## 1AC

I picked and chose stuff to read in the 1AC

### Role of the Ballot (:45)

#### The state is inevitable- speaking the language of power through policymaking is the only way to create social change in debate.

Coverstone 5 Alan Coverstone (masters in communication from Wake Forest, longtime debate coach) “Acting on Activism: Realizing the Vision of Debate with Pro-social Impact” Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Conference November 17th 2005 JW 11/18/15

An important concern emerges when Mitchell describes reflexive fiat as a contest strategy capable of “eschewing the power to directly control external actors” (1998b, p. 20). Describing debates about what our government should do as attempts to control outside actors is debilitating and disempowering. Control of the US government is exactly what an active, participatory citizenry is supposed to be all about. After all, if democracy means anything, it means that citizens not only have the right, they also bear the obligation to discuss and debate what the government should be doing. Absent that discussion and debate, much of the motivation for personal political activism is also lost. Those who have co-opted Mitchell’s argument for individual advocacy often quickly respond that nothing we do in a debate round can actually change government policy, and unfortunately, an entire generation of debaters has now swallowed this assertion as an article of faith. The best most will muster is, “Of course not, but you don’t either!” The assertion that nothing we do in debate has any impact on government policy is one that carries the potential to undermine Mitchell’s entire project. If there is nothing we can do in a debate round to change government policy, then we are left with precious little in the way of pro-social options for addressing problems we face. At best, we can pursue some Pilot-like hand washing that can purify us as individuals through quixotic activism but offer little to society as a whole. It is very important to note that Mitchell (1998b) tries carefully to limit and bound his notion of reflexive fiat by maintaining that because it “views fiat as a concrete course of action, it is bounded by the limits of pragmatism” (p. 20). Pursued properly, the debates that Mitchell would like to see are those in which the relative efficacy of concrete political strategies for pro-social change is debated. In a few noteworthy examples, this approach has been employed successfully, and I must say that I have thoroughly enjoyed judging and coaching those debates. The students in my program have learned to stretch their understanding of their role in the political process because of the experience. Therefore, those who say I am opposed to Mitchell’s goals here should take care at such a blanket assertion. However, contest debate teaches students to combine personal experience with the language of political power. Powerful personal narratives unconnected to political power are regularly co-opted by those who do learn the language of power. One need look no further than the annual state of the Union Address where personal story after personal story is used to support the political agenda of those in power. The so-called role-playing that public policy contest debates encourage promotes active learning of the vocabulary and levers of power in America. Imagining the ability to use our own arguments to influence government action is one of the great virtues of academic debate. Gerald Graff (2003) analyzed the decline of argumentation in academic discourse and found a source of student antipathy to public argument in an interesting place. I’m up against…their aversion to the role of public spokesperson that formal writing presupposes. It’s as if such students can’t imagine any rewards for being a public actor or even imagining themselves in such a role. This lack of interest in the public sphere may in turn reflect a loss of confidence in the possibility that the arguments we make in public will have an effect on the world. Today’s students’ lack of faith in the power of persuasion reflects the waning of the ideal of civic participation that led educators for centuries to place rhetorical and argumentative training at the center of the school and college curriculum. (Graff, 2003, p. 57) The power to imagine public advocacy that actually makes a difference is one of the great virtues of the traditional notion of fiat that critics deride as mere simulation. Simulation of success in the public realm is far more empowering to students than completely abandoning all notions of personal power in the face of governmental hegemony by teaching students that “nothing they can do in a contest debate can ever make any difference in public policy.” Contest debating is well suited to rewarding public activism if it stops accepting as an article of faith that personal agency is somehow undermined by the so-called role playing in debate. Debate is role-playing whether we imagine government action or imagine individual action. Imagining myself starting a socialist revolution in America is no less of a fantasy than imagining myself making a difference on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, both fantasies influenced my personal and political development virtually ensuring a life of active, pro-social, political participation. Neither fantasy reduced the likelihood that I would spend my life trying to make the difference I imagined. One fantasy actually does make a greater difference: the one that speaks the language of political power. The other fantasy disables action by making one a laughingstock to those who wield the language of power. Fantasy motivates and role-playing trains through visualization. Until we can imagine it, we cannot really do it. Role-playing without question teaches students to be comfortable with the language of power, and that language paves the way for genuine and effective political activism. Debates over the relative efficacy of political strategies for pro-social change must confront governmental power at some point. There is a fallacy in arguing that movements represent a better political strategy than voting and person-to-person advocacy. Sure, a full-scale movement would be better than the limited voice I have as a participating citizen going from door to door in a campaign, but so would full-scale government action. Unfortunately, the gap between my individual decision to pursue movement politics and the emergence of a full-scale movement is at least as great as the gap between my vote and democratic change. They both represent utopian fiat. Invocation of Mitchell to support utopian movement fiat is simply not supported by his work, and too often, such invocation discourages the concrete actions he argues for in favor of the personal rejectionism that under girds the political cynicism that is a fundamental cause of voter and participatory abstention in America today.

#### Critical movements must be strategically oriented legalistic demands against the state to promote real change.

Zizek 07 Slavoj “Resistance is Surrender” London Review of Books November 15th 2007 <http://www.lacan.com/zizsurcrit.htm> JW

One of the clearest lessons of the last few decades is that capitalism is indestructible. Marx compared it to a vampire, and one of the salient points of comparison now appears to be that vampires always rise up again after being stabbed to death. Even Mao's attempt, in the Cultural Revolution, to wipe out the traces of capitalism, ended up in its triumphant return. Today's Left reacts in a wide variety of ways to the hegemony of global capitalism and its political supplement, liberal democracy. It might, for example, accept the hegemony, but continue to fight for reform within its rules (this is Third Way social democracy). Or, it accepts that the hegemony is here to stay, but should nonetheless be resisted from its 'interstices'. Or, it accepts the futility of all struggle, since the hegemony is so all-encompassing that nothing can really be done except wait for an outburst of 'divine violence' - a revolutionary version of Heidegger's 'only God can save us.' Or, it recognises the temporary futility of the struggle. In today's triumph of global capitalism, the argument goes, true resistance is not possible, so all we can do till the revolutionary spirit of the global working class is renewed is defend what remains of the welfare state, confronting those in power with demands we know they cannot fulfil, and otherwise withdraw into cultural studies, where one can quietly pursue the work of criticism. Or, it emphasises the fact that the problem is a more fundamental one, that global capitalism is ultimately an effect of the underlying principles of technology or 'instrumental reason'. Or, it posits that one can undermine global capitalism and state power, not by directly attacking them, but by refocusing the field of struggle on everyday practices, where one can 'build a new world'; in this way, the foundations of the power of capital and the state will be gradually undermined, and, at some point, the state will collapse (the exemplar of this approach is the Zapatista movement). Or, it takes the 'postmodern' route, shifting the accent from anti-capitalist struggle to the multiple forms of politico-ideological struggle for hegemony, emphasising the importance of discursive re-articulation. Or, it wagers that one can repeat at the postmodern level the classical Marxist gesture of enacting the 'determinate negation' of capitalism: with today's rise of 'cognitive work', the contradiction between social production and capitalist relations has become starker than ever, rendering possible for the first time 'absolute democracy' (this would be Hardt and Negri's position). These positions are not presented as a way of avoiding some 'true' radical Left politics - what they are trying to get around is, indeed, the lack of such a position. This defeat of the Left is not the whole story of the last thirty years, however. There is another, no less surprising, lesson to be learned from the Chinese Communists' presiding over arguably the most explosive development of capitalism in history, and from the growth of West European Third Way social democracy. It is, in short: we can do it better. In the UK, the Thatcher revolution was, at the time, chaotic and impulsive, marked by unpredictable contingencies. It was Tony Blair who was able to institutionalise it, or, in Hegel's terms, to raise (what first appeared as) a contingency, a historical accident, into a necessity. Thatcher wasn't a Thatcherite, she was merely herself; it was Blair (more than Major) who truly gave form to Thatcherism. The response of some critics on the postmodern Left to this predicament is to call for a new politics of resistance. Those who still insist on fighting state power, let alone seizing it, are accused of remaining stuck within the 'old paradigm': the task today, their critics say, is to resist state power by withdrawing from its terrain and creating new spaces outside its control. This is, of course, the obverse of accepting the triumph of capitalism. The politics of resistance is nothing but the moralising supplement to a Third Way Left. Simon Critchley's recent book, Infinitely Demanding, is an almost perfect embodiment of this position. For Critchley, the liberal-democratic state is here to stay. Attempts to abolish the state failed miserably; consequently, the new politics has to be located at a distance from it: anti-war movements, ecological organisations, groups protesting against racist or sexist abuses, and other forms of local self-organisation. It must be a politics of resistance to the state, of bombarding the state with impossible demands, of denouncing the limitations of state mechanisms. The main argument for conducting the politics of resistance at a distance from the state hinges on the ethical dimension of the 'infinitely demanding' call for justice: no state can heed this call, since its ultimate goal is the 'real-political' one of ensuring its own reproduction (its economic growth, public safety, etc). 'Of course,' Critchley writes, history is habitually written by the people with the guns and sticks and one cannot expect to defeat them with mocking satire and feather dusters. Yet, as the history of ultra-leftist active nihilism eloquently shows, one is lost the moment one picks up the guns and sticks. Anarchic political resistance should not seek to mimic and mirror the archic violent sovereignty it opposes. So what should, say, the US Democrats do? Stop competing for state power and withdraw to the interstices of the state, leaving state power to the Republicans and start a campaign of anarchic resistance to it? And what would Critchley do if he were facing an adversary like Hitler? Surely in such a case one should 'mimic and mirror the archic violent sovereignty' one opposes? Shouldn't the Left draw a distinction between the circumstances in which one would resort to violence in confronting the state, and those in which all one can and should do is use 'mocking satire and feather dusters'? The ambiguity of Critchley's position resides in a strange non sequitur: if the state is here to stay, if it is impossible to abolish it (or capitalism), why retreat from it? Why not act with(in) the state? Why not accept the basic premise of the Third Way? Why limit oneself to a politics which, as Critchley puts it, 'calls the state into question and calls the established order to account, not in order to do away with the state, desirable though that might well be in some utopian sense, but in order to better it or attenuate its malicious effect'? These words simply demonstrate that today's liberal-democratic state and the dream of an 'infinitely demanding' anarchic politics exist in a relationship of mutual parasitism: anarchic agents do the ethical thinking, and the state does the work of running and regulating society. Critchley's anarchic ethico-political agent acts like a superego, comfortably bombarding the state with demands; and the more the state tries to satisfy these demands, the more guilty it is seen to be. In compliance with this logic, the anarchic agents focus their protest not on open dictatorships, but on the hypocrisy of liberal democracies, who are accused of betraying their own professed principles. The big demonstrations in London and Washington against the US attack on Iraq a few years ago offer an exemplary case of this strange symbiotic relationship between power and resistance. Their paradoxical outcome was that both sides were satisfied. The protesters saved their beautiful souls: they made it clear that they don't agree with the government's policy on Iraq. Those in power calmly accepted it, even profited from it: not only did the protests in no way prevent the already-made decision to attack Iraq; they also served to legitimise it. Thus George Bush's reaction to mass demonstrations protesting his visit to London, in effect: 'You see, this is what we are fighting for, so that what people are doing here - protesting against their government policy - will be possible also in Iraq!' It is striking that the course on which Hugo Chávez has embarked since 2006 is the exact opposite of the one chosen by the postmodern Left: far from resisting state power, he grabbed it (first by an attempted coup, then democratically), ruthlessly using the Venezuelan state apparatuses to promote his goals. Furthermore, he is militarising the barrios, and organising the training of armed units there. And, the ultimate scare: now that he is feeling the economic effects of capital's 'resistance' to his rule (temporary shortages of some goods in the state-subsidised supermarkets), he has announced plans to consolidate the 24 parties that support him into a single party. Even some of his allies are sceptical about this move: will it come at the expense of the popular movements that have given the Venezuelan revolution its élan? However, this choice, though risky, should be fully endorsed: the task is to make the new party function not as a typical state socialist (or Peronist) party, but as a vehicle for the mobilisation of new forms of politics (like the grass roots slum committees). What should we say to someone like Chávez? 'No, do not grab state power, just withdraw, leave the state and the current situation in place'? Chávez is often dismissed as a clown - but wouldn't such a withdrawal just reduce him to a version of Subcomandante Marcos, whom many Mexican leftists now refer to as 'Subcomediante Marcos'? Today, it is the great capitalists - Bill Gates, corporate polluters, fox hunters - who 'resist' the state. The lesson here is that the truly subversive thing is not to insist on 'infinite' demands we know those in power cannot fulfil. Since they know that we know it, such an 'infinitely demanding' attitude presents no problem for those in power: 'So wonderful that, with your critical demands, you remind us what kind of world we would all like to live in. Unfortunately, we live in the real world, where we have to make do with what is possible.' The thing to do is, on the contrary, to bombard those in power with strategically well-selected, precise, finite demands, which can't be met with the same excuse.

### Plan Text (:03)

#### Resolved: the United States federal government will ban private ownership of handguns.

### Plan Text – Fines (:15)

#### Resolved: the United States federal government will ban private ownership of handguns by enforcing confiscation and a $500 fine on individuals in possession of handguns.

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

Perhaps enforcing unpopular, or at least controversial, handgun disarmament could be made easier by setting the punishment low. If illegal possession of a handgun were treated as a misdemeanor or administrative violation, punishable by a small fine, say $250 or $500, jury trials could be avoided altogether. However, under that scheme, people who were (p.165) committed to keeping their handguns would be no more deterred from violating the gun law than from violating the speed limit.

### Plan Text – Passive (:15)

#### Resolved: the United States federal government will ban private ownership of handguns through passive enforcement.

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

These potential problems suggest that passive enforcement might be a better alternative. BATF agents might make no special effort to identify and arrest handgun possessors. They could simply make arrests when handguns come to light in the course of investigations of other crimes. Of course, that is not much different than the way federal and state felon-inpossession laws are currently enforced.

### Adv 1 = Latin American Relations (1:15)

#### US-Latin American relations are waning now. Decisive federal action to lessen gun ownership creates the perception of cooperation on instability which fixes relations.

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

The flow of high-powered weaponry from the United States to Latin America and the Caribbean exacerbates soaring rates of gun-related violence in the region and undermines U.S. influence in the Western Hemisphere. Though the Senate rejected measures to expand background checks on firearms sales, reinstate a federal assault-weapons ban, and make straw purchasing a federal crime, the Obama administration can still take executive action to reduce the availability and trafficking of assault weapons and ammunition in the Americas. The Problem With the launch of the Merida Initiative in 2007, the U.S. and Mexican governments agreed to a regional security framework guided by the principle of shared responsibility. Among its domestic obligations, the United States committed to intensify its efforts to combat the illegal trafficking of weapons and ammunition to Mexico and elsewhere in the Americas. Six years later, little has changed: the U.S. civilian firearms market continues to supply the region's transnational criminal networks with high-powered weaponry that is purchased with limited oversight, especially from unlicensed individuals at gun shows, flea markets, pawn shops, and on the Internet. Lax U.S. gun laws enable straw purchasers, including those under investigation in Operation Fast and Furious, to legally procure thousands of AK-47 and AR-15 variants every year and traffic them across the border to sell them illegally to criminal factions. U.S. government data highlights the problem. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' (ATF) Web-based firearm trace request and analysis system, eTrace, enables law enforcement officials to collaborate with ATF to track the path of recovered weapons from the manufacturer or importer though the distribution chain to the first retail purchase. Over 70 percent of the ninety-nine thousand weapons recovered by Mexican law enforcement since 2007 were traced to U.S. manufacturers and importers. Likewise, 2011 eTrace data for the Caribbean indicates that over 90 percent of the weapons recovered and traced in the Bahamas and over 80 percent of those in Jamaica came from the United States. The ATF has not released data for Central America, but the numbers are likely similar. The UN Office on Drugs and Crime reports that easy access to firearms is a major factor influencing homicide trends in Latin America and the Caribbean; the gun-related homicide rate in Latin America exceeded the global average in 2010 by more than 30 percent. The World Bank estimates that crime and violence cost Central America nearly 8 percent of its GDP when accounting for the costs of law enforcement, security, and health care. The U.S. government has empowered law enforcement in the region to recover and investigate the source of weapons used by criminal factions. In December 2009, the ATF introduced the Spanish version of eTrace. Since 2012, the State Department has funded the Organization of American States' (OAS) program to provide firearm-marking equipment and training to law enforcement in twenty-five countries. Yet, these efforts notwithstanding, Mexican authorities intercepted only 12.7 percent of the roughly 250,000 guns smuggled into Mexico between 2010 and 2012, while the ATF intercepted no more than 2 percent. In effect, the United States undermines its own efforts at preventing arms trafficking with its unwillingness to strengthen oversight of the firearms industry and lukewarm support for multilateral agreements. The United States is one of three countries that have not ratified the Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials (CIFTA). In addition to requiring parties to criminalize the illegal manufacture, import, or export of high-powered weapons, the treaty encourages information exchange and cooperation on initiatives including the marking and tracing of weapons and the identification of criminal transit routes. President Bill Clinton signed CIFTA in 1997 and submitted it for ratification to the Senate, where it has lingered for over a decade. Likewise, although the United States voted in favor of the United Nations' Arms Trade Treaty in April 2013, it has yet to sign or ratify the treaty. Given the political complexity of legislative action to reduce arms trafficking, Latin American governments have moved to disarm criminal networks by tightening their own gun codes: Mexico prohibits the sale of handguns with calibers greater than .38 and Colombia bans civilians from carrying firearms in Medellin and Bogota. Brazil, Mexico, and El Salvador have implemented gun buyback programs. At the 2012 Summit of the Americas, heads of state demanded a new approach to the failed war on drugs, including greater efforts to disarm criminal networks. U.S. allies have repeatedly urged the United States to reinstate the federal assault-weapons ban and take action against weapons trafficking. Their patience—and the United States' credibility as a responsible partner—is waning. U.S. action will strengthen those regional heads of state who want to work with the United States and who also regard lax U.S. gun laws as fueling violence and anti-Americanism among their own publics. Across the board, Latin American governments are turning toward the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States and the Union of South American Nations, which pointedly exclude the United States, to handle regional political and security dilemmas. Stronger action to regulate the southward flow of weapons represents an opportunity for the Obama administration to enhance U.S. relevance in the region, especially at the early stages of new regional institutions and security protocols. Recommendations In the absence of major legislative action, the Obama administration should pursue the following executive and diplomatic actions—consistent with the Second Amendment—to reduce the trafficking of firearms that contribute to crime and violence across the Americas: Expand nationwide the state-level multiple-sale reporting requirement for assault weapons. In 2011, the Obama administration adopted a federal rule that requires gun dealers in California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico to report sales of more than two semiautomatic rifles to the same person within a five-day period. Unintentionally, the rule shifted gun sales to states not covered by the requirement, prompting the need for improved oversight of all suspicious semiautomatic firearm sales. Incorporate strategies to reduce existing stocks of illegal firearms into U.S.-Brazil dialogue on defense and security. As home to the two largest firearms industries in the hemisphere, the United States and Brazil have a mutual interest in incorporating this topic into their ongoing bilateral policy dialogues. For example, sharing best practices regarding gun buyback programs in border regions on the U.S.-Mexican and Brazilian-Bolivian borders will build mutual confidence between the two largest Hemispheric powers. Exclude firearms and ammunition products from the Export Control Reform Initiative. As currently crafted, President Barack Obama's reform initiative may make it easier for U.S. manufacturers to export military-style weapons to allies. Liberalizing export restrictions on firearms poses a serious security risk to the Americas; potential reexport of firearms without U.S. oversight could jeopardize local law enforcement efforts to keep weapons from criminal groups and rogue security forces in the region. Apply the "sporting test" standards of the 1968 Gun Control Act. This provision prohibits the import of weapons not "suitable or readily adaptable for sporting purposes," including but not limited to military-style firearms. Throughout the 1990s, under Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton, the ATF adhered to the sporting test guidelines, preventing thousands of assault weapons from entering the U.S. firearms market. Enforcement of the test lapsed under President George W. Bush and has not been reestablished under President Obama. Continue to support federal, state, and local initiatives to improve regulation of the U.S. civilian firearms market. As grassroots organizations prepare their long-term legislative strategies, the White House should back state and local legislation, based on reforms in Maryland and Connecticut, which bans the sale of assault rifles and high-capacity magazines, broadens existing background check requirements for firearm purchases, and modernizes gun-owner registries by requiring, among others, that buyers submit their fingerprints when applying for a gun license. While piecemeal regulation of the U.S. civilian firearms market does not represent a comprehensive solution, passage of state and local measures, including gun buyback programs, will reduce the number of weapons in circulation and available for smuggling and generate momentum for a broader federal approach over the long run. Conclusion Strengthening U.S. gun laws will not eliminate gun violence in Latin America, where weak judiciaries and police forces, the proliferation of gangs and black markets, and deep inequality exacerbate violent conflict. Nonetheless, lax U.S. gun regulations do enable international trafficking. While the effects of tighter regulation will not be felt overnight, such steps will offset widespread regional views that the United States remains indifferent to its own role in exacerbating one of Latin America's most significant challenges. Although recent federal gun control measures have run aground on congressional opposition, the Obama administration retains considerable leeway in the foreign policy arena, where concerted action can help U.S. allies in Latin America make the case to their constituents and to other skeptical governments that the United States can be a legitimate partner in combating transnational crime. At a juncture in U.S.-Latin American relations that again features both tension and opportunity, these actions will demonstrate that the United States is prepared, if imperfectly, to fulfill its shared responsibility for regional security and enhance American standing and positive influence in Latin America.

#### US-LAC relations are key to combatting climate change and preventing nuclear proliferation.

Brookings Institution 08 “Rethinking U.S.—Latin American Relations: A Hemispheric Partnership for a Turbulent World” Report of the Partnership for the Americas Commission, 2008 <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Reports/2008/11/24-latin-america-partnership/1124_latin_america_partnership.PDF> JW

Developments in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) have a very significant impact on the daily lives of those who live in the United States. Yet because of a lack of trust, an inability to undertake stable commitments by some countries, and different U.S. priorities, the United States and Latin America have rarely developed a genuine and sustained partnership to address regional—let alone global—challenges. If a hemispheric partnership remains elusive, the costs to the United States and its neighbors will be high, in terms of both growing risks and missed opportunities. Without a partnership, the risk that criminal networks pose to the region’s people and institutions will continue to grow. Peaceful nuclear technology may be adopted more widely, but without proper regional safeguards, the risks of nuclear proliferation will increase. Adaptation to climate change will take place through isolated, improvised measures by individual countries, rather than through more effective efforts based on mutual learning and coordination. Illegal immigration to the United States will continue unabated and unregulated, adding to an ever-larger underclass that lives and works at the margins of the law. Finally, the countries around the hemisphere, including the United States, will lose valuable opportunities to tap new markets, make new investments, and access valuable resources. Today, several changes in the region have made a hemispheric partnership both possible and necessary. The key challenges faced by the United States and the hemisphere’s other countries—such as securing sustainable energy supplies, combating and adapting to climate change, and combating organized crime and drug trafficking—have become so complex and deeply transnational that they cannot be managed or overcome by any single country. At the same time, the LAC countries are diversifying their international economic and political relations, making them less reliant on the United States. Finally, the LAC countries are better positioned than before to act as reliable partners.

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic, and causes extinction.

Jamail 15 Dahr “Mass Extinction: It's the End of the World as We Know It” July 6 2015 Truthout <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/31661-mass-extinction-it-s-the-end-of-the-world-as-we-know-it> JW

Guy McPherson is a professor emeritus of evolutionary biology, natural resources and ecology at the University of Arizona, and has been a climate change expert for 30 years. He has also become a controversial figure, due to the fact that he does not shy away from talking about the possibility of near-term human extinction. While McPherson's perspective might sound like the stuff of science fiction, there is historical precedent for his predictions. Fifty-five million years ago, a 5-degree Celsius rise in average global temperatures seems to have occurred in just 13 years, according to a study published in the October 2013 issue of the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. A report in the August 2013 issue of Science revealed that in the near term, earth's climate will change 10 times faster than during any other moment in the last 65 million years. McPherson fears that we are well along in the process of causing our own extinction. Prior to that, the Permian mass extinction that occurred 250 million years ago, also known as the "Great Dying," was triggered by a massive lava flow in an area of Siberia that led to an increase in global temperatures of 6 degrees Celsius. That, in turn, caused the melting of frozen methane deposits under the seas. Released into the atmosphere, those gases caused temperatures to skyrocket further. All of this occurred over a period of approximately 80,000 years. The change in climate is thought to be the key to what caused the extinction of most species on the planet. In that extinction episode, it is estimated that 95 percent of all species were wiped out. Today's current scientific and observable evidence strongly suggests we are in the midst of the same process - only this time it is anthropogenic, and happening exponentially faster than even the Permian mass extinction did. In fact, a recently published study in Science Advances states, unequivocally, that the planet has officially entered its sixth mass extinction event. The study shows that species are already being killed off at rates much faster than they were during the other five extinction events, and warns ominously that humans could very likely be among the first wave of species to go extinct. So if some feel that McPherson's thinking is extreme, when the myriad scientific reports he cites to back his claims are looked at squarely and the dots are connected, the perceived extremism begins to dissolve into a possible, or even likely, reality. The idea of possible human extinction, coming not just from McPherson but a growing number of scientists (as well as the aforementioned recently published report in Science), is now beginning to occasionally find its way into mainstream consciousness. "A Child Born Today May Live to See Humanity's End, Unless ..." reads a recent blog post title from Reuters. It reads: Humans will be extinct in 100 years because the planet will be uninhabitable, according to Australian microbiologist Frank Fenner, one of the leaders of the effort to eradicate smallpox in the 1970s. He blames overcrowding, denuded resources and climate change. Fenner's prediction is not a sure bet, but he is correct that there is no way emissions reductions will be enough to save us from our trend toward doom. And there doesn't seem to be any big global rush to reduce emissions, anyway. McPherson, who maintains the blog "Nature Bats Last," told Truthout, "We've never been here as a species and the implications are truly dire and profound for our species and the rest of the living planet." Truthout first interviewed McPherson in early 2014, at which time he had identified 24 self-reinforcing positive feedback loops triggered by human-caused climate disruption. Today that number has grown to more than 50, and continues to increase. A self-reinforcing positive feedback loop is akin to a "vicious circle": It accelerates the impacts of anthropogenic climate disruption (ACD). An example would be methane releases in the Arctic. Massive amounts of methane [is] are currently locked in the permafrost, which is now melting rapidly. As the permafrost melts, methane - a greenhouse gas 100 times more potent than carbon dioxide on a short timescale - is released into the atmosphere, warming it further, which in turn causes more permafrost to melt, and so on. As soon as this summer, we are likely to begin seeing periods of an ice-free Arctic. (Those periods will arrive by the summer of 2016 at the latest, according to a Naval Postgraduate School report.) Once the summer ice begins melting away completely, even for short periods, methane releases will worsen dramatically. Is it possible that, on top of the vast quantities of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels that continue to enter the atmosphere in record amounts yearly, an increased release of methane could signal the beginning of the sort of process that led to the Great Dying? McPherson, like the scientists involved in the recent study that confirms the arrival of the sixth great extinction, fears that the situation is already so serious and so many self-reinforcing feedback loops are already in play that we are well along in the process of causing our own extinction. Furthermore, McPherson remains convinced that it could happen far more quickly than generally believed possible - in the course of just the next few decades, or even sooner.

#### Prolif causes extinction; no deterrence.

Miller 02 James D. (Professor of economics, Smith College) NATIONAL REVIEW, January 23, 2002, http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-miller012302.shtml, Accessed 7-31-09

The U.S. should use whatever means necessary to stop our enemies from gaining the ability to kill millions of us. We should demand that countries like Iraq, Iran, Libya, and North Korea make no attempt to acquire weapons of mass destruction. We should further insist on the right to make surprise inspections of these countries to insure that they are complying with our proliferation policy. What if these nations refuse our demands? If they refuse we should destroy their industrial capacity and capture their leaders. True, the world's cultural elites would be shocked and appalled if we took preventive military action against countries that are currently doing us no harm. What is truly shocking, however, is that America is doing almost nothing while countries that have expressed hatred for us are building weapons of mass destruction. France and Britain allowed Nazi Germany's military power to grow until Hitler was strong enough to take Paris. America seems to be doing little while many of our foes acquire the strength to destroy U.S. cities. **We can't rely upon deterrence** to prevent an atomic powered dictator from striking at us. Remember, the Nazi's killed millions of Jews even though the Holocaust took resources away from their war effort. As September 11th also shows, **there exist evil [people]** men in the world **who would gladly sacrifice all other goals** for the opportunity **to commit mass murder.** The U.S. should take not even the slightest unnecessary chance that some dictator, perhaps a dying Saddam Hussein, would be willing to give up his life for the opportunity to hit America with nuclear missiles. **Once a dictator has** the ability to hit a U.S., or perhaps even a European city, with **atomic weapons it will be too late** for America **to pressure [them] him to give up** his weapons. **His [their] ability to hurt us will** effectively **put [them] him beyond** our **military reach.** Our conventional forces might even be made impotent by a nuclear-armed foe. Had Iraq possessed atomic weapons, for example, we would probably have been unwilling to expel them from Kuwait. What about the rights of those countries I have proposed threatening? America should not even pretend to care about the rights of dictators. In the 21st century the only leaders whom we should recognize as legitimate are those who were democratically elected. The U.S. should reinterpret international law to give no rights to tyrants, not even the right to exist. We should have an ethically based foreign policy towards democratic countries. With dictatorships, however, we should be entirely Machiavellian; we should deal with them based upon what is in our own best interests. It's obviously in our self-interest to prevent as many dictators as possible from acquiring the means to destroy us. We shouldn't demand that China abandon her nuclear weapons. This is not because China has proved herself worthy to have the means of mass annihilation, but rather because her existing stockpile of atomic missiles would make it too costly for us to threaten China. It's too late to stop the Chinese from gaining the ability to decimate us, but for the next ten years or so it is not too late to stop some of our other rivals. If it's politically impossible for America to use military force against currently non-hostile dictators then we should use trade sanctions to punish nations who don't agree to our proliferation policy. Normal trade sanctions, however, do not provide the punishing power necessary to induce dictators to abandon their arms. If we simply don't trade with a nation other countries will sell them the goods that we used to provide. To make trade sanctions an effective weapon the U.S. needs to deploy secondary boycotts. America should create a treaty, the signatories of which would agree to: • only trade with countries which have signed the treaty, and • not trade with any country which violates our policy on weapons proliferation. Believe that if only the U.S. and, say, Germany initially signed this treaty then nearly every other country would be forced to do so. For example, if France did not sign, they would be unable to trade with the U.S. or Germany. This would obviously be intolerable to France. Once the U.S., Germany and France adopted the treaty every European nation would have to sign or face a total economic collapse. The more countries which sign the treaty, the greater the pressure on other countries to sign. Once most every country has signed, any country which violated America's policy on weapons proliferation would face almost a complete economic boycott. Under this approach, the U.S. and Germany alone could use our economic power to dictate the enforcement mechanism of a treaty designed to protect against Armageddon. **Even the short-term survival of humanity is in doubt. The greatest threat of extinction surely comes from the prolif**eration of weapons of mass destruction. America should refocus her foreign policy to prioritize protecting us all from atomic, biological, and chemical weapons.

#### Nuclear war causes mass death, food insecurity, disease, race wars, and possibly extinction.

Germanos 13 Andrea (senior editor and a staff writer at Common Dreams) “Nuclear War Could Mean 'Extinction of the Human Race'” Common Dreams December 10th 2013 <http://www.commondreams.org/news/2013/12/10/nuclear-war-could-mean-extinction-human-race> JW

A war using even a small percentage of the world's nuclear weapons threatens the lives of two billion people, a new report warns. The findings in the report issued by International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) and Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) are based on studies by climate scientists that show how nuclear war would alter the climate and agriculture, thereby threatening one quarter of the world's population with famine. Nuclear Famine: Two Billion People at Risk? offers an updated edition to the groups' April of 2012 report, which the groups say "may have seriously underestimated the consequences of a limited nuclear war." "A nuclear war using only a fraction of existing arsenals would produce massive casualties on a global scale—far more than we had previously believed," Dr. Ira Helfand, the report’s author and IPPNW co-president, said in a statement. As their previous report showed, years after even a limited nuclear war, production of corn in the U.S. and China's middle season rice production would severely decline, and fears over dwindling food supplies would lead to hoarding and increases in food prices, creating further food insecurity for those already reliant on food imports. The updated report adds that Chinese winter wheat production would plummet if such a war broke out. Based on information from new studies combining reductions in wheat, corn and rice, this new edition doubles the number of people they expect to be threatened by nuclear-war induced famine to over two billion. "The prospect of a decade of widespread hunger and intense social and economic instability in the world’s largest country has immense implications for the entire global community, as does the possibility that the huge declines in Chinese wheat production will be matched by similar declines in other wheat producing countries," Helfand stated. The crops would be impacted, the report explains, citing previous studies, because of the black carbon particles that would be released, causing widespread changes like cooling temperatures, decreased precipitation and decline in solar radiation. In this scenario of famine, epidemics of infectious diseases would be likely, the report states, and could lead to armed conflict. From the report: Within nations where famine is widespread, there would almost certainly be food riots, and competition for limited food resources might well exacerbate ethnic and regional animosities. Among nations, armed conflict would be a very real possibility as states dependent on imports attempted to maintain access to food supplies. While a limited nuclear war would bring dire circumstances, the impacts if the world's biggest nuclear arms holders were involved would be even worse. "With a large war between the United States and Russia, we are talking about the possible —not certain, but possible—extinction of the human race," Helfand told Agence-France Presse. “In order to eliminate this threat, we must eliminate nuclear weapons," Helfand stated. (Photo: MAPWcommunications/cc/flickr) "In this kind of war, biologically there are going to be people surviving somewhere on the planet but the chaos that would result from this will dwarf anything we've ever seen," Helfand told the news agency. As Helfand writes, the data cited in the report "raises a giant red flag about the threat to humanity posed." Yet, as Dr. Peter Wilk, former national executive director of PSR writes in an op-ed today, the "threat is of our own creation." As a joint statement by 124 states delivered to the United Nations General Assembly in October stated: "It is in the interest of the very survival of humanity that nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances." "Countries around the world—those who are nuclear-armed and those who are not—must work together to eliminate the threat and consequences of nuclear war," Helfand said. “In order to eliminate this threat, we must eliminate nuclear weapons.”

### Adv 2 = Suicide (1:00)

#### Consensus of studies proves handgun ownership increases risk of impulsive suicide- talking about suicide should be at the forefront of gun control debates.

DeFilippis and Hughes 14 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “MORE GUNS, MORE SUICIDES – THE VICIOUS RELATIONSHIP” Armed With Reason March 29th 2014 <http://www.armedwithreason.com/more-guns-more-suicides-the-vicious-relationship/> JW

The Impulsiveness of Suicide An impulsive suicide is one for which there is very little preparation prior the attempt. A 2001 study, using the Beck’s Suicidal Intent Scale, examined 478 individuals who attempted suicide, and found that more than half (55 percent) of attempts could be classified as “impulsive,” while only about one-sixth (17 percent) of attempts were premeditated. One study found that 40 percent of suicide attempt survivors contemplated suicide for less than five minutes before the attempt. Another study examined self-inflicted gunshot wounds that would have been fatal in the absence of emergency treatment. The researchers found that none of the 30 individuals who attempted suicide had written a note, and more than half of them said that the thought to commit suicide occurred within 24 hours of the attempt. In a two-year follow up, none of the 30 had attempted suicide again, and the overwhelming sentiment among the group was that they were happy to be alive. The data is clear, then, that there’s nothing “inevitable” about a suicide, nothing predictable about impulsiveness. To turn a blind eye to suicide based on the pretense that they’ll “just try again” demonstrates a profound ignorance of the psychology of suicide, and a callous unwillingness to consider the struggle of another human being. The Data The latest available data on suicide rates, published by the Centers for Disease Control, shows that 38 [thousand],364 suicides occurred in the United States in 2010 — an average of 105 each day. This made suicide the tenth leading cause of death for all age groups. More people kill themselves with guns than all other methods combined. Males are atparticularly high risk of firearm suicide, given that guns account for 56 percent of male suicides, but 32 percent of female suicides. Firearms tend to be the weapon of choice for a suicide given their lethality factor — for example, one study from Dallas found that, of those attempting suicide with a gun, 76 percent died. Dr. David Hemenway of the Harvard School of Public Health summarized 10 studies in the previous 20 years examining the relationship between gun ownership and suicide and found that “all [of them] find that firearms in the home are associated with substantially and significantly higher rates of suicide.” Furthermore, every single case control study done in the United States has found the presence of a firearm is a strong risk factor for suicide. (That’s 24 separate studies). The most recent case-control study published in the American Journal of Epidemiology found at least five reasons to believe that firearm ownership is drivingthe suicide rate: The association between firearm availability and suicide is robust to adjustments for measures of psychopathology and aggregate-level measures of suicidality such as depression, mental illness, alcoholism, poverty, unemployment, and drug abuse. The risk of suicide extends beyond just the gun owner to all members of a household, and lasts for years after the firearm has been purchased. The rates of psychiatric illness and suicidal tendencies is similar in households with and without firearms across the United States. Multiple ecological studies have confirmed the results of individual-level studies to show aggregate-level trends in suicide rates. Suicide attempts are not significantly associated with firearm ownership rates. If it were the case that gun owners had stronger suicidal proclivities than non-gun owners we would expect the suicide attempt rate to be positively associated with the firearm ownership rate, but it isn’t. This means that the primary way through which firearms influence the suicide rate is by making each attempt comparatively more lethal than other methods. There is little controversy, then, that firearms exacerbate the suicide rate primarily by increasing the likelihood of a “successful” suicide attempt. Discussion about suicide should be at the forefront of gun control debates, yet it is often a footnote in meaningful policy discussion. This reflects poorly on our nation’s priorities — it shows a cruel insensitivity to the value of human life, and a miscalibrated sense of morality which says that change is only worth having if it benefits me.

#### Even if people substitute other methods there are fewer fatalities.

Miller et al 13 Matthew Miller (Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard School of Public Health), Catherine Barber, Richard A. White, and Deborah Azrael “Firearms and Suicide in the United States: Is Risk Independent of Underlying Suicidal Behavior?” American Journal of Epidemiology Vol. 178, No. 6 August 23, 2013 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23975641> JW

In the United States, where firearms are the method used in more than 50% of all suicides and where roughly 1 in 3 homes contains firearms, even small relative declines in the use of firearms in suicide acts could result in large reductions in the number of suicides, depending on what, if any, method would be substituted for firearms. Consider, for example, the fact that more than 90% of all suicidal acts with firearms are fatal, but suicidal acts with firearms constitute only 5% of all deliberate self-harm episodes. In contrast, fewer than 3% of all suicidal acts with drugs or cutting are fatal but, as a group, such acts constitute approximately 90% of all attempts (33, 34). If even 1 in 10 of the approximately 22,000 persons who attempted suicide with firearms in 2010 (the 19,932 who died and the approximately 2,000 who survived) substituted drugs or cutting, there would have been approximately 1,900 fewer suicide deaths. The potential for substantial reduction in suicide rates is apparent in our comparison of suicides in high– versus low–gun ownership states, where suicide attempt rates are similar, but the rate of suicide is twice as high in high– gun ownership states (with differences in mortality attributable entirely to differences in suicide by firearms), with a net excess of approximately 6,000 suicides in high–gun ownership states over a 2-year period.

#### Gun control empirically solves.

DeFilippis and Hughes 13 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “SUICIDES: THE MISSING MOVEMENT- WHY MORE GUNS MEANS MORE SUICIDES” Armed With Reason October 31st 2013 http://www.armedwithreason.com/suicides-the-missing-movement/ JW

Two theoretical caveats problematize the assessment of causation, and should be mentioned before delving into the literature on this topic. First, though a correlation exists between gun ownership per capita and suicide, there may be a self-selection bias. That is, that the types of people who are likely to own guns might be predisposed to suicidal behavior. It could also be the case that some exogenous change in the environment decreased suicide rates and gun ownership concomitantly. A more liberal Congress, for example, might implement both gun regulation policies and suicide prevention policies, producing the illusion of causation between these two variables. Both of these issues have been dealt with through statistical techniques and robust research methods, and the data clearly show that the direction of causality runs from guns to suicides. A 2000 paper by Ludwig and Cook estimated whether declines in suicides over the period 1985-1997 were associated with the passage of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act. The Brady Act required that federally licensed firearms dealers perform a background check and implement a five-day waiting period prior to the sale of a handgun. Eighteen states and the District of Colombia already satisfied Brady requirements, while the other thirty-four states required more stringent procedures. Therefore, researchers observed a natural experiment in which the states that already met Brady requirements were considered a ‘control’ group, and were compared against states in which dealers and law enforcement officials had yet to implement requirements. The study found that the legislation produced a significant reduction in suicide rates among persons aged 55 or older, suggesting that suicidal impulses in older individuals were attenuated by the imposition of the five day waiting period, thereby decreasing the suicide rate. A 2006 paper published by Miller and colleagues at the Harvard School of Public Health explored changes in household firearm ownership in the United States over the period 1981-2002 as it related to a decline in the suicide rate, controlling for age, unemployment, per capita alcohol consumption, and poverty rates. Household gun ownership levels and rates of firearm and non‐firearm suicide mortality: United States, 1981–2002 (Miller et al., 2006). The study found that, for every 10% decline in the household firearm ownership rate, firearm suicides decreased by 4.2%, and total suicides dropped by 2.5%. The decline in suicide rates was highest among children. Examining just households containing both children and firearms, every 10% decline in the percentage of households owning a firearm was related with a 8.3% drop in the suicide rate for individuals between the ages of 0-19. Gun-regulation opponents alleging that this study is merely correlation should have to point out some covariate not accounted for in this analysis that could simultaneously explain why changes in the firearm suicide rate are related to changes in firearm ownership rate, but not related to the non-firearm suicide rate (as might be the case with an exogenous environmental change). Furthermore, the largest study done to assess mental health trends in the United States over the period investigated by the paper found that there was no significant change in suicidal tendencies between 1990-2000. We therefore have evidence that, even after holding psychological tendencies constant, the presence of guns has a dramatic effect on the suicide rate.

#### Legal purchase of handguns causes the harms- only the aff would solve.

Miller et al 13 Matthew Miller (Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard School of Public Health), Catherine Barber, Richard A. White, and Deborah Azrael “Firearms and Suicide in the United States: Is Risk Independent of Underlying Suicidal Behavior?” American Journal of Epidemiology Vol. 178, No. 6 August 23, 2013 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23975641> JW

In addition, the only large US cohort study to examine the firearm-suicide connection found that suicide rates among California residents who purchased handguns from licensed dealers were more than twice as likely to die by suicide as were age- and sex-matched members of the general population, not only immediately after the purchase, but throughout the 6-year study period (21). Here too, the increase in suicide risk was attributable entirely to an excess risk of suicide with firearms (21). The following observations further support the plausibility that the association between firearms and suicide is real: 1) the association is robust to adjustment for measures of psychopathology (7–16), 2) the risk extends beyond the gun owner to all household members (14, 15, 21) and persists for years after firearms are purchased (14, 15, 21), 3) the rates of psychiatric illness and psychosocial distress are similar among households with firearms versus those without firearms (15, 22–25), and 4) ecological studies of the firearm-suicide relationship, which are not subject to recall bias or to reverse causation, yield associations similar to those observed in individual-level studies. Nevertheless, the idea that the availability of firearms plays an important role in determining a person’s suicide risk and a population’s suicide rate continues to meet with skepticism, the most decisive objection being that empirical studies to date have not adequately controlled for the possibility that members of households with firearms are inherently more suicidal than members of households without firearms (26).

#### Most gun deaths are suicides.

Mariani 15 Mike “America’s Biggest Gun Problem is Suicide” Newsweek 9-21-15 <http://www.newsweek.com/2015/10/02/americas-biggest-gun-problem-suicide-374547.html>

These types of catastrophic events can warp our view of what gun violence in the U.S. really looks like. The five deadliest U.S. mass shootings of the 21st century—Virginia Tech, Sandy Hook, Fort Hood, Binghamton and the Washington Navy Yard—resulted in 101 deaths combined. In 2012 (the most recent year for which there is solid data), 32 [thousand],288 people died from gunshot wounds in the United States. According to research published this year in the Annual Review of Public Health, suicides accounted for 64 percent of those deaths. We may have cut down murders in this country over the past two decades, but gun violence has not abated so much as it has evolved into a more insidious form.

### Fwk

#### Phenomenal introspection is reliable and proves that util is objectively valid.

Sinhababu Neil (National University of Singapore) “The epistemic argument for hedonism” [http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3 accessed 2-4-16](http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3%20accessed%202-4-16) JW

The Odyssey's treatment of these events demonstrates how dramatically ancient Greek moral intuitions differ from ours. It doesn't dwell on the brutality of Telemachus, who killed twelve women for the trivial reasons he states, making them suffer as they die. While gods and men seek vengeance for other great and small offenses in the Odyssey, no one finds this mass murder worth avenging. It's a minor event in the denouement to a happy ending in which Odysseus (who first proposes killing the women) returns home and Telemachus becomes a man. That the[y] Greeks could so easily regard these murders as part of a happy ending for heroes shows how deeply we disagree with them. It's as if we gave them a trolley problem with the 12 women on the side track and no one on the main track, and they judged it permissible for Telemachus to turn the trolley and kill them all. And this isn't some esoteric text of a despised or short-lived sect, but a central literary work of a long-lived and influential culture. Human history offers similarly striking examples of disagreement on a variety of topics. These include sexual morality; the treatment of animals; the treatment of other ethnicities, families, and social classes; the consumption of intoxicating substances; whether and how one may take vengeance; slavery; whether public celebrations are acceptable; and gender roles.12 Moral obligations to commit genocide were accepted not only by some 20th century Germans, but by much of the ancient world, including the culture that gave us the Old Testament. One can only view the human past and much of the present with horror at the depth of human moral error and the harm that has resulted. One might think to explain away much of this disagreement as the result of differing nonmoral beliefs. Those who disagree about nonmoral issues may disagree on the moral rightness of a particular action despite agreeing on the fundamental moral issues. For example, they may agree that healing the sick is right, but disagree about whether a particular medicine will heal or harm. This disagreement about whether to prescribe the medicine won't be fundamentally about morality, and won't support the argument from disagreement. I don't think the moral disagreements listed above are explained by differences in nonmoral belief. This isn't because sexists, racists, and bigots share the nonmoral views of those enlightened by feminism and other egalitarian doctrines – they don't. Rather, their differing views on nonmoral topics often are rationalizations of moral beliefs that fundamentally disagree with ours.13 Those whose fundamental moral judgments include commitments to the authority of men over women, or of one race over another, will easily accept descriptive psychological views that attribute less intelligence or rationality to women or the subjugated race.14 Moral disagreement supposedly arising from moral views in religious texts is similar. Given how rich and many-stranded most religious texts are, interpretive claims about their moral teachings often tell us more about the antecedent moral beliefs of the interpreter than about the text itself. This is why the same texts are interpreted to support so many different moral views. Similar phenomena occur with most moral beliefs. Environmentalists who value a lovely patch of wilderness will easily believe that its destruction will cause disaster, those who feel justified in eating meat will easily believe that the animals they eat don't suffer greatly, and libertarians who feel that redistributing wealth is unjust will easily believe that it raises unemployment. We shouldn't assume that differing moral beliefs on practical questions are caused by fundamental moral agreement combined with differing nonmoral beliefs. Often the differing nonmoral beliefs are caused by fundamental moral disagreement. As we have no precise way of quantifying the breadth of disagreement or determining its epistemic consequences, it's unclear exactly how much disagreement the argument requires. While this makes the argument difficult to evaluate, it shouldn't stop us from proceeding, as we have to use the unclear notion of widespread disagreement in ordinary epistemic practice. If 99.9% of botanists agree on some issue about plants, non-botanists should defer to their authority and believe as most of them do. But if disagreement between botanists is suitably widespread, non-botanists should remain agnostic. A more precise and systematic account of when disagreement is widespread enough to generate particular epistemic consequences would be very helpful. Until we have one, we must employ the unclear notion of widespread disagreement, or some similar notion, throughout epistemic practice. Against the background of widespread moral disagreement, there may still be universal or near-universal agreement on some moral questions. For example, perhaps all cultures agree that one should provide for one’s elderly parents, even though they generally disagree elsewhere. How do these narrow areas of moral agreement affect the argument? This all depends on whether the narrow agreement is reliably or unreliably caused. If narrow agreement results from a reliable process of belief-formation, it lets us avoid error, defeating the argument from disagreement. But widely accepted moral beliefs may result from widely prevailing unreliable processes leading everyone to the same errors. There's no special pressure to explain agreement in terms of reliable processes when disagreement is widespread. Explaining agreement in terms of reliable processes is preferable when we have some reason to think that the processes involved are generally reliable. Then we would want to understand cases of agreement in line with the general reliability of processes producing moral belief. But if disagreement is widespread, error is too. Since moral beliefs are so often false, invoking unreliable processes to explain them is better than invoking reliable ones. The next two sections discuss this in more detail. We have many plausible explanations of narrow agreement on which moral beliefs are unreliably caused. Evolutionary and sociological explanations of why particular moral beliefs are widely accepted often invoke unreliable mechanisms.15 On these explanations, we agree because some moral beliefs were so important for reproductive fitness that natural selection made them innate in us, or so important to the interests controlling moral education in each culture that they were inculcated in everyone. For example, parents' influence over their children's moral education would explain agreement that one should provide for one's elderly parents. Plausible normative ethical theories won't systematically connect these evolutionary and sociological explanations with moral facts. If disagreement and error are widespread, they'll provide useful ways to reconcile unusual cases of widespread agreement with the general unreliability of the processes producing moral belief. 1.3 If there is widespread error about a topic, we should retain only those beliefs about it formed through reliable processes Now I'll defend 3. First I'll show how the falsity of others' beliefs undermines one's own belief. Then I'll clarify the notion of a reliable process. I'll consider a modification to 3 that epistemic internalists might favor, and show that the argument accommodates it. I'll illustrate 3's plausibility by considering cases where it correctly guides our reasoning. Finally, I'll show how 3 is grounded in the intuitive response to grave moral error. First, a simple objection: “Why should I care whether other people have false beliefs? That's a fact about other people, and not about me. Even if most people are wrong about some topic, I may be one of the few right ones, even if there's no apparent reason to think that my way of forming beliefs is any more reliable.” While widespread error leaves open the possibility that one has true beliefs, it reduces the probability that my beliefs are true. Consider a parallel case. I have no direct evidence that I have an appendix, but I know that previous investigations have revealed appendixes in people. So induction suggests that I have an appendix. Similarly, I know on the basis of 1 and 2 that people's moral beliefs are, in general, rife with error. So even if I have no direct evidence of error in my moral beliefs, induction suggests that they are rife with error as well. 3 invokes the reliability of the processes that produce our beliefs. Assessing processes of belief-formation for reliability is an important part of our epistemic practices. If someone tells me that my belief is entirely produced by wishful thinking, I can't simply accept that and maintain the belief. Knowing that wishful thinking is unreliable, I must either deny that my belief is entirely caused by wishful thinking or abandon the belief. But if someone tells me that my belief is entirely the result of visual perception, I'll maintain it, assuming that it concerns sizable nearby objects or something else about which visual perception is reliable. While providing precise criteria for individuating processes of belief-formation is hard, as the literature on the generality problem for reliabilism attests, individuating them somehow is indispensable to our epistemic practices.16 Following Alvin Goldman's remark that “It is clear that our ordinary thought about process types slices them broadly” (346), I'll treat cognitive process types like wishful thinking and visual perception as appropriately broad.17 Trusting particular people and texts, meanwhile, are too narrow. Cognitive science may eventually help us better individuate cognitive process types for the purposes of reliability assessments and discover which processes produce which beliefs. Epistemic internalists might reject 3 as stated, claiming that it isn't widespread error that would justify giving up our beliefs, but our having reason to believe that there is widespread error. They might also claim that our justification for believing the outputs of some process depends not on its reliability, but on what we have reason to believe about its reliability. The argument will still go forward if 3 is modified to suit internalist tastes, changing its antecedent to “If we have reason to believe that there is widespread error about a topic” or changing its consequent to “we should retain only those beliefs about it that we have reason to believe were formed through reliable processes.” While 3's antecedent might itself seem unnecessary on the original formulation, it's required for 3 to remain plausible on the internalist modification. Requiring us to have reason to believe that any of our belief-formation processes are reliable before retaining their outputs might lead to skepticism. The antecedent limits the scope of the requirement to cases of widespread error, averting general skeptical conclusions. The argument will still attain its conclusion under these modifications. Successfully defending the premises of the argument and deriving widespread error (5) and unreliability (7) gives those of us who have heard the defense and derivation reason to believe 5 and 7. This allows us to derive 8. (Thus the pronoun 'we' in 3, 6, and 8.) 3 describes the right response to widespread error in many actual cases. Someone in the 12th century, especially upon hearing the disagreeing views of many cultures regarding the origins of the universe, would do well to recognize that error on this topic was widespread and retreat to agnosticism about it. Only when modern astrophysics extended reliable empirical methods to cosmology would it be rational to move forward from agnosticism and accept a particular account of how the universe began. Similarly, disagreement about which stocks will perform better than average is widespread among investors, suggesting that one's beliefs on the matter have a high likelihood of error. It's wise to remain agnostic about the stock market without an unusually reliable way of forming beliefs – for example, the sort of secret insider information that it's illegal to trade on. 3 permits us to hold onto our moral beliefs in individual cases of moral disagreement, suggesting skeptical conclusions only when moral disagreement is widespread. When we consider a single culture's abhorrent moral views, like the Greeks' acceptance of Telemachus and Odysseus' murders of the servant women, we don't think that maybe the Greeks were right to see nothing wrong and we should reconsider our outrage. Instead, we're horrified by their grave moral error. I think this is the right response. We're similarly horrified by the moral errors of Hindus who burned widows on their husbands' funeral pyres, American Southerners who supported slavery and segregation, our contemporaries who condemn homosexuality, and countless others. The sheer number of cases like this requires us to regard moral error as a pervasive feature of the human condition. Humans typically form moral beliefs through unreliable processes and have appendixes. We are humans, so this should reduce our confidence in our moral judgments. The prevalence of error in a world full of moral disagreement demonstrates how bad humans are at forming true moral beliefs, undermining our own moral beliefs. Knowing that unreliable processes so often lead humans to their moral beliefs, we'll require our moral beliefs to issue from reliable processes. 1.4 If there is widespread error about morality, there are no reliable processes for forming moral beliefs A reliable process for forming moral beliefs would avert skeptical conclusions. I'll consider several processes and argue that they don't help us escape moral skepticism. Ordinary moral intuition, whether it involves a special rational faculty or our emotional responses, is shown to be unreliable by the existence of widespread error. The argument from disagreement either prevents reflective equilibrium from generating moral conclusions or undermines it. Conceptual analysis is reliable, but delivers the wrong kind of knowledge to avert skepticism. If all our processes for forming moral beliefs are unreliable, moral skepticism looms. 4 is false only because of one process – phenomenal introspection, which lets us know of the goodness of pleasure, as the second half of this paper will discuss. Widespread error guarantees the unreliability of any process by which we form all or almost all of our moral beliefs. While widespread error allows some processes responsible for a small share of our moral beliefs to predominantly create true beliefs, it implies that any process generating a very large share of moral belief must be highly error-prone. Since the process produced so many of our moral beliefs, and so many of them are erroneous, it must be responsible for a large share of the error. If more of people's moral beliefs were true, things would be otherwise. Widespread truth would support the reliability of any process that produced most or all of our moral beliefs, since that process would be responsible for so much true belief. But given widespread error, ordinary moral intuition must be unreliable. This point provides a forceful response to Moorean opponents who insist that we can't give up the reliability of a process by which we form all or nearly all of our beliefs on an important topic, since this would permit counterintuitive skeptical conclusions. Even if this Moorean response helps against external world skeptics who employ counterfactual thought experiments involving brains in vats, it doesn't help against moral skeptics who use 1 and 2 to derive widespread actual error. Once we accept that widespread error actually obtains, a great deal of human moral knowledge has already vanished. Insisting on the reliability of the process then seems implausible and pointless. I'll briefly consider two conceptions of moral intuition – as a special rational faculty by which we grasp non-natural moral facts, and as a process by which our emotions lead us to form moral beliefs – and show how widespread error guarantees their unreliability. Some philosophers regard moral intuition as involving a special rational faculty that lets us know non-natural moral facts.18 They argue that knowledge on many topics including mathematics, logic, and modality involves this rational faculty, so moral knowledge might operate similarly. This suggests a way for them to defend the reliability of moral intuition in the face of widespread error: if intuition is reliable about these other things, its overall reliability across moral and nonmoral areas allows us to reliably form moral beliefs by using it. This defense won't work. When an epistemic process is manifestly unreliable on some topic, as widespread error shows any process responsible for most of our moral beliefs to be, the reliability of that process elsewhere won't save it on that topic. Even if testimony is reliable, this doesn't imply the reliability of compulsive gamblers' testimony about the next spin of the roulette wheel. Even if intuition remains reliable elsewhere, widespread disagreement still renders it unreliable in ethics. I see ordinary moral intuition as a process of emotional perception in which our feelings cause us to form moral beliefs.19 Just as visual experiences of color cause beliefs about the colors of surfaces, emotional experiences cause moral beliefs. Pleasant feelings like approval, admiration, or hope in considering actions, persons, or states of affairs lead us to believe they are right, virtuous or good. Unpleasant emotions like guilt, disgust, or horror in considering actions, persons, or states of affairs lead us to believe they are wrong, vicious, or bad. We might have regarded this as a reliable way to know about moral facts, just as visual perception is a reliable way to know about color, if not for widespread error. But because of widespread error, we can only see it as an unreliable process responsible for our dismal epistemic situation. Reflective equilibrium is the prevailing methodology in normative ethics today. It involves modifying our beliefs about particular cases and general principles to make them cohere. Whether or not nonmoral propositions like the premises of the argument from disagreement are admissible in reflective equilibrium, widespread error prevents reflective equilibrium from reliably generating a true moral theory, as I'll explain. If the premises of the argument from disagreement are admitted into reflective equilibrium, the argument can be reconstructed there, and reflective equilibrium will dictate that we give up all of our moral beliefs. To avoid this conclusion, the premises of the argument from disagreement would have to be revised away on moral grounds. These premises are a metaethical claim about the objectivity of morality which seems to be a conceptual truth, an anthropological claim about the existence of disagreement, a very general epistemic claim about when we should revise our beliefs, and a more empirically grounded epistemic claim about our processes of belief-formation and their reliability. While reflective equilibrium may move us to revise substantive moral beliefs in view of other substantive moral beliefs, claims of these other kinds are less amenable to such revision. Unless ambitious arguments for revising these nonmoral claims away succeed, we must follow the argument to its conclusion and accept that reflective equilibrium makes moral skeptics of us.20 If only moral principles and judgments are considered in reflective equilibrium, it won't make moral skeptics of us, but the argument from disagreement will undermine its conclusions. The argument forces us to give up the pre-existing moral beliefs against which we test various moral propositions in reflective equilibrium. While we may be justified in believing something because it coheres with our other beliefs, this justification goes away once we see that those beliefs should be abandoned. Coherence with beliefs that we know we should give up doesn't confer justification. Now I'll consider conceptual analysis. It can produce moral beliefs about conceptual truths – for example, that the moral supervenes on the nonmoral, and that morality is objective. It also may provide judgments about relations between different moral concepts – perhaps, that if the only moral difference between two actions is that one would produce morally better consequences than the other, doing what produces better consequences is right. I regard conceptual analysis as reliable, so that the argument from disagreement does not force us to give up the beliefs about morality it produces. Unfortunately, if analytic naturalism is false, as has been widely held in metaethics since G. E. Moore, conceptual analysis won't provide all the knowledge we need to build a normative ethical theory.21 Even when it relates moral concepts like goodness and rightness to each other, it doesn't tell us that anything is good or right to begin with. That's the knowledge we need to avoid moral skepticism. So far I've argued that our epistemic and anthropological situation, combined with plausible metaethical and epistemic principles, forces us to abandon our moral beliefs. But if a reliable process of moral belief-formation exists, 4 is false, and we can answer the moral skeptic. The rest of this paper discusses the only reliable process I know of. 2.1 Phenomenal introspection reveals pleasure's goodness Phenomenal introspection, a reliable way of forming true beliefs about our experiences, produces the belief that pleasure is good. Even as our other processes of moral belief-formation prove unreliable, it provides reliable access to pleasure's goodness, justifying the positive claims of hedonism. This section clarifies what phenomenal introspection and pleasure are and explains how phenomenal introspection provides reliable access to pleasure's value. Section 2.2 argues that pleasure's goodness is genuine moral value, rather than value of some other kind. In phenomenal introspection we consider our subjective experience, or phenomenology, and determine what it's like. Phenomenal introspection can be reliable while dreaming or hallucinating, as long as we can determine what the dreams or hallucinations are like. By itself, phenomenal introspection doesn't produce beliefs about things outside experience, or about relations between our experiences and non-experiential things. So it doesn't produce judgments about the rightness of actions or the goodness of non-experiential things. It can only tell us about the intrinsic properties of experience itself. Phenomenal introspection is generally reliable, even if mistakes about immediate experience are possible. Experience is rich in detail, so one could get some of the details wrong in belief. Under adverse conditions involving false expectations, misleading evidence about what one's experiences will be, or extreme emotional states that disrupt belief-formation, larger errors are possible. Paradigmatically reliable processes like vision share these failings. Vision sometimes produces false beliefs under adverse conditions, or when we're looking at complex things. Still, it's so reliable as to be indispensible in ordinary life. Regarding phenomenal introspection as unreliable is about as radical as skepticism about the reliability of vision. While contemporary psychologists reject introspection into one's motivations and other psychological causal processes as unreliable, phenomenal introspection fares better. Daniel Kahneman, for example, writes that “experienced utility is best measured by moment-based methods that assess the experience of the present.”22 Even those most skeptical about the reliability of phenomenal introspection, like Eric Schwitzgebel, concede that we can reliably introspect whether we are in serious pain.23 Then we should be able to introspectively determine what pain is like. So I'll assume the reliability of phenomenal introspection. One can form a variety of beliefs using phenomenal introspection. For example, one can believe that one is having sound experiences of particular noises and visual experiences of different shades of color. When looking at a lemon and considering the phenomenal states that are yellow experiences, one can form some beliefs about their intrinsic features – for example, that they're bright experiences. And when considering experiences of pleasure, one can make some judgments about their intrinsic features – for example, that they're good experiences. Just as one can look inward at one's experience of lemon yellow and recognize its brightness, one can look inward at one's experience of pleasure and recognize its goodness.24 When I consider a situation of increasing pleasure, I can form the belief that things are better than they were before, just as I form the belief that there's more brightness in my visual field as lemon yellow replaces black. And when I suddenly experience pain, I can form the belief that things are worse in my experience than they were before. Having pleasure consists in one's experience having a positive hedonic tone. Without descending into metaphor, it's hard to give a further account of what pleasure is like than to say that when one has it, one feels good. As Aaron Smuts writes in defending the view of pleasure as hedonic tone, “to 'feel good' is about as close to an experiential primitive as we get.” 25 Fred Feldman sees pleasure as fundamentally an attitude rather than a hedonic tone.26 But as long as hedonic tones are real components of experience, phenomenal introspection will reveal pleasure's goodness. Opponents of the hedonic tone account of pleasure usually concede that hedonic tones exist, as Feldman seems to in discussing “sensory pleasures,” which he thinks his view helps us understand. Even on his view of pleasure, phenomenal introspection can produce the belief that some hedonic tones are good while others are bad. There are many different kinds of pleasant experiences. There are sensory pleasures, like the pleasure of tasting delicious food, receiving a massage, or resting your tired limbs in a soft bed after a hard day. There are the pleasures of seeing that our desires are satisfied, like the pleasure of winning a game, getting a promotion, or seeing a friend succeed. These experiences differ in many ways, just as the experiences of looking at lemons and the sky on a sunny day differ. It's easy to see the appeal of Feldman's view that pleasures “have just about nothing in common phenomenologically” (79). But just as our experiences in looking at lemons and the sky on a sunny day have brightness in common, pleasant experiences all have “a certain common quality – feeling good,” as Roger Crisp argues (109).27 As the analogy with brightness suggests, hedonic tone is phenomenologically very thin, and usually mixed with a variety of other experiences.28 Pleasure of any kind feels good, and displeasure of any kind feels bad. These feelings may or may not have bodily location or be combined with other sensory states like warmth or pressure. “Pleasure” and “displeasure” mean these thin phenomenal states of feeling good and feeling bad. As Joseph Mendola writes, “the pleasantness of physical pleasure is a kind of hedonic value, a single homogenous sensory property, differing merely in intensity as well as in extent and duration, which is yet a kind of goodness” (442).29 What if Feldman is right and hedonic states feel good in fundamentally different ways? Then phenomenal introspection suggests a pluralist variety of hedonism. Each fundamental flavor of pleasure will have a fundamentally different kind of goodness, as phenomenal introspection more accurate than mine will reveal. This isn't my view, but I suggest it to those convinced that hedonic tones are fundamentally heterogenous. If phenomenal introspection reliably informs us that pleasure is good, how can anyone believe that their pleasures are bad? Other processes of moral belief-formation are responsible for these beliefs. Someone who feels disgust or guilt about sex may not only regard sex as immoral, but the pleasure it produces as bad. Even if phenomenal introspection on sexual pleasure disposes one to believe that it's good, stronger negative emotional responses to it may more strongly dispose one to believe that it's bad, following the emotional perception model suggested in section 1.4. Explaining disagreement about pleasure's value in terms of other processes lets hedonists maintain that phenomenal introspection univocally supports pleasure's goodness. As long as negative judgments of pleasure come from unreliable processes instead of phenomenal introspection, the argument from disagreement eliminates them. The parallel between yellow’s brightness and pleasure’s goodness demonstrates the objectivity of the value detected in phenomenal introspection. Just as anyone's yellow experiences objectively are bright experiences, anyone's pleasure objectively is a good experience.30 While one's phenomenology is often called one's “subjective experience”, facts about it are still objective. “Subjective” in “subjective experience” means “internal to the mind”, not “ontologically dependent on attitudes towards it.” My yellow-experiences objectively have brightness. Anyone who thought my yellow-experiences lacked brightness would be mistaken. Pleasure similarly is objectively good. It's true that anyone's pleasure is good. Anyone who denies this is mistaken. As Mendola writes, the value detected in phenomenal introspection is “a plausible candidate for objective value” (712). Even though phenomenal introspection only tells me about my own phenomenal states, I can know that others' pleasure is good. Of course, I can't phenomenally introspect their pleasures, just as I can't phenomenally introspect pleasures that I'll experience next year. But if I consider my experiences of lemon yellow and ask what it would be like if others had the same experiences, I must think that they would be having bright experiences. Similarly, if in a pleasant moment I consider what it's like for others to have exactly the experience I'm having, I must think that they're having good experiences. If they have exactly the same experiences I'm having, their experiences will have exactly the same intrinsic properties as mine. This is also how I know that if I have the same experience in the future, it'll have the same intrinsic properties. Even though the only pleasure I can introspect is mine now, I should believe that others' pleasures and my pleasures at other times are good, just as I should believe that yellow experienced by others and myself at other times is bright. My argument thus favors the kind of universal hedonism that supports utilitarianism, not egoistic hedonism.

Three impacts: A. highest layer of the framework debate- reliable processes disprove your theory.

Sinhababu 2 Neil Sinhababu (National University of Singapore) “The epistemic argument for hedonism” <http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3> JW

A full moral theory including accounts of rightness and virtue can be built from the deliverances of phenomenal introspection combined with conceptual analysis. Shaver, Kagan, and I suggest that phenomenal introspection reveals pleasure to have a kind of goodness that makes states of affairs better in consequentialist moral theories. A state of affairs thus is pro tanto better as there is more pleasure and pro tanto worse as there is more displeasure. More pleasure makes states of affairs better. Conceptual analysis here connects the concept of goodness with the concept of a better state of affairs, and with other moral concepts like rightness and virtue. Even if conceptual analysis cannot connect the moral and the nonmoral as a full normative ethical theory requires, it reveals connections between our moral concepts. For example, the following propositions or something like them seem to be conceptual truths: states of affairs are pro tanto better insofar as they include more goodness, an action is pro tanto better insofar as it causally contributes to better states of affairs, and agents are pro tanto more virtuous insofar as they desire that better states of affairs obtain. These putative conceptual truths about pro tanto relations do not contradict strong forms of deontology, as they allow that obligations may trump good consequences in determining right action. Utilitarians who build their theories along these lines can treat deontology as a conceptually coherent position whose substantive claims are in fact not favored by evidence from any reliable processes. So they need not treat utilitarianism itself as a conceptual truth and run afoul of Moore's open question argument. If the argument from disagreement forces us to abandon belief in all other moral facts, introspecting pleasure's goodness and following these conceptual pro tanto connections to conclusions involving other moral concepts may be the only way to develop a full moral theory through reliable processes.

B. outweighs on probability- any other justification relies on long chains of questionable metaphysical assumptions- util is verifiable to every agent. C. no util calc indicts- pleasures aggregative because its goodness is relevant to everyone; all pleasures boil down to basically feeling good. Indicts just prove my frameworks hard to use, not that it’s incorrect.

Thus, the standard is maximizing happiness.

Prefer the standard:

1. Means based theories devolve to util-there’s no intent foresight distinction: if we’re knowledgeable about the consequence of an action then we calculate that into our intention because we could always decide not to act.

2. Ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate. Any standard is an interpretation of the word ought-thus framework is functionally a topicality argument about how to define the terms of the resolution. Definitions should be subject to theoretical contestation in the same way other words should be. My framework interprets ought as maximizing happiness. Prefer this definition:

A. Ground- every impact can function under my standard but other ethics exclude arguments and flow to one side- kills fairness since we both need arguments to win.

B. Topic lit- most articles are written through the lens of util because they’re crafted for policymakers and the general public who take consequences to be important, not philosophy majors. Key to fairness and education- the lit is where we do research and determines how we engage in the round.

C. Topic education- util forces us to read arguments about the impacts of the res in the real world and not get caught up in abstract ethics debates- key to education because we only have the topic for two months and need to learn about current events.

Fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity-no debater ought to have an advantage otherwise you’re picking the better cheater. Education is a voter since it’s why schools fund debate and also provides portable skills for the real world. This is a framework warrant, not a reason to drop the debater.

3. Actor specificity. Policymaking must be consequentialist since collective action results in conflicts that only util can resolve. Side constraints paralyze state action since policy makers have to consider tradeoffs between multiple people. States lack intentionality since they're composed of multiple individuals—there is no act-omission distinction for them since they create permissions and prohibitions in terms of policies so authorizing action could never be considered an omission since the state assumes culpability in regulating the public domain.

4. Personal identity does not exist since its division creates contradictions.

Olson Eric T. (Professor of Philosophy at the University of Sheffield) “Personal Identity” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Aug 20, 2002; substantive revision Oct 28, 2010 <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-personal/#PsyApp> JW

Whatever psychological continuity may amount to, a more serious worry for the Psychological Approach is that you could be psychologically continuous with two past or future people at once. **If your cerebrum**—the upper part of the brain largely responsible for mental features—**were transplanted, the recipient would be** psychologically continuous with **you** by anyone's lights (even if there would also be important psychological differences). The Psychological Approach implies that she would be you. If we destroyed one of your cerebral hemispheres, the resulting being would also be psychologically continuous with you. (Hemispherectomy—even the removal of the left hemisphere, which controls speech—is considered a drastic but acceptable treatment for otherwise-inoperable brain tumors: see Rigterink 1980.) What **if we** did both at once, **destroy**ing **one hemisphere and transplant**ing **the other**? Then too, **the one who got the transplant**ed hemisphere would be psychologically continuous with you, and according to the Psychological Approach **would be you.** But now **suppose** that **both hemispheres are transplanted, each into a different empty head.** (We needn't pretend, as some authors do, that the hemispheres are exactly alike.) **The two recipients**—call them Lefty and Righty—**will each be** psychologically continuous with **you.** The Psychological Approach as I have stated it implies that any future being who is psychologically continuous with you must be you. It follows that you are Lefty and also that you are Righty. **But that cannot be**: Lefty and Righty are two, and **one thing cannot be** numerically identical with **two things.** Suppose Lefty is hungry at a time when Righty isn't. If you are Lefty, you are hungry at that time. If you are Righty, you aren't. If you are Lefty and Righty, you are both hungry and not hungry at once: **a contradiction.**

Thus, moral theories based on intentions and the worth of an individual fail-only states of affairs can have relevance since they are not dependent on a conception of an agent existing.

5. Prefer reflective equilibrium as a procedure for the framework debate. A. regress-all completely deductive justifications devolve into certain basic premises that we must accept-finding coherence among our intuitions determine the validity of these assumptions. B. solves moral uncertainty-philosophers have been disagreeing for decades so no foundational premise can have complete plausibility-we should compare a wide range of beliefs to reach the best epistemic conclusions. And, contesting reflective equilibrium requires warranting another theory of justification-otherwise I’m the only who has a way to weigh between framework justifications.

Reflective equilibrium means util.

**Singer** Peter Singer (Ira W. DeCamp Professor of Bioethics at Princeton, Laureate Professor at the University of Melbourne, named one of the 100 most influential people in the world by Time magazine in 2005) and Katryzyna de Lazari-Radek (assistant professor at the Institute of Philosophy at the University of Lodz, Poland. Received her PhD at that university). The Point of View of the Universe: Sidgwick and Contemporary Ethics. Oxford. 2014. Pg. 212, Chapter 8: Ultimate Good, Part I: Perfectionism and Desire-Based Theory.

Thus Sidgwick takes himself to have shown that common sense is not really opposed to the idea that the ultimate good is pleasure. But before concluding his argument, he offers one more consideration for accepting this view. If we reject it, he says, can we frame any coherent account of ultimate good? **If we do not take universal happiness as the proper common goal** of human activities**, on what** other **basis can we systematize our ends? How**, for example, **can we compare** the **values** of the different ends, other than hedonism, **with each other and with the value of happiness?** For **in practice, we need to decide not only whether we should pursue truth rather than** beauty or **freedom, but how far we should seek** any of **these if we foresee that doing so will lead to more pain**, or less pleasure, for humans or other sentient beings. Sidgwick tells us that he has failed to find ‘any systematic answer to this question that appears to me deserving of serious consideration’. As a result, he concludes that **rigorously applying** the method of **intuitionism leads us to** universalistic hedonism, or in a world, **util**itarianism**.**

AND: our basic intuition is that we must make the world a better place.

Sinnott-Armstrong 2 Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (Chauncey Stillman Professor of Practical Ethics in the Department of Philosophy and the Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University) “Consequentialism” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2011/entries/consequentialism/>

Even if consequentialists can accommodate or explain away common moral intuitions, that might seem only to answer objections without yet giving any positive reason to accept consequentialism. However, most people begin with the presumption that we morally ought to make the world better when we can. The question then is only whether any moral constraints or moral options need to be added to the basic consequentialist factor in moral reasoning. (Kagan 1989, 1998) If no objection reveals any need for anything beyond consequences, then consequences alone seem to determine what is morally right or wrong, just as consequentialists claim.

Thus, any reason to reject the NC framework is sufficient to default to util even if I don’t win proactive framework warrants.

### Underview (:40)

1. Prefer a comparing worlds paradigm—the neg must prove proactive desirability of a competitive advocacy. Truth-testing gives the neg an infinite amount of NIBs-they can prove morality doesn’t exist, it’s inaccessible, or read multiple side constraint theories. If they have to prove desirability then they share assumptions with the aff which levels out the playing field, so it’s key to fairness.

2. Use epistemic modesty to evaluate the normative framework debate-that’s probability of the moral theory multiplied by the action’s value under the theory if it were true. We can never be totally confident in any conclusion-humans make mistakes evaluating arguments all the time. Being ahead on the framework debate doesn’t create 100% confidence- rather we should account for our errors by granting credence to both contentions.

3. Disads that aren’t intrinsic to the aff don’t link: if a logical policymaker could do both then there’s no value to pretending like there’s a trade-off because the aff is still overall good.

4. Aff gets 1AR theory- otherwise the neg can be infinitely abusive and there’s no way to check against this- meta theory also precedes the evaluation of initial theory shells because it determines whether or not I could engage in theory in the first place. 1AR theory is drop the debater- the 1ARs too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance- you must be punished.

### Substitution Preempt (:15)

#### No substitution effect- empirics

Cook and Ludwig 03 Philip J. Cook (ITT/Sanford Professor of Public Policy at Duke University) and Jens Ludwig (Nonresident Senior Fellow, Economic Studies) Evaluating Gun Policy: Effects on Crime and Violence 2003 JW

Although definitive conclusions are hard to come by, it seems that the hand-gun ban in Britain may have helped to sustain the mid-1990s reversal of the buildup to the relatively high handgun crime levels of a few years earlier. Crime and firearm crimes fell in the immediate aftermath of the ban, but that trend is subsequently ended: according to statistics on recorded crimes, current rates are near pre-ban levels. It can be stated with more certainty that the handgun ban has not resulted in any sort of crime nightmare in Britain, as some had feared. First, the handgun ban did not lead to a perverse effect, where fewer guns in the hands of law-abiding citizens generated a huge crime spree by gun-toting crim-inals.83 Second, the handgun ban did not lead to a noticeable substitution toward shotgun crime, though shotguns have long been by far the most commonly avail-able type of gun, and fears of such a substitution are often voiced in discussion about proposed handgun controls in the United States.84 Britain remains a na-tion with enviably low levels of homicide and firearm crime.

# \*\*1AR\*\*

# Suicide

## Suicide

### Suicide 1st

#### Suicide impacts come first:

#### A. magnitude- massive death and suffering.

Goldsmith et al 02 “Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative” SK Goldsmith, TC Pellmar, AM Kleinman, WE Bunney, Editors, Committee on Pathophysiology & Prevention of Adolescent & Adult Suicide, Board on Neuroscience and Behavioral Health 2002 http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10398.html

**Suicide is** the eleventh leading cause of death for all ages in the United States and **the third leading cause of death among adolescents**. A great deal of local and national funding and effort has been devoted to the problem of homicide in contrast to suicide. However, **suicides** in this country **outnumber homicides by a third. During the period of the Vietnam War, four times the number of Americans died by suicide than** died in **combat**. **Two hundred thousand more people died of suicide than died of AIDS in the past 20 years**. **These** mortality **figures do not capture the intense suffering of the suicidal patient**. One patient stated the night before she committed suicide: “**The pain is all consuming**, overwhelming. The pain has become excruciating, **constant and endless**.”

#### B. discourse is key to prevention efforts- that’s an out of round benefit.

Anonymous 15 ("Megsanity" is the alias of a licensed clinical therapist who has spent the majority of the last ten years working as the Clinical Director/Vice President of Clinical Operations for a JCAHO accredited mental health facility. She needed an anonymous outlet where it was acceptable to drop the F-bomb like it's hot. She has experience in private clinical practice as well as community-based mental health agencies, schools and the veteran's administration) “Do We Need To Worry About Suicide Contagion” September 9th 2015 http://megsanity.com/article.asp?post=226 JW

But those people who are vulnerable to suicide contagion are already considering it. This isn't like some happy-go-lucky softmore is suddenly going to want to die just because her favorite comic did. By avoiding discussions of suicide, we push it into a closet. We tell people thinking those thoughts, “We do not accept you, this isn’t normal, this isn’t okay,” instead of “We understand, let us help.” We force people to suffer alone, in silence, and are inexplicably shocked when someone ends their own life. Suicide isn't what kills people. It is the depression, the deep feelings of being misunderstood and helpless, the isolation that propels one down that path. Suicide is the end result, but not the ultimate cause of death. And by avoiding these discussions, we also ensure that the people who might have been able to help don't know what signs to look for in someone who is depressed or considering suicide. As a society, we are stuck between a rock and a hard place, where the shame and judgment and fear that one death will trigger another sometimes outweighs the desire to clarify what occurred. We are left to repeat the cycle for eternity, sweeping suicide under the rug, never to discuss it again.

### High Probability 1st

#### High probability impacts come first.

1. Magnitude-lack of credible specific brink means that we don’t know when the neg impacts will occur but the aff impact aggregates every day, meaning the magnitude will be greater by the time your scenario occurs.

2. reversibility-systemic impacts create irreversible harms to people-we can’t un-murder someone, but we can intervene to solve impacts that rely on lots of link chains.

3. timeframe-violence happens daily whereas your DAs go through a series of steps. New political developments can drastically change the probability of your link chain, but there are no comparable variables that will likely change the probability of violence.

4. Extinction first justifies not picking up a pen because it could cause nuke war; that causes policy paralysis

5. Expert predictions are incorrect.

Menand 05 Louis Menand (the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of English at Harvard University) “Everybody’s An Expert” The New Yorker 2005 http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2005/12/05/everybodys-an-expert

“Expert Political Judgment” is not a work of media criticism. Tetlock is a psychologist—he teaches at Berkeley—and his conclusions are based on a long-term study that he began twenty years ago. He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. By the end of the study, in 2003, the experts had made 82,361 forecasts. Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate. Tetlock got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, economic growth), or less of something (repression, recession). And he measured his experts on two dimensions: how good they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and how accurate they were at predicting specific outcomes. The results were unimpressive. On the first scale, the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability to all three outcomes—if they had given each possible future a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world, in other words, are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices.

### A2 McAllister/Other Methods

Cross apply Miller et al 13- even if people switch to other methods, those methods are less fatal so there’s an overall decrease.

Cross apply DeFilippis and Hughes 14- the suicides the aff solves for are impulsive, not premeditated. If someone really wants to kill themselves they can, the aff just prevents them from doing it without forethought.

Cross apply DeFilippis and Hughes 13- we have statistical solvency with gun control which empirically denies all your random indicts.

### A2 other countries

This is just correlation, not causation- those countries have high suicide rates for other cultural and economic factors.

### Suicide O/W Homicide

#### Suicide scenario outweighs-according to the CDC, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr64/nvsr64_02.pdf> almost twice as many deaths occur due to suicide with a firearm than homicide with a firearm.

### A2 Suicide Good

#### Suicide is often compulsive and non-autonomous—gun control is key.

DeGrazia 14 David (Professor of Philosophy at George Washington University) “The Case for Moderate Gun Control” Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal Vol. 24, No. 1, 1–25 2014 JW

First, even if we acknowledge a right to commit suicide, from any reasonable perspective the vast majority of suicides must be regarded as tragic. It is not very often that we carefully reflect upon the circumstances of someone who committed a suicide and think, “Yes, suicide was the very best option for that individual.” Sometimes we may, but not very often—especially when the victim of suicide is a child, a mentally ill person, or someone who acts impulsively. Often those who commit [die by] suicide are unaware of, or are momentarily unable to appreciate, the prospects for their lives going better. In a very real sense, then, many people who feel a desire to commit suicide do need protection against themselves. Relatedly, if there is a right to commit suicide, it is plausibly limited to suicidal choices that are genuinely autonomous—choices, that is, that are carried out voluntarily (not primarily driven by external pressures or internal compulsions) with an adequate understanding of one’s realistic options (including those involving available forms of help), and with the psychological capacity to appreciate those options (as opposed to devaluing them due to the distorting effects of depression). An autonomous choice will accord with one’s values and stable preferences. Some suicides committed with the help of a physician meet these criteria; no doubt some suicides committed without such help do as well. But, of course, one doesn’t need a gun to commit suicide autonomously. And the presence of guns makes it more likely that one will kill oneself impulsively and non-autonomously. Thus, a right to commit suicide, plausibly construed, will not undermine the thesis that gun ownership for the purpose of self-defense is, on average, self-defeating.

## Solvency

### A2 Substitution

#### 1. No substitution effect

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

One has to doubt the reliability of the statements of prisoners as to what firearms they would carry in certain circumstances. Macho bragging and outright lying are very likely in such situations, and relegate Kleck's projections to the status of unsupported conjecture. In view of the fact that such a small percentage of the actual murders in the United States in 1990 were committed with long guns,' the burden on Kleck to prove his hypothetical speculation is even heavier. As for Kates and Benenson, their projections are based on the unsupported assertion that the 70% of handgun killers who do not turn to long guns would instead use knives, the most lethal weapon other than firearms. It is more probable that at least some potential murderers would turn to less lethal weapons or their bare hands, and that some would be deterred from assaults altogether. Since Kates and Benenson ignore these probable scenarios, and since their substitution predictions are in any case purely speculative, it is safe to conclude that their estimate of the increase in the homicide rate in the event of a handgun-only ban is inflated. The conjectures offered in support of the substitution hypothesis are inadequate and fail to meet the burden of proof encumbent on opponents of my proposal. Another reason to doubt that long guns would be used in great numbers to replace handguns in robberies, assaults, and homicides is that long guns are obviously much more difficult to conceal. A potential mugger roaming the streets wielding a long gun will cause everyone in sight to flee, and is likely to be quickly arrested when alarmed people call the police. Similarly, a bank robber carrying a long gun will be immediately detected by security guards, alarm systems will be triggered, and the chances of a successful robbery greatly diminished. Handguns are obviously much more convenient for the commission of such crimes. Kates and Benenson point out that most homicides occur in the home, where concealability is "irrelevant." 95 However, concealability would seem to be an important factor even in the home. Since the victim may well be unaware that the killer is carrying a concealed weapon, the "surprise factor" which is peculiar to handguns can still apply even in the home. In contrast, people can hardly be unaware that the person they are with is carrying a shotgun or rifle. Moreover, in any argument or domestic quarrel, regardless of whether the potential victim knows that the assaulter is carrying a handgun, the ease of pulling out the gun and shooting makes such arguments more likely to spill over into murder. In contrast, by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their long gun and loaded it, the potential victim has crucial seconds in which to escape. Another reason that the concealability of handguns is not a good reason for a handgun-only ban is proposed by Hardy and Kates in their discussion of the impact of handgun control on robberies. They point out that "[t]he difference between a long gun and a handgun is ten minutes and a hacksaw."' Even robberies, then, would not be diminished by a handgun ban. However, this contention runs directly counter to the evidence collected by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms' Project Identification. Seventy-one percent, or 7,538, of the handguns submitted for tracing, had a barrel length of 3 inches or less. Sixty-one percent, or 6,476, had a caliber of .32 or less. Since both of these factors relate to the size of the weapon, these figures indicate that concealability is an overriding factor in selecting a handgun for use in crime. 7 Sawed-off shotguns will be much longer and much bulkier than any of these short and small-caliber handguns, especially "Saturday Night Specials," which combine a caliber of .32 or less with a barrel length of three inches or less, comprised 44% of all the weapons successfully traced, and fit into the palm of an average sized hand. We may conclude, then, that because of the difficulty of concealment, neither long guns nor sawed-off versions of the same are likely to be used in great numbers to replace handguns in the commission of crimes. The difficulty of concealment factor will outweigh the greater lethalness of long gun shots. Consequently, a ban on handguns will indeed result in a decrease in firearms-related homicide and other violent crimes. Since firearms are the most lethal weapons, and they were used in 64.1% of homicides in the United States in 1990,98 such a ban is, therefore, likely to result in a reduction in the overall murder rate.'

#### 2. Empirically denied.

Cook and Ludwig 03 Philip J. Cook (ITT/Sanford Professor of Public Policy at Duke University) and Jens Ludwig (Nonresident Senior Fellow, Economic Studies) Evaluating Gun Policy: Effects on Crime and Violence 2003 JW

Although definitive conclusions are hard to come by, it seems that the hand-gun ban in Britain may have helped to sustain the mid-1990s reversal of the buildup to the relatively high handgun crime levels of a few years earlier. Crime and firearm crimes fell in the immediate aftermath of the ban, but that trend is subsequently ended: according to statistics on recorded crimes, current rates are near pre-ban levels. It can be stated with more certainty that the handgun ban has not resulted in any sort of crime nightmare in Britain, as some had feared. First, the handgun ban did not lead to a perverse effect, where fewer guns in the hands of law-abiding citizens generated a huge crime spree by gun-toting crim-inals.83 Second, the handgun ban did not lead to a noticeable substitution toward shotgun crime, though shotguns have long been by far the most commonly avail-able type of gun, and fears of such a substitution are often voiced in discussion about proposed handgun controls in the United States.84 Britain remains a na-tion with enviably low levels of homicide and firearm crime.

### A2 Illicit Markets

#### 1. I solve illicit markets—criminals get their weapons from people who purchased guns legally-by restricting the primary market we increase cost in the secondary market which makes guns less available.

#### 2. Chicago proves-criminals guns are recently purchased and the plan empirically solves.

DeFilippis and Hughes 15 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “Gun-Rights Advocates Claim Criminals Don’t Follow Gun Laws. Here’s the Research That Shows They’re Wrong.” September 8 2015 Armed With Reason http://www.thetrace.org/2015/09/gun-laws-work-criminals-effectiveness-research/ JW

How Laws Stem the Flow of Guns in the Gray Market Wayne LaPierre of the NRA frequently casts doubt on the ability of regulations to curb criminal behavior, stating earlier this year that “we don’t have to guess how hardened criminals will get their guns if universal background checks are passed, because we already know how they get them now: through theft, black market purchases, criminal associates, and straw purchasers. Background checks cannot and do not stop any of these things.” Contrary to LaPierre’s pessimism regarding the apparent futility of trying to stem the tide of illegal guns, Philip Cook of Duke University and several colleagues have found that it is the flow of firearms, not the volume, that is the key factor in gun crime. These market characteristics mean that regulations on transactions, even in the legal channels, can help increase costs in the black market and subsequently deter criminals from obtaining firearms. If gun regulations can effectively dampen the supply of new firearms and ammunition, thereby making transactions more challenging to complete, prices will rise and criminals will be more hesitant to obtain a firearm — and may even forgo it altogether. These market influences were validated in a 2007 study by Cook and Jens Ludwig of the University of Chicago, which discovered a significant [illicit] black market markup on the price of weapons relative to the cost in the legal market. The economics are perhaps most vivid in Chicago, where ammunition is largely illegal except under specific circumstances. In interviews with researchers, one gang member reported paying $50 for 10 bullets for a Beretta semi-automatic, roughly 50 times more expensive than store prices at the time. “You really don’t have someone who sells ammo around here,” another criminal said. “I mean it’s like you have to hope you can get it from [a gang] or maybe [a street dealer].” Another startling feature of the markets that supply criminals is how swiftly guns make their way from legal gun stores to crime scenes when they are not fettered by tougher laws. In one study conducted by Franklin Zimring, a UC Berkeley law professor, it was discovered that a large number of the guns seized in major metropolitan areas were sold by retail outlets relatively recently. Other studies have confirmed this point, finding that the many crime guns have a short “time-to-crime” (the time between when a gun is first bought and found at a crime scene), usually of a couple of months to a couple years. The exception to this rule are guns used by gang members in areas with strict gun regulations — again including Chicago, where time-to-crime numbers ran to 11.6 years as of 2013, the most recent data available. More than 60 percent of those guns were imported from outside Illinois, meaning that criminals looked to states with weaker gun laws to obtain their weaponry. In fact, time-to-crime is often used as a proxy in gun violence research to measure the effectiveness of gun laws in limiting the diversion of firearms to criminals. If guns used for illegal purposes in Chicago consistently have a longer time-to-crime than guns in other cities, then that can be taken as evidence that Chicago’s gun laws are obstructing criminal activity. A 2014 study by criminologist Glenn Pierce at Northeastern University found that California, with its strict legal and regulatory regime governing firearms, also produces crime guns with a much longer time-to-crime than other states. These numbers were confirmed by a recently issued ATF report, which found in 2014 that California, a state with strict gun laws, had an average time-to-crime of 13.52 years, versus a state with lax gun laws like Arizona, which had an average of 8.86 years. A recent survey conducted by Cook and several colleagues interviewed 99 prison inmates with gun related offenses in Chicago, and found that very few respondents bought their gun directly from a federally licensed gun dealer. Instead, most relied on a network of family and friends to obtain their weaponry. Pro-gun media and the NRA quickly pounced on the survey, claiming this was proof that criminals don’t follow laws and will be able to obtain firearms no matter what restrictions are implemented. Actually, the survey points in the opposite direction, indicating that regulations that produce higher prices for guns and ammunition in the black market can have a significant impact on criminal activity in the aggregate. The interviews by the Cook team reveal that gun regulations have forced Chicago’s criminals (particularly gang members) to search for out of state sources and create an elaborate network of personal contacts to transfer guns, out of fear of being caught by police. As one respondent stated: “Most people either go to the down-South states or go to Indiana” — where gun laws are looser than Chicago’s and Illinois’ — “to get guns, or people obtain gun licenses, go to the store and then resell.” Another respondent further expounded on the difficulties of obtaining firearms: “A lot of guys in the ‘hood’ don’t have access — a lot of networking stuff going on.” These findings paired with time-to-crime data demonstrate that Chicago’s gun laws are influencing the behavior of criminals and imposing greater transaction burdens on the illicit market. Gun violence continues to rock the city, but it’s fueled by the supply of guns from lightly regulated markets that undermine local barriers. As Cook tells The Trace, if guns and ammunition “were more readily available in Chicago, and more of the dangerous youths had ready access at low prices, I’m convinced that there would be even more shootings.”

### 1AR Value Reorientation

#### The plan causes a value reorientation which solves gun violence.

LaFollette 2k Hugh (USF St. Petersburg Philosophy Professor) “Gun Control” Ethics 110 (January 2000): 263–281 http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/233269 JW

The strong correlation between the presence of guns and a higher murder rate is compelling. Since the correlation is statistically significant to a .01 level, it is difficult to believe that limiting private gun ownership will not have a noticeable effect on the numbers of murders. Gun advocates disagree: they claim that cultural factors explain the correlation. Although I think they are partly correct, they draw the wrong inference. For one crucial difference between European and American cultures is the widespread presence of guns. Each culture is the way it is, at least in part, because of the role of guns (or their absence) played in its creation and maintenance. Therefore, curtailing the private possession of guns might well change the American culture so that it would be less violent. Consequently, it is not only that fewer guns would directly cause some decline in violent crimes—which it should. It is also likely to reshape the cultural values which, along with the ready availability of deadly weapons, led to such an extraordinarily high murder rate in America.

### A2 Kates and Mauser

#### Kates and Mauser is a terrible study-they analyzed all the wrong things.

DeFilippis and Hughes 15 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “Harvard Study Embraced by Gun Rights Advocates Is Neither a “Study,” Nor Really “Harvard”” The Trace October 21st 2015 <http://www.thetrace.org/2015/10/harvard-study-false-claims-armed-with-reason/> JW

In the wake of the Oregon college shooting, the website beliefnet.com caused a stir on social media with an article titled “Harvard University Study Reveals Astonishing Link Between Firearms, Crime and Gun Control.” The post pointed to a “virtually unpublicized” 2007 paper by Don Kates and Gary Mauser that uses international data to argue that higher rates of gun ownership correlate with lower crime rates. Other right-wing blogs soon picked up on the story, insisting that this was the study that “gun-grabbers fear.” The frenzy is a carbon copy of what happened when the so-called Harvard study was rediscovered back in 2013, and previously in 2012. However, despite its continued resurrection, Kates and Mauser’s work contains serious flaws. For starters, the phrase “Harvard study” is a misnomer, as the paper was not written by researchers at all affiliated with Harvard. Kates is a prominent, NRA-backed Second Amendment activist, while Mauser is a well-known Canadian gun advocate. Their paper appeared in the Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy, a journal that, unlike most academic publications, does not have peer review. The publication describes itself as a “student-edited” law review that provides a forum for “conservative and libertarian legal scholarship.” The journal’s past contents include a thoroughly repudiated article, “What is Marriage?,” which argued that gay marriage was morally wrong. One function that publications like the Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy serve is to provide a home for papers that wouldn’t survive vetting by other academics; research that can pass peer review is almost always sent to publications whose more stringent standards also come with greater reach. What’s more, the report by Kates and Mauser does not meet even the loosest criteria of an academic study, which requires either new analysis of an old dataset or boilerplate analysis of a new dataset. Kates and Mauser’s paper offers neither of these, instead relying on highly subjective eyeball comparisons of suspect data, without constructing a single statistical model. In their paper, Kates & Mauser make several bizarre and obviously false claims. They first state, without supporting evidence, that guns are not uniquely available in the United States, ignoring the fact that the U.S. now has one gun per person (double the rate of second-place Switzerland), and has, by any measure, the least stringent gun laws in the developed world. They then proclaim that much of the current gun violence debate is the product of Soviet propaganda. Leaving aside the paper’s dubious label, and the affronts the authors’ statements present to serious scholarship, there are four particularly egregious errors in the paper. They are: Faulty International Data Kates and Mauser correctly note that socio-cultural and economic factors play a key role in shaping a country’s level of violence. But their insight stops there as they then proceed to directly compare countries with dramatically different socio-cultural and economic conditions (like Russia and Norway) to draw conclusions about the efficacy of gun control. In doing so, they commit a cardinal sin of statistical analysis: not comparing likes to likes. To understand the social and economic factors that could significantly influence homicide rates, they should choose a basket of comparable countries with very similar conditions. Without controlling for these confounding factors, Kates and Mauser immediately undermine any conclusions they hope to draw. The authors proceed to compound these errors by us[e]ing Luxembourg — a very small western European country of only 300,000 people — as the linchpin of their international analysis. Luxembourg’s scant population means that only a handful of murders could cause its homicide rate (measured by homicides per 100,000 residents) to fluctuate wildly. More problematic, the data from Luxembourg that the authors rely on is demonstrably wrong. Kates and Mauser cite Luxembourg’s homicide rate as a whopping 9.01 killings per 100,000 people in 2002. However, not only does that figure come from a source missing multiple years of data (a major red flag), but the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime places the country’s homicide rate for the year in question at 1.4 per 100,000. This suggests that Kates and Mauser didn’t bother to double-check their source. Indeed, after the article was published, Mauser admitted that their data for Luxembourg was incorrect, an admission that was buried in the notes section of a PowerPoint slide.

## 1AR Homicide Adv.

### 1AR Homicide Add-On

#### Handgun ownership is strongly correlated with homicide-reducing handguns substantially reduces murder.

Dixon 11 Nicholas (Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College) “Handguns, Philosophers, and the Right to Self-Defense” International Journal of Applied Philosophy Volume 25, Issue 2, Fall 2011 pp. 151-170

Before turning to nonconsequentialist defenses of handguns based on the right to self-defense, a brief sketch of my original utilitarian argument for prohibition is in order. Its starting point is a striking set of international data. The United States far outstrips five other developed countries (Australia, Canada, Israel, Sweden, and the United Kingdom) in both handgun ownership and handgun homicide rates per 100,000 people. The United States' handgun homicide rate is over twenty times greater than that in these other countries, and its handgun ownership rate is over nine times as high. 4 My reason for singling out handguns for prohibition in the United States is that they are, in this country, the firearm of choice of criminals, being used in at least 72.2 percent of firearms homicides in the years 2006—2010.5 Substantially reducing the number of handguns in the U.S. will very likely substantially reduce the rate of total homicide. This prediction is based not only on the noted statistics, but also on the following considerations, which constitute a rudimentary causal theory. First, a large proportion of these crimes is currently committed with handguns. Since 1970, approximately one-half of the homicides in the U.S. have been committed with handguns. In 2006-2010, an average of 6,909 homicides (48.7 percent of all homicides) was committed per year With handguns.6 Second, because of their cheapness, concealability, ease of use, and lethality, handguns are ideally suited to the commission of crimes and criminals are highly unlikely to be able to commit as many violent crimes by switching to alternative weapons. Third, other weapons that assailants might substitute for firearms are far less lethal than handguns, and in the case of firearms other than handguns, although the wounds that they inflict are more serious, their lower concealability makes it harder to inflict wounds in the first place.' Since the appearance of my first articles, social scientists have performed far more sophisticated statistical analyses of much more comprehensive comparative data, and they provide strong support for my causal hypothesis that prohibition would reduce homicide in the U S. In three separate studies of fourteen, eighteen, and twenty-one countries, Martin Killias has found that the prevalence of firearms is strongly correlated with the firearms homicide rate. The first study indicated a correlation of .746 (where 1 is a perfect correlation), with a probability of less than 0.01 that this would happen by chance, the second produced a correlation of .476—.610 (p<0.031) and the third indicated a correlation of .54 (p<0.05) when the countries with extreme scores are excluded.10 More important, both Killias's and other studies have shown a correlation between gun ownership and total (gun plus non-gun) homicide rates. Most notably, in a 2000 study of twenty-six high-income countries, David Hemenway and Matthew Miller found a correlation of .69 (p<0.00). This study is of special interest because it investigated twenty-six of the twenty-seven countries with a population of over one million defined by the World Bank as high income or highly industrialized. Focusing on a more homogenous group of countries helps to narrow attention to the variable in question—firearms—and minimizes the confounding effect of other causes of homicide. Hemenway and Miller's study found that the overall homicide rate in the U.S. was 5.98 times higher than in the other twenty-five countries, thus obviating the objection that the total homicide rate in these other countries could be just as high as in the U.S., due 'to non-handgun homicides. Finally, in a study of twelve countries using some of Killias's data, Gregg Lee Carter concludes that total homicide is correlated with gun ownership at a rate of .67 and with handgun ownership at a rate of .84." In its review of the literature on the connection between firearms and violence, the National Academy of Science concludes that "in comparisons among countries, there is a substantial association between gun ownership and homicide." 14 To complete the argument that these correlations indicate that handguns cause murder, we need to rule out alternative explanations of the data. First, causation may operate in reverse, in that handgun ownership may be a response to high homicide rates, not a cause, because some people buy firearms to protect them- selves against crime. Second, both handgun ownership and homicide rates may be a function of a third factor, while not affecting each other. In this vein, some proponents of gun rights argue that the United States' very high handgun owner- ship and overall homicide rates are both caused by some third factor unrelated to guns. The second hypothesis is hard to reconcile with the data. Any causes that lead Americans to buy more guns and commit more homicides than inhabitants of other affluent societies—for example, a greater propensity to violence—should equally affect homicide in general and not just homicides committed with firearms. What we find, in contrast, is a far greater disparity between the United States and Western European countries in firearms homicide than in non-gun homicide. The American firearm homicide rate is 4.96 times higher than the average rate in eighteen Western European countries, but its non-gun homicide rate is only 1.96 times higher than the European rate.15 While this data lends some support for the existence of a greater propensity to violence in the United States independent of firearms, the only plausible explanation of the far greater disparity in firearms homicide is that the prevalence of guns is itself a significant causal factor.

#### The plan restricts the primary market which is where criminals go for weapons—this eliminates the illicit market and reduces gun availability.

LaFollette 2k Hugh (USF St. Petersburg Philosophy Professor) “Gun Control” Ethics 110 (January 2000): 263–281 http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/233269 JW

Second, the nature of secondary gun markets helps explain how the widespread availability of guns increases crime in general and homicides in particular. Various opponents of gun control claim that ‘‘If we outlaw guns, only outlaws will have guns.’’ Armchair arguments suggest why this is a silly claim. Where, one might ask, do criminals get their guns? They often steal them or buy [guns] them from those who purchased them legally. Even guns obtained from other criminals are usually traceable to people who purchased them legally. Empirical evidence supports this armchair supposition. Most criminals report having stolen their guns, received them from a friend or family member, or purchased them from someone who had stolen it. At least half a million guns are stolen each year, and these swell the numbers of guns available illegally.13 Not only does the primary (legal) market affect the availability of guns on secondary markets, it also affects the price of guns on those markets, much ‘‘like the analogous markets for motor vehicles or prescription drugs.’’ 14 As we restrict the availability of guns in the primary market, the supply of guns in the secondary markets decreases and their cost increases.15 This increase in cost will diminish teenagers’ ability to obtain guns since they are least able to afford hefty prices. Since teenagers commit most deadly crimes, decreasing the availability of legal guns will thereby decrease the number of homicides. The converse is true as well: having huge numbers of legally available guns increases the number of guns on secondary markets and typically lowers their price. This makes it easier for prospective criminals, including teenagers, to obtain guns. Third, having a gun around the house (or on the person)—even for self-protection—apparently increases the chance that someone in the family will kill themselves with the gun or will be the victim of a homicide or an accident. One study found that ‘‘for every time a gun in the home was involved in a self-protection homicide, they noted 1.3 unintentional deaths, 4.5 criminal homicides, and 37 firearm suicides.’’ 16 This implies that for every case where someone in a gun-owning household uses a gun to successfully stop a life-threatening attack, nearly forty-three people in similar households will die from a gunshot. Taken together the evidence does not prove that widespread availability of guns increases the number of homicides. However, that empirical evidence, bolstered by earlier armchair arguments, makes the claim highly plausible. 2. The use of guns to prevent crime.—The biggest ‘‘gun’’ in the antigun- control lobby is the claim that having (and perhaps carrying) a gun prevents crime. As I noted earlier, this is a sensible armchair claim. Someone contemplating a robbery is more likely to proceed if they think they can succeed with little risk to themselves. So if a prospective robber believes the tenants are at home and have a gun they know how to use, then he likely will seek another target. Two surveys support this belief. According to one survey, 4 percent of all Americans have used a handgun in the past five years to avert a crime. Given those figures, researchers estimate that there are at least 600,000 defensive uses of guns per year. Kleck uses these results, in conjunction with another survey, to claim that the number might be as high as 2.5 million.17 Given the number of violent crimes using guns, ‘‘the best evidence indicates that guns are used about as often for defensive purposes as for criminal purposes.’’ 18 If true, that is a powerful reason to resist attempts to limit availability of guns.19 Such statistics, particularly when bolstered by moving anecdotes of those who have saved their lives by having a gun, cannot be cavalierly dismissed by gun control advocates. However, these figures are inflated, likely dramatically so. First, Kleck’s methodology is flawed. Surveys have an inherent tendency to overestimate rare events. Kleck made his estimates based on phone interviews with people in 5,000 dwelling units. One percent of those units claimed to have used a gun defensively in the past year. Kleck inferred from these responses that there are 2.5 million defensive handgun uses per year. However, since this inference is based on an affirmative answer by one person out of a hundred, that means that for every chance for a false negative (someone who falsely denies using a gun defensively) there are ninety-nine chances for a false positive (someone who falsely claims to have used a gun defensively).20 The probability that this or some other bias skews the findings is substantial. Second, Kleck’s findings are inconsistent with findings by the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which interviewed far more people and interviewed them more regularly.21 Kleck’s estimates even clash with the findings of the NCVS on the incidence and circumstances of robberies (which seems less subject to reporting bias). If Kleck’s figures were correct, then ‘‘Kleck asks us to believe that burglary victims in gun owning households use their guns in self-defense more than 100% of the time, even though most were initially asleep.’’ 22 Finally, if there were 2.5 million defensive gun uses each year, how many of those were necessary? Given the negative results of private gun ownership, gun advocates should show not only that guns deter crime but that they are the best way of doing so. Some people plausibly claim that owning a dog is an effective deterrent. If true, then a not insignificant percentage of those who used a gun defensively could have achieved the same results without the accompanying danger. In summary, there is no doubt that guns deter some crime and stop the completion of other crimes, just not in the numbers that Kleck claims. John Lott supplements Kleck’s argument by claiming that the widespread use of concealed weapons would decrease the annual number of homicides by 1,400; rapes by 4,200; aggravated assaults by 60,000; and robberies by 12,000.23 If true, and if there were no countervailing costs, this would be a powerful reason not only to permit guns but to encourage people to have and carry them. However, Lott’s conclusions have also come under severe criticism: ‘‘The central problem is that crime moves in waves, yet Lott’s analysis does not include variables that can explain these cycles. For example, he used no variables on gangs, on drug consumption, or community policing. As a result, many of Lott’s findings make no sense. He finds for instance, that both increasing the rate of unemployment and reducing income reduces the rate of violent crimes.’’ 24 Perhaps the most compelling critique comes from Jens Ludwig, who compares the rate of violent crime toward youths and adults in states that passed shall-issue carrying permits. Most of these states issue gun permits only to people over twenty-one. Armchair considerations predict that younger people, who cannot legally carry, will not receive the full benefits from the purported deterrent effect of shall-issue laws. Thus, those under twenty-one years of age are a natural control group to track general swings in crime. Once we include this factor, we find that shall-issue laws lead to higher—not lower—homicide and robbery rates.25 I also have an overarching worry about Lott’s conclusions. The one correlation in the gun control debate that seemingly is beyond dispute is the high correlation between the presence of guns—especially handguns— and homicide rates. Gun advocates offer explanations for the correlation, but no one I have seen seriously challenges it. I find it difficult to square this correlation with Kleck’s and Lott’s claims that having more guns—and toting them—will lower crime. C. An Overall Assessment of the Empirical Evidence The strong correlation between the presence of guns and a higher murder rate is compelling. Since the correlation is statistically significant to a .01 level, it is difficult to believe that limiting private gun ownership will not have a noticeable effect on the numbers of murders. Gun advocates disagree: they claim that cultural factors explain the correlation. Although I think they are partly correct, they draw the wrong inference. For one crucial difference between European and American cultures is the widespread presence of guns. Each culture is the way it is, at least in part, because of the role of guns (or their absence) played in its creation and maintenance. Therefore, curtailing the private possession of guns might well change the American culture so that it would [to] be less violent. Consequently, it is not only that fewer guns would directly cause some decline in violent crimes—which it should. It is also likely to reshape the cultural values which, along with the ready availability of deadly weapons, led to such an extraordinarily high murder rate in America. However, the statistical evidence that guns prevent or thwart crimes is suggestive and cannot be ignored despite its identified weaknesses. In summary, the overall statistical evidence tilts in favor of gun control advocates, although the evidence is disputable. But we should not expect nor do we need indisputable evidence. We can act on the best evidence we have while being open to new evidence. If widespread availability of guns were responsible for even one-fourth of the increase in the number of murders, that would be a significant harm that the state should prevent if it could do so in a relatively unintrusive and morally acceptable way. There is little doubt that we could do that, at least to some degree. If nothing else, we could control some types of guns and ammunition. To take one obvious example, teflon-coated bullets are designed to pierce protective vests. People do not use these bullets to pierce the vests on a deer or a squirrel, on a target or a clay pigeon. They use them to pierce the vests on people, usually law-enforcement officers. This ammunition has no purpose except to cause harm. Hence, we are justified in abolishing teflon bullets and in establishing severe criminal penalties for those possessing them. This would not save large numbers of lives. But, assuming the enforcement of this ban is not impractical, then, if it saved even a few lives, that would be a compelling reason to outlaw such bullets. Some guns, however, have a much wider use, even if they occasionally are used for ill. People have seemingly legitimate uses for shotguns and single-shot rifles. Consequently, barring strong evidence to the contrary, we should not abolish them. We should, however, study their con- tributory role in causing harm and explore ways we might reduce this harm in a relatively unintrusive way. The central debate concerns handguns. The evidence we have shows that handguns are disproportionately used in homicides and in robberies. Although ‘‘there are approximately three times as many long guns as handguns in the US, more than 80 percent of gun homicides and 90 percent of gun robberies involve handguns.’’ 26 The experience in Canada suggests that criminals will not switch to long guns if handguns are unavailable. Given the special role handguns play in causing harm, we have compelling reasons to extensively control, or perhaps even abolish, handguns. But policy considerations, mentioned earlier, should give us pause.

### Handgun Ownership = Homicide

#### New study proves causation, not just correlation- this outweighs self-defense.

DeFilippis and Hughes 15 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “New Study Is Latest to Find That Higher Rates of Gun Ownership Lead to Higher Rates of Violent Crime” The Trace June 24 2015 <http://www.thetrace.org/2015/06/new-study-is-latest-to-find-that-higher-rates-of-gun-ownership-lead-to-higher-rates-of-violent-crime/> JW

A Gallup poll taken last October found that around 63 percent of Americans believe that having a gun in the house makes their home safer. It’s a perception in keeping with a constant refrain from the National Rifle Association and other gun-rights proponents, who have steadfastly pushed the idea that a society with more guns leads to less crime, and that “the only way to stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun.” But those arguments, however persuasive on the surface, do not withstand empirical scrutiny. Instead, the most reliable academic analysis consistently shows that gun ownership is more often a catalyst than a deterrent to crime. Last week, amid heightened scrutiny of gun violence in the wake of the Charleston church shootings, a group of researchers released the latest study on the correlation between firearm prevalence and crime rates. Their findings only add to the growing evidence against the “More Guns, Less Crime” hypothesis. The authors of “Firearm Ownership and Violent Crime in the U.S.” are researchers from Boston’s Children Hospital and the Harvard School of Public Health. They set out to gauge the effect of firearm-ownership rates on specific types of violent gun crimes. To do so, they used national gun-ownership surveys conducted by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and criminal data taken from the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR), a large annual database administered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The data covers all 50 states for the years 2001, 2002, and 2004, the only years for which the CDC firearm-ownership statistics are available. The study then sorted the states into quintiles according to their level of firearm ownership. After controlling for a variety of demographic, socioeconomic, and geographic factors, the authors analyzed each group of states and their rates of the following crimes: robbery committed with a firearm, nonfatal assault with a firearm, firearm homicide, and overall homicide. According to the “More Guns, Less Crime” hypothesis, states with higher levels of gun ownership would expect to see lower crime rates in those categories. By contrast, the study found that states with the lowest rates of firearm ownership (Connecticut, Hawaii, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, California, Florida, Illinois, and Maryland) had significantly lower rates of firearm-related assault and robbery, firearm homicide, and overall homicide. States with the highest gun-ownership levels (Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, Arkansas, Arizona, West Virginia, North Dakota, Idaho, Mississippi, and Alabama), meanwhile, had 6.8 times the rate of firearm assaults, 2.8 times the rate of firearm homicides, and twice the rate of overall homicides than states with the lowest gun-ownership levels. In the category of robbery with a firearm, the relationship between gun ownership rates was less clear: The study did find that robbery rates rose with gun-ownership rates, but in some states the increases were not statistically significant. For every other type of crime examined by the authors, however, the conclusion was the same: more guns, more crime. Some gun proponents may argue that “correlation doesn’t equal causation,” that perhaps gun ownership isn’t causing an increase in crime, but instead crime is causing an increase in gun ownership. In other words, people living in high-crime areas may be purchasing guns for protection. This possibility, known as “reverse causation,” was preempted by the authors of the new study, who showed that a state’s firearm-ownership rates in 2001 strongly predict violent crime rates in 2002 and 2004. The most coherent explanation is that higher rates of gun ownership lead to increases in crime, rather than the other way around. Undergirding the idea that expanding gun ownership deters and prevents crimes is the belief that the “bad guy with a gun” will usually be a random assailant, someone the would-be victim has never encountered before or does not know personally. But here again the hard numbers are at odds with perceptions. Nearly 70 percent of homicides involve guns, and the majority of all homicide victims know their killers; among female homicide victims, 93 percent are killed by a familiar person. Earlier research has shown that it’s nonstranger homicide that sees the most increase as gun ownership expands. When a team led by Michael Siegel at Boston University broke down homicides by the victim’s relationship to the killer for a 2014 study, they found that an increase in gun-ownership rates did not produce a statistically significant increase in murders by strangers. But when they looked at victims killed by someone they knew, they found that every 1 percent increase in gun ownership corresponded with a .9 percent increase in murders. “Our findings refute the argument that gun ownership deters strangers from committing homicide,” Dr. Siegel explained. “Instead, these findings suggest that gun ownership actually increases the risk of violent death.”

# Latin America Adv.

### UQ

#### The overall trend is decline in relations.

Estep 14 Chris (founding editor of RealPolitik News) “How the U.S. is Losing Latin America” Feb 12 2014 Independent Voter Project <http://ivn.us/2014/02/12/u-s-losing-latin-america/> JW

Recently, American foreign policy priorities have been highly focused on the Middle East and Asia-Pacific regions. Between winding down the U.S. military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan and navigating the tumult caused by the Arab Spring, President Obama has spent much of his diplomatic capital in the Middle East. In the Asia-Pacific region, the president has further increased American diplomatic involvement. For the past few years, the U.S. has engaged China on trade and security issues, grappled with the increasingly volatile situation in North Korea, and worked to develop more robust trade partnerships with other countries in the region. Meanwhile, American clout in Latin America is waning. Nick Miroff of the Washington Post wrote in January that “with Washington’s diplomatic attention largely focused elsewhere, on Asia and the Middle East, Latin America’s shift had resulted in declining U.S. influence.” Mark Weisbrot agreed with this analysis when he wrote in The Guardian that “Latin America, and especially South America, has become independent of Washington in the past 15 years…” This presents a huge challenge to American foreign policy interests. Already, the trade relationship between the United States and Latin America has suffered. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, exports to South and Central America decreased from approximately $183 billion in 2012 to roughly $169 billion in 2013. At the same time, imports from Latin America were approximately $172 billion in 2012, and decreased to roughly $146 billion in 2013. Even as trade between the United States and Latin America has been disappointing, China has moved into the gap left by the lack of U.S. interest in the region. Patricia Rey Mallen of the International Business Times reported in December 2013 that “in some Latin countries, China has even reached the status of top trading partner. For example, with respect to Brazil, China surpassed the U.S. in 2009…” Not only is China working to out-trade the United States in the Latin American region, China is also working to out-invest the United States in the region. Weisbrot writes: “China has already helped Venezuala with tens of billions of dollars of loans–much of which has already been repaid–as well as investment. It has also provided significant lending and investment in Ecuador, Cuba, Brazil and other countries.” The United States has also made critical mistakes with regard to many countries in Latin America. Last July, Anthony Boadle of Reuters reported that several nations in the region were “irate” in response to allegations that the U.S. National Security Agency has been monitoring the Internet. Then in September, before the United Nations General Assembly, Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff condemned NSA phone eavesdropping. She also cancelled a state visit to the United States. In the end, it is apparent that the United States cannot afford to lose influence in Latin America. According to a January report by the World Bank, GDP growth in Latin America and the Caribbean is expected to be 3.7 percent in 2016. Columbia is expected to see growth at or above 4 percent for the next several years. Brazil’s growth rate is expected to increase from 2.2 percent in 2013 to 3.7 percent in 2016. In Foreign Affairs, Christopher Sabatini wrote that “twenty-first-century Latin America has its own, autonomous power dynamics. A little realism would go a long way.” Latin America is poised to make solid economic gains in the next several years, and the United States should actively re-engage in the region. On issues of trade and security issues, America can make substantial progress with countries like Mexico and Colombia and Brazil. The United States cannot allow itself to be out-done in its own backyard, and especially by one of its primary rivals: China.

### #1

#### US-Latin American relations decreasing now – Obama’s visits did more harm than help. Hirthlier 4/5/2016

JASON HIRTHLER, APRIL 5, 2016, “Doctrine of Denial: the Atlantic Does Obama,” <http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/04/05/doctrine-of-denial-the-atlantic-does-obama/> JO

The president seems equally misguided about Latin America, a region steeped in American intrigues. He instanced his appearance at the Summit of the Americas as a moment when his low-key, non-hysterical approach to foreign affairs worked. This as contrasted with the Bush regime’s grave fearmongering and snarling posturing. Obama sniveled that he had to sit through an hour-long lecture by Nicaragua’s Daniel Ortega on the crimes of the United States. Well—and why not? Is Ortega wrong to condemn the crimes that destroyed his country and its once-budding socialist movement, felled by the hysterical hand of the Reagan administration, beholden to its McCarthyite Manicheanism? Obama also accepted, or was handed, a Marxist critique of U.S.-Latin American relations from Hugo Chavez, whom he deigned to meet. Though meeting foreign leaders is the very stuff of geopolitics, Obama stresses it as an example of his reasonableness as against the hardline rejectionism of neoconservatives. And yet we continue to back coups and violent destabilization in Venezuela. Obama does not seem to notice that this grand new approach to foreign relations is mere window-dressing. It does little to change the underlying neoliberal imperial capitalist policy. What was new was simply a plan not to directly insult or dramatically demonize one’s professed enemies, most of whom were actually interested in rapprochement, which was rejected time and again unless the rival government acceded to Washington’s destructive demands. In the end, so what if he shook Chavez’s hand? He still denounced—two sentences later—the Bolivarian revolution that lifted millions from poverty and illiterate obscurity. So what if he sat through Ortega’s harangue? He has still worked to undermine Latin American independence. The article praises Obama for the disintegrating character of the once-hopeful ALBA (Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra America), a regrettable development that has more to do with the death of Chavez than any policy prescription. Though on this front it should be said that the Western-backed business community in Venezuela has done a bang-up job of destabilizing the Venezuelan economy with its commodity hoarding exercise, which has helped send the Caracas government careening off a cliff.

### #2

#### Argentina leads Latin American relations – but since Bush’s refusal to support bailout in 2001, relations have steadily declined. Especially key under new Argentine president Macri. Trinkunas 3/15

Harold Trinkunas “Obama’s other Latin America trip” | March 15, 2016 8:00am. <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/order-from-chaos/posts/2016/03/15-obama-visit-to-argentina-trinkunas> JO

Argentina-U.S. relations soured quickly after the 2001 financial crisis (when Argentina defaulted on $93 billion in external debt), leading to a nearly unmanageable political crisis that produced five presidents in a matter of weeks. Right or wrong, Argentines saw betrayal in the decision by the George W. Bush administration to refuse to support a bailout package for a close ally—unlike what the United States had done for Mexico in 1994 or supported for Brazil through the International Monetary Fund in 1999. Under the Peronist governments of Eduardo Duhalde (2002-2003), Néstor Kirchner (2003-2007), and Cristina Fernández de Kirchner (2007-2015), relations with the United States grew distant. The two countries disagreed on economic models, on democracy, on human rights, even on coordinating responses to regional humanitarian crises. In a way, this was a return to a traditional pattern of distance from the United States that characterized Argentinean foreign policy for much of the 20th century, but that under Cristina Fernández de Kirchner acquired a much more hostile tone as she grew ever closer to Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez and the Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestras Américas (ALBA). Relaunching Argentina on the global stage Newly elected President Mauricio Macri, a center-right businessman, represents an unusual choice by Argentine voters to lead a country whose politics have been dominated by the Peronist party for 70 years. Indeed, Macri has made a number of sure-footed moves in his first 100 days, taking the first steps to restore economic growth by ending a fixed currency exchange regime and resolving a long-running feud with hedge funds hoping to profit from their purchases of Argentina’s defaulted bonds for pennies on the dollar. This has renewed incentives for Argentina’s traditionally productive agroindustry to resume exports and offers the prospect of Argentina returning to international capital markets for loans to support new investments. Regionally, Macri has distanced himself from once-allies in the Bolivarian block, particularly from Venezuela over the deterioration of democracy and human rights in that country. But it has not all come up roses. Macri faces criticism at home: Some of it is merely political maneuvers, particularly from disgruntled elements of the Peronist movement that are still embittered by their loss; but there are also real domestic concerns over the impact of rising inflation and other economic pain from recently implemented adjustment measures. In a recent speech, Macri laid out the problematic inheritance from 13 years of Peronist rule and how much still remains to be done, including reforming a bloated government bureaucracy, reducing massive deficits, restoring eroded institutions, and containing high inflation. To do so, he will need the support of the more reasonable elements of the Peronist opposition, both in the legislature and among provincial governors, which means that Macri has to be careful to manage and contain Argentina’s natural bent for polarized party politics.

### AT Argentina

#### US-Latin relations declining – Obama’s been criticized for visiting Argentina on the coup’s anniversary.

VOA News. Last updated on: March 25, 2016 9:01 AM. VOA News. “Obama Back at White House After Visiting Cuba, Argentina.” <http://www.voanews.com/content/obama-heads-back-to-washington-from-latin-american-trip/3254392.html> JO

Criticized for visiting on coup anniversary Critics of the president's visit, including many who lost friends or relatives during the years under the military government, say the Obamas should not have come to Argentina on such an important anniversary. Protests linked to the anniversary were held in Buenos Aires and across the nation. Obama was the guest of Argentina's new president, Mauricio Macri, who is intent on strengthening the strained ties between the two nations. After being guests of honor at a state dinner Wednesday night, President Obama and first lady Michelle Obama attended a ceremony Thursday to remember the victims of the regime at Remembrance Park in Buenos Aires. Evidence of U.S. support for South American dictatorships has been public knowledge for more than a decade; but, the United States announced last week, at the behest of the Argentine government, that it will declassify even more military and intelligence documents linked to the Dirty War. White House aide Ben Rhodes said last week that the president believes "moving forward in the Americas or any other part of the world involves a clear-eyed recognition of the past." Landmark Cuba visit The president's trip to Argentina followed a landmark visit to Cuba, the first by a sitting U.S. president in almost nine decades.

### AT Cuba trip

#### Obama’s trip to Cuba left a bitter taste among natives. Williams 3/10/2016

Juan Williams, co-host of FNC's "The Five," where he is one of seven rotating Fox personalities, “Barack Obama's Cuban mistake”, Published March 10, 2016 FoxNews.com <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2016/03/10/barack-obamas-cuban-mistake.html> JO

America’s left-wing academics and Hollywood celebrities have long romanticized Latin American strongmen as righteous revolutionaries, opposed to mid-20th century American military and business dominance of the region. But to people living in those nations, the reality is that the revolutionaries became cruel, oppressive dictators in the case of Arias, the late Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and most of all, Fidel Castro. Given my scars, President Obama’s trip to Cuba later this month leaves a bitter taste in my mouth. To me, it is painful to see the president of a nation based on individual liberty and protection of rights under law have to keep silent about the thousands of people who have suffered oppression at the hands of the Castro regime.

#### Cuban visit declining Obama’s . FoxNews 3/20/16

“Obama in Cuba amid hopes, criticism about improving diplomatic relations”, Published March 20, 2016. FoxNews.com <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2016/03/20/obama-to-cuba-amid-hopes-criticism-about-improving-diplomatic-relations.html> JO

White House officials are mindful that Obama cannot appear to gloss over deep and persistent differences. Even as the president works toward better ties, his statements alongside Castro and dissidents will be scrutinized for signs of how aggressively he is pushing the Havana government to fulfill promises of reform. Cuban Foreign Minister Bruno Rodriguez rebuked Obama ahead of the trip for suggesting that he would use the visit to promote change. Rodriguez said that many of Obama's policy changes have essentially been meaningless, and he dismissed the notion that Obama was in any position to empower Cubans.

### Perception Key

#### The Latin America advantage is perception based; that’s Sweig 13. Lines from the evidence:

At the 2012 Summit of the Americas, heads of state demanded a new approach to the failed war on drugs, including greater efforts to disarm criminal networks. U.S. allies have repeatedly urged the United States to reinstate the federal assault-weapons ban and take action against weapons trafficking.

[…]

Strengthening U.S. gun laws will not eliminate gun violence in Latin America, where weak judiciaries and police forces, the proliferation of gangs and black markets, and deep inequality exacerbate violent conflict. Nonetheless, lax U.S. gun regulations do enable international trafficking. While the effects of tighter regulation will not be felt overnight, such steps will offset widespread regional views that the United States remains indifferent to its own role in exacerbating one of Latin America's most significant challenges.

[…]

At a juncture in U.S.-Latin American relations that again features both tension and opportunity, these actions will demonstrate that the United States is prepared, if imperfectly, to fulfill its shared responsibility for regional security and enhance American standing and positive influence in Latin America.

#### Worst case scenario, studies take years for data collection, writing, and peer review which means news of the aff being bad would take a while to come out- I outweigh on timeframe.

### Handguns Key

#### Handguns from the US are used all the time by cartels.

PW 15 “How I Smuggled 50M Worth of Guns Into Mexico” Peekworthy 2015 <http://peekworthy.com/how-i-smuggled-50m-worth-of-guns-into-mexico/#axzz3zB12KNNB> JW

Anybody can find copious amount of stories about smuggling drugs and items into the United States from Mexico, but what smuggling the other way around? It is a little known fact that smuggling items INTO Mexico is just as common and profitable as smuggling vice versa, the only difference is WHAT is being smuggled. While drugs are the major import into the United States, conversely, guns are the import of choice into Mexico. In fact over 90% of guns seized from Mexican Cartels have been found to be from the United States. The traffic is reflected in the disproportionately high number of federally licensed firearms dealers along the U.S. side of the border. Of the 51,300 retail gun shops in the United States that hold federal licenses, some 6,700 of them are concentrated in the four U.S. states that border Mexico. On average, there are more than three gun dealers for every mile of the 1,970-mile border between the countries. US influence over gun availability in Mexico can even be reflected by the type of guns that are currently being used in Mexico. Increasingly more and more killings in Mexico are carried out with handguns, not the high-powered assault weapons that garner much of the attention related to the countries violence. In fact the vast majority of deaths arising from Violence in Mexico can be attributed to .38 caliber handguns, it just so happens that the United States is the largest market for .38 Caliber handguns.

## Impact Weighing

### Extinction First

#### Tiny risk of extinction outweighs everything because of lost potential for future generations.

Bostrom 11 Nick Bostrom (Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School & Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford), “THE CONCEPT OF EXISTENTIAL RISK”, 2011 http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html

Even if we use **the most conservative** of these **estimates,** which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we **find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than** the value of **1018**human **lives.  This implies that** the expected value of **reducing existential risk by** a mere**one millionth of one percentage point is** at least **ten times** the value of **a billion** human **lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1052 lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives.

### Prolif O/W

#### Prolif is the largest existential threat; no deterrence.

Miller 02 James D. (Professor of economics, Smith College) NATIONAL REVIEW, January 23, 2002, http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-miller012302.shtml, Accessed 7-31-09

The U.S. should use whatever means necessary to stop our enemies from gaining the ability to kill millions of us. We should demand that countries like Iraq, Iran, Libya, and North Korea make no attempt to acquire weapons of mass destruction. We should further insist on the right to make surprise inspections of these countries to insure that they are complying with our proliferation policy. What if these nations refuse our demands? If they refuse we should destroy their industrial capacity and capture their leaders. True, the world's cultural elites would be shocked and appalled if we took preventive military action against countries that are currently doing us no harm. What is truly shocking, however, is that America is doing almost nothing while countries that have expressed hatred for us are building weapons of mass destruction. France and Britain allowed Nazi Germany's military power to grow until Hitler was strong enough to take Paris. America seems to be doing little while many of our foes acquire the strength to destroy U.S. cities. We can't rely upon deterrence to prevent an atomic powered dictator from striking at us. Remember, the Nazi's killed millions of Jews even though the Holocaust took resources away from their war effort. As September 11th also shows, there exist evil men in the world who would gladly sacrifice all other goals for the opportunity to commit mass murder. The U.S. should take not even the slightest unnecessary chance that some dictator, perhaps a dying Saddam Hussein, would be willing to give up his life for the opportunity to hit America with nuclear missiles. Once a dictator has the ability to hit a U.S., or perhaps even a European city, with atomic weapons it will be too late for America to pressure him to give up his weapons. His ability to hurt us will effectively put him beyond our military reach. Our conventional forces might even be made impotent by a nuclear-armed foe. Had Iraq possessed atomic weapons, for example, we would probably have been unwilling to expel them from Kuwait. What about the rights of those countries I have proposed threatening? America should not even pretend to care about the rights of dictators. In the 21st century the only leaders whom we should recognize as legitimate are those who were democratically elected. The U.S. should reinterpret international law to give no rights to tyrants, not even the right to exist. We should have an ethically based foreign policy towards democratic countries. With dictatorships, however, we should be entirely Machiavellian; we should deal with them based upon what is in our own best interests. It's obviously in our self-interest to prevent as many dictators as possible from acquiring the means to destroy us. We shouldn't demand that China abandon her nuclear weapons. This is not because China has proved herself worthy to have the means of mass annihilation, but rather because her existing stockpile of atomic missiles would make it too costly for us to threaten China. It's too late to stop the Chinese from gaining the ability to decimate us, but for the next ten years or so it is not too late to stop some of our other rivals. If it's politically impossible for America to use military force against currently non-hostile dictators then we should use trade sanctions to punish nations who don't agree to our proliferation policy. Normal trade sanctions, however, do not provide the punishing power necessary to induce dictators to abandon their arms. If we simply don't trade with a nation other countries will sell them the goods that we used to provide. To make trade sanctions an effective weapon the U.S. needs to deploy secondary boycotts. America should create a treaty, the signatories of which would agree to: • only trade with countries which have signed the treaty, and • not trade with any country which violates our policy on weapons proliferation. Believe that if only the U.S. and, say, Germany initially signed this treaty then nearly every other country would be forced to do so. For example, if France did not sign, they would be unable to trade with the U.S. or Germany. This would obviously be intolerable to France. Once the U.S., Germany and France adopted the treaty every European nation would have to sign or face a total economic collapse. The more countries which sign the treaty, the greater the pressure on other countries to sign. Once most every country has signed, any country which violated America's policy on weapons proliferation would face almost a complete economic boycott. Under this approach, the U.S. and Germany alone could use our economic power to dictate the enforcement mechanism of a treaty designed to protect against Armageddon. Even the short-term survival of humanity is in doubt. The greatest threat of extinction surely comes from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. America should refocus her foreign policy to prioritize protecting us all from atomic, biological, and chemical weapons.

### Warming O/W

Warming causes extinction from Earth exploding-outweighs other extinction risks.

**Chalko 4** Dr. Tom J. Chalko, MSc, PhD (Head of Geophysics Division, Scientific E Research P/L, Mt Best, Australia). “No second chance? Can Earth explode as a result of Global Warming?” NU Journal of Discovery. Revised October 30th, 2004. http://nujournal.net/core.pdf

**Consequences of** global **warming are** far more **serious** than previously imagined. **The REAL danger** for our entire civilization **comes** not from slow climate changes, but **from overheating of the planetary interior. Life** on Earth **is possible** only **because of** the **efficient cooling of the** planetary **interior** - a process that is **limited primarily by the atmosphere**. This cooling is responsible for a thermal balance between the heat from the core reactor, the heat from the Sun and the radiation of heat into space, so that the average temperature on Earth’s surface is about 13 degrees Celsius. This article examines the possibility of **overheating and** the **“meltdown” of the solid planetary core due to** the atmospheric pollution trapping progressively more solar heat (**the** so-called **greenhouse effect**) and reducing the cooling rate of the planetary interior. The most serious consequence of such a ”meltdown” could be centrifugal segregation of unstable isotopes in the molten part of the spinning planetary core. Such segregation **can “enrich”** the **nuclear fuel in the core** to the point of **creating conditions for** a chain reaction and a **gigantic atomic explosion**. Will Earth become another ”asteroid belt” in the Solar system? It is common knowledge (experiencing seasons) that solar heat is the dominant factor that determines temperatures on the surface of Earth. Under the polar ice however, the contribution of solar heat is minimal and this is where the increasing contribution of the heat from the planetary interior can be seen best. Rising polar ocean temperatures and melting polar ice caps should therefore be the first symptoms of overheating of the inner core reactor. While politicians and businessmen debate the need for reducing greenhouse emissions and take pride to evade accepting any responsibility, the process of overheating the inner core reactor has already begun - polar oceans have become warmer and polar caps have begun to melt. Do we have enough imagination, intelligence and integrity to comprehend the danger before the situation becomes irreversible? **There will be NO SECOND CHANCE...**

## A2 Warming Defense

### A2 Adaptation

Humans won’t adapt.

Reilly 14 John Reilly (co-director of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change) “Why We Can’t Just Adapt to Climate Change” MIT Technology Review April 3rd 2014 http://www.technologyreview.com/view/526116/why-we-cant-just-adapt-to-climate-change/

That is where a measure of wealth brings some resilience—I have those options, others do not. The report “quantifies” in some sense by establishing an element of “relative risk,” concluding that the poor and marginalized in society are more vulnerable because they do not have the means to adapt. Beyond this, it is not clear that climate prediction is at a high enough level to offer information that I can use to take concrete actions for most day-to-day decisions and investments. What the report does provide is some documentation of adaptation in action—what different regions, cities, sectors, and groups are doing to adapt—concluding that there is a growing body of experience from which to learn. However, perhaps the greatest truth in the report is in the following statement: “Adaptation is place and context specific, with no single approach for reducing risks appropriate across all settings (high confidence). Effective risk reduction and adaptation strategies consider the dynamics of vulnerability and exposure and their linkages with socioeconomic processes, sustainable development, and climate change.” Hence, while it’s possible to learn from others’ adaptation experiences, in the end, the specifics of climate change in my place, given my circumstances, and the socio-economic environment in which I live will present me with very different climate outcomes and opportunities to adapt than you will have where you live. This fact alone raises the cost of adaptation, because to some degree each recipe needs to be invented anew. What worked in the past likely won’t work in the future—or at least, not as well. And we need to process a lot of highly uncertain climate projections in developing the new recipe. The report also concludes, not surprisingly, that risks increase and extend to more people, places, and things if the global temperature rise is three degrees Celsius or greater than if there is only a one-degree rise. Overall, the report provides, in my judgment, a compelling case for more serious mitigation efforts—the topic of the next IPCC report, to come out later this month.

### A2 Too Late

Some warming is inevitable, but acting now is key to mitigate effects.

Dizard 14[Wilson, citing a UN report, Digital News Producer,7-8-14, “Act Now: Experts Say Climate Change May Not Be Inevitable”, <http://theterramarproject.org/thedailycatch/act-now-experts-say-climate-change-may-inevitable/>, Accessed 7-9-14, CX]

**Significant climate change may not be inevitable if governments take swift and decisive action now to reduce greenhouse gases**, according to a report released Tuesday that rolls back some of the bleaker and more pessimistic assessments of recent climate negotiations. The report, prepared for the **United Nations** by **experts from leading research institutes from 15 countries, challenge**s **the idea that the world can’t avoid breaching a 2 degrees Celsius rise in global average temperature** — many climate scientists have warned that an increase of 3 to 4 C is now inevitable. Moreover, they suggest defeatism on the 2 C limit target would contribute to dithering by heavily industrialized countries most responsible for climate change — the United States, China, India, major European economies and rising economic powers like Brazil and South Africa. “We do not subscribe to the view held by some that the 2 C limit is impossible to achieve and that it should be weakened or dropped altogether,” the authors of the report from the Deep Decarbonization Pathways Project (DDPP) wrote. Since the start of the industrial revolution two hundred years ago, the Earth’s atmosphere has seen a dramatic spike in carbon dioxide released by burning coal, oil and methane. As the gases trap solar radiation, the planet has already warmed about a degree over the last century, and **scientists say the effects are already being felt and can be seen in melting glaciers, rising sea levels and droughts — problems which are forecast to become far worse if nothing is done to reduce carbon output**.

### A2 Not Real

Only 0.01% of scientists think warming is not real- 99.99% of scientists are on my side.

Jogalekar 14 Ashutosh “About that consensus on global warming: The Curious Wavefunction, Scientific American Blog Network” Scientific American Global January 10th 2014 from <http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/the-curious-wavefunction/2014/01/10/about-that-consensus-on-global-warming-9136-agree-one-disagrees/>

**It’s worth noting how many authors agree with the basic fact of global warming – more than nine thousand. And that’s just in a single year**. Now I understand as well as anyone else that consensus does not imply truth but I find it odd how there aren’t even a handful of scientists who deny global warming presumably because the global warming mafia threatens to throttle them if they do. **It’s not like we are seeing a 70-30% split, or even a 90-10% split. No, the split is more like 99.99-0.01%.** Isn’t it remarkable that **among the legions of scientists working around the world**, many with tenured positions, secure reputations and largely nothing to lose, **not even a hundred out of ten thousand come forward to deny the phenomenon in the scientific literature**? **Should it be that hard for them to publish papers if the evidence is really good enough**? Even detractors of the peer review system would disagree that the system is that broken; after all, studies challenging consensus are quite common in other disciplines. So are contrarian climate scientists around the world so utterly terrified of their colleagues and world opinion that they would not dare to hazard a contrarian explanation at all, especially if it were based on sound science? The belief stretches your imagination to new lengths.

### A2 CO2 Ag

Benefits are short-term – can’t act as a sufficient negative feedback and warming kills other resources needed to sustain agriculture.

Mann 4 Michael E, PHD in Geology and Geophysics from Yale, member of the Penn State University faculty, holding joint positions in the Departments of Meteorology and Geosciences, and the Earth and Environmental Systems Institute (EESI). He is also director of the Penn State Earth System Science Center (ESSC), "CO2 Fertilization," <http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2004/11/co_2-fertilization/>

**It has** sometimes **been argued** that the **earth’s biosphere** (in large part, the terrestrial biosphere) may **have the capacity to sequestor** much of the increased carbon dioxide (**CO2**) in the atmosphere associated with human fossil fuel burning. **This** effect **is known as “CO2 fertilization**” because, in the envisioned scenario, higher ambient CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere literally “fertilize” plant growth. Because plants in turn, in the process of photosynthesis, convert CO2 into oxygen, it is thus sometimes argued that such “co2 fertilization” could potentially provide a strong negative feedback on changing CO2 concentrations. **Recent experiments and model calculations**, however, **suggest** that **this is unlikely** to be the case. A set of controlled experiments known as FACE (“Free Air CO2 Enrichment”) **experiments have been performed in which ambient CO2 levels are elevated in forest stands and changes in various measures of productivity are made over several years**. Experiments of this sort that have been done at Duke Forest indicate (in agreement with models), that **any** elevation of **productivity is likely to be short-lived and is unlikely to significantly offset any gradual, long-term increases in co2 due to human activity. This is due in part to the fact that other conditions** (e.g. availability of nutrients such as Nitrogen and Phosphorus) **appear to quickly become limiting, even when carbon availability is removed as a constraint on plant growth when ambient CO2 concentrations are sufficiently increased**. A few simple calculations indicate that any hypothesized co2 fertilization response is unlikely to offset a significant fraction of projected increases in atmospheric co2 concentration over the next century. At present, **about 600 billion tons of carbon are tied up in the above-ground vegetation. About 2-3 times this much is tied up in roots and below ground carbon, which is a more difficult carbon pool to augment. By comparison, scenarios for fossil fuel emissions for the 21st century range** from about 600 billion tons (if we can keep total global emissions at current levels) **to over 2500 billion tons** if the world increases its reliance on combustion of coal as economic growth and population increase dramatically. **These numbers** clearly **indicate** that **sequestering** a significant fraction of projected emissions in vegetation **is likely to be very difficult**, especially as forests are cleared to make way for agriculture and communities. While there are possibilities of storage in wells and deep in the ocean, **stabilizing the atmospheric CO2 concentration would require gathering up the equivalent of 1 to 2 times the world’s existing above ground vegetation and putting it down abandoned oil wells or deep in the ocean**. While CO2 fertilization could help to increase above ground vegetation a bit, storing more than a few tens of percent of the existing carbon would be quite surprising, and this is likely to be more like a few percent of global carbon emissions projected for the 21st century.

CO2 is net worse for food.

Gillis 11 Justin Gillis June 4, 2011 is an assistant business editor at The New York Times, in charge of the paper's coverage of food, agriculture and energy. He joined the Times last year after a dozen years as an editor and reporter at The Washington Post, and before that, a dozen years at The Miami Herald. A Warming Planet Struggles to Feed Itself <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/05/science/earth/05harvest.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1>

Now, **the latest scientific research suggests that a** previously discounted **factor is helping to destabilize the food system:** [climate change](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier)**. Many** of the **failed harvests of the past decade were a consequence of weather disasters**, like floods in the United States, drought in Australia and blistering heat waves in Europe and Russia. **Scientists believe some**, though not all, of those **events were caused or worsened by human-induced global warming. Temperatures are rising rapidly during the growing season in some of the most important agricultural countries**, and a paper published several weeks ago found that this had shaved several percentage points off potential yields, adding to the price gyrations. For nearly two decades, **scientists had predicted that climate change would be relatively manageable for agriculture,** suggesting that even under worst-case assumptions, it would probably take until 2080 for [**food prices**](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/food_prices/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) to double. In part, **they** **were counting on** a counterintuitive ace in the hole: that **rising carbon dioxide levels**, the primary contributor to global warming, **would act as a powerful plant fertilizer and offset many of the ill effects of climate change**. Until a few years ago, these assumptions went largely unchallenged. But lately, **the destabilization of the food system and the soaring prices have rattled many leading scientists**. “The success of agriculture has been astounding,” said [Cynthia Rosenzweig](http://www.giss.nasa.gov/staff/crosenzweig.html), a researcher at NASA who helped pioneer the study of climate change and agriculture. “But I think **there’s starting to be premonitions that it may not continue forever**.” A scramble is on to figure out whether climate science has been too sanguine about the risks. **Some researchers**, analyzing computer forecasts that are used to advise governments on future crop prospects, are **point**ing **out** what they consider to be **gaping holes. These include a failure to consider the effects of extreme weather**, like the floods and the heat waves that are increasing as the earth warms. A rising unease about the future of the world’s food supply came through during interviews this year with more than 50 agricultural experts working in nine countries. These experts say **that in coming decades, farmers need to withstand whatever climate shocks come their way while roughly doubling the amount of food they produce to meet rising demand. And they need to do it while reducing the considerable environmental damage caused by the business of agriculture.**

### A2 Ice Age

Alt causes to ice age.

World Net Daily, ’07 (World Net Daily, September 29, 2007, “Study finds CO2 didn't end ice age.”,

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\_ID=57895)//CC

A new peer-reviewed scientific study counters a major premise of global warming theory, concluding carbon dioxide did not end the last ice ageThe study, led by University of Southern California geologist Lowell Stott, concluded deep-sea temperatures rose 1,300 years before the rise in atmospheric CO2, which would rule out the greenhouse gas as the main agent of the meltdown. "There has been this continual reference to the correspondence between CO2 and climate change as reflected in ice core records as justification for the role of CO2 in climate change," said Stott. "You can no longer argue that CO2 alone caused the end of the ice ages."Another new study published in Science refutes the "Hockey Stick" temperature graph, used by man-made global warming theorists such as former Vice President Al Gore to argue for a recent spike in average global temperature after centuries of relative stability. Stott's new study suggests the rise in greenhouse gas likely was a result of warming. It may have accelerated the meltdown, he says, but was not its main cause. He cautioned that the study does not discount the role of CO2.

Even the worst ice age won’t cause extinction—technology solves.

Jaworowski 4 Zbigniew (Chairman of the Scientific Council of the Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection in Warsaw) “Solar Cycles, Not CO2, Determine Climate” http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202004/Winter2003-4/global\_warming.pdf

However **lets assume** that Budyko has been right and **that everything, to the very ocean bottom, will be frozen. Will mankind survive this?** I **think yes, it would**. The present technology of **nuclear power**, based on the nuclear fission of uranium and thorium, **would secure heat and electricity supplies for 5 billion people for about 10,000 years**. At the same time, the **stock of hydrogen in the ocean for future fusion-based reactors would suffice for 6 billion years. Our cities, industrial plants, food-producing greenhouses, our livestock, and also zoos and botanical gardens turned into greenhouses, could be heated virtually forever, and we could survive, together with many other organisms, on a planet that had turned into a gigantic glacier.** I think, however, that **such a "passive" solution would not fit the genius of our future descendants, and they would learn how to restore a warm climate** for ourselves and for everything that lives on Earth.

Ice age won’t happen.

IBTimes 12 IBTIMES, an international business news corporation, January 9th 2012“Next Ice Age in 1,500 years prevented by carbon dioxide emissions.” http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/279016/20120109/next-ice-age-years-carbon-emissions.htm

**The next ice age, due in the next 1,500 years, won't arrive** because of high levels of carbon dioxide greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, scientists reported Monday. **Researchers already discovered evidence of at least five Ice Ages on Earth and** around 3,500, the world will be due for another round of chilling and frozen wastelands. However, because of greenhouse gases that already exist in the atmosphere, **another Ice Age likely won't happen.** The research appeared in the Monday edition of the journal Nature Geoscience. "**At current levels of CO2, even if emissions stopped now we'd** probably **have a long interglacial duration** determined by whatever long-term processes could kick in and bring [atmospheric] CO2 down," Luke Skinner, lead author and professor at Cambridge University told BBC News. The study also included researchers from University College London, Bergen University in Norway and the University of Florida. The study concluded that **for an Ice Age to occur, concentrations of carbon dioxide would have to fall to 240 parts per million** - a 40 percent reduction of the 390 ppm in the current atmosphere.

### A2 Idso

Idso is paid by right-wing hacks and his PhD is a sham.

Davies 14Kert, Director of the Climate Investigations Center, former Research Director at Greenpeace, former Science Policy Director at Ozone Action and researcher at the Environmental Working Group, holds degrees in Environmental Studies from Hampshire College and the University of Montana, “Heartland Institute NIPCC Climate Denier Craig Idso: “Climate Change Is Good For You”,” April 8th 2014 http://www.desmogblog.com/2014/04/08/heartland-institute-nipcc-craig-idso-climate-change-good-you

Heartland Institute on the other hand, in its NIPCC “Climate Change Reconsidered II: the Biological Impacts” document, will say that climate change is good for the world, will have a net benefit for both plants and human health. This is the latest line run by right wing think tanks like Heartland, the coal industry’s ACCCE coalition, Peabody Coal, the American Legislative Exchange Council, and echoed across the blogosphere by climate deniers. This set of messaging and all 'reports' to back this line, all appear to be coming from one organization, the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and specifically from its chairman and former president, Craig Idso, one of the NIPCC’s lead authors, who has been arguing the same “C02 is beneficial” line for nearly 20 years, along with his father, Sherwood Idso. Background Craig Idso, his father Sherwood B. Idso, and brother Keith Idso, founded Arizona-based organization in 1998. The Center's claimed mission is to “separate reality from rhetoric in the emotionally-charged debate that swirls around the subject of carbon dioxide and global change.” Its main publication is CO2 Science, a weekly magazine that features articles questioning the science verifying man-made climate change and its impacts. In 2012, **leaked documents from the Heartland Institute revealed that they were paying** Craig **Idso $11,600 a month** for his NIPCC work. We do not know how much Idso has been paid since that time, or prior. The organization’s total funding peaked in 2009 at $1.5 million a year. Funders have included ExxonMobil (total, $100,000 since 1998), Donors Trust, Sarah Scaife Foundation and a number of other right wing funders. See Conservative Transparency for a recent (but not full) breakdown. The Center's IRS 990’s are here at Citizen Audit. Publications produced by Craig Idso, with members of C02Science,org: In 2011 he and Sherwood wrote a book entitled “The Many Benefits of Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment”. Idso has produced a series of video documentaries espousing his theory of C02’s beneficial effect on plant life. Keith and Sherwood Idso wrote a paper in 1992 about how C02 benefits plant life, referenced in the NIPCC’s Summary for Policymakers. After founding the organisation, Idso got his PhD in geography at Arizona State University under the tutelage of one of the very early climate deniers employed by the fossil fuel industry, Robert C Balling Jr. More resources at DeSmogBlog: Craig Idso; Sherwood Idso Idso, the Greening Earth Society and the Western Fuels Association Robert Balling, Idso's mentor, was one of the leading scientists paid by the Greening Earth Society, the climate science-denying front group created by the Western Fuels Association, one of the first and earliest coal industry groups funding the denial of climate change. But the coal industry's line was not 'climate denial' but 'climate change is good for you'. The Western Fuels Association is a cooperative of utilities and power companies supplying coal from the Powder River Basin in the western U.S.

### A2 Warming Slow

Warming is fast.

Griffiths 13 [Sarah, Science and Tech Reporter for Mail Online, citing Stanford climatology studies, “Global warming is happening is '10 times faster than at any time in the Earth's history', climate experts claim,” http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2383472/Global-warming-happening-10-times-faster-time-Earths-history-climate-experts-claim.html]

American scientists claim the planet is undergoing one of the largest changes in climate in the past 65 million years. Climatologists at Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment have warned the likely rate of change over the next century will be at least 10 times quicker than any climate shift since the dinosaurs. became extinct. If the trend continues at its current rapid pace, it will place significant stress on terrestrial ecosystems around the world, and many species will need to make behavioral, evolutionary or geographic adaptations to survive, they said. The findings come from a review of climate research by Earth system science expert Noah Diffenbaugh and Chris Field, a professor of environmental Earth system science and the director of the Department of Global Ecology at the Institution. The work is part of a special report on climate change in the current issue of Science. However, the research is part of a much bigger picture and other scientists have recently claimed that global warming has 'paused' for the time being. The professors in this latest study reviewed scientific literature on aspects of climate change that can affect ecosystems, and investigated how recent observations and projections for the next century compare to past events in Earth's history. For instance, the planet experienced a sharp rise in temperature by 5 degree Celsius 20,000 years ago, as Earth emerged from the last ice age. This is a change comparable to the high-end of the projections for warming over the 20th and 21st centuries, according to the reserachers. The geologic record shows that, 20,000 years ago, as the ice sheet that covered much of North America receded northward, plants and animals recolonised areas that had been under ice. As the climate continued to warm, those plants and animals moved northward, to cooler climes. Professor Diffenbaugh said: 'We know from past changes that ecosystems have responded to a few degrees of global temperature change over thousands of years. 'But the unprecedented trajectory that we're on now is forcing that change to occur over decades. 'That's orders of magnitude faster, and we're already seeing that some species are challenged by that rate of change.' Some of the strongest evidence for how the global climate system responds to high levels of carbon dioxide comes from paleoclimate studies. 55 million years ago, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere was elevated to a level comparable to today, the scientists said. The Arctic Ocean did not have ice in the summer and nearby land was warm enough to support alligators and palm trees. 'There are two key differences for ecosystems in the coming decades compared with the geologic past,' Professor Diffenbaugh said. 'One is the rapid pace of modern climate change. 'The other is that today there are multiple human stressors that were not present 55 million years ago, such as urbanisation and air and water pollution.' The professors also examined results from two-dozen climate models to describe possible climate outcomes from present day to the end of the century. In general, extreme weather events, such as heat waves and heavy rainfall, are expected to become more severe and more frequent. For example, the researchers said that, with continued emissions of greenhouse gases at the high end of the scenarios, annual temperatures over North America, Europe and East Asia will increase by two to four degrees Celsius between 2046 and 2065.

### A2 SO2 Screw

T-Large amounts of SO2 causes extinction.

Ward 9 Peter Ward, Ph.D. from Colombia University and natural scientist for more than 40 years, 02/11/2009, tetontectonics.org, http://www.tetontectonics.org/Climate/Ward2009SulfurDioxide.pdf

Most paleontologists conclude that mass extinctions are not instantaneous; they tend to occur over at least thousands of years. While a meteorite may have complicated the extinction around 65.5 Ma, it is now clear that radiation did not kill the dinosaurs and that large percentages of animals could have survived a large impact by sheltering. **Mass extinctions typically involve runaway greenhouse warming, major changes of acidity of air and water**, dramatic increases in light carbon isotopes, and anoxia over hundreds to tens of thousands of years. Given that **massive increases in SO2 appear to have caused mass extinctions in the past and that there has been a signiﬁcant increase in SO2 gases since 1925, we should not be too surprised to discover that we are currently in the midst of a major mass extinction**. In 2005, more than 1360 scientists under the auspices of the United Nations, completed the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. This was followed by the Global Biodiversity Outlook 2 under the Convention on Biological Diversity, a legally binding global treaty created in 1992 with nearly universal participation of countries. Among their conclusions are: 1. “15 out of 24 ecosystem services are in decline including the ability to provide fresh water and the ability of the atmosphere to cleanse itself of pollutants.” 2. “Trends among 3000 wild populations of species show a consistent decline in average species abundance of about 40% between 1970 and 2000.” 3. “Between 12% and 52% of species within well-studied higher taxa are threatened with extinction.” 4. “The global demand for resources exceeds the biological capacity of the Earth to renew these resources by some 20%.” 5. “Humans are currently responsible for the sixth major extinction event in the history of the earth, and the greatest since the dinosaurs disappeared, 65 million years ago.”

Sulfate models are uncertain and susceptible to author manipulation.

Smith et al. 11 (S. J., Joint Global Change Research Institute, Paciﬁc Northwest National Laboratory, “Anthropogenic sulfur dioxide emissions: 1850–2005.”)

The uncertainty methodology used here uses a relatively simple procedure whereby conﬁdence intervals, based largely on¶ the authors’ judgment, but also informed by analysis of inventory differences, are applied to broad emissions sectors¶ and regions. The relatively small resulting global uncertainty¶ that results indicates that a more complex global uncertainty¶ analysis may not be warranted. Regional uncertainty can be¶ far higher than global uncertainty, however, and more detailed analysis of high-emitting regions, and the countries of¶ the Former Soviet Union in particular, may be useful to better bound current and past environmental impacts of sulfur¶ dioxide emissions.¶ Because the simple methodology used here does not incorporate correlations between uncertainty assumptions in¶ different regions and sectors (parameters that can be difﬁcult to estimate in any event), a systemic uncertainty component was added. Systematic errors and biases are difﬁcult¶ to quantify, but are particularly important for emissions such¶ as sulfur dioxide, where most input values are only weakly¶ correlated between regions, which results in relatively small¶ global uncertainties as random errors tend to statistically cancel across regions.¶ When comparing data sets, it should be noted that most¶ of these estimates rely on similar, if not identical, data sets¶ for historical fossil fuel use and for historical emissions from¶ Europe and the United States. Errors or biases in these data,¶ such as the apparent underestimate of SO2 emissions from¶ petroleum products in the United States prior to 1980, are¶ likely to be common to most of these estimates.¶ As shown by an analysis of inventory values from the¶ USA (§S.14), however, signiﬁcant changes can occur over¶ time in national inventory values. Substantial changes have¶ also occurred for inventory estimates for Europe (e.g., see¶ Konovalov et al., 2008 for NOx emissions). Analysis of the¶ sources of such changes would be valuable for both improving both inventory methodologies and uncertainty estimates.

# Ks

## Role of the Ballot

### Policymaking

#### Prefer policymaking focus- individual action makes oppression more likely in the status quo political system.

Stephanopoulos 15 Nicholas (assistant professor at the University of Chicago Law School) “The False Promise of Black Political Representation” The Atlantic June 11th 2015 <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/06/black-political-representation-power/395594/> JW

One answer is that the appearance of black political clout is deceiving. Despite their gains in participation and representation, blacks continue to fare worse than whites in converting their policy preferences into law. This poor performance is more revealing than statistics on turnout or black electoral success. And even though its causes remain mysterious, it is very much a rationale for frustration with the status quo. In a recent study, I analyzed group political power at the federal and state levels. At the federal level, I relied on a remarkable database compiled by Princeton political scientist Martin Gilens. It includes responses to thousands of survey questions from the last few decades. Crucially, it also tracks whether each policy referred to by a question was adopted by the federal government over the next four years. At the state level, I measured people’s ideologies using exit polls that asked whether they are liberal, moderate, or conservative. And I assessed state laws using an index of overall policy liberalism created by another pair of scholars. At both levels, I found that blacks hold much less sway than whites. For example, a federal policy with no white support has only a 10 percent chance of being enacted, while one with universal white support has a 60 percent shot of adoption. But while a proposal with no black support has a 40 percent chance of becoming law, one enjoying unanimous approval has only a 30 percent probability of enactment. In other words, as support for a policy rises within the black community, the odds of it being achieved actually decline. Likewise, whether most black voters are conservative or liberal, state legislative outcomes barely budge. But vary the views of white voters to an equivalent degree, and a state’s policies go from looking like Alabama’s to resembling Michigan’s, even controlling for black and white population size. The story is similar for several other groups. The more that women, the poor, or Hispanics support a federal policy, the less likely the policy is to be enacted. Strikingly, as women move from universal opposition to a proposal to universal support, its odds of adoption plummet from 75 percent to 10 percent. Changes in the ideology of female or poor voters also have no effect on state legislative outcomes (although shifts in the views of Hispanic voters do). In contrast, both federal and state laws are acutely sensitive to the preferences of whites, men, and the rich. These results help explain the rage that has recently coursed through America’s cities. If blacks seem not to be satisfied with (mostly) uninhibited access to the polls and (close to) proportional representation, this is because they should not be content with these achievements. What really matters in a democracy is getting policies enacted that correspond to people’s views. And on this front, blacks still have a long way to go. Their opinions—on vital issues like crime, welfare, and housing—are too often ignored by elected officials when they conflict with whites’ preferences. This grim reality is well worth getting upset about. More broadly, the results also highlight other distortions of the political process. Unsurprisingly, in this era of skyrocketing inequality and campaign-finance deregulation, policymakers pay closer attention to the views of the rich than to those of the poor (or of the middle class). More unexpectedly, women are largely ineffectual politically despite their large numbers, high turnout rates, and substantial representation. None of these assets provides them with what a healthy democracy should: laws as reflective of their preferences as of those of men. And Hispanics seem to hold an intermediate position, neither as weak as blacks nor as influential as whites. So how might the promise of American pluralism be fulfilled—so that public policy is about equally responsive to each group’s views? Unfortunately, this is where we reach the limits of current academic knowledge. We can now quantify the power wielded by different groups. But neither my work, nor anyone else’s, has determined what the causes of group influence might be, let alone how disparities in clout can be corrected. Still, even in the absence of hard data, it is possible to speculate. In particular, three drivers of group power come readily to mind: participation, resources, and ideology. Perhaps groups whose members engage more actively in politics—by voting but also by attending meetings, contacting representatives, volunteering for campaigns, and so on—have more sway over policy outcomes. Or maybe wealthy groups have more influence. If money is the mother’s milk of politics, as Jesse Unruh once said, it is the affluent who control more of this vital resource. And ideology may matter too. Extreme groups may have trouble making deals and forming alliances as effectively as moderate ones. These hypotheses point to an agenda of sorts for those who are troubled by the power imbalances of modern American politics. Automatic voter registration and other electoral reforms might broaden political participation. Reducing income inequality, and introducing public financing or more vigorous campaign-finance regulation, could lessen the impact of money on politics. And groups could try aiming for tactical moderation even as they keep fighting to achieve their ideological goals. Ultimately, it is unclear if these policies would eliminate the power differentials that my study identified. But they would likely help. The first step, though, is simply recognizing the hurdles facing many groups as they struggle to translate their views into law.

Critique is useless without a concrete policy option that solves for your harms.

Bryant 12 Levi Bryant (Professor of Philosophy at Collin College) “A Critique of the Academic Left” 2012 <https://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/underpants-gnomes-a-critique-of-the-academic-left/> JW

Unfortunately, the academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It’s good at carrying out critiques that denounce various social formations, yet very poor at proposing any sort of realistic constructions of alternatives. This because it thinks abstractly in its own way, ignor[es]ing how networks, assemblages, structures, or regimes of attraction would have to be remade to create a workable alternative. Here I’m reminded by the “underpants gnomes” depicted in South Park: The underpants gnomes have a plan for achieving profit that goes like this: Phase 1: Collect Underpants Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Profit! They even have a catchy song to go with their work: Well this is sadly how it often is with the academic left. Our plan seems to be as follows: Phase 1: Ultra-Radical Critique Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Revolution and complete social transformation! Our problem is that we seem perpetually stuck at phase 1 without ever explaining what is to be done at phase 2. Often the critiques articulated at phase 1 are right, but there are nonetheless all sorts of problems with those critiques nonetheless. In order to reach phase 3, we have to produce new collectives. In order for new collectives to be produced, people need to be able to hear and understand the critiques developed at phase 1. Yet this is where everything begins to fall apart. Even though these critiques are often right, we express [critiques] them in ways that only an academic with a PhD in critical theory and post-structural theory can understand. How exactly is Adorno to produce an effect in the world if only PhD’s in the humanities can understand him? Who are these things for? We seem to always ignore these things and then look down our noses with disdain at the Naomi Kleins and David Graebers of the world. To make matters worse, we publish our work in expensive academic journals that only universities can afford, with presses that don’t have a wide distribution, and give our talks at expensive hotels at academic conferences attended only by other academics. Again, who are these things for? Is it an accident that so many activists look away from these things with contempt, thinking their more about an academic industry and tenure, than producing change in the world? If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, it doesn’t make a sound! Seriously dudes and dudettes, what are you doing? But finally, and worst of all, us Marxists and anarchists all too often act like assholes. We denounce others, we condemn them, we berate them for not engaging with the questions we want to engage with, and we vilify them when they don’t embrace every bit of the doxa that we endorse. We are every bit as off-putting and unpleasant as the fundamentalist minister or the priest of the inquisition (have people yet understood that Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus was a critique of the French communist party system and the Stalinist party system, and the horrific passions that arise out of parties and identifications in general?). This type of “revolutionary” is the greatest friend of the reactionary and capitalist because they do more to drive people into the embrace of reigning ideology than to undermine reigning ideology. These are the people that keep Rush Limbaugh in business. Well done! But this isn’t where our most serious shortcomings lie. Our most serious shortcomings are to be found at phase 2. We almost never make concrete proposals for how things ought to be restructured, for what new material infrastructures and semiotic fields need to be produced, and when we do, our critique-intoxicated cynics and skeptics immediately jump in with an analysis of all the ways in which these things contain dirty secrets, ugly motives, and are doomed to fail. How, I wonder, are we to do anything at all when we have no concrete proposals? We live on a planet of 6 billion people. These 6 billion people are dependent on a certain network of production and distribution to meet the needs of their consumption. That network of production and distribution does involve the extraction of resources, the production of food, the maintenance of paths of transit and communication, the disposal of waste, the building of shelters, the distribution of medicines, etc., etc., etc.

#### The state is inevitable- speaking the language of power through policymaking is the only way to create social change in debate.

Coverstone 5 Alan Coverstone (masters in communication from Wake Forest, longtime debate coach) “Acting on Activism: Realizing the Vision of Debate with Pro-social Impact” Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Conference November 17th 2005 JW 11/18/15

An important concern emerges when Mitchell describes reflexive fiat as a contest strategy capable of “eschewing the power to directly control external actors” (1998b, p. 20). Describing debates about what our government should do as attempts to control outside actors is debilitating and disempowering. Control of the US government is exactly what an active, participatory citizenry is supposed to be all about. After all, if democracy means anything, it means that citizens not only have the right, they also bear the obligation to discuss and debate what the government should be doing. Absent that discussion and debate, much of the motivation for personal political activism is also lost. Those who have co-opted Mitchell’s argument for individual advocacy often quickly respond that nothing we do in a debate round can actually change government policy, and unfortunately, an entire generation of debaters has now swallowed this assertion as an article of faith. The best most will muster is, “Of course not, but you don’t either!” The assertion that nothing we do in debate has any impact on government policy is one that carries the potential to undermine Mitchell’s entire project. If there is nothing we can do in a debate round to change government policy, then we are left with precious little in the way of pro-social options for addressing problems we face. At best, we can pursue some Pilot-like hand washing that can purify us as individuals through quixotic activism but offer little to society as a whole. It is very important to note that Mitchell (1998b) tries carefully to limit and bound his notion of reflexive fiat by maintaining that because it “views fiat as a concrete course of action, it is bounded by the limits of pragmatism” (p. 20). Pursued properly, the debates that Mitchell would like to see are those in which the relative efficacy of concrete political strategies for pro-social change is debated. In a few noteworthy examples, this approach has been employed successfully, and I must say that I have thoroughly enjoyed judging and coaching those debates. The students in my program have learned to stretch their understanding of their role in the political process because of the experience. Therefore, those who say I am opposed to Mitchell’s goals here should take care at such a blanket assertion. However, contest debate teaches students to combine personal experience with the language of political power. Powerful personal narratives unconnected to political power are regularly co-opted by those who do learn the language of power. One need look no further than the annual state of the Union Address where personal story after personal story is used to support the political agenda of those in power. The so-called role-playing that public policy contest debates encourage promotes active learning of the vocabulary and levers of power in America. Imagining the ability to use our own arguments to influence government action is one of the great virtues of academic debate. Gerald Graff (2003) analyzed the decline of argumentation in academic discourse and found a source of student antipathy to public argument in an interesting place. I’m up against…their aversion to the role of public spokesperson that formal writing presupposes. It’s as if such students can’t imagine any rewards for being a public actor or even imagining themselves in such a role. This lack of interest in the public sphere may in turn reflect a loss of confidence in the possibility that the arguments we make in public will have an effect on the world. Today’s students’ lack of faith in the power of persuasion reflects the waning of the ideal of civic participation that led educators for centuries to place rhetorical and argumentative training at the center of the school and college curriculum. (Graff, 2003, p. 57) The power to imagine public advocacy that actually makes a difference is one of the great virtues of the traditional notion of fiat that critics deride as mere simulation. Simulation of success in the public realm is far more empowering to students than completely abandoning all notions of personal power in the face of governmental hegemony by teaching students that “nothing they can do in a contest debate can ever make any difference in public policy.” Contest debating is well suited to rewarding public activism if it stops accepting as an article of faith that personal agency is somehow undermined by the so-called role playing in debate. Debate is role-playing whether we imagine government action or imagine individual action. Imagining myself starting a socialist revolution in America is no less of a fantasy than imagining myself making a difference on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, both fantasies influenced my personal and political development virtually ensuring a life of active, pro-social, political participation. Neither fantasy reduced the likelihood that I would spend my life trying to make the difference I imagined. One fantasy actually does make a greater difference: the one that speaks the language of political power. The other fantasy disables action by making one a laughingstock to those who wield the language of power. Fantasy motivates and role-playing trains through visualization. Until we can imagine it, we cannot really do it. Role-playing without question teaches students to be comfortable with the language of power, and that language paves the way for genuine and effective political activism. Debates over the relative efficacy of political strategies for pro-social change must confront governmental power at some point. There is a fallacy in arguing that movements represent a better political strategy than voting and person-to-person advocacy. Sure, a full-scale movement would be better than the limited voice I have as a participating citizen going from door to door in a campaign, but so would full-scale government action. Unfortunately, the gap between my individual decision to pursue movement politics and the emergence of a full-scale movement is at least as great as the gap between my vote and democratic change. They both represent utopian fiat. Invocation of Mitchell to support utopian movement fiat is simply not supported by his work, and too often, such invocation discourages the concrete actions he argues for in favor of the personal rejectionism that under girds the political cynicism that is a fundamental cause of voter and participatory abstention in America today.

#### Critical movements must be strategically oriented legalistic demands against the state to promote real change.

Zizek 07 Slavoj “Resistance is Surrender” London Review of Books November 15th 2007 <http://www.lacan.com/zizsurcrit.htm> JW

One of the clearest lessons of the last few decades is that capitalism is indestructible. Marx compared it to a vampire, and one of the salient points of comparison now appears to be that vampires always rise up again after being stabbed to death. Even Mao's attempt, in the Cultural Revolution, to wipe out the traces of capitalism, ended up in its triumphant return. Today's Left reacts in a wide variety of ways to the hegemony of global capitalism and its political supplement, liberal democracy. It might, for example, accept the hegemony, but continue to fight for reform within its rules (this is Third Way social democracy). Or, it accepts that the hegemony is here to stay, but should nonetheless be resisted from its 'interstices'. Or, it accepts the futility of all struggle, since the hegemony is so all-encompassing that nothing can really be done except wait for an outburst of 'divine violence' - a revolutionary version of Heidegger's 'only God can save us.' Or, it recognises the temporary futility of the struggle. In today's triumph of global capitalism, the argument goes, true resistance is not possible, so all we can do till the revolutionary spirit of the global working class is renewed is defend what remains of the welfare state, confronting those in power with demands we know they cannot fulfil, and otherwise withdraw into cultural studies, where one can quietly pursue the work of criticism. Or, it emphasises the fact that the problem is a more fundamental one, that global capitalism is ultimately an effect of the underlying principles of technology or 'instrumental reason'. Or, it posits that one can undermine global capitalism and state power, not by directly attacking them, but by refocusing the field of struggle on everyday practices, where one can 'build a new world'; in this way, the foundations of the power of capital and the state will be gradually undermined, and, at some point, the state will collapse (the exemplar of this approach is the Zapatista movement). Or, it takes the 'postmodern' route, shifting the accent from anti-capitalist struggle to the multiple forms of politico-ideological struggle for hegemony, emphasising the importance of discursive re-articulation. Or, it wagers that one can repeat at the postmodern level the classical Marxist gesture of enacting the 'determinate negation' of capitalism: with today's rise of 'cognitive work', the contradiction between social production and capitalist relations has become starker than ever, rendering possible for the first time 'absolute democracy' (this would be Hardt and Negri's position). These positions are not presented as a way of avoiding some 'true' radical Left politics - what they are trying to get around is, indeed, the lack of such a position. This defeat of the Left is not the whole story of the last thirty years, however. There is another, no less surprising, lesson to be learned from the Chinese Communists' presiding over arguably the most explosive development of capitalism in history, and from the growth of West European Third Way social democracy. It is, in short: we can do it better. In the UK, the Thatcher revolution was, at the time, chaotic and impulsive, marked by unpredictable contingencies. It was Tony Blair who was able to institutionalise it, or, in Hegel's terms, to raise (what first appeared as) a contingency, a historical accident, into a necessity. Thatcher wasn't a Thatcherite, she was merely herself; it was Blair (more than Major) who truly gave form to Thatcherism. The response of some critics on the postmodern Left to this predicament is to call for a new politics of resistance. Those who still insist on fighting state power, let alone seizing it, are accused of remaining stuck within the 'old paradigm': the task today, their critics say, is to resist state power by withdrawing from its terrain and creating new spaces outside its control. This is, of course, the obverse of accepting the triumph of capitalism. The politics of resistance is nothing but the moralising supplement to a Third Way Left. Simon Critchley's recent book, Infinitely Demanding, is an almost perfect embodiment of this position. For Critchley, the liberal-democratic state is here to stay. Attempts to abolish the state failed miserably; consequently, the new politics has to be located at a distance from it: anti-war movements, ecological organisations, groups protesting against racist or sexist abuses, and other forms of local self-organisation. It must be a politics of resistance to the state, of bombarding the state with impossible demands, of denouncing the limitations of state mechanisms. The main argument for conducting the politics of resistance at a distance from the state hinges on the ethical dimension of the 'infinitely demanding' call for justice: no state can heed this call, since its ultimate goal is the 'real-political' one of ensuring its own reproduction (its economic growth, public safety, etc). 'Of course,' Critchley writes, history is habitually written by the people with the guns and sticks and one cannot expect to defeat them with mocking satire and feather dusters. Yet, as the history of ultra-leftist active nihilism eloquently shows, one is lost the moment one picks up the guns and sticks. Anarchic political resistance should not seek to mimic and mirror the archic violent sovereignty it opposes. So what should, say, the US Democrats do? Stop competing for state power and withdraw to the interstices of the state, leaving state power to the Republicans and start a campaign of anarchic resistance to it? And what would Critchley do if he were facing an adversary like Hitler? Surely in such a case one should 'mimic and mirror the archic violent sovereignty' one opposes? Shouldn't the Left draw a distinction between the circumstances in which one would resort to violence in confronting the state, and those in which all one can and should do is use 'mocking satire and feather dusters'? The ambiguity of Critchley's position resides in a strange non sequitur: if the state is here to stay, if it is impossible to abolish it (or capitalism), why retreat from it? Why not act with(in) the state? Why not accept the basic premise of the Third Way? Why limit oneself to a politics which, as Critchley puts it, 'calls the state into question and calls the established order to account, not in order to do away with the state, desirable though that might well be in some utopian sense, but in order to better it or attenuate its malicious effect'? These words simply demonstrate that today's liberal-democratic state and the dream of an 'infinitely demanding' anarchic politics exist in a relationship of mutual parasitism: anarchic agents do the ethical thinking, and the state does the work of running and regulating society. Critchley's anarchic ethico-political agent acts like a superego, comfortably bombarding the state with demands; and the more the state tries to satisfy these demands, the more guilty it is seen to be. In compliance with this logic, the anarchic agents focus their protest not on open dictatorships, but on the hypocrisy of liberal democracies, who are accused of betraying their own professed principles. The big demonstrations in London and Washington against the US attack on Iraq a few years ago offer an exemplary case of this strange symbiotic relationship between power and resistance. Their paradoxical outcome was that both sides were satisfied. The protesters saved their beautiful souls: they made it clear that they don't agree with the government's policy on Iraq. Those in power calmly accepted it, even profited from it: not only did the protests in no way prevent the already-made decision to attack Iraq; they also served to legitimise it. Thus George Bush's reaction to mass demonstrations protesting his visit to London, in effect: 'You see, this is what we are fighting for, so that what people are doing here - protesting against their government policy - will be possible also in Iraq!' It is striking that the course on which Hugo Chávez has embarked since 2006 is the exact opposite of the one chosen by the postmodern Left: far from resisting state power, he grabbed it (first by an attempted coup, then democratically), ruthlessly using the Venezuelan state apparatuses to promote his goals. Furthermore, he is militarising the barrios, and organising the training of armed units there. And, the ultimate scare: now that he is feeling the economic effects of capital's 'resistance' to his rule (temporary shortages of some goods in the state-subsidised supermarkets), he has announced plans to consolidate the 24 parties that support him into a single party. Even some of his allies are sceptical about this move: will it come at the expense of the popular movements that have given the Venezuelan revolution its élan? However, this choice, though risky, should be fully endorsed: the task is to make the new party function not as a typical state socialist (or Peronist) party, but as a vehicle for the mobilisation of new forms of politics (like the grass roots slum committees). What should we say to someone like Chávez? 'No, do not grab state power, just withdraw, leave the state and the current situation in place'? Chávez is often dismissed as a clown - but wouldn't such a withdrawal just reduce him to a version of Subcomandante Marcos, whom many Mexican leftists now refer to as 'Subcomediante Marcos'? Today, it is the great capitalists - Bill Gates, corporate polluters, fox hunters - who 'resist' the state. The lesson here is that the truly subversive thing is not to insist on 'infinite' demands we know those in power cannot fulfil. Since they know that we know it, such an 'infinitely demanding' attitude presents no problem for those in power: 'So wonderful that, with your critical demands, you remind us what kind of world we would all like to live in. Unfortunately, we live in the real world, where we have to make do with what is possible.' The thing to do is, on the contrary, to bombard those in power with strategically well-selected, precise, finite demands, which can't be met with the same excuse.

### Modesty

#### Use modesty to evaluate the role of the ballot debate.

Overing 15 Bob Overing (LD TOC finalist 2012) “Recovering the Role of the Ballot: Evaluative Modesty in Academic Debate” July 31st 2015, presented to the 2015 Alta Argumentation Conference JW

The first major advantage to modesty is that it balances the benefits of policy-based education and critical education derived from continental philosophy, critical race theory, rhetoric, etc. Proponents of both types of education make persuasive arguments for theories and practices that meet their ends (E.g. Strait & Wallace, 2008; Varda & Cook, 2012). Modesty maintains the advantages of both by forcing teams to engage on the assumption that both ROBs matter to the judge’s decision calculus. This prevents teams from talking past each other, which is surprisingly common. For instance, on this year’s college topic, an affirmative could defend legalization of marijuana by presenting the history of violent and racist drug criminalization but simultaneously argue that a disadvantage to legalization based on cartel violence is not germane to their role of the ballot. Or, a policy-based affirmative could argue that the epistemic problems in its representations of the international arena and its call for greater U.S. securitization are irrelevant to whether the plan is a good idea. Both examples of “framing” the debate are a means of hastily excluding discussion, and both are dominant strategies precisely because they enable the complete exclusion of the opposing team’s offense. Ryan Galloway (2007) extols the values of debate as a dialogical conversation, but nothing hampers dialogue more than a confident view of ROBs that allows teams to assert to their opponents, “You must only do X.” I believe that modesty excels at meeting Galloway’s vision for dialogue: Such an approach would have little use for rigid rules of logic or argument, such as stock issues…except to the point where the participants agreed that these were functional approaches. Instead, a dialogic approach encourages evaluations of affirmative cases relative to their performative benefits (p. 3). Indeed, modesty does away with rigid rules for the content of ROBs, embracing what Harrigan (2007) calls “argumentative pluralism” (p. 51-52). While Galloway and Harrigan use these values to motivate defenses of “the resolution as the bright line standard for evaluation” and switch-side debate, respectively, I find modesty a much better compromise. A modest judge can give weight to the effects of a plan while still considering “pre-fiat” problems of representation, ideology, epistemology, and the like. Rather than attempting to fit one set of arguments into another’s toolbox, modesty allows teams to do what they do best without excluding the opposition wholesale.

### A2 Reps Focus

#### Excessive focus on discourse and representations kills the liberal movements you seek to promote by abstracting away from social change.

Chait 15 Jonathan Chait “How the language police are perverting liberalism.” NY Magazine January 275h 2015 <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/01/not-a-very-pc-thing-to-say.html> JW

Or maybe not. The p.c. style of politics has one serious, possibly fatal drawback: It is exhausting. Claims of victimhood that are useful within the left-wing subculture may alienate much of America. The movement’s dour puritanism can move people to outrage, but it may [and] prove ill suited to the hopeful mood required of mass politics. Nor does it bode well for the movement’s longevity that many of its allies are worn out. “It seems to me now that the public face of social liberalism has ceased to seem positive, joyful, human, and freeing,” confessed the progressive writer Freddie deBoer. “There are so many ways to step on a land mine now, so many terms that have become forbidden, so many attitudes that will get you cast out if you even appear to hold them. I’m far from alone in feeling that it’s typically not worth it to engage, given the risks.” Goldberg wrote recently about people “who feel emotionally savaged by their involvement in [online feminism] — not because of sexist trolls, but because of the slashing righteousness of other feminists.” Former Feministing editor Samhita Mukhopadhyay told her, “Everyone is so scared to speak right now.” That the new political correctness has bludgeoned even many of its own supporters into despondent silence is a triumph, but one of limited use. Politics in a democracy is still based on getting people to agree with you, not making them afraid to disagree. The historical record of political movements that sought to expand freedom for the oppressed by eliminating it for their enemies is dismal. The historical record of American liberalism, which has extended social freedoms to blacks, Jews, gays, and women, is glorious. And that glory rests in its confidence in the ultimate power of reason, not coercion, to triumph.

#### Reps first focus is bad-making every piece of discourse a possible voter discourages argumentation about politically contentious issues because the cost of messing up is a loss. This causes less advocacies for marginalized groups because people will shy away from controversy and suggesting new ideas.

#### Weigh the reps of the aff against the K—I’m the only one endorsing a positive action towards disadvantaged groups which is a reason why my discourse is valuable and the permutation is key. This is the most important form of reps because it suggests something good to do in the context of tradeoffs whereas your criticism is hyper-abstract.

## Biopower K (PVP)

1. Uniqueness overwhelms the link- your Nadesan 8 evidence says that the state started having monopoly on violence in the medieval period- we’re too far over the brink to care about the negligible aff impact.

2. No link: your evidence is about the legitimate use of violence- but when people use handguns in the status quo for violent purposes they’re put in jail. The aff doesn’t give more power to the state- the power is already there and legitimized.

3. Permutation, do both: engage in historical analyses but recognize that the state can be selectively good; case is a net benefit.

4. **PERM: Do the plan and the alt. Double Bind: A. If the alternative is strong enough to solve back all other instances of biopower, then the perm do both can solve back the residual link to the plan, or B. the alternative isn’t strong to solve, and their impacts are non-unique.**

#### Biopolitical control is no longer a threat---crisis of the sovereign state has caused violence to be abandoned

Jonathan Short 5, Ph.D. candidate in the Graduate Programme in Social & Political Thought, York University, “Life and Law: Agamben and Foucault on Governmentality and Sovereignty,” Journal for the Arts, Sciences and Technology, Vol. 3, No. 1

Adding to the dangerousness of this logic of control, however, is that while there is a crisis of undecidability in the domain of life, it corresponds to a similar crisis at the level of law and the national state. It should be noted here that despite the new forms of biopolitical control in operation today, Rose believes that bio-politics has become generally less dangerous in recent times than even in the early part of the last century. At that time, bio- politics was linked to the project of the expanding national state in his opinion. In disciplinary-pastoral society, bio-politics involved a process of social selection of those characteristics thought useful to the nationalist project. Hence, according to Rose, "once each life has a value which may be calculated, and some lives have less value than others, such a politics has the obligation to exercise this judgement in the name of the race or the nation" (2001: 3). Disciplinary-pastoral bio- politics sets itself the task of eliminating "differences coded as defects", and in pursuit of this goal the most horrible programs of eugenics, forced sterilization, and outright extermination, were enacted (ibid.: 3). If Rose is more optimistic about bio-politics in 'advanced liberal' societies, it is because this notion of 'national fitness', in terms of bio- political competition among nation-states, has suffered a precipitous decline thanks in large part to a crisis of the perceived unity of the national state as a viable political project (ibid.: 5). To quote Rose once again, "the idea of 'society' as a single, if heterogeneous, domain with a national culture, a national population, a national destiny, co-extensive with a national territory and the powers of a national political government" no longer serves as premises of state policy (ibid.: 5). Drawing on a sequential reading of Foucault's theory of the governmentalization of the state here, Rose claims that the territorial state, the primary institution of enclosure, has become subject to fragmentation along a number of lines. National culture has given way to cultural pluralism; national identity has been overshadowed by a diverse cluster of identifications, many of them transcending the national territory on which they take place, while the same pluralization has affected the once singular conception of community (ibid.: 5). Under these conditions, Rose argues, the bio-political programmes of the molar enclosure known as the nation-state have fallen into disrepute and have been all but abandoned.

#### Gun ownership gives power to the government by fragmenting communities.

Debrabander 12 Firmin Debrabander “The Freedom of an Armed Society” The New York Times December 16th 2012 <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/16/the-freedom-of-an-armed-society/> JW

Gun rights advocates also argue that guns provide the ultimate insurance of our freedom, in so far as they are the final deterrent against encroaching centralized government, and an executive branch run amok with power. Any suggestion of limiting guns rights is greeted by ominous warnings that this is a move of expansive, would-be despotic government. It has been the means by which gun rights advocates withstand even the most seemingly rational gun control measures. An assault weapons ban, smaller ammunition clips for guns, longer background checks on gun purchases — these are all measures centralized government wants, they claim, in order to exert control over us, and ultimately impose its arbitrary will. I have often suspected, however, that contrary to holding centralized authority in check, broad individual gun ownership gives the powers-that-be exactly what they want. After all, a population of privately armed citizens is one that is increasingly fragmented, and vulnerable as a result. Private gun ownership invites retreat into extreme individualism — I heard numerous calls for homeschooling in the wake of the Newtown shootings — and nourishes the illusion that I can be my own police, or military, as the case may be. The N.R.A. would have each of us steeled for impending government aggression, but it goes without saying that individually armed citizens are no match for government force. The N.R.A. argues against that interpretation of the Second Amendment that privileges armed militias over individuals, and yet it seems clear that armed militias, at least in theory, would provide a superior check on autocratic government. As Michel Foucault pointed out in his detailed study of the mechanisms of power, nothing suits power so well as extreme individualism. In fact, he explains, political and corporate interests aim at nothing less than “individualization,” since it is far easier to manipulate a collection of discrete and increasingly independent individuals than a community. Guns undermine just that — community. Their pervasive, open presence would sow apprehension, suspicion, mistrust and fear, all emotions that are corrosive of community and civic cooperation. To that extent, then, guns give license to autocratic government. Our gun culture promotes a fatal slide into extreme individualism. It fosters a society of atomistic individuals, isolated before power — and one another — and in the aftermath of shootings such as at Newtown, paralyzed with fear. That is not freedom, but quite its opposite. And as the Occupy movement makes clear, also the demonstrators that precipitated regime change in Egypt and Myanmar last year, assembled masses don’t require guns to exercise and secure their freedom, and wield world-changing political force. Arendt and Foucault reveal that power does not lie in armed individuals, but in assembly — and everything conducive to that.

#### Critique is useless without a concrete policy option that solves for biopower-otherwise harms are non unique.

Bryant 12 Levi Bryant (Professor of Philosophy at Collin College) “A Critique of the Academic Left” 2012 <https://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/underpants-gnomes-a-critique-of-the-academic-left/> JW

Unfortunately, the academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It’s good at carrying out critiques that denounce various social formations, yet very poor at proposing any sort of realistic constructions of alternatives. This because it thinks abstractly in its own way, ignor[es]ing how networks, assemblages, structures, or regimes of attraction would have to be remade to create a workable alternative. Here I’m reminded by the “underpants gnomes” depicted in South Park: The underpants gnomes have a plan for achieving profit that goes like this: Phase 1: Collect Underpants Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Profit! They even have a catchy song to go with their work: Well this is sadly how it often is with the academic left. Our plan seems to be as follows: Phase 1: Ultra-Radical Critique Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Revolution and complete social transformation! Our problem is that we seem perpetually stuck at phase 1 without ever explaining what is to be done at phase 2. Often the critiques articulated at phase 1 are right, but there are nonetheless all sorts of problems with those critiques nonetheless. In order to reach phase 3, we have to produce new collectives. In order for new collectives to be produced, people need to be able to hear and understand the critiques developed at phase 1. Yet this is where everything begins to fall apart. Even though these critiques are often right, we express [critiques] them in ways that only an academic with a PhD in critical theory and post-structural theory can understand. How exactly is Adorno to produce an effect in the world if only PhD’s in the humanities can understand him? Who are these things for? We seem to always ignore these things and then look down our noses with disdain at the Naomi Kleins and David Graebers of the world. To make matters worse, we publish our work in expensive academic journals that only universities can afford, with presses that don’t have a wide distribution, and give our talks at expensive hotels at academic conferences attended only by other academics. Again, who are these things for? Is it an accident that so many activists look away from these things with contempt, thinking their more about an academic industry and tenure, than producing change in the world? If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, it doesn’t make a sound! Seriously dudes and dudettes, what are you doing? But finally, and worst of all, us Marxists and anarchists all too often act like assholes. We denounce others, we condemn them, we berate them for not engaging with the questions we want to engage with, and we vilify them when they don’t embrace every bit of the doxa that we endorse. We are every bit as off-putting and unpleasant as the fundamentalist minister or the priest of the inquisition (have people yet understood that Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus was a critique of the French communist party system and the Stalinist party system, and the horrific passions that arise out of parties and identifications in general?). This type of “revolutionary” is the greatest friend of the reactionary and capitalist because they do more to drive people into the embrace of reigning ideology than to undermine reigning ideology. These are the people that keep Rush Limbaugh in business. Well done! But this isn’t where our most serious shortcomings lie. Our most serious shortcomings are to be found at phase 2. We almost never make concrete proposals for how things ought to be restructured, for what new material infrastructures and semiotic fields need to be produced, and when we do, our critique-intoxicated cynics and skeptics immediately jump in with an analysis of all the ways in which these things contain dirty secrets, ugly motives, and are doomed to fail. How, I wonder, are we to do anything at all when we have no concrete proposals? We live on a planet of 6 billion people. These 6 billion people are dependent on a certain network of production and distribution to meet the needs of their consumption. That network of production and distribution does involve the extraction of resources, the production of food, the maintenance of paths of transit and communication, the disposal of waste, the building of shelters, the distribution of medicines, etc., etc., etc.

5. Biopower is no longer operated with coercive state mechanisms- it’s now done through surveillance. The 1NC speech act distracts from this form of oppression.

DeBrabander 15 Firmin (professor of philosophy at the Maryland Institute College of Art) “Do Guns Make Us Free?” Yale University Press 2015 JW

In the War on Terror, the U.S. government has claimed broad rights to survey the civilian population. The ACLU laments the rise of “America’s Surveillance Society” in a report of the same name: since 2001, the FBI has compelled Internet service providers, banks, and others to provide sensitive private information about their clients, all “without prior court approval and without probable cause”; the National Security Agency (NSA) carries out “warrantless surveillance of Americans’ international telephone calls and e- mails”; and the American public is subjected to “pervasive video surveillance.” 46 “An increasing number of American cities,” the report states, “have spent taxpayer dollars to create elaborate camera and video surveillance systems designed to monitor public places such as parks, plazas and sidewalks. Governments are also accessing images collected by privately- owned camera and video systems.”47 Following the Boston Marathon bombing, law enforcement used widespread access to private cell phone videos and photos taken at the site, together with footage from surveillance cameras from businesses, to track down the perpetrators. This seemed a reasonable approach, the Boston police commissioner opined, since the site of the marathon was “probably one of the most photographed areas in the country” that day.48 By allowing us to record ourselves and those around us abundantly, digital technology fashions a tantalizing network for government to tap into if it wishes. Digital technology has also given rise to billions of communications—e- mails, tweets, text messages, Facebook updates, and good old phone calls—all of which are available for surveillance. Through such communications, twentyfi rst- century Americans conduct their increasingly public lives; “private life” conducted on the Internet or through mobile phones is not private at all. The GPS signals in our cell phones make our location perpetually known—and it turns out that law enforcement has access to that information. We happily indulge in these media, of course, because of the wonderful conveniences they provide, but in so doing, we offer government all the information it might care to learn about us. In 2012, Wired magazine called the information the NSA aims to collect about us “digital pocket litter”: Flowing through [the NSA’s] servers and routers stored in near- bottomless databases will be all forms of communication, including the complete contents of private emails, cell phone calls, and Google searches, as well as all sorts of personal data trails—parking receipts, travel itineraries, bookstore purchases. . . . It is, in some measure, the realization of the “total information awareness” program created during the fi rst term of the Bush administration—an effort that was killed by Congress in 2003 after it caused an outcry over its potential for invading Americans’ privacy.49 The Wired article was prescient. A year after its publication, a prominent leak by a private NSA contractor revealed that the agency was engaged in just such immense data collection and analysis—“secret blanket surveillance,” as Al Gore put it, which he declared “obscenely outrageous.”50 Government offi cials claimed that the NSA had not violated anyone’s civil rights because it was only storing the communications and analyzing the “metadata”—that is, as Hendrik Hertzberg observed in the New Yorker, “the time and duration of the calls, along with the number, and potentially the locations of the callers and the called,” all of which is analyzed to detect suspicious patterns.51 The agency, as of 2013, still needs a judicial warrant to inspect the contents of communications it deems suspicious. Yet this is still plenty of information the government is amassing about private citizens. This metadata tells an awful lot about a person: whom he is contacting and associating with, where, and when— where he is parking, where he is going, when he is traveling, and much else. Washington Post reporter Barton Gellman argues that government monitoring of metadata is in fact “more intrusive”: I would much rather someone listen to my phone calls for a month than to have them map who I’ve talked to, where I went, all my connections for a month, because I can control what I say on the phone. You get a much more revealing picture of people, for example, who are my confi dential sources, or whether I’m negotiating to leave my employer and take a new job or a secret business deal, whether I’m having an extramarital affair, whether I’m seeing a psychiatrist. Anything that I might not want to broadcast to the world will be revealed quite clearly from metadata.52 As if NSA’s efforts were not far- reaching enough, our government has other surveillance tools at its disposal, most notably drone technology, which is returning from foreign battlefi elds for domestic use. Several government agencies employ drone surveillance with increasing regularity, as does local law enforcement. When the Federal Aviation Administration approved the use of surveillance drones for commercial purposes in 2013, it predicted there would be 30,000 drones (or UAVs—unmanned aviation vehicles) in our skies by 2020 doing public and private work.53 Government agencies aim to arm drones, too, but have limited their plans to nonlethal weapons for the moment.54 It seems the options for armed drones are quite chilling. Greenwald highlights the “Switchblade drone,” for example, hailed as “the ultimate assassin bug,” which “worms its way around buildings and into small areas, sending its surveillance imagery to an i- Pad held by the operator, who can then direct the Switchblade to lunge forward and kill the target . . . by exploding in his face.”55 It should be abundantly clear that civilians armed with semiautomatic weapons are no match for government- deployed Switchblades. Beyond the remarkable fact of its existence, the emerging surveillance state contains several noteworthy features. For one thing, it is an impressive merger of public and private sectors. The commercial stake many have in the surveillance state means it is sure to grow. Second, expanded surveillance is less and less controversial. The PATRIOT Act has been renewed every three years since its inception, by members of both parties, with limited objection. The American public seems to have accepted the arguments for widespread and intrusive surveillance as a necessary tool in an age of terrorism. Or at least, the public is too preoccupied to care, as people dive into the myriad new technologies that allow them to be watched. Third, the surveillance state is a “one- way mirror,” as Greenwald puts it.56 It gives government deep insight into our activities and behavior while those watching us—who they are, what they want, what they know—remain hidden. This was made abundantly clear, Greenwald argues, when Wikileaks, the international journalistic organization that publishes leaked government documents, posted on its website millions of pages of classifi ed U.S. security documents, and most of the exposed communications were in fact quite banal. “What that refl ected,” Greenwald explains, “is that the U.S. government refl exively labels everything that it does of any conceivable signifi cance as ‘classifi ed’ and ‘secret.’ It keeps everything that it does from us, at the same time that it knows more and more about what we’re doing.”57 Why is the surveillance state a concern? The ease with which it grows and envelops us all suggests that most of the American public is not overly disturbed by it. Tocqueville might say this is because the surveillance state has not—yet— gotten in the way of our private interests. To the contrary, the surveillance state, especially in its private sector incarnations, offers our personal lives and business ventures bountiful convenience. The hardware chain Lowe’s, for example, advertises that it can keep track of every purchase you make at its stores—to assist you with future purchasing decisions, of course. The American shopper might be thrilled that retailers can provide their wares in so much greater detail, but who else has access to that information? It is surprisingly hard to articulate why privacy is so important. Why, in an age of terror, should my private life be sacrosanct? The argument is often made that if you are doing nothing illegal, then you have nothing to hide. Privacy seems like an easy sacrifi ce in this war, and a tedious encumbrance in the digital age. In our eagerness for new technologies, author Gary Shteyngart cites “a general giddy sense that privacy is kind of stupid.”58 Just imagine the possibilities: if everything is known about you, retailers and businesses can cater to your every desire, at any moment—even desires you didn’t know you had! And the government might know we are a danger before we realize it ourselves, and act accordingly. This starts to sound a lot like the soft despotism Tocqueville foresaw for us: everything is provided for us, all our personal wants sated. We may feel fulfi lled and empowered by our new digital reality—indeed, its devices are sold on the premise that they enable us to do more, and be freer—but as Tocqueville fears, it threatens to reduce us to a state of “perpetual childhood,” where we will require potent political consolation. Claire Cain Miller describes how the Google Now app reads her emails and alerts her, without her asking, to bits of highly personal information: “Now I trust it to tell me whether there is a delay on my route to work (even though I never told it where I live or work). How many steps I walk each month, which recipes I should try, when my e- commerce packages have shipped and whether I need to remember to buy diapers next time I am at the store.”59 A host of moral and political problems arise with our surveillance society, but I will zero in on the most pertinent one for our discussion, the one the gun rights movement supposedly cares so much about. As our privacy is increasingly broached and we live so much more of our lives in public, we become extremely vulnerable. Many interests might wish to take advantage of us in this state, and government is certainly one. Our government vows that it will not abuse, and is not abusing, its privileged knowledge of our private lives, but this puts us at its mercy all the same, perhaps intolerably so. Imagine what an abusive administration might do with all this information. The possibilities for oppression are immense. The only thing preventing such a turn of events is the character of those in office. But it is just such vulnerability that the Founding Fathers aimed to prevent when they designed our government and laid out our rights—and insisted on protecting us against unreasonable search and seizure. The American people must be insulated from the caprices of those in power, since some are sure to be corrupt. Or worse, the power of offi ce will corrupt them. Greenwald argues that “allowing government offi cials to eavesdrop on other people, on citizens, without constraints or oversight, to do so in the dark, is a power that gives so much authority and leverage to those in power that it is virtually impossible for human beings to resist abusing that power.”60 Surveillance seems quite harmless to all involved. For those in power, it hardly seems like an abuse. It’s so easy to survey the public without much protest, and it’s easy to increase this power—exponentially. Gun rights advocates claim to be a prime defense against a government that would gain too much power over the American public. The Founding Fathers intended that we not be at the mercy of those who rule us, but retain a necessary and basic independence. The surveillance state violates that concern. While LaPierre waves his rifl e in the face of the government, it has gained immense leverage over us all. What will it do with all this power? Shall we trust it? Can we trust it? It seems most have decided to ignore the danger. That is their right, but the infrastructure of oppression has been put in place, even if it is not deployed for nefarious ends—yet. Of course, there are some who claim it already does great damage. Hertzberg says the following of the 2013 leaks that revealed the breadth of the NSA’s surveillance operations: “The harm is civic. The harm is collective. The harm is to the architecture of trust and accountability that supports an open society and a democratic polity. The harm is to the reputation, and perhaps, the reality of the United States as such a society, such a polity.”61 Surveillance signals, and sows, mistrust—especially when the surveillance is a one- way mirror. Being watched is inherently corrosive of trust. And it is deeply unsettling that the government is so opaque in its intentions and operations. Foucault would be full of admiration for the emerging surveillance state: it is unverifi able, anonymous, invisible. Indeed, he argued, surveillance can be oppression itself. And it is a form of oppression against which guns are wholly ineffective. For Bentham, the great virtue of the Panopticon was precisely how it might affect subjects’ behavior, and compel. Foucault offers the following, ebullient quote from Bentham advertising the benefi ts of the panoptic scheme: “Morals reformed—health preserved—industry invigorated— instruction diffused—public burthens lightened—Economy seated, as it were, upon a rock—the Gordian knot of the poor- law not cut, but untied—all by a simple idea in Architecture!” 62 For prisoners, anonymous surveillance is a silent and continuous warning that they must watch what they do, and act as the warden expects. Applied to the workplace, the panoptic scheme might ward off temptations to laziness. In short, surveillance is a manner of imposing behavior on those who are watched, snapping them into line. But it is a soft tyranny—and as such, Foucault maintains, especially pernicious. It is a kind of oppression we hardly notice or worry about. In the digital age, we willingly subject ourselves to surveillance, and facilitate our surveyors’ task. Digital technologies make us feel empowered and free, but silently have the opposite effect. Under surveillance, we come to watch what we do without even realizing it. If we are expressly forbidden to associate with a certain political group, we will feel compelled, and register it as coercion—and that might irritate us. If, however, we are unsure if we are watched when we visit certain websites or communicate with certain groups, and suspect we might get in trouble for doing so, we will cease, seemingly of our own volition. Privacy is essential to freedom because it allows us to indulge in eccentric behavior without fear of judgment or incrimination. From discussion of bold, sometimes crazy ideas, brave new political notions are born. Privacy lends an openness and courage to the political arena, a necessary dynamism—it empowers political thinkers and agents at the most basic level. Thus it is essential to democracy, or at least to the aspirations of democratic regimes: if you would embolden citizens to be politically active at every level of society, you require the utter freedom privacy affords. “[Secrecy] and privacy are prerequisites” to political activism and protest, Greenwald argues.63 What is political opposition to look like, how is it to behave, if it knows it is constantly watched and followed? Guns do little to protect our freedom in this respect. They are no remedy for the oppression that may be at hand. The surveillance state grows and compels whether we are armed or not. In fact, the gun rights movement inadvertently assists the surveillance state by urging adherents to beware government oppression in a wholly other form—a form in which oppression, in our time, is less likely to emerge. Greenwald says of the surveillance state, in an assessment that is eerily evocative of guns: “You can acculturate people to believing that tyranny is freedom, that their limits are actually emancipations and freedom, that is what this Surveillance State does, by training people to accept their own conformity that they are actually free, that they no longer even realize the ways in which they’re being limited.”64 Guns are likewise a cultural fi xation that offers the illusion of freedom—and makes us vulnerable to manipulation, abuse, and oppression. They invite us to feel free and indomitable, while blinding us to the ways in which we are limited and dominated. Accordingly, Machiavelli tells us, those in power are all too happy to see us armed. They nod their heads in approval when Cooke claims guns are the ultimate right of a free people—as LaPierre says, the true mark of liberty! Cooke and LaPierre fail to grasp that modern nation states do not need physical force to put us underfoot. They can achieve oppression in ways that cannot be opposed or hindered by mere guns.

## Black Self-Defense (Newark)

Permutation, do both. The AC bans handguns, NOT self-defense, there are still lots of other methods other than handguns. Case is a net benefit to the perm and outweighs because people will find ways to use knives and other guns.

#### TURN-owning a handgun increases the risk of death- self-defense flows AFF.

SGL 15. Statistics on the Dangers of Gun Use for Self-Defense. May 11th, 2015. smartgunlaws.org/category/gun-studies-statistics/gun-violence-statistics/ NP

Claims that guns are used defensively millions times every year have been widely discredited.  Using a gun in self-defense is no more likely to reduce the chance of being injured during a crime than various other forms of protective action.[4](http://smartgunlaws.org/category/gun-studies-statistics/gun-violence-statistics/#footnote_3_6085) At least one study has found that carrying a firearm significantly increases a person’s risk of being shot in an assault; research published in the American Journal of Public Health reported that, even after adjusting for

The alt empirically can’t solve- black people have handguns in the status quo and the government is oppressive as ever. Only case can reduce racial violence.

#### TURN: the black community is being TORN APART by this notion of self-defense; there’s rampant handgun violence that increases homicide.

DeFilippis and Hughes 15 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “How America’s Lax Gun Laws Help Criminals and Cripple Minority Communities” Vice July 6 2015 <http://www.vice.com/read/how-americas-lax-gun-laws-help-mass-murderers-and-cripple-minority-communities-706> JW

And as federal prosecutors decide whether to file hate-crime charges against the shooter— 21-year-old white supremacist Dylann Roof, whose manifesto lays out his plans to start a "race war"—some gun-rights advocates have argued that new gun control laws would disproportionately hurt black Americans and other minorities, claiming that similar laws have disproportionately targeted these communities and contributed to the already-massive racial disparities in the US prison system. But these arguments also tend to ignore the devastating consequences that weak gun laws have had for minority communities. According to data from the Centers for Disease Control, black Americans are twice as likely as whites to be victims of gun homicide. According to a report from the Center for American Progress, in 2010, 65 percent of gun murder victims between the ages of 15 and 24 were black, despite making up just 13 percent of the population. Gun homicide is also the leading cause of death for black teens in the US, a group that also suffers gun injuries 10 times more frequently than their white counterparts. The numbers may help explain why an overwhelming majority of black Americans—75 percent according to a 2013 Washington Post/ABC News poll—support stronger gun control laws. Yet even in areas where local governments have enacted gun control measures, lax regulations elsewhere have sustained a robust network of unregulated private transactions that allow gun dealers to look the other way while supplying gangs and other criminals with a vast assortment of weapons. This network leaves a place like Chicago, which remains crippled by violence despite relatively strict gun laws, hard-pressed to keep weapons off the street—as this New York Times map illustrates, anybody in the city who wants a gun need only take a short drive outside Cook County to get to a jurisdiction with much weaker regulations. A similar situation has arisen in Maryland, which despite having some of the country's most stringent gun laws, has been plagued by violent crime in urban areas. Amid finger-pointing over the rioting that ravaged Baltimore earlier this year, it's worth pointing out that the majority of crime guns are trafficked in from outside the state. So while the gun policies Maryland has implemented—including a policy requiring individuals to pass a background check and obtain a permit prior to buying a firearm—have been shown to reliably reduce gun violence, neighboring states like Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia have much looser requirements, making it easy for weapons to flow across the border. RELATED: Gun Control Will Not Save America from Racism This haphazard patchworks of state and local gun laws has enabled many private gun dealers to effectively exploit gang violence and crime to boost sales. Chuck's Gun Shop, for example, which operates just outside Chicago, is responsible for selling at least 1,300 crime guns since 2008, and one study found that 20 percent of all guns used in Chicago crimes recovered within a year of purchase came from the store, because existing gun laws allow the store to sell firearms to criminals who would undoubtedly fail a background check if it were required. The same is true for Realco, a Maryland gun shop on the outskirts of Washington, DC: Between 1992 and 2009, law enforcement agents from Maryland and DC traced 2,500 crime guns back to Realco, four times more than were traced to second most prolific crime-gun dealer in Maryland. The disastrous effects of these policies has overwhelmingly been borne by minority communities. In Chicago, for example, 76 percent of murder victims between 1991 and 2011 were black, 19 percent were Hispanic, and just 4 percent were white. The cause of these deaths was overwhelmingly gun violence. Across the country, the evidence suggests that weak gun laws not only play into the hands of mass murderers looking for the easiest way to commit atrocity, but also exacerbate the tragic, everyday violence that disproportionately cripples minority communities. The solution is not to pretend, as has become fashionable among gun advocates, that gun violence is simply the unavoidable cost our of constitutional freedoms, but to instead support commonsense policies of the sort implemented in nearly every other industrialized nation.

## Fem (Harrison)

### Overview:

#### Guns are a symbol of the patriarchy that the aff destroys

Bassin 97, Alana. *Why Packing a Pistol Perpetuates Patriarchy*. Hastings Women’s Law Journal Volume 8 | Issue 2, Article 5. 9/1/1997. (Bassin is a law clerk for the Honorable William A. Neumann, North Dakota Su- preme Court. She is a graduate of Queen's University, Canada, where she received a Bachelor of Honors Commerce and Bachelor of Arts and the University of North Dakota School of Law, where she received her Juris Doctor with distinction.) NP 12/1/15.

Firearms are a source of male domination - a symbol of male power and aggression. First, the gun is phallic. Just as sex is the ultimate weapon of patriarchy used to penetrate and possess women, and the gun's sole purpose is to intrude and wound its victim. Historically, men have used guns to conquer and dominate other peoples. European men first developed small arms between the Fourteenth and SIxteenth centuries for use in warfare. By the 1600s, guns were a common weapon of war for soldiers in Europe. In Colonial America, every male serving in the militia was required to carry a gun. Today, firearms and missile are the backbone of the modern military, arguably America's most patriarchal institution. Beyond war, guns also have played a significant role in perpetuating patriarchy. During the slave trade, men traded firearms in Africa for slaves. At common law, guns were used to protect a man's home and all his possessions, including his wife. In the private sphere, the gun is passed down from father to son for hunting, a sport that continues to be a "rite of passage" for many young males. Even in today's media, movies and television glorify "guns and guys," often employing gun showdowns between the "good guys" and the "bad guys" as their focal point.

This outweighs your offense: A) it’s a genealogy of the history of guns whereas your evidence just cites a mindset that certain laws have had, I apply to the nature of guns as a symbol. B) the 1AC is distinct from past gun bans- no reason why I’m bound to defend other bad policies.

They’ll say lived experiences come first:

1. Every statistic conveys thousands of lived experiences- there’s no reason why it has to be outlined in a narrative

2. this is BS- if more women are killed by handguns, they don’t get to share their narrative because they’ve been brutally murdered.

#### The alt just causes more violence towards womxn. This self-defense theory is bullshit.

DeFilippis 14 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) “Having a Gun in the House Doesn't Make a Woman Safer” Feb 23 2014 The Atlantic <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2014/02/having-a-gun-in-the-house-doesnt-make-a-woman-safer/284022/> JW

Christy Salters Martin is a professional boxer and the owner of a concealed carry permit. But when she attempted to leave her husband, she was shot with her own gun. Today, she cautions other women against making the same mistake. “Just putting a weapon in the woman’s hand is not going to reduce the number of fatalities or gunshot victims that we have. Too many times, their male counterpart or spouse will be able to overpower them and take that gun away.” Wayne LaPierre, executive vice-president of the National Rifle Association, has argued that firearms are a great equalizer between the sexes. In a speech at the Conservative Political Action Committee last year, he declared, “The one thing a violent rapist deserves to face is a good woman with a gun.” But the empirical reality of firearm ownership reflects anything but equality, particularly when it comes to intimate partner violence. Such fights become much more frequent and lethal when firearms are involved, and the violence is nearly unidirectional, inflicted by males upon females. This relationship holds true not only across the United States, but around the world. A recent meta-analysis concluded what many people already knew: the availability of firearms is a strong risk factor for both homicide and suicide. But the study came to another conclusion that is rarely mentioned in the gun control debate: females are uniquely impacted by the availability of a firearm. Indeed, the study found that women with access to firearms become homicide victims at significantly higher rates than men. It has long been recognized that higher rates of gun availability correlate with higher rates of female homicide. Women in the United States account for 84 percent of all female firearm victims in the developed world, even though they make up only a third of the developed world’s female population. And within American borders, women die at higher rates from suicide, homicide, and accidental firearm deaths in states where guns are more widely available. This is true even after controlling for factors such as urbanization, alcohol use, education, poverty, and divorce rates. What’s more surprising is how many of these deaths occur in the home, at the hands of a male partner. In a study in the Journal of Trauma, A.L. Kellermann, director of the RAND Institute of health, and his coauthor J.A. Mercy concluded: “More than twice as many women are killed with a gun used by their husbands or intimate acquaintances than are murdered by strangers using guns, knives, or any other means.” In another study, published in the American Journal of Public Health, researchers interviewed 417 women across 67 battered women’s shelters. Nearly a third of these women had lived in a household with a firearm. In two-thirds of the homes, their intimate partners had used the gun against them, usually threatening to kill (71.4%) them. A very small percentage of these women (7%) had used a gun successfully in self-defense, and primarily just to scare the attacking male partner away. Indeed, gun threats in the home against women by their intimate partners appear to be more common across the United States than self-defense uses of guns by women. Another large case-control study compared women who were murdered by their intimate partner with a control group of battered women. Only 16 percent of the women who had been abused, but not murdered, had guns in their homes, whereas 51 percent of the murder victims did. In fact, not a single study to date has shown that the risk of any crime including burglary, robbery, home invasion, or spousal abuse against a female is decreased through gun ownership. Though there are examples of women using a gun to defend themselves, they are few and far between, and not statistically significant. These facts should be as chilling to men as they are to women. A 2005 study examining mortality data from 1998-2000 found that when a female was shot by her intimate partner, the perpetrator subsequently killed himself in two thirds of the cases. This statistic not only shows necessity of getting mental help for at-risk men. It also further suggests that owning a firearm may make a household more vulnerable than ever.

## Neolib (Harker)

### T: Gun Culture

#### The plan solves gun culture.

LaFollette 2k Hugh (USF St. Petersburg Philosophy Professor) “Gun Control” Ethics 110 (January 2000): 263–281 http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/233269 JW

The strong correlation between the presence of guns and a higher murder rate is compelling. Since the correlation is statistically significant to a .01 level, it is difficult to believe that limiting private gun ownership will not have a noticeable effect on the numbers of murders. Gun advocates disagree: they claim that cultural factors explain the correlation. Although I think they are partly correct, they draw the wrong inference. For one crucial difference between European and American cultures is the widespread presence of guns. Each culture is the way it is, at least in part, because of the role of guns (or their absence) played in its creation and maintenance. Therefore, curtailing the private possession of guns might well change the American culture so that it would be less violent. Consequently, it is not only that fewer guns would directly cause some decline in violent crimes—which it should. It is also likely to reshape the cultural values which, along with the ready availability of deadly weapons, led to such an extraordinarily high murder rate in America.

### T: Gun Rights

#### Gun rights are at the heart of neolib-the plan is a step away from this.

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

LOOKING OUT FOR ONESELF: GUNS, RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM, AND NEOLIBERAL VIRTUE In a neoliberal world, a virtuous citizen is one that is self-reliant, assumes personal responsibility for his/her own problems, and demands or expects as little as possible from others, especially from government. This ideal version of a neoliberal subject is consistent with the notion of "rugged individualism"-i.e., the type of individual who embodies the American pioneer ethic, steps up to any challenge, and lifts him/herself "up by his/her boot straps." In contrast, any person who fails to display these qualities is assumed to fail not only as an economic actor, but also as a moral being (Soss, Fording, and Schram 2009, p. 4). Indeed, those who rely on welfare assistance and other "government hand-outs" are regarded as morally corrupt individuals who live off tax payers and lack proper values. Personal virtue and responsibility, therefore, is expressed in behavior aimed at meeting one's personal needs and resolving one's own personal problems. Among many in the pro-gun community, support for this neoliberal tendency to associate virtue with rugged individualism and to emphasize private/personal solutions to all social problems is easily discernible. In his book Gun Crusaders, Scott Melzer interviews members of the NRA and described the following: [A] do-it-it-yourself attitude is the basic philosophy of most NRA members. Need protection? Buy a gun and learn to shoot. Not earning enough money to make ends meet? Work harder. Can't afford child care or health care? Don't expect government to bail you out. Freedom and self-reliance are indivisible. A country whose citizens have to rely on government for personal safety or basic needs is a country that is lazy and apathetic, and ultimately undemocratic (Melzer, 2009, p. 28). The parallel between Neoliberal ideology and what Melzer described as the "do-it-yourself' philosophy embraced by members of the NRA cannot be clearer. Not only freedom but democracy is assumed to be synonymous with self-reliance. Both neoliberal and pro-gun philosophy reinforce one another in that both presuppose an atomistic view of the world in which people are not understood as part of an interconnected community. Instead, all individuals are assumed to be autarkic subjects concerned almost exclusively with their own private lives. Far from supporting freedom and democracy, therefore, critics argue that what easily results from this social imagery is a depoliticized citizenry that is anathema to an effective democracy (e.g., McChesney 1999). As is well known, a viable democracy requires that people have a strong sense of connection to their fellow citizens. Yet because of the emphasis on self-interest/self-reliance, neoliberalism attenuates democracy by giving individuals a green light to prioritize their self-serving interest over those of a community (e.g., Giroux 2008). The fanatical-like zeal with which many gun supporters prioritize Second Amendment rights over all other rights is consistent with this tendency. While those who support the Second Amendment emphasize the individual's right to own firearms in order to protect his/her personal liberty, safety, or property, this right ignores the fact that individuals are also members of a community. More specifically, an emphasis on the individual's right to own firearms overlooks how that right might infringe on other people's right to live without fear of unprovoked gun violence or unintended gun-related tragedies.

#### This outweighs- the government is neoliberal so even if the plan minorly increases neolib we still orient our values against it which ensures future policy reform.

### A2 Esposito 14/NRA Link

1. TURN- your evidence says people flock to stores to buy more guns but the aff prevents stores from selling them.

2. Non-unique and turn: NRA’s pushing against gun control now so it’s impossible impacts are unique to aff since NRA extremism already exists, but once laws pass they’re infrequently repealed, so extremism decreases after the aff passes

3. people already cling to their guns in the status quo-things can’t worse than what’s already happening. Risk of a turn is sufficient to vote aff.

4. Turn: handgun ban takes exerts pressure on the gun industry, which weakens the NRA monetarily and politically.

**Cassidy 13**, John. How Can We Defeat the N.R.A.?. www.newyorker.com/news/john-cassidy/how-can-we-defeat-the-n-r-a May 7, 2013.

Gun-control advocates know this, of course, and they are trying to tackle it head on. Gerney said it’s important to exert public pressure on the N.R.A.’s partners in the gun industry and the investors that finance it. Another thing that would help would be the emergence of a moderate alternative to the N.R.A. for gun owners. One such group, Bullmoose Sportsmen, already exists, but it’s pretty small. “**The NRA is effective in large measure because they’ve developed a well-crafted myth about how effective they are,”** Gerney wrote to me. “Why are **there [are] so many calls to Congress? Because the NRA spends millions of dollars on direct mail and paid ‘patch-through’ call vendors** to generate the calls. That’s not a bad thing necessarily—our side has things to learn on generating engagement of our supporters—but in inflates the NRA’s power.”

## Race

### T: Gun Violence

#### Gun violence disproportionately affects black communities.

DeFilippis and Hughes 15 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “How America’s Lax Gun Laws Help Criminals and Cripple Minority Communities” Vice July 6 2015 <http://www.vice.com/read/how-americas-lax-gun-laws-help-mass-murderers-and-cripple-minority-communities-706> JW

And as federal prosecutors decide whether to file hate-crime charges against the shooter— 21-year-old white supremacist Dylann Roof, whose manifesto lays out his plans to start a "race war"—some gun-rights advocates have argued that new gun control laws would disproportionately hurt black Americans and other minorities, claiming that similar laws have disproportionately targeted these communities and contributed to the already-massive racial disparities in the US prison system. But these arguments also tend to ignore the devastating consequences that weak gun laws have had for minority communities. According to data from the Centers for Disease Control, black Americans are twice as likely as whites to be victims of gun homicide. According to a report from the Center for American Progress, in 2010, 65 percent of gun murder victims between the ages of 15 and 24 were black, despite making up just 13 percent of the population. Gun homicide is also the leading cause of death for black teens in the US, a group that also suffers gun injuries 10 times more frequently than their white counterparts. The numbers may help explain why an overwhelming majority of black Americans—75 percent according to a 2013 Washington Post/ABC News poll—support stronger gun control laws. Yet even in areas where local governments have enacted gun control measures, lax regulations elsewhere have sustained a robust network of unregulated private transactions that allow gun dealers to look the other way while supplying gangs and other criminals with a vast assortment of weapons. This network leaves a place like Chicago, which remains crippled by violence despite relatively strict gun laws, hard-pressed to keep weapons off the street—as this New York Times map illustrates, anybody in the city who wants a gun need only take a short drive outside Cook County to get to a jurisdiction with much weaker regulations. A similar situation has arisen in Maryland, which despite having some of the country's most stringent gun laws, has been plagued by violent crime in urban areas. Amid finger-pointing over the rioting that ravaged Baltimore earlier this year, it's worth pointing out that the majority of crime guns are trafficked in from outside the state. So while the gun policies Maryland has implemented—including a policy requiring individuals to pass a background check and obtain a permit prior to buying a firearm—have been shown to reliably reduce gun violence, neighboring states like Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia have much looser requirements, making it easy for weapons to flow across the border. RELATED: Gun Control Will Not Save America from Racism This haphazard patchworks of state and local gun laws has enabled many private gun dealers to effectively exploit gang violence and crime to boost sales. Chuck's Gun Shop, for example, which operates just outside Chicago, is responsible for selling at least 1,300 crime guns since 2008, and one study found that 20 percent of all guns used in Chicago crimes recovered within a year of purchase came from the store, because existing gun laws allow the store to sell firearms to criminals who would undoubtedly fail a background check if it were required. The same is true for Realco, a Maryland gun shop on the outskirts of Washington, DC: Between 1992 and 2009, law enforcement agents from Maryland and DC traced 2,500 crime guns back to Realco, four times more than were traced to second most prolific crime-gun dealer in Maryland. The disastrous effects of these policies has overwhelmingly been borne by minority communities. In Chicago, for example, 76 percent of murder victims between 1991 and 2011 were black, 19 percent were Hispanic, and just 4 percent were white. The cause of these deaths was overwhelmingly gun violence. Across the country, the evidence suggests that weak gun laws not only play into the hands of mass murderers looking for the easiest way to commit atrocity, but also exacerbate the tragic, everyday violence that disproportionately cripples minority communities. The solution is not to pretend, as has become fashionable among gun advocates, that gun violence is simply the unavoidable cost our of constitutional freedoms, but to instead support commonsense policies of the sort implemented in nearly every other industrialized nation.

#### Outweighs on magnitude- even if the plan has other racist aspects, the alternative is letting more black people die. That’s the worst impact since death prevents black people from having any autonomous life whatsoever.

### A2 Gourevitch/racist enforcement

#### 1. TURN-Gun ownership gives police a pretense for brutality which outweighs.

DeBrabander 15 Firmin (professor of philosophy at the Maryland Institute College of Art) “Do Guns Make Us Free?” Yale University Press 2015 JW

This leads to another reason guns are inimical to protest: they might incite police to react roughly, as has happened many times in the past, even when rallies were nominally or largely peaceful. What if the protesters had been armed at the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1968—where police, goaded by the defiant mayor, were already itching for a confrontation— or in Seattle in 2000, when police battled anarchists smashing store windows? What if the Occupy Wall Street protesters had stashed guns in their tents before the New York City Police Department descended on Zuccotti Park to disband their encampment? We cannot imagine guns in each of these cases because the police never would have allowed such protests in the fi rst place. Police typically justify rough treatment of protesters by saying the latter had become unruly, violent, abusive, and posed a threat to the larger community. In many cities in 2011, police departments broke up Occupy camps on the grounds that they were becoming dangerous. Guns in the hands of protesters only strengthen the police’s case for subduing protest. Further, consider the prospect of armed protesters in the face of our increasingly militarized police. Many observers of the Occupy movement commented on the militaristic approach taken by police, especially in disbanding the protests. A New York Times article entitled “When the Police Go Military” offered a summation: “Riot police offi cers tear- gassing protesters at the Occupy movement in Oakland, Calif. The surprising nighttime invasion of Zuccotti Park in Lower Manhattan, carried out with D- Day like secrecy by offi cers deploying klieg lights and a military- style sound machine. And campus police offi cers in helmets and face shields dousing demonstrators at the University of California Davis with pepper spray.”89 The article went on to say that such actions stem from years of police department build- up during the War on Terror. Facing the possibility of a domestic terror attack and showered with money from the Department of Homeland Security, police departments across the country have bulked up on military gear—even in small towns—and shown greater readiness to employ SWAT teams for all manner of incidents, including nonviolent protests.90 In his book The Democracy Project, activist David Graeber writes of the anomalous presence of a SWAT team at a small Occupy protest soon after the Zuccotti Park sweep. Cato Institute fellow Timothy Lynch complains of an increasingly “militaristic mind- set” among police, apparent in “the way they search and raid homes and the way they deal with the public.”91 Lynch goes on to explain that “the more police fail to defuse confrontations but instead help create them—be it with their equipment, tactics or demeanor—the more ties with community members are burned. . . . The effect is a loss of civility, and an erosion of constitutional rights, rather than a building of good will.”92 The journalist Radley Balko quotes a New Hampshire resident critical of his town’s plan to purchase a BearCat (a kind of armored vehicle) for its police department: “It promotes violence. . . . We should promote more human interaction rather than militarize.”93 A militarized police, according to Lynch, endangers civility on both sides. Sending a SWAT team to a nonviolent, gun- free protest is an uncivil gesture by the police; it is an expression of deep suspicion. At the very least, it is a demonstrative threat to the protesters not to get out of hand—or, as Graeber argues, if the protesters are obviously peaceful, a SWAT team is a heavy- handed attempt to threaten them into protesting less vocally—or just less. Further, as Lynch suggests, militarized police are more likely to create than defuse confrontation. It is diffi cult to imagine how armed protesters, in the face of a SWAT team, could make the situation better for the protesters and uphold their right to speech. An armed protest facing a SWAT team is a combustible mixture; the presence of guns provides a perfect excuse for the police to crack down. Police were happy to disperse Occupy camps on far lesser grounds, including supposed public health threats. Imagine what they would do in the face of AR- 15s. Even if they did not physically confront armed protesters, what would protest look like under those circumstances? I can’t imagine that it would be anything we could describe as free. To the contrary, it would be unbearably tense, electric, and ultimately muted as a result of the weaponry. But of course, police would outlaw protest in the fi rst place, if protesters were armed. We can only exercise the right of assembly if assembly is nonviolent. When guns are present, especially among protesters, both assembly and free speech quickly vanish.

#### 2. TURN-gun bans fix the problem with status quo gun control by applying to everyone.

#### 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 tougher 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 legally-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.

#### 3. Non unique- the paradigm of policing is racist, not the application of it. Police will always look for a way to incarcerate black people. The system is already screwed up no matter what gun control laws exist.

#### 4. TURN- in the status quo, black people are criminalized because there’s a mess of gun control laws that change from state to state and have different implications, like concealed and open carry, and permit and licensing. Creating a streamlined national policy that bans all handguns makes it easier for black people to avoid being targeted.

#### 5. Absurd logic- even if police criminalize more people for things like assault, that doesn’t mean we shouldn’t have assault laws. Other impacts always outweigh.

### A2 History

#### 1. Status quo gun control isn’t influenced by racist history- rejecting everything that used to be racist is a bad idea.

Winkler 13 Gun Control Is "Racist"? The NRA would know BY [ADAM WINKLER](https://newrepublic.com/authors/adam-winkler) February 4, 2013 <https://newrepublic.com/article/112322/gun-control-racism-and-nra-history> Adam Winkler is a professor at UCLA School of Law and the author of [Gunfight: The Battle over the Right to Bear Arms in America](http://www.amazon.com/Gunfight-Battle-over-Right-America/dp/0393077411/ref%3Dsr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1355876870&sr=8-1&keywords=adam+winkler).

Of course, not every gun law in American history was motivated by racism. In fact, some of our earliest gun laws had nothing to do with prejudice. After 1820, for instance, a wave of laws swept through the South and Midwest barring people from carrying concealed weapons. These laws weren't racist in origin; blacks in many of these states were already prohibited from even owning a gun. The target of concealed carry laws was white people, namely violence-prone men who were a bit too eager to defend their honor by whipping out their guns. These laws, which might be thought of as the first modern gun control laws, had their origin in reducing criminal violence among whites. Moreover, Keene's claim that gun control has racist roots is not made to correct the historical record. He uses that history to raise doubts about President Obama's proposals for background checks and restrictions on high-capacity magazines and assault weapons. Of course, there is no evidence any of these laws are [not] motivated by even the hint of racism. To suggest that we shouldn't adopt any gun regulations today because our ancestors had racist gun laws is, to be generous, far-fetched. Property law was once profoundly racist, allowing racially restrictive covenants; voting law was once profoundly racist, allowing literacy tests; marriage law was once profoundly racist, allowing no interracial marriage. Does that mean we should never have laws regulating property, voting, or marriage?

#### 2. TURN-firearm ownership is historically tied with racial violence and hate crimes.

Younge 15 Gary “Charleston church shooting: Without gun control, racism will keep killing black people” The Guardian June 18th 2015 <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jun/18/charleston-church-shooting-gun-control-racism-killing-black-people-us> Gary Younge is a British journalist, author and broadcaster. [Wikipedia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gary_Younge) JW 1/10/16.

Mass shootings have become a banal fact of death in America. (Last year there were 283 incidents in which four or more people were shot.) The nation as a whole, meanwhile, has become newly sensitised to racial violence, with growing activism around police shootings. In April video of a white policeman shooting Walter Scott – an unarmed African American – eight times in the back in as he ran away in North Charleston, South Carolina, went viral. But the shooting of nine black church-goers in Charleston (not far from where Scott was killed) by a white gunman in what police are treating as a “hate crime” marks a doubling down on the nation’s twin pathologies of racism and guns. Both are deeply rooted in the nation’s history since its founding: neither are going anywhere soon. The timing of this particular tragedy, given the heightened consciousness and activism around the #BlackLivesMatter movement, provides a particular lens through which to view this massacre. When Barack Obama won the South Carolina primary in 2008 a huge multiracial crowd gathered in the state capitol of Columbia and chanted “race doesn’t matter”. With each new well-publicised account of racial violence, be it at the hands of the state or the public, claims that the arrival of a black president signals the arrival of a post-racial era collapses under the weight of its own delusion. Racism isn’t dead. We know this because it keeps killing black people. The fact that Clementa Pinckney, a state senator, was among the dead indicates that nobody is safe. The fact that it took place in a church during a prayer meeting indicates that nowhere is safe. America does not have a monopoly on racism. But what makes its racism so lethal is the ease with which people can acquire guns. While the new conversation around race will mean the political response to the fact of this attack will be different, the stale conversation around gun control means the legislative response to the nature of this attack will remain the same. Nothing will happen. After Adam Lanza shot 20 primary school children and six adults in Sandy Hook, Connecticut, in 2012 before turning his gun on himself, nothing happened. Seven children and teens are shot dead every day in America and nothing happens. So these nine victims will join those who perished before them – a sacrifice to the blood-soaked pedestal erected around the constitution’s second amendment that gun lobbyists say guarantees the right of individuals to bear arms. Where guns are concerned this is what passes for American exceptionalism – an 18th century compromise with fatal 21st century ramifications. For the parishioners of the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston nothing will ever be the same again. And for those who have the power to prevent it happening again, nothing will change.

#### 3. TURN- the past wasn’t wrong because it took guns away from blacks, the past was wrong because it allowed whites to have guns. The aff is a radical rejection of gun control’s racist legacy.

### A2 Police Brutality

#### 1. Non unique-police are already brutal in the status quo. It doesn’t matter whether it’s a handgun ban or concealed carry laws-they will still target minorities.

#### 2. TURN-police become more brutal when they see someone is owning a gun.

Yuhas 15, Alan. Mere sight of a gun makes police – and public – more aggressive, experts say. www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/aug/05/gun-police-public-more-aggressive-psychology-weapons-effect NP 12/21/15.

When police officers put on their badges and blues, do they somehow change inside? Surrounded by stories of pepper-sprayed protesters, threats at traffic stops, and sudden bursts of violence sometimes causing deaths, the US has spent a year asking itself about police misconduct, circling the question, “why?” Psychology may give some clues. For decades psychologists have looked for evidence that weapons affect behavior, and a large body of research has borne out their suspicions: simply seeing a weapon – whether a sword, hand grenade, tank or gun – makes people more aggressive. Speaking to the Guardian, Ohio State psychology professor Brad Bushman said that research has shown humans respond as quickly to guns as to spiders and snakes, though unlike that impulse the effect must be at some level learned. “Weapons increase all of those aggressive thoughts, feelings, hostile appraisals and the type of thinking that somebody’s out to get you, or wants to hurt you,” Bushman said. Aggressive impulses can sometimes be strong enough to override common sense, studies have found. Confronted with a pickup truck driver who had stalled at a green light, drivers in one 2006 study were more likely to honk at the pickup with a rifle than they were at the pickup without a rifle. The study developed a similar 1975 experiment that also included a bumper sticker reading “vengeance”. “You’d have to be complete idiot to honk your horn,” Bushman said, “but that’s the power about the weapons effect, people don’t think about it much. The effects are very automatic.” Studies have also shown that carrying a gun tends to make people more likely to deliver electric shocks, increase paranoia about people and objects, and increase testosterone. (The “vast majority” of perpetrators of gun violence are men, according to the APA.) The toolkit of police in America often includes a handgun, Taser and nightstick, and many departments also have the assault weapons, riot gear and armored vehicles that transformed Ferguson, Missouri, into an illustration of militarized police action. The surfeit of weapons probably makes both officers and people around them more aggressive, the experts said, regardless of the type of weaponut of their teens is irresponsible.”

### T: Discrimination

#### Status quo gun control is inherently discriminatory-it gives guns to some people and not others.

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

Further, the text of most gun laws requires discrimination. For example, existing federal law prohibits certain people from having a gun.83 The categories of people prohibited from possessing a firearm include people with certain types of criminal history; people who are addicted to controlled substances; undocumented immigrants and people present in the U.S. as visitors; people dishonorably discharged from the military; and people who have had certain types of mental health treatment.84 All of these restrictions disproportionately impact marginalized communities. The prohibition on people with criminal histories possessing guns has a highly discriminatory impact on people of color, and trans people and queer youth of color in particular, because of the high rates of criminal legal system targeting of these communities.85 The prohibition on addiction also has a disparate impact. While most studies indicate no racial differences in rates of illicit drug use, people of color are far more likely to be identified as addicted to controlled substances because they are disproportionately targeted for enforcement of drug laws.86 They are also less likely to have access to high-quality, voluntary, confidential treatment for addiction or to licit medications for reducing chronic pain or symptoms of anxiety or depression.87 Also, some studies have shown high rates of drug abuse in LGBT communities, which many theorize results from high rates of stress from homophobia and transphobia.88 The provisions preventing undocumented immigrants and certain other immigrants from lawfully obtaining guns also have profound implications in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, and disability. People of color from other countries may be more likely to immigrate to the United States, if they can, because of economic colonialism and military occupation that has devastated much of the global South, Middle East and parts of Asia.89 Trans people of color and queer women of color also may have particular incentives to leave their home countries because of transphobic, sexist, and homophobic violence in home countries (which can also be related to colonial legacies).90 While the explicit ban on immigration of people living with HIV was lifted in 2001 and the ban on immigration of people perceived as “sexually deviant” was lifted in 1990,92 trans people and queer women are still even less likely than other immigrants to be able to get access to lawful immigration status in the U.S. The two primary routes to immigration to the US are less likely to be open to trans people and queer women. Poverty and employment discrimination make it unlikely they will be able to access employment-based routes to immigration status. Family-based immigration status is less likely to be available to queer women and trans people because immediate biological family members sometimes reject their trans, queer, or lesbian family and U.S. immigration law refuses to acknowledge chosen family networks that trans people of color and queer women of color often create. Also, the extensive criminalization of trans immigrants of color creates further barriers to immigration status.93 Bias and sexual exploitation on the part of immigration officers also create greater barriers to immigration.94 Dishonorable discharges from the military may also be a result of racism, sexism, homophobia, and/or transphobia. For example, Black women were disproportionately likely to be discharged under Don’t Ask Don’t Tell.95 Cross-dressing has been found to be conduct unbecoming an officer.96 Trans people of color and queer women of color may also be disproportionately labeled as mentally ill and subjected to involuntary treatment, as explained further below,97 which means that prohibitions on gun possession for people with certain histories of mental health treatment discriminate not just on the basis of disability but also have a discriminatory impact on the basis of race, gender, and sexuality.

#### The aff solves-we give guns to NO ONE, so we don’t privilege certain groups.

# DAs

## Bambi DA (PVP)

#### Deer hunting doesn’t depend on handguns- many variable weapons do the job. Handguns are already uncommon in the deer hunting game.

Vohringer 06 Othmar “Weapon Choices for Deer Hunters” June 24 2006 <http://whitetaildeerpassion.blogspot.com/2006/06/weapon-choices-for-deer-hunters.html> JW

Get a few hunters together in a deer camp and start talking about the best weapon choice for deer hunting and you soon will have, at times, a heated and opinionated debate going. Each hunter has his own favourite weapon choice and within that weapon category his favorite set up. There is no one single best weapon for every situation. There are many variables to be considered in choosing a weapon for deer hunting. Such as the terrain the hunter hunts in, what hunting method he prefers and finally what's the hunters personal preference in weapon type, stile and even brand name. One aspect that all weapons have in common is that they are only as good as the person operating them. If I could give only one single advice to every beginning hunter, and seasoned hunter for that matter, then it is this. Before you make you decide to buy any weapon for hunting purpose invest a considerable amount of time to research and try as many different weapons as possible. Forget for a moment the brand name and choose a weapon which fits you physic and feels comfortable to carry and handle. Once you get the weapon of your choice home don't put it in the cabinet for all to look at it. Instead keep practicing with it all year round and spend as much time to get to know your weapon as possible. In order to become a proficient shooter you have to be as familiar with your weapon as you are with yourself. In fact the weapon has to become an appendage of your body. Practice the one shot mentality, because under field conditions that is all you will get. The following list is by no means complete but rather should be viewed as a rough guideline. Also make sure that you study the hunting regulations of the area, state or province you wish to hunt. The hunting regulations often will have specific requirements for weapons, their storage and transport. Rifles - there are many to choose from, I just listed a few here. Light End: .243 Winchester, 6mm Remington, .250 Savage,.257 Roberts, .260 Remington, 30-30 Winchester. Medium: .270 Winchester, .280 Remington, 7x57 Mauser, 7mm-08 Remington, .284 Winchester. Heavy End: .308 Winchester, 30-06 Springfield, 7mmRemington Magnum. Authors note. -My personal choice is a 7mm-08 Remington, which I use in forested areas and other spaces with thick vegetation where shots are at close range. As a long-range rifle for deer in the open plains I like the flat shooting 7mm Remington Magnum. Pistols (Handguns are not legal in every U.S. State and Canadian Province. Make sure you read the regulations before taking a handgun into the field.) Light End: .357 Magnum. Medium: .41 Magnum, .44 Remington Magnum. Heavy End: .454 Casual Bows (This includes modern compound and traditional recurve and long bows. Read the hunting regulations for specific recommendations of draw weight and let-off percentages, such regulations can vary from state to state or provinces. In most areas it is legal to use a bow with a draw weight between 40lb. to 45lb. minimum.) Light End: 40lb. pound draw weight. Medium: 45lb., - 50lb.,- 55lb. draw weight. Heavy End: 60lb.,- 65lb.,- 70lb. draw weight. Authors note. - My choice is a 65lb. compound bow with a 75% let off. For me this bow is easy to draw and hold when I have to wait for the perfect shot at full draw. Crossbows (The very exiting news is that more U.S. Wildlife Agencies legalize this traditional archery weapon for all hunters to be used as a very effective hunting tool. However, I recommend strongly that you check with your local wildlife agency about the legal use for non-physically challenged persons.) Light End: 110 pounds draw weight. Medium: 125 pounds draw weight. Heavy End: 175 pounds draw weight. Authors Note. - Personally I prefer the heavy end cross bow to hunt with. But generally speaking any crossbow is a very effective weapon to hunt deer with. I am very exited that there are more opportunities available to hunt with this weapon that has an undeserved negative reputation. Muzzleloaders (This includes all muzzleloader firearms, including black powder handguns, modern in-lines, percussion cap locks and flintlocks. Please check with the hunting regulations for more detailed information, regulations and special seasons.) Light End: .45 Calibre. Medium: .50 Calibre Heavy End: .54 Calibre Authors note. - The .50 calibre muzzleloader is a very good choice for deer hunting with round balls, conical bullets and sabboted pistol bullets. It has moderate recoil depending on the load combination. Shotguns Light End: 20 gauge. Medium: 12 gauge. Heavy End: 10 gauge. Authors note: - My choice of shotgun is a 12 gauge dedicated (centre fire rifle style) slug gun with sabboted slugs. Personally, I do not recommend using "buck shot" as I feel it is not as efficient as a well-placed slug. Also a slug gun is a short range weapon shots should be kept just slightly over 100 yards with a well tuned gun, preferably under 100 yards. Slug guns are perfect "brush guns".

#### Deer hunters like deer hunting- they’ll find other ways to hunt if handguns are banned because they enjoy it- that’s terminal defense.

#### This turns the disad- they’ll switch to rifles which are BETTER at hunting deer.

Snow 14 John B. “10 Best Deer Guns for Hunting Today” September 29 2014 Outdoor Life <http://www.outdoorlife.com/blogs/hunting/10-best-deer-guns-hunting-today> JW

We’re not pulling any punches here. We’ve assembled a list of the best deer guns made today for every type of hunting, whether you’re chasing whitetails in a cedar swamp or scouting miles of open prairie for mule deer. Yes, a basic synthetic-stocked .30/06 bolt gun will serve just fine for the majority of deer hunts, but there’s something to be said for having the right tool for the right job. Sometimes that means an extra-­accurate rifle for making long shots, or a lightweight rig for hauling up a mountain. And sometimes hunting regs won’t allow a centerfire rifle of any type. So for whatever type of deer hunting you do, you’ll find a perfect gun on this list. 1. Beanfield Sniper Remington Sendero SF II With a heavy 26-inch barrel, the Sendero is built to squeeze as much velocity as possible out of flat-­shooting cartridges for long, accurate shots. The rifle is heavy—with a scope, it is going to weigh 10 pounds or more—but if you’ve got a short hike to your stand or don’t mind humping a beefy rig, the Sendero is ideal. The rigid HS Precision stock helps with accuracy. Currently it’s offered in 7mm Rem. Mag., .300 Win. Mag., and .300 Rem. Ultramag., though if you search for used guns, you might find one in the underappreciated .264 Win. ($1,465; remington.com) 2. Timber Classic Marlin 336C Lever guns endure not from some misguided sense of nostalgia, but because they strike a balance between portability, balance, handling, and firepower like no other deer rifle. The “thuddy-thuddy” remains a top deer cartridge, but I’ve always gravitated to the .35 Rem., which packs greater oomph. Either way, however, you won’t go wrong. Topped with a low-magnification scope or a peep sight, the Marlin is ideal for hunting dark timber or from within the confines of a small blind. With moderate recoil and a magazine capacity that most bolt guns can only dream of, it is a potent rifle. ($610; marlinfirearms.com) 3. Alpine Shooter Sako Finnlight The Sako Finnlight won Outdoor Life’s Editor’s Choice award a few years back due to its superb accuracy and reliability, which are not a given for rifles that have thin barrels and other weight-saving features. Light weight often comes at the expense of performance, but that’s not so with the 6-pound Finnlight. I’ve shot this rifle until it’s hot enough to fry an egg on its fluted barrel, but it still manages tight groups. It comes in a wide range of great calibers—.260 Rem., .270 WSM, 6.5x55 SE, 7mm Rem. Mag., to name a few—but I think it would be hard to top the .308, given the cartridge’s mild recoil, proven killing power, and broad selection of accurate loads. ($1,699; sako.fi) 4. All-Purpose All-Star Weatherby Vanguard Series 2 When it comes to the best all-around big-game bolt gun, the Weatherby Vanguard Series 2 is at the top of the list. These rifles hit a sweet spot for their price, accuracy, handling, and craftsmanship. One of my friends, an avid gun nut who is also a penny-pinching farmer, was so smitten after shooting my .308 that he bought four Vanguards, one for every member of his family. The refinements that Weatherby made with the introduction of the Series 2—a better trigger and stock, and a handy three-position safety—took what had been a good rifle to begin with and made it great. Vanguards come in a host of configurations and calibers, but if you’re looking for a no-nonsense working gun for any type of deer, go for the Stainless Synthetic. It will handle rough use and rough weather, and with Weatherby’s accuracy guarantee, you can count on the rifle to do its part to guide your shot to its mark. ($799; weatherby.com) 5. Penny-Pincher Ruger American I’ve shot at least a half dozen different Ruger Americans since they first came out, and all of them are absurdly accurate and sell for a price that gives other gunmakers fits. For a street price of about 400 bucks, Ruger has built a rifle with a good barrel and an innovative bedding system. It also comes with an adjustable trigger and a three-lug action that runs smoothly from the shoulder, which is something that many semi-custom bolt guns don’t do. The rifle comes with Weaver-style scope bases, making it an even better value. About the only knock on the rifle, I suppose, are its aesthetics—though that seems a little ungenerous given the value it otherwise represents. The stock feels a bit flimsy in hand, and the rifle isn’t one that a hunter is likely to mount above the mantlepiece for its looks. Maybe this is a good thing, however. If Ruger managed to make the American a thing of beauty on top of its other virtues, other gunmakers would probably just give up in frustration. ($499; ruger.com) 6. Small-Plot Smasher Ambush 300 Blackout Hunters on small parcels of private ground need a rifle with the ability to put an animal down quickly. This is a scenario where a large-caliber AR shines. A deer that makes it to land where the hunter doesn’t have permission to search can be a nightmare to recover. The Ambush 300 Blackout is well suited for this kind of work. Most hunters will probably opt for the supersonic .30-caliber loads that launch bullets weighing around 115 to 125 grains at 2,200 fps or more. For shots out to 200 yards, these rounds are deadly, and given the moderate recoil and semi-automatic operation of the Ambush, fast follow-up shots are possible if needed. The Ambush comes with a threaded 16-inch barrel, so attaching a sound suppressor to lessen the muzzle blast is easy to do, should the hunter want to save his hearing and be less of a nuisance to whoever might live nearby. ($1,799; ambushfirearms.com) 7. First-Timer outfit H&R Handi Rifle These rifles are as basic as they get. And basic is what one wants when putting a deer gun into the hands of a young or inexperienced hunter. The way the Handi Rifle operates couldn’t be simpler. The small lever on the back of the receiver unlocks the action, which pivots open on a hinge. When the shooter is ready to hunt, he drops a round in the pipe and closes the gun, and away he goes. Prior to the shot, the hunter cocks the hammer and that’s it. There’s nothing complicated to remember or to mess up. The exposed hammer makes it easy to check the status of the loaded gun, which is a good thing. These rifles also have pretty good triggers and are accurate as well. And there’s something to be said for a ­single-shot, which places emphasis on accuracy and marksmanship whenever the trigger is pulled. This platform is offered in many calibers, including the .44 Magnum, .223 Rem., and .243 Win., all of which are good deer rounds that don’t have excessive recoil, making them smart options for young hunters. ($322; hr1871.com) 8. Slug-Zone Specialist Savage M220 Stainless Camo My high opinion of these bolt-action slug guns was cemented the day I used one to help a blind hunter kill hogs in Texas while looking over his shoulder through a special scope mounted high above the barrel. Communicating in whispers, the two of us were able to knock over multiple pigs. Like everything Savage makes, these guns are accurate and, in the case of the M220, come equipped with Savage’s Accu-­Trigger. That this gun is chambered in 20-gauge is another reason to love it. These slugs are much softer shooting than 12-gauge slugs, and no deer you might shoot would end up any less dead. The rifles have a detachable box magazine that holds two rounds and comes in a couple of different grades, either plain black with a synthetic stock or with stainless and camo finish, which costs a bit more. ($582; savagearms.com) 9. Muzzleloading workhorse Thompson/Center Pro Hunter FX I’ll confess that it is a bit difficult to pick a “best” muzzleloader out there because, frankly, there are a number of excellent ones on the market. The Pro Hunter FX from T/C gets the nod, however. These rifles are well made, easy to clean and shoot, have comfortable stocks and good ergonomics, and also have a proven track record, which makes them a solid option for blackpowder hunting. For areas that don’t allow optics, the open sights on the Pro Hunter do their job well. The recoil-dampening system, which is built into the stock and consists of a series of squishy strips that compress under recoil, is also quite effective. While I don’t usually care for guns with finger grooves molded into the stock, the ones on the Pro Hunter are comfortable and help align the shooting hand for a good trigger squeeze. The Pro Hunter FX comes with a 26-inch barrel, a breech plug that is easy to remove by hand, and a crisp trigger. ($649; tcarms.com) 10. Open-Country Stalker Nosler M48 Patriot The 26 Nosler is the new kid in town and has hunters who stalk medium-size game in big country all aflutter with its barrel-smoking ballistics. Nosler’s initial loads in this 6.5mm caliber are a 129-grain AccuBond Longrange at 3,400 fps and a 140-grain AccuBond at 3,300 fps. For a hard-hitting and effective long-range hunting round, it is difficult to do better. But the ballistics and ammunition are only part of the story. The M48 Patriot, which is the rifle Nosler is making for the new round, is an outstanding bolt gun. Every component on the rifle is top-notch, and it is easy to tell that the craftsmen who designed and built the M48s are hunters and shooters. The triggers are lovely, the barrels are accurate, the stocks are well proportioned and strong and stiff, and the action is one of the finest hunting actions made. Little surprise that this rifle, new in 2014, took top honors in the Outdoor Life annual gun test, winning our Editor’s Choice award. ($1,695; nosler.com)

#### Impact’s empirically denied- humans don’t interact with deers and there has been no massive lyme disease epidemic. It would have happened already.

#### Lyme disease isn’t fatal- that severs the internal link to zoonotic disease extinction.

#### Past 2000 years disproves extinction from disease- AIDS, influenza, the plague proves we’ll survive, especially since we have better tech now.

## Court Clog DA (HWL)

#### No link- this is not how lawsuits work. It’s not like every single person sues the government- class action lawsuits are individual claims combined. That means the aff causes literally just one more trial.

Your uniqueness evidence says judges might leave- they’ll just get replaced with new judges which means no impact.

Non unique- gun rights lawsuits are happening in the squo.

O’Connell and Fields 10

Flood of Gun-Rights Suits Seen By **VANESSA O'CONNELL** And **GARY FIELDS** Updated June 29, 2010 12:01 a.m. ET The Wallstreet Journal <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748703279704575335253375497716>

**Monday's high-court decision expanding gun rights will likely trigger a flood of litigation in states and cities with restrictive laws**, so it could take years before the practical impact of the ruling is clear. The ruling requires states to respect a federal right under the Second Amendment to keep and bear arms, but it doesn't say specifically how broadly the right extends. That means existing regulations must be weighed by federal judges who will have to interpret the Supreme Court's vague language. **Gun-rights groups are preparing to file suits in states with restrictive laws**—in particular New York and California—while groups favoring gun control said they were confident most rules would pass constitutional muster. Among the restrictions likely to be in play are assault-weapons bans, registration rules and state laws that give governments permission to suspend certain gun rights in emergencies. Wayne LaPierre, executive vice president of the National Rifle Association, said, "We're going to go everywhere cynical politicians attempt to pervert, defy or nullify the decision." He said one target for court challenges would be New York City's gun laws. The city requires owners of handguns, shotguns and rifles to register the weapons, hold licenses or carry permits. Alan M. Gottlieb, founder of the Second Amendment Foundation, another gun-rights group, said the group filed a lawsuit Monday in federal court challenging a North Carolina statute that bars possession of firearms off of one's property in areas where there is a declared state of emergency. "We wouldn't have been able to challenge" the law "without this decision," Mr. Gottlieb said. "We had this ready to go." The decision is also likely to affect two California cases filed by gun-rights group Calguns Foundation that were put on hold pending the outcome of the Supreme Court case. Those cases challenge California's method of issuing gun licenses and its list of handguns designated unsafe. Many state constitutions already recognize gun rights. California is one of at least six that don't have such a right, said Calguns Chairman Gene Hoffman and other experts. The Supreme Court ruling affected handgun bans in Chicago and Oak Park, Ill. It follows a 2008 decision that struck down a handgun ban in the District of Columbia. Many of the rules in localities around the country are less broad, requiring only registration, background checks and the like. The Supreme Court rulings "have to do with handgun bans" and "don't provide a strong basis for challenging other laws," said Joshua Horwitz, executive director of the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence. In Chicago, officials Monday said they were already drafting a replacement ordinance, although Mayor Richard M. Daley was mum on details. The mayor said he would support both required gun registration and liability insurance for firearms owners in any future law. "We are a country of laws. Not a country of guns," Mr. Daley said, criticizing the high court. As it reviews its options, Chicago may take some cues from Washington, D.C. The 2008 ruling in District of Columbia v. Heller forced the capital to revamp its gun laws, but its restrictions are still among the most stringent in the nation. "We have battled the demons for over a year, dealing with Heller," said Peter Nickles, the district's attorney general. The district now requires gun owners to get five hours of safety training, register firearms every three years and to undergo two criminal checks—one by the police and the second by the gun dealer. "We have what we consider to be a careful balance between safety and the Constitution," Mr. Nickles said. Gun-rights groups disagree. They say the district's rules don't comply with Heller and have challenged them in federal court as unconstitutional. A federal district judge ruled earlier this year in favor of the district, and that decision is being appealed. "I would expect **it's going to be years and years of litigation**," Mr. Nickles said. Gun owners welcomed the ruling as an affirmation of what they had preached for years. At Sharpshooters Small Arms Range in Lorton, Va., the crack of small-arms fire echoed from the 16 separate lanes at the indoor range where shooters practiced. Paul Swiergosz, a 43-year-old retired Army officer, said he returned from a tour in Iraq to Fort Drum, N.Y., only to learn that getting a permit for a handgun was difficult, even for someone who had carried one on behalf of the nation just months before. Mr. Swiergosz, who was at the range with his 18-year-old daughter, said "it'd be nice if they annotate" the decision and spell out some of the regulations that states can no longer impose. "It would appear **there will be more court cases**. It's a big step though," he said.

Uniqueness overwhelms the link- your uniqueness says there is huge court clog now and we’re at a breaking point- something else will push us over the impact.

Separation of powers worked in the 19th century but not anymore.

Posner and Vermeule, 10- \*professor of law at the University of Chicago AND \*\*professor of law at Harvard (Eric and Adrian, The Executive Unbound, p. 17-18)

We begin with the constitutional framework, and with the official constitutional theory of liberal legalism. In this theory lawmaking powers are separated among three different branches-legislature, executive, and judiciary-in order to promote an institutional division of labor and to protect liberty The liberty-protecting function of the separation of powers, Madison suggested, is that the combination of powers in one institution would be "the very definition of tyranny". Mutual checking and monitoring by the branches of government would prevent concentration of power suppress the evils of factionalism, and conduce to better policymaking overall. This theory has collapsed. Its fit with reality is no longer merely imperfect, in the way that all regulative ideals are imperfect; rather it does not even approximate the political terrain it purports to cover. We will proceed to explain this conclusion in three steps. First, we examine the checking function of the separation of powers. Here Madison made two crucial mistakes: first in assuming that the individual ambitions of government officials would cause them to support the power of the institutions they occupy and second in assuming that some invisible-hand mechanism would cause the mutual contest among institutions to produce a socially beneficial system of mutual checks. Nothing in the actual separation-of-powers system, however, guarantees or even generally tends to produce socially beneficial results. In particular, we show that the system will predictably lead to suboptimal checking-to a political regime in which some institutions (such as legislature and judiciary) do too little to check the swelling power of others (such as the executive). Second, we examine the monitoring function of the separation of powers, focusing particularly on legislative and judicial monitoring of the executive. The vastly increased complexity and scale of the executive, since Madison's day ensures that the monitoring function is largely obsolete. In the administrative state, the scope of the executive's responsibility is vast, and legislative and judicial institutions lack the capacity to monitor any important fraction of what the executive does, even where opposing political parties occupy the executive and other branches, and even with the help of "fire alarms"-alerts from interest groups with stakes in particular issues.2 In many of the most important domains, and those most difficult to monitor-those involving intelligence, foreign affairs and national security or highly complex questions of economic policy-legislators and the courts are overmatched, for enduring structural reasons that prevail no matter what the contingent political constellation. We thus reject any strong version of the "congressional dominance" thesis-the idea that Congress, sometimes enlisting the aid of interest groups and the courts, exerts implicit but effective control over executive and administrative behavior.

#### De facto constraints are sufficient

**Posner and Vermeule, 9** - \* University of Chicago – Law School AND \*\*Harvard University – Harvard Law School (Eric and Adrian, “Tyrannophobia” 9/15, SSRN)

Demography and the Administrative State. The best explanation for the lack of dictatorship in America – at least in America today, as opposed to the 19th century – is neither psychological nor institutional, but demographic. Part III examined the strong comparative evidence that wealth is the best safeguard for democracy. Equality, homogeneity, and education matter as well. How does the United States, circa 2009, fare on these dimensions? Ethnic, religious and linguistic homogeneity have declined, but because of its high performance on other margins, there is little cause for concern about American democracy. The United States has an enormously rich, relatively well-educated population and multiple overlapping cleavages of class, race, religion and geography. Simply by virtue of its high per capita income, the likelihood of dictatorship in the United States **is almost nil**, at least if the historical pattern reflects causation. The highwater mark of the modern presidency’s approach to domestic dictatorship – Nixon’s “third-rate burglary” of the offices of his political opponents – was pathetic stuff in historical and comparative perspective, and immediately put Nixon on a slippery slope to disgrace. Likewise, comparisons between Weimar Germany and the United States of the Bush administration87 were worse than irresponsible; they were ignorant. We add a less obvious point. Legal scholars, especially those of a libertarian or civil-libertarian bent, often express concern that the formal separation of powers has atrophied over the course of the 20th century. On this account, economic and security crises, the rise of the administrative state, the death of the nondelegation doctrine, the imperial presidency, the ineffectual character of the War Powers Resolution and the other framework statutes of the 1970s, all mean that in many domains presidents operate without substantial legal checks, although they have political incentives to cooperate with Congress and to seek statutory authorization for their actions. Among the framer’s miscalculations was their failure to understand the “presidential power of unilateral action”88 – the president’s power to take action in the real world, with debatable legal authority or none at all, creating a new status quo that then constrains the response of other institutions. In the most overheated version of this view, such developments are taken to pose a real risk of executive tyranny in the United States.89 We suggest, however, that the same large-scale economic and political developments that have caused a relaxation of the legal checks on the executive have simultaneously strengthened the nonlegal checks. Legal checks on the presidency have been relaxed largely because of the need for centralized, relatively efficient government under the complex conditions of a modern dynamic economy and a highly interrelated international order. Yet those economic and political conditions have themselves helped to create de facto constraints on presidential power that make democracy in the United States extremely stable. The modern economy, whose complexity creates the demand for administrative governance, also creates wealth, leisure, education and broad political information, all of which strengthen democracy and make a **collapse into authoritarian rule nearly impossible**. Modern presidents are substantially constrained, not by old statutes or even by Congress and the courts, but by the tyranny of public and (especially) elite opinion. Every action is scrutinized, leaks from executive officials come in a torrent, journalists are professionally hostile, and potential abuses are quickly brought to light. The modern presidency is a fishbowl, in large part because the costs of acquiring political information have fallen steadily in the modern economy, and because a wealthy, educated and leisured population has the time to monitor presidential action and takes an interest in doing so. This picture implies that modern presidents are both more accountable than their predecessors and more responsive to gusts of elite sentiment and mass opinion, but they are not dictators in any conventional sense. More tentatively, we also suggest that the relaxation of legal checks may itself have contributed to the growth of the political checks, rather than both factors simply being the common result of a complex modern economy. On this hypothesis, the administrative and presidential state of the New Deal and later has, despite all its inefficiencies, plausibly supplied efficiency-enhancing regulation, political stability, and a measure of redistribution, and these policies have both added to national economic and cultural capital and dampened political conflict. The administrative state has thus helped to create a wealthy, educated population and a super-educated elite whose members have the leisure and affluence to care about matters such as civil liberties, who are politically engaged to a fault, and who help to check executive abuses. While the direct effects of wealth, education and other factors on the stability of democracy are clear in comparative perspective, there is more dispute about the overall economic effects of regulation and the administrative state,90 so we offer this as a hypothesis for further research.

## Extremism DA (Immac Heart)

Only some vets going to these groups won’t push us over

Obama executive actions trigger the links

Assault sweapons ban didn’t trigger the imapct

1. Revolt never even gets off the ground-handgun ban means possession will force them all into jail where they are confined.

2. No warrant for why this revolt would be even remotely successful-the US has done fine in the past suppressing violent uprisings. They would get crushed by the police.

#### Empirically denied. The worst case scenario happened… four times.

**Dove 12**

<Alan Dove, PhD in Microbiology, science journalist and former Adjunct Professor at New York University, “Who’s Afraid of the Big, Bad Bioterrorist?” Jan 24 2012, http://alandove.com/content/2012/01/whos-afraid-of-the-big-bad-bioterrorist/>

The second problem is much more serious. Eliminating the toxins, we’re left with a list of infectious **bacteria and viruses**. With a single exception, these organisms **are** probably near-**useless as weapons, and history proves it**. There have been at least three well-documented military-style deployments of infectious agents from the list, plus one deployment of an agent that’s not on the list. I’m focusing entirely on the modern era, by the way. There are historical reports of armies catapulting plague-ridden corpses over city walls and conquistadors trying to inoculate blankets with Variola (smallpox), but it’s not clear those “attacks” were effective. Those diseases tended to spread like, well, plagues, so there’s no telling whether the targets really caught the diseases from the bodies and blankets, or simply picked them up through casual contact with their enemies. **Of** the **four modern biowarfare incidents, two have been fatal**. The first was the **1979** Sverdlovsk **anthrax incident**, which **killed** an estimated **100 people**. In that case, a Soviet-built biological weapons lab accidentally released a large plume of weaponized Bacillus anthracis (anthrax) over a major city. Soviet authorities tried to blame the resulting fatalities on “bad meat,” but in the 1990s Western investigators were finally able to piece together the real story. The **second fatal incident also involved anthrax from a government-run lab**: the 2001 “Amerithrax” attacks. That time, a rogue employee (or perhaps employees) of the government’s main bioweapons lab sent weaponized, powdered anthrax through the US postal service. **Five** people **died. That gives us** a grand total of around **105 deaths, entirely from agents** that were grown and **weaponized in officially-sanctioned and funded bioweapons** research **labs**. Remember that. **Terrorist groups have** also **deployed** **bio**logical **weapons twice**, and these cases are very instructive. The first was the 1984 Rajneeshee bioterror attack, in which members of **a cult in Oregon inoculated** restaurant **salad bars with Salmonella** bacteria (an agent that’s not on the “select” list). 751 people got sick, but **nobody died**. Public health authorities handled it as a conventional foodborne Salmonella outbreak, identified the sources and contained them. Nobody even would have known it was a deliberate attack if a member of the cult hadn’t come forward afterward with a confession. Lesson: our **existing public health infrastructure was** entirely **adequate** to respond to a major bioterrorist attack. The **second** genuine bioterrorist **attack** took place in 1993. Members of the **Aum Shinrikyo** cult successfully isolated and **grew** a large stock of **anthrax** bacteria, **then sprayed it** as an aerosol from the roof of a building **in downtown Tokyo**. **The cult was well-financed,** **and had** many **highly educated members, so this** release over the world’s largest city really **represented a worst-case scenario**. **Nobody got sick** or died. From the cult’s perspective, it was a complete and utter failure. Again, the only reason we even found out about it was a post-hoc confession. Aum members later demonstrated their lab skills by producing Sarin nerve gas, with far deadlier results. Lesson: one of the top “select agents” is extremely hard to grow and deploy even for relatively skilled non-state groups. It’s a really crappy bioterrorist weapon. Taken together, these events point to an uncomfortable but inevitable conclusion: our biodefense industry is a far greater threat to us than any actual bioterrorists.

## Industry DA

#### 1. Gun sales are declining rapidly.

CAF 12-7 Caliber Auction Firearms “The Downturn Has Been Harsh, But The Market Is Stabilizing.” 12-7-15 <http://x-caf.com/news/news-recent/15-12-07/U_S_Firearms_Industry_Today_2015> JW

**The downturn in the U.S. firearms industry has been**, to put it gently, **unpleasant**. Yes, the industry has experienced numerous ups-and-downs in its history, but perhaps **no decline has been as rapid or as steep.** Last year’s slowdown created a painful whiplash: Companies — manufacturers through dealers — struggled to adjust to the new normal. The impact has been harsh. Yet, there’s a glimmer of hope. Following aggressive marketing to rightsize overloaded inventories and to draw consumers back into gun shops, there are indications the market is stabilizing. That may seem difficult to grasp, especially at the dealer level, where parking lots haven’t been full in many months. And there are still the summer months to navigate on the way to a hoped-for healthy hunting and holiday buying season. It’s then, most experts say, the industry will experience modest growth.E ncouraging Signs During May, NICS conducted 918,707 (NSSF-adjusted) background checks, a 4.7 percent increase compared to May 2014. It was the second highest May on record. Not surprising, the highest May was in 2013, with 974,457 (NSSF-adjusted) background checks. In May, Ruger reported sales for its 2015 first quarter, which ended March 28. The company posted sales of $137 million, a 19 percent decrease compared to the first quarter of 2014. However, Ruger’s performance during its first quarter this year was 12 percent higher than the fourth quarter of 2014 — an encouraging sign. “Demand for the company’s firearms in the first quarter of 2015 increased from the fourth quarter of 2014 due to the successful annual sales promotions in effect during the first quarter of 2015, coupled with a reduction in the aggressive price discounting by many of our competitors that was prevalent in the latter half of 2014,” said Mike Fifer, Ruger CEO. In previous financial reports, Fifer noted “the lack of significant new product introductions” contributed to the company’s drop in sales. Ruger responded with numerous new product introductions, with positive results. “New products, including the AR-556 modern sporting rifle and the LC9s pistol, represented $22.8 million or 17 percent of firearm sales in the first quarter of 2015,” Fifer said. In March, Smith & Wesson reported its 2015 third quarter sales, which ended Jan. 31, decreased 10.5 percent, compared to 2014. Firearm sales during the third quarter were down 14.7 percent. However, S&W’s overall sales during the third quarter were 20 percent higher than the previous second quarter. “Our third quarter results reflect the successful navigation of a normalizing firearm market following an earlier consumer surge in firearm purchases, combined with the ongoing focused execution of our long-term strategy. Sales in our firearm division exceeded our updated expectations, reflecting solid orders from distributors and key retailers at the start of our annual industry show season in January,” said James Debney, S&W Holding Corp. president and CEO.] In April, Smith & Wesson announced it was updating expectations for its fourth quarter and full 2015 fiscal year. The company indicated orders throughout its fiscal fourth quarter were stronger than originally anticipated. In March, **Remington** Outdoor Co. reported its firearms sales for the three months ending March 29 **decreased 27.5 percent**, compared to the quarter ending March 30, 2014. “**Our firearms sales experienced declines** across all our major product categories. MSR and centerfire sales decreased $16.2 million. Sales of shotguns decreased $15.7 million, primarily due to softness in demand for tactical shotguns and certain brand rationalization initiatives. In addition, **sales of handguns decreased $3.5 million**, while sales of rimfire rifles decreased $1.5 million. These decreases were partially offset by increases in sales of our other firearm products of $2.8 million,” according to the company’s financial report. What brands are top sellers? According to consumer purchasing data from Southwick Associates, Smith & Wesson was the top-selling handgun in 2014. Southwick reports Remington and Ruger shared the top-selling rifle title for 2014, while Remington dominated 2014 shotgun sales.

#### 2. The great recession disproves the impact-there’s been no conflict ten years later which means no escalation.

#### 3. If gun manufacturers want to make money they’ll pivot to assault rifles and other weapons, they won’t just roll over and die

#### 4. Gun industry isn’t reliant on private ownership of handguns.

Plumer 12 Brad (senior editor at Vox, previous reporter at WashPost covering climate and energy policy) “How the U.S. gun industry became so lucrative” Washington Post December 19th 2012 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2012/12/19/seven-facts-about-the-u-s-gun-industry/>

2. While private citizens still make up the bulk of gun purchases, the industry is also heavily reliant on sales to government agencies. Back in the late 1990s, the gun industry was actually facing decline, as the economy was humming along and crime fears were subsiding. Then Sept. 11 hit. Thanks to new counter-terrorism measures, law enforcement agencies and the U.S. military started buying up weapons at a faster pace, reviving the industry. Today, government agencies make up 40 percent of industry revenues: That's not necessarily good news for the gun industry in the years ahead. States are now paring back on budgets and law enforcement agencies are slowing down their purchases. IBIS World projects the gun industry to grow slightly more slowly in the next five years than it did in the last five. Case in point: In a recent filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, for instance, Smith & Wesson noted as one of its “risk factors” that it had yet to secure a long-term contract with the U.S. military. “As a result, 89.0% of our net firearm sales remain in the sporting goods distribution channel.” 3. Handguns make up roughly half of the guns produced in the United States nowadays — and that number has been growing rapidly. In 2011, about half of the six million guns manufactured in the United States were pistols and revolvers. That's up from just one-third in 2001, according to a report from First Research. Rifles now account for 35 percent of the market, with shotguns and other guns making up the rest. 4. Ammunition is an enormous portion of the gun industry's revenues: Here's how one gun lobbyist put it: "You make a product for $300, and somebody could buy this revolver and, by the time they are 80, they'll have fired $10,000 worth of ammunition through it." In 2012, the industry made nearly as much on small arms ammunition as it did on small arms. ("Other ammunition" in this chart includes bombs, grenades, mines, mortar shells. "Other ordnance" includes things like antiaircraft artillery, antitank rocket, field artillery, and so forth.) 5. Exports to other countries are also a huge part of business. U.S. firearms manufacturers will export some $4.4 billion worth of guns and ammunition to other countries this year. The biggest customers are Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia, who accounted for nearly 40 percent of exports in 2012 (it's mainly law enforcement and military agencies doing the buying, as private gun ownership is heavily regulated in those nations). IBIS World expects exports to keep surging in the coming years, with ammunition and ordnance being an especially popular item overseas.

#### 5. gun industry isn’t a pillar of the economy-your ev exaggerates the impact. There are thousands of popular products that exist in the squo-it’s unlikely that taking out one industry would send econ reeling.

#### 6. Manufacturing in every industry is declining in the squo. The economy is already going to shit-our ev postdates yours.

Bartash February 3rd Jeffrey bartash “Biggest part of economy growing at slowest pace in two years, ISM finds” Market Watch 2-03-16 <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/biggest-part-of-us-economy-not-growing-as-fast-ism-finds-2016-02-03> JW

Companies in the U.S. service sector such as retail, banking and health care grew in January at the slowest pace in almost two years, adding to a drumbeat of data suggesting the economy has softened The Institute for Supply Management said its nonmanufacturing index fell to 53.5% from 55.8% in December. Economists polled by MarketWatch had forecast a 55.2% reading. Any number over 50% indicates more businesses are expanding instead of contracting, but the ISM service index has dropped three straight months and is at the lowest level since February 2014. The slowdown suggests that weakness among energy producers, manufacturers and major exporters may have spread to the much larger service side of the economy that employs the vast majority of Americans. “This report will only add to fears that the overall economy is weakening,” said Jim O’Sullivan, chief U.S. economist of High Frequency Economics. The survey is compiled from a questionnaire of the executives who buy supplies for their companies; it tends to rise in fall in tandem with the broader economy. Most executives had a positive outlook about business conditions, ISM said, but they are more worried about declining stock markets and a shaky global economy weighing on the U.S. “Sales have improved,” said one executive at a retailer. “We are feeling more optimism, but remain concerned about the impact of global unrest.” A sign of that anxiety: The employment fell 4.2 points to 52.1% to hit the lowest rate in a year. The ISM’s employment survey for manufacturers released earlier this week was even weaker, falling to a six-year bottom that marked the lowest level since the end of the Great Recession. Taken together, the two ISM employment indexes point to a much slower pace of hiring in January after a large 292,000 gain in new jobs in December. Another labor-market gauge produced by payroll processor ADP also found that hiring came back to earth in early 2016.

#### 7. No correlation between economic decline and war. Comprehensive economic studies prove.

**Miller 2k** <Morris Miller, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?”>

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of **the Carnegie Endowment** for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. **After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War** they **concluded that:**19 “**Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis** - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - **bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes** ... (**or**, in democratic states, rarely) **to an outbreak of violence** ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).”

### T: Gun Violence

#### TURN-gun violence takes a huge toll on the economy.

Follman 15 Mark (national affairs editor at Mother Jones) “What does Gun Violence Really Cost?” Mother Jones May/June 2015 Issue <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/04/true-cost-of-gun-violence-in-america> JW

Miller's approach looks at two categories of costs. The first is direct: Every time a bullet hits somebody, **expenses can include emergency services, police investigations, and long-term medical and mental-health care, as well as court and prison costs**. About 87 percent of these costs fall on taxpayers. The second category consists of indirect costs: Factors here include **lost income, losses to employers, and impact on quality of life**, which Miller bases on amounts that juries award for pain and suffering to victims of wrongful injury and death. In collaboration with Miller, Mother Jones crunched data from 2012 and found that **the annual cost of gun violence in America exceeds $229 billion.** Direct costs account for $8.6 billion—including long-term prison costs for people who commit assault and homicide using guns, which at $5.2 billion a year is the largest direct expense. **Even before accounting for the more intangible costs of the violence**, in other words, **the average cost to taxpayers for a single gun homicide** in America **is nearly $400,000.** And we pay for 32 of them every single day.

#### This outweighs gun industry decline

Hamilton 12 Gina “The economics of gun control” The New Maine Times December 18th 2012http://www.newmainetimes.org/articles/2012/12/18/smart-money-economics-gun-control/

This year, like every other year, approximately 30,000 Americans will die of gun deaths. A little more than half of those are suicides, another third are homicides, and the rest are accidents. Only about 480 are justifiable homicides, either a homeowner defending himself or a police shooting or someone moving to stop a gunman from committing mass slaughter. Well, that's never happened, except for police. But **at a loss to the economy for each life estimated at $200,000, in terms of lost productivity, police and judicial** time**, medical** care **and medical** examiner **costs**, final expenses, and so on, **the hit to the economy each year from gun deaths is approximately $6 trillion. If half of that number is not lost because of** an assault weapons **ban** (and the estimate from the Brady Foundation is that the 1994 ban cut the gun murder rate by 45 percent), that **$3 trillion would far outweigh the loss to the economy caused by the ban of only $3.2 billion. Economically, assault gun control makes good sense.**

## IPV DA

#### Guns in the home causes more IPV-best studies prove.

DeFilippis 14 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) “Having a Gun in the House Doesn't Make a Woman Safer” Feb 23 2014 The Atlantic <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2014/02/having-a-gun-in-the-house-doesnt-make-a-woman-safer/284022/> JW

Christy Salters Martin is a professional boxer and the owner of a concealed carry permit. But when she attempted to leave her husband, she was shot with her own gun. Today, she cautions other women against making the same mistake. “Just putting a weapon in the woman’s hand is not going to reduce the number of fatalities or gunshot victims that we have. Too many times, their male counterpart or spouse will be able to overpower them and take that gun away.” Wayne LaPierre, executive vice-president of the National Rifle Association, has argued that firearms are a great equalizer between the sexes. In a speech at the Conservative Political Action Committee last year, he declared, “The one thing a violent rapist deserves to face is a good woman with a gun.” But the empirical reality of firearm ownership reflects anything but equality, particularly when it comes to intimate partner violence. Such fights become much more frequent and lethal when firearms are involved, and the violence is nearly unidirectional, inflicted by males upon females. This relationship holds true not only across the United States, but around the world. A recent meta-analysis concluded what many people already knew: the availability of firearms is a strong risk factor for both homicide and suicide. But the study came to another conclusion that is rarely mentioned in the gun control debate: females are uniquely impacted by the availability of a firearm. Indeed, the study found that women with access to firearms become homicide victims at significantly higher rates than men. It has long been recognized that higher rates of gun availability correlate with higher rates of female homicide. Women in the United States account for 84 percent of all female firearm victims in the developed world, even though they make up only a third of the developed world’s female population. And within American borders, women die at higher rates from suicide, homicide, and accidental firearm deaths in states where guns are more widely available. This is true even after controlling for factors such as urbanization, alcohol use, education, poverty, and divorce rates. What’s more surprising is how many of these deaths occur in the home, at the hands of a male partner. In a study in the Journal of Trauma, A.L. Kellermann, director of the RAND Institute of health, and his coauthor J.A. Mercy concluded: “More than twice as many women are killed with a gun used by their husbands or intimate acquaintances than are murdered by strangers using guns, knives, or any other means.” In another study, published in the American Journal of Public Health, researchers interviewed 417 women across 67 battered women’s shelters. Nearly a third of these women had lived in a household with a firearm. In two-thirds of the homes, their intimate partners had used the gun against them, usually threatening to kill (71.4%) them. A very small percentage of these women (7%) had used a gun successfully in self-defense, and primarily just to scare the attacking male partner away. Indeed, gun threats in the home against women by their intimate partners appear to be more common across the United States than self-defense uses of guns by women. Another large case-control study compared women who were murdered by their intimate partner with a control group of battered women. Only 16 percent of the women who had been abused, but not murdered, had guns in their homes, whereas 51 percent of the murder victims did. In fact, not a single study to date has shown that the risk of any crime including burglary, robbery, home invasion, or spousal abuse against a female is decreased through gun ownership. Though there are examples of women using a gun to defend themselves, they are few and far between, and not statistically significant. These facts should be as chilling to men as they are to women. A 2005 study examining mortality data from 1998-2000 found that when a female was shot by her intimate partner, the perpetrator subsequently killed himself in two thirds of the cases. This statistic not only shows necessity of getting mental help for at-risk men. It also further suggests that owning a firearm may make a household more vulnerable than ever.

## Recreation DA

#### 1. Shooting ranges solve.

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

Many recreational uses of handguns are compatible with a ban on private ownership. For instance, target shooting can still be enjoyed at licensed facilities. Shooters would be allowed to own or rent handguns that would be permanently stored at the shooting ranges.7

#### 2. you don’t need handguns, you can use other guns and weapons, like assault rifles or take up archery.

#### 3. gun violence outweighs-it kills people which prevents all future happiness.

#### 4. people will find new hobbies out of desperation

## Revolt DA (Valley)

1. Uniqueness overwhelms the link-your Gellman evidence is from 2010 and says that this revolt group sees all forms of gun control as an extreme affront on liberty. There’s gun control in the squo which means either the impact is empirically denied or it will happen soon anyway regardless of the aff

2. Revolt never even gets off the ground-handgun ban means possession will force them all into jail where they are confined.

3. No warrant for why this revolt would be even remotely successful-the US has done fine in the past suppressing violent uprisings. They would get crushed by the police. And- there’s no impact to them fighting. This also link turns the DA-US civil society is bolstered by crushing opposition-makes them look more powerful.

4. Impact is way over-tagged. The revolt won’t possibly “destroy American society,” your evidence is missing a warrant for why this is the case or what destroying even entails.

5. Extinction comes first-it prevents all possible human future life and is irreversible whereas the US is an isolated country that can be rebuilt.

## SCOTUS DA

Normal means is consistent with the constitution including amendments to ensure durable fiat- otherwise contentious affs would never happen because of the status quo political climate killing ground- let me go past the SCOTUS

#### Liberal justices allow handgun bans.

Sullum 10 Jacob (senior editor at Reason magazine) “Gun Shy: Four Supreme Court Justices Make Case Against Constitutional Rights” 2010 <http://www.creators.com/opinion/jacob-sullum/gun-shy-four-supreme-court-justices-make-case-against-constitutional-rights.html> JW

On Monday, the Supreme Court ruled that the Second Amendment applies to states and cities as well as the federal government. Judging from their objections, the four dissenters were still reeling from the court's landmark 2008 decision recognizing that the amendment protects an individual right to keep and bear arms. In their dissenting opinions, Justices John Paul Stevens and Stephen Breyer (joined by Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Sonia Sotomayor) worry that overturning gun control laws undermines democracy. If "the people" want to ban handguns, they say, "the people" should be allowed to implement that desire through their elected representatives.

#### A Democrat will win the presidency in 2016- an amalgam of reliable models prove; they’ll get to pick the justice.

#### VANKIN 15 [Jonathan Vankin (author, journalist, former news editor), “Latest 2016 Eleciton Predictions: Donald Trump Still a Big Loser, Dem to Win White House by Wide Margin”, December 23, 2015, Inquisitr News, DDA]

The latest expert predictions for the 2016 presidential election — predictions from a variety of established models for calling presidential races — show Donald Trump finishing somewhat closer to the Democratic candidate, who will almost certainly be Hillary Clinton. But in the end, most major prediction models continue to say, Trump will go home on November 8, 2016, as a big loser.¶ Or, as Trump himself might say, he will find himself “schlonged” by Hillary Clinton.¶ Nonetheless, Trump appears to be closing the gap between himself and the eventual Democratic nominee, at least in the popular vote, thanks largely to the recent spate of terrorist incidents such as the Paris attacks and San Bernardino mass shooting.¶ The Moody’s Analytics model, a prediction system employed by the leading economic analysis firm which claims to have correctly predicted every presidential election since 1980, shows the Republican gaining in the popular vote and finishing in a relatively close election. But when electoral college votes are tallied, the Democrat will win by a sizable margin.¶

Separation of powers worked in the 19th century but not anymore.

Posner and Vermeule, 10- \*professor of law at the University of Chicago AND \*\*professor of law at Harvard (Eric and Adrian, The Executive Unbound, p. 17-18)

We begin with the constitutional framework, and with the official constitutional theory of liberal legalism. In this theory lawmaking powers are separated among three different branches-legislature, executive, and judiciary-in order to promote an institutional division of labor and to protect liberty The liberty-protecting function of the separation of powers, Madison suggested, is that the combination of powers in one institution would be "the very definition of tyranny". Mutual checking and monitoring by the branches of government would prevent concentration of power suppress the evils of factionalism, and conduce to better policymaking overall. This theory has collapsed. Its fit with reality is no longer merely imperfect, in the way that all regulative ideals are imperfect; rather it does not even approximate the political terrain it purports to cover. We will proceed to explain this conclusion in three steps. First, we examine the checking function of the separation of powers. Here Madison made two crucial mistakes: first in assuming that the individual ambitions of government officials would cause them to support the power of the institutions they occupy and second in assuming that some invisible-hand mechanism would cause the mutual contest among institutions to produce a socially beneficial system of mutual checks. Nothing in the actual separation-of-powers system, however, guarantees or even generally tends to produce socially beneficial results. In particular, we show that the system will predictably lead to suboptimal checking-to a political regime in which some institutions (such as legislature and judiciary) do too little to check the swelling power of others (such as the executive). Second, we examine the monitoring function of the separation of powers, focusing particularly on legislative and judicial monitoring of the executive. The vastly increased complexity and scale of the executive, since Madison's day ensures that the monitoring function is largely obsolete. In the administrative state, the scope of the executive's responsibility is vast, and legislative and judicial institutions lack the capacity to monitor any important fraction of what the executive does, even where opposing political parties occupy the executive and other branches, and even with the help of "fire alarms"-alerts from interest groups with stakes in particular issues.2 In many of the most important domains, and those most difficult to monitor-those involving intelligence, foreign affairs and national security or highly complex questions of economic policy-legislators and the courts are overmatched, for enduring structural reasons that prevail no matter what the contingent political constellation. We thus reject any strong version of the "congressional dominance" thesis-the idea that Congress, sometimes enlisting the aid of interest groups and the courts, exerts implicit but effective control over executive and administrative behavior.

#### De facto constraints are sufficient

**Posner and Vermeule, 9** - \* University of Chicago – Law School AND \*\*Harvard University – Harvard Law School (Eric and Adrian, “Tyrannophobia” 9/15, SSRN)

Demography and the Administrative State. The best explanation for the lack of dictatorship in America – at least in America today, as opposed to the 19th century – is neither psychological nor institutional, but demographic. Part III examined the strong comparative evidence that wealth is the best safeguard for democracy. Equality, homogeneity, and education matter as well. How does the United States, circa 2009, fare on these dimensions? Ethnic, religious and linguistic homogeneity have declined, but because of its high performance on other margins, there is little cause for concern about American democracy. The United States has an enormously rich, relatively well-educated population and multiple overlapping cleavages of class, race, religion and geography. Simply by virtue of its high per capita income, the likelihood of dictatorship in the United States **is almost nil**, at least if the historical pattern reflects causation. The highwater mark of the modern presidency’s approach to domestic dictatorship – Nixon’s “third-rate burglary” of the offices of his political opponents – was pathetic stuff in historical and comparative perspective, and immediately put Nixon on a slippery slope to disgrace. Likewise, comparisons between Weimar Germany and the United States of the Bush administration87 were worse than irresponsible; they were ignorant. We add a less obvious point. Legal scholars, especially those of a libertarian or civil-libertarian bent, often express concern that the formal separation of powers has atrophied over the course of the 20th century. On this account, economic and security crises, the rise of the administrative state, the death of the nondelegation doctrine, the imperial presidency, the ineffectual character of the War Powers Resolution and the other framework statutes of the 1970s, all mean that in many domains presidents operate without substantial legal checks, although they have political incentives to cooperate with Congress and to seek statutory authorization for their actions. Among the framer’s miscalculations was their failure to understand the “presidential power of unilateral action”88 – the president’s power to take action in the real world, with debatable legal authority or none at all, creating a new status quo that then constrains the response of other institutions. In the most overheated version of this view, such developments are taken to pose a real risk of executive tyranny in the United States.89 We suggest, however, that the same large-scale economic and political developments that have caused a relaxation of the legal checks on the executive have simultaneously strengthened the nonlegal checks. Legal checks on the presidency have been relaxed largely because of the need for centralized, relatively efficient government under the complex conditions of a modern dynamic economy and a highly interrelated international order. Yet those economic and political conditions have themselves helped to create de facto constraints on presidential power that make democracy in the United States extremely stable. The modern economy, whose complexity creates the demand for administrative governance, also creates wealth, leisure, education and broad political information, all of which strengthen democracy and make a **collapse into authoritarian rule nearly impossible**. Modern presidents are substantially constrained, not by old statutes or even by Congress and the courts, but by the tyranny of public and (especially) elite opinion. Every action is scrutinized, leaks from executive officials come in a torrent, journalists are professionally hostile, and potential abuses are quickly brought to light. The modern presidency is a fishbowl, in large part because the costs of acquiring political information have fallen steadily in the modern economy, and because a wealthy, educated and leisured population has the time to monitor presidential action and takes an interest in doing so. This picture implies that modern presidents are both more accountable than their predecessors and more responsive to gusts of elite sentiment and mass opinion, but they are not dictators in any conventional sense. More tentatively, we also suggest that the relaxation of legal checks may itself have contributed to the growth of the political checks, rather than both factors simply being the common result of a complex modern economy. On this hypothesis, the administrative and presidential state of the New Deal and later has, despite all its inefficiencies, plausibly supplied efficiency-enhancing regulation, political stability, and a measure of redistribution, and these policies have both added to national economic and cultural capital and dampened political conflict. The administrative state has thus helped to create a wealthy, educated population and a super-educated elite whose members have the leisure and affluence to care about matters such as civil liberties, who are politically engaged to a fault, and who help to check executive abuses. While the direct effects of wealth, education and other factors on the stability of democracy are clear in comparative perspective, there is more dispute about the overall economic effects of regulation and the administrative state,90 so we offer this as a hypothesis for further research.

## Self-Defense DA

#### Gun ownership increases risk of death- bad for self-defense.

SGL 15. Statistics on the Dangers of Gun Use for Self-Defense. May 11th, 2015. smartgunlaws.org/category/gun-studies-statistics/gun-violence-statistics/ NP

Claims that guns are used defensively millions times every year have been widely discredited.  Using a gun in self-defense is no more likely to reduce the chance of being injured during a crime than various other forms of protective action.[4](http://smartgunlaws.org/category/gun-studies-statistics/gun-violence-statistics/#footnote_3_6085) At least one study has found that carrying a firearm significantly increases a person’s risk of being shot in an assault; research published in the American Journal of Public Health reported that, even after adjusting for confounding factors,  individuals who were in possession of a gun were about 4.5 times more likely to be shot in an assault than those not in possession.[5](http://smartgunlaws.org/category/gun-studies-statistics/gun-violence-statistics/#footnote_4_6085)

### A2 Kleck

#### Kleck is a bad study.

DeFilippis and Hughes 15 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “The Myth Behind Defensive Gun Ownership” Politico January 14th 2015 <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/01/defensive-gun-ownership-myth-114262_full.html#.VuZEC_krIdU> JW

In 1997, David Hemenway, a professor of Health Policy at the Harvard School of Public Health, offered the first of many decisive rebukes of Kleck and Getz’s methodology, citing several overarching biases in their study. First, there is the social desirability bias. Respondents will falsely claim that their gun has been used for its intended purpose—to ward off a criminal—in order to validate their initial purchase. A respondent may also exaggerate facts to appear heroic to the interviewer. Second, there’s the problem of gun owners responding strategically. Given that there are around 3 million members of the National Rifle Association (NRA) in the United States, ostensibly all aware of the debate surrounding defensive gun use, Hemenway suggested that some gun advocates will lie to help bias estimates upwards by either blatantly fabricating incidents or embellishing situations that should not actually qualify as defensive gun use. Third is the risk of false positives from “telescoping,” where respondents may recall an actual self-defense use that is outside the question’s time frame. We know that telescoping problems produce substantial biases in defensive gun use estimates because the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), the gold standard of criminal victimization surveys, explicitly catalogs and corrects for it. Specifically, NCVS asks questions on the household level every 6 months. The first household interview has no time frame. Follow-up interviews are restricted to a six-month time frame and then NCVS corrects for duplicates. Using this strategy, NCVS finds that telescoping alone likely produces at least a 30 percent increase in false positives. These sorts of biases, which are inherent in reporting self-defense incidents, can lead to nonsensical results. In several crime categories, for example, gun owners would have to protect themselves more than 100 percent of the time for Kleck and Getz’s estimates to make sense. For example, guns were allegedly used in self-defense in 845,000 burglaries, according to Kleck and Getz. However, from reliable victimization surveys, we know that there were fewer than 1.3 million burglaries where someone was in the home at the time of the crime, and only 33 percent of these had occupants who weren’t sleeping. From surveys on firearm ownership, we also know that 42 percent of U.S. households owned firearms at the time of the survey. Even if burglars only rob houses of gun owners, and those gun owners use their weapons in self-defense every single time they are awake, the 845,000 statistic cited in Kleck and Gertz’s paper is simply mathematically impossible.

#### Kleck’s objection fails.

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

However, these figures are inflated, likely dramatically so. First, Kleck’s methodology is flawed. Surveys have an inherent tendency to overestimate rare events. Kleck made his estimates based on phone interviews with people in 5,000 dwelling units. One percent of those units claimed to have used a gun defensively in the past year. Kleck inferred from these responses that there are 2.5 million defensive handgun uses per year. However, since this inference is based on an affirmative answer by one person out of a hundred, that means that for every chance for a false negative (someone who falsely denies using a gun defensively) there are ninety-nine chances for a false positive (someone who falsely claims to have used a gun defensively).20 The probability that this or some other bias skews the findings is substantial. Second, Kleck’s findings are inconsistent with findings by the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which interviewed far more people and interviewed them more regularly.21 Kleck’s estimates even clash with the findings of the NCVS on the incidence and circumstances of robberies (which seems less subject to reporting bias). If Kleck’s figures were correct, then ‘‘Kleck asks us to believe that burglary victims in gun owning households use their guns in self-defense more than 100% of the time, even though most were initially asleep.’’ 22 Finally, if there were 2.5 million defensive gun uses each year, how many of those were necessary? Given the negative results of private gun ownership, gun advocates should show not only that guns deter crime but that they are the best way of doing so. Some people plausibly claim that owning a dog is an effective deterrent. If true, then a not insignificant percentage of those who used a gun defensively could have achieved the same results without the accompanying danger. In summary, there is no doubt that guns deter some crime and stop the completion of other crimes, just not in the numbers that Kleck claims.

### A2 Lott

#### Lott doesn’t account for variables

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

John Lott supplements Kleck’s argument by claiming that the widespread use of concealed weapons would decrease the annual number of homicides by 1,400; rapes by 4,200; aggravated assaults by 60,000; and robberies by 12,000.23 If true, and if there were no countervailing costs, this would be a powerful reason not only to permit guns but to encourage people to have and carry them. However, Lott’s conclusions have also come under severe criticism: ‘‘The central problem is that crime moves in waves, yet Lott’s analysis does not include variables that can explain these cycles. For example, he used no variables on gangs, on drug consumption, or community policing. As a result, many of Lott’s findings make no sense. He finds for instance, that both increasing the rate of unemployment and reducing income reduces the rate of violent crimes.’’ 24 Perhaps the most compelling critique comes from Jens Ludwig, who compares the rate of violent crime toward youths and adults in states that passed shall-issue carrying permits. Most of these states issue gun permits only to people over twenty-one. Armchair considerations predict that younger people, who cannot legally carry, will not receive the full benefits from the purported deterrent effect of shall-issue laws. Thus, those under twenty-one years of age are a natural control group to track general swings in crime. Once we include this factor, we find that shall-issue laws lead to higher—not lower—homicide and robbery rates.25

## Tyranny DA

### Surveillance K

#### The claim that we need guns to protect ourselves from tyranny distracts away from biopolitical oppression like the surveillance state. Vote aff to reject the notion that guns can create any meaningful form of freedom.

DeBrabander 15 Firmin (professor of philosophy at the Maryland Institute College of Art) “Do Guns Make Us Free?” Yale University Press 2015 JW

In the War on Terror, the U.S. government has claimed broad rights to survey the civilian population. The ACLU laments the rise of “America’s Surveillance Society” in a report of the same name: since 2001, the FBI has compelled Internet service providers, banks, and others to provide sensitive private information about their clients, all “without prior court approval and without probable cause”; the National Security Agency (NSA) carries out “warrantless surveillance of Americans’ international telephone calls and e- mails”; and the American public is subjected to “pervasive video surveillance.” 46 “An increasing number of American cities,” the report states, “have spent taxpayer dollars to create elaborate camera and video surveillance systems designed to monitor public places such as parks, plazas and sidewalks. Governments are also accessing images collected by privately- owned camera and video systems.”47 Following the Boston Marathon bombing, law enforcement used widespread access to private cell phone videos and photos taken at the site, together with footage from surveillance cameras from businesses, to track down the perpetrators. This seemed a reasonable approach, the Boston police commissioner opined, since the site of the marathon was “probably one of the most photographed areas in the country” that day.48 By allowing us to record ourselves and those around us abundantly, digital technology fashions a tantalizing network for government to tap into if it wishes. Digital technology has also given rise to billions of communications—e- mails, tweets, text messages, Facebook updates, and good old phone calls—all of which are available for surveillance. Through such communications, twentyfi rst- century Americans conduct their increasingly public lives; “private life” conducted on the Internet or through mobile phones is not private at all. The GPS signals in our cell phones make our location perpetually known—and it turns out that law enforcement has access to that information. We happily indulge in these media, of course, because of the wonderful conveniences they provide, but in so doing, we offer government all the information it might care to learn about us. In 2012, Wired magazine called the information the NSA aims to collect about us “digital pocket litter”: Flowing through [the NSA’s] servers and routers stored in near- bottomless databases will be all forms of communication, including the complete contents of private emails, cell phone calls, and Google searches, as well as all sorts of personal data trails—parking receipts, travel itineraries, bookstore purchases. . . . It is, in some measure, the realization of the “total information awareness” program created during the fi rst term of the Bush administration—an effort that was killed by Congress in 2003 after it caused an outcry over its potential for invading Americans’ privacy.49 The Wired article was prescient. A year after its publication, a prominent leak by a private NSA contractor revealed that the agency was engaged in just such immense data collection and analysis—“secret blanket surveillance,” as Al Gore put it, which he declared “obscenely outrageous.”50 Government offi cials claimed that the NSA had not violated anyone’s civil rights because it was only storing the communications and analyzing the “metadata”—that is, as Hendrik Hertzberg observed in the New Yorker, “the time and duration of the calls, along with the number, and potentially the locations of the callers and the called,” all of which is analyzed to detect suspicious patterns.51 The agency, as of 2013, still needs a judicial warrant to inspect the contents of communications it deems suspicious. Yet this is still plenty of information the government is amassing about private citizens. This metadata tells an awful lot about a person: whom he is contacting and associating with, where, and when— where he is parking, where he is going, when he is traveling, and much else. Washington Post reporter Barton Gellman argues that government monitoring of metadata is in fact “more intrusive”: I would much rather someone listen to my phone calls for a month than to have them map who I’ve talked to, where I went, all my connections for a month, because I can control what I say on the phone. You get a much more revealing picture of people, for example, who are my confi dential sources, or whether I’m negotiating to leave my employer and take a new job or a secret business deal, whether I’m having an extramarital affair, whether I’m seeing a psychiatrist. Anything that I might not want to broadcast to the world will be revealed quite clearly from metadata.52 As if NSA’s efforts were not far- reaching enough, our government has other surveillance tools at its disposal, most notably drone technology, which is returning from foreign battlefi elds for domestic use. Several government agencies employ drone surveillance with increasing regularity, as does local law enforcement. When the Federal Aviation Administration approved the use of surveillance drones for commercial purposes in 2013, it predicted there would be 30,000 drones (or UAVs—unmanned aviation vehicles) in our skies by 2020 doing public and private work.53 Government agencies aim to arm drones, too, but have limited their plans to nonlethal weapons for the moment.54 It seems the options for armed drones are quite chilling. Greenwald highlights the “Switchblade drone,” for example, hailed as “the ultimate assassin bug,” which “worms its way around buildings and into small areas, sending its surveillance imagery to an i- Pad held by the operator, who can then direct the Switchblade to lunge forward and kill the target . . . by exploding in his face.”55 It should be abundantly clear that civilians armed with semiautomatic weapons are no match for government- deployed Switchblades. Beyond the remarkable fact of its existence, the emerging surveillance state contains several noteworthy features. For one thing, it is an impressive merger of public and private sectors. The commercial stake many have in the surveillance state means it is sure to grow. Second, expanded surveillance is less and less controversial. The PATRIOT Act has been renewed every three years since its inception, by members of both parties, with limited objection. The American public seems to have accepted the arguments for widespread and intrusive surveillance as a necessary tool in an age of terrorism. Or at least, the public is too preoccupied to care, as people dive into the myriad new technologies that allow them to be watched. Third, the surveillance state is a “one- way mirror,” as Greenwald puts it.56 It gives government deep insight into our activities and behavior while those watching us—who they are, what they want, what they know—remain hidden. This was made abundantly clear, Greenwald argues, when Wikileaks, the international journalistic organization that publishes leaked government documents, posted on its website millions of pages of classifi ed U.S. security documents, and most of the exposed communications were in fact quite banal. “What that refl ected,” Greenwald explains, “is that the U.S. government refl exively labels everything that it does of any conceivable signifi cance as ‘classifi ed’ and ‘secret.’ It keeps everything that it does from us, at the same time that it knows more and more about what we’re doing.”57 Why is the surveillance state a concern? The ease with which it grows and envelops us all suggests that most of the American public is not overly disturbed by it. Tocqueville might say this is because the surveillance state has not—yet— gotten in the way of our private interests. To the contrary, the surveillance state, especially in its private sector incarnations, offers our personal lives and business ventures bountiful convenience. The hardware chain Lowe’s, for example, advertises that it can keep track of every purchase you make at its stores—to assist you with future purchasing decisions, of course. The American shopper might be thrilled that retailers can provide their wares in so much greater detail, but who else has access to that information? It is surprisingly hard to articulate why privacy is so important. Why, in an age of terror, should my private life be sacrosanct? The argument is often made that if you are doing nothing illegal, then you have nothing to hide. Privacy seems like an easy sacrifi ce in this war, and a tedious encumbrance in the digital age. In our eagerness for new technologies, author Gary Shteyngart cites “a general giddy sense that privacy is kind of stupid.”58 Just imagine the possibilities: if everything is known about you, retailers and businesses can cater to your every desire, at any moment—even desires you didn’t know you had! And the government might know we are a danger before we realize it ourselves, and act accordingly. This starts to sound a lot like the soft despotism Tocqueville foresaw for us: everything is provided for us, all our personal wants sated. We may feel fulfi lled and empowered by our new digital reality—indeed, its devices are sold on the premise that they enable us to do more, and be freer—but as Tocqueville fears, it threatens to reduce us to a state of “perpetual childhood,” where we will require potent political consolation. Claire Cain Miller describes how the Google Now app reads her emails and alerts her, without her asking, to bits of highly personal information: “Now I trust it to tell me whether there is a delay on my route to work (even though I never told it where I live or work). How many steps I walk each month, which recipes I should try, when my e- commerce packages have shipped and whether I need to remember to buy diapers next time I am at the store.”59 A host of moral and political problems arise with our surveillance society, but I will zero in on the most pertinent one for our discussion, the one the gun rights movement supposedly cares so much about. As our privacy is increasingly broached and we live so much more of our lives in public, we become extremely vulnerable. Many interests might wish to take advantage of us in this state, and government is certainly one. Our government vows that it will not abuse, and is not abusing, its privileged knowledge of our private lives, but this puts us at its mercy all the same, perhaps intolerably so. Imagine what an abusive administration might do with all this information. The possibilities for oppression are immense. The only thing preventing such a turn of events is the character of those in office. But it is just such vulnerability that the Founding Fathers aimed to prevent when they designed our government and laid out our rights—and insisted on protecting us against unreasonable search and seizure. The American people must be insulated from the caprices of those in power, since some are sure to be corrupt. Or worse, the power of offi ce will corrupt them. Greenwald argues that “allowing government offi cials to eavesdrop on other people, on citizens, without constraints or oversight, to do so in the dark, is a power that gives so much authority and leverage to those in power that it is virtually impossible for human beings to resist abusing that power.”60 Surveillance seems quite harmless to all involved. For those in power, it hardly seems like an abuse. It’s so easy to survey the public without much protest, and it’s easy to increase this power—exponentially. Gun rights advocates claim to be a prime defense against a government that would gain too much power over the American public. The Founding Fathers intended that we not be at the mercy of those who rule us, but retain a necessary and basic independence. The surveillance state violates that concern. While LaPierre waves his rifl e in the face of the government, it has gained immense leverage over us all. What will it do with all this power? Shall we trust it? Can we trust it? It seems most have decided to ignore the danger. That is their right, but the infrastructure of oppression has been put in place, even if it is not deployed for nefarious ends—yet. Of course, there are some who claim it already does great damage. Hertzberg says the following of the 2013 leaks that revealed the breadth of the NSA’s surveillance operations: “The harm is civic. The harm is collective. The harm is to the architecture of trust and accountability that supports an open society and a democratic polity. The harm is to the reputation, and perhaps, the reality of the United States as such a society, such a polity.”61 Surveillance signals, and sows, mistrust—especially when the surveillance is a one- way mirror. Being watched is inherently corrosive of trust. And it is deeply unsettling that the government is so opaque in its intentions and operations. Foucault would be full of admiration for the emerging surveillance state: it is unverifi able, anonymous, invisible. Indeed, he argued, surveillance can be oppression itself. And it is a form of oppression against which guns are wholly ineffective. For Bentham, the great virtue of the Panopticon was precisely how it might affect subjects’ behavior, and compel. Foucault offers the following, ebullient quote from Bentham advertising the benefi ts of the panoptic scheme: “Morals reformed—health preserved—industry invigorated— instruction diffused—public burthens lightened—Economy seated, as it were, upon a rock—the Gordian knot of the poor- law not cut, but untied—all by a simple idea in Architecture!” 62 For prisoners, anonymous surveillance is a silent and continuous warning that they must watch what they do, and act as the warden expects. Applied to the workplace, the panoptic scheme might ward off temptations to laziness. In short, surveillance is a manner of imposing behavior on those who are watched, snapping them into line. But it is a soft tyranny—and as such, Foucault maintains, especially pernicious. It is a kind of oppression we hardly notice or worry about. In the digital age, we willingly subject ourselves to surveillance, and facilitate our surveyors’ task. Digital technologies make us feel empowered and free, but silently have the opposite effect. Under surveillance, we come to watch what we do without even realizing it. If we are expressly forbidden to associate with a certain political group, we will feel compelled, and register it as coercion—and that might irritate us. If, however, we are unsure if we are watched when we visit certain websites or communicate with certain groups, and suspect we might get in trouble for doing so, we will cease, seemingly of our own volition. Privacy is essential to freedom because it allows us to indulge in eccentric behavior without fear of judgment or incrimination. From discussion of bold, sometimes crazy ideas, brave new political notions are born. Privacy lends an openness and courage to the political arena, a necessary dynamism—it empowers political thinkers and agents at the most basic level. Thus it is essential to democracy, or at least to the aspirations of democratic regimes: if you would embolden citizens to be politically active at every level of society, you require the utter freedom privacy affords. “[Secrecy] and privacy are prerequisites” to political activism and protest, Greenwald argues.63 What is political opposition to look like, how is it to behave, if it knows it is constantly watched and followed? Guns do little to protect our freedom in this respect. They are no remedy for the oppression that may be at hand. The surveillance state grows and compels whether we are armed or not. In fact, the gun rights movement inadvertently assists the surveillance state by urging adherents to beware government oppression in a wholly other form—a form in which oppression, in our time, is less likely to emerge. Greenwald says of the surveillance state, in an assessment that is eerily evocative of guns: “You can acculturate people to believing that tyranny is freedom, that their limits are actually emancipations and freedom, that is what this Surveillance State does, by training people to accept their own conformity that they are actually free, that they no longer even realize the ways in which they’re being limited.”64 Guns are likewise a cultural fi xation that offers the illusion of freedom—and makes us vulnerable to manipulation, abuse, and oppression. They invite us to feel free and indomitable, while blinding us to the ways in which we are limited and dominated. Accordingly, Machiavelli tells us, those in power are all too happy to see us armed. They nod their heads in approval when Cooke claims guns are the ultimate right of a free people—as LaPierre says, the true mark of liberty! Cooke and LaPierre fail to grasp that modern nation states do not need physical force to put us underfoot. They can achieve oppression in ways that cannot be opposed or hindered by mere guns.

### T: Individualism

#### Gun ownership gives power to the government by fragmenting communities.

Debrabander 12 Firmin Debrabander “The Freedom of an Armed Society” The New York Times December 16th 2012 <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/16/the-freedom-of-an-armed-society/> JW

Gun rights advocates also argue that guns provide the ultimate insurance of our freedom, in so far as they are the final deterrent against encroaching centralized government, and an executive branch run amok with power. Any suggestion of limiting guns rights is greeted by ominous warnings that this is a move of expansive, would-be despotic government. It has been the means by which gun rights advocates withstand even the most seemingly rational gun control measures. An assault weapons ban, smaller ammunition clips for guns, longer background checks on gun purchases — these are all measures centralized government wants, they claim, in order to exert control over us, and ultimately impose its arbitrary will. I have often suspected, however, that contrary to holding centralized authority in check, broad individual gun ownership gives the powers-that-be exactly what they want. After all, a population of privately armed citizens is one that is increasingly fragmented, and vulnerable as a result. Private gun ownership invites retreat into extreme individualism — I heard numerous calls for homeschooling in the wake of the Newtown shootings — and nourishes the illusion that I can be my own police, or military, as the case may be. The N.R.A. would have each of us steeled for impending government aggression, but it goes without saying that individually armed citizens are no match for government force. The N.R.A. argues against that interpretation of the Second Amendment that privileges armed militias over individuals, and yet it seems clear that armed militias, at least in theory, would provide a superior check on autocratic government. As Michel Foucault pointed out in his detailed study of the mechanisms of power, nothing suits power so well as extreme individualism. In fact, he explains, political and corporate interests aim at nothing less than “individualization,” since it is far easier to manipulate a collection of discrete and increasingly independent individuals than a community. Guns undermine just that — community. Their pervasive, open presence would sow apprehension, suspicion, mistrust and fear, all emotions that are corrosive of community and civic cooperation. To that extent, then, guns give license to autocratic government. Our gun culture promotes a fatal slide into extreme individualism. It fosters a society of atomistic individuals, isolated before power — and one another — and in the aftermath of shootings such as at Newtown, paralyzed with fear. That is not freedom, but quite its opposite. And as the Occupy movement makes clear, also the demonstrators that precipitated regime change in Egypt and Myanmar last year, assembled masses don’t require guns to exercise and secure their freedom, and wield world-changing political force. Arendt and Foucault reveal that power does not lie in armed individuals, but in assembly — and everything conducive to that.

### A2 Militias

#### Assault weapons solve- militias can still arm themselves

#### Militias empirically do nothing

DeFilippis and Hughes 14 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “DEBUNKING THE FIVE MOST IMPORTANT MYTHS ABOUT GUN CONTROL” January 14 2014 Armed With Reason <http://www.armedwithreason.com/debunking-the-five-most-important-myths-about-gun-control/> JW

Even a cursory reading of history finds that militias, especially unregulated ones, are overwhelmingly inimical to the functioning of a free society. In Vietnam, Afghanistan, Cuba, Somalia, Iraq, and southern Lebanon, even while fighting against foreign rule, these countries’ militias actively worked against the establishment of a free state. Finding developed country analogs for these examples is impossible, as there are simply no wealthy countries, with the exception of Costa Rica, that use militias for self-defense. For examples closer to home, we can look to how miserably the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Panthers, and Neo-Nazi factions (all examples of real militias) failed to promote a free society. It is also demonstrably false, as gun advocates argue, that armed populations are never given the opportunity to stop tyranny because they are disarmed first. Yemen, for example, is the second most heavily armed country in the world (per capita), and is currently embroiled in a civil war between a Western dictatorship and Jihadist groups. Saddam Hussein, by any definition a tyrant, invigilated over a brutal regime despite the fact that Iraqi people were heavily armed.

### A2 Revolution

#### We can’t overthrow the ruling class with handguns.

DeBrabander 15 Firmin (professor of philosophy at the Maryland Institute College of Art) “Do Guns Make Us Free?” Yale University Press 2015 JW

We should, of course, be concerned that our government might turn tyrannical. And we should be worried that if it does, it has the most powerful military on earth at its disposal. But 300 million guns in the hands of a motley assortment of individuals will not depose such tyranny or deter our ruling class from amassing power—especially since the public at large is hardly united against tyrannical government. Yet gun rights advocates inadvertently raise an important question here, which I will take up in the fi nal chapter: what would equivalent force look like today? What power at the people’s disposal would be suffi cient to hold a tyrannical government in check or, better yet, prevent it from emerging in the fi rst place?

#### Assault weapons solve-the plan doesn’t stop people from using them in revolution

### A2 Hitler took guns

#### This arg is really stupid.

DeFilippis and Hughes 14 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) and Devin Hughes (senior at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Finance and Risk Management. He is a National Merit Scholar and Oklahoma Chess Champion, with numerous academic publications) “DEBUNKING THE FIVE MOST IMPORTANT MYTHS ABOUT GUN CONTROL” January 14 2014 Armed With Reason <http://www.armedwithreason.com/debunking-the-five-most-important-myths-about-gun-control/> JW

The most common form of “armed populations prevent tyranny” is “Hitler took the guns.” First, the idea that a small group of heavily armed Jews could have succeeded where the Polish and French armies failed is laughable. Second, the argument fails to recognize that most strict gun control implemented in the Wiemar Republic was implemented to prevent armed coups from materializing by the Nazis or the Communists. It failed. When Hitler seized power, he implemented policy in 1938 that actually loosened restrictions on gun ownership.

#### This argument trivializes the holocaust and deeply misunderstands how history works

Steinweis 15, Alan E. Ben Carson Is Wrong on Guns and the Holocaust. www.nytimes.com/2015/10/15/opinion/ben-carson-is-wrong-on-guns-and-the-holocaust.html October 14th, 2015. (Alan E. Steinweis is a professor of history and Holocaust studies at the University of Vermont. He is the author of three books, including, most recently, “Kristallacht 1938.) NP 12/7/15.

TO anyone who studies Nazi Germany and the Holocaust for a living, as I do, Ben Carson’s statements about gun control are difficult to fathom. “I think the likelihood of Hitler being able to accomplish his goals would have been greatly diminished if the people had been armed,” the Republican presidential candidate said in a recent interview. Mr. Carson’s argument, which he made in his new book “A More Perfect Union” and was asked to defend last week, is strangely ahistorical, a classic instance of injecting an issue that is important in our place and time into a historical situation where it was not seen as important. I can think of no serious work of scholarship on the Nazi dictatorship or on the causes of the Holocaust in which Nazi gun control measures feature as a significant factor. Neither does gun control figure in the collective historical memory of any group that was targeted by the Nazi regime, be they Jews, Gypsies, the disabled, gay people or Poles. It is simply a nonissue. Continue reading the main story Sign Up for the Opinion Today Newsletter Every weekday, get thought-provoking commentary from Op-Ed columnists, The Times editorial board and contributing writers from around the world. Adolf Hitler became chancellor of Germany in January 1933, but it was only in March 1938 that the Third Reich promulgated its Waffengesetz, or weapons law, which required police permission for ownership of a handgun. Other firearms were left unregulated. If, as Mr. Carson maintains, the Nazi regime made it a priority to disarm the German population, then why did it wait more than five years to issue such a law, and why did it limit licensure to handguns? Mr. Carson also fails to mention that the democratic Weimar Republic, which had preceded the Nazi regime, had passed its own gun law, which in some respects had been more restrictive than the later Nazi version. On Nov. 11, 1938, on the basis of the weapons law, the regime issued an order prohibiting Jews from owning weapons of any kind, including swords, which many Jewish army veterans had kept as mementos from World War I. This order was issued just one day after the Kristallnacht pogrom, during which Nazi mobs attacked Jews and destroyed synagogues. The newly imposed ban on Jewish ownership of weapons must be understood as an element of the propaganda campaign launched by the Nazi regime in the wake of the pogrom. As a pretext for the Kristallnacht, the Nazis had seized upon the assassination of a low-ranking German diplomat by the Jewish teenager Herschel Grynszpan in Paris on Nov. 7. Then, in order to justify the orgy of anti-Jewish violence retroactively, the regime tried to depict German Jews as posing a physical danger to the German population as a whole. The Jews of Germany constituted less than 1 percent of the country’s population. It is preposterous to argue that the possession of firearms would have enabled them to mount resistance against a systematic program of persecution implemented by a modern bureaucracy, enforced by a well-armed police state, and either supported or tolerated by the majority of the German population. Mr. Carson’s suggestion that ordinary Germans, had they had guns, would have risked their lives in armed resistance against the regime simply does not comport with the regrettable historical reality of a regime that was quite popular at home. Inside Germany, only the army possessed the physical force necessary for defying or overthrowing the Nazis, but the generals had thrown in their lot with Hitler early on. The failure of Jews to mount an effective defense against the Waffen-SS in the Warsaw Ghetto in 1943 provides a good example of what happens when ordinary citizens with small arms go up against a well-equipped force. The uprising in the ghetto possesses enduring symbolic significance, as an instance of Jews’ determination to resist their oppression. But the uprising saved few Jewish lives and had little to no impact on the course of either World War II or the Holocaust. Jews around the world did, to be sure, react to the Holocaust by concluding that they needed to protect themselves from anti-Semites more effectively. But they understood that this would be accomplished not through the individual acquisition of firearms, but rather through the establishment of a Jewish state with an army to defend it. Mr. Carson’s remarks not only trivialize the predicament in which Jews found themselves in Germany and elsewhere in Europe during the 1930s and 1940s. They also trivialize the serious, prolonged and admirable efforts undertaken by many Germans to work through the causes of their country’s catastrophic mistakes of that period. The origins of the Nazi dictatorship are to be found in the authoritarian legacy of the German Empire, the inability to cope with the defeat in World War I and the failure to achieve political compromise during the Weimar Republic. When it comes to explaining the Holocaust, Germans inquire about the place of anti-Semitism and xenophobia in their society and about the psychological and cultural factors that led ordinary citizens to participate in, or to accept, horrific atrocities. They understand their own history well enough to avoid being distracted by demagogy about gun control. If the United States is going to arrive at a workable compromise solution to its gun problem, it will not be accomplished through the use of historical analogies that are false, silly and insulting. Similarly, coming to terms with a civilizational breach of the magnitude of the Holocaust requires a serious encounter with history, rather than political sloganeering that exploits history as a prop for mobilizing one’s base.

### A2 American Revolution

#### American revolutionaries played a tiny role in success of the American revolution and is super different from any political revolution today, which would be a complete disaster.

Nuckols 13, Mark. Why the 'Citizen Militia' Theory Is the Worst Pro-Gun Argument Ever. January 31st, 2013. www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2013/01/why-the-citizen-militia-theory-is-the-worst-pro-gun-argument-ever/272734/ NP

If America experienced a widespread political uprising today, it would bear little resemblance to Lexington and Concord in 1775, with well-disciplined minutemen assembling on the town square to defend liberty against the redcoats. It would more likely be a larger scale reenactment of the "Bleeding Kansas" revolt of 1854 to 1861, when small bands of armed zealots unleashed an orgy of inter-communal violence, unbounded by any laws of war or human decency. There is, we all know, a Second Amendment right to gun ownership. Under our constitutional form of government, the Supreme Court has the authority to decide what the Constitution means, and after decades of judicial ambiguity, in District of Columbia v. Heller a majority of the justices found an individual right to gun ownership, unrelated to membership in a state militia. But the Heller decision also makes it clear that this is not an unlimited right, and that it may be subject to extensive government regulation. A citizen uprising today would probably not involve like-minded constitutionalists taking up arms to defend democracy and liberty. However, in recent years, the belief in widespread gun ownership as a defense against tyrannical government has become an alluring idea, gaining traction with members of Congress as well as fringe conspiracy theorists. As Senator Tom Coburn of Oklahoma put it just last week, "The Second Amendment wasn't written so you can go hunting, it was to create a force to balance a tyrannical force here." And if this is insufficiently incendiary, one only need look to the doctrine of the "Three Percenters," with its ominous warning that "all politics in this country now is just dress rehearsal for civil war." It is easy to ridicule such rhetoric as just overindulgence in Red Dawn fantasies about resourceful and brave citizens resisting a modern army with nothing more than small arms and their wits. Even individual Americans armed with military-style assault rifles could hardly pose any serious resistance to any future tyrannical central government supported by overwhelmingly powerful military capabilities. But many otherwise sensible people seem willing to concede that gun ownership could one day play some role in preserving democracy. Just this month, a Rasmussen poll reported that 65 percent of Americans see gun rights as a protection against tyranny. There are two primary pillars to this shaky intellectual edifice. The first is a cottage industry of academics and lawyers who have scoured ancient political tracts and common law to establish that in the distant English past that there was a constitutional right to bear arms as a defense against tyranny. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia has given some credence to this view: In his majority opinion for Heller, he asserted that "the Stuart Kings Charles II and James II succeeded in using select militias loyal to them to suppress political dissidents, in part by disarming their opponents." This line of reasoning ignores the fact that, in 21st century America, the prospect of monarchs and their select militias oppressing the populace is reasonably remote. It also ignores the fact that the common law evolves and is subordinate to acts of the legislature. Other nations built on English common law have all enacted strict regulation of gun ownership, with no perceptible diminution of political liberties. The second pillar has fewer scholarly pretensions, but it employs even more historically dubious arguments. It suggests, for example, that the Holocaust could have been avoided if Germany's miniscule Jewish population had been better armed. It also argues that Ukrainian peasants could have defeated the Stalinist regime, backed by the NKVD and the Red Army, if they had possessed individual firearms. But these counterfactual interpretations of history are wildly speculative -- and downright implausible. To understand how misguided these kinds of arguments truly are, it's best to begin where their adherents generally do: the Battle of Lexington and Concord. Any comparison between the American revolutionaries and today's would-be freedom fighters is seriously flawed. Eighteenth century colonial society was dramatically less organized than 21st century America. The Minutemen and other colonial militias were formed by farmers and tradesmen who possessed individual firearms. But they were organized into disciplined companies under the authority of the Massachusetts Provisional Congress, the successor to a legally established provincial assembly. Even though the British had abrogated its charter, the structure of the assembly still remained. In other words, when these militias assembled in Lexington and Concord to resist British troops, they were subject to formal lines of command and control under a legitimate authority, and they had the broad support of their political communities. Colonial Massachusetts also enjoyed a degree of social cohesion and agreement on basic political principles far greater than we have in 21st century America. Despite the colonial victory at Concord, the Minutemen and other local militias played a minor role in the eventual American defeat of King George III. The decisive factors in America's War of Independence were the battlefield victories of organized colonial armies acting under the authority of the Continental Congress and state-organized militias. The financial and military support of America's European allies also played a crucial role. Guerrilla warfare waged by small bands of partisans was not militarily important to America's defense of its liberty.

## Yellowstone DA (PVP)

#### TURN-complex ecosystems are more prone to failure.

Heath 99 Jim “Why Save Orchids Under Threat?” Orchids Australia December 1999 http://www.orchidsaustralia.com/whysave.htm

Some people say we can’t afford to lose any species, no matter what species they are. Everything needs everything else, they say, to make nature balance. If that were right, it might explain why the six orchid species should be saved. Alas, no. We could pour weedkiller on all the orchids in Australia and do no ecological damage to the rest of the continent’s biology. But wouldn’t the natural ecological systems then become less stable, if we start plucking out species - even those orchids? Not necessarily. Natural biological systems are hardly ever stable and balanced anyway. Everything goes along steadily for a time, then boom - the system falls apart and simplifies for no visible reason. Diverse systems are usually more unstable than the less diverse ones. Biologists agree that in some places less diversity is more stable (in the Arctic, for example). Also, monocultures - farms - can be very stable. Not to mention the timeless grass of a salt marsh. In other words, there’s no biological law that says we have to save the orchids because they add diversity, and that added diversity makes the biological world more stable.

#### That outweighs- A. strength of link- they assume that species loss harms diversity. I account for the internal link in the opposite way. B. probability- the best data concludes less diverse ecosystems are most resilient and resistant. Your authors mistake productivity for resilience.

Naeem 02 Shahid (Professor and Chair of Columbia University Department of Ecology) “Biodiversity: Biodiversity equals instability?” Evolution and Environmental Biology March 7th 2002 Nature Magazine

Chief among the 'begets-stability' theories is the insurance hypothesis — the impeccably logical notion that having a variety of species insures an ecosystem against a range of environmental upsets. For example, suppose an ecosystem faces a drought, then a flood, which in turn is followed by a fire. According to the insurance hypothesis, **if that ecosystem is diverse** — if it has some species that can tolerate drought, some that are flood-resistant and some that are fire-tolerant — then two scenarios are likely. **The ecosystem may show resistance, remaining broadly unchanged, because its many species buffer it against damage**. Or it may show resilience: if it does get hammered, it may bounce back to its original state quickly because the tolerant species ultimately drive the recovery process and compensate for the temporary loss of their less hardy compatriots. But Pfisterer and Schmid3 found that, **when challenged with an experimentally induced drought, species-poor communities were both more resistant and more resilient** (as reflected by their ability to sustain and recover pre-drought biomass production) than plots of higher diversity. **The higher-diversity plots were** originally **more productive**, but their resistance and resilience — that is, **their stability** — was **low** (Fig. 1). **This is the opposite of what the insurance hypothesis predicts.** It also contrasts with what combinatorial 'microcosm' experiments have found5, 6 and what theoretical models of biodiversity have claimed4. Pfisterer and Schmid's findings3 appear to support those who claim that diversity does not lead to stability. But there's a twist, and those on each side of the debate run the risk of having their own pet theories turned against them. Pfisterer and Schmid suggest that the observed inverse association between diversity and stability is due to a theoretical mechanism known as niche complementarity. This mechanism, however, is the very same as that touted as the chief cause of the positive biodiversity–productivity relationships found in other combinatorial biodiversity experiments, such as those at Cedar Creek7 and those run by the BIODEPTH consortium8. The central idea of niche complementarity is that a community of species whose niches complement one another is more efficient in its use of resources than an equivalent set of monocultures. For example, a uniform mixture of early- and late-season plants and shallow- and deep-rooting plants that are spread over 4 m2 will yield more biomass than combined 1-m2 monocultures of each species7, 9. So niche complementarity can explain why higher diversity tends to lead to higher productivity, and has also been adopted by those in the 'diversity leads to stability' camp because one would expect that more efficient communities would fare better in the face of stress. Those on the other side, however, feel that **existing data better support a mechanism known as sampling**, **where diverse communities produce more biomass simply because they are more likely to contain productive species**10, 11. In other words, we can't read too much into experiments in which higher diversity leads to greater productivity. What Pfisterer and Schmid suggest is that **complementarity among species in a diverse plot could be its downfall when faced with perturbation**. **Niche complementarity is disrupted and so the whole community suffers**. But **this is not a problem for less diverse plots.** So those in the 'diversity begets stability' camp risk being hoist on the petard of their own theory of niche complementarity. Meanwhile, although Pfisterer and Schmid's findings support the idea that diversity does not lead to stability, the authors reject a large role for sampling — the theory generally favoured by the camp that disagrees with the idea that biodiversity leads to stability.

#### The tax applies to all weapons and ammunition- the aff doesn’t kill it.

Corn and Gravelle 13 M.Lynne and Jane G. Specialists in Natural Resources/Economic Policy. “Guns, Excise Taxes, and Wildlife Restoration” Congressional Research Service. https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42992.pdf. March 12, 2013. 1/12/16

As a result of the recent debate over guns, gun rights, and gun-related violence, there has been a marked increase in sales of many weapons as well as ammunition. Through an excise tax on firearms and ammunition, such sales have a marked beneficial effect on funding for state wildlife programs through the Wildlife Restoration Program (also known as Pittman-Robertson or P-R). This report examines these taxes, their allocation, and their use. It also examines the effects of sequestration of this account, pursuant to the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA, P.L. 112-25). The Excise Taxes The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act of 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669-669k; P-R) uses the proceeds from a federal excise tax to fund grants to states and territories for projects to benefit wildlife resources and to conduct programs for hunter education. The excise tax predates the act, having begun in 1919. The excise tax is set at 10 of the wholesale price for pistols and revolvers, and 11 for other firearms as well as shells or cartridges,1 and is collected by the wholesaler. An 11 tax on archery equipment is also deposited into the fund. The tax is applied whether the equipment is likely to be used for hunting or not. Total collections from these taxes were $388.2 million in FY2011 and $555.3 million in FY2012. Most of the tax is collected from firearms and ammunition. Of the tax on firearms and ammunition, approximately one-third is due to each source: 31 for pistols and revolvers, 37 for other firearms, and 31 for ammunition.2 These amounts become available for expenditure in the year following their collection.3 (See Figure 1.)

#### None of your evidence says taxes are KEY to funding- they just say it’s a part of funding. They’ll find another thing to tax to create funds or dip into other parts of the budget.

#### We’ve been killing biodiversity for dozens of years since the industrial revolution but haven’t seen any deaths because of it- make them prove that extinction will happen and has begun in the squo. That also proves no uniqueness since things like national parks in other countries still get screwed up.

#### Tech has decoupled humanity from the environment

Science Daily 10

Science Daily, reprinted from materials provided by American Institute of Biological Sciences, September 1, 2010, "Human Well-Being Is Improving Even as Ecosystem Services Decline: Why?", http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/09/100901072908.htm

Global degradation of ecosystems is widely believed to threaten human welfare, yet accepted measures of well-being show that it is on average improving globally, both in poor countries and rich ones. A team of authors writing in the September issue of BioScience dissects explanations for this "environmentalist's paradox." Noting that understanding the paradox is "critical to guiding future management of ecosystem services," Ciara Raudsepp-Hearne and her colleagues confirm that improvements in aggregate well-being are real, despite convincing evidence of ecosystem decline. Three likely reasons they identify -- past increases in food production, technological innovations that decouple people from ecosystems, and time lags before well-being is affected -- provide few grounds for complacency, however. Raudsepp-Hearne and her coauthors accept the findings of the influential Millennium Ecosystem Assessment that the capacity of ecosystems to produce many services for humans is now low. Yet they uncover no fault with the composite Human Development Index, a widely used metric that incorporates measures of literacy, life expectancy, and income, and has improved markedly since the mid-1970s. Although some measures of personal security buck the upward trend, the overall improvement in well-being seems robust. The researchers resolve the paradox partly by pointing to evidence that food production (which has increased globally over past decades) is more important for human well-being than are other ecosystem services. They also establish support for two other explanations: that technology and innovation have **decoupled human well-being from ecosystem degradation**, and that there is a time lag after ecosystem service degradation before human well-being will be affected.

#### Bio-D isn’t key to the environment – best studies prove

**WashPost 97** <The Washington Post. “Three Studies Show Diversity Can't Guarantee Ecosystem Strength.” Volume 117 >> Issue 38 : Thursday, August 28, 1997. http://tech.mit.edu/V117/N38/shorts2.38w.html >

Ecologists have long maintained that diversity is one of nature's greatest strengths, but new research suggests that diversity alone does not guarantee strong ecosystems. In findings that could intensify the debate over endangered species and habitat conservation, three **new studies suggest** a greater abundance of **plant and animal varieties do**es**n't always translate to better ecological health**. At least equally important, the research found, are the types of species and how they function together. "Having a long list of Latin names isn't always better than a shorter list of Latin names," said Stanford University biologist Peter Vitousek, co-author of one of the studies published in the journal Science. **Separate experiments in California, Minnesota and Sweden, found that diversity often had little bearing on** the performance of **ecosystems** -- at least as measured by the growth and health of native plants. In fact, the communities with the greatest biological richness were often the poorest when it came to productivity and the cycling of nutrients. One study compared plant life on 50 remote islands in northern Sweden that are prone to frequent wildfires from lightning strikes. Scientist David Wardle of Landcare Research in Lincoln, New Zealand, and colleagues at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, found that islands dominated by a few species of plants recovered more quickly than nearby islands with greater biological diversity. Similar findings were reported by University of Minnesota researchers who studied savannah grasses, and by Stanford's Vitousek and colleague David Hooper, who concluded that functional characteristics of plant species were more important than the number of varieties in determining how ecosystems performed. **British** plant **ecologist** J.P. **Grime**, in a commentary summarizing the research, **said there is** as yet **no "convincing evidence that species diversity and ecosystem function are** consistently and causally **related**." "It could be argued," he added, "that the tide is turning against the notion of high biodiversity as a controller of ecosystem function and insurance against ecological collapse."

#### Zero impact even in the worst case scenario

Sagoff 97 Mark, Senior Research Scholar – Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs – U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, “INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT”, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on the brink of an episode of massive extinction, it may not follow from this grim fact that human beings will suffer as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans one iota." n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "**The human species could survive** just as well **if 99.9%** of our fellow creatures **went extinct**, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346 [\*906] The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349 Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain **even if** **every threatened organism becomes extinct**. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352 [\*907] To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they? Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen. One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, **the number of species has been increasing** dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, biodiversity matters only up to a point; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make **little difference**." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet.

# NCs

## Extinction 1st

#### Extinction turns all NCs:

#### 1. It precludes the possibility of any kind of moral value.

Seeley 86 Robert A., Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, The Handbook of Non-Violence, p. 269-70

In moral reasoning prediction of consequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in deciding whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however, human extinction is unlike any other risk. No conceivable human good could be worth the extinction of the race, for in order to be a human good it must be experienced by human beings. Thus extinction is one result we dare not-may not-risk. Though not conclusively established, the risk of extinction is real enough to make nuclear war utterly impermissible under any sane moral code.

#### 2. Letting people die is the same as killing them-thus inaction in the context of the aff is murder.

#### 3. State stability comes first under any moral standard—it’s the only way to create the possibility for good action.

Matusek 5 Ed “THE FRIEND-ENEMY DISTINCTION” 2005 Virginia Tech Graduate Student Conference Fall 2005 <http://www.phil.vt.edu/HTML/events/Fall2005_gradconf/matusek.pdf>

Thus, liberals do “concede”, although in an indirect fashion, that “the existence of a functioning political entity is necessarily prior to any normativ[e]istic restraints on it,” which amounts to a tacit admission that “normativism can never provide an adequate basis for a political community.” 15 Stated another way, “The very differentiation of a people from the ‘alien foe’ is inevitably supranormative;” 16 Schmitt is doubtful that “political identity can rest meaningfully on ‘normativistic’ ideas,…because political conflict with ‘existential’ enemies reaches such a pitch of intensity that ‘normativities’ are likely to prove meaningless.” As a result, the very idea that Schmitt’s necessary point of departure transcends ethics has, of course, enormous ramifications for the liberal political models of his time with their particular notions of normativity. Schmitt’s existential twist in his political theory renders liberal models essentially irrelevant right from the beginning from two angles: either the idea of how the state began is not covered in the model at all, or any serious proposal to answer that question would have to necessarily involve Schmittian concepts to justify the existence of any type of state. Scheuermann elaborates on the second angle by delineating more precisely the connection Schmitt draws between the “enemy” concept and the inadequacies of normativism in this regard: “A people is ‘constituted’17 first and foremost by means of possessing a capacity for undertaking violence against external threats, by the fact that it is ‘awakened’ and ‘capable of action’ against potential political enemies.”18 Therefore, “only if a political entity can successfully ward off the ‘stranger’19 and thus guarantee its survival do liberal legal normativities even have a chance to function successfully.” A connection, then, arguably exists between external and domestic factors in justifying the existence and purpose of the state in Schmittian terms. Regardless of how liberals of Schmitt’s time would construe what the ideal model of government would be for the inner workings of society within the territory in question, the presence of a reasonably powerful state, powerful enough to ensure the continued stability of the society under discussion, must be existentially present prior to a domestic scene that meets the liberal ideal popular in that period.

## Constitution NC

### T: Freedom of Speech

#### TURN-gun ownership kills freedom of speech- that’s the first amendment.

Debrabander 12 Firmin Debrabander “The Freedom of an Armed Society” The New York Times December 16th 2012 <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/12/16/the-freedom-of-an-armed-society/> JW

As ever more people are armed in public, however — even brandishing weapons on the street — this is no longer recognizable as a civil society. Freedom is vanished at that point.And yet, gun rights advocates famously maintain that individual gun ownership, even of high caliber weapons, is the defining mark of our freedom as such, and the ultimate guarantee of our enduring liberty. Deeper reflection on their argument exposes basic fallacies. In her book “The Human Condition,” the philosopher Hannah Arendt states that “violence is mute.” According to Arendt, speech dominates and distinguishes the polis, the highest form of human association, which is devoted to the freedom and equality of its component members. Violence — and the threat of it — is a pre-political manner of communication and control, characteristic of undemocratic organizations and hierarchical relationships. For the ancient Athenians who practiced an incipient, albeit limited form of democracy (one that we surely aim to surpass), violence was characteristic of the master-slave relationship, not that of free citizens. Arendt offers two points that are salient to our thinking about guns: for one, they insert a hierarchy of some kind, but fundamental nonetheless, and thereby undermine equality. But furthermore, guns pose a monumental challenge to freedom, and particular, the liberty that is the hallmark of any democracy worthy of the name — that is, freedom of speech. Guns do communicate, after all, but in a way that is contrary to free speech aspirations: for, guns chasten speech. This becomes clear if only you pry a little more deeply into the N.R.A.’s logic behind an armed society. An armed society is polite, by their thinking, precisely because guns would compel everyone to tamp down eccentric behavior, and refrain from actions that might seem threatening. The suggestion is that guns liberally interspersed throughout society would cause us all to walk gingerly — not make any sudden, unexpected moves — and watch what we say, how we act, whom we might offend. As our Constitution provides, however, liberty entails precisely the freedom to be reckless, within limits, also the freedom to insult and offend as the case may be. The Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld our right to experiment in offensive language and ideas, and in some cases, offensive action and speech. Such experimentation is inherent to our freedom as such. But guns by their nature do not mix with this experiment — they don’t mix with taking offense. They are combustible ingredients in assembly and speech. I often think of the armed protestor who showed up to one of the famously raucous town hall hearings on Obamacare in the summer of 2009. The media was very worked up over this man, who bore a sign that invoked a famous quote of Thomas Jefferson, accusing the president of tyranny. But no one engaged him at the protest; no one dared approach him even, for discussion or debate — though this was a town hall meeting, intended for just such purposes. Such is the effect of guns on speech — and assembly. Like it or not, they transform the bearer, and end the conversation in some fundamental way. They announce that the conversation is not completely unbounded, unfettered and free; there is or can be a limit to negotiation and debate — definitively.

### A2 2nd Amendment

#### 1. T-2nd amendment gets overridden by general welfare.

Martelle 14 Scott (writer for LA times) “You say gun control doesn't work? Fine. Let's ban guns altogether.” Los Angeles Times May 28th 2014 <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-gun-control-ban-homicides-suicides-20140528-story.html> JW

Yes, the Supreme Court has upheld private gun ownership under the 2nd Amendment, but the Supreme Court has been wrong before (Fugitive Slave Law, the Dred Scott case, decisions allowing deed restrictions to bar home sales to African Americans, etc.). One can hope that the court will someday go further than its recognition that the 2nd Amendment is not an absolute right and determine that rampant gun ownership is a public safety threat. And that Congress will push legislation that recognizes that the heavy societal costs of gun ownership outweigh any 2nd Amendment pretense to the right to own guns. (By comparison, the 1st Amendment, near and dear to my heart, is not absolute: We have libel laws, which inherently limit free speech for the sake of the broader good, yet even journalists recognize them as a reasonable compromise.)

#### Outweighs: A. the preamble of the constitution is to promote the general welfare—that comes first since it frames the duties prescribed by all the amendments, B. specificity—right to bear arms is too vague to obligate government action--bear arms could mean hold guns or the limbs of the big scary animal.

#### 2. The 2nd amendment only applies to militias which the plan allows for.

Ensley 15 Gerald (senior writer) “Stop the insanity: Ban guns” Tallahassee Democrat January 7th 2015 http://www.tallahassee.com/story/opinion/columnists/ensley/2014/11/22/stop-insanity-ban-guns/19426029/ JW

I'm talking about flat-out banning the possession of handguns and assault rifles by individual citizens. I'm talking about repealing or amending the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The Second Amendment has been misinterpreted. It says guns are permitted to a "well-regulated militia." That means trained citizen soldiers called into action for emergencies — because in colonial times every able-bodied man was required to be a member of the militia. It does not mean everyone with $50 and a driver's license is entitled to own a gun. That's what former Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger said in 1990, when he called claims of Second Amendment protection of individual gun ownership, "a fraud on the American public."

#### 3. 2nd amendment repeal is normal means and part of durable fiat—otherwise supreme court strikes down the plan and I don’t get solvency which kills aff strat—I can’t garner offense.

### Constitution = Permiss Affirms

A. Interpretation: if debaters read a standard of [\_\_\_\_\_consistency with the constitution\_\_\_\_\_\_], they must concede that permissibility affirms.

B. Violation: they don’t give me permissibility ground.

C. Reciprocity—the constitution isn’t a super large document, finding obligations for the specific aff policy is terrible ground-you’ll always be structurally ahead since you can prove a constitutional violation, or that there is simply no obligation. Kills fairness since you have a 2-1 advantage over me. Giving it to the aff is better since a) you prepped the NC before the round so you’ll have a prep advantage with frontlines and it should be easy for you to prove a violation, b) it discourages you from playing defense and forces you to go for the contentions that you very clearly are able to defend, c) the aff is already structurally skewed by a short 1AR and neg reactivity, d) most consistent with real world-when policymakers using the constitution find no violation-they don’t assume that the bill shouldn’t be passed-they weigh other benefits under other moral frameworks such as util. Real world is key since we all have to know about current events and the point of debate is to teach us to be better people when we’re older.

### Must Allow Contestation of Court Decision

A. Interpretation: if debaters read a standard of [\_\_\_\_\_consistency with the constitution\_\_\_\_\_\_], they may not make weighing arguments that contention level offense outweighs because supreme court justices or constitutional interpreters know more than us.

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. reciprocity-if the NC is just a question of what people say and not allowing me to contest the reasoning behind the decision then it’s literally a NIB because handgun bans have been struck down in the past. The only way to make it reciprocal is if I get to make args for why the aff would be consistent with the constitution in theory. Reciprocity is key to fairness-ensures equal access to the ballot.

2. real world education-instead of just blindly listening to authorities, we can actually make our own arguments and readings of the founding documents which encourages critical investigation on what kind of laws the uS should pass. Key to education-ensures we fully learn and understand the constitution.

## Kant NC

### Turns

1. TURN- all actions are obligatory under Kant. If practical reason is inherent in agency then every action taken is reasoned practically and good.

TURN-states have a monopoly on force in their territory.

Ripstein Arthur Ripstein, “Force and Freedom”. Harvard University Press, 2009

The first, “legalistic” argument turns on the claim that no one can sit in judgment of the sovereign, on the grounds that the person who could do so would be the sovereign**,** and so, either the real sovereign, or subject to having still others sit in judgment, generating either a regress or a contradiction**,** since under such an arrangement the supreme authority would both be and not be the supreme authority. Thus a constitution that reserves to the people a right of revolution necessarily contains a contradiction. This argument is often discussed independently of the other parts of Kant’s argument for the state, and unsurprisingly, it strikes many readers as too legalistic to be of much interest. However, Kant’s point in making it needs to be understood in the broader context of his argument for the state. As we saw in Chapter 6, that argument turns on the problem of unilateral choice, and the need for authoritative institutions to make choice omnilateral. In order for the power to resolve a dispute to be anything more than yet another unilateral use of force, the arbiter of the dispute must be able to make a decision on behalf of the parties to the dispute. In the case of a revolution, however, someone presents himself as outside the legal order, yet entitled to resolve a dispute in relation to it. In those terms, the revolutionary’s position is incoherent. From the claim that the revolutionary is not entitled to be judge in his own case, Kant draws the surprising conclusion that the sovereign is entitled to be judge in his own case.14

#### And- In order to leave the state of nature, individuals give up their power to use deadly force against others, since this would enable us to unilaterally determine the ends others set, since individuals could be coerced to cohere with our desires.

#### And, handguns are intrinsically objects used to exert force over another agent.

#### A. Definitions prove:

#### Merriam Webster defines a gun as “Gun” http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/gun JW

a weapon that shoots bullets or shells

#### And a weapon as “Weapon” http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/weaponJW

something (as a club, knife, or gun) used to injure, defeat, or destroy

#### Even if guns have other uses- their definition means they are intrinsically forceful.

#### B. Handguns are designed to kill people.

Honeywell Ken (editor-in-chief of Punchnel’s) “What is the Purpose of a Gun?” <http://www.punchnels.com/2014/07/17/what-is-the-purpose-of-a-gun/> JW

What, after all, is the purpose of a gun? The purpose of a gun–if we’re being honest–is to kill something. It’s a tool that has enough power, when used properly (and very often improperly) to kill. Hunting rifles and shotguns are for killing animals. Handguns–if we’re being honest–are for killing people. That’s the purpose behind their design**–**they are portable, concealable, easy-to-use tools for killing a person. You may feel protected when you carry a gun, but guns are not for protection: They are for killing. Were I a paranoid person or on some sort of mystery-solving adventure, I might also feel safer if I carried my eight-inch chef’s knife that is for chopping vegetables. I might feel safer carrying a baseball bat or accompanied by a dog. (P.S.: The purpose of a dog is not to protect you. As far as I can tell, the purpose of a dog is to be a dog.) But guns are only for killing. So we have laws that make it easy for you and me and just about anybody to go to the gun store and buy a gun, and carry it damn near anywhere we please in Indiana, including our state parks. It only stands to reason that when lots of people are walking around the streets with tools that are made to kill people, people are going to die. I’m sure that if people were walking around with butcher knives, more people would get stuck. I’m also pretty sure that if more people were walking around with shovels, more people would get whacked in the melon with shovels. But I’ll bet more holes would get dug, too. And a gun is not for anything else. Except killing. Yes, target practice. But there’s a reason those targets are shaped like humans.

#### And, an object’s intrinsic function is inherent in its design -a bread knife becomes a machete once you lose the ridges made to go through bread A handgun turns into a hunk of metal once you lose the trigger and elements that make it shoot. Even if the hunk of metal is dangerous, it is no longer intrinsically an object of force.

## Ownership NC (Valley)

#### Self ownership is conditional on our actions not harming others.

**Vallentyne** Vallentyne, Peter, and Bas van der Vossen. 2002. "Libertarianism".*Plato.Stanford.Edu*. Accessed December 20 2015. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/libertarianism/.

Full-**self ownership is sometimes thought to guarantee that the agent has a certain basic *liberty of action*, but this is not s**o. For **if the rest of the world** (natural resources and artifacts) **is fully** (“maximally”) **owned by others, one is not permitted to do anything without their consent**—**since that would involve the use of their property**. For example, as a result of one's trespass on their land, one may become their slave. The protection that **self-ownership affords** is **a basic protection against others doing certain things to one, but not a guarantee of liberty**. Even **this protection**, however, **may be merely formal**. A plausible thesis of self-ownership must allow that **some rights** (e.g., against imprisonment) **may be lost if one violates the rights of other**s. Hence, if the rest of world is owned by others, then anything one does without their consent violates their property rights, and, as a result of such violations, one may lose some or all of one's rights of self-ownership. This point shows that, **because agents must use natural resources** (occupy space, breathe air, etc**.), self-ownership on its own has no substantive implications**. It is only when combined with assumptions about how the rest of the world is owned (and the consequences of violating those property rights) that substantive implications follow.

Impact: Self ownership is reliant on another external theory of how the world is owned, and only the aff util framework does that.

# CPs

## Background Checks

### Solvency

#### 1. The aff solves *first time offenders­*- background checks only apply to people with previous criminal records.

#### 2. Causes illicit markets and straw purchases- you can get a clean friend to buy a gun for you.

### Ableism K

#### Mental competency standards for background checks cause ableism and fail to solve gun violence. Vote them down to reject ableist representations.

Scholl 15 T.J. Scholl (senior student of English literature and gender studies at Sewanee: The University of the South in Eastern Tennessee) “Obama’s Gun Control Ableism” July 26th, 2015 Center for a Stateless Society <https://c4ss.org/content/39123> JW

President Obama’s recent gun control efforts exemplify the ableism and general discrimination inherent in progressive paternalism. In his latest attempt at gun control, Obama seeks to bar individuals who collect Social Security benefits and whose resources are overseen by “representative payees” due to “marked subnormal intelligence, or mental illness, incompetence, condition, or disease” from owning or purchasing a firearm. Under the terms of the proposal, the Social Security Administration would be required to report the identities of four million plus disabled and neurodivergent individuals to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS). This is the same system that identifies and prevents sales of weapons to members of a number of other marginalized groups, including undocumented immigrants, felons, and known drug users. The mistreatment of differently abled and neurodivergent individuals by the state is an insufferable fact of life in America, a nation where over fifteen percent of all incarcerated people suffer from a severe mental illness. Attempts to further smother the already oppressed are always high on the priority list of do-gooder bureaucrats who see anyone with even a hint of a problem as a potential client. While it is indeed critical that society offers support to those in need of physical, mental, and emotional assistance, bodily autonomy and independent agency are of paramount importance. Freedom does not exist without those elements. Involuntary institutionalization and other forms of coercive psychology are all too common in our neoliberal welfare state. Criminalizing firearm possession for anyone who fails to meet the federal government’s arbitrary definition of “competency” forces millions of already vulnerable individuals to rely on third parties for protection, further stripping them of their independence. It seems to be the state’s goal that it never be rendered irrelevant. And that is precisely why the anarchist supports illegal ownership of firearms, outside the purview of the state, where individuals feel it necessary. The same government that has systematically imprisoned, maimed, murdered, and labeled deviant for two centuries those who don’t fit snuggly into the box of societal acceptability is now demanding that its victims sit back and accept its “benevolence.” Your right to self-defense be damned. We simply cannot have “crazies” running around with guns, they say. It may lead to innocent people being injured or killed. Gun control, especially this variety of it, is intrinsically ableist. It privileges neurotypicality by preventing neurodivergent individuals from acquiring the means to practically and effectively defend themselves. Given that rights do not exist in a vacuum, the right to defend oneself is meaningless when those in power make it illegal to both obtain and keep the only tools realistically useful in exercising that right. Not only would this measure strip millions of marginalized individuals of their ability to defend themselves, it would inevitably lead to an uptick in the imprisonment and institutionalization of the very people whom the state claims deserve protection. As radical social critics have pointed out, gun control laws naturally target disenfranchised groups and contribute to the perpetuation of a vicious cycle of poverty. No matter how much lip service Obama pays to criminal justice reform, his dedication to gun-grabbing reveals that he has no intention of putting an end to mass incarceration and marginalization. Regardless of what the statist left may assert, neurodivergent individuals and other stigmatized groups having access to firearms is not the problem; government- mandated abelism is.

#### Rejecting ableism comes first-it’s a prerequisite to effective debate.

Berube 3 Berube, Michael. Citizenship and Disability: Disability is a matter of civil rights, even if the Supreme Court doesn't seem to agree. May 1st, 2003. Dissent Magazine. http://www.alternet.org/story/15809/citizenship\_and\_disability. NP 8/27/15

Imagine a building in which political philosophers are debating, in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the value and the purpose of participatory parity over against forms of authoritarianism or theocracy. Now imagine that this building has no access ramps, no Braille or large-print publications, no American Sign Language interpreters, no elevators, no special-needs paraprofessionals, no in-class aides. Contradictory as such a state of affairs may sound, it's a reasonably accurate picture of what contemporary debate over the meaning of democracy actually looks like. How can we remedy this? Only when we have fostered equal participation in debates over the ends and means of democracy can we have a truly participatory debate over what "participatory parity" itself means. That debate will be interminable in principle, since our understandings of democracy and parity are infinitely revisable, but lest we think of deliberative democracy as a forensic society dedicated to empyreal reaches of abstraction, we should remember that debates over the meaning of participatory parity set the terms for more specific debates about the varieties of human embodiment. These include debates about prenatal screening, genetic discrimination, stem-cell research, euthanasia, and, with regard to physical access, ramps, curb cuts, kneeling buses, and buildings employing what is now known as universal design. Leftists and liberals, particularly those associated with university humanities departments, are commonly charged with being moral relativists, unable or unwilling to say (even after September 11) why one society might be "better" than another. So let me be especially clear on this final point. I think there's a very good reason to extend the franchise, to widen the conversation, to democratize our debates, and to make disability central to our theories of egalitarian social justice. The reason is this: a capacious and supple sense of what it is to be human is better than a narrow and partial sense of what it is to be human, and the more participants we as a society can incorporate into the deliberation of what it means to be human, the greater the chances that that deliberation will in fact be transformative in such a way as to enhance our collective capacities to recognize each other as humans entitled to human dignity. As Jamie reminds me daily, both deliberately and unwittingly, most Americans had no idea what people with Down syndrome could achieve until we'd passed and implemented and interpreted and reinterpreted a law entitling them all to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. I can say all this without appealing to any innate justification for human dignity and human rights, and I can also say this: Without a sufficient theoretical and practical account of disability, we can have no account of democracy worthy of the name. Perhaps some of our fellow citizens with developmental disabilities would not put the argument quite this way; even though Jamie has led me to think this way, he doesn't talk the way I do. But those of us who do participate in political debates, whether about school funding in a specific district or about the theory and practice of democracy at its most abstract, have the obligation to enhance the abilities of [those] our children and our fellow citizens with disabilities to participate in the life of the United States as political and moral equals with their nondisabled peers-both for their own good, and for the good of democracy, which is to say, for the good of all of us.

## Bullets (Greenhill)

#### 1. Guns are highly mechanical and complex but bullets can just be shards of metal people find-they don’t need to get them legally.

#### 2. Perm, do both—that’s double solvency.

#### 3. If the CP is functionally handgun prohibition then you bite just as hard to any other disad to the aff.

#### 4. Guns are large and noticeable which makes it easier to enforce a ban-bullets are tiny enough that people could hide them in their pockets.

## IPV PIC

#### Guns in the home causes more IPV-best studies prove.

DeFilippis 14 Evan Defilippis (graduated from the University of Oklahoma with a triple degree in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He was the University of Oklahoma's valedictorian in 2012, he is one of the nation's few Harry S. Truman Scholars based on his commitment to public service, and is a David L. Boren Critical Languages scholar, fluent in Swahili, and dedicated to a career in African development. He worked on multiple poverty-reduction projects in Nairobi, Kenya, doing big data analysis for Innovations for Poverty Action. He will be attending Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School in the Fall.) “Having a Gun in the House Doesn't Make a Woman Safer” Feb 23 2014 The Atlantic <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2014/02/having-a-gun-in-the-house-doesnt-make-a-woman-safer/284022/> JW

Christy Salters Martin is a professional boxer and the owner of a concealed carry permit. But when she attempted to leave her husband, she was shot with her own gun. Today, she cautions other women against making the same mistake. “Just putting a weapon in the woman’s hand is not going to reduce the number of fatalities or gunshot victims that we have. Too many times, their male counterpart or spouse will be able to overpower them and take that gun away.” Wayne LaPierre, executive vice-president of the National Rifle Association, has argued that firearms are a great equalizer between the sexes. In a speech at the Conservative Political Action Committee last year, he declared, “The one thing a violent rapist deserves to face is a good woman with a gun.” But the empirical reality of firearm ownership reflects anything but equality, particularly when it comes to intimate partner violence. Such fights become much more frequent and lethal when firearms are involved, and the violence is nearly unidirectional, inflicted by males upon females. This relationship holds true not only across the United States, but around the world. A recent meta-analysis concluded what many people already knew: the availability of firearms is a strong risk factor for both homicide and suicide. But the study came to another conclusion that is rarely mentioned in the gun control debate: females are uniquely impacted by the availability of a firearm. Indeed, the study found that women with access to firearms become homicide victims at significantly higher rates than men. It has long been recognized that higher rates of gun availability correlate with higher rates of female homicide. Women in the United States account for 84 percent of all female firearm victims in the developed world, even though they make up only a third of the developed world’s female population. And within American borders, women die at higher rates from suicide, homicide, and accidental firearm deaths in states where guns are more widely available. This is true even after controlling for factors such as urbanization, alcohol use, education, poverty, and divorce rates. What’s more surprising is how many of these deaths occur in the home, at the hands of a male partner. In a study in the Journal of Trauma, A.L. Kellermann, director of the RAND Institute of health, and his coauthor J.A. Mercy concluded: “More than twice as many women are killed with a gun used by their husbands or intimate acquaintances than are murdered by strangers using guns, knives, or any other means.” In another study, published in the American Journal of Public Health, researchers interviewed 417 women across 67 battered women’s shelters. Nearly a third of these women had lived in a household with a firearm. In two-thirds of the homes, their intimate partners had used the gun against them, usually threatening to kill (71.4%) them. A very small percentage of these women (7%) had used a gun successfully in self-defense, and primarily just to scare the attacking male partner away. Indeed, gun threats in the home against women by their intimate partners appear to be more common across the United States than self-defense uses of guns by women. Another large case-control study compared women who were murdered by their intimate partner with a control group of battered women. Only 16 percent of the women who had been abused, but not murdered, had guns in their homes, whereas 51 percent of the murder victims did. In fact, not a single study to date has shown that the risk of any crime including burglary, robbery, home invasion, or spousal abuse against a female is decreased through gun ownership. Though there are examples of women using a gun to defend themselves, they are few and far between, and not statistically significant. These facts should be as chilling to men as they are to women. A 2005 study examining mortality data from 1998-2000 found that when a female was shot by her intimate partner, the perpetrator subsequently killed himself in two thirds of the cases. This statistic not only shows necessity of getting mental help for at-risk men. It also further suggests that owning a firearm may make a household more vulnerable than ever.

## Police CP (Newark)

Permutation, do both KILLS this counterplan. In an ideal world, nobody would have guns because they are a tool of violence, police AND citizens. The perm solves best by removing violence from all forms of social interaction, not just police- that solves Kopel 93.

Permutation, the CP is a part of the AC advocacy: private ownership of handguns means ownership by individuals but police are individuals too- that means that they wouldn’t be able to get guns under the aff.

The counterplan CANNOT solve global US violence because drone strikes which Fang 15 cites are not handgun attacks.

## Registry Delay CP

#### Aff solves Latin American Relations better then the CP- relations are waning NOW because of the perception of no cooperation- efficiacy of the policy is irrelevant, it’s about quickly taking a strong stance against trafficking.

#### 6 months is a solvency deficit for suicide- you just allow thousands more people to die- strong solvency defense means vote aff.

#### Confiscation is irrelevant to suicide; the harms are about legal purchase of handguns by non-criminals. They’ll turn in their guns and they won’t be allowed to buy new ones in both worlds.

#### Perm, do the CP. Normal means is months in the docket; status quo proves. I advocate passing the aff now but it will take a while to be implemented.

#### Gun registration fails- empirics prove.

Kopel 15 David (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute) “The Costs and Consequences of Gun Control” Policy Analysis Cato Institution December 1st 2015 No. 785 JW

Mass prohibitions of guns or gun components or accessories invite a repetition of the catastrophe of alcohol prohibition. Just as alcohol prohibition in the 1920s spawned vast increases in state power and vast infringements of the Bill of Rights, another domestic war against the millions of Americans who are determined to possess a product that is very important to them is almost certain to cause significant erosion of constitutional freedom and traditional liberty.101 Legal and customary protections against unreasonable search and seizure and against invasions of privacy would all suffer.102 Americans are well aware that gun registration can be a tool for gun confiscation, and not just in other countries. In New York City during the mid-1960s, street crime was rising rapidly. So as a gesture to “do something,” the New York City Council and Mayor John Lindsay (R) enacted long-gun registration. The per gun fee was low, just a few dollars.103 Registration never did solve crimes, and crime continued to worsen. So in 1991, with the city becoming increasingly unlivable, Mayor David Dinkins (D) made a grand gesture of his own, convincing the City Council to enact a ban on so-called assault weapons.104 Then, the New York police used the registration lists to conduct home inspections of individuals whose registered guns had been outlawed. The police said they were ensuring that the registered guns had been moved out of the city, or had already been surrendered to the government.105 In California, in 2013, only strenuous opposition finally led to the defeat of a proposed law, AB 174, which, before it was amended to cover a different subject, would have confiscated grandfathered assault weapons that had previously been registered in compliance with California state law. Precisely because of concerns about confiscation, many Americans will not obey laws that would retroactively require them to register their guns. During the first phase of the assault-weapon panic, in 1989 and 1990, several states and cities enacted bans and allowed grandfathered owners to keep the guns legally by registering them. The vast majority of gun owners refused to register.106 Gun-prohibition advocates are quite correct in characterizing registration as an important step on the way to confiscation.107 That is why Congress has enacted three separate laws to prohibit federal gun registration.108 Obama apparently hopes to reverse federal policy with his euphemistic call for a national database of guns, and his imposition of registration for many long gun sales in the southwest border states.109 Yet when Canada tried to impose universal gun registration the result was a fiasco. The registration system cost a hundred times more than promised. Non-compliance was at least 50 percent, and the registration system proved almost entirely useless in fighting crime. In 2012, the Canadian government repealed the registration law and ordered all the registration records destroyed.110 New Zealand’s Arms Act of 1983, enacted at the request of the police, abolished the registration of rifles and shotguns. Rifle registration had been the law since 1920, and shotgun registration since 1968. The New Zealand Police explained that long-gun registration was expensive and impractical, and that the money could be better spent on other police work. The New Zealand Police pointed out that the database management is an enormously difficult and expensive task, that the long-gun registration database was a mess, and that it yielded virtually nothing of value to the police.111 Although some gun-control advocates began pushing in 1997 to revive the registry—since computers would supposedly make it work this time—the plan was rejected after several years of extensive debate and analysis.112 As for registration in the United States, the largest, most detailed comparative study of the effects of various firearms laws was conducted by Florida State University criminologist Gary Kleck, and published in his 1991 book Point Blank: Guns and Violence in America. His book was awarded the highest honor by the American Society of Criminology, the Michael Hindelang Book Award, “for the greatest contribution to criminology in a three-year period.” The Kleck study examined many years of crime data for the 75 largest cities in the United States. The study controlled for numerous variables such as poverty, race, and arrest rates. Kleck’s study found no crime-reducing benefits from gun registration.113 In 2013, at the request of the Canadian Department of Justice, Kleck prepared a report that synthesized all prior research in the United States and Canada. He found registration to be of no benefit in reducing any type of firearms misuse.114

## Smartgun PIC

#### 1. People can still use smart guns for violence- this PIC solves basically nothing.

#### 2. Smartguns make people less safe.

Stokes 16 Jon “Will smart guns make us less safe?” 1-17-16 LA Times [http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-0117-stokes-smart-gun-problems-20160117-story.html#](http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-0117-stokes-smart-gun-problems-20160117-story.html)

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. 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.

#### 3. Smartguns get jailbroken- terminal defense

Stokes 16 Jon “Will smart guns make us less safe?” 1-17-16 LA Times [http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-0117-stokes-smart-gun-problems-20160117-story.html#](http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-0117-stokes-smart-gun-problems-20160117-story.html)

For the sake of argument, however, let's say that the reliability objection to smart gun technology has been definitively addressed, and that there exists an electronically lockable gun that's practically flying off the shelves. Such technology would not dependably stop unauthorized users from firing stolen weapons, for the simple fact that every piece of locked-down consumer technology that has ever been introduced — from the DRM schemes that encrypt Blu-ray disks to the software locks intended to keep users from installing illicit software on their iPhones — has been “jailbroken” and can be defeated by anyone with a little time and access to YouTube. As impossible as sealed electronic gadgets are to secure against tampering, guns are even more hopeless, because firearms are mechanical devices that are designed to be disassembled for regular cleaning and repair. Once a gun has been broken down, any component that prevents it from firing can be filed off, taped over, replaced, or otherwise circumvented. Smith & Wesson users, for instance, routinely remove the integrated mechanical locks that the Clinton administration convinced the gunmaker to add to its popular family of revolvers. Smart gun technology can and will be jailbroken — but that isn't even the worst consequence of this particular “safety” trend.

## States CP

### Competition

#### States CP isn’t competitive with the aff.

Damerdji 16 Salim (debate coach) “An Argument Against the States CP” NSD Update January 12th 2016 <http://nsdupdate.com/2016/01/12/an-argument-against-the-states-cp-by-salim-damerdji/> JW

There is no entity with the power to decide between state & federal action…. Why do we need to get further into educational or fairness concerns? The choice posed by the counterplan is silly because no entity has the power to choose between the plan and the counterplan. That is the real damage done by the states counterplan: Voting negative rejects the plan for a reason nobody should consider. I find this argument compelling, but if you don’t, consider the following analogy. Suppose you are a security guard working the night-shift at an art museum. You realize a disgruntled co-worker is wandering around, and to your dismay, punching painting after painting. You could run up to your co-worker and tackle them, but that would certainly damage the next painting. In an ideal world, your co-worker would stop their rampage on their own. But based on their aggressive demeanor, you figure this is unlikely. So the choice is yours: tackle your co-worker (and definitely cause more harm) or do nothing at all with the hope that your co-worker will abort their rampage on their own volition. It seems pretty compelling that you should take matters into your own hands. While it’d be ideal for your co-worker to stop their rampage on their own, you have little to no confidence that they will, and so you still have a moral obligation to stop the rampage. Now consider the States CP. The USFG sees serious harm in the status quo. It would be ideal for the 50 states to ban handguns instead of the federal government, but keep in mind, many of these 50 states openly oppose any gun control whatsoever, let alone a handgun ban. Moreover, it’s sheer fantasy to suppose all 50 states would act in unison. In sum, the ideal outcome, whereby the 50 states implement a handgun ban, is virtually zero. Just as the security guard would be foolish to play the odds of not acting, the same would be true for the federal government. In both cases, there’s little to no chance that the ideal actor would actually act. And so the obligation falls back to you, the non-ideal actor. As the language here suggests, this logic applies to all alternate actor CP’s, not just the 50 States CP.[2]

#### AND: Multiple actors can have the same obligation, so proving that the states should act doesn’t disprove that congress has the same obligation.

### Theory

#### States CPs are a voting issue: they kill aff ground and clash since you don’t have to answer the point of the 1AC which is that gun control is good and instead moot my offense making me start new in the 1AR—advantage CPs and rich neg topic literature solve your offense. No education benefit-people read states and federal affs, you can read the CP as disads to both of those plans. States is worse for real world- it’s utopian to imagine 50 separate entities doing the same thing.

### Permutation

#### Permutation, do both.

#### States will pass weak versions of the aff- you don’t solve case. At worst, the perm’s key to enforcement.

DeFilippis and Zimring 16 Evan DeFilippis (graduated number one in his class at the University of Oklahoma with degrees in Economics, Political Science, and Psychology. He is a Harry S. Truman Scholar, a David L. Boren Critical Languages Scholar, and currently works as a research analyst at Quest Opportunity Fund. His work on gun violence has been featured in Washington Post, Atlantic, Slate, VICE, Huffington Post, Vox, Media Matters, Boston Review, and many others) and Franklin Zimring (Law Professor at University of California, Berkeley School of Law, J.D., University of Chicago, Zimring's major fields of interest are criminal justice and family law, with special emphasis on the use of empirical research to inform legal policy) “Cal RR Finals Post-Round Discussion [Transcript]” Debate Matters March 5th 2016 JW

Jonas: Uh, my name is Jonas. Uh, I go to Palos Verdes Peninsula High School in Los Angeles. Uh, I guess my question is, in terms of implementing a ban on the private ownership of handguns in the United States, what are the pros and cons of doing it on a federal level versus a state level, and which personally do you think is better? Randall: Professor? Profess? Zimring: Uh, there's another book, but it's an old one. It's called Firearms and Violence in American Life, it's the taskforce on violence. The National Violence Commission. Uh, possibly written after your parents were born. Uh, and unfortunately I was a co-author, and the answer is that the overall enforcement of the part of it, which is the commerce in guns, has to be federal, but the, the number of street and law enforcers who are federal in the United States is quite minimal, and that's about the only defense of liberty we have these days, so it is the, the municipal government ... Whatever gun control is at retail on the streets, our municipal police and sheriffs, federal standards, but local, uh, uh, officials doing, and the truth of the matter is that that means that the gun control is either going to be as good or as bad as the local police are. If they are members of the Klu Klux Klan, you're going to get the kind of gun control that you had in the American Southern States all during the late 19th century and early 20th century. If police enforcement is both meticulous and even-handed, you've got a chance, but they've got to be the foot soldiers, the standards have to be national, and the regulatory rules have to national. DeFilippis: Yeah, I mean I echo those thoughts. I think federal implementation is far more credible. Uh, the regulatory regime, uh, needs to be consistent and, uh, needs to have credibility. Uh, my only fear with, um, leaving it up to the states is that it runs the risk of, uh, some of the more conservative states that may be, uh, allergic to gun control, implementing extremely weak, or watered down versions of, of, of gun control legislation, which we're already seeing that sort of sloppy patchwork of state laws and municipalities allows, uh, you know, private retailers to set up shop just outside the outskirts of, um, areas with strict gun control regulation and sort of bypass, uh, uh, state level law, so um, yeah I think it's far more intelligent to do it on a federal level.

#### States can’t do the aff by themselves-training and jurisdiction

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

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.

#### Permutation solves enforcement flaws-two governments step in for each other

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

In addition to the federal government providing the minimum floor and the states experimenting with tougher regulations, the federal government and states would cooperate on another level. Specifically, under a coordinated federal-state approach, the federal government would concentrate on regulating firearm manufacturers and commercial dealers, and the states would concentrate on private ownership and use of firearms. Because of the need for uniformity in setting standards for the manufacturer of firearms, it would be preferable for the federal government to set those standards. Conversely, when adopting regulations for the safe storage of firearms inside the home or transfers of guns between collectors or friends, there is much less need for uniformity and much greater opportunity for regulation to be tailored to reflect the specific values and customs of a particular state. Finally, the coordinated federal-state approach would include a coordination of enforcement activities by the two levels of government. For example, if the federal government decided for reasons of fiscal prudence not to devote enough resources to properly enforce federal regulations, the states would step in. If there were not enough ATF agents to inspect the records of the federally licensed gun dealers in a particular state to ensure compliance with federal regulations, the state police or some other state law enforcement agency would begin doing so.

No link and perm solves. Federalism Isn’t Zero-Sum.

**Rabe 6** (Rabe, Professor of Environmental Policy, University of Michigan, 06. [Barry, “STATE COMPETITION AS A SOURCE DRIVING CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION,”NYU Environmental Law Journal, Volume 14, February 1st 2006 p1-53, http://www.law.nyu.edu/journals/envtllaw/issues/vol14/1/v14\_n1\_rabe-roman-dobelis.pdf]

The **federal/state choice in** environmental **regulation is not** an “**either/or”** proposition as it was sometimes cast in the environmental federalism debate of the mid-1990s.137 **Those studying** environmental law and **policy** today **must contemplate a fluid system** of relationships, **in which influence can pass from the federal to the state** level, **from the state to the federal** level, or from state to state, **via mechanisms** ranging **from the political** **process** to the legal process. The inter-state competition framework developed here should be useful in this study, and also for those seeking to influence U.S. environmental law and policy. For both scholars and practitioners, dynamics such as those observed above may form helpful guideposts.

### A2 Federalism DA

1. The aff is a drop in the bucket- federalism gets determined by taxes and trade. States won’t care if one type of gun is banned. If the impact was probable then it would have been triggered by the supreme court overruling state’s right to decide marriage last year. That outweighs because gay marriage was much more controversial.

2**.** Federalism has been destroyed for years.

Edwards 08 Edwards, Executive Articles Editor, New York University Annual Survey of American Law, 08. [David B., “OUT OF THE MOUTH OF STATES: DEFERENCE TO STATE ACTION FINDING EFFECT IN FEDERAL LAW,” New York University Annual Survey of American Law, 2008. Accessed 7/15/08 from LexisNexis]

The particular powers ofa segment, level, or branch of government are almost never static. The "hydraulic" pressure inherent within each of these governmental units exerts influence on the others. **[n66](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.699793.6910736902&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1216157574370&returnToKey=20_T4168169577&parent=docview" \l "n66)** Consequently, powers arguably not originally intended to be exercised by their new masters bleed over time from one unit to the other. [n67](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.699793.6910736902&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1216157574370&returnToKey=20_T4168169577&parent=docview" \l "n67) The history of the Interstate Commerce Clause [n68](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.699793.6910736902&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1216157574370&returnToKey=20_T4168169577&parent=docview" \l "n68) gives the most concrete example of this pressure. Originally the clause was fairly circumscribed, but has now, with very rare exception, become a nearly unlimited congressional power. [n69](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.699793.6910736902&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1216157574370&returnToKey=20_T4168169577&parent=docview" \l "n69) Other examples include the judiciary's asserting itself through judicial review, [n70](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.699793.6910736902&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1216157574370&returnToKey=20_T4168169577&parent=docview" \l "n70) the executive's attempting to become more prominent through reliance on the Vesting Clause, [n71](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.699793.6910736902&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1216157574370&returnToKey=20_T4168169577&parent=docview" \l "n71) Congress's utilization of the Necessary  [\*441]  and Proper Clause to increase its reach, [n72](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.699793.6910736902&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1216157574370&returnToKey=20_T4168169577&parent=docview#n72) and the states' claiming their stake through the police power. [n73](http://www.lexisnexis.com/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.699793.6910736902&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1216157574370&returnToKey=20_T4168169577&parent=docview#n73) There are two basic forms of power-bleeding: between branches of the same level of government (horizontal) and between different levels of government (vertical).

3. Federalism is meaningless.

Greve 12 Michael S. Greve is the John G. Searle Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, 2/10/2012, http://libertylawsite.org/2012/02/10/obamacaid-revisited-against-balance/

In an instructive law review article, the late Bobby Lipkin collected the contemporary Supreme Court’s references to federalism’s “balance” and showed that the notion is empty. It has no constitutional reference point, and its deployment as an actual constitutional norm—as opposed to high-toned burble to tart up a result reached on other grounds—has absurd implications. Suppose, for example, that some otherwise constitutional federal law shifts the “constitutionally mandated” balance to the states’ detriment: could we make it up to the states by giving them a power to, say, tax imports from China? Would that make us feel better about our federalism (because “balance” has been restored)? I didn’t think so, either.

### A2 US Modeling

#### 1. If federalism got modeled then there wouldn’t be as many dictatorships as there are in the squo

#### 2. No modeling.

Stepan 99 Stepan, Wallace Sayre Professor of Government at Columbia University, 99. [Alfred, “Federalism and Democracy: Beyond the U.S. Model,” Journal of Democracy Vol. 10, No. 4 (1999) pp. 19-34. Accessed 7/8/08 from <https://netfiles.uiuc.edu/fesnic/fspub/6_7_Stepan_1999_Federalism_J_of_Dem.pdf>]

Finally, many of the new federations that could emerge from the currently nondemocratic parts of the world would probably be territorially based, multilingual, and multinational. For the reasons spelled out in this article, very few, if any, such polities would attempt to consolidate democracy using the U.S. model of "coming-together," "*demos-*constraining," symmetrical federalism.

#### 3. TURN- US modeling causes genocides.

Schetter 05 Center for Development Research, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany, **05**. [“Ethnoscapes, National Territorialisation, and the Afghan War,” Geopolitics, 10:50–75, 2005. Accessed 7/9/08 <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdf?vid=13&hid=15&sid=91519a6e-f6b8-4b39-928d-d1ecbb16c7af%40sessionmgr7>]

The territorialisation of national ideologies emerged as one of the most significant prerequisites for the use of violence in the name of a nation or an ethnic group. On the one hand, beginning in the nineteenth century the practise of ethnic cleansing gained ground all over the world as a means of creating ethnically homogenised territories and achieving the unity of nation-state and territory.24 On the other hand, the establishment of nation-states and the politics of territorial homogenisation were often enough accompanied by the emergence of political counter-movements. Ethnic elites excluded from access to state power competed with national elites by stressing ethnic counter-ideologies reflecting their own perceptions of ethnoscapes. Once political thinking in terms of the nationstate had attained global primacy, ethnoscapes laid the groundwork for territiorialised claims ranging from rights of territorial autonomy and selfdetermination in a federalist framework to demands for independent territorial nation-states. These ethnoscapes were not in conformity with national territory, since they usually pointed to current or past patterns of settlement and migration or to the territorialisation of ethnic symbols such as battlefields, places of pilgrimage, etc. The rhetorical disputes between protagonists of the nation and rival ethnic groups often culminated in the question: who arrived here first? In many conflicts the belief in a certain ethnoscape was perceived by people as an axiomatic fact that called for certain courses of action: in escalating violent conflicts, for instance, spatial perceptions of national and ethnic identities have again and again provided the immediate legitimacy for acts of violence such as ethnic cleansing and ‘ethnocide’.25

### Fism Bad-Natural Disasters

Federalism kills natural disaster preparedness.

**Governing Magazine 5** RISK AND RESPONSIBILITY, October, 2005, LEXIS

After Hurricane Frances ripped through Florida about a year ago, the Federal Emergency Management Agency wrote checks worth $31 million to residents of Miami-Dade County. There was a big problem with the payouts, though: The storm had actually hit about 200 miles to the north. Frances gave Miami a good soaking but didn't really do much damage there. It's an ironic tale, in light of all the finger-pointing wrought by the catastrophe of Hurricane Katrina. To be sure, state and local officials never relish having to work with FEMA's bureaucracy when disaster strikes. That's been abundantly clear this past month. But there's usually a silver--or green--lining. It's not too hard to shake millions, even billions, out of Washington after a calamity, or even a rainstorm in Miami's case. In fact, it's much easier than winning federal aid for workaday priorities such as education or public housing. This is one of **federalism**'s little quirks--one that some argue **makes natural disasters** even **more disastrous. If the feds always pick up the tab,** then **there's no incentive for states or localities to halt** risky development in areas prone to **flooding, mudslides or wildfires.** It's an example of what economists call a "moral hazard" problem. **"The signal that's gone out** over many years **is that no matter what type of natural disaster** it is**, FEMA** comes in and **bails you out**," says Pietro Nivola, a senior fellow with the Brookings Institution. **"State and local governments become complacent."**

Natural disasters cause extinction.

**Sid Ahmed 5** Mohammed, Al-Ahram Online, Jan 6-12, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2005/724/op3.htm

The human species has never been exposed to a natural upheaval of this magnitude within living memory. What happened in South Asia is the ecological equivalent of 9/11. Ecological problems like global warming and climatic disturbances in general threaten to make our natural habitat unfit for human life. The **extinction** of the species **has become a** very **real possibility**, whether by our own hand or **as a result of natural disasters** of a much greater magnitude than the Indian Ocean earthquake and the killer waves it spawned. Human civilisation has developed in the hope that Man will be able to reach welfare and prosperity on earth for everybody. But now things seem to be moving in the opposite direction, exposing planet Earth to the end of its role as a nurturing place for human life. Today, **human conflicts have become less of a threat than** the **confrontation between Man and Nature. At least they are less likely to bring about the end of the human species.** The reactions of Nature as a result of its exposure to the onslaughts of human societies have become more important in determining the fate of the human species than any harm it can inflict on itself. Until recently, the threat Nature represented was perceived as likely to arise only in the long run, related for instance to how global warming would affect life on our planet. Such a threat could take decades, even centuries, to reach a critical level. This perception has changed following the devastating **earthquake and tsunamis** that hit the coastal regions of South Asia and, less violently, of East Africa, on 26 December. This cataclysmic event has **underscore**d **the vulnerability of our world before the wrath of Nature** and shaken the sanguine belief that the end of the world is a long way away. Gone are the days when we could comfort ourselves with the notion that the extinction of the human race will not occur before a long-term future that will only materialise after millions of years and not affect us directly in any way. **We are now forced to live with the possibility of** an **imminent demise of humankind.**