootings. A study of youth suicide found that more than 75 percent of guns used by youth in suicide attempts and unintentional injuries were kept in the home of the victim, a relative, or a friend. David C. Grossman et al., Self-Inflicted and Unintentional Firearm Injuries Among Children and Adolescents: The Source of the Firearm, 153 Archives of Pediatric & Adolescent Med. 875, 875 (1999), available at http:// archpedi.ama-assn.org/cgi/reprint/153/8/875. Another study, published by the U.S. Secret Service, of 37 school shootings in 26 states found that, in more than 65 percent of the cases, the shooter got the gun from his or her home or that of a relative. United States Dep't of the Treasury, U.S. Secret Service, An Interim Report on the Prevention of Targeted Violence in Schools, Oct. 2000, at 6, available at http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ ericdocs2sql/content\_storage\_01/0000019b/80/16/a6/ d6.pdf. n8 [\*10] Handguns are also undeniably the "firearm of choice" among teens. A 1996 survey of high school students by the National Institute of Justice found that high-school aged youth who carried guns outside the home most frequently carried an automatic or semiautomatic handgun (50 percent) and next most likely carried a revolver (30 percent). Joseph F Sheley & James D. Wright, U.S. Dep't of Justice, Nat'l Inst. of Justice, High School Youths, Weapons, and Violence: A National Survey, Oct. 1998, at 3, Ex. 2, available at http:/ /www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/172857.pdf. In addition, of those students who admitted to carrying a gun, 43 percent  [\*11]  indicated that they were carrying a gun as protection, while 36 percent boasted to carrying a gun to "scare someone" or "get back at someone." [Id. at 6.](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/lnacui2api/mungo/lexseestat.do?bct=A&risb=21_T23137248960&homeCsi=6318&A=0.9530190756909797&urlEnc=ISO-8859-1&&citeString=614%20F.2d%201,at%206&countryCode=USA&_md5=00000000000000000000000000000000) Most significantly, 52 percent of the armed youth stated that they had received or borrowed a gun from a family member or had taken it from their home without their parent's permission. See id. at 4.

#### Impacts:

#### A. Outweighs on probability – lots of children die everyday from a loaded handgun in the home. WALESH 1:

Kim Walesh “Handguns In The Home: An Unnecessary Risk” http://scholar.valpo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=core\_reader

**Handguns make the home an easy target for accident**al death. The U.S. Surgeon General's 1981 Select Panel for the Promotion of Child Health proclaimed an "epidemic of [handgunrelated] deaths and injuries among children and youth." **One child dies every day from accidental shootings and perhaps thirteen more** are **injured.** In 1978 the U.S. had more killings with handguns by children ten years old and younger than Great Britain had by killers of all ages. 21 The problem is basic: **in order for a handgun to be useful, it must be kept loaded and handy** always. The danger is obvious. When curious children, careless adults, and easy-to-use handguns mix, **the result is horrifying accidental death.** One three-year-old boy carried a gun into the kitchen, asked, "Mommy, is this where I pull" and shot his stupefied mother. Another fourteen-year-old boy shot his fourteen-year-old friend after watching film clippings of the Reagan assassination attempt. The boys had gone exploring, looking for the gun in the basement. 22 Gun advocates argue that accidents happen only in careless homes. However, **as long as guns are so**. **readily available, children can kill parents and friends, as well as themselves**; **safety classes and other precautions cannot prevent every accident**. Ironically, the **increasing number of guns bought to provide security and protection actually raises the"chances of more accidents**, homicides, and self-destruction. The U.S. is an influential, respected world leader, and yet handguns continue slaughtering Americans and victimizing their relatives. Judging from our lack of concern and action, we Americans must need death in order to understand the value of life.

#### B. Guns leading cause of kids deaths; they outnumber cancer and heart disease – getting rid of them are key to children’s’ protection. HOOK 14

BRANDY ZADROZNY AFTER SANDY HOOK05.15.14 5:45 AM ET Pediatricians Take on the NRA Over Gun Safety

An estimated 20,600 people under the age of 25 are injured by a gun every year and 6,570 die, according to the AAP. Guns kill twice as many in this age group as cancer, five times as many as heart disease and 20 times as many as infections. By 2015, guns are expected to surpass motor vehicle crashes as a cause of death for young people, according to the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank.

## Advantage 2: Physocological Harms

#### The “weapons effect” means that the mere presence of handguns perpetuates this culture and causes children to become aggressive. Limiting ownership is key. WALESH 2:

Kim Walesh “Handguns In The Home: An Unnecessary Risk” http://scholar.valpo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=core\_reader

Leonard Berkowitz, professor of psychology at the University of Wisconsin, first discovered this "weapons effect" in 1967. He hypothesized that **the presence of a gun would stimulate aggressive behavior. [**Methodology:] The original research design placed subjects individually, in rooms with electric shock machines and made them judge lists of new ideas by delivering shocks to their partners who originated the idea. For some students there was nothing else in the room; for others, there were badminton rackets and shuttlecocks (neutral stimuli); and for the last group, there was a 12-guage shotgun and a snub-nosed .38 revolver. As predicted, students in the rooms with the guns shocked their partners longer and harder. Berkowitz [the study] concluded that “the mere sight of a weapon can be a conditioned stimulus that evokes ideas and motor responses associated with aggression." Later **studies** at the University of Utah **applied the** weapons effect **theory to child aggression.** Charles Turner and Diane Goldsmith observed the behavior of four and five year-olds in play sessions for several weeks. On some days the children played with neutral toys, such as airplanes, and on other days they played with toy guns. **When** the **children play**ed **with [toy] guns, there was a higher rate of** anti-social behavior (**pushing, hitting, name-calling**) than on the neutral toy '' "' days. The children had probably associated the guns with aggression and had acted violently as society had taught them. Berkowitz feels that **we** often **act mindlessly and impulsively in the presence of guns** and suggests that **the only way to control the** weapons **effect is to decrease** the **availability** of guns. 14 If the presence of guns does indeed create aggression, we may not have as much control over our actions as the classic NRA argument might suggest

## Solvency:

#### Plan solves - these mortality rates must be dealt with by decreasing availability – WALESH 3:

Kim Walesh “Handguns In The Home: An Unnecessary Risk”

Handgun injury is a major cause of morbidity and mortality in American society, particularly among young people. **Large numbers of children are affected** by handgun violence through the loss of fathers, brothers, and other relatives. Young children are injured, and occasionally killed, in handgun “accidents”. Some young children and many adolescents are murdered with handguns. Like infant mortality, handgun violence in the United States is a medical as well as a social problem. Because of the great lethality of handguns and their very limited ability to provide personal protection, **handgun injury can best be reduced by making handguns less available**. Handgun control cannot reduce rates of crime or interpersonal assault, but it can reduce the frequency and severity of injury arising from these situations toward the much lower levels found in other countries. The involvement of children in the United States handgun injury epidemic warrants effective pediatrician involvement in efforts toward handgun control.

#### And, no substitution – parents uniquely are affected by gun tragedies and will do what it takes to comply with handgun control – the ev indicates that parents changed their mind from wanting handguns to gun control after tragedies occurred. Thus, spreading awareness of the aff is key to spreading more gun laws URIST 12:

After school massacre, parents' divide deepens on gun control Dec. 16, 2012 at 12:57 PMJacoba Urist TODAY contributor

Still, the thought of gun control weighs heavily on the minds of many parents as they try to make sense of the tragedy. Melinda Blanch, the mom of two boys under 3 and a resident of New Haven, Conn., says she’s conflicted. She understands the constitutional right to bear arms, but points out the constitution was written at a time when a musket was the biggest threat. Until Friday she wasn’t opposed to private ownership of firearms, like the handguns used at Sandy Hook, with a limited amount of ammunition. But as a mom, the stories of those little ones at the elementary school shook her to the core. Now she favors much stricter gun laws. Most of all she, says, “Let’s hope as moms we can have some productive discussions and come up with real ways to prevent another situation from arising like this in the future.”

## Framework:

#### The judge must resist the imposition of dominant ideology on marginalized groups in educational spaces. TRIFONAS 03:

Trifonas, Peter. PEDAGOGIES OF DIFFERENCE: RETHINKING EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL CHANGE. New York, London. 2003.

Domination and subordination, I imply that they are relations of power. **In** an **education**al context, the exercise of **power is accomplished in interactions** (i.e., in a social organization), manifesting itselfas acts **of** exclusion, **marginalization**, silencing, and so forth. Thus**,** **paying attention to** how **power** operatesalong axes of gender, race, class, and ability (that is, recognizing that social differences are not given, but are accomplished in and through educational settings) **is a step toward educational equity**. What does the above discussion mean in the educational context? It means that in the interactions of teachers with students in the classroom, or in other contexts, **attention needs to be directed toward how dominant** andsubordinate **relations** (be they based on race, gender, class, or ability) **permeate these contexts and** intersect in complicated ways to **produce inequality** and marginalization. The frequently used and well-meaning phrase, “I treat everyone the same, ” often used by teachers and administrators to indicate their lack of bias in a diverse educational setting, in fact masks unequal power relations. Similarly, educational policies that assume that people are the same or equal may serve to entrench existing inequality precisely because people enter into the educational process with different and unequal experiences. These attempts, well meaning though they may be, tend to render inequality invisible, and thus work against equity in education. In her exploration of white privilege in higher education in the United States, Frances Rains (1998), an aboriginal-Japanese American woman, states emphatically that these benign acts are disempowering for the minority person because they erase his or her racial identity. The denial of racism in this case is in fact a form of racism. **Thus, in moving toward equity in education that allows us to address multiple and intersecting axes of difference and inequality, I recommend that we try to think and act “against the grain” in developing educational policies and handling various kinds of pedagogical situations. 5 To work against the grain is to recognize that education is not neutral; it is contested**. Mohanty puts it as such: … [E]ducation represents both a struggle for meaning and a struggle over power relations. [It is] a central terrain where power and politics operate out of the lived culture of individuals and groups situated in asymmetrical social and political positions. (Mohanty 1990:184) We need to develop a critical awareness of the power dynamics operative in institutional relations-and of the fact that people participate in institutions as unequal subjects. **Working against the grain is to take a proactive approach to understanding and acting upon institutional relations, whether in the classroom, in other interactions with students, or in policy development. Rather than overlooking the embeddedness of gender, race, class, ability, and other forms of inequality that shape our interactions, working against the grain** makes explicit the political nature of education and how power operates to **privilege, silence, and** marginalize individuals who are differently located in the educational process. In her exploration of feminist pedagogy, Linda Briskin (1990) makes a clear distinction between nonsexist and antisexist education critical to our understanding here. She asserts that nonsexism is an approach that attempts to neutralize sexual inequality by pretending that gender can be made irrelevant in the classroom. Thus, for instance, merely asserting that male and female students should have equal time to speak-and indeed giving them equal time-cannot adequately rectify the endemic problem of sexism in the classroom. One of Briskin's students reported that in her political science tutorials that when the male students spoke, everyone paid attention. When a female student spoke, however, the class acted as if no one was speaking (13). Neutrality is an attempt to conceal the unequal distribution of power. An against the grain approach would acknowledge explicitly that we are all gendered, racialized, and differently constructed subjects who do not participate in interactional relations as equals. This goes beyond formulating sexism, racism, abilism, and class privilege in individualist terms and treating them as if they were personal attitudes. Terry Wolverton (1983) discovered the difference between nonracism and antiracism in her consciousness-raising attempt: I had confused the act of trying to appear not to be racist with actively working to eliminate racism. Trying to appear not racist had made me deny my racism, and therefore exclude the possibility of change. (191) Being against the grain means seeing inequality as systemic and interpersonal (rather than individual), and combatting oppression as a collective responsibility, not just as a personal attribute (so that somehow a person can cleanse herself or himself of sexism, racism, abilism, or class bias). It is to pay attention to oppression as an interactional property that can be altered (see Manners 1998). Roger Simon (1993) suggests, in his development of a philosophical basis for teaching against the grain, which shares many commonalities in how I think about an integrative approach to equity in education, that teaching against the grain is fundamentally a moral practice. By this he does not mean that teachers simply fulfill the mandate and guidelines of school authorities. He believes that teachers must expose the partial and imperfect nature of existing knowledge, which is constructed on the basis of asymmetrical power relations (for instance, who has the power to speak and whose voices are suppressed?). It is the responsibility of the teacher or educator to show how dominant forms of knowledge and ways of knowing constrict human capacities. In exposing the power relations integral to the knowledge construction process, the educator, by extension, must treat teaching and learning as a mutual and collaborative act between teachers and students. What may this ideal look like in practice? Marilyn Cochran-Smith (1991) also explores the notion of teaching against the grain in her research on how teachers and students worked together in a preservice program in the Philadelphia area. Borrowing from Gramsci's formulation that action is everyone's responsibility, she asserts that teaching is fundamentally a political activity. In practical terms, she outlines what it may mean to teach against the grain in an actual teaching and learning situation. Her succinct articulation is worth quoting at length: To teach against the grain, teachers have to understand and work both within and around the culture of teaching and the politics of schooling at their particular schools and within their larger school system and communities. They cannot simply announce better ways of doing things, as outsiders are likely to do. They have to teach differently without judging the ways other teach or dismissing the ideas others espouse…. [They] are not at liberty to publicly announce brilliant but excoriating critiques of their colleagues and the bureaucracies in which they labor. Their ultimate commitment is to the school lives and futures of the children with whom they live and work. Without condescension or defensiveness, they have to work with parents and other teachers on different ways of seeing and measuring development, connecting and dividing knowledge, and knowing about teaching and schooling. They have to be astute observers of individual learners with the ability to pose and explore questions that transcend cultural attribution, institutional habit, and the alleged certainty of outside experts. They have to see beyond and through the conventional labels and practices that sustain the status quo by raising unanswerable and often uncomfortable questions. Perhaps most importantly, teachers who work against the grain must name and wrestle with their own doubts, must fend off the fatigue of reform and depend on the strength of their individual and collaborative convictions that their work ultimately makes a difference in the fabric of social responsibility. (Cochran-Smith 1991:284-85) For me, to be against the grain is therefore to recognize that the routinized courses of action and interactions in all educational contexts are imbued with unequal distribution of power that produce and reinforce various forms of marginalization and exclusion. Thus, a commitment to redress these power relations (i.e., equity in education) involves interventions and actions that may appear “counter-intuitive.” 6 Undoing inequality and achieving equity in education is a risky and uncomfortable act because we need to disrupt the ways things are “normally” done. **This involves a serious** (and frequently threatening) **effort to interrogate our privilege** as well as our powerlessness. It obliges us to examine our own privilege relative though it may be,to move out of our internalized positions as victims, to take control over our lives, and **to take responsibilities for change.** It requires us to question what we take for granted, and a commitment to a vision of society built on reflection, reform, mutuality, and respect in theory and in practice. Teaching and learning against the grain is not easy, comfortable, or safe. It is protracted, difficult, uncomfortable, painful, and risky. It involves struggles with our colleagues, our students, as well as struggles within ourselves against our internalized beliefs and normalized behaviors. In other words, it is a lifelong challenge. However, as Simon (1993) puts it, teaching against the grain is also a project of hope. We engage in it with the knowledge and conviction that we are in a long-term collaborative project with like-minded people whose goal is to make the world a better place for us and for our childre

#### And, current discourse on young people is violent – they are viewed as criminals, public disorders that must be dealt with, and resources for markets. Solving for children’s oppression accesses other forms of oppression. GIROUX 15:

Henry A. Giroux | Youth in Authoritarian Times: Challenging Neoliberalism's Politics of Disposability Wednesday, 21 October 2015 00:00 By Henry A. Giroux, Truthout | News Analysis

The transformation of the social state into the corporate-controlled punishing state is made startlingly clear when young people, to rephrase W.E.B. Du Bois, become problem people rather than people who face problems. Young people, especially low-income and poor people of color, are now viewed as trouble rather than being seen as facing troubles. As such, they are increasingly subject to the dictates of the criminal legal system rather than subject to assistance [for] from social programs that could address their most basic needs. If youth were once the repository of society's dreams, that is no longer true. Beyond exposing the moral depravity of a society that fails to provide for its youth, the symbolic and real violence waged against many young people reflects nothing less than a collective death wish - especially visible when youth protest their conditions. As Alain Badiou argues, we live in an era in which there is near zero tolerance for democratic resistance and "infinite tolerance for the crimes of bankers and government embezzlers which affect the lives of millions." (13) How else to explain the FBI's willingness to label as a "terrorist threat" youthful activists speaking against corporate and government misdeeds, while at the same time the Bureau refuses to press criminal charges against the banking giant HSBC for laundering billions of dollars for Mexican drug cartels and terrorist groups linked to al-Qaeda? (14) Equally disturbing are the revelations that the Department of Homeland Security, which was "created in large part to combat terrorism," has put under surveillance members of the Black Lives Matter movement who have been organizing against the racist conditions producing police violence against Black people in the United States. (15) If youth were once the repository of society's dreams, that is no longer true. Increasingly, young people are viewed as a public disorder, a dream now turned into a nightmare. Many youth are forced to negotiate a post-9/11 social order that positions them as a prime target of its "governing through crime" complex. Consider the many "get tough" policies that now render young people criminals, while depriving them of basic health care, education and social services. Punishment and fear have replaced compassion and social responsibility as the most important modalities for mediating the relationship of youth to the larger society, all too evident by the upsurge of zero-tolerance laws in schools along with the expanding reach of the punishing state in the United States. (16) When the criminalization of social problems becomes a mode of governance and war its default strategy, youth are reduced to soldiers or targets - not social investments. As anthropologist Alain Bertho points out, "Youth is no longer considered the world's future, but as a threat to its present." (17) Increasingly, the only political discourses available to many young people derive from privatized regimes of self-discipline and "emotional self-management." (18) Youth are now removed from any meaningful register of democracy. Their absence is symptomatic of a society that has turned against itself, punishing its children at the risk of bringing down the entire body politic. What I call the war on youth emerged in its contemporary forms when the social contract, however compromised and feeble, came crashing to the ground around the time Margaret Thatcher "married" Ronald Reagan. Both were hard-line advocates of a market fundamentalism, and announced, respectively, that there was no such thing as society and that government was the problem not the solution to citizens' woes. Within a decade, democracy and the political process were hijacked by corporations and the call for austerity policies became a cheap copy for weakening the welfare state, public values and public goods. The results of this emerging neoliberal regime included a widening gap between the rich and the poor, a growing culture of cruelty and the dismantling of social provisions. One result has been that the promise of youth has given way to an age of market-induced angst, and a view of many young people as a drain on short-term investments and a threat to untrammeled self-interest and quick profits. Many young people are being depoliticized because they are struggling just to survive, not only materially [and] but also existentially. The war on youth is spreading out across the United States. How else might we explain the United States' turning of schools into training centers, modeling many after prisons, or promoting the rise of pedagogies of repression such as teaching to the test and high-stakes testing, all in the name of educational reform? What is the role of education in a democracy when a society burdens an entire generation with high tuition costs and student loans? I think David Graeber is right in arguing, "Student loans are destroying the imagination of youth. If there's a way of a society committing mass suicide, what better way than to take all the youngest, most energetic, creative, joyous people in your society and saddle them with, like $50,000 of debt so they have to be slaves? There goes your music. There goes your culture.... We're a society that has lost any ability to incorporate the interesting, creative and eccentric people." (19) What he does not say is that many young people are also being depoliticized because they are struggling just to survive, not only materially but also existentially. Under such circumstances, all bets are off regarding the future of democracy. What is also being lost in the current historical conjuncture is the very idea of interpersonal responsibility, a commitment to the collective good, a democratic notion of the commons, the idea of connecting learning to social improvement and the promise of a robust democracy dedicated to a full measure of personal, political and economic rights. Under the regime of a ruthless economic Darwinism, we are witnessing the crumbling of social bonds and the triumph of individual desires over social rights, nowhere more exemplified than in the growth of civic illiteracy, gated minds in gated communities, simplistic intolerance, atrophied social skills, a culture of cruelty and a downward spiral into the dark recesses of an oligarchic social order. Children pay most acutely for this. Consider that the United States is the only country in the world that has refused to ratify the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which calls for "a commitment to promote and respect the human rights of children, including the right to life, to health, to education and to play, as well as the right to family life, to be protected from violence and from any form of discrimination." (20) Politics is now driven by a much-promoted hypercompetitive ideology with a message that surviving in society demands reducing social relations to forms of social combat. Too many young people today learn quickly that their fate is [an] solely a matter of individual responsibility, irrespective of wider structural forces. As such, politics has become an extension of war, just as "systemic economic insecurity and anxiety" and state-sponsored violence increasingly find legitimation in the discourses of austerity, privatization and demonization, which promote anxiety, moral panics and fear, and undermine any sense of communal responsibility for the well-being of others. The curse of privatization in a consumer-driven society is intensified by the market-driven assumption that for young people the only obligation of citizenship is to consume. Yet, there is more at work here than the mechanisms of depoliticization; there is also a flight from social responsibility, if not politics itself. Also lost is the importance of those social bonds, modes of collective reasoning, public spheres and cultural apparatuses crucial to the formation of a sustainable democratic society. As one eminent sociologist points out, "Visions have nowadays fallen into disrepute and we tend to be proud of what we should be ashamed of." (21) For instance, politicians, such as former Vice President Dick Cheney, not only refuse to apologize for the immense misery, displacement and suffering they have imposed on the Iraqi people - principally Iraqi children - but also they seem to gloat in defending such policies. Doublespeak takes on a new register as President Obama employs the discourse of national security to sanction a surveillance state, a targeted assassination list and the ongoing killing of young children and their families by drones. This expanding landscape of lies has not only produced an illegal and global war on terror and justified state torture, even against children; it has also provided a justification for the United States' slide into barbarism after the tragic events of 9/11. Yet, such acts of state violence appear to be of little concern to the shameless apostles of permanent war.

#### Thus, the role of the ballot and judge is to vote for the better gun control policy that protects the youth. More warrants:

#### 1. Children are particularly excluded and not considered relevant by academics, allowing willful ignorance of violence that costs them their lives. Only a focus on children as an important group can stop systemic structural violence – otherwise all oppression towards them is rendered unseen. GIROUX 2K:

Public Pedagogy and the Responsibility of Intellectuals: Youth, Littleton, and the Loss of Innocence Henry A. Giroux. jac 20.1 (2000)

Unfortunately, as the post-Littleton debate has clearly shown, educators in a variety of fields, including rhetoric and composition studies, have had little to say about how young people increasingly have become the victims of adult mistreatment, greed, neglect, and domination. The question of how young people experience, resist, challenge, and mediate the complex cultural politics and social spaces that mark their everyday lives does not seem to warrant the attention such issues deserve, especially in light of the ongoing assaults on minority youth of color and class that have taken place since the 1980s. Figures of youth and age circulate almost unnoticed. While educators in rhetoric and composition have learned to consider gender, race, class, and sexuality as part of a politics of education, they have not begun to think of youth as a critical category for social analysis or of the politics of youth and its implications for a radical democracy. The category of youth [have] has not yet been factored into a broader discourse on politics, power, and social change. In what follows, I attempt to address this lacunae in rhetoric and composition studies in particular and in educational theory in general by analyzing the current assault on youth, and I suggest that educators rethink the interrelated dynamics of politics, culture, and power as they increasingly erode those social spaces necessary for providing young people with the intellectual and material resources they need to participate in and shape the diverse economic, political, and social conditions influencing their lives. I also attempt to develop a critical language that both engages youth as a critical category and offers suggestions for the political and pedagogical roles that educators might play in addressing the crisis of youth, which is itself part of the broader crisis ofpubliclife, and I maintain that understanding the crisis of youth must be central to any notion of literacy, pedagogy, and cultural politics. Central to the view developed here is the assumption that any viable notion of cultural politics must make the pedagogical more political because it is through the pedagogical force of culture that identities are constructed, citizenship rights are enacted, and possibilities are developed for translating acts of interpretation into forms of intervention. Pedagogy, in my view, is about putting subject positions in place and linking the construction of agency to issues of ethics, politics, and power. Recognizing the educational force of the cultural sphere also suggests making the political more pedagogical by addressing how agency unfolds within power-infused relations-that is, how the very processes of learning constitute the political mechanisms through which identities are produced, desires mobilized, and experiences take on specific forms and meanings. This broad definition of pedagogy is not limited to what occurs in institutionalized forms of schooling; it encompasses every relationship that young people imagine to be theirs in the world, where social agency is both enabled and constrained across multiple sites and where meanings enter the realm of power and function as public discourses. Cultural politics, in this instance, must include the issue of youth culture and can no[t] longer be abstracted from considerations of what happens to the bodies and minds of young people at a time in history when the state is being hollowed out and policies of surveillance, regulation, and disciplinary control increasingly replace a welfare state that once provided minimal social services (food stamp programs, child nutrition programs, child health programs, funds for family planning) designed to prevent widespread poverty, suffering, and deprivations among large numbers of youth. Children have been made our lowest national priority, a fact that is most evident as social policy in this country has shifted from social investment to a politics of containment.2 The crisis of youth does not simply reflect the loss of social vision, the ongoing corporatization of public space, and the erosion of democratic life; it also suggests the degree to which youth have been "othered" across a wide range of ideological positions, rendered unworthy of serious analysis as an oppressed group, or deemed to be no longer at risk but rather to be a risk to democratic public life (see Stephens 13). Indifference coupled with demonization make an unholy alliance that fails to foreground the importance of children's agency and the role that young people can play in shaping a future that will not simply repeat the present, a present in which children are increasingly regarded as a detriment to adult society rather than as a valuable resource.

#### And, Addressing the material conditions for violence specifically with children is required for the success of symbolic critique. Pure critique is not enough – it must be combined into tangible policy action. GIROUX 2:

Public Pedagogy and the Responsibility of Intellectuals: Youth, Littleton, and the Loss of Innocence Henry A. Giroux. jac 20.1 (2000)

To address the problems of youth, rigorous educational work must respond to the dilemmas of the outside world by focusing on how young people make sense of their possibilities for agency within the power regulated relations of everyday life. The motivation for scholarly work 1cannot be narrowly academic; such work must connect with what Tony Bennett sees as "'real life ' social and political issues in the wider society" (538). This requires, in part, that educators and other-cultural workers address the practical social consequences of their work while simultaneously making connections to the often ignored institutional forms and cultural spheres that position and influence young people within unequal relations of power. Moreover, critical educators must begin to recognize that the forms of domination that bear down on young people are both institutional and cultural and that one cannot be separated from the other. Within this approach to cultural politics, the effects of domination cannot be removed from the educational conditions in which such behavior is learned, appropriated, or challenged. Analyzing the relationship between culture and politics in addressing the problems of youth requires that critical educators and cultural workers engage both the symbolic and the material conditions that construct the various social formations in which young people experience themselves and their relations to others. That is, any viable form of cultural politics must address the institutional machineries of power that promote child poverty, violence, unemployment, police brutality, rape, sexual abuse, and racism.

#### 2. Debate is a unique forum for high-schooler’s to advocate for children – children are denied participation due to the current structure of society. GODWIN 11:

Children's Oppression, Rights and Liberation by Samantha Godwin 2011

While **childhood** similarly marks a stage of life that each of us will pass through, it **is unlike old age**, **excluded from the consideration in the majoritarian process.** While all **adult voters** were once children, they **will not become children again** at some point in the future **so they need not worry about the legal disadvantages of children** being applied to them, whereas adults anticipate becoming elderly and therefore have a self-preservation motive to prevent discrimination against the elderly. Another obvious difference is simply that the elderly, unlike children, can vote, and in practice they vote disproportionately. **Children are** also **de facto denied the right to assemble**: **their ability to travel to demonstrations** or to political meetings **can be restricted by their parents and** truancy **laws,** with the state ready to use its police power to enforce parental authority if necessary. **Access to the media** **is** further **curtailed** not only because children lack the financial means to popularize their views but because they lack the legal rightsto have the opportunity to acquire those means.

#### And, this form of gun debate is needed - the youth are under discussed in the gun debates in the squo. The FOC:

http://futureofchildren.org/futureofchildren/publications/docs/12\_02\_01\_.pdf// LHP AA

**The wide-ranging public debate about the** appropriate **uses of guns** in society also **frequently overlooks** **youth**, **focusing instead on the circumstances** under **which adults should have the right to** **own** and use **guns**. Gun rights supporters emphasize the legitimate uses of guns for sport and self-defense.5–7 But here again, **few propose that children and youth**—especially younger children—**should have access to guns for** **any purpose without adult supervision**. As one prominent pro-gun advocate said, "No one defends unsupervised access to firearms by children."8 The key point is that **when it comes to gun policy**, according to both law and public opinion, **children and youth are a special case**. Given this consensus, and the enormous negative impact that gun violence has on children and youth, the goal of this journal issue is to **[we should]** help **ensure that young people's safety becomes a** central focus **of the public debate on gun policy.**

## Underview:

#### 1. Debater’s biases overestimate high impact scenarios – high magnitude focus distort debate's potential to meaningfully speak to issues like child violence. COHN 13:

Nate Cohn 13, covers elections, polling and demographics for The Upshot, a Times politics and policy site. Previously, he was a staff writer for The New Republic. Before entering journalism, he was a research assistant and Scoville Fellow at the Stimson Center “Improving the Norms and Practices of Policy Debate,” Nov 24, [http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php/topic,5416.0.html](http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php/topic%2C5416.0.html)

So let me offer another possibility: the problem isn’t the topic, but modern policy debate. The unrealistic scenarios, exclusive focus on policy scholarship, inability to engage systemic impacts and philosophical questions. And so long as these problems characterize modern policy debate, teams will feel compelled to avoid it.¶ It might be tempting to assign the blame to “USFG should.” But these are bugs, not features of plan-focused, USFG-based, active voice topics. These bugs result from practices and norms that were initially and independently reasonable, but ultimately and collectively problematic. I also believe that these norms can and should be contested. I believe it would be possible for me to have a realistic, accessible, and inclusive discussion about the merits of a federal policy with, say, Amber Kelsie. Or put differently, I’m not sure I agree with Jonah that changing the topic is the only way to avoid being “a bunch of white folks talking about nuke war.”¶ The fact that policy debate is wildly out of touch—the fact that we are “a bunch of white folks talking about nuclear war”—is a damning indictment of nearly every coach in this activity. It’s a serious indictment of the successful policy debate coaches, who have been content to continue a pedagogically unsound game, so long as they keep winning. It’s a serious indictment of policy debate’s discontents who chose to disengage. ¶ That’s not to say there hasn’t been any effort to challenge modern policy debate on its own terms—just that they’ve mainly come from the middle of the bracket and weren’t very successful, focusing on morality arguments and various “predictions bad” claims to outweigh. ¶ Judges were receptive to the sentiment that disads were unrealistic, but negative claims to specificity always triumphed over generic epistemological questions or arguments about why “predictions fail.” The affirmative rarely introduced substantive responses to the disadvantage, rarely read impact defense. All considered, the negative generally won a significant risk that the plan resulted in nuclear war. Once that was true, it was basically impossible to win that some moral obligation outweighed the (dare I say?) obligation to avoid a meaningful risk of extinction.¶ There were other problems. Many of the small affirmatives were unstrategic—teams rarely had solvency deficits to generic counterplans. It was already basically impossible to win that some morality argument outweighed extinction; it was totally untenable to win that a moral obligation outweighed a meaningful risk of extinction; it made even less sense if the counterplan solved most of the morality argument. The combined effect was devastating: As these debates are currently argued and judged, I suspect that the negative would win my ballot more than 95 percent of the time in a debate between two teams of equal ability.¶ But even if a “soft left” team did better—especially by making solvency deficits and responding to the specifics of the disadvantage—I still think they would struggle. They could compete at the highest levels, but, in most debates, judges would still assess a small, but meaningful risk of a large scale conflict, including nuclear war and extinction. The risk would be small, but the “magnitude” of the impact would often be enough to outweigh a higher probability, smaller impact. Or put differently: policy debate still wouldn’t be replicating a real world policy assessment, teams reading small affirmatives would still be at a real disadvantage with respect to reality. . ¶ Why? Oddly, this is the unreasonable result of a reasonable part of debate: the burden of refutation or rejoinder, the responsibility of debaters to “beat” arguments. If I introduce an argument, it starts out at 100 percent—you then have to disprove it. That sounds like a pretty good idea in principle, right? Well, I think so too. But it’s really tough to refute something down to “zero” percent—a team would need to completely and totally refute an argument. That’s obviously tough to do, especially since the other team is usually going to have some decent arguments and pretty good cards defending each component of their disadvantage—even the ridiculous parts. So one of the most fundamental assumptions about debate all but ensures a meaningful risk of nearly any argument—even extremely low-probability, high magnitude impacts, sufficient to outweigh systemic impacts. ¶ There’s another even more subtle element of debate practice at play. Traditionally, the 2AC might introduce 8 or 9 cards against a disadvantage, like “non-unique, no-link, no-impact,” and then go for one and two. Yet in reality, disadvantages are underpinned by dozens or perhaps hundreds of discrete assumptions, each of which could be contested. By the end of the 2AR, only a handful are under scrutiny; the majority of the disadvantage is conceded, and it’s tough to bring the one or two scrutinized components down to “zero.”¶ And then there’s a bad understanding of probability. If the affirmative questions four or five elements of the disadvantage, but the negative was still “clearly ahead” on all five elements, most judges would assess that the negative was “clearly ahead” on the disadvantage. In reality, the risk of the disadvantage has been reduced considerably. If there was, say, an 80 percent chance that immigration reform would pass, an 80 percent chance that political capital was key, an 80 percent chance that the plan drained a sufficient amount of capital, an 80 percent chance that immigration reform was necessary to prevent another recession, and an 80 percent chance that another recession would cause a nuclear war (lol), then there’s a 32 percent chance that the disadvantage caused nuclear war. ¶ I think these issues can be overcome. First, I think teams can deal with the “burden of refutation” by focusing on the “burden of proof,” which allows a team to mitigate an argument before directly contradicting its content. ¶ Here’s how I’d look at it: modern policy debate has assumed that arguments start out at “100 percent” until directly refuted. But few, if any, arguments are supported by evidence consistent with “100 percent.” Most cards don’t make definitive claims. Even when they do, they’re not supported by definitive evidence—and any reasonable person should assume there’s at least some uncertainty on matters other than few true facts, like 2+2=4.¶ Take Georgetown’s immigration uniqueness evidence from Harvard. It says there “may be a window” for immigration. So, based on the negative’s evidence, what are the odds that immigration reform will pass? Far less than 50 percent, if you ask me. That’s not always true for every card in the 1NC, but sometimes it’s even worse—like the impact card, which is usually a long string of “coulds.” If you apply this very basic level of analysis to each element of a disadvantage, and correctly explain math (.4\*.4\*.4\*.4\*.4=.01024), the risk of the disadvantage starts at a very low level, even before the affirmative offers a direct response. ¶ Debaters should also argue that the negative hasn’t introduced any evidence at all to defend a long list of unmentioned elements in the “internal link chain.” The absence of evidence to defend the argument that, say, “recession causes depression,” may not eliminate the disadvantage, but it does raise uncertainty—and it doesn’t take too many additional sources of uncertainty to reduce the probability of the disadvantage to effectively zero—sort of the static, background noise of prediction.¶ Now, I do think it would be nice if a good debate team would actually do the work—talk about what the cards say, talk about the unmentioned steps—but I think debaters can make these observations at a meta-level (your evidence isn’t certain, lots of undefended elements) and successfully reduce the risk of a nuclear war or extinction to something indistinguishable from zero. It would not be a factor in my decision.¶ Based on my conversations with other policy judges, it may be possible to pull it off with even less work. They might be willing to summarily disregard “absurd” arguments, like politics disadvantages, on the grounds that it’s patently unrealistic, that we know the typical burden of rejoinder yields unrealistic scenarios, and that judges should assess debates in ways that produce realistic assessments. I don’t think this is too different from elements of Jonah Feldman’s old philosophy, where he basically said “when I assessed 40 percent last year, it’s 10 percent now.”¶ Honestly, I was surprised that the few judges I talked to were so amenable to this argument. For me, just saying “it’s absurd, and you know it” wouldn’t be enough against an argument in which the other team invested considerable time. The more developed argument about accurate risk assessment would be more convincing, but I still think it would be vulnerable to a typical defense of the burden of rejoinder. ¶ To be blunt: I want debaters to learn why a disadvantage is absurd, not just make assertions that conform to their preexisting notions of what’s realistic and what’s not. And perhaps more importantly for this discussion, I could not coach a team to rely exclusively on this argument—I’m not convinced that enough judges are willing to discount a disadvantage on “it’s absurd.” Nonetheless, I think this is a useful “frame” that should preface a following, more robust explanation of why the risk of the disadvantage is basically zero—even before a substantive response is offered.¶ There are other, broad genres of argument that can contest the substance of the negative’s argument. There are serious methodological indictments of the various forms of knowledge production, from journalistic reporting to think tanks to quantitative social science. Many of our most strongly worded cards come from people giving opinions, for which they offer very little data or evidence. And even when “qualified” people are giving predictions, there’s a great case to be extremely skeptical without real evidence backing it up. The world is a complicated place, predictions are hard, and most people are wrong. And again, this is before contesting the substance of the negative’s argument(!)—if deemed necessary.¶ So, in my view, the low probability scenario is waiting to be eliminated from debate, basically as soon as a capable team tries to do it.¶ That would open to the door to all of the arguments, previously excluded, de facto, by the prevalence of nuclear war impacts. It’s been tough to talk about racism or gender violence, since modest measures to mitigate these impacts have a difficult time outweighing a nuclear war. It’s been tough to discuss ethical policy making, since it’s hard to argue that any commitment to philosophical or ethical purity should apply in the face of an existential risk. It’s been tough to introduce unconventional forms of evidence, since they can’t really address the probability of nuclear war

#### Evaluate probability first – 1% risk kills decision-making since any action has some risk, so avoiding risk freezes action and prevents change. Their risks are constructed to preserve the status quo – it’s the same strategy used to block every progressive reform like ending slavery and civil rights

#### 2. Aff flex/strat outweighs – the aff is at disadvantage – the 13-7 time skew and 7.3% neg side bias[[1]](#footnote-1) proves. The 6-minute 2NR means the aff can go all in on substance and theory, which allows them to cover all the args I make and have a positive time tradeoff. Time skew outweighs – a) it’s a verifiable skew b) because time is the only thing that makes a debate round functional and c) all arguments can be traded linearly for time.

#### 3. Theory is an RVI for the aff – if I win no abuse or offense to a counter-interp, I win the round.

#### a) Fairness – they have more qualitative routes to the ballot. They can win substance or theory, whereas I have to win both in order to win. Neg always gets bidirectional theory, whereas the aff speaks in the dark so they have a structural advantage. Reciprocity o/w – it is the definition of unfairness and creates tangible skews – other fairness concerns can be solved by practice but structural skews like reciprocity can not.

#### b) Education – disincentivizes theory for strategic reasons and promotes substantive discussion – either the debate collapses to theory and no education anyways, or theory is kicked and there’s a huge deficit to topical discussion. Topic ed outweighs – it has a lasting impact; we can use what we learn in this space to create change in the real world.

# Frontlines:

## Extra:

### Advantage – Physiological Damage:

#### Gun violence devastates minority communities. It is the number one cause of death for black youth, destroying families, causing psychological damage, and spurring police militarization – it also has a spillover effect where those affected will cause future violence. KAPLAN ET AL. ‘13:

"Top 10 Reasons Why Communities Of Color Should Care About Stricter Gun-Violence Prevention Laws". name. N. p., 2016. Web. 9 Apr. 2016. By Morriah Kaplan and [Sophia Kerby](https://www.americanprogress.org/?person=kerby-sophia) | Thursday, January 17, 2013 https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/news/2013/01/17/49885/top-10-reasons-why-communities-of-color-should-care-about-stricter-gun-violence-prevention-laws 1/17/13

Acts of **gun violence take[s] approximately 30,000** American **lives every year, and** gun violence is one of the leading causes of death among teens. Although the majority of these shootings rarely make national headlines, the tragedy is no less real. As the following facts show, communities and families of color disproportionately suffer from gun violence. Here are 10 reasons why communities of color have a great stake in the public discourse on violence prevention. 1. People of color account for the majority of gun-violence victims. There are large racial disparities in homicide rates due to gun violence. The gun-homicide rate for black males is 2.4 times as high as that of Latino males, and it is 15.3 times as high as the rate for non-Hispanic white males. Murder and non-negligent manslaughter victims are most frequently black or Latino, with blacks comprising 67 percent of victims and Latinos comprising 28.1 percent. Blacks make up roughly 13 percent of the U.S. population, but in 2010—the last year for which data is available—they suffered 56 percent of all firearm homicides. 2. Gun violence **is one of the leading causes of death for teens of color.** Guns cause the deaths of thousands of teens each year. In 2008 and 2009 gun homicide was the leading cause of death among black teens, and the rates of gun-related deaths are highest for black male teens. For black families, the chance of a [black] male child dying from a gunshot wound is 62 percent higher than the chance of him dying in a motor-vehicle crash. In 2010 American Indian male teens had the second-highest rate of gun-related deaths, with 19.3 gun-related deaths per 100,000 teens. Latino male teens followed, with 17.8 per 100,000. In contrast,white male teens had the second-lowest rate, with only 9.4 per 100,000. 3. Gun violence is a vicious cycle. **Teens exposed** to gun violence **are more likely to commit violence** in the future. In a study conducted by the Department of Justice, teens were interviewed over a number of years about their exposure to violence, as well as their own violent acts. Teens who had been exposed to firearms violence reported committing more serious acts of violence than teens who had not been exposed. Additionally, youth who live in dangerous and disadvantaged neighborhoods and have had more exposure to violence were found to be more likely to carry concealed firearms. This means that **communities** already facing high levels of gun violence will likely **continue to experience violence** unless policymakers take action. 4. Gun injuries disproportionately affect communities of color. Of the 34,347 children and teens who suffered gun injuries in the United States in 2008 and 2009, almost half were black, and more than one-fifth were Latino. Black teens alone are 25 times more likely to be injured by a gun than white teens. 5. People of color strongly support gun-violence prevention. As people of color suffer higher rates of gun violence, it is not surprising that they strongly support stricter gun laws. Forty-nine percent of people of color are in favor of stricter gun-violence prevention. 6. The militarization of school safety and orderliness most heavily impacts children of color. In the wake of recent school shootings, members of the National Rifle Association, the nation’s largest gun lobby, have suggested putting armed police officers in every school. But research shows that increased **police** presence in schools **disproportionately affect**s **youth of color, driving the school-to-prison pipeline** and leading to youths’ unnecessary involvement in the justice system. Studies have shown that the more interaction a young person has with the criminal justice system, the more likely they are to come into contact with the criminal justice system in the future. This dynamic works to push a disproportionate number of black and Latino students out of school and into the criminal justice system. Black boys in particular are three times more likely to be suspended than white boys, and black girls are four times more likely to be suspended than white girls. 7. **Gun violence is concentrated in urban** and **poor neighborhoods,** which tend to be populated predominately by people of color. In 2006 and 2007 the 62 center cities of America’s 50 largest metro areas accounted for only 15 percent of the population but 39 percent of gun-related murders. This ratio is only growing: In 2011 there were record highs of gun violence in cities such as Chicago and Detroit. Plans to combat gun violence must include prevention programs and policies that target urban violence. 8. The cost of gun violence is a significant burden on the health care system. Firearm‐related injuries generally require hospitalization and significant emergency center resources. In 2005 U.S hospitals charged $108.4 million to care for about 10,000 victims of firearm injuries.

#### These impacts are analytically and empirically true – handguns in the home ensure anxiety in children – turns self defense since children don’t view the handgun as a tool of security, only violence. WALESH 83’:

Kim Walesh “Handguns In The Home: An Unnecessary Risk” http://scholar.valpo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1095&context=core\_reader

**Handguns in the home have psychological as well as life-threatening effects** on children. Too often, people buy guns to protect their defenseless children without considering the many dangers. Many social scientists suggest that **guns make children feel powerless.** Instead of viewing the gun's presence as providing security, **the gun is seen as frightening.** As Rosalyn Weinman Schram, sociologist and consultant on matters of work and family, states, "**They**'re **get**ting **the message** that **their parents** really **can't take care of them [and are], that they're intimidated** by crime **and not** very much **in control.**'' Dr. Martin Cohen, a New York City clinical psychologist, feels that **guns** actually **increase children's anxiety** levels. Children, perhaps more than adults, associate guns directly with violent behavior--a probable result of a rising number of assassination attempts as well as excessive television violence. Also, children may view the local police force, which has traditionally provided a sense of comfort and security, as farcical at a time when more and more "protective" guns are brought into the home. Guns may also make our children more violent, as seen in the Berkowitz study. We stare in shock at photos of four-year-old children lifting machine guns in war-torn foreign countries. But we fail to understand that children learn mainly by imitating their parents. Guns, even if never used, are readily accepted by children because they are accepted, if not worshiped, by their parents. Guns in the home will **[they] increase** aggressive behavior and promote an **acceptance of violence** and guns **in future generations.**

#### This psychological damage traps minority youth into cycles of PTSD that has both short and long term impacts. GARBARINO ET AL ‘02:

Mitigating the Effects of Gun Violence on Children and Youth James Garbarino, Catherine P. Bradshaw, and Joseph A. Vorras http://futureofchildren.org/publications/journals/article/index.xml?journalid=42&articleid=166&sectionid=1068

**Exposure to gun violence can traumatize children and youth** not just physically, but emotionally as well. Studies have documented that young people exposed to gun violence experience lasting emotional scars. Some children may develop posttraumatic stress disorder **(PTSD**), which **can affect[s] brain development**. The psychological trauma of gun violence may lead some children to arm themselves “for protection,” or desensitize them so that they feel less hesitation about engaging in violent acts. Psychological Impacts Associated with Exposure to Gun Violence Young people who are exposed to gun violence may experience negative psychological impacts **in both** the **short and long term.** For example, a recent study of rural third- through eighth-graders indicated that children exposed to gun violence reported significantly **higher levels of anger, withdrawal, and** posttraumatic **stress.**5 The problem is exacerbated when youth get caught in a cycle of violence: Those who witnessed at least one incidence of gun violence reported significantly greater exposure to other types of violence, higher levels of aggression, and less parental monitoring than their peers. 5 Exposure to gun violence also can desensitize youth to the effects of violence and increase the likelihood that they [children] will use violence [to] as a means of resolveing problems or expressing emotions. Research shows that exposure to violence can cause intrusive thoughts about the traumatic event and sleep disturbances.6 Therefore, it is not surprising that children and youth exposed to gun violence commonly experience difficulty concentrating in the classroom, declines in academic performance, and lower educational and career aspirations.7,8 Other outcomes associated with exposure to violent trauma includeincreased delinquency, risky sexual behaviors,and substance abuse.7,8 Exposure to gun violence can cause children and youth to withdraw from the very people who may be best equipped to help them—friends and family. Researchers at the University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) Trauma Psychiatry Program conduct interventions with young people who have sustained or witnessed violent injury. Their research suggests that exposure to gun violence affects the quality of youth friendships. For example, wounded adolescents are particularly focused on the physical scars resulting from their injuries because the scars are daily reminders of the trauma.8 These injuries can disrupt social relationships, because they often prompt questions from peers or even strangers about the event—questions that only perpetuate the distress. Victims or those exposed to violence often become estranged from friends who were with them during the trauma,8 because seeing people who were involved in the incident can remind them of it. Wounded and violence-exposed youth may experience other disruptions in their relationships with important peers and family members. Some young people experience survivor guilt after witnessing the violent victimization or death of a peer. Studies at UCLA indicate that many survivors and bystanders agonize during the event about whether to flee from the danger in self-preservation or to stay to aid their victimized friend. Memories of this dilemma can be extremely distressing. Furthermore, bystanders’ actions can affect their subsequent relationship with the victim, because many victims report feeling angry when bystanders and friends do not intervene.8 internal representation” of the trauma. Recurrent exposure to the trauma strengthens this response and lowers the child’s ability to deal with any type of trauma. The child’s brain becomes highly sensitive to threat and trauma-related cues, which in turn can affect his or her emotional and psychological wellbeing.11 Several studies have documented that children with a history of trauma develop a persistent, low-level fear, and respond to threats either with dissociation (separating certain ideas or emotions from the rest of their mental activity to avoid stress or anxiety) or with an unusually heightened state of arousal.11,12 This pattern of brain activity may also affect children’s general information processing.13 For example, children who have experienced trauma may misinterpret ambiguous stimuli as threatening. **Children do not have to witness gun violence directly to develop symptoms of traumatic stress.** After hearing about incidences of gun violence or learning about them on television, children may feel that their safety is threatened.14 Teens may respond to this threat by adopting what they perceive as “protective behaviors,” such as joining a gang or arming themselves with guns or knives.15 Many youth associate great power with carrying or having access to a gun.

## CPs:

### A2 Educate Children CP:

#### 1. Doesn’t solve and increases handling. THE AAP 12:

November 2012, VOLUME 130 / ISSUE 5 From the American Academy of Pediatrics Policy Statement Firearm-Related Injuries Affecting the Pediatric Population COUNCIL ON INJURY, VIOLENCE, AND POISON PREVENTION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

**Gun avoidance programs are designed to educate children as a way of reducing firearm injury** (eg, Eddie Eagle, STAR); **however, several evaluation studies have demonstrated that such programs do not prevent risk behaviors** 49–51 **and** **may even increase gun handling among children**.45 In contrast, results of a large national randomized controlled trial demonstrated that brief physician counseling directed at parents, combined with distribution of gunlocks, may be effective in promoting safer storage of guns in homes with children.52 A recent randomized controlled trial found that a safe storage campaign with gun safe distribution was both feasible and effective at limiting household exposure to unlocked and loaded guns.53

#### 2. Perm - do both: solves best since children will be educated incase they get guns of the streets or black market

### A2 States CP:

#### 1. States can’t solve child accidents because of enforcement authorities. HARWOOD:

Volume 11 | Issue 1 2002 Gun Control: State Versus Federal Regulation of Firearms William S. Harwood

**The states present a different challenge**. Unlike ATF, **there are thousands of state and local law** **enforcement officials and police officers already at work in the states**. However**, their duties extend** well **beyond the regulation of firearms**. Given their broad jurisdiction**, it is not clear that state** and local police **are well positioned to mount the** kind of specialized and **focused campaign that may be** **needed to significantly reduce the level of gun** **violence.** Furthermore, as described above, **gun** **violence is a multifaceted problem**, and **state** and local **police may not have the training** **or** **resources** necessary **to carry out a regulatory** **program aimed** **at** preventing suicides, domestic violence and **children’s accidents.**

#### Now, weigh case against the DA

#### 2. 50 state fiat is a voting issue for fairness and education:

#### A. uniform fiat means it isn’t real world - they can always shift out of our solvency responses

#### B. Ground - 50 states moots the entirety of the AC since it does the same thing as it– I can’t leverage any of the AFF against the CP, and 1AR time skew means starting the round over in the 1AR is impossible

#### Drop the debater to deter future and generate norms that ensure substantive engagement

#### 3. Links to politics – states passing the same policy would anger the NRA and increase lobbying which is the internal link to GOP votes and the DA – also independently anger’s conservatives so they’d backlash too.

#### 4. Race DA: state enforcement is racist – welfare policies prove. CASHIN 99:

Sheryll D. Cashin, Professor of Law, GeorgetownUniversityLawCenter, 1999, Columbia Law Review, 99 Colum. L Rev. 552, “Federalism, Welfare Reform, and the Minority Poor: Accounting for the Tyranny of State Majorities,” p. 591-4

While state majoritarian political and economic self-interest augurs poorly for redistributive spending at the state level, racial attitudes also create a serious risk of state majoritarian tyranny over welfare recipients.   Consistent with Madison's intuition that majority factions are more likely to dominate weak minorities at lower levels of government, the history of racial subordination in the United States has been marked by a great deal of state sponsorship or acquiescence in racist acts and policies. While the federal government has also been a sponsor of racist policies, federal intervention has historically been necessary to ameliorate both state-sponsored racial discrimination and private discrimination acquiesced in by many states. Similarly, the dominant role of race in shaping white voters' attitudes toward welfare recipients suggests a continuing need for federal-level protections against majoritarian tyranny.Historically, the decision to decentralize many aspects of AFDC implementation was tied directly to racial attitudes concerning African- Americans. In charting the historical evolution of the AFDC program and other social welfare policies, one author concluded that "African- Americans have suffered most when the institutions of American social policy have been parochial, and they have benefited the most when those institutions have been national." The risks of majoritarian tyranny at state and local levels stem from the fact that popular sentiments regarding welfare spending are "race-coded." In other words, while policy debates concerning welfare appear to be race neutral, racial attitudes, specifically those of the white majority, are a strong determinant of the public's level of support, velnon, for welfare spending. Relying on a national opinion survey, Martin Gilens has found that "the dimension of racial attitudes with the strongest effect on welfare views is the extent to which blacks are perceived as lazy, and this perception is a better predictor of welfare attitudes than such alternatives as economic self-interest, egalitarianism, and attributions of blame for poverty." In a subsequent telephone survey designed to assess separately the influence of popular attitudes toward the poor and popular attitudes toward African-Americans, Gilens found that whites' perception that blacks are lazy was more important in shaping their opposition to welfare than their perceptions of poor people generally. Ultimately, Gilens concluded that "racial considerations are the single most important factor shaping whites' views of welfare." In particular, white Americans have typically exaggerated the degree to which African-Americans constitute the poverty and welfare population. Welfare, **therefore,** tends to take on a powerful symbolic meaning for white voters that can be "attractive to some politicians precisely because they can exploit the power of racial suspicion **and animosity while insulating themselves from charges of race-baiting**."

#### Outweighs – the state will always try to prevent security threats, but if they are doing it in a racist manner then there is no reason to live

### A2 Smart Gun CP:

#### 1. Perm do both – double solvency

#### 2. Doesn’t solve advantage 2 – the Walsch ev proves that the mere presence of a gun spurs aggression in children because they view it as the only response to problems.

#### 3. Doesn’t solve. STOKES 16

http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-0117-stokes-smart-gun-problems-20160117-story.html

The **bad news for** anyone looking to **the smart gun** as a technological quick fix for gun violence is that, absent a government mandate requiring all guns to be “smart,” a robust market is unlikely to materialize. And **even if new laws were to require that all new firearms include smart gun tech, many proposed smart systems would actually make us less safe**. **The** primary **objection that** American gun **buyers have to smart guns is that any integrated** **electronic** locking **mechanism** **will** necessarily **decrease a gun's reliability** **by introducing more points of failure**. Smart gun proponents are quick to dismiss these concerns as overblown, but they don't seem to understand how all-important reliability is to gun buyers, or how difficult it is for even premium gun makers to mass-produce weapons that will function smoothly under the most adverse conditions. Every gun owner who has put enough rounds down range has had his favorite firearm fail to go “bang” when he pulled the trigger. These failures can happen to the very best semiautomatic weapons in the final round of a competition, in the heat of battle, or when a trophy buck is in the hunter's sights. Weapon malfunctions are such a widely acknowledged reality that basic training courses typically explain how to rapidly troubleshoot such failures during a gunfight. **Gun owners are terrified of anything that might make their guns less reliable**. And when they consider the frequency with which their $700 smart phone's fingerprint scanner fails when presented with a clean, dry, perfectly-positioned thumb, they rightly conclude that putting any type of electronic lock on their Glock will likely make them less secure, not more.

#### 4. Feasibility DA: the CP would have to take everyone’s gun and upgrade them with smart gun technology which is like triple the price of a handgun ban – no solvency advocate actually thinks this is possible so CP is nonsense

### A2 Gun Safety CP:

#### 1. Perm do both – double solvency

#### 2. Doesn’t solve existing guns that the aff collects – so we solve better

#### 3. Doesn’t solve advantage 2 – the Walsch ev proves that the mere presence of a gun spurs aggression in children because they view it as the only response to problems.

## DAs:

### OV – Probablilty First:

#### Evaluate case over extinction:

#### 1. Extinction based scenarios are the type of security threats that are used to gloss over child violence – the 1NC’s focus on security threat allows policy makers to have an excuse for not protecting children. You say extinction affects all, but while the state is trying to stop these threats, child violence is manifesting in the squo – so case o/w.

#### 2. Extend Cohn – debaters overestimate high impact scenarios – you artificially inflate them, which is unrealistic for policy makers in real life – no one gives these risk calculations credence so they allow them to gloss over tangible violence.

#### And, probability flows my way - Extend Walesh – 1 kid dies a day from accidental shootings and it happens more than any other disease – that’s Hook

### A2 Illicit Market DA:

#### 1. Plan isn’t large enough to trigger a full scale illegal market – we only ban handguns for households with children which is not close enough to boost the market.

#### 2. Doesn’t turn case – some guns might go to the black market but case still outweighs since the alternative would be much worse and allow violence

#### 3. No Link - the plan only affects a population where people purchase guns legally. DEFILIPPIS and HUGHES 14:

http://www.slate.com/articles/health\_and\_science/medical\_examiner/2014/06/gun\_deaths\_in\_children\_statistics\_show\_firearms\_endanger\_kids\_despite\_nra.html “Guns Kill Children, The overwhelming evidence that pediatricians are right and the NRA is wrong” [Evan DeFilippis](http://www.slate.com/authors.evan_defilippis.html) and [Devin Hughes](http://www.slate.com/authors.devin_hughes.html) // LHP AA

The **overwhelming empirical evidence indicates that the presence of a gun makes children less safe**; that programs such as Eddie Eagle are insufficient; and that measures the NRA and extreme gun advocates vehemently oppose, such as gun safes and smart guns, could dramatically reduce the death toll. **Study after study** unequivocally **demonstrates that the** **prevalence of firearms directly increases the risk of youth homicide**, **suicide, and unintentional** **death**. **This** effect **is consistent across the U**nited **S**tates and throughout the world. As a country, we should be judged by how well we protect our children. By any measure, we are failing horribly. **The U**nited **S**tates **accounts for** nearly **75 percent of all children murdered in the developed world**. Children between the ages of 5 and 14 in the United States are [17 times](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/content/27/2/214.full.pdf) more likely to be murdered by firearms than children in other industrialized nations. **Children from states where firearms are prevalent suffer from**[**significantly**](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11834986)**higher rates of homicide**, even after accounting for poverty, education, and urbanization. **A study** focusing **on youth** in North Carolina **found** **that most of these deaths were caused** by legally purchased handguns. A recent meta-analysis revealed that easy access to firearms doubled the risk of homicide and tripled the risk for suicide among all household members. Family violence is also much [more likely to be lethal](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1588718) in homes where a firearm is present, placing children especially in danger. Murder-suicides are another major risk to children and are most likely to be committed with a gun. Crucially, **these deaths are not offset by** **defensive gun use**. As one [study](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9715182) found, **for every time a gun is used legally in self-defense at home**, **there** **are “four unintentional shootings,** seven criminal assaults or homicides, and 11 attempted or completed suicides.” A [study](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15066882) of adolescents in California found that there were 13 times as many threatening as self-defensive uses of guns. Of the defensive encounters, many arose in confrontations that became hostile because of the presence of a firearm.

### A2 Politics DA [Generic]:

#### Obama’s PC is crazy low and getting worse – kills compromise. STEINHAUER 4-29[[2]](#footnote-2)

WASHINGTON — This could have been the start of a fruitful time in a capital barren of major policy accomplishments over the last few years. President **Obama**, his days in office waning, **should be closing in on legacy items**. Democrats and Republicans — locked in a cage match over control of the Senate — are motivated to help him end his term with the kind of bipartisan deals that often mark divided government, and help members on each side win re-election. At the same time, **Republicans should be light of heart[y], with prospect of winning the White House** and their nemesis-in-chief heading to his final helicopter ride. **But these are not normal times. Republicans, rather than rallying with** joy around **a nominee** on the rise, this week **settled into a** bit of **a hate dance with** Donald J. **Trump**, in a bizarre bunny-hop of new endorsements, feeble thumbs up and continued denial and rage. **Distrust between Congress and** Mr. **Obama** — at times **involving even the president’s own party** — **and a Republican allergy to** almost **any increased federal spending have combined into** a contentious **brew that led** this week **to the unraveling of a[n]** basic **appropriations bill, an unsettled fight over** funding to combat **the Zika virus and a dim horizon for** once-promising items like an overhaul of **criminal justice laws. Other bills that left** the committee **on** a wave of **bipartisan bliss have been parked outside** the **House and Senate floors**, and many judicial nominations are stalled. **Republicans say it is** Mr. **Obama’s fault, for** being too far from them on every policy issue, and **using executive o[‘s]rders and regulations over legislative wooing** to get to achieve his ends. “This is my third president I’ve served with,” Speaker **Paul** D. **Ryan said** on Thursday. “I’d say **this is the most ideological president** I’ve ever served with. He’s very dogmatic in pursuit of his ideology, and therefore **I don’t see a [with no] bridging of the gap because of the nature of this** presidency.” **Democrats blame the far right** of the Republican Party, which they say has dictated the terms of congressional action, and more often, inaction, for years. **That** in turn **pushes Democrats farther from** the **compromise** mode. “The forces in our politics are pushing things to the extreme,” said Senator Chuck Schumer, Democrat of New York who stood with several of his colleagues on Thursday to deride Republicans over their own to-do list of legislation and confirmations left waiting. “**The** old **forces that once brought things together are now pulling them apart**. On both sides, but mostly on their side.”

#### And, political capital doesn’t exist because of a because winners win – turns DA. HIRSCH ’13.

Hirsch ‘13 [Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal, “There’s no such thing as Political Capital,” National Journal, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207>] PO

On Tuesday, in his State of the Union address, President Obama will do what every president does this time of year. For about 60 minutes, he will lay out a sprawling and ambitious wish list highlighted by gun control and immigration reform, climate change and debt reduction. In response, the pundits will do what they always do this time of year: They will talk about how unrealistic most of the proposals are, discussions often informed by sagacious reckonings of how much “political capital” Obama possesses to push his program through. Most of this talk will ha[s]ve no bearing on what actually happens over the next four years. Consider this: Three months ago, just before the November election, if someone had talked seriously about Obama having enough political capital to oversee passage of both immigration reform and gun-control legislation at the beginning of his second term—even after winning the election by 4 percentage points and 5 million votes (the actual final tally)—this person would have been called crazy and stripped of his pundit’s license. (It doesn’t exist, but it ought to.) In his first term, in a starkly polarized country, the president had been so frustrated by GOP resistance that he finally issued a limited executive order last August permitting immigrants who entered the country illegally as children to work without fear of deportation for at least two years. Obama didn’t dare to even bring up gun control, a Democratic “third rail” that has cost the party elections and that actually might have been even less popular on the right than the president’s health care law. And yet, for reasons that have very little to do with Obama’s personal prestige or popularity—variously put in terms of a “mandate” or “political capital”—chances are fair that both will now happen. What changed? In the case of gun control, of course, it wasn’t the election. It was the horror of the 20 first-graders who were slaughtered in Newtown, Conn., in mid-December. The sickening reality of little girls and boys riddled with bullets from a high-capacity assault weapon seemed to precipitate a sudden tipping point in the national conscience. One thing changed after another. Wayne LaPierre of the National Rifle Association marginalized himself with poorly chosen comments soon after the massacre. The pro-gun lobby, once a phalanx of opposition, began to fissure into reasonables and crazies. Former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, D-Ariz., who was shot in the head two years ago and is still struggling to speak and walk, started a PAC with her husband to appeal to the moderate middle of gun owners. Then she gave riveting and poignant testimony to the Senate, challenging lawmakers: “Be bold.” As a result, momentum has appeared to build around some kind of a plan to curtail sales of the most dangerous weapons and ammunition and the way people are permitted to buy them. It’s impossible to say now whether such a bill will pass and, if it does, whether it will make anything more than cosmetic changes to gun laws. But one thing is clear: The political tectonics have shifted dramatically in very little time. Whole new possibilities exist now that didn’t a few weeks ago. Meanwhile, the Republican members of the Senate’s so-called Gang of Eight are pushing hard for a new spirit of compromise on immigration reform, a sharp change after an election year in which the GOP standard-bearer declared he would make life so miserable for the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. that they would “self-deport.” But this turnaround has very little to do with Obama’s personal influence—his political mandate, as it were. It has almost entirely to do with just two numbers: 71 and 27. That’s 71 percent for Obama, 27 percent for Mitt Romney, the breakdown of the Hispanic vote in the 2012 presidential election. Obama drove home his advantage by giving a speech on immigration reform on Jan. 29 at a Hispanic-dominated high school in Nevada, a swing state he won by a surprising 8 percentage points in November. But the movement on immigration has mainly come out of the Republican Party’s recent introspection, and the realization by its more thoughtful members, such as Sen. Marco Rubio of Florida and Gov. Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, that without such a shift the party may be facing demographic death in a country where the 2010 census showed, for the first time, that white births have fallen into the minority. It’s got nothing to do with Obama’s political capital or, indeed, Obama at all. The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.” The real problem is that the idea of political capital—or mandates, or momentum—is so poorly defined that presidents and pundits often get it wrong. “Presidents usually over-estimate it,” says George Edwards, a presidential scholar at Texas A&M University. “The best kind of political capital—some sense of an electoral mandate to do something—is very rare. It almost never happens. In 1964, maybe. And to some degree in 1980.” For that reason, political capital is a concept that misleads far more than it enlightens. It is distortionary. It conveys the idea that we know more than we really do about the ever-elusive concept of political power, and it discounts the way unforeseen events can suddenly change everything. Instead, it suggests, erroneously, that a political figure has a concrete amount of political capital to invest, just as someone might have real investment capital—that a particular leader can bank his gains, and the size of his account determines what he can do at any given moment in history. Naturally, any president has practical and electoral limits. Does he have a majority in both chambers of Congress and a cohesive coalition behind him? Obama has neither at present. And unless a surge in the economy—at the moment, still stuck—or some other great victory gives him more momentum, it is inevitable that the closer Obama gets to the 2014 election, the less he will be able to get done. Going into the midterms, Republicans will increasingly avoid any concessions that make him (and the Democrats) stronger. But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote. Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”¶ ALL THE WAY WITH LBJ¶ Sometimes, a clever practitioner of power can get more done just because he’s aggressive and knows the hallways of Congress well. Texas A&M’s Edwards is right to say that the outcome of the 1964 election, Lyndon Johnson’s landslide victory over Barry Goldwater, was one of the few that conveyed a mandate. But one of the main reasons for that mandate (in addition to Goldwater’s ineptitude as a candidate) was President Johnson’s masterful use of power leading up to that election, and his ability to get far more done than anyone thought possible, given his limited political capital. In the newest volume in his exhaustive study of LBJ, The Passage of Power, historian Robert Caro recalls Johnson getting cautionary advice after he assumed the presidency from the assassinated John F. Kennedy in late 1963. Don’t focus on a long-stalled civil-rights bill, advisers told him, because it might jeopardize Southern lawmakers’ support for a tax cut and appropriations bills the president needed. “One of the wise, practical people around the table [said that] the presidency has only a certain amount of coinage to expend, and you oughtn’t to expend it on this,” Caro writes. (Coinage, of course, was what political capital was called in those days.) Johnson replied, “Well, what the hell’s the presidency for?” Johnson didn’t worry about coinage, and he got the Civil Rights Act enacted, along with much else: Medicare, a tax cut, antipoverty programs. He appeared to understand not just the ways of Congress but also the way to maximize the momentum he possessed in the lingering mood of national grief and determination by picking the right issues, as Caro records. “Momentum is not a mysterious mistress,” LBJ said. “It is a controllable fact of political life.” Johnson had the skill and wherewithal to realize that, at that moment of history, he could have unlimited coinage if he handled the politics right. He did. (At least until Vietnam, that is.) And then there are the presidents who get the politics, and the issues, wrong. It was the last president before Obama who was just starting a second term, George W. Bush, who really revived the claim of political capital, which he was very fond of wielding. Then Bush promptly demonstrated that he didn’t fully understand the concept either. At his first news conference after his 2004 victory, a confident-sounding Bush declared, “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it. That’s my style.” The 43rd president threw all of his political capital at an overriding passion: the partial privatization of Social Security. He mounted a full-bore public-relations campaign that included town-hall meetings across the country. Bush failed utterly, of course. But the problem was not that he didn’t have enough political capital. Yes, he may have overestimated his standing. Bush’s margin over John Kerry was thin—helped along by a bumbling Kerry campaign that was almost the mirror image of Romney’s gaffe-filled failure this time—but that was not the real mistake. The problem was that whatever credibility or stature Bush thought he had earned as a newly reelected president did nothing to make Social Security privatization a better idea in most people’s eyes. Voters didn’t trust the plan, and four years later, at the end of Bush’s term, the stock-market collapse bore out the public’s skepticism. Privatization just didn’t have any momentum behind it, no matter who was pushing it or how much capital Bush spent to sell it. The mistake that Bush made with Social Security, says John Sides, an associate professor of political science at George Washington University and a well-followed political blogger, “was that just because he won an election, he thought he had a green light. But there was no sense of any kind of public urgency on Social Security reform. It’s like he went into the garage where various Republican policy ideas were hanging up and picked one. I don’t think Obama’s going to make that mistake.… Bush decided he wanted to push a rock up a hill. He didn’t understand how steep the hill was. I think Obama has more momentum on his side because of the Republican Party’s concerns about the Latino vote and the shooting at Newtown.” Obama may also get his way on the debt ceiling, not because of his reelection, Sides says, “but because Republicans are beginning to doubt whether taking a hard line on fiscal policy is a good idea,” as the party suffers in the polls.¶ THE REAL LIMITS ON POWER¶ Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood. Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said. Weighing the imponderables of momentum, the often-mystical calculations about when the historic moment is ripe for an issue, will never be a science. It is mainly intuition, and its best practitioners have a long history in American politics. This is a tale told well in Steven Spielberg’s hit movie Lincoln. Daniel Day-Lewis’s Abraham Lincoln attempts a lot of behind-the-scenes vote-buying to win passage of the 13th Amendment, banning slavery, along with eloquent attempts to move people’s hearts and minds. He appears to be using the political capital of his reelection and the turning of the tide in the Civil War. But it’s clear that a surge of conscience, a sense of the changing times, has as much to do with the final vote as all the backroom horse-trading. “The reason I think the idea of political capital is kind of distorting is that it implies you have chits you can give out to people. It really oversimplifies why you elect politicians, or why they can do what Lincoln did,” says Tommy Bruce, a former political consultant in Washington. Consider, as another example, the storied political career of President Franklin Roosevelt. Because the mood was ripe for dramatic change in the depths of the Great Depression, FDR was able to push an astonishing array of New Deal programs through a largely compliant Congress, assuming what some described as near-dictatorial powers. But in his second term, full of confidence because of a landslide victory in 1936 that brought in unprecedented Democratic majorities in the House and Senate, Roosevelt overreached with his infamous Court-packing proposal. All of a sudden, the political capital that experts thought was limitless disappeared. FDR’s plan to expand the Supreme Court by putting in his judicial allies abruptly created an unanticipated wall of opposition from newly reunited Republicans and conservative Southern Democrats. FDR thus inadvertently handed back to Congress, especially to the Senate, the power and influence he had seized in his first term. Sure, Roosevelt had loads of popularity and momentum in 1937. He seemed to have a bank vault full of political capital. But, once again, a president simply chose to take on the wrong issue at the wrong time; this time, instead of most of the political interests in the country aligning his way, they opposed him. Roosevelt didn’t fully recover until World War II, despite two more election victories. In terms of Obama’s second-term agenda, what all these shifting tides of momentum and political calculation mean is this: Anything goes. Obama has no more elections to win, and he needs to worry only about the support he will have in the House and Senate after 2014. But if he picks issues that the country’s mood will support—such as, perhaps, immigration reform and gun control—there is no reason to think he can’t win far more victories than any of the careful calculators of political capital now believe is possible, including battles over tax reform and deficit reduction. Amid today’s atmosphere of Republican self-doubt, a new, more mature Obama seems to be emerging, one who has his agenda clearly in mind and will ride the mood of the country more adroitly. If he can get some early wins—as he already has, apparently, on the fiscal cliff and the upper-income tax increase—that will create momentum, and one win may well lead to others. “Winning wins.” Obama himself learned some hard lessons over the past four years about the falsity of the political-capital concept. Despite his decisive victory over John McCain in 2008, he fumbled the selling of his $787 billion stimulus plan by portraying himself naively as a “post-partisan” president who somehow had been given the electoral mandate to be all things to all people. So Obama tried to sell his stimulus as a long-term restructuring plan that would “lay the groundwork for long-term economic growth.” The president thus fed GOP suspicions that he was just another big-government liberal. Had he understood better that the country was digging in against yet more government intervention and had sold the stimulus as what it mainly was—a giant shot of adrenalin to an economy with a stopped heart, a pure emergency measure—he might well have escaped the worst of the backlash. But by laying on ambitious programs, and following up quickly with his health care plan, he only sealed his reputation on the right as a closet socialist. After that, Obama’s public posturing provoked automatic opposition from the GOP, no matter what he said. If the president put his personal imprimatur on any plan—from deficit reduction, to health care, to immigration reform—Republicans were virtually guaranteed to come out against it. But this year, when he sought to exploit the chastened GOP’s newfound willingness to compromise on immigration, his approach was different. He seemed to understand that the Republicans needed to reclaim immigration reform as their own issue, and he was willing to let them have some credit. When he mounted his bully pulpit in Nevada, he delivered another new message as well: You Republicans don’t have to listen to what I say anymore. And don’t worry about who’s got the political capital. Just take a hard look at where I’m saying this: in a state you were supposed to have won but lost because of the rising Hispanic vote. Obama was cleverly pointing the GOP toward conclusions that he knows it is already reaching on its own: If you, the Republicans, want to have any kind of a future in a vastly changed electoral map, you have no choice but to move. It’s your choice.

### A2 TPP DA:

#### Wont Pass. Palmer 4-29.

Palmer, Doug. “TPP Could Be Dead After This Year.” 4/29/2016. Politico. // LHP MK

PANETTA: **TPP COULD BE DEAD AFTER THIS YEAR**: Former Defense Secretary Leon **Panetta** said Thursday he **saw a “very low probability” of the Trans-Pacific Partnership** ever **becoming law** if Congress does not pass the agreement **before the end of this year,** because of the opposition of leading presidential candidates on both the right and the left. Story Continued Below “I would say a **failure to pass this before** the end of [President Barack Obama’s] term **would mean it’s unlikely** to be proposed in the future, given the positions staked by Mr. Trump, Sen. Cruz and Secretary Clinton,” **Panetta told reporters** on a conference call with another former secretary of defense, William Cohen, to urge lawmakers to consider the damage that failing to pass the 12-nation agreement would have on U.S. national security interests. Cohen said he was “a little more hopeful” the pact could be revived if Clinton wins in November with a message of “responsible world leadership.” But both Washington veterans said the White House and Republican leaders need to strike deals soon on outstanding issues for the pact to have a credible chance of being approved in the lame duck session after the election. IT’S FRIDAY, APRIL 29! Welcome to Morning Trade, where I’d like to recommend the music of Thomas Tallis if you’re feeling a little stressed. It got me through the final weeks of the 1996 Farm Bill and 20 years later it still does the job. You know the deal: thoughts, news, fool-proof life strategies? Send them todpalmer@politico.com and [@tradereporter](https://twitter.com/tradereporter). FORMER DEFENSE CHIEFS SEND LETTER: Panetta, Cohen and six other former defense chiefs, including Chuck Hagel and Donald Rumsfeld, in a letter Wednesday urged Congress to approve TPP or risk letting China write the trade rules for this century. "And let us be clear: trade rules written by China would not promote a trading system consistent with American interests and values," the group said. The main obstacle to approval, Republicans leaders say, is that **there is not enough support to approve the agreement because of concerns raised by financial services, pharmaceutical and tobacco companies**. The former defense chiefs urged Congress to take a larger view. “With a trade agreement of this magnitude, **there will be** elements that some **dislike**, but the overall benefits to our economy and national security cannot be overstated,” they said. Pros can click here to read the [letter](http://go.politicoemail.com/?qs=f3a17f2f2288f40781d59a4508f0a4697989a27e34fb2cae2e7e14ee1f87310c).

### A2 Prison DA:

#### 1. TURN: Youth gun violence spurs police militarization – outweighs the DA since it has a spillover effect where those affected will cause future violence. KAPLAN ET AL. ‘13:

"Top 10 Reasons Why Communities Of Color Should Care About Stricter Gun-Violence Prevention Laws". name. N. p., 2016. Web. 9 Apr. 2016. By Morriah Kaplan and [Sophia Kerby](https://www.americanprogress.org/?person=kerby-sophia) | Thursday, January 17, 2013 https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/news/2013/01/17/49885/top-10-reasons-why-communities-of-color-should-care-about-stricter-gun-violence-prevention-laws 1/17/13

Acts of **gun violence take[s] approximately 30 [k],000** American **lives every year, and** gun violence is one of the leading causes of death among teens. Although the majority of these shootings rarely make national headlines, the tragedy is no less real. As the following facts show, communities and families of color disproportionately suffer from gun violence. Here are 10 reasons why communities of color have a great stake in the public discourse on violence prevention. 1. People of color account for the majority of gun-violence victims. There are large racial disparities in homicide rates due to gun violence. The gun-homicide rate for black males is 2.4 times as high as that of Latino males, and it is 15.3 times as high as the rate for non-Hispanic white males. Murder and non-negligent manslaughter victims are most frequently black or Latino, with blacks comprising 67 percent of victims and Latinos comprising 28.1 percent. Blacks make up roughly 13 percent of the U.S. population, but in 2010—the last year for which data is available—they suffered 56 percent of all firearm homicides. 2. Gun violence **is one of the leading causes of death for teens of color.** Guns cause the deaths of thousands of teens each year. In 2008 and 2009 gun homicide was the leading cause of death among black teens, and the rates of gun-related deaths are highest for black male teens. For black families, the chance of a [black] male child dying from a gunshot wound is 62 percent higher than the chance of him dying in a motor-vehicle crash. In 2010 American Indian male teens had the second-highest rate of gun-related deaths, with 19.3 gun-related deaths per 100,000 teens. Latino male teens followed, with 17.8 per 100,000. In contrast,white male teens had the second-lowest rate, with only 9.4 per 100,000. 3. Gun violence is a vicious cycle. **Teens exposed** to gun violence **are more likely to commit violence** in the future. In a study conducted by the Department of Justice, teens were interviewed over a number of years about their exposure to violence, as well as their own violent acts. Teens who had been exposed to firearms violence reported committing more serious acts of violence than teens who had not been exposed. Additionally, youth who live in dangerous and disadvantaged neighborhoods and have had more exposure to violence were found to be more likely to carry concealed firearms. This means that **communities** already facing high levels of gun violence will likely **continue to experience violence** unless policymakers take action. 4. Gun injuries disproportionately affect communities of color. Of the 34,347 children and teens who suffered gun injuries in the United States in 2008 and 2009, almost half were black, and more than one-fifth were Latino. Black teens alone are 25 times more likely to be injured by a gun than white teens. 5. People of color strongly support gun-violence prevention. As people of color suffer higher rates of gun violence, it is not surprising that they strongly support stricter gun laws. Forty-nine percent of people of color are in favor of stricter gun-violence prevention. 6. The militarization of school safety and orderliness most heavily impacts children of color. In the wake of recent school shootings, members of the National Rifle Association, the nation’s largest gun lobby, have suggested putting armed police officers in every school. But research shows that increased **police** presence in schools **disproportionately affect**s **youth of color, driving the** school-to-prison pipelineand leading to youths’ unnecessary involvement in the justice system. Studies have shown that the more interaction a young person has with the criminal justice system, the more likely they are to come into contact with the criminal justice system in the future. This dynamic works to push a disproportionate number of black and Latino students out of school and into the criminal justice system. Black boys in particular are three times more likely to be suspended than white boys, and black girls are four times more likely to be suspended than white girls. 7. **Gun violence is concentrated in urban** and **poor neighborhoods,** which tend to be populated predominately by people of color. In 2006 and 2007 the 62 center cities of America’s 50 largest metro areas accounted for only 15 percent of the population but 39 percent of gun-related murders. This ratio is only growing: In 2011 there were record highs of gun violence in cities such as Chicago and Detroit. Plans to combat gun violence must include prevention programs and policies that target urban violence. 8. The cost of gun violence is a significant burden on the health care system. Firearm‐related injuries generally require hospitalization and significant emergency center resources. In 2005 U.S hospitals charged $108.4 million to care for about 10,000 victims of firearm injuries.

#### Only plan resolves since it has the biggest step towards youth gun violence

#### 2. No link – people are still able to defend themselves just not the very small amount of people who own guns and have kids

#### [Not needed] 3. TURN: Their racist crackdown args only apply to moderate gun control—a ban solves the problem because there’s no room for racist enforcement. BOVY 15

Phoebe Maltz Bovy, Writer at The Atlantic and New Republic, “It’s Time to Ban Guns. Yes, All of Them”, New Republic, December 10, 2015, DDA}

There’s also a more progressive version of this argument, and a more contrarian one, which involves suggesting that an anti-gun position is racist, because crackdowns on guns are criminal-justice interventions. **Progressives who** might have been able to **brush off accusations of anti-rural-white classism may have a tough**er **time confronting arguments about the** disparate **impact gun control policies can have on marginalized communities. These**, however, **are criticisms of** certain tentative, **insufficient gun control measures**—**the ones that would leave** small-town **white families with legal**ly-acquired **guns** well enough alone, **allowing them to shoot** themselves or **one another and to let their guns enter the general population. Ban Guns**, meanwhile, **is not discriminatory in this way. It’s not about dividing society into “good” and “bad” gun owners. It’s about placing gun ownership itself in the “bad” category.** It’s worth adding that **the anti-gun position is** ultimately **about** **police not carrying guns, either.** That could never happen, right? Well, certainly not if we keep on insisting on its impossibility.

### A2 Substitution DA:

#### 1. Urist evidence takes this out – families are too scarred after a they have an accident to switch to any other gun.

#### 2. Handguns are way more involved in accidents than long guns – case o/w. LAMBERT:

http://scienceblogs.com/deltoid/1997/02/24/handguns-00000/LHP AA

Try 1 to 4. **Handguns are four times as likely to be involved in an accidental shooting as long guns. Handguns comprise about 1/3 of the US gun stock and are involved in 2/3 of the accidental woundings** (NEISS). Peter H. Proctor writes: *Er, According to Kleck ( Point Blank, table 2, ) 90% or more of* *firearms kept loaded at any one time are handguns.* Er, there is no table 2 in “Point Blank”. Nor does Kleck make thisclaim anywhere in “Point Blank”. Nor is true. **You can estimate thepercentage of firearms kept loaded all the time from a survey** offirearm storage practices (JAMA 92). 80% of those who said that they kept a gun loaded all or some of the time said they owned a handgun. From this we can conclude that AT MOST **80% of the guns kept loaded are handguns.** It would only be 80% if every person who owns a handgun NEVER keeps a long gun loaded. *Presumably, you cannot get shot by an unloaded gun, so handgun “exposure’ ( in the sense we toxicologists use it) is very high relative to long guns, even though there* *are more long guns.1* You CAN get shot with an “unloaded” gun. In fact guns that are, in fact, loaded but are believed to be unloaded are particularly likely to be involved in accidents. Surveys measure whether people believe the gun to be unloaded, not whether it really is unloaded. *2* Your measure of “exposure” is wrong. If hunting rifles were never stored loaded, do you think that this would magically stop all hunting accidents from occurring? *3* The far greater **handgun involvement in accidents may indeed be partly caused by the greater likelihood for a handgun being kept loaded.** This still doesn’t change the fact that a handgun is four times as likely to be involved in a gun accident. *Yet handguns are involved in less than 14% of accidental gun* *fatalities.* ABSOLUTELY FALSE. You really should not rely on Kates for this stuff. He has deliberately misled you. Handguns are involved in about half of accidental gun fatalities. *A very interesting review of all of this is: Kates et al Guns and Public* *Health. Tennessee Law Review, vol 62, #3, p513 (1995).* A fiercely partisan pro-gun piece that manages to misstate or get wrong just about every relevant fact on this issue. See [here](http://timlambert.org/category/guns/kates) for the discussion I had with Kates on this.

#### 3. How are kids supposed to shoot themselves with a double barrel shotgun that is bigger than them – they cant – all our inherency evidence is about handguns specifically so DA doesn’t matter

## T:

### A2 Group Spec Bad:

#### Counter-Interpretation: The aff may only defend a handgun ban on a specific group if (a) it’s a ban for households with at least one person under 18 years of age and (b) it is the TOC. DeFilippis 16:

CAL RR FINALS POST-ROUND DISCUSSION [TRANSCRIPT], March 5, 16, D

Varad: Hi, I'm Varad Agrawala from Greenhill, um, and my question was in terms of the legal definitions of a ban, uh, **would banning for particular groups still count as a ban on private ownership,** or would that be more of a restriction? What I mean by that is, would a ban necessitate banning private ownership for all individuals or is it okay to just ban it for like particular groups such as, one might say, you know, domestic violence abusers, or people in dating relationships? Zimring: Okay, in general, the distinction between, and this is the problem with talking about bans. The technical meaning of ban or prohibition is nothing at all. It, it's a wonderful word, but it hasn't been used. The distinction for handgun position regulations is between permissive and restrictive licensing. It is not a question of which group. The question is what's the assumption? Permissive says everybody except can own, and the exceptions are 90% the immature, then criminal records, and then something in the mental health situation. Restrictive licensing reverses the presumption and says nobody can own unless you have a particular good reason. It then has to, if it does it right, say what the good reasons are and what the evidence for them is right. The problem with that, it's highly restrictive. That's the good news. The bad news is, uh, the richer you are, and the more you contributed to last successful mayor, the more likely it is you're going to get a license. Welcome to politics. So, there are implementation problems. Those are the best conceptual frames. DeFilippis: I was just going to add really quickly that, uh, I mean, at risk of having this turn into like a topicality debate or something, but (audience laughs) ... Uh ... Varad: That's the reason I asked the question. DeFilippis: Uh, there's much of the literature as Professor mentioned, ban is not legally operationalized well in gun control literature, but there are plenty of research articles that use the phrase in the context of you know people with criminal records are banned from using guns, most people with different types of mental health records are banned from using guns. I think that in terms of banning subsets of the population, uh, I think it can be argued that it's a ban. Zimring: Oh, it's done, but it's part of what's really permissive licensing and regulation. Randall: All right. Zimring: It's everybody but ... Randall: Okay, all right. Bietz: Backfired.

#### Net Benefits:

#### 1. Aff flex at TOC is key – TOC is the last tournament where people break new so having the ability of reading new nuanced positions that are not gen res are key to combating the new neg strategies. Outweighs – the marginal skew you get from limits is nothing compared to being skrewed over by the vast majority of neg reactivity. Also extend all our warrants why aff flex outweighs – terminal D on your shell since I get to be a little abusive to combat with neg strat.

#### 2. Defending a whole ban means the neg can PIC out of any group like children, non-uniques their offense and skrews the aff – two impacts:

#### A. Time skew - they beat me with framework or generic Ks even with slight aff advantage.

#### B. Reactivity – they have infinite other CPs against a plan but PICs coopt 99% of the aff and I can’t pick a new advocacy in the 1AR.

#### 3. Discussion of the aff comes first – FOC ev proves making kids the central question of the gun debate is key. Speccing specifically to children is key:

#### A. Not taking about specifically children is what allows them to be excluded in current academia that’s all our Giroux ev – so there’s no topical version of the aff under their interp.

#### B. I outweigh on depth – speccing all people means we get superficial education about every group, but my aff goes in depth on one, which allows us to get real education that we can apply out of round. It’s also the TOC – we’ve had debates about plans that affect people but there hasn’t been a plan specific to children like ours so we have uniqueness for this education

### A2 - Limits [Debois]:

#### 1. No qualifications to determine what the lit base entails – this is just prediction so don’t give the ev this leeway.

#### 2. This evidence alludes to background checks, which obviously doesn’t make sense in the context of our aff because the parents where never convicted of anything so it’s still fair.

### A2 – Limits [General]:

#### 1. I solve limits – my interp justifies all other forms of group spec as bad except for this aff.

## Ks:

### A2 Hierarchy K

#### 1. Debate rounds are short - we don't have a lot of time, part of what it means to be the AC is to pick the oppression we're going to talk about.

#### 2. TURN: It's bad to talk about oppression in general - it only happens to particular people in particular contexts - your alt is hopelessly general.

#### 3. Case outweighs – making children the central issue of the gun debate is needed – our FOC evidence is very explicit on this issue – children are underrepresented especially in the gun debate

### A2 Adult Child Division K:

#### 1. This is the status quo and alt cant resolve this – the way society is set up is by having the parents care for the children – impact to the K is nonunqiue

### A2 Race:

#### 1. Extend Giroux– we need to address symbolic representation with tangible violence in order to effectively solve any sort of child violence. Education has to work with real life in order to properly address the power relations. This means we link turn your framing arguments and the impact to the aff matter under your ROB.

#### And, case solves tangible harms – offense under case and turns the 1NC. KAPLAN ET AL. ‘13:

"Top 10 Reasons Why Communities Of Color Should Care About Stricter Gun-Violence Prevention Laws". name. N. p., 2016. Web. 9 Apr. 2016. By Morriah Kaplan and [Sophia Kerby](https://www.americanprogress.org/?person=kerby-sophia) | Thursday, January 17, 2013 https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/news/2013/01/17/49885/top-10-reasons-why-communities-of-color-should-care-about-stricter-gun-violence-prevention-laws 1/17/13

Acts of **gun violence take[s] approximately 30 [k],000** American **lives every year, and** gun violence is one of the leading causes of death among teens. Although the majority of these shootings rarely make national headlines, the tragedy is no less real. As the following facts show, communities and families of color disproportionately suffer from gun violence. Here are 10 reasons why communities of color have a great stake in the public discourse on violence prevention. 1. People of color account for the majority of gun-violence victims. There are large racial disparities in homicide rates due to gun violence. The gun-homicide rate for black males is 2.4 times as high as that of Latino males, and it is 15.3 times as high as the rate for non-Hispanic white males. Murder and non-negligent manslaughter victims are most frequently black or Latino, with blacks comprising 67 percent of victims and Latinos comprising 28.1 percent. Blacks make up roughly 13 percent of the U.S. population, but in 2010—the last year for which data is available—they suffered 56 percent of all firearm homicides. 2. Gun violence **is one of the leading causes of death for teens of color.** Guns cause the deaths of thousands of teens each year. In 2008 and 2009 gun homicide was the leading cause of death among black teens, and the rates of gun-related deaths are highest for black male teens. For black families, the chance of a [black] male child dying from a gunshot wound is 62 percent higher than the chance of him dying in a motor-vehicle crash. In 2010 American Indian male teens had the second-highest rate of gun-related deaths, with 19.3 gun-related deaths per 100,000 teens. Latino male teens followed, with 17.8 per 100,000. In contrast,white male teens had the second-lowest rate, with only 9.4 per 100,000. 3. Gun violence is a vicious cycle. **Teens exposed** to gun violence **are more likely to commit violence** in the future. In a study conducted by the Department of Justice, teens were interviewed over a number of years about their exposure to violence, as well as their own violent acts. Teens who had been exposed to firearms violence reported committing more serious acts of violence than teens who had not been exposed. Additionally, youth who live in dangerous and disadvantaged neighborhoods and have had more exposure to violence were found to be more likely to carry concealed firearms. This means that **communities** already facing high levels of gun violence will likely **continue to experience violence** unless policymakers take action. 4. Gun injuries disproportionately affect communities of color. Of the 34,347 children and teens who suffered gun injuries in the United States in 2008 and 2009, almost half were black, and more than one-fifth were Latino. Black teens alone are 25 times more likely to be injured by a gun than white teens. 5. People of color strongly support gun-violence prevention. As people of color suffer higher rates of gun violence, it is not surprising that they strongly support stricter gun laws. Forty-nine percent of people of color are in favor of stricter gun-violence prevention. 6. The militarization of school safety and orderliness most heavily impacts children of color. In the wake of recent school shootings, members of the National Rifle Association, the nation’s largest gun lobby, have suggested putting armed police officers in every school. But research shows that increased **police** presence in schools **disproportionately affect**s **youth of color, driving the** school-to-prison pipelineand leading to youths’ unnecessary involvement in the justice system. Studies have shown that the more interaction a young person has with the criminal justice system, the more likely they are to come into contact with the criminal justice system in the future. This dynamic works to push a disproportionate number of black and Latino students out of school and into the criminal justice system. Black boys in particular are three times more likely to be suspended than white boys, and black girls are four times more likely to be suspended than white girls. 7. **Gun violence is concentrated in urban** and **poor neighborhoods,** which tend to be populated predominately by people of color. In 2006 and 2007 the 62 center cities of America’s 50 largest metro areas accounted for only 15 percent of the population but 39 percent of gun-related murders. This ratio is only growing: In 2011 there were record highs of gun violence in cities such as Chicago and Detroit. Plans to combat gun violence must include prevention programs and policies that target urban violence. 8. The cost of gun violence is a significant burden on the health care system. Firearm‐related injuries generally require hospitalization and significant emergency center resources. In 2005 U.S hospitals charged $108.4 million to care for about 10,000 victims of firearm injuries.

## NCs:

### A2 Kant NC:

#### 1. The AAP evidence turns this – handguns are uniquely responsible for the most child deaths - non-uniques self defense because the thing that should save children just helps them kill themselves

#### 2. Prefer non-ideal theory: ethics don’t just exist to map out beautiful ideals – they exist so we can implement the theory and act morally. Only non-ideal theory can guide action. Ideal theory doesn’t work with the realities that prevent realization of the ideal, so it’s self-defeating. Mills:

Charles W. Mills, “Ideal Theory” as Ideology, 2005

I suggest that this spontaneous reaction, far from being philosophically naïve or jejune, is in fact the correct one. If we start from what is presumably the uncontroversial premise that the ultimate point of ethics is to guide our actions and make ourselves better people and the world a better place, then the framework above will not only be unhelpful, but will in certain respects be deeply antithetical to the proper goal of theoretical ethics as an enterprise. In modeling humans, human capacities, human interaction, human institutions, and human society on ideal-as-idealized-models, in never exploring how deeply different this is from ideal-as-descriptive-models, we are abstracting away from realities crucial to our comprehension of the actual workings of injustice in human interactions and social institutions, and thereby guaranteeing that the ideal-as-idealized-model will never be achieved.

#### Takes out the NC since Kantianism since it is predicated off of a priori principles that are generally applicable

#### 3. The 1NC is a link – the way Kant thinks about the structure of willing unjustifiably excludes children - they are irrational so it just justifies the exclusion of children

#### 4. People can choose to not have kids - it's not just their liberty in question. Hun ownership liberty causes kids deaths - not keeping guns in a house with children avoids this – so don't have children. When a child’s involved, it's not just gun owner’s liberty being involved but also the children

# Extensions:

## Inherency:

#### Extend Luo and McIntire: the 1AC has uniqueness. Less than 20 states have legislation for kids, and any negative NRA ev is from the lowest citations for deaths.

#### Extend Lidgett: Accidental child death is high now. (DA says accidental child deaths might go up but the question is versus what, it’s already increasing in the squo – try or die for the affirmative *and the alt fails*)

## Plan:

#### Extend Hare: A ban on handguns has really really big impacts for households – but these only make up 24% of America – your disad link is marginal so my impacts outweigh.

## Advantage 1 - Accidental Child Death

#### Extend the second AAP card - handguns are uniquely responsible for the most child deaths, 89% percent of childhood unintentional deaths happen at home and 73% know where the guns are. Also solves 75% of suicides. (Non-uniques self defense because the thing that should save children just helps them kill themselves)

#### Extend Walesh – probability flows my way. 1 kid dies a day from accidental shootings and 13 die.

#### Extend Hook – gun outnumbers ALL other concerns for kids – specifically protects kids where they need it.

## Advantage 2 - Psychological Harms

#### Extend Walesh 2 – “weapons effect” is the thing that causes child aggression in the first place – controls the internal link to the education system (solves better than the adult); removes cycles of violence

## Solvency

#### Extend Walesh 3 – mortality rates must be deal with by getting rid of guns – only a handgun ban will actually solve handgun presences.

#### Extend Urist – takes out substitution effects - parents uniquely are affected by gun tragedies and will do what it takes to comply with handgun control – the ev indicates that parents changed their mind from wanting handguns to gun control after tragedies. (also just speaking about the aff is key)

## Framework:

1. Methodology at request. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Another Chance for Bipartisan Achievement Slips Away.* [JENNIFER STEINHAUER](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/jennifer_steinhauer/index.html)APRIL 29, 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)