## 1AC

### FW

#### We are in an age of youth exclusion, an era where sovereign power extends to control both our intellectual production and to separate and commodify youth. Youth are at the intersection of multiple forms of exclusion, but have entered a state of nonbeing where their voice effectively is nonexistent.

Chadderton and Colley, [Chadderton, C. & Colley, H. (2012), “School-to-work transition services: marginalising ‘disposable’ youth in a state of exception?”, Discourse. Studies in the cultural politics of education 33:3, pp. 329-343. SK]

**Disadvantaged young people often inhabit a dangerous space: excluded from education, training and employment markets; constructed as disposable; and cast out as ‘human waste’** (Bauman, 2004). There are many macro-level analyses of this catastrophic trend, but **this** paper **provides insights into some of the everyday educational micro-practices which contribute to such marginalisation**. It presents findings from a study of a national school-to-work transition service in England, in a context not only of neo-liberal policies but also of severe austerity measures. The data reveal processes of triage, surveillance and control – driven by governmental and institutional targets – which denied many young people access to the service, including some of the most vulnerable. **Beneath a rhetoric of social inclusion, the service in fact acted as a conduit into a dangerous space of exclusion.** Drawing on the work of Butler and of Agamben, the article argues innovatively that **such practices may represent an encroaching state of exception, in which more or less subtle forms of governmentality are gradually being supplanted by the more overt exercise of sovereign power.** Many scholars have outlined the ways in which ‘the new capitalism’ (Sennet, 2006) has transformed economic and social conditions since the oil crisis of 1973 and the global recession it provoked. Neo-liberal policies have promoted economic competitiveness rather than welfare of citizens as the primary task of governments, shifting the risk and responsibility for lifelong education, employment and well-being to individuals (Bauman, 2004). This process has accelerated in recent years, as crises of overproduction and of finance capital have limited capital accumulation, leading to a strategy of ‘accumulation by dispossession’ (Harvey, 2003). This notion refers to massive reductions in spending on health and social services, the appropriation of 2 pension funds, and the marketization or privatization of ‘the living space’ (Harvey, 2006) – those areas of work, including education, dedicated to social reproduction. Since the financial crash of 2008, this crisis has deepened rapidly, to become the most severe since the Great Depression of the 1930s (Allman, 2010). Some of the most advanced capitalist countries around the globe are now imposing harsh austerity measures; in the UK, this is threatening the very existence of the welfare state. A key consequence of this crisis has been the growth of unemployment and precarious, low-paid work, creating large communities of ‘unemployable and invalid’ people (Bauman, 2004, p. 51) condemned to the status of ‘human waste’: **The production of ‘human waste’** **[...] is an inescapable side-effect of order-building** (each order casts some parts of the extant population as ‘out of place’, ‘unfit’ or ‘undesirable’) **and of economic progress** (that cannot proceed without degrading and **devaluing the previously effective modes of ‘making a living’** and therefore cannot but deprive their practitioners of their livelihood) (original italics). In order to legitimate these changes, the moralistic rhetoric of the ‘underclass’ is invoked to pathologise the most disadvantaged, and present them as ‘the blockage to future global competition and national economic prosperity’ (Skeggs, 2004, p. 79, original emphasis; see also Levitas, 2005). Bauman draws on Agamben’s (1998) notion of **the homo sacer: a person who is expelled to a dangerous space at the margins of civil society, and to whom legal rights no longer apply**. He claims that such persons **have become … things excluded – thrown out of focus, cast in the shadow, forced into the vague or invisible background** – [they] no longer belong to ‘what is’. They have been denied existence (Bauman, 2004, p. 18). Insofar as state expenditure on public services is obliged to continue to some degree, its purpose is increasingly shifted away from care and towards control (Harvey, 2003), that is, away from a focus on meeting human needs, and towards the surveillance and control of suspect populations: Repression increases and replaces compassion. Real issues such as a tight housing market and massive unemployment in the cities – as causes of homelessness, youth loitering and drug epidemics – are overlooked in favour of policies associated with discipline, containment and control. (Giroux, 2002, cited in Bauman, 2004, p. 85) **Young people, especially those in poverty, have been particular targets of these discourses:** **This is a generation of young people** who have been **betrayed by the irresponsibility of their elders and relegated to the margins of society**, **often in ways that suggest they are an excess, a population who**, in the age of rampant greed and rabid individualism, **appear to be expendable and disposable**. (Giroux, 2009, p. xi) **As young people bear the brunt of social disadvantage and economic poverty**, Giroux (2009) argues that **the dominant construction of their position has changed: it used to be an ambiguous one, denoting both hope for a better future and a threat to society as a whole; now it is one simply of threat**. **Young people are demonised by the mass media and by politicians alike** (Colley & Hodkinson, 2001; Osler and Starkey, 2005; O’Toole, 2007), referred to in terms such as ‘[f]eral youths … living outside the boundaries of civil society’ (Sargeant, 2009). Such discourses create popular support 3 for ‘discipline, containment and control’ of these disadvantaged young people, in the form of surveillance and policing. Portrayals of youth as ‘feral’ fail to link their social problems to the lack of opportunities they face in their transitions from school to work. Recent European studies point to the shortcomings of current metaphors such as ‘navigating uncertainty’ or following ‘crazy paving’ pathways. They refer instead to ‘yo-yo’ transitions, in order to convey the precariousness of young people’s lives and represent more graphically the way that many of them recurrently attempt to enter the labour market, but often remain afflicted by poverty, and are pushed out again by structural inequalities and employer discrimination (DuBois Reymond & Lopez Blasco, 2003; Fahmy, 2007). Even before the current economic crisis first hit in 2008, an OECD report (2008) showed that youth unemployment was increasing sharply in Britain, that the labour market was strongly polarised against lowerqualified youth, and that many young people were employed only in precarious, short-term jobs. By July 2011, youth unemployment had reached almost one million (13.5 per cent of 16-24 year olds), the highest level ever recorded in the UK, while 2.6 million more were ‘economically inactive’ (1) (Kingsley, 2011; ONS, 2011). Yet in this context, employment has become vaunted by policy-makers as the prime solution to social exclusion (Levitas, 2005), and ‘employability’ has become the main policy objective for youth support initiatives (Colley, 2003a). Young people have become subject to a ‘Catch 22’ which disciplines and punishes them for not being employed, although very little employment is available for them. Moreover, ‘exclusion’ is conceived of narrowly as a condition of those who suffer it, rather than as the practices of those more powerful groups who do the excluding (Macrae, Maguire, & Milbourne, 2003). These processes illustrate a point made in the editorial to this special edition (Schostak, 2012): neoliberalism promotes freedom but without equality – ultimately a contradictory position because those who are in poverty have no freedom (Balibar, 1994). As we write, this situation is being exemplified in the wave of youth riots sweeping English cities in August 2011. The mass media have promoted condemnations of those involved as ‘scum’ or ‘feral rats’ (Williams, 2011), government leaders have ridiculed arguments that poverty is a cause of the unrest, and round-the-clock court sittings have processed hundreds of youth in a peremptory fashion, dealing out harsh custodial sentences. In such ways, young people are dehumanised and cast beyond the pale of ‘civilised’ communities. In moments which are both iconic and bitterly ironic, members of parliament and city councillors appear before news cameras to declare that the perpetrators do not belong to ‘our’ city. Such statements lack any recognition that the riots might be an inchoate response by young people to their own long-standing perceptions that they indeed did not belong to the cities where they live, in which the recent priorities of the powerful have been to promote the interests of elite groups whilst slashing support services and failing to address a dire lack of training and jobs. This situation resonates with the claims of Bauman (2004) and Agamben (2005) that groups of disadvantaged people are being created in and by supposedly liberal democracies, pushed to the margins of society, and having their very citizenship itself brought into question. Like the homo sacer, these are citizens who are non-citizens, stripped of societal membership and legal protection, and yet paradoxically their existence is intensely political. This position of exclusion and erasure, then, is how we conceptualise the ‘dangerous spaces’ that are the theme of this special issue. But how can we theorise this context at a deeper level? SK

#### Youth become ruled by fear, subject to the militarization and criminalization which follow the imposition of violence into society. This fear of being disciplined, the fear of rules or norms which will bind us down and limit our ability to think critically must be opposed. The increase in violence directly relates to a decrease in youth empowerment. Our activism within this educational space is uniquely key. The role of the judge as the intellectual with the power to determine truth or falsity within the debate space and transform the discursive space is to vote for the performance that best challenges youth fear of violence.

Giroux ’13, [Henry A. Giroux | Violence, USA: The Warfare State and the Brutalizing of Everyday Life Wednesday, 02 May 2012 10:03 By Henry A. Giroux, Truthout | Op-Ed. SK]

**Even public school reform is now justified in the dehumanizing language of national security, which increasingly legitimates the trans- formation of schools into adjuncts of the surveillance and police state**. '3 **The privatization and militarization of schools mutually inform each other as students are increasingly subjected to** disciplinary apparatuses that limit their capacity for critical thinking **while molding them** into consumers, testing them into submission, **stripping them of** any sense of social responsibility, and convincing large numbers of poor minority students that they are better off under the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system instead of being treated as valued members of the public schools. Schools are increasingly absorbing the culture of prisons and are aggressively being transformed into an extension of the criminal justice system. Many public schools are being militarized to resemble prisons instead of being safe places that would enable students to learn how to be critical and engaged citizens. Rather than being treated with dignity and respect, students are increasingly treated as if they were criminals, given that they are repeatedly "photographed, fingerprinted, scanned, x-rayed, sniffed and snooped on."" As I mentioned in chapter 2, the space of the school resembles a high-security prison with its metal detectors at the school entrances, drug-sniï¬‚ing dogs in school corri- dors, and surveillance cameras in the hallways and classrooms. Student behaviors that were once considered child play are now elevated to the status of a crime. Young people who violate dress codes, engage in food fights, hug each other, doodle, and shoot spit wads are no longer repri- manded by the classroom teacher or principal; instead their behavior is criminalized. Consequently, the police are called in to remove them is criminalized. Consequently, the police are called in to remove them from the classroom, handcuff them, and put them in the back of a police car to be carted off to a police station where they languish in a holding cell. There is a kind of doubling that takes place here between the culture of punishment, on the one hand, and the feeding of profits for the security-surveillance industries. What has emerged in the United States is a civil and political order structured around the problem of violent crime. This governing- through-crime model produces a highly authoritarian and mechanistic approach to addressing social problems that often focuses on low- income and poor minorities, promotes highly repressive policies, and places undue emphasis on personal security rather than considering the larger complex of social and structural forces that fuels violence in the first place. Far from promoting democratic values, a respect for others, and social responsibility, a governing-through-crime approach criminalizes a wide range of behaviors and in doing so often functions largely to humiliate, punish, and demonize. "lhe abuse and damage that criminalizes a wide range of behaviors and in doing so often functions largely to humiliate, punish, and demonize. The abuse and damage that is being imposed on young people as a result of the ongoing militariza- tion and criminalization of public schools defy the imagination. And ;';.':;~.n='.~m':' 74 AMERICA'S EDUCATION DEFICIT AND THE WAR ON the trivial nature of the behaviors that produce such egregious prac- tices is hard to believe. A few examples will suffice: In November 2011, a 14-year-old student in Brevard County, Florida, was suspended for hugging a female friend, an act which even the principal acknowledged as innocent. A 9-year-old in Charlotte, North Carolina, was suspended for sexual harassment after a substitute teacher overheard the child tell another student that the teacher was "cute." A 6-year-old in Georgia was arrested, handcuffed and suspended for the remainder of the school year after throwing a temper tantrum in class. A 6-year-old boy in San Francisco was accused of sexual assault following a game of tag on the playground. A 6-year-old in Indiana was arrested, handcuffed and charged with battery after kicking a school principal. Twelve- year-old Alexa Gonzalez was arrested and handcuffed for doodling on a desk. Another student was expelled for speaking on a cell phone with his mother, to whom he hadn't spoken in a month because she was in Iraq on a military deployment. Four high school students in Detroit were arrested and handcuffed for participating in a food fight and charged with a misdemeanor with the potential for a 90-day jail sentence and a $500 fine. A high school student in Indiana was expelled after sending a profanity-laced tweet through his Twitter account after school hours. The school had been con- ducting their own surveillance by tracking the tweeting habits of all students. These are not isolated incidents. In 2010, some 300,000 Texas schoolchildren received misdemeanor tickets from police officials. One 12-year-old Texas girl had the police called on her after she sprayed perfume on herself during class." **Public spaces that should promote dialogue, thoughtfulness, and critical exchange are** ruled by fear **and become the ideological corol- lary of a state that aligns its priorities to war** and munitions sales while declaring a state of emergency (under the aegis of a permanent war) as a major reference for shaping domestic policy. **In addition, the media and other cultural apparatuses now** produce, circulate, and **validate forms of** symbolic and real violence **that dissolve the democratic** bonds of social reciprocity. **This dystopian use of violence** as enter- tainment and spectacle **is reinforced through the media's incessant appeal to the** market-driven **egocentric interests of the autonomous individual, a fear of the Other, and a stripped-down version of secu- rity that narrowly focuses on personal safety** rather than collective security nets and social welfare. One consequence is that **those who are viewed as disposable and reduced to zones of abandonment are forced "to address the reality of extreme violence** . . . **in the very heart of their everyday life**."'Â° Violence in everyday life is matched by a surge of violence in popular culture. Violence now runs through media and popular culture like an electric current. As the New York Times reported recently, "The top-rated show on cable TV is rife with shoot- ings, stabbings, machete attacks and more shootings. The top drama at the box office fills theaters with the noise of automatic weapons fire. The top-selling video game in the country gives players the choice to kill or merely wound their quarry.""' SK

Implications:

**A.** Under the pretense of power, the presence of guns which induce violence denies ability for youth to actually empower themselves

**B.** Getting rid of tools of violence would empower youth and open up avenues for political participation.

**C.** The presence of guns increase exclusion of youth by decreasing a sense of social responsibility and redirecting it to self-preservation and constantly buying handguns.

**D.** The overarching hegemonic powers can justify the militarization of the police in return for the increase in guns among the public which they can only do if they legitimize the existence of guns – a ban would delegitimize this action.

**E.** The presence of guns increase individualization and remove reciprocity which increasingly divides the populous – when the people are divided they cannot rally against whatever power oppresses them.

### Solvency

I advocate that the United States ought to ban private ownership of handguns in order to combat youth violence. I will modify my advocacy to be the resolution text if necessary – just ask in CX.

#### Bans to prohibit the possession of a particular type of firearm can be passed and can reduce minors’ access.

Northrop and Hamrick ‘90, [AUTHOR Northrop, Daphne; Hamrick, Kim TITLE Weapons and Minority Youth Violence. INSTITUTION Education Development Center, Inc., Newton, Mass. SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Centers for Disease Control (DHHS/PHS), Atlanta, GA. SK]

**Laws regulating storage are primarily designed to reduce access by minors to firearms**. In Florida, for example, the state legislature recently passed laws requiring gun owners to keep guns stored or locked in a manner that deters accessibility to minors. Individuals found in violation of the law are subject to criminal penalties. There are, however, weaknesses inherent in this law. While this law may encourage some firearm owners to make their guns less accessible, the implication of this bill is that the responsibility rests with the gun owner who can, at will, prevent firearm tragedy. In addition, **laws like this one may have a minimal effect on intentional shootings**. Rather, **they are designed to prevent unintentional shootings by very young children**. **A more stringent approach to firearms regulation is a ban**. **Bans prohibit the possession of a particular type of firearm, for example**, machine guns, other automatic and semi-automatic weapons, sawed-off shotguns, Saturday Night Specials, or **all handguns**. Such laws also define the circumstances under which an individual may be exempted from the ban. How large or small these exempted categories are can vary. **In recent years, three Illinois communities** Morton Grove, Evanston, and Oak Parkhave **passed ordinances that ban the private possession of handguns**. **There are**, however, some **logistical problems with** this approach; namely, **how to go about removing guns already in circulation**. SK

#### And – I will specify a mechanism and agency – to ban handguns we regulate design, manufacture, and distribution of them through the Department of the Treasury.

VPC 2k, [Violence Policy Center, “Why America needs to Ban Handguns”, 2000. SK]

The Politics Of Gun Control Obsessed with its search for "common sense" gun control and ever fearful of being perceived as radical, **most of the American gun control movement has given up on trying** to ban handguns. This has helped create the notion that support for a ban is absent or marginal. However, polling data taken over the past 20 years have consistently shown that more than 30 percent of the public favor a handgun ban with this support ranging at times between 40 percent and 45 percent (even hitting 50 percent in one 1999 poll).41 Nonetheless, many in the gun control movement insist on ignoring the existence of this significant bloc of American voters. An objection continually raised to gun control is that the Second Amendment to the Constitution somehow forbids it. This is pure myth. No gun control law has ever been overturned by the U.S. Supreme Court on Second Amendment grounds.42 Federal bans on machine guns as well as city ordinances banning handgun possession have remained on the books for decades—despite vigorous court challenges. For all its posturing, the National Rifle Association has been reluctant to bring its Second Amendment arguments into court. (The last time it did so was in an attempt to overturn the 1981 Morton Grove, Illinois, handgun ban; the organization was roundly rejected on both the federal and state levels.)43 **If Congress or individual states want to ban handguns, they can do so** constitutionally—all they need is the will. Gun Control Laws Why has more than 30 years of federal gun control legislation failed to slow the carnage? This is in large measure due to the ad hoc nature in which gun control legislation has been enacted often in response to specific acts of violence. Effective legislation must take into account the following— Most victims know their killers and are often related to them. Criminals often get their guns through gun stores and are skilled in evading point-of-purchase legal roadblocks. The secondary gun market—i.e.,the selling of guns at gun shows or over the Internet—is in reality totally unregulated. It is the self-defense handgun purchased by "law-abiding" citizens that ends up being used in most handgun violence. Politicians and gun control advocates alike, however, have a tendency to proffer the same legislative remedies over and over ("licensing and registration" or "background checks") without consideration of these fundamentals or inquiry into the actual effects such laws might have on reducing firearms violence overall. A contrasting legislative approach to curtailing gun violence begins with the recognition that the firearms industry remains the last unregulated manufacturer of a consumer product. Guns are the only consumer product in America specifically exempted from federal health and safety requirements. The firearms industry maintains this regulatory immunity despite the fact that their products kill more Americans every year than all household and recreational products combined. **To end this era of national denial, Congress should vest the Department of the Treasury with strong authority to regulate the design,** manufacture, and distribution of firearms. **Such authority should include the ability to remove from the market firearms** that pose a serious threat to public health and safety. In every other part of the consumer economy we have long recognized that **the damage wrought** by some products **can be controlled only by an unequivocal ban**. Products such as three-wheel ATVs and lawn darts had related death rates microscopic in comparison to handguns, but were nevertheless banned. **Also**, under **federal regulation**, products ranging from cribs to automobiles have undergone major structural alterations to minimize inherent dangers. Firearms and **[of]** **particularly handguns** are long overdue to receive the same regulatory scrutiny. If a handgun ban were enacted, what should be done about the existing supply of some 65 million civilian-owned handguns? Could the nation afford to eliminate them through a program? Since many handguns began as cheap "junk guns," a generous estimate of the average buy-back price would be $250. The total tab would be about $16.25 billion, which is slightly more than three SSN-21 nuclear attack submarines.44 Considering that by conservative estimates America spends $4 billion annually on medical care for gun violence victims, the cost of a buy-back could be recouped in a few years. A clear-cut plan to ban handguns should be developed and implemented soon. Considering the many thousands who are killed or maimed by the handgun each year, how much more motivation do we need? SK

### Advantage

#### We are in an era of youth violence – thousands of youth kill each other each day, and the primary weapon of choice is a handgun.

Northrop and Hamrick ‘90, [AUTHOR Northrop, Daphne; Hamrick, Kim TITLE Weapons and Minority Youth Violence. INSTITUTION Education Development Center, Inc., Newton, Mass. SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Centers for Disease Control (DHHS/PHS), Atlanta, GA. SK]

**In violent altercations, increasing numbers of our nation's youth are dying or being disabled by weapons**, especially firearms. Homicide rates for persons aged 15 to 24 have been 40 to 50 percent higher than the population average, with a still wider gap (to over 60 percent) emerging in 1986 and 1987.1 In Washington, D.C., **penetration injuries, especially from handguns, among children seen at Children's Hospital have increased 1,500 percent since 1986.**2 **And among the young, minorities suffer disproportionately**. In fact, homicide by firearm is the number-one cause of death for young African American men. **Handguns, in particular, account for most of these injuries and deaths: about one in 32 urban African American males from 16 through 24 years old is a handgun crime victim**.3 Because firearm injuries typically affect young males and are more severe than other types of injuries, they exact a great financial toll. They represent a productivity loss of $370,706 per personthe most costly cause per injury deathand cost society an estimated $14.4 billion (1985 dollars).4 These costs burden not only the injured but also families, employers, the community, and society. The psychological burden of firearm injuries is substantial, but difficult to calculate. Consider the mother who is afraid to let her children walk home from school alone or go out after dark because of the proliferation of guns and drug use in her neighborhood. However, it is important to note that violence with weapons does not occur in a vacuum. Most of the homicides among youth occur in the context of an argument and are committed by someone known to the victim.5 Moreover, victims are re-victimized and in the case of firearm homicide, especially among those involved in intimate relationships, there has often been a long history of abuse and violence.6 In these cases, weapons become the tools by which aggression and violence turn fatal. If that weapon happens to be a gun, then the chances of the anger becoming fatal increase. Additional factors such as exposure to violence on television and in the motion pictures and playing with toy weapons as children shape our culture and attitudes about violence and weapons. Economic disparity and poverty may also be legitimate predictors of violence. Although the relationships among race, socioeconomic status, and violence are complex and often confused, one conclusion is clear: When socioeconomic status is considered, the disparity between African Americans and the general population as both victims and perpetrators becomes quite small.' Thus, socioeconomic status is a more accurate predictor of violence than race. And finally, while we may not understand how drug use makes individuals physiologically more prone to violent behavior, we do know that drugs are associated with many homicides and nonfatal assaults. In some large cities, most homicides are related to drug use and drug dealing, and firearms play an important role in the drug trade.\* Although firearms and other weapons are only part of the violence problem, they are the part that makes so much aggression lethal. However, as Phil Cook states, "the widespread involvement of firearms in personal violence is not just an incidental detail, but, rather, has an important influence on the patterns and lethality of this violence."9 Each gun injury is five times more likely to result in death than an injury from the next most deadly weapon, a knife.13 **Although the question of restricting firearm ownership and usage is a contentious political issue, few would argue that youth, particularly adolescents, should have unsupervised access to firearms or other lethal weapons at school or on city streets**. Yet such weapons are routinely confiscated by police or school officials across the nation. In California, from July 1, 1988 until June 30, 1989, schools confiscated 10,569 weapons, an increase of 21 percent over the past year." In Baltimore, a court study found that of 390 high school students polled, 64 percent knew someone who had carried a handgun to school in the preceding months; 60 percent knew someone who had been shot, threatened or robbed at gunpoint in school and almost all of the males said they carried a handgun to school at least once.12 Although knives are the most common weapon found in schools, **more** sophisticated **firearms are available to students**, increasing the chances for serious injury or death.13 Schools and communities across the United States have only begun to address the problem with a handful of programs and interventions that target weapons and youth violence. These essentially aim to educate people about the dangers inherent in possessing weapons, especially firearms; restrict firearm availability and accessibility; and reduce the potential lethality of weapons. SK

#### The widespread existence of guns specifically cause this harm.

Dowd ’12, [American Academy of Pediatrics, POLICY STATEMENT Firearm-Related Injuries Affecting the Pediatric Population. SK]

**The absence of guns from children’s homes and communities is the most reliable and effective measure to prevent firearm-related injuries in children and adolescents.** **Adolescent suicide risk is strongly associated with firearm availability**. Safe gun storage (guns unloaded and locked, ammunition locked separately) reduces children’s risk of injury. Physician counseling of parents about firearm safety appears to be effective, but firearm safety education programs directed at children are ineffective. The American Academy of Pediatrics continues to support a number of specific **measures to reduce the destructive effects of guns in the lives of children and adolescents, including the regulation of the manufacture, sale, purchase, ownership, and use of firearms**; a ban on semiautomatic assault weapons; **and the strongest possible regulations of handguns** for civilian use. SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM Although rates have declined since the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) issued the original policy statement in 1992, firearm-related deaths continue as 1 of the top 3 causes of death in American youth.1 As shown in Fig 1, the firearm-associated death rate among youth ages 15 to 19 has fallen from its peak of 27.8 deaths per 100 000 in 1994 to 11.4 per 100 000 in 2009, driven by a decline in firearm homicide rates.1 No single study has adequately explained the decline in firearmrelated homicide rates. Postulated reasons include improved socioeconomic conditions, violence prevention programs, decline in the crack/cocaine market, changes in legislation, declines in firearms availability for other reasons, and community policing. Nevertheless, **firearm-associated death and disability rates remain unacceptably high**. Of all injury deaths of individuals 15 through 19 years of age in the United States in 2009, more than 1 (28.7%) in 4 were firearm related, and of those younger than 20 years, nearly 1 (19.5%) in 5 were firearm related.1 These firearm deaths result from homicide, suicide, and unintentional injury (Fig 2). Black Americans are particularly affected; injuries from firearms were the leading cause of death among black males 15 through 34 years of age in 2009.2 Although national data cannot fully document urban and rural differences in the patterns of injuries from firearms that involve children, local data indicate that **children in rural areas as well as in urban areas are at risk for firearm-related mortality**.3–5. SK

#### Youth death outweighs in terms of time-frame: they have a greater chance for challenging the institution in later years – also empirically proven that they will be more likely to engage in reform at younger ages.

#### This is a problem – the very presence of guns at home from a young age alters the psychology of children and creates cyclical harms where children are indoctrinated within a system of fear rather than hope.

Walesh, [Walesh, Kim. "Handguns in the Home: An Unnecessary Risk (1983)." (1983). SK]

**Handguns in the home have psychological as well as life-threatening effects on children.** Too often, people buy guns to protect their defenseless children without considering the many dangers. Many social scientists suggest that **guns make children feel powerless**. **Instead of viewing the gun's presence as providing security, the gun is seen as frightening.** As Rosalyn Weinman Schram, sociologist and consultant on matters of work and family, states, "**They're getting the message that their parents really can't take care of them, that they're intimidated by crime and not very much in control**.'' Dr. Martin Cohen, a New York City clinical psychologist, feels that **guns actually increase children's anxiety levels**. 18 Children, perhaps more than adults, associate guns directly • 41 with violent behavior--a probable result of a rising number of assassination attempts as well as excessive television violence. 19 Also, children may view the local police force, which has traditionally provided a sense of comfort and security, as farcical at a time when more and more "protective" guns are brought into the home. **Guns may also make our children more violent,** as seen in the Berkowitz study. We stare in shock at photos of four-year-old children lifting machine guns in war-torn foreign countries. But we fail to understand that children learn mainly by imitating their parents. Guns, even if never used, are readily accepted by children because they are accepted, if not worshiped, by their parents. **Guns in the home will increase aggressive behavior and promote an acceptance of violence and guns in future generations**.SK

#### The impacts of this handgun culture upon children after they enter schools are real and appalling. Handguns severely reduce the education sector, with increases of dropout rates and inhibits educational processes.

Chamberlain, [Chamberlin, Carl W. "Johnny Can't Read'Cause Jane's Got a Gun: The Effects of Guns in Schools, and Options After Lopez." Cornell JL & Pub. Pol'y 8 (1998): 281. SK]

But it does not require a tragedy the magnitude of a double homicide to disrupt America's education system. Chronic violent crime and **the prevalence of guns are disruptive** as well. Studies conducted in the 1970s showed that **students were fear[s]ful of certain school-related locations**.68 **As the number of guns and the frequency of gun-related violence have proliferated, these fears have increased**. In a 1992 survey, fifteen percent of inner-city high school students said they were afraid at school almost all of the time.69 Sixteen percent of eighth graders, fourteen percent of tenth graders and twelve percent of twelfth graders told University of Michigan researchers that they fear for their safety. 70 A full thirty-seven percent of tenth and twelfth graders had reported that they did not feel safe at school, and forty-three percent avoided school restrooms. 71 67 See Edna Negron, 400 Students Want Out of Jefferson HS, NEWSDAY, Feb. 28, 1992, at 2. (Despite the Newsday article's title, "four or five"--not 400-parents had requested transfers for their children. By the following day that number had risen to ten. The article was corrected in a later edition of Newsday.). 68 One-third of junior high school pupils in large cities and nearly one-fifth of their counterparts in rural areas reported being afraid of three or more places on school grounds, i.e. bathrooms. See SAFE SCHooL REPORT, supra note 12 at 62 fig.l-6 & 64. As researchers have concluded, "about 1.7 million junior and 2.0 million senior high youth [are] afflicted by moderate or high levels of fear." Ivor Wayne & Robert J. Rubel, Student Fear in Secondary Schools, 14 URn. REv. 197, 203 (1982). About 11% of them are afraid on the way to school at least once a week. Id. at 219. In a study of 1,250 Philadelphia families having 12-year old boys, two researchers determined that "about one-quarter found the school building itself dangerous (halls and rooms), and about half were fearful of streets leading to and from school, and the school yard." Id. at 198-99. 69 See J.F. Sheley et al., Gun Related Violence In and Around Inner-City Schools, 146 AM. J. DisAsss C1nNDR 677, 678-79 (1992). 70 Toch et al., supra note 17, at 32. 71 See Recess from Violence, supra note 41, at 39 (statement of Ronald D. Stephens, Exec. Dir., NSSC). EFFECTS OF GUNs Fearing the violence, many students avoid school altogether. 72 **This same fear inhibits the learning of those who manage to stay in school**.73 A 1972 study reported that: The perception of the school environment as being dangerous could very well influence the students' ability to do well in school. A student who feels that he is in danger of being beaten up or robbed in the schoolroom is not likely to devote full attention to his or her teacher. Also, the perception of the schoolyard and halls as dangerous may account somewhat for the high truancy rates that are recorded by the inner-city schools.74 Indeed, a 1976 study of the criminal victimization of public school students in Dade County, Florida, revealed that "about one-fifth of the responding secondary school students [felt] that their ability to learn in class was affected by their fear of other students."75 Students who were highly apprehensive of their school for safety reasons were considerably more likely to have below-average grades (D's and F'S).7 6 Very apprehensive students rated themselves much lower than their classmates in 72 "[S]tudents are frequently led by apprehensiveness to avoid some school locations and that, in extreme cases, fear of the school setting makes students avoid school altogether." Wayne & Rubel, supra note 68, at 230. According to the Justice Dep't, each day in the 1970's 160,000 kids failed to attend school because they were afraid to go. Id. (citing M. LAL AND L. SAvrrz, U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, DELINQUENCY AND CrrY LIFE (1972)). More recently, nearly eight percent of urban junior and senior high school students missed at least one day of school a month because they were afraid to go. NSSC, SAFE SCHOOLS Ov.RviEw, NSSC RESOURCE PAPER, 3 (Feb. 1986). See SAFE SCHOOL REPORT, supra note 12, at 63 fig.1-17, 64. See also Witkin, supra note 2, at 32 (citing study of Illinois high school students which found that one in 12 students confessed to staying away from school out of fear). In 1996, five percent of high school students nationwide, and as many as 17 percent in Chicago schools, stayed home due to fear. Melissa Sickmund, Howard N. Snyder, and Eileen Poe-Yamagata, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence 14-15 (1997). See Hearings on H.R. 3757, supra note 18, at 44 (statement of Joel Packer, Legislative Specialist, National Education Ass'n and National PTA) ("**The threat of violence is a significant factor in the dropout rate, the stress related to fear of violence threatens the educational goals related to student achievement**, and fear of violence impedes the ability of schools to attract and retain qualified school personnel.").

#### And, it is not the *youth* that are the problem, it is the *gun* – pinning the problem on external causes, such as poverty and racism, that the youth face, merely separate them from society, increasing their disposability.

Elliot, [Elliott, Delbert S. Youth violence: An overview. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, Institute for Behavioral Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1994. SK]

Is the current violence “epidemic” a distortion resulting from excesses in media coverage or does it reflect a real change in the behavior of youth? The evidence suggests the following conclusions about trends in youth violence over the past decade: 1) **There is a substantial increase in the violence victimization rates for adolescents**, particularly for 12-15 year olds; 2) There has been a relatively small increase (8-10 percent) in the proportion of adolescents involved in some type of serious violent offending; and 3) There has been a dramatic increase in adolescent homicide rates, beginning in 1988. **In essence, today’s youth are more frequently the victims of violence; but about the** same proportion **of youth are committing serious violent offenses** today as in 1980 and their frequency of offending is approximately the same. **One important dimension of youth violence has clearly changed. Today’s violent acts are** more lethal**, a larger proportion of these acts result in serious injury or death**. The fact that the adolescent homicide rate has more than doubled since 1988 (while the overall rate has remained relatively constant) is grim evidence of this increased lethality. And **this dramatic increase in the lethality of adolescent violence is explained** almost entirely **by the increased** use of handguns **in these violent exchanges**. These findings do not suggest a massive failure in our social institutions or a dramatic decline in the commitment of most young persons to responsible, lawful behavior. While levels of youth participation in violent behavior are unacceptably high (see below) and constitute a serious crime and public health problem that must be addressed, what is different about youth violence in the 90s is its lethality. **This should** focus our concern **on the dramatic increase in the use of handguns in juvenile assaults** at a time when handgun crimes in general are declining, and on what has happened in the lives of these violent young people that they have so little respect for human life. SK

#### Youth who possess guns increasingly are stealing guns from those who privately own them or purchase it from those who own guns – stolen guns drive the illicit market, so a ban would logically crush the market.

Kennedy et. al, [DAVID M. KENNEDY (Senior Researcher, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.), ANNE M. PIEHL (Assistant Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.), ANTHONY A. BRAGA (Research Associate, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government. Harvard University.) “YOUTH VIOLENCE IN BOSTON: GUN MARKETS, SERIOUS YOUTH OFFENDERS, AND A USE-REDUCTION STRATEGY”, Copyright © 1996 by Law and Contemporary Problems, The research described herein was supported under award #94-IJ-CX-0056 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. SK]

Another finding concerned the importance of stolen guns. 5 Since **many stolen firearms are taken from private residences**, **and** since **there are estimated to be some 200 million guns in private hands**, 16 the pool of available weapons-even if other supplies could be interrupted-is enormous. This stockpile of firearms dwarfs even the considerable annual flow of guns sold new at retail. One study of the firearms used in Boston felonies showed that forty percent of them had been stolen; 7 **a survey of convicted felons showed from forty to seventy percent of felons obtaining their most recent handgun through theft**. 8 Not surprisingly, many felons had little difficulty obtaining firearms. In one survey of incarcerated felons, three-quarters said they would have no trouble arming themselves upon release, "in a matter of a few hours or, at most, a few days," through theft, from friends, or through simple purchase. 9 Felons identified as "handgun predators"-with more experience of and with greater commitment to gun crimes-were even more certain they could arm themselves, half within a few hours and almost all within a few days.2 ' **More recent survey research on juveniles paints a strikingly similar picture. A** recent **study** of juvenile gun ownership **by** Joseph **Sheley** **and** James **Wright**, 12. See, e.g., Keeping Handguns, supra note 3, at 96-101; The Bird in Hand, supra note 3, at 190-92; Philip J. Cook & Mark H. Moore, Gun Control, in CRIME 288 (James Q. Wilson & Joan Petersilia eds., 1995). 13. See Keeping Handguns, supra note 3, at 105. 14. Recent research suggests that much trafficking may be relatively concentrated, at least at the early end of its diversion from the licit market. Half of all Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms firearms traces are associated with less than half a percent of all federal firearms licensees ("FFLs"). See GLENN L. PIERCE ET AL., OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT, U.S. BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND FIREARMS, THE IDENTIFICATION OF PATrERNS IN FIREARMS TRAFFICKING: IMPLICATIONS FOR FOCUSED ENFORCEMENT TRAFFICKING 14-15 (Dec. 1995). 15. More than 300,000 guns were reported stolen in 1994; most were handguns. See MARIANNE W. ZAwiTZ, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS, GUNS USED IN CRIMES 6 (1995). It is generally assumed that many, perhaps most, stolen guns are not reported. 16. See Cook & Moore, supra note 12, at 268. 17. See Keeping Handguns, supra note 3, at 107. 18. See WRIGHT & ROSSI, supra note 10, at 193-97. 19. Id. at 214, 212-13 tbl. 11. 20. Id. at 18, 214. Page 147: Winter 1996] LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS [Vol. 59: No. 1 conducted in four urban areas with high rates of youth gun violence, showed that eighty-six percent of incarcerated juveniles surveyed and thirty percent of male high school students surveyed had owned guns. Seventy percent of inmates and **forty-one percent of students said that obtaining guns was "no trouble at all**" and street prices for firearms were well below normal retail prices.21 **Juveniles' guns came from a variety of sources: theft from individuals, houses, and stores; borrowing from friends and family; and purchase from friends, family, drug dealers, and gun stores**. 22 The survey could reveal little about the original source of guns bought on the street, whether, for instance, they were purchased or stolen. The **researchers concluded that**, given the reported frequency of both theft and transfer among friends and family, **it was likely that "theft and burglary were the ultimate source of many of the guns acquired by the juveniles** surveyed, but only occasionally the proximate source. SK

#### This is also why a national ban is key – the very presence of handguns, even when owned by others, increases the risk of theft and usage by youth.

#### And, minority youth in high-crime urban areas are disproportionately affected – owning guns and the culture and legitimization of their presence leads to youth involvement in drug gangs – means banning handguns is one of our best options for destroying gang power and eventually dissolve them in urban areas.

Kennedy et. al, [DAVID M. KENNEDY (Senior Researcher, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.), ANNE M. PIEHL (Assistant Professor, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.), ANTHONY A. BRAGA (Research Associate, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government. Harvard University.) “YOUTH VIOLENCE IN BOSTON: GUN MARKETS, SERIOUS YOUTH OFFENDERS, AND A USE-REDUCTION STRATEGY”, Copyright © 1996 by Law and Contemporary Problems, The research described herein was supported under award #94-IJ-CX-0056 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. SK]

Running through recent research on youth violence is the powerful role of fear in driving youth gun acquisition. 24 For some years, it has been a commonplace that the decade-old surge in youth gun violence stemmed from inner-city crack cocaine trafficking. 5 There is reason to believe, however, that **gun acquisition is today not so closely linked to drug trafficking.** In particular, it appears that **the urban environment has become so threatening** even for youth not involved in the drug trade **that many are arming themselves** (and engaging in other nominally self-protective behavior such as joining gangs) 6 for selfdefense. We may thus be entering into a second phase of the impact of drugs and drug trafficking on troubled communities.27 In the first phase, trafficking and competition among traffickers caused high levels of violence, just as occurred during Prohibition. This violence emerged from business interests and was instrumental in protecting these interests.' It also, however, profoundly escalated the level of fear and weaponry in affected communities.29 Drug traffickers, many of them young and not particularly measured, armed themselves. The streets were the marketplace, so robberies were attempted, and business disputes were often settled, in public. Many traffickers were part-timers, in and out of the business, but once they had guns, they often kept and carried them. The trade was ruled by the same selfregulation that governs all illicit enterprises-those who offend get hurt 3 0 -but since traffickers were numerous and widely distributed throughout the community, the gangland ethos of violence often came to govern even more ordinary interactions. This new regime of guns and violence has created a very high level of fear among young men in affected communities." **More than forty percent of the high school students** surveyed by Sheley and Wright **reported having been shot at or threatened with a gun**; nearly half knew schoolmates who had actually been fired on.32 Not surprisingly, **these youths sometimes arm themselves as a means of selfdefense**. Sheley, Wright, and M. Dwayne Smith report that for the high-school students they surveyed, a population not heavily involved in drug trafficking, "the desire for protection and the need to arm oneself against enemies were the primary reasons to obtain a gun, easily outpacing all other motivations."33 Nearly a quarter had done so, and more than a third carried a gun at least occasionally. 34 In such an environment, the "senseless" shootings that have become an urban commonplace should come as no surprise. **These kids are armed, edgy, and believe that they cannot be insulted or walk away from a fight without irretrievably losing face and thereby risking additional victimization**.35 **They are surrounded by violence, leading them to feel that they have few alternatives.** They cannot get out of Dodge, nor is anybody making them check their guns at the edge of town. It is more surprising, perhaps, that there is not even more gun violence. If this picture is correct, that is, if **the youth gun problem has become "decoupled" from the drug and gang activity that sparked it some ten years ago**, it is an important insight. It implies that **measures aimed only at drug trafficking, gang activity, and serious offenders will not be sufficient responses to the problem**. It also seems very likely, however, that drug trafficking, serious offenders, and gangs remain a core part of the problem. In Sheley and Wright's 1993 survey, gun possession was associated with drug activity, and the "seriously troublesome" inmates they surveyed were more likely than the students they surveyed to have owned guns, to have carried guns, to have had ready access to guns, to have owned assault-style weapons, to have owned sawed-off shotguns, to have owned semiautomatic pistols, to have owned large numbers of guns, and to have been involved (as both offenders and victims) in violence. Inmates who had trafficked in guns were more involved in gun ownership, gun use, and the commission of other crimes. Those who had gone out of state to buy guns for resale were even more involved.36 Conflicts between street gangs have long been noted to fuel much of the youth violence in major cities.37 **Sheley and Wright found gang membership associated with** gun ownership**, gun theft, gun sale, gun sharing, and other crimes, and with** norms promoting gun ownership and use.38 In surveys of arrestees in several cities, Scott **Decker** **and** Susan **Pennell** **found gun ownership to have a** higher correlation with gang membership than with drug dealing.3 9. SK

Implications: **First**, this functions as an external impact – banning handguns reduces violence within cities caused by drug gangs, the exclusion of youth from society due to being part of drug gangs, and the criminalization of these youth due to their participation in these illicit activities. **Second**, it removes the individualization and militarization that prevents political revolt. **Third**, youth who own handguns only do so because *other children have them*; thus, notions of self-defense are false as youth only need guns to defend from other guns. **Fourth**, the presence of drug gangs doesn’t lead to youth gun possessions, it’s the other way around nowadays – many youth join gangs for protection against other youth with guns and because they believe the gun gives them power.

#### And, this fear created which harms youth is created from the presumption that guns can and should exist which creates the ‘ecology of danger – a ban solves regardless of whether it gets rid of guns as it gets rid of the presumption that these guns *should* exist.

Fagan and Wilkinson, [Guns, Youth Violence, and Social Identity in Inner Cities Author(s): Jeffrey Fagan and Deanna L. Wilkinson Source: Crime and Justice , Vol. 24, Youth Violence (1998), pp. 105-188 Published by: The University of Chicago Press Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1147584 Accessed: 24-04-2016 04:52 UTC. SK]

First, **we examine normative social processes that influence cultural norms**, the effects of omnipresent guns on these norms, and expectan- cies about one's own and others' behaviors. As illustrated by Anderson (1994, 1997), **street codes have evolved in socially and economically isolated areas**. **These codes establish h what is important in social rela- tions among teenagers,** and the methods for redressing grievances and disputes arising from violations of the code. The street code deter- mines not only what is important but also appropriate means for re- solving grievances and disputes. **It also places values on "toughness" and violent identities. In an ecology of "danger,"** **where actors** presume that guns are present**, conflicts and disputes arising from street codes may be potentially deadly.** **These beliefs have shaped the meth- ods for resolving conflicts and have been conflated with the means for self-preservation and maintaining identity**. SK

## Frontlines – Contention

### AT: Substition (0:10)

#### Substitution doesn’t work for youth – handguns have to be more concealable

Arrendono ’99,

**Nationally, the increase in youth homicides has been fueled by the use of handguns**. **The rate at which other types of guns (shotguns, rifles, etc.) and other types of weapons have been used to commit homicides has remained relatively stable** since 1980. However, the trends are slightly different in Colorado. They differ from national trends in that the increase in youth handgun homicides was sharper and began at a later date (1988, compared to 1984, nationally). Most of the increases in youth homicide rates are handgun-related, but unlike the nation, Colorado experienced a small increase in youth homicides involving other guns between 1983 and the early 90s, when they leveled off. Colorado has also experienced an increase in homicide with other weapons in the 1990s that was not present throughout the country. SK

#### A ban on private possession of handguns would still be net better. Handguns are the primary cause within communities of violence as these are the communities that cannot necessarily afford other guns. No matter, what, the 1AC is the first step to change.

Harper ’86,

**A** strict permit system a ban on private possession of handguns **would significantly alter the firearms habits of law-abiding citizens**, **who would then turn to safer, long guns for self-protection**. Hence, the twenty-five hundred handgun deaths and 100,000 accidental handgun woundings that take place every year cannot be excluded from measurement. 79 **Cheap handguns, commonly categorized as a "Saturday night special"'8 " should be banned altogether.** **This would deny many people access to a common source of an instrument of violence**,' 8' **the most common weapon obtained and found in the streets of our community**. **Cutting off this major supply of handguns should bring about a reduction in the number of gun homicides in our nation**. **Enforcing and modifying our current gun laws will not completely alleviate the societal detriment** caused by their presence, **but it is undoubtedly a viable method destined for use in efforts to rectify the problems permeating our social structure**. We must stop the killing, and the **banning of cheap guns and the enforcement of current gun laws seems to be an appropriate beginning**. SK

### AT: Illegal Market (0:15)

#### Extend Kennedy – stolen guns drive the illegal market – banning private possession of handguns would decrease illegal market by decreasing amount of guns that can be stolen.

#### Youth don’t have as much access to illegal street vendors as stealing from adults that they know – study proves –

Arrendono ’99,

There was strong concurrence between youth and adult focus groups that **adolescents** under the age of 18 **get handguns from the following sources**, in rough order of priority: • **Parents/close relatives**: Respondents reported that **theft, or unauthorized “borrowing,” of handguns from adults in the same household was the** single most frequent source of supply**.** Some adults noted that it is almost impossible to prevent a determined adolescent from gaining access to a household handgun, no matter how securely the weapon is stored. Youth generally echoed this observation. A few reported that parents and/or close relatives would actually allow them access to a handgun. 24 • Other Youth: Adults and youth reported that there is a sufficient illicit supply of handguns among underage youth to satisfy unlawful demand. Kids can get guns from other kids. Youth in particular reported that they could borrow, “rent,” or buy a handgun from friends. • Older Adults: Youth also reported that, like the underage purchase of alcohol, they could get someone they know who is over 18 to buy a handgun for them. Many youth, particularly in urban areas, reported that unlawful retail sales by “street vendors” is common. Often these transactions were described as taking place “out of the trunk of a car.” • Theft and Burglary: Adults and youth focus groups noted that some adolescents would commit thefts/burglaries with the specific intention of stealing handguns. Typically, these respondents noted that adolescents know those households in the community that have handguns (such as gun collectors) and that these households become targets for burglary and theft. Adult groups noted that with household handgun possession rates running between 50% and 65% in Colorado, there is about a 50/50 chance that a burglary committed by an underage youth will net a handgun. Again, however, the most common victims of handgun thefts were reported to be the parents of adolescents. • Illicit Vendors: In urban areas, a few youth, and even fewer adults, reported that illicit “street vendors” would sell handguns to underage youth.

### AT: Inherency

Adams ’16,

Meanwhile, **a vicious war zone thrives, ripping away the childhoods of scores of Chicago's kids**. It doesn't matter what political party you cling to. It doesn't matter how affluent your family is. It doesn't matter if you live on the South Side or in the suburbs. The **gun violence** is not a fleeting headline across a TV screen; **it's a deepening wound with 2,986 shootings in Chicagoland in 2015 that's not only killing children, it's killing all children's innocence**. And as January ended with the dubious distinction of the deadliest month in Chicago since 2000, it's clear that Chicago's biggest problem isn't going away. The frontlines When Catherine Humikowski took the job as medical director of the pediatric intensive care unit at Comer Children's Hospital on the South Side, she felt up to the challenge. That is, she says, until her first week on the job. In her first week in Chicago, she treated as many children with gunshot wounds as she had in two years at her former job at Boston Children's Hospital. "I left Boston thinking I had seen it all," she says. "But by the end of the first week, I realized I was completely unprepared for this level of physical and social trauma associated with poverty and violence. It was a stark difference, a total reality check." That shock wore off quickly, and Humikowski says her horror gradually turned into numbness. "It becomes part of your routine, and to think that a child who's been shot would be a part of anyone's routine had me sit up and realize this story needs to be told." Humikowski says from where she sits in the ICU, the volume and significance of gun violence is still beyond imagination. She says it seems like the **kids only get younger and the weapons only get more powerful**. "It's reached a level of insanity. **These kids would have grown up to be productive members of society. This is everybody's problem, and everybody has to collectively demand a solution so that kids everywhere are safe daily**." But after so many news stories with the same devastating lede, after being cited in countless studies as one of the country's most brutal cities in regards to gun violence despite holding some of the strictest gun laws in the U.S., it's challenging to remain optimistic in Chicago. "A child who survives a gunshot wound doesn't feel the same way for doctors," she says. "We might be able to heal that kid's injuries, and they might recover. But that sense we normally have of achieving something for a child is not there because where do we return them? If they do get better and can go back home, they're going back into the communities where they got shot and where violence is normative. They're just going back into a cycle of violence that puts them at risk." It is especially difficult to remain positive when the root causes of Chicago's issues are so complex. There's no reasonable explanation, for instance, why Joy McCormack's son, a stellar student from Lincoln Park, was shot by gang members on Halloween night. No simple reason why Pam Bosley's son with a passion for gospel music was killed outside their church on the South Side. These two moms aren't surrendering to the violence; they want to be part of a solution. McCormack discovered her way to help by starting Chicago Survivors, a nonprofit that provides services to assist families affected by gun violence. Bosley began working at the safe haven youth program at The ARK of Saint Sabina to be a resource for children in the "urban storm." "There's a real consequence to not caring about this," McCormack says. "I would just really like for people to be willing to care before they have to." And despite the heartbreak associated with her job, Humikowski has never lost faith in the idea that Chicagoans can fix this problem and heal these children. "Within a child is infinite capacity for growth and good," Humikowski says. "I think that's what keeps me–perhaps naively–committed to believing we can make this problem better. And that's what keeps me, and all of us, going." Everyone’s problem "We should care, we all should care, because it's robbing our community of an entire future generation," says Bradley Stolbach, who treats about 150 to 200 children a year who have been affected by gun violence in Chicago. As a clinical psychologist, trauma counsel leader and director of Healing Hurt People Chicago with the University of Chicago, his job is to provide ongoing intensive case management, hospital-based support and trauma psycho-education to every patient under age 19 who has been injured by gun violence. "For people who live in communities where the violence is happening–even if it's not happening all the time–it's a constant stress because they always have it either in the back of the mind or the front of their mind that something life-threatening could happen," he says. "Their sense of safety is compromised all the time. It limits their mobility and activity. It limits their quality of life." According to Stolbach, gun violence in Chicago isn't even at its highest point in history, but the average age for the perpetrators and victims anecdotally does seem to get younger and younger every year. "I think that the story that's generally told is that there's a small percentage of people who are bad people who are criminals, and they are responsible for all the bad stuff that's happening. And that's just absolutely untrue," he says. In contrast, **one of the main issues**, according to Stolbach, **is an exploitation of children from a young age** because of economic and social status. He says many recent studies have shown that children who grow up in gang-infested environments exhibit many similar psychological issues as that of child soldiers. "We need to change how we think about our children," he says. "If many of these children were in Colombia–where they're in very similar situations–they would be viewed as child soldiers, but that's not how we view them here." There are a few basic responses Stolbach notes individuals have when immersed in this type of traumatic environment, regardless of age: fear, sadness and anger over a sense of injustice. "One of the things that happens with trauma in general is that we don't want to talk about it or think about it," he says. "So a lot of bad things that happen end up being avoided or they go unacknowledged." But he says the number one thing he focuses on while treating children is giving their feelings a voice. "A lot of the time, people carry these feelings around with them and don't have opportunities to talk about them with others, and then the feelings may influence their behavior in ways they might not even be aware of." Stolbach says this is particularly the case with kids, so the next step he always takes is to identify adults who can provide support and help them feel safe. He says one of the biggest mistakes society makes when it comes to children and trauma is thinking that the trauma won't affect them as deeply as it does adults. That's one reason Chicagoland schools bring in experts like Dion McGill with the Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence to spark conversation and provide alternatives to violence. "They know the violence is happening," McGill says. "They need to know why and what they can do about it." And McGill says that he can tell when he visits schools that kids are looking for a platform on which to talk about their fears. Because, as Stolbach says, the really difficult thing in his experience is that, most of the time, when a child is shot in Chicago, it is not the first or the last time they'll be around gun violence. That trauma just continues. Even if they never directly experience a gunshot wound again, he says their bodies persistently take them back to the injury. Randomly, their hearts will race, their minds will panic, their nightmares will manifest. For children in Chicago, the war never ends. "The world is unpredictable, and things that are horrible can happen, and they can happen to any of us," Stolbach says. "I think that is true for children and adults." SK

AAP ’12,

**The absence of guns from children’s homes and communities is the most reliable and effective measure to prevent firearm-related injuries in children and adolescents.** **Adolescent suicide risk is strongly associated with firearm availability**. Safe gun storage (guns unloaded and locked, ammunition locked separately) reduces children’s risk of injury. Physician counseling of parents about firearm safety appears to be effective, but firearm safety education programs directed at children are ineffective. The American Academy of Pediatrics continues to support a number of specific **measures to reduce the destructive effects of guns in the lives of children and adolescents, including the regulation of the manufacture, sale, purchase, ownership, and use of firearms**; a ban on semiautomatic assault weapons; **and the strongest possible regulations of handguns** for civilian use. SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM Although rates have declined since the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) issued the original policy statement in 1992, firearm-related deaths continue as 1 of the top 3 causes of death in American youth.1 As shown in Fig 1, the firearm-associated death rate among youth ages 15 to 19 has fallen from its peak of 27.8 deaths per 100 000 in 1994 to 11.4 per 100 000 in 2009, driven by a decline in firearm homicide rates.1 No single study has adequately explained the decline in firearmrelated homicide rates. Postulated reasons include improved socioeconomic conditions, violence prevention programs, decline in the crack/cocaine market, changes in legislation, declines in firearms availability for other reasons, and community policing. Nevertheless, **firearm-associated death and disability rates remain unacceptably high**. Of all injury deaths of individuals 15 through 19 years of age in the United States in 2009, more than 1 (28.7%) in 4 were firearm related, and of those younger than 20 years, nearly 1 (19.5%) in 5 were firearm related.1 These firearm deaths result from homicide, suicide, and unintentional injury (Fig 2). Black Americans are particularly affected; injuries from firearms were the leading cause of death among black males 15 through 34 years of age in 2009.2 Although national data cannot fully document urban and rural differences in the patterns of injuries from firearms that involve children, local data indicate that **children in rural areas as well as in urban areas are at risk for firearm-related mortality**.3–5. SK

#### Gun Violence has gone up since 1990 – recent evidence proves

Strausberg ’16,

Hundreds viewed the film “Making A Killing: Guns, Greed and the NRA,” late Friday night at Saint Sabina where Father Michael Pfleger said the city “is under siege” **given the rise of gun violence since 1990** including **112 people** who **have been killed and 547 wounded so far in two-and-a-half months of 2016**. “That is a scandal, a sin and a shame to America that is going on in Chicago,” said Pfleger referring to the daily shootings and killings. “While some people are talking about a new Ferris Wheel up North or the NFL draft, we need to be talking about what is going on the South and West Sides of Chicago, people getting hurt.” Referring to the Chicago Tribune report which talked about the dangerous South Side is creating an exodus of Blacks…there is an exodus of people leaving, Pfleger said **there is an exodus of people dying**. Pfleger, who on Saturday, April 23, 2016, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. is holding a gun turn-in at his church, said two years ago he talked to a NRA person who told him, “The number one consumer of guns in America” is illegal sales. “We cut out easy access to guns…. It is indeed a business, but we got to make them understand you are not going to make money off the blood of our children….”. SK

#### Problem persists

Xuan ’15, [State Gun Law Environment and Youth Gun Carrying in the United States Ziming Xuan, ScD, SM, MA1; David Hemenway, PhD2 [+] Author Affiliations JAMA Pediatr. 2015;169(11):1024-1031. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2015.2116. SK]

**Gun violence and injuries pose a substantial threat to children and youth in the United States**. **Existing evidence points to the need for interventions and policies for keeping guns out of the hands of children and youth**. Objectives (1) To examine the association between state gun law environment and youth gun carrying in the United States, and (2) to determine whether adult gun ownership mediates this association. Design, Setting, and Participants This was a repeated cross-sectional observational study design with 3 years of data on youth gun carrying from US states. The Youth Risk Behavior Survey comprises data of representative samples of students in grades 9 to 12 from biennial years of 2007, 2009, and 2011. We hypothesized that states with **more restrictive gun laws have lower rates of youth gun carrying**, and **this association is mediated by adult gun ownership**. Exposures State gun law environment as measured by state gun law score. Main Outcomes and Measures Youth gun carrying was defined as having carried a gun on at least 1 day during the 30 days before the survey. Results In the fully adjusted model, a 10-point increase in the state gun law score, which represented a more restrictive gun law environment, was associated with a 9% decrease in the odds of youth gun carrying (adjusted odds ratio [AOR], 0.91 [95% CI, 0.86-0.96]). Adult gun ownership mediated the association between state gun law score and youth gun carrying (AOR, 0.94 [ 95% CI, 0.86-1.01], with 29% attenuation of the regression coefficient from −0.09 to −0.07 based on bootstrap resampling). Conclusions and Relevance **More restrictive overall gun control policies are associated with a reduced likelihood of youth gun carrying**. These findings are relevant to gun policy debates about the critical importance of strengthening overall gun law environment to prevent youth gun carrying. SK

### AT: Incarceration (0:14)

**A.** No link - Guns are illegal for youth now – my argument considers how youth get guns from the private market.

**B.** No UQ – youth are incarcerated now because they carry guns – banning has a risk of reducing the amount of guns they carry.

Webster et al ’15, [YOUTH ACQUISITION AND CARRYING OF FIREARMS IN THE UNITED STATES: PATTERNS, CONSEQUENCES, AND STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTION\* Daniel W. Webster, ScD, MPH John Speed Meyers, MPA Shani Buggs, MPH Center for Gun Policy and Research Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. SK]

Arrests for weapon-related offenses (the vast majority are for illegal gun possession) reveal the same dramatic reduction in adolescent gun carrying occurring from 1993 to 2000. However, **juvenile gun carrying arrests** per 100,000 population **increased by 51%** from 94.7 in 2000 to 143.3 in 2006 and then declined steadily to 75.2 in 2012, 48% lower than the 2006 rate. 51 This measure of adolescent gun carrying more directly measures high-risk gun involvement and is not limited to school populations, it is impossible to discern the degree to which changes reflect differing levels of gun carrying versus differing levels of enforcement. Juvenile arrests rates for any crime and especially for drug-related crimes have declined significantly during the post-economic recession period of 2008-2012 and may reflect some reductions in police activity due to budget constraints on local governments. Consistent with the notion some of the recent downturn in weapon arrests for juveniles is due to law enforcement changes, **the percentage of arrests of juveniles that are for weapons offenses declined only slightly from 2007 to 2012**. SK

### AT: Bad Conditions

#### Bad conditions are because of a fear of urban violence – taking away guns would reduce the actualization and thus the fear itself causing external benefits.

Meeks ’06, [Police Militarization in Urban Areas: The Obscure War Against the Underclass Author(s): Daryl Meeks Source: The Black Scholar, Vol. 35, No. 4, ROSA PARKS and HAROLD CRUSE: Black Activists and Intellectuals (WINTER 2006), pp. 33-41 Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/41069174 Accessed: 29-04-2016 00:05 UTC. SK]

**IS THIS FEAR OF URBAN CRIME and the urban underclass**, expressed by middle- class suburban Americans, **that has served to shape and encourage a Social Darwinistic perspective of individuals residing in urban centers**. **Funding of social programs** that pro- vide support for the urban underclass **has been reduced**, **while operational budgets for law enforcement and their war on crime in urban communities have increased.** The total United States Department of Justice budget for 2002 was approximately $21.8 bil- lion and increased to approximately $23.1 billion in 2003. Between 1995 and 2004, in support of the war on drugs and crime, the budget for the Department of Justice's Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) increased from $814.1 million to $1.6 billion. Between 2002 and 2003, the federal alloca- tion for the Community Policing by law enforcement agencies increased from approximately $1 million to $1.3 million. This increase in funding for community policing may appear to be paltry in terms of the dollar amount but it is significant nonetheless. **This increase in funding for community policing, in urban areas, enabled many of the law enforcement agencies to militarize special units**, **while shifting the focus of community-oriented policing units away from its original intent** to a focus on the war on crime. SK

### \*AT: No Root Cause (0:17)

#### The root cause of youth gun violence is *gun availability and amount of gun possession*

Webster et al ’15, [YOUTH ACQUISITION AND CARRYING OF FIREARMS IN THE UNITED STATES: PATTERNS, CONSEQUENCES, AND STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTION\* Daniel W. Webster, ScD, MPH John Speed Meyers, MPA Shani Buggs, MPH Center for Gun Policy and Research Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. SK]

Demographic correlates provide a picture of how **adolescent gun carrying varies across sub-groups**, but provide limited insights into what factors facilitate or inhibit this behavior. **The general availability of guns**, measured in terms of gun ownership prevalence or proxy indicators of gun ownership, **appear to be an important determinant of whether an adolescent carries a gun.** **Gun availability at the aggregate level is correlated with adolescent gun carrying.** Garen Wintemute used YRBSS data and found that **for each percentage point increase in a proxy for gun ownership, adolescent gun carrying increased by 0.18 percent**.52 Phillip Cook and Jens Ludwig subject to a rigorous test the proposition that rates of gun ownership among the general population are related to youth handgun carrying. By using micro-data from the National Survey of Adolescent Males and a variety of statistical tests, including a placebo test and a two-stage least squares regression, the researchers create a strong case that **gun ownership has a direct causal effect on increasing adolescent handgun carrying**. SK

### \*AT: Solvency Deficits (0:16)

#### Recent evidence proves that stricter gun laws reduce youth gun holdings.

Storrs ’15, [Study: Stricter state gun laws keep firearms out of hands of youth By Carina Storrs, Special to CNN Updated 1:08 PM ET, Mon September 21, 2015. SK]

(CNN) **Teens who live in states with less restrictive gun laws may be more likely to carry guns**, according to a study. **They're able to access them because more adults in those states own guns**, researchers said. The researchers focused on high school-aged teens and found that youth from states with the least restrictive gun laws were more likely to have a gun while outside the home. Among 38 states studied, 5.7% of high school students from states with stricter laws carried a gun in the past 30 days. In states with weaker laws, 7.3% of students carried a gun in that time. The data on youth came from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System. Data on gun laws came from the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, a gun control advocacy group that scores states on gun laws, such as controls of firearm trafficking, measures to ensure child safety and restrictions on guns in public places. Researchers looked at data from 38 states in 2007, 2009 and 2011. For every 10-point decrease in a state's gun law score, a teen was 9% more likely to report having carried a gun at least once in the last month. "We were able to demonstrate for the first time that **across all the states** (in the study) that **gun laws reduce youth gun carrying by limiting or reducing adult gun ownership**," said Ziming Xuan, assistant professor of community health services at Boston University School of Public Health. Xuan is the lead author of the study, which was published on Monday in JAMA Pediatrics. Easier access to guns means more teens carrying The researchers also found that states with low gun control scores were also more likely to have high rates of adults who owned guns; this appeared to be the main reason for the increase in youth carrying guns. Previous research found that about a quarter of U.S. adolescents said they can easily access guns in their home. The national minimum age to buy a handgun is 18 and some states require people to be 21. Some states also have laws on the minimum age to possess a firearm, but may make exceptions for activities such as hunting and target practice. Although the study did not address whether fewer teenagers carrying guns could lead to less youth gun violence and death, it is a "reasonable conclusion," Xuan said. Guns are involved in 83% of murders committed by youth and 45% of suicides, according to CDC data. Related: Strict state gun laws could cut suicides, study says The states with the lowest scores, meaning least-restrictive gun laws, were Utah (1.3), Alaska, Kentucky and Oklahoma (all 2.0), whereas those with the highest scores -- meaning more restrictive gun laws -- were California (79.7), New Jersey (69.3) and Massachusetts (57.7). The Brady Campaign uses a 100-point scale. The researchers found an overlap between the states with the lowest scores and those with the highest prevalence of adult gun ownership. For example, in Utah and Alaska, 52% and 63% of adults had guns, respectively, compared with 40% and 29% in California and New Jersey. Although the study suggests that **gun laws indirectly affect teen gun carrying by limiting adult gun ownership**, laws that focus on youth gun safety may have direct effects as well, Xuan said. For example, laws that require adults to keep handguns locked or inaccessible to children, and laws that put age restrictions on the purchase of guns, could help, he said. "The important message in this paper is that gun control really involves comprehensive laws from both dimensions," both to make sure gun ownership among adults is safe and to restrict ownership and use in youth, Xuan said. Understanding why young people carry guns Gun laws have less effect on whether some groups of youth carry guns, according to the study: All teens in grades 9 and 10, and black and Hispanic teens. Black and Hispanic teens in particular "deserve very special attention" because of the high rates of gun carrying in those groups, Xuan said. Finding out why should be the subject of further research, said Michele Cooley-Strickland, research psychologist in the David Geffen School of Medicine at the University of California Los Angeles, who was not involved in the research. "If we understand the why, we can work to prevent it." The study is a "good first start," she said. But **adults are going to continue to own guns, so youth will continue to have a way to get these weapons** -- researchers need to determine the reasons that teens want to pick them up in the first place, Cooley-Strickland said. Related: Mass killings, school shootings are 'contagious,' study finds To answer the question, researchers will need to look at gun culture and attitudes in different areas of the country, she said. In states such as Wyoming, which has a gun law score of 8.3 and where 66% of adults own guns, children might be more interested in carrying guns for hunting, Cooley-Strickland said. Her research in the Baltimore area, however, suggests that children carry guns, knives and other weapons because they are in high-crime areas and want to protect themselves and their loved ones, she said. "I think it goes back to the reasons that youth are carrying weapons, and African-American and Hispanic youth are more likely to live in inner city areas in which there's higher violence. ... So these youth might feel more at risk for harm." SK

### AT: Bans fail

A. Double Bind – either (a) banning guns will work and youth will be empowered against the system which keeps them from acting out and thus will engage in political protest, breaking down hegemony, or (b) banning guns will not work which will demonstrate the power of the system to the public in keeping the citizenry down, and they will begin the ideological shift away from trusting the government, leading to ideological protest in the future.

## Extension

### 1AR Gangs Overview

You will have at least one thing on your flow at the end of the 2AR:

You have conceded the Kennedy external impact that drug gangs recruit youth who carry guns because of norms which validate gun use, and maintain their power through guns. Thus, youth are trapped within a system of fear of violence, and the external community is afraid of the gang. This makes the 1AC key – we’re the only ones who take out the incentive for gang violence

### 1AR Education Overview

You will have at least one thing on your flow at the end of the 2AR:

Chamberlain says the fact that society believes guns are valuable leads to the valorization of threat consumption, which leads to increased dropout rates and destroys education for children within schools – outweighs: (a) timeframe as the harms persist (b) cyclicality as they learn to be afraid and (c) they become disposable.

This is an apriori issue – means all of my violence impacts become inevitable and roll back long term net benefit to preserving the status quo.

### 1AR No Ban Overview

Extend Fagan and Wilkinson – the government legitimizes guns to alter social norms to condone the ecology of danger where people presume others have guns – by banning guns we remove the normative presumption that guns should exist, decreasing fear of violence. It doesn’t matter if we don’t completely solve actual handgun violence – we eliminate justification for social control which filters all impacts in the round.

### 1AR Cyclicality Overview

First is framing: extend Giroux and Colley – the fear of violence creates threat consumption, repressing citizens and ideas, creating more violence. The 1AC does not claim to solve the inherent culture, but it removes the way in which the culture actualizes material harms. Children die and society becomes more afraid every day – that’s Northrop and Walesh. The 1AC framing question is cyclicality – the culture hasn’t changed, but as guns are more lethal, crimes are more lethal due to the accessibility of handguns specifically for youth – that’s Elliot. The more fatal death is, people become more afraid, and the politics of fear continue. We cut out the tool of fear, the gun, which minimizes the impact of fear and cuts off its cyclicality. Means you have to vote aff as only we pinpoint the root cause of violence and eliminate it.

### 1AR Gun Ban Mini Overview

All of your turns talk about “gun control” – you have conceded the VPC 2k evidence that says that a Congressional ban is where we ban manufacturing, selling, and distribution of handguns which literally cuts off all possible avenues for creating a handgun – none of your turns link.

### 1AR Full Case Extension

Extend the **Colley** and **Giroux** evidence – this is framing criticizing the fear of violence and threat consumption within society – as guns proliferate more people are afraid of violence, which increasingly excludes specifically youth within educational systems from activism and makes their bodies disposable as violence becomes normalized. At that point it is game over as you are conceding the implications under Giroux that indicate that a gun ban is necessary for youth empowerment against governmentality which creates this fear of violence, and that guns divide the populous so they cannot have political participation which outweighs on long term solvency for change.

Extend Northrop and Hamrick ’90 and VPC 2k – a ban must be specific to one type of gun such as handgun and necessitates Congressional action that destroys manufacturing, proliferation, and selling of handguns which crushes the handgun markets – turns that deal with “gun control” don’t link as gun control is weak and obviously doesn’t solve compared to the total dismantlement the aff does.

Extend Northrop 2 and Dowd – handguns cause the most amount of violence in youth communities as they are cheap and easily accessible, can be easily stolen, and are most likely to be concealable – means banning handguns is uniquely key

Extend the weighing – youth indoctrination within systems of violence outweighs as they are the best chance for political revolt in their young age – outweighs on long term solvency

Extend Walesh – the very presence of guns create fear – the fear of being shot or the fear that their parents cannot actually protect them and thus have bought a gun for superficial safety psychologically alters children into being threat consumers.

Extend Chamberlain who says the fact that society believes guns are valuable leads to the valorization of threat consumption, which leads to increased dropout rates and destroys education for children within schools – outweighs: (a) timeframe as the harms persist (b) cyclicality as they learn to be afraid and (c) they become disposable.

Extend Elliot – this evidence is great –we cannot place the blame for this violence on alt causes as the reason that people *die* is because of the guns – empirically proven as violence persists but has become more lethal as handguns enter the mix – means that solving for the lethality of violence would also decrease the fear, as the media portrayal of lethal handgun death leads to greater fear of violence. Also, saying that there are alt causes and so we can’t solve the problem increases disposability – as people think the underlying problems can’t be solved, more living children are turned into empty carcasses on the street, shot by handguns.

Extend Kennedy – youth steal guns from people who privately possess them or get them from stolen guns on the illegal market which means that a ban on private possession would logically cut off the diversion of guns onto the illegal market, especially as they are not manufactured.

You have conceded the Kennedy external impact that drug gangs recruit youth who carry guns because of norms which validate gun use, and maintain their power through guns. Thus, youth are trapped within a system of fear of violence, and the external community is afraid of the gang. This makes the 1AC key – we’re the only ones who take out the incentive for gang violence

Extend Fagan and Wilkinson – the government legitimizes guns to alter social norms to condone the ecology of danger where people presume others have guns – by banning guns we remove the normative presumption that guns should exist, decreasing fear of violence. It doesn’t matter if we don’t completely solve actual handgun violence – we eliminate justification for social control which filters all impacts in the round.

### 1AR fear of NRA Mini Overview

This is literally what I am criticizing - extend Giroux – the fear of violence or backlash is what stunts movements and increases violence – your argument that we shouldn’t do the plan because of the fear of the NRA having political backlash bites back in to the critique of fear and means you should lose – if fear is a reason to stick with the status quo we act against it. Even if some risk of their offense is true about backlash; that’s necessary towards long term dismantling of fear culture – voting neg just placates militant gun owners which is what causes violence in that status quo.

## General Expansions

### XP - Lofstrom

#### Extend Chamberlain – increased guns lead to increased dropouts - Lower education and higher dropout rates are the root cause of criminal activity and gun violence in the first place. This means that not only does banning handguns solve back the cyclicality of violence, but it also removes any need to have handguns for self-defense.

Lofstrom proves,

Journal Issue: America's High Schools Volume 19 Number 1 Spring 2009; Finishing High School: Alternative Pathways and Dropout Recovery; [John H. Tyler](https://www.princeton.edu/futureofchildren/publications/author-bios/author_show.xml?autid=22&catid=7) [Magnus Lofstrom](https://www.princeton.edu/futureofchildren/publications/author-bios/author_show.xml?autid=23&catid=7); https://www.princeton.edu/futureofchildren/publications/journals/article/index.xml?journalid=30&articleid=49&sectionid=175

**Dropouts** are also greatly **overrepresent**ed **in U.S. prisons**. The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that **[with] 68 percent of** the nation's state prison **inmates** are **[as] dropouts**.58 Dropouts constitute 62 percent of white inmates, 69 percent of black inmates, and 78 percent of Hispanic inmates. Although these figures represent strikingly strong relationships between education and crime, the extent of causality is unknown. For example, **children who** grow up in poor, inner-city neighborhoods **are more likely** both **to drop out of school** and to **engage in criminal activities** during the adolescent and post-adolescent years. It is clearly challenging to estimate the causal effect of education on criminal behavior. In an influential study, Lance **Lochner and** Enrico **Moretti find that education does causally affect** individuals' propensities to engage in **criminal activities**, though **[especially] with racial differences**.59 Black male high school graduates are more than 3 percentage points less likely to be incarcerated than black dropouts; the share for white males is less than 1 percentage point. Lochner and Moretti also **estimate[ing]**e the **effect of schooling** on different types of crime**. They find[ing] that**, on average, **one additional year of schooling will** reduce the murder **and assault rate by close to** 30 percent, motor vehicle theft by 20 percent, arson by 13 percent, and burglary and larceny by about 6 percent. They find no significant negative effect on robbery and rape.60 Their findings indicate that a 1 percent increase in male high school graduation rates could save as much as $1.4 billion a year, or up to $2,100 for each additional male high school graduate. **Students who drop out may also be less effective at parenting** and may participate less often and less effectively in the nation's democratic processes. To date there is little research on these costs of school dropout. The discussion so far has dealt only with the costs—individual and social—associated with dropping out. A full social cost-benefit analysis would include potential social benefits associated with having students leave school early, such as lower public spending on education. =

### \*XP – Cook and Ludwig

#### Youth gun use is caused by private handgun ownership – ban is key.

Cook et al ’10, [Philip J. Cook (ITT/Terry Sanford Professor of Public Policy Studies; Professor of Economics and Sociology and Associate Director, Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy.), Jens Ludwis (McCormick Foundation Professor of Social Service Administration, Law, and Public Policy, University of Chicago.) Adam M. Samaha (Assistant Professor of Law and Herbert & Marjorie Fried Teaching Scholar, The University of Chicago Law School.), “GUN CONTROL AFTER HELLER: THREATS AND SIDESHOWS FROM A SOCIAL WELFARE PERSPECTIVE”, 56 UCLA LAW REVIEW 1041 2010. SK]

The likelihood that a gun will be used in crime is closely linked to the general availability of guns, and especially handguns. **In jurisdictions where handgun ownership is common, the various types of transactions by which youths and criminals become armed are facilitated**. **The list of transactions includes thefts from homes and vehicles, loans to family members and friends, and off-the-books sales**. **In an area with a high-prevalence of gun ownership, then, transactions in the secondary market are subject to less friction** and may well be cheaper than in markets where gun ownership is rare.191 While there is no evidence that gun prevalence affects the rate of violent crime, gun prevalence does have a demonstrable effect on the likelihood that the assailants in robbery and assault will be armed with guns, resulting in a higher case-fatality rate than would otherwise occur. SK

## 1AR v K

### XP – Education (0:15)

#### The 1AC’s performance of educating about youth gun violence is uniquely key to solving the problem.

Northrop and Hamrick ‘90,

**Weapons violence is a major public health problem that especially impacts minority youth**. Interventions designed to reduce weapon use by youth are categorized as educational/behavioral change, legal, and technological/environmental. Few educational programs currently exist, but those that do largely concern firearm safety courses, public information campaigns, counseling, classroom education, peer education and mentoring, and crisis intervention. Given that legal snd technological countermeasures have difficulty in controlling weapons violence, **education seems a critical first step toward a comprehensive approach to preventing weapons-related violence**. **Potential** educational **interventions include educating students and their communities about the dangers inherent in carrying or possessing firearms**. **Potential legal interventions include** firearm legislation assessment, taxation, stricter licensing and registration policies, and **bans on selected types of firearms**. Potential technological/environment interventions include designing safer weapons, eliminating ammunition types, and modifying the adverse environment in which weapons are used or carried. A combination of strategies should be used, but before interventions are discussed, professionals must address the inadequacy of current information on which to base firearm policy, ethical and philosophical issues involving metal detector use, and the community's role. The appendix contains a list of 16 associations to contact for additional information. (GLR). SK

### 1AR v Wilderson (1:00)

#### First is the Negrophobia disad –

Desire to own handguns and arguments against bans are based on a fear of blacks – whites think they need guns to protect themselves.

O’Brien et al, [O’Brien, Kerry, et al. "Racism, gun ownership and gun control: Biased attitudes in US whites may influence policy decisions." (2013): e77552. SK]

Just over half (52%) of the sample had a gun in the home, **66% opposed bans on handguns in the home**, and 52% reported support for permits to carry a concealed handgun. Participants reported being slightly more conservative than liberal, and more Republican than Democratic leaning. Mean **scores** for symbolic racism, and to a lesser extent the race IAT, **indicated anti-black sentiment**; however, participants had mean scores considerably below the midpoint of scoring for the stereotype that ‘blacks are violent’. Table 5 displays full weighted descriptives. After adjusting for all explanatory variables in the model, **symbolic racism was significantly related to having a gun in the home**. Specifically, for each 1 point increase in symbolic racism, there was a 50% greater odds of having a gun in the home (see Table 1), and there was a 28% increase in the odds of supporting permits to carry concealed handguns (see Table 3). The relationship between symbolic racism and opposing a ban on guns in the home (27% increase in odds), was reduced (17% increase in odds) and became non-significant when the outcome ‘having a gun in the home’ was entered in the model (see Table 2). This is unsurprising as, in effect, opposition to gun control policy is conflated with having a gun already, and reflects self-interest [38]. Thus the gun ownership variable mediated the relationship between symbolic racism and opposition to a ban on handguns in the home. It is noteworthy that **symbolic racism still maintained its significant relationship with support for permits to carry** concealed **handguns** in the presence of having a gun in the home. SK

#### Fear is coordinated with guns and guns perpetuate the fear – Wilderson agrees

Wilderson in **‘**10 [Frank B Wilderson III, Interview: Frank Wilderson, Wallowing in the Contradictions, Part 2, Conducted by Percy Howard, July 14 2010, SK]

FW I think it’s such a deep problem that it’s even hard to go ahead and think about, but we’ll try here. One of the things I didn’t get as deeply into in my book as I would have wanted to would be the work of a Black psychoanalytic scholar named David Marriott who’s down at UC Santa Cruz. And I’m not sure I have the time to do the heavy lifting of reading all his work right now, but what I can say is that he has this theoretical intervention about the unconscious which suggests that **the Black unconscious is always at war with itself because it shares something with the White unconscious which is a hatred for the** Black imago, for the **image of the Black**. I hope I can do the theory justice because I use his work in my film book but I don’t use it in the breadth and the depth that he has written in his books. He’s not trying to condemn Black people for an unconscious that has as a constituent element hatred of blackness, but he’s trying to suggest that **there is violence in the world which is coordinated with Negrophobia.** **There’s the fantasy of a Black as a phobic object, an object that will destroy you and you don’t even know how it will destroy you, just an anxious threat, you know**. And he says, okay, that’s a fantasy, but what’s important, what psychoanalysis hasn’t really figured out, is that **what’s important about this fantasy is that it is supported and coordinated with** all the guns in the world… PH Uh-huh. FW And I, the Black, can have a fantasy of white aggression, but it is not coordinated with any institutional power. PH Right. FW And he says if you go through generations, that it’s really not immediately possible for you to simply genocide that unconscious hatred of yourself because **the hatred of Black**, of the Black, **is also fundamental to being accepted in society**. So he’s saying that there is, that there’s two things happening in the Black unconscious, one is a hatred of the Black, of aggressivity towards the Black imago which is the same aggressivity that society has, so that Denzel Washington can say at the end of Training Day “I’m King Kong”, you know. You know, my God. You know? SK

#### Second is impact framing:

A. Extend Chadderton and Colley – youth are pushed to the margins of society and are excluded from civil society – means 1AC functions as offense under your impact framing.

B. Just like the black is viewed as the antithesis of the state, so are youth – by definition the construction of the youth class demonstrates the desire to exclude them as they are a threat to the state

#### Third – aff solves the K - All of these arguments justify why either the Perm – do the aff, or Perm – do both solve.

A. Double Bind – either (a) banning guns will work and youth will be empowered against the state and will revolt against it, breaking it down, or (b) banning guns will not work which will demonstrate the power of the state which will justify a revolt to the public.

B. The fear of the black body is what leads to this violence – my argument is that reducing the fear reduces the violence which is done by guns – that’s Walesh

C. Youth violence disproportionately affects minorities who are forced into drug gangs against their will – AC is key to solve the indoctrination of youth into poverty and systems which bind them down – that’s Kennedy

Also, Perm – do the aff then do the K – this is a sequencing issue – banning guns allows for youth empowerment which gives them the freedom necessary to revolt. Another net benefit is that it prevents individualization by separating the populous which means socialization is key to revolt so the aff is key.

### 1AR v Capitalism (0:51)

First overview on the impact level – the 1AC’s ban on handguns solves the harms of capitalism.

#### A. Turn - The formation of interchangeable parts and the extension of capitalism into the US was the creation of handguns – this means the 1AC is a symbolic rejection of one of the founding fathers of capitalism – handguns are unique.

Kemp,

**Conditions in the United States**. **notably the existence of a large. uniform market for articles of everyday use**. led to the adoption of these methods earlier than in Europe. Already. in 1851. at the Great Exhibition held at the Crystal Palace in London, American exhibits attracted the attention of foreign. especially British. observers. The Bri- tish government sent a commission to the United States to study on the spot what became ltnown as 'the American System of Manufactures'. It was not always clear that what was specifically new in American production methods arose from particular conditions. In any case. from about this time American technology began to break new ground and move into the vanguard. a harbinger of the **rapid industrialization of the last quarter of the nineteenth century which was to transform the United States into an industrial giant** ' **interchangeability and standardization of parts** began with handguns‚ (one of the key contributors to this development being Eli Whitney. inventor of the cotton gin). **They rapidly spread to other branches of industry**. such as watches and clocks, agricultural machinery. wherever moving parts were involved. Use of these methods undoubtedly assisted American industry to occupy a leading position in new types of manufacture such as the sewing machine. the typewriter and later the automobile.0.! IIIL Jsvvlllb IlII\l|lII\. \|I\ \'rV\VvII\\I IIlI\a lIl\| Ills uutvlllvvllbn However impressive such industrial advances were. they took place. at first. in what was still a small sector of an economy dominated by primary production. In 1840 manufacturing accounted for only ten per cent of Gross National Product. reaching a modest seventeen per cent on the eve of the Civil War. But it was the most dynamic sector and already the dominant one in some areas. particularly in the North East. Meanwhile, improvements in transport were knitting together the older settled regions into a single. more integrated market and pushing settlement further west across the continent. Exports continued to be dominated by the products of the Southern plantation system and the cereal-growing West. On the eve of the Civil War. the United States could be characterized perous country of commercial agriculture and merchant ; **industry was still largely organized on the older handicraft lines. but there was a significant. and growing. part of industry which was highly capitalized**. technologically advanced and poised to talte the lead in the world market. As a primary producer and a debtor country the United States was still dependent upon Europe. The inï¬‚ow of capital. like that oflabour. was vital for continued expansion. leaving locally generated capital free to exploit the possibilities of what was becoming a continental economy. SK

#### B. Turn - The zeal for guns is premised upon capitalism – empirically proven by the NRA

Kotler,

**One of the most troublesome marketing outputs under capitalism is the widespread production and purchase of guns**. Most nations have banned or curbed the public carrying ofguns, with the glaring exception of the United States. **The U.S. gun lobby** (the National Rifle Association) **is powerful, and most legislators are ready to accept the NRA's financial support** in exchange for their voting to block curbs on gun purchases. **Americans are able to buy** not only semiautomatic **handguns**, but rapid- firing assault weapons. In some states, it's legal for gun owners to carry a gun into a mall, movie theater, or church. **Gun owners claim a constitu- tional right** to own and carry a gun on the grounds of the Second Amendment, which vaguely holds that citizens can bear arms. How- ever, **the constitutional intention was that members of a militia could carry arms, not inclividual citizens**. SK

#### And, 1AC offense functions as offense on the kritik – destroying the normalization of youth within the system solves the K.

A. Cross-apply Giroux ’13 – the disposability of youth is exactly what drives the mentality of capitalism which means that we solve back for that

B. Crossapply the second analytic under Giroux – we open up avenues for political protest for youth which allows them to topple the system – outweighs on long term solvency

C. Fear is what drives the politics of capitalism and allows it to characterize everyone in terms of material value – means the 1AC, by mitigating the politics of fear, solves the impact level of the kritik.

D. Handguns sew discord throughout the populous which decreases collectivism and increases individualism which allows capitalism to function

#### And, on the alt:

A. Perm – ban handguns and engage in a social revolution through grassroots lobbying

B. Perm – do the aff then do the K – this is a sequencing argument – we first have to remove youth from the logic of the system before they can revolt against the system.

### 1AR v Ban Culture K

A. Your author’s alternative IS THE AFF – we foster a discussion in the aff by examining the ban within the context of youth violence and the politics of fear – net benefit to the aff which is offense for me.

Green ’14,

**So those calling for something to be "banned" should therefore ask two simple questions**. **First, what will the prohibition do in respect of the undesired behaviour**? **And second, what other consequences may flow from the prohibition**? Good answers to both these questions will inform the political choice as to whether such a ban should be implemented and, if so, how. We may even get better laws as a consequence; we could even get prohibitions that actually work and are proportionate. **The call for something to be "banned" should be the start of a mature and constructive political debate, and not the end of one**. Perhaps the time has come to ban just banning things. SK

B. This argument is not specific to banning guns so be very skeptical of it – guns cause massive death and minor regulations don’t work which is why we should ban them

C. Aff solvency proves that banning guns is key to removing youth oppression and stigmatization due to fear and opens up avenues for political dissent rather than making citizens assume they are secure from the state which means I link turn the K – that’s offense.

D. No reason to vote me down – s/he has the burden of proving that this is a *bad mindset* not just that it can be construed badly

### 1AR v Medical Cap K

On the link –

A. No link - We focus on the root cause of which is governmentality – the fact that the government keeps guns in the populous to deny the reformulation of its power structure.

B. Guns create individualization which means that aff solves and prereqs the link as the link claims that the individualization within society creates capitalism

On the impacts –

A. Aff solves – only way to unveil neolib is to question dominant structures of power – that’s the aff which questions how the state formulates norms

B. Aff solves – interrogation of government is key because government sustains capitalism

C. Doesn’t link – we solve gun culture and gun culture doesn’t cause the problem the government does

On the alt –

A. Perm do the aff and the alt in all other instances – gets out of your tricky tag that says “instead of banning handguns” which your author doesn’t advocate for.

B. Turn – this creates stigma against those with depression by making it seem as if they are a disease and that they cause gun violence (which is false) – it doesn’t solve the root cause.

Gupta,

Now Slutkin believes **the** exact same **model can be applied to preventing mass shootings, by having interrupters looking for people who may be isolated or marginalized**. In many of the recent tragedies, **the shooters were described as loners, full of emotional pain and who, at times, were blatantly antisocial**. Most of society simply ignores those people, further marginalizing them. **The interrupters** would do the opposite; they **would target those people**. "I think we should be developing outreach networks that look at high-risk situations and high-risk people through all kinds of methods. It could be as simple as word of mouth, through the dorms, postings on social media, and the Internet as a whole," Slutkin said. In medicine, it is referred to as active case finding. If done properly, it can prevent the spread of illnesses and lead to the early treatment of people who are already infected. SK

C. This alt literally does nothing about capitalism – the medical sphere is a product of capitalist control of health in itself which means Turn – you make the problem worse

D. The alt does nothing to solve capitalism – capitalism creates the medical system in order to control health through systems which place a material value on a cure to human life and thus life itself so TURN – you increase capitalism

D. Perm – ban handguns – this solves the alt

E. Perm – do both – treat those who are prone to violence while removing guns which allow them to express that violence

## 1AR v CPs

### 1AR v Bullets CP

Perm – this is a way to ban handguns meaning it is (a) aff ground or (b) not competitive. Also, empirics prove the only way the action is taken is if it is to ban handguns which outweighs on field context. THIS IS YOUR AUTHOR!

Griffiths ‘75, [Patti, Oscala Star-Banner, April 13th 1975. SK]

WASHINGTON (AP) - While Congress cori- siders legislation to impose new handgun con- trols. the Consumer Product Safety Commissior. is moving ahead on a related issue that it says could virtually ban the weapois in America. its five **commissioners**. under federal court or- der. begin deliberations Monday on a **petition to ban handgun bullets** as a hazardous substance. If the agency outlaws pistol bullets. the com-' rrussion has said. "the practical effect would be a virtual ban on handguns." a prohibition unlike'y to be enacted by Congress this session. Some long guns also would be affected. firearms experts assert. because bullets for some handgun calibers are identical to those for rifles and could be interchangeable. The petition does not seek to ban cartridges. it is aimed only at bullets. the small lead projec- tiles. Casings. primers and powder are not under consideration. **This** back-door approach to ban handguns **by outlawing pistol bullets is the idea of the Chicago-based Committee for Handgun Control**. founded by four suburban mothers. They say they got the idea from the National Riï¬‚e Association. "Guns without bullets are not dangerous. The bullets are actually taken from the bodies of those who are killed or injured with handguns." the committee has written the safety commis- sion. The committee says its efforts to ban bullets stems from an inability to obtain federal gun control legislation. SK

2. Banning bullets doesn’t change the stigma associated with a gun – my argument is that the legality of guns makes the populous feel safe from the government even when they are not

3. The very image of guns sews fear within communities – that’s Walesh – means that guns promote the individualization which prevents people from engaging in political forms of dissent

### 1AR v Israel CP

A. Blanket ban is necessary – removes illusion that people can revolt against government, that’s the analytic under Giroux which says that guns break up communities and make people believe that they can stop the state on their own because they have a false sense of security

B. Israeli gun control is for those the government has a vested interest in getting a gun. Two implications: (a) furthers oppression of citizenry because permits are issued only by the government so the government can regulate which communities they want to break up under the illusion that the people are free which means CP can’t solve case and (b) Perm – CP is not exclusive because aff is private ownership where individuals rather than government officers want guns – the people rather than the government have an interest in being armed.

Hartman ’12, (your author)

“There is an essential difference between the two. In America the right to bear arms is written in the law, here it’s the opposite... only those who have a license can bear arms and not everyone can get a license.” **Amit said gun licenses are only given out to those who have a reason because they work in security or law enforcement, or those who live in settlements “where the state has an interest in them being armed**.” He added that former IDF officers above a certain rank can get a license. Anyone who fits the requirements, is over age 21 and an Israeli resident for more than three years, must go through a mental and physical health exam, Amit said, then pass shooting exams and courses at a licensed gun range, as well as background checks by the Public Security Ministry.

### 1AR v Degrazia CP

A. My arg is about the loss of political power – moderate gun control still has the separation of the populous by allowing guns within communities and separating them.

B. Your author assumes that there is a right to ownership – I say the culture of violence creates this illusion

Degrazia,

**In addressing** the shape of appropriate **gun policy, this essay assumes** for the sake of discussion **that there is a legal and moral right to private gun ownership.** My thesis is that, against the background of this right, the most defensible policy approach in the United States would feature moderate gun control. The first section summarizes the American gun control status quo and characterizes what I call “moderate gun control.” The next section states and rebuts six leading arguments against this general approach to gun policy. The section that follows presents a positive case for moderate gun control that emphasizes safety in the home and society as well as rights whose enforcement entails some limits or qualifications on the right to bear arms. A final section shows how the recommended gun regulations address legitimate purposes, rather than imposing arbitrary restrictions on gun rights, and offers concluding reflections.

C. Violence is a product of fear; therefore banning guns is the only way for peaceful protests which are more successful

D. Perm – ban handguns and do moderate gun control for all other guns (a) your author only talks about other guns and (b) handguns are more accessible which makes them more individualized

### 1AR v States CP

#### CP fails – multiple warrants

Damerdji ’15, [Salim Damerdji, “An Argument against the States CP”, NSDupdate, <http://nsdupdate.com/2016/01/12/an-argument-against-the-states-cp-by-salim-damerdji/>. SK]

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] Let’s consider some replies. In 2009, Eric Morris offered the following response to JP Lacy:[3] one actor has the ability to directly choose between Federal and State action: the debate judge. This is roughly the same number of actors who have the ability to dictate Congressional/Presidential cooperation to get a particular law passed & signed, not to mention funded, implemented, and upheld in perpetuity. Though it may seem implied by Lacy’s language, there doesn’t actually need to be a single entity to push for the aff to happen (it may entail fiating a lot of congresspeople pass a bill, for instance). And even if it were the case that a single entity had to make the aff happen, the judge could not be that entity. The judge quite literally does not dictate congressional/presidential cooperation – the USFG does. To test whether the aff is desirable, we merely ask whether the USFG affirming would be good, putting aside the issue of whether the congressional/presidential cooperation it requires is likely. This is distinct from the issue with the States CP. The problem here is made vivid by returning to the security guard example. The security guard can agree that the co-worker would be the ideal actor. But the security guard lacks God-like powers to force their co-worker to stop their rampage. So it’s irrelevant whether the co-worker would be the ideal actor since we’re nearly certain they won’t act. Second, someone may reply, “Of course the neg world won’t happen, but neither will the aff world happen. The whole point of fiat is to discover the best outcome, not the most likely one.” **The point of fiat is not to figure out the best imaginable outcome – it’s to test whether we should affirm or not**. When the neg fiats a counter-plan, they acquire the ability to test whether the world of the CP is good. **But the neg world being preferable to the aff world isn’t enough to win.** (To think otherwise is just another bizarre implication of the contrived comparing worlds paradigm.) Perms demonstrate this. If the CP ended world hunger and gave everyone a pony, it’d be an amazing world, maybe even better than the aff’s world. But until there’s a disadvantage to the aff, then there’s still every reason to affirm. Counter-plans only matter if they are opportunity costs weighty enough to make the aff advocacy undesirable. In this case, the fact that the states are so unlikely to act means there’s virtually no opportunity cost to affirming. It looks like we’ve taken the “just imagine it would happen” view of fiat too literally. When the security guard imagines how great it’d be for their co-worker to stop their rampage on their own, the security guard doesn’t also need to believe that the chance of that happening is actually guaranteed. Of course the security guard can agree the co-worker would be the ideal actor; this just has no bearing on what to do. Fiating a States CP can only tell us it’d be good for the states to act[4]. But **given that it surely won’t happen, a States CP doesn’t change the calculation of whether the USFG should act**. We should be cautious about deferring to conventions of fiat over what seems to us to be the case in the security guard example. Jacob Nails offers insight here:[5] **“I won’t,” does not refute “you should.” … with or without an agreed upon convention of fiat…. Attempting to directly justify or indict a debate practice by direct appeal to fiat puts the cart before the horse**. There is no rule of fiat governing debates, over and above other considerations. It should be possible to drop the reference to debate fiat and make the same argument appealing to logic directly. After all, fiat is itself grounded in the logical principles of decision-making. If this task cannot be accomplished, the debater has most likely snuck some additional assumption into their notion of fiat that does not belong. Let’s abandon a misguided view of fiat, not a basic intuition. **When the ideal actor won’t act, the non-ideal actor must**. SK

## 1AR v Topicality

### 1AR v Substantive Engagement

#### A. Your focus on your own ability to substantively engage bites into Giroux who criticizes focus on the self through personal safety which is exactly what you are doing by protecting yourself from losing the round by calling me unfair –this destroys social reciprocity which link turns your fairness voter as there will never be equal access in society which also outweighs on real world applicability – that’s Giroux ’15.

#### B. Your implication for the shell of (drop the argument/drop the debater) is definitely not consistent with your idea of substantive engagement. If I am really denying your ability to substantively engage then you should read whatever better (topical/theoretically viable) version of the aff as a counterplan instead of saying that I should be punished – this sort of punishment is what leads to the disposability of positions and ideas and people which doesn’t advance the end goal of the aff of finding a solution to youth violence.

#### C. 1AC comes prior – the existence of youth violence and the fear of violence is what destroys your ability to engage in the first place – you are too afraid of exploring new areas of literature that will give you access to answer the aff because they are considered “too radical” or “not good” – the whole point of the 1AC is that we destroy the fear of violence which means I have long term solvency – if the aff happens then people will be able to engage and think of new ways of engaging creatively in the future.

## 1AR v Theory

### 1AR v General

Overview – there are two dropped implications out of the 1AC which both take out theory and link into the judges role in the round as contextualized by the 1AC. This necessitates that **(a)** the 1AC framework must always come before theory as we have to evaluate the 1AC before determining whether or not to accept your starting point of theory and **(b)** the two kritiks function as offense on the prefiat layer – they demonstrate why your act of reading theory is proactively bad.

#### Extend Giroux ’15 – here’s the first link – theory drives the fear of punishment for insubordination or going outside the boundaries of what is deemed appropriate for kritikal engagement. This is exactly what drives the logic of someone else taking away the rights of youth *and* is a form of metaphysical violence against youth by cutting off their avenues for participation. Multiple impacts from the evidence.

A. This validates the destruction of social reciprocity as people become focused on themselves rather than others which link turns your fairness voter as there will never be equal access in society which also outweighs on real world applicability.

B. The fear of punishment facilitates dominant power who exercise violence against those who “don’t matter” which renders them disposable – this is the ultimate form of violence which outweighs under the 1AC framework.

#### Extend Giroux ’15 – the second link is that theory which creates rules or norms is a disciplinary force which attempts to limit what is possible within the educational space. This limits the capacity for critical thinking. Two impacts:

A. Destroys the ability for social activism which outweighs in the long term – even if you claim some impossibility to engage within this round, your norm of setting boundaries destroys critical thinking in the long run, which is key to solving real world issues.

B. Violates the 1AC Framework – you support the normalization of youth into violent structures by denying them the way to break out – the logic that justifies the boundary-setting of theory justifies the repressiveness of the state.

#### These arguments also function as permutations on theory – only after destroying the fear of normalization into basic structures and the fear of punishment can we evaluate your theoretical considerations.

#### And – these warrants about rules and norms and disciplinary forces being bad are conceded out of the 1AC – no new responses in the 2 NR.

My opponent will say that there is implicit clash between theory and the Giroux evidence but that is not sufficient – my opponent actually has to answer the most important framing piece of evidence coming out of the 1AC.

## 1AR Evidence Comparison

### Sheley and Wright

#### Extend Kennedy – private gun ownership through the legal market drives the illegal market as illegal guns get diverted from the legal market in the first place – we solve root cause

#### Extend Kennedy 2 – drug gangs increasingly recruit adolescents who have guns and guns sustain drug gang power allowing them to indoctrinate more youth – this proves a reverse causal chain.

#### Prefer Sheley and Wright who are the core of Kennedy’s meta-analysis – they are the best study in the field on juvenile gun acquisition and causes of youth gun violence.

Webster et al ’15, [YOUTH ACQUISITION AND CARRYING OF FIREARMS IN THE UNITED STATES: PATTERNS, CONSEQUENCES, AND STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTION\* Daniel W. Webster, ScD, MPH John Speed Meyers, MPA Shani Buggs, MPH Center for Gun Policy and Research Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. SK]

**This** broad **category refers to in-depth interviews and questionnaires** targeted at delinquent youth, often incarcerated, that elicit information about the guns the youth previously acquired, the method by which the gun was acquired, and the actual source of the gun. Joseph **Sheley** **and** James **Wright** **pioneered the use of this source to study firearm acquisition** in their early 1990’s study of male serious offenders in juvenile correction facilities and male students in inner-city high schools with a history of violent incidents near the correctional facilities.5 **This sampling design was meant to capture those most at-risk of gun-related behaviors.** Another survey provides a similar data source. The Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities (SISCF) provides a nationally representative sample of inmates in state prisons, including individuals who commit serious crimes as juveniles.6 A study of New Mexico juvenile delinquents performs a similar function but for a smaller population.7 These **large-scale surveys provide systematic, representative data on the methods and sources of firearm 3 acquisition**. Their data, generally speaking, illuminate the methods and sources that juveniles use to acquire firearms. The pathways that these guns took since illegal diversion, however, remain obscure in these studies. Offenders themselves likely do not even know the origins, much less the intervening owners, of their firearms. There are also more idiosyncratic, though richer, sources in this category. One such source is **open-ended interviews with delinquents in Maryland juvenile detention centers**. **These** thorough **interviews allowed researchers to understand the differences in method and source of acquisition between a juvenile’s first firearm and more recent firearms, an advantage not shared by other studies**.

#### And, consistent empirics and meta-analyses confirm their analysis – outweighs on timeframe, reliability, consistency and thoroughness

Webster et al ’15, [YOUTH ACQUISITION AND CARRYING OF FIREARMS IN THE UNITED STATES: PATTERNS, CONSEQUENCES, AND STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTION\* Daniel W. Webster, ScD, MPH John Speed Meyers, MPA Shani Buggs, MPH Center for Gun Policy and Research Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. SK]

Scholars have extensively debated the relative importance of different diversion channels that eventually serve the youth gun market. Based on Sheley and Wright’s large-scale survey of juvenile offenders and at-risk youth, early scholarship emphasized theft. Though this survey data provided only indirect data on the diversion stage of the gun market, researchers inferred that theft likely served as the most important conduit of guns possessed by youth.5 **A recent report based on data from the** National Crime Victimization Survey (**NCVS**) **found that** during the years 2005-2010, an average of 5 172,040 **firearms** per year **were stolen from private residences, vehicles, or directly from residents.**14 This estimate is down substantially from NCVS estimates of guns stolen per year at roughly 500,000 during the mid-1990s when gun ownership levels and crime rates were both much higher.3 Importantly, there has also been research into the size of this stage of the market. Some might reasonably wonder if there truly is a black market for youth seeking guns in the United States, a country where high firearm ownership rates potentially spell easy access, making a black market search unnecessary. Department of Justice data from the Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities (SISCF) suggests that youth in the United States do indeed turn to a firearms black market. **Webster** and colleagues **analyzed data on offender handgun acquisition** from the SISCF for offenders who had used a firearm when committing the crime for which they were incarcerated.4 When those data are broken down by the age of the offender at the time of the offense, just under half of youth (**46.7%** of youth under age 18 years and 47.7% of youth ages 18-20 years) **acquired the handgun from “the street** or black market” **and** just over a third (**37.5%** for those under age 18 years and 35% for those ages 18-20 years) **acquired their handgun from a friend or family member**. Table 1. Source of handgun by age at current offense (SISCF Data) The national survey data from the SISCF found that 37% of youthful gun offenders acquired the handguns they used in sales, trades, or loans from friends or family members. **This is very similar to what Sheley and Wright found in their survey** of Less than 18 (n=317) Ages 18-20 (n=325) N % n % FFL 8 2.5 28 8.6 Friends/ Family Member 119 37.5 114 35.1 Street/ Black Market 148 46.7 155 47.7 Gun Show/ Flea Market 1 0.3 4 1.2 Stolen/ Victim 41 12.9 24 7.4 6 incarcerated juveniles.3 The late 1990s study of detained juvenile delinquents in New Mexico reported that 58% of their interviewees acquired a gun from a friend, parent, or relative.5 Similarly, interviews from the early 2000’s with Maryland youth delinquents revealed that family and friends served as an important source of acquisition for a youth’s first gun, though later guns were more likely to be acquired from other sources. SK

## Methodology

### M – Arrendano

**APPENDIX A: GUN PROGRAMS**

**Crisis Intervention and Counseling Programs (From Table 1)**

Drive-By-Agony Lynwood, CA (310) 537-8018 www.drive-by-agony.org

Kids Alive and Loved (KAL) Atlanta, GA (404) 727-4437 www.sph.emory.edu/bshe/imhr/prevention.html

HELP for Survivors Chicago, IL (312) 879-7920 www.childmmc.edu/help/survivor.htm

Save Our Sons and Daughters (SOSAD) Detroit, MI (313) 361-5200

**Hospital-Based Prevention Programs (From Table 2)**

Hospital-Based Youth Violence Intervention Boston, MA (617) 534-5196

People Opening the World's Eye to Reality (P.O.W.E.R.) Brooklyn, NY (718) 574-5100

Hospital-Based Youth Violence Prevention Program Trauma Unit Tour Camden, NJ (No longer in operation)

Shock Mentor Program Prince George's Hospital Center Cheverly, MD (301) 618-3751

**Community-Based Youth Outreach (From Table 3)**

East Bay Gun Violence Prevention Project Oakland, CA (510) 832-7071

Hands Without Guns Washington, DC (202) 544-2637 www.handswithoutguns.org

Hands Without Guns Boston, MA (617) 542-7712 www.handswithoutguns.org

MAD DADS Omaha, NE (402) 451-3500 www.maddadsnational.com

Hands Without Guns Chicago, IL (312) 879-7923 www.handswithoutguns.org

Youth, Firearms and Violence in Atlanta Atlanta, GA (404) 727-5481

Hands Without Guns Holland, MI (616) 494-2637 www.handswithoutguns.org
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**Law Enforcement Strategies (From Table 4)**

Assault Crisis Teams St. Louis, MO (314) 516-5038

National Gun Buyback Program Atlanta, GA (No longer in operation)

Boston Gun Project Cambridge, MA (617) 495-5188

Operation Cease Fire: Denver Nuggets Gun Buyback Denver, CO (303) 893-6700

Gun Court Providence, RI (401) 222-3215

Philadelphia Firearms Trafficking Task Force Philadelphia, PA (215) 597-3059

Gun Suppression Program Kansas City, MO (No longer in operation)

Project LIFE (Lasting Intense Firearms Education) Indianapolis, IN (317) 924-7440

Handgun Intervention Program Detroit, MI (313) 965-3724

Saint Louis Police Department Gun Buyback Saint Louis, MO (314) 444-5321

Juvenile Diversion Program: Firearm Awareness and Safety Training Tucson, AZ (Unable to contact - March 1999)

Saint Paul Police Department Youth Gun Project Saint Paul, MN (612) 292-3613

Juvenile Weapons Court - Brooklyn, NY New York, NY (No longer in operation)

Save Our Streets Program Washington, DC (202) 293-0388

Kansas City Weed and Seed Program Kansas City, MO (No longer in operation)

Seattle Gun Buyback Seattle, WA (206) 684-7555

**Neighborhood Programs (From Table 5)**

Safe Homes and Havens Program Violent Injury Prevention Center Chicago, IL (773) 880-2192 www.childrensmemorial.org/cmhweb/cmhotherdepts/advocacy/vipc/vipcsafe.htm

Safe Kids/Healthy Neighborhoods Injury Prevention Program New York, NY (212) 939-1426
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**Family Gun Violence Prevention Programs (From Table 6)**

Blue Oaks Home Firearm Safety Course Chandler, AZ (602) 897-0909 www.blueoaks.com/courses.htm

Home Firearm Safety Course Colorado Springs Police Department Colorado Springs, CO (No longer in operation)

Colorado Medical Society Task Force on Youth Englewood, CO (303) 930-0407

Polymath Enterprises' Home Firearm Safety Class P.O. Box 3706 Winnetka, CA 91396-3706 www.babcom.com/polymath/hfsc.htm

A Gentle Touch: 10 Step Violence Prevention Curriculum Englewood, CO (303) 220-9200

Steps to Prevent Firearm Injury (STOP) and STOP II Center to Prevent Handgun Violence Washington, DC (202) 289-7319 www.handguncontrol.org

**School-Based Curricula (From Table 7)**

Eddie Eagle Gun Safety Program/National Rifle Association Fairfax, VA (800) 231-0752 www.nrahq.org/safety/eddie

Oklahoma State Department of Health School Safety Curriculum Oklahoma City, OK (405) 271-3430

Firearm Injury Prevention Curriculum NM Emergency Medical Services for Children Albuquerque, NM (505) 272-5062

Options, Choices and Consequences Seattle Police Department Crime Prevention Section Seattle, WA (206) 386-9766

Gun Safety Awareness Program Dade County Public Schools Miami, FL (305) 757-0514

Solutions Without Guns or Violence: Peacemaker Program The Gun Safety Institute Cleveland, OH (216) 623-1111

Handgun Violence Reduction Program Baltimore County Police Department Towson, MD (410) 887-2214

Straight Talk About Risks (STAR) Center to Prevent Handgun Violence Washington, DC (202) 289-7319 www.handguncontrol.org

Making the Peace Curriculum Oakland Men's Project Oakland, CA (510) 835-2433

Reading, Writing and Weapons Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Brookfield, WI (414) 783-5787

No Guns For Me! Options, Inc. Merrimack, NH (800) 782-7300

Safe Alternatives and Violence Education (SAVE) San Jose Police Department San Jose, CA (408) 277-4133 www.sccoe.k12.ca.us/savejpd.htm
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**School-Based Curricula (Continued)**

Think First for Kids Park Ridge, IL (847) 692-2740 www.thinkfirst.org

Violence Prevention Curriculum Little Rock, AR (501) 324-2162

Tragic Consequences: Teenagers and Guns Niles, IL (800) 424-0362 www.unitedlearning.com

Virginia Youth Violence Project Charlottesville, VA (804) 924-8929 curry.edschool.virginia.edu/curry/centers/youthvio

**Counseling and Academic Services for Suspended Youth (From Table 8)**

Boston Public Schools Counseling and Intervention Center Jamaica Plain, MA (617) 635-8123

Second Chance School Topeka, KS (785) 232-0551

Hazelwood Center High School Student Intervention Program Florissant, MO (314) 839-9500

**School-Based Gun Violence Awareness Programs (From Table 9)**

Build the Missing Peace Cloverly, MD (No longer in operation)

Kelsey's Pizzaria School Gun Program Orlando, FL (No longer in operation)

GRIEF - Gun Responsibility in Every Family Naugatuck, CT (203) 729-3636

Student Pledge Against Gun Violence Northfield, MN (507) 645-5378 www.pledge.org

Guns, Teens, and Consequences Tulsa, OK (918) 746-6450

Students Against Handgun Abuse Baltimore, MD (410) 889-1477

Gunwise: Wake Up America Program University of Utah, Department of Pediatrics Salt Lake City, UT (801) 588-2293 or (801) 982-1241

Weapons Are Removed Now (WARN) Reseda High School Reseda, CA (818) 342-6186

**School Enforcement Strategies (From Table 10)**

New York City Metal Detector Program New York, NY (718) 935-2000

Weapon Watch Memphis, TN (901) 325-4240

State Attorney General's Law Enforcement Task Force Trenton, NJ (609) 984-6500

Zero Tolerance Program San Diego, CA (619) 293-8050
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**Peer Group Intervention and Prevention Efforts (From Table 11)**

Caught in the Crossfire Oakland, CA (510) 444-6191 ext. 303 www.dreamtek.com/Youth\_ALIVE/crossfire.html

Teens on Target (TNT) - Los Angeles Downey, CA (310) 940-7847 www.dreamtek.com/Youth\_ALIVE/tnt.html

Keep Our Kids Alive (KOKA) New York, NY (No longer in operation)

Teens on Target (TNT) - Oakland Oakland, CA (510) 444-6191 ext. 303 www.dreamtek.com/Youth\_ALIVE/tnt.html

Pioneers for Peace Rehabilitation Institute of Michigan Detroit, MI (313) 745-5053

"Words Not Weapons" Massachusetts Department of Public Health Boston, MA (617) 624-5433

**Gun Violence Research Organizations and Centers**

Center to Prevent Handgun Violence (CPHV) Washington, DC (202) 289-7319 www.handguncontrol.org

Minnesota Center Against Violence & Abuse (MINCAVA) Saint Paul, MN (612) 624-0721 www.mincava.umn.edu

Firearm Injury Center Medical College of Wisconsin Milwaukee, WI (414) 257-5576 www.mcw.edu/fic

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Atlanta, GA (770) 488-1506 www.cdc.gov/ncipc

Harborview Injury Prevention and Resource Center Seattle, WA (206) 521-1520 weber.u.washington.edu/~hiprc

Pacific Center for Violence Prevention San Francisco, CA (415) 285-1793 www.pcvp.org

Harvard Injury Control Research Center Boston, MA (617) 432-2123 hsphsun2.harvard.edu/Organizations/hcra/hicc.html

Violence Policy Center Washington, DC (202) 822-8200 www.vpc.org

Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research Baltimore, MD (410) 955-3995 www.jhsph.edu/gunpolicy

Violence Prevention Research Program University of California, Davis Sacramento, CA (916) 734-3539 web.ucdmc.ucdavis.edu/vprp
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**National Coalitions and Public Awareness Campaigns**

Anti Violence Campaign International Health and Epidemiology Research Center Sherman Oaks, CA (818) 788-2662

Mothers Against Violence in America (MAVIA) Seattle, WA (206) 323-2303 or (800) 897-7697 www.mavia.org

Ceasefire Action Network (CAN) Washington, DC (202) 530-5888 www.gunfree.org

McGrufff Handgun Violence Prevention Campaign National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) Washington, DC (202) 466-6272 www.ncpc.org

Cease Fire, Inc. Washington, DC (202) 429-1741 www.ceasefire.org

National SAFE KIDS Campaign Washington, DC (202) 662-0600 www.safekids.org

Coalition to Stop Gun Violence (CSGV) Washington, DC (202) 530-0340 www.gunfree.org

PAX: Gun Violence Awareness New York, NY (212) 254-5300 www.paxusa.org

Educational Fund to End Handgun Violence (EFEHV) Washington, DC (202) 530-5888 www.gunfree.org

Project Lifeline Center to Prevent Handgun Violence (CPHV) Washington, DC (202) 289-7319 www.handguncontrol.org

HELP Network (Handgun Epidemic Lowering Plan) Chicago, IL (773) 880-3826 www.childmmc.edu/help/helphome.htm

Safe Start Campaign Children’s Defense Fund Washington, DC (202) 628-8787 www.childrensdefense.org/safestart.html

Handgun Control, Inc. (HCI) Washington, DC (202) 898-0792 www.handguncontrol.org

The Silent March Against Gun Violence Brooklyn, NY (516) 247-9101

Join Together Boston, MA (617) 437-1500 www.jointogether.org

Target Guns - Physicians for Social Responsibility Washington, DC (202) 898-0150 www.psr.org

Mothers Against Violence Fairfield, AL (205) 785-6765

72

**State Coalitions and Public Awareness Campaigns**

**Alabama**

Coalition to Decrease Firearm Violence Vestavia Hills, AL (205) 979-2999

**Arizona**

Arizona Lawyer’s Committee on Violence Tucson, AZ (520) 628-8300

Handgun Control Activists 3617 Camino Real Glendale, AZ 89310

**California**

Californians for Responsible Gun Laws Berkeley, CA (510) 649-8946 www.gunlaws.org

Handgun Control, Inc. – Sacramento Sacramento, CA (916) 492-9797

Contra Costa Coalition to Prevent Gun Violence Walnut Creek, CA (510) 313-6808 www.planeteria.net/home/cccpgv

Prevent Handgun Violence Against Kids San Rafael, CA (415) 331-3337

Gun Violence Task Force Coalition for a Nonviolent City Pasadena, CA (213) 254-2274

Handgun Control, Inc. San Diego Committee Against Handgun Violence San Diego, CA (619) 235-9167

Orange County Citizens for the Prevention of Gun Violence Mission Viejo, CA (714) 888-8740 members.aol.com/stopgunvio

Legal Community Against Violence (LCAV) San Francisco, CA (415) 433-2062 www.lcav.org

Handgun Control, Inc. – Western Regional Office Los Angeles, CA (310) 446-0056

Women Against Gun Violence Los Angeles, CA (310) 204-2348

**Colorado**

Colorado Coalition Against Gun Violence Denver, CO (303) 298-8001

**Connecticut**

Connecticut Collaborative for Education Against Gun Violence Southport, CT (203) 637-2694
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**Florida**

Florida Coalition to Stop Gun Violence Dania, FL (954) 989-9374

**Georgia**

Georgians Against Gun Violence, Inc. Marietta, GA (404) 521-3605 www.gagv.org

"Not Even One" Program (NEO) The Carter Center Atlanta, GA (404) 420-3870

Georgians United Against Gun Violence Atlanta, GA (404) 699-0708

**Hawaii**

Hawaii Firearms Coalition Kaneohe, HI (808) 235-4222

Hawaii Firearms Control Coalition Honolulu, HI (808) 586-5940

**Illinois**

On Target Coalition Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence (ICHV) Chicago, IL (312) 341-0939 www.ichv.org

Quad Citizens for Responsible Gun Laws Rock Island, IL (319) 322-1240

**Indiana**

Concerned Citizens About Gun Violence Indianapolis, IN (317) 940-9682

**Iowa**

Iowans for the Prevention of Gun Violence Iowa City, IA (319) 887-1188

**Kansas**

Kansas Safe State Wichita, KS (316) 264-9303

Kansans for Handgun Control Shawnee Mission, KS (913) 369-5499

**Kentucky**

Kentuckian’s Chapter for Handgun Control Louisville, KY (502) 894-9050
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**Louisiana**

Louisiana Ceasefire Baton Rouge, LA (504) 766-6432

**Maryland**

Marylanders Against Handgun Abuse Education Fund Baltimore, MD (410) 889-1477

**Massachusetts**

City-Wide Violence Prevention Task Force Department of Health and Human Services Springfield, MA (413) 787-6710 www.increasethepeace.org

Teens Against Gang Violence (TAGV) Dorchester, MA (617) 282-9569 www.tagv.org

Stop Handgun Violence, Inc. Newton, MA (617) 243-8174

**Michigan**

Michigan Citizens for Handgun Control Birmingham, MI (810) 540-6868

Women Against Gun Violence Farmington Hills, MI (810) 661-2030

Michigan Partnership to Prevent Gun Violence East Lansing, MI (517) 332-4299 www.mppgv.org

**Minnesota**

Citizens for a Safer Minnesota (CSM) Saint Paul, MN (612) 292-8698

Unload It & Lock It Campaign Minneapolis, MN (612) 378-1875

Minnesota Gun Violence Action Team Saint Paul, MN (612) 266-8354

Violence-Free Duluth Gun Circle Duluth, MN (218) 726-2067

**Missouri**

Coalition Against Concealed Guns Charles, MO (314) 946-2657

Missourians Against Handgun Violence Saint Louis, MO (314) 997-6301

Missourians Against Handgun Violence Kansas City , MO (816) 855-1721
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**Nebraska**

Nebraskans for Responsible Gun Ownership Omaha, NE (402) 334-8944

**New Hampshire**

Seacoast Advocates for Gun Control New Hampshire Ceasefire Rye, NH (603) 964-9079

**New Jersey**

Cease Fire New Jersey Trenton, NJ (609) 396-7044

**New Mexico**

Ceasefire New Mexico Santa Fe, NM (505) 982-8336

**New York**

Handgun Control, Inc. of New York New York, NY (212) 873-3361

New Yorkers Against Gun Violence (NYAGV) New York, NY (212) 674-3710 www.nyagv.org

**North Carolina**

North Carolinians Against Gun Violence (NCGV) Education Fund Chapel Hill, NC (919) 403-7665 www.ncgv.org

**Ohio**

ANDREW Toledo, OH (419) 474-6902

**Oregon**

Oregonians Against Gun Violence Portland, OR (503) 233-1224

Oregon Safe Storage Coalition Portland, OR (503) 261-2822
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**Pennsylvania**

Pennsylvanians Against Handgun Violence Wynnewood, PA (888) 444-7248 www.pahv.org

**Tennessee**

Tennesseans for Responsible Gun Ownership 2504 Forestglen Circle Clarksville, TN 37043

**Texas**

Texans Against Gun Violence (TAGV) - Austin Austin, TX (512) 473-9100

Zero Accidental Killings 2411 Fountainview, Suite 170 Houston, TX 77057

Texans Against Gun Violence (TAGV) - Greater Houston Chapter Houston, TX (713) 827-8916 www.insync.net/~tagvhou

**Utah**

Utahns Against Gun Violence Salt Lake City, UT (801) 328-4930 www.inconnect.com/~uagv

**Vermont**

Vermonters Against Violence South Burlington, VT (802) 864-4677

**Virginia**

Virginians Against Handgun Violence (VAHV) Richmond, VA (804) 649-8752 www.vahv.org

**Washington**

Safe Storage Coalition Harborview Injury Prevention and Research Center Seattle, WA (206) 521-1524

Washington Cease Fire/Ceasefire Foundation of Washington Seattle, WA (206) 322-1236 www.waceasefire.org
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**APPENDIX B: SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS**

**School-Based Suicide Prevention Programs (From Table 12)**

Gryphon Place Kalamazoo, MI (616) 381-1510 www.gryphon.org

Suicide Prevention/Crisis Support of Alameda County Teen For Life Project Berkeley, CA 94709 (510) 848-1515

Project SOAR Dallas, TX (214) 989-8200

Team Up To Save Lives Institute for Juvenile Research Chicago, IL 60612 (312) 996-9170

San Francisco Youth Suicide/Risk Reduction Curriculum San Francisco, CA (415) 984-1902

Teen Outreach Program Suicide Prevention Service of Santa Cruz Santa Cruz, CA (408) 459-9373

**Community-Based Suicide Prevention Programs (From Table 13)**

Alaska Community-Based Suicide Prevention Program Alaska Department of Health & Social Services Juneau, AK (800) 478-2072 or (907) 465-4894

Rush Youth Suicide Prevention Program Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke’s Medical Center Chicago, IL (312) 563-2550

American Association of Suicidology Washington, DC (202) 237-2286

Speak Out For Kids Campaign Acadia Hospital Youth Suicide Prevention Task Force Bangor, ME (207) 973-6166

Arkansas Youth Suicide Prevention Program Little Rock, AR (800) 448-3014 or (501) 682-1323

Suicide Prevention Services of Sacramento Sacramento, CA (916) 368-3324

Community Action for Youth Survival - Suicide Institute for Juvenile Research University of Illinois at Chicago Chicago, IL (312) 996-1666

Washington State Youth Suicide Prevention Program Olympia, WA (360) 236-3675 depts.washington.edu/ysp

International Association for Suicide Prevention - Means Restriction Advocacy Rush Center for Suicide Research & Prevention Chicago, IL 60612 (312) 942-7208

Youth Suicide Prevention Project Bothell, WA (No longer in operation)

The Link Counseling Center, Inc. Suicide Prevention & Aftercare Atlanta, GA (404) 256-9797 www.thelink.org
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**Suicide Research Organizations**

American Association of Suicidology (ASA) Washington, DC (202) 237-2280 www.suicidology.org

Suicide Information and Education Center (SIEC) Calgary, Alberta, Canada (403) 245-0299 www.siec.ca

American Foundation for Suicide Prevention (AFSP) New York, NY (888) 333-2377 www.afsp.org

79

**APPENDIX C: TYPES OF SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS\***

School Gatekeeper Training: This type of program is directed at school staff (teachers, counselors, coaches, etc.) to help them identify students at risk of suicide and refer such students for help. These programs also teach staff how to respond in cases of a tragic death or other crisis in the school.

Community Gatekeeper Training: This type of gatekeeper program provides training to community members such as clergy, police, merchants, and recreation staff. This training is designed to help these people identify youths at risk of suicide and refer them for help.

General Suicide Education: These school-based programs provide students with facts about suicide, alert them to suicide warning signs, and provide them with information about how to seek help for themselves or for others. These programs often incorporate a variety of self-esteem or social competency development activities.

Screening Programs: Screening involves administration of an instrument to identify high-risk youth in order to provide more thorough assessment and treatment for a smaller, targeted population.

Peer Support Programs: These programs, which can be conducted in either school or non-school settings, are designed to foster peer relationships, competency development, and social skills as a method to prevent suicide among high-risk youth.

Crisis Centers and Hotlines: These programs primarily provide emergency counseling for suicidal people. Hotlines are usually staffed by trained volunteers. Some programs offer a “drop-in” crisis center and referral to traditional mental health services.

Means Restriction: This prevention strategy consists of activities designed to restrict access to firearms, drugs, and other common means of committing suicide.

Intervention After a Suicide: Strategies have been developed to cope with the crisis sometimes caused by one or more youth suicides in a community. They are designed in part to help prevent or contain suicide clusters and to help youth effectively cope with feelings of loss that come with the sudden death or suicide of a peer. Preventing further suicides is but one of several goals of intervention made with friends and relatives of a suicide victim - so-called “postvention” efforts.

\* Reprinted from: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (1992). Youth Suicide Prevention Programs: A Resource Guide. Atlanta, GA: Author.
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**APPENDIX D**

**Focus Group Consent Forms**

Adult Participants

Parent Consent for Youth Participants

Youth Participants
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**Youth and Guns Focus Group Discussion: Adult Consent Form**

You are invited to participate in a focus group discussion on youth and guns in Colorado. A focus group discussion is a guided group interview with a facilitator who will ask questions and an assistant who will take notes and tape record the discussion. The Youth and Guns Project is being conducted by the University of Colorado to gather information about youth access to handguns, carrying handguns, and using handguns in attempted or completed suicide, homicide, or gun injuries to others.

Participation in the project will have no known direct benefit to you, but the information gained could help determine the seriousness of the youth handgun violence problem in Colorado and inform future efforts to prevent or reduce it.

The focus group discussion will last about one hour. We will ask your opinion about youth and handguns. Topics such as the following will be discussed: The magnitude of the problem in your community, the kinds of youth involved with handgun violence, how they access handguns, circumstances for carrying and using handguns, what can be done about the problem, obstacles to doing so, and any other general perceptions you might have about youth and handguns.

There is little risk to you from participating in this study besides the potential discomfort of discussing unpleasant issues. Furthermore, we are interested in general themes coming out of focus groups discussions across the state. All information will be presented in summary form so that nothing can be traced to specific groups or individuals. Tape recordings of the discussion will be transcribed, and any identifying information will be deleted. Once they have been transcribed, the tapes will be destroyed. This will protect the confidentiality of all information collected.

If you decide to participate, please know that your participation is voluntary. You can withdraw your consent or cancel your participation in the focus group at any time. You also can refuse to answer any question(s) for any reason.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant, any concerns regarding this project, or any dissatisfaction with any aspect of this study, you may report them, confidentially if you wish, to:

Executive Secretary, Human Research Committee, Graduate School, Campus Box 26, Regent 208, University of Colorado - Boulder, Boulder CO 80309-0026 or by telephone to (303) 492-7401. Copies of the University of Colorado Assurance of Compliance to the federal government regarding research involving human subjects are available upon request from the Graduate School address listed. You also may contact the research director of this study: Dr. Kirk R. Williams, Professor and Associate Director, Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0442 (303- 492-1032). (also local contact person when identified)

Thank you for your consideration of this important study.

**I understand the above information and voluntarily consent to participate in the focus group discussions, as part of the Youth and Guns Project.**

Yes\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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**Youth and Guns Focus Group Discussion: Parental Consent Form**

Your child has been asked to participate in a focus group discussion on youth and guns in this state. A focus group discussion is a guided group interview with a facilitator who will ask questions and an assistant who will take notes and tape record the discussion. The Youth and Guns Project is being conducted by the University of Colorado to gather information about youth access to handguns, carrying handguns, and using handguns in attempted or completed suicide, homicide, or gun injuries to others.

The purpose of the study is to gather information about how youth access handguns, why they carry handguns, and the circumstances in which they use handguns, including attempted or completed suicide, homicide, or gun injuries to others.

Participation in the project will have no known direct personal benefits to your child, but the information gained could help determine the seriousness of the youth handgun violence problem in Colorado and inform future efforts to prevent or reduce it.

The focus group discussion will last about one hour. We will ask questions about topics such as: The seriousness of the problem in your community, the types of youth involved, how they access handguns, circumstances in which they carry or use handguns, what can be done about the problem, obstacles in doing so, and other general perceptions about youth and handguns.

There is very little risk involved with participating in the focus group, besides the potential discomfort of discussing unpleasant issues. Furthermore, we are interested in general themes coming out of focus group discussions across the state. All information will be presented in summary form so that nothing can be traced to specific groups or individuals. Tape recordings of the discussion will be transcribed, and any identifying information will be deleted. Once they have been transcribed, the tapes will be destroyed. This will protect the confidentiality of all information collected.

If you decide to allow your child to participate, please know that his or her participation is voluntary. Your child can choose to withdraw consent or cancel participation in the focus group at any time. Your child can also refuse to answer any question(s) for any reason.

If you have questions regarding your child’s rights as a participant, any concerns regarding this project, or any dissatisfaction with any aspect of this study, you may report them, confidentially if you wish, to:

Executive Secretary, Human Research Committee, Graduate School, Campus Box 26, Regent 308, University of Colorado - Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309-0026 or by telephone to (303) 492-7401. Copies of the University of Colorado Assurance of Compliance to the federal government regarding research involving human subjects are available upon request from the Graduate School address listed. You also may contact the research director of this study: Dr. Kirk R. Williams, Professor and Associate Director, Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0442 (303- 492-1032). (also local contact person when identified)

**Thank you for your consideration of this important study. I understand the above information and give consent for my child to participate in the focus group discussions, as part of the Youth and Guns Project.**

Yes\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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**Youth and Guns Focus Group Discussion: Youth Consent Form**

You are invited to be a part of a focus group discussion on youth and handgun violence in Colorado. A focus group discussion is a guided group interview with a facilitator who will ask questions and an assistant who will take notes and tape record the discussion. The Youth and Guns Project is being conducted by the University of Colorado to gather information about youth access to handguns, carrying handguns, and using handguns in attempted or completed suicide, homicide, or gun injuries to others.

This is part of a study being conducted by the University of Colorado – Boulder. If you want to participate, you must first take a parental consent form home to get permission from your parent or guardian. He or she must read and sign the form, and you must return it to the scheduled time and place of the meeting. You also must sign THIS form yourself and return it with the parental consent form if you want to participate in the focus group discussion.

The focus group discussion will last about one hour. We will be covering topics such as: The seriousness of the youth handgun violence problem in your community, the types of youth involved, how they get handguns, the situations in which they carry or use them, what can be done about the problem, things that may stand in the way of doing so, and any other general ideas you may have on this topic.

There is very little risk involved with participating in the focus group, besides the potential discomfort of discussing youth handgun violence. We are interested in general themes coming out of focus group discussions held across the state. If you choose to be involved, please know that your participation is voluntary. You can change your mind about participating or quit at anytime. You also can refuse to answer any questions for any reason. Every effort will be made to make sure that no comments will be linked to specific groups or individuals. All information will be presented in summary form. Tape recordings of the discussion will be transcribed, and any identifying information will be deleted. Once they have been transcribed, the tapes will be destroyed. This will protect the confidentiality of all information collected.

Your involvement will help us understand the seriousness of the youth handgun violence problem in the state and what can be done to reduce or stop it. Thank you for considering this important study.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant, any concerns regarding this project, or any dissatisfaction with any aspect of this study, you may report them, confidentially if you wish, to:

Executive Secretary, Human Research Committee, Graduate School, Campus Box 26, Regent 308, University of Colorado - Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309-0026 or by telephone to (303) 492-7401. Copies of the University of Colorado Assurance of Compliance to the federal government regarding research involving human subjects are available upon request from the Graduate School address listed. You also may contact the research director of this study: Dr. Kirk R. Williams, Professor and Associate Director, Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0442 (303- 492-1032). (also local contact person when identified)

**I understand the above information and voluntarily agree to participate in the focus group discussion on youth and handgun violence in Colorado, as part of the Youth and Guns Project.**

Yes\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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**APPENDIX E: A STUDY OF YOUTH HANDGUN VIOLENCE**

**Background:**

Nationally, from 1984 to 1993, there has been a 465% increase in handgun homicides among youth ages 15 to 19. This rate has declined only slightly since 1993 and raises a couple of questions: How prevalent is youth handgun violence, including suicide, in Colorado? Are there promising strategies for eliminating or reducing youth handgun violence?

The Colorado Trust is interested in learning more about the issue and is funding a research effort to answer these questions. The research is being conducted by the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado at Boulder, in cooperation with the Centers for Public-Private Sector Cooperation, University of Colorado at Denver. This effort is one of many scanning efforts regularly conducted by the Colorado Trust to explore current issues related to the health and well- being of the people of Colorado.

**This research project WILL:**

♦ document the nature of the problem, both nationally and in Colorado; ♦ review existing prevention or intervention programs focusing on youth access to handguns,

carrying and using handguns; ♦ summarize results obtained from focus groups conducted across the state; and ♦ identify concrete and promising prevention or intervention efforts that can reduce youth

handgun violence in Colorado.

**This Research Project WILL NOT:**

♦ address the issue of handgun control; or ♦ advocate for or against any kind of handgun control policy or legislation.

Research: The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado at Boulder (CSPV), will conduct the study in cooperation with the Centers for Public-Private Sector Cooperation, University of Colorado at Denver (UCD). CSPV is a national center that conducts research, disseminates information and provides technical assistance on the causes and prevention of violence. The Center at UCD is the service and outreach arm of the Graduate School of Public Affairs.

Funding: The Colorado Trust is a private foundation dedicated to the health and well-being of the people of Colorado. Through its mission, it supports the goals of accessible and affordable health care programs and the strengthening of families.
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**APPENDIX F: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL**

**Project Description**

▪ Nationally, from 1984 through 1993, there has been a 465% increase in handgun homicides among youth ages 15 to 19. This rate has declined only slightly since 1993 and raised a couple of questions: How prevalent is youth handgun violence, including suicide, in Colorado? Are there promising strategies for eliminating or reducing youth handgun violence?

▪ The Colorado Trust is interested in learning more about the issue and is funding a research effort to answer these questions. The research will be conducted by the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado at Boulder, in cooperation with the Center for Public-Private Sector Cooperation, University of Colorado at Denver. This effort is one of many scanning efforts regularly conducted by The Colorado Trust to explore current issues related to the health and well-being of the people of Colorado.

▪ The Research Project Will:

▪ Document the nature of the problem, both nationally and in Colorado;

▪ Review existing prevention or intervention programs focusing on youth access to handguns, carrying and using handguns;

▪ Summarize results obtained from focus groups conducted across the state; and

▪ Identify concrete and promising prevention or intervention efforts that can reduce youth handgun violence in Colorado.

▪ The Research Project Will Not:

▪ Address the issue of handgun control; or

▪ Advocate for or against any kind of handgun control policy or legislation.

**Research**

The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado at Boulder (CSPV), will conduct the study in cooperation with the Center for Public-Private Sector Cooperation, University of Colorado at Denver (UCD). CSPV is a national center that conducts research, disseminates information and provides technical assistance on the causes and prevention of violence. The Center at UCD is the service and outreach arm of the Graduate School of Public Affairs.

**Funding**

The Colorado Trust is a private foundation dedicated to the health and well-being of the people of Colorado. Through its mission, it supports the goals of accessible and affordable health programs and the strengthening of families.
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**Instructions**

**Guidelines**

1. No self-disclosure. Participants will be asked not to disclose any sensitive/incriminating

information that could be traced to them or identify themselves during the recording of focus group discussions.

2. No reporting about other named individuals. Participants will be asked not to mention

the names of any other individuals who may have been involved in handgun-related activities.

3. Only a thematic summary of results. Focus group data will be summarized to document themes cutting across the focus groups, without identification of a specific group or any specific individuals.

4. Tape-recorded sessions. Focus group meetings will be recorded, and all participants will be informed that this is being done in the instructions. The tapes will be transcribed then destroyed.

5. Ask them if they have any questions?

**Consent Forms**

6. Informed consent. All adult subjects and youth will be asked to complete a consent form, and parental consent forms will be obtained for all youth (high school students, typically 14-18 years of age) participating in the focus groups.

7. Standardized instructions and questions. Focus group protocols will include the instructions

covering points 1-3 and the focus group questions.

8. Tape-recorded sessions. Focus group meetings will be recorded, and all participants will be

informed that this is being done in the instructions.

9. Destruction of tapes. Tapes will be transcribed, and any identifying or incriminating information that perhaps may be divulged during the session, despite instructions to the contrary, will not be included in the transcriptions. Once the transcription process is completed, including any necessary deletion of identifying or incrimination comments, the tapes will be destroyed.
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**Youth Focus Group Questions**

1. How common is it for youth that you know to have access to handguns?

Possible probes:

• How many youth do you know who have access to handguns?

• Is it common among your friends?

• What about at your school?

2. Are certain kinds of youth more likely to have access to handguns?

Possible probes:

• What kinds? Tell me about these youth? What are their characteristics?

• Are they from certain neighborhoods/areas?

• Do they go to certain schools?

• How else would you describe them in general terms? Describe the kinds of youth that are more likely to have access to handguns?

3. How do youth in your community get access to handguns?

Possible probes:

• Do they get them from their homes?

• Do they buy them? Where?

• Do they steal them?

4. Why do you think these youth carry handguns?

Possible probes:

• Tell me more about that.

• Are there any other reasons these youth might carry handguns?

5. Under what circumstances do you think youth would, or do, use handguns? (Said

another way: Why do you think youth would, or do, use handguns?) When do you think youth would, or do, use handguns? Possible probes:

• Do you personally know of a situation in which a youth used a handgun?

• Can you describe it without identifying the people involved?

6. What do you think can be done in your community to reduce, or prevent, youth access to

handguns? Possible probes:

• What can be done to prevent youth from carrying handguns?

• What can be done to prevent them from using them?
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7. If you tried to do any of the things we just talked about, what obstacles do you think you

would face in your community (what do you think would get in the way of preventing youth from carrying handguns or from using them)? Possible probes:

• Do you think you could overcome (each) obstacle? How?

8. Is there anything else we should know about problem with youth and handguns in your

community, or how communities like yours might address these problems?
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### M – Northrop

#### This is the methodology for the study cited in Northrop which deals with why handguns disproportionately cause these harms: Bureau of Justice Statistics. June 1990. "Handgun Crime Victims." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

The data for this report for all crimes except homicide were obtained from the NCS for 1979 to 1987. Data for murder and nonnegllgent manslaughter were drawn from the UCR. In the NCS an average sample of 114,000 Individuals age 12 or older In 52,000 households were Interviewed twice a year about all crimes that they had experienced during the previous 6 months, Including any not reported to police. The crimes measured In this report are those In which the victim reported that the offender used a handgun to threaten, to shoot at, or to shoot the victim. To threaten Includes displaying the gun, waving or pointing it, and referring to it verbally. Definitions of some terms that are used In this report are as follows: Serious Injury -Injuries (1) thaI Involve gunshot or knife wounds, Internal injuries, broken bones, loss of consciousness, loss of teeth or (2) that are of an undetermined nature and required 2 or more days of hospitalization. Minor injury-Injuries (1) that Involve bruises, black eyes, cuts, scratches, swellIng or (2) that are of an undetermined nature and required less than 2 days of hospitalization. Some research suggests that the NCS may undercount the number of persons nonfatally injured by handguns. In a 1985 study of gunshot victimizations, Philip Cook calculated a gunshot death-to-injury rate from NCS data and UCR criminal homicide data, for 1973 to 1979. \* The rate was the ·PhilipJ. Cook, "The case of the missing victims: Gunshot woundlngs In the National Crime Survey" Journal of Quanlitaliv9 Criminology (1985) 1:91-102. Male Victims Female victims White Black White Black 3.5 27.2 1.0 4.2 .2 .4 .2 .4 .7 4.8 .5 .8 3.8 33.3 1.0 5.2 7.4 61.3 1.8 8.4 6.7 57.3 1.5 9.7 4.5 34.4 1.4 4.8 2.3 16.7 .8 2.0 1.0 10.0 .5 1.5 Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1986. number of UCR gun homicides divided by the sum of the NCS estimate of nonfatal gunshot victimizations and the UCR gun homicides. He compared this rate to similar rates constructed from small··area police data and to national data on the num-ber of police officers assaulted or killed. Cook found that the NCS-UCR death-toInjury rate indicated that 35% of all persons shot during a crime died from the attack; other studies cited by Cook Indicated that about 15% of all gunshot victims died. (NCS and UCR data for this report produce a rate of 38% for handguns. Cook's calculations Included ail types of guns.) Because Cook thought It unlikely that all the other studies were incorrect, he CO\1- cluded that the NCS underestimates nonfatal gunshot !.ryjurles. He presented two possible causes for the undercount: (1) Persons shot by relatives or while engaged In criminal activity may not report such injuries to NCS Interviewers; (2) persons most likely to be victims of serious violent crime - young males and persons not livIng In established households - are probably underrepresented in the NCS sample and therefore are never Interviewed. It could be argued that a rate of gunshot injuries to deaths based on police Injuries and deaths would be lower than such a ratio based on the general population because police officers are better prepared than civilians to defend themselves. Police officers' actions may divert the offenders' aim, and police officers are more likely than others to be wearing protective clothIng that would help te prevent fatal Injury. Because police officers are often accompanied and have communication and emergency procedures, when they are shot, they are likely to receive quicker 8 medical attention than other victims of gunshots. At present, however, there are no data that address these Issues of selfdefense and treatment. Even If Cook's conclusions and conjectures are correct, the NCS, while failing to count everyone Injured by handguns, does accurately estimate the number of gunshot Injuries among people living In stable household settings. It thus enables most Americans to judge the degree to which they are vulnerable to gunshot InJu~. Reliability of comparisons • All comparisons presented In this report were tested to determine If the differences were statistically significant. Most c(lmparIsons passed a hypothesis test at the ,05 level of statistical significance (or the "95% confidence level"), meaning that the estlmatad difference between comparisons was greater than twice the standard error of this difference. Statements quallfled by the phrase "somewhat" or "some evidence" were significant at the 90% level. The data tables note when estimates are based on 10 or fewer sample cases. It Is not possible to compute standard errors accurately for such estimates. Therefore, • it Is Inadvisable to compare estimates based upon 10 or feVier sample cases to other small estimates. More information on NCS sample design and estimation procedures can be obtained from appendix III of Criminal Victimization

### M – Elliot

#### Methodology for APA study cited within this section of the article:

The American Psychological Association Commission on Violence and Youth was convened in July 1991 by APA’s Public Interest Directorate. The Commission’s primary purpose was to bring psychological knowledge to bear on the national problem of violence involving youth. In giving the problem of violence and youth such extraordinary visibility within APA, the Public Interest Directorate was responding to members’ concerns about this growing problem and to their desire to make psychology, with its unique perspective on how behaviors are learned and unlearned, a part of the public dialogue. The Commission’s 12 members have longstanding professional interest in the study of children and adolescents who are victims, perpetrators, or witnesses of violence. Ten of the 12 are psychologists and APA members; one was at the time of his appointment Chief of Police in Washington, DC; and one is an attorney with special expertise in the area of hate crimes. The Commission began its work by accepting APA’s charge to accomplish the following tasks: To articulate the state of psychological knowledge relevant to violence and youth; To define existing practical problems and how psychological knowledge can be applied to resolve or constructively intervene in those problems; To describe effective intervention models for preventing violence, mitigating its effects or resolving problems related to violence and youth; THE COMMISSION'S PROCESS 87 APPENDIX II To recommend policies, programs, or projects that will constructively influence psychological research, practice, and education relevant to violence and youth; and To recommend promising directions for public policy, advocacy, research, and program development to prevent the spread of violence and temper its negative consequences for individuals and communities. To address these tasks, the Commission met in plenary sessions five times: two times in 1991 and three times in 1992. In November 1991, in conjunction with one of the plenary sessions, a number of invited experts from a variety of disciplines addressed the Commission during open hearings. Those participating in the hearings, and their affiliations at the time of participating, included: • Carol Behrer, Family and Youth Services Bureau, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families • George Bellinger, District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department • Thomas Blagburn, District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department • Beverly Coleman-Miller, MD, President, BCM Group • Sandy Colvard, Sexual Minority Youth Assistance League, District of Columbia • Michael B. Greene, PhD, Juvenile Justice Administrator, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety, New York City • Wade Horn, PhD, Administration on Children, Youth, and Families • Dionne J. Jones, PhD, The Urban League • Patricia Jones, PhD, Chicago School of Professional Psychology • Mireille Kanda, MD, Director of Child Protection Services, Children’s National Medical Center 88 APPENDIX II • Iseli Krauss, EdD, Committee on Disability Issues in Psychology, APA • David Lloyd, JD, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect • Mandel Montes, Latin American Youth Center, District of Columbia • Celeste Morgan, Sexual Minority Youth Assistance League, District of Columbia • James Perry, Violence Prevention Program, Washington Hospital Center • Steven Powell, Director, District of Columbia Youth Task Force • John E. Richters, PhD, National Institute of Mental Health • Denise Snyder, Executive Director, DC Area Rape Crisis Center • Santiada Street, District of Columbia Youth Task Force Health Initiatives • Enrique Valez, Latin American Youth Center, District of Columbia • Amy Vitro, Executive Director, Sexual Minority Youth Assistance League, District of Columbia • Daniel Webster, ScD, Violence Prevention Program, Washington Hospital Center • Leon West, Congress of National Black Churches During the hearings, the Commission also met with children and youth from Washington, DC, who described their experiences of living in an atmosphere of violence and shared their ideas for solutions. COLLEGIAL WORKINGS The Commission sought and received expert help by establishing a 130- member Cadre of Experts on Violence, many of whom were drawn from APA’s membership. APA members also helped shape the Commission’s activities by participating in an open forum at the 1991 APA convention in San Francisco. At 89 APPENDIX II the 1992 APA convention in Washington, DC, participants in a second open forum offered comments on several draft papers that will form part of the Commission’s report to APA. Throughout the Commission’s work, APA members were kept informed of the Commission’s progress through minutes of the Commission’s meetings and articles in APA publications; many members responded by sending papers and other valuable information supporting the Commission’s work. The Commission received the input of other APA groups working on issues pertinent to violence and youth. Representatives of the APA Committee on Disability Issues in Psychology, for example, testified at the Commission’s hearings. Members of APA’s governance groups commented on the initial drafts of the Commission’s report. One of the Commissioners who had been a member of the APA Task Force on Television and Society was able to share the insights of that group to inform the Commission’s work. The Commission’s work also was informed by the ongoing activities of other APA initiatives on violence, including the APA Task Force on Violence Against Women and the five Working Groups established under the direction of the Coordinating Committee on Child Abuse and Neglect to implement APA’s Resolution on the Psychological Implications of Child Abuse and Neglect. During the Commission’s tenure, expert panels organized by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Research Council, and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services issued major interdisciplinary reports addressing the problem of violence. Several Commission members participated in the work of these panels, a fact that allowed the Commission to benefit from the experience of all groups. Commission members also sought advice and shared their work with members of the international scholarly community. In the summer of 1992, for example, four Commission members took part in a panel presentation at the International Society for Research on Aggression (ISRA) in Siena, Italy, and received comments and reactions from international experts. 90 APPENDIX II All papers included in Volume II of the Commission’s report to APA, with the exception of the Commission’s policy recommendations, were submitted for peer review by subject matter experts. Policy recommendations were prepared with the assistance of APA’s Office of Public Policy. The Commissioners extends special thanks to the following people for their assistance with development of the Commission’s report: Jean M. Baker, PhD; Kevin Berrill; Kenyon S. Chan, PhD; William Davidson, PhD; Lemyra DeBruyn, PhD; Paul Gendreau, PhD; L. Philip Guzman, PhD; Darnell Hawkins, PhD; James M. Jones, PhD; Iseli K. Krauss, EdD; Teresa LaFromboise, PhD; Donald Lollar, EdD; John Meier, PhD; John P. Murray, PhD; Jerry Newberry; Melissa Ring, PhD; Donald Routh, PhD; Carolyn Swift, PhD; Harry C. Triandis, PhD; Penelope Trickett, PhD; Reiko Homma True, PhD; and members of the APA Task Force on Violence Against Women and of the Committee on Women in Psychology. The Commissioners also wish to thank the following people who provided valuable assistance for Commission activities: Phyllis Belford, Kurt Jones, Simone C.E. Kniff, Ann Rutherford, and Pamela Uyehara. For the design and layout of this report, the Commissioners thank Ramona Weaver with W3 Graphics Group of Fairfax, VA. 91 APPENDIX II 92 APPENDIX II Anne Anderson Washington, DC Jean Athey, PhD Rockville, MD Ron Avi Astor San Francisco, CA Rhoda Wasserman Baruch, EdD Washington, DC Carol J. Behrer Washington, DC George Bellinger Washington, DC David Benton, PhD Wales, UK Richard Berendzen, PhD Arlington, VA Lanny Berman, PhD Washington, DC Naftali Berrill, PhD Brooklyn, NY Tom Blagburn Washington, DC Barbara L. Bonner, PhD Oklahoma City, OK Charles M. Borduin, PhD Columbia, MO Sue Bredekamp Washington, DC John N. Briere, PhD Los Angeles, CA Angela Browne, PhD Newton Centre, MA Maria Candamil Washington, DC Liliana Caparo-Ariza Madison, WI Janet Chapin, RN, MPH Washington, DC Larry Cohen, MSW Pleasant Hill, CA John D. Coie, PhD Durham, NC Beverly Coleman-Miller, MD Washington, DC Karen Colvard New York, NY Rudolph E. Cook, PhD Santa Clara, CA Dewey G. Cornell, PhD Charlottesville, VA Stacy Daniels, PhD Kansas City, MO Lemyra DeBruyn, PhD Albuquerque, NM Irene Deitch, PhD Staten Island, NY Morton Deutsch, PhD New York, NY Eduardo I. Diaz, PhD Miami, FL Douglas Dodge Washington, DC Christine Doylea, PhD Houston, TX Jean E. Dumas, PhD West Lafayette, IN David F. Duncan, DrPH, CAS Providence, RI Ronald S. Ebert, PhD Belmont, MA Joe Elam, PhD Oklahoma City, OK Nathaniel M. Floyd, PhD White Plains, NY Del Elliott Boulder, CO Charles Patrick Ewing, JD, PhD Buffalo, NY David W. Foy, PhD Pasadena, CA Bernard Z. Friedlander, PhD West Hartford, CT Mike Furlong Santa Barbara, CA Paul Gendreau, PhD St. John NB CANADA Vesta S. Gettys, PhD Oklahoma City, OK Amy Goldman, PhD New York, NY The Commissioners also want to acknowledge the following people who made up the Commission’s Cadre of Experts on Violence: Leonard Morgenbesser, PhD Albany, NY Charles Mueller, PhD Honolulu, HI Beatrice Nagby, PhD New York, NY Melany Nakagiri Washington, DC Victor Nell, DLitt, et Phil Johannesburg, South Africa J. Renae Norton, PsyD Cincinnati, OH Bert W. Ollie, Jr., PhD Washington, DC Susan Opotow, PhD New York, NY Eduardo J. Padron, PhD Miami, FL James Perry Washington, DC Sheila Peters Nashvillle, TN Tara Pir, PhD Los Angeles, CA Suzanne Plihcik Greensboro, NC Steven Powell Washington, DC Robert A. Prentky, PhD Arlington, MA Gregory E. Price, PhD Lorton, VA Charles Regal San Francisco, CA Steven R. Gray, EdD Tucson, AZ Lorraine Williams Greene, PhD Nashville, TN Michael Greene, PhD New York, NY L. Kevin Hamberger, PhD Kenosha, WI Kathleen M. Heide, PhD Tampa, FL Gregory M. Herek, PhD Berkeley, CA Anthony L. Hill, PhD Washington, DC Bertha Holliday, PhD Washington, DC Wade Horn, PhD Washington, DC Hampton P. Howell, PhD Nashville, TN Honore M. Hughes, PhD St. Louis, MO Patricia Yolanda James, PhD Chicago, IL Esther J. Jenkins, PhD Chicago, IL Dionne J. Jones, PhD Washington, DC Patricia Jones, PhD Chicago, IL Mireille Kanda, MD Washington, DC Richard Kempter, PhD Ann Arbor, MI 93 APPENDIX II Christine Keyser Lonjuevil, Quebec CANADA Gerhard Kohn, PhD Long Beach, CA Hal Kooden, PhD New York, NY Mary P. Koss, PhD Tucson, AZ Paul F. Kradell, EdD Martinsburg, WV Katherine Krefft, PhD Plymouth, MA Iseli Krauss, EdD Clarion, PA Steven Krugman, PhD Boston, MA Alice Darnell Lattal Chicago, IL David Lloyd Washington, DC Rolf Loeber, PhD Pittsburgh, PA Spero M. Manson, PhD Denver, Colorado Dorita R. Marina, PhD Miami, FL David B. Mitchell Palmer Park, MD Oliver Moles, PhD Washington, DC John B. Mordock, PhD Poughkeepsie, NY John Richters, PhD Rockville, MD Paul I. Riel, PhD Chicago, IL Rosalyn L. Roesel, RN, PhD Savannah, GA Jeffrey Rubin, PhD Painted Post, NY Isreal Rubenstein, PhD Beverly Hills, CA Saul Scheidlinger, PhD Bronx, NY K. Jeffrey Schlichter, PhD Virginia Beach, VA Cleveland Schmidt, PhD Cloverdale, BC Robert Shellow, PhD Bethesda, MD Brewster Smith, PhD Santa Cruz, CA Robert Smith Blacksburg, VA Denise Snyder Washington, DC Dorothy Simon New York, NY Marcel P. Soriano, PhD Los Angeles, CA Serena Stier Albany, NY Martha B. Straus, PhD Keene, NH Donald E. Streufert, LPC, PhD Grand Rapids, MN Suzanne Stutman, MA, MSW Washington, DC 94 APPENDIX II Derius Swinton Richmond, VA Ruby Takanishi, PhD Washington, DC David Temple Washington, DC Franklin A. Tucker Jamaica Plain, MA Eric M. Vernberg, PhD Coral Gables, FL Amy Vitro Washington, DC C. Eugene Walker, PhD Oklahoma City, OK Joel Wallman New York, NY Dottie Ward-Wimmer Washington, DC Nancy Ware Washington, DC Daniel Webster, ScD Washington, DC Sheila Wellstone Washington, DC Ralph S. Welsh, PhD Bridgeport, CT Richard Wener, PhD Brooklyn, NY Leon M. West Washington, DC Jacquelyn W. White, PhD Greensboro, NC Robert Zagar, PhD Chicago, IL OUTCOMES OF THE COMMISSION’S WORK On the basis of their profound conviction that psychology can contribute significantly to society’s quest for solutions related to violence and youth, Commission members decided to emphasize preventive and rehabilitative interventions in their deliberations and in the report rendering their findings and recommendations to the members of APA. They expressed a strong commitment to making their work relevant and meaningful to the communities and professionals who confront the practical implications of violence and its effects on the lives of young people. To make the insights of psychology on the problem of youth and violence available both to the community of professional psychologists and to the audience of policymakers, advocates, law enforcement personnel, professionals in other disciplines who work in the fields of violence and youth, and community leaders, Commission members decided to issue their report in two volumes: A summary volume, to make available the key findings of the Commission in a format that addresses the Commission’s broader audience. A volume of scientific papers, which will contain 19 chapters addressed specifically to the scientific community. These chapters provide detailed supporting data and references for the assertions in the summary volume. They also address the theoretical, methodological, and practical issues affecting psychological research and clinical interventions in areas relevant to youth and violence. During the Commission’s hearings, expert participants repeatedly urged APA to go beyond the mere production of a report in its response to the problems of violence and youth. These urgings reinforced the Commission members’ convictions that psychology must offer communities new and effective responses to 95 APPENDIX II youth violence. For this reason, APA will actively seek to promote the recommendations presented in this report to policymakers. The Association also will continue to seek ways to educate psychologists, other professionals, and the general public about issues related to violence and youth, and to involve interested APA members in turning the Commission’s perspective on interventions into research-based model interventions. Also important will be APA’s ongoing efforts, based on the Commission’s work, to build bridges to professionals in other disciplines for creating multidisciplinary responses to violence involving youth.

### M – Sheley and Wright (2 Studies)

Interviews were conducted with 835 male inmates in six juvenile correctional institutions in four states. These interviews were complemented by surveys of 758 male high school students from ten inner-city public schools in the largest cities in each state (described above). Both student and inmate samples were voluntary, and non-incarcerated dropouts were not included. Most (84%) of the inmate sample reported that they had been threatened with a gun or shot at, and 83% owned a gun prior to incarceration. Over one in three inmates (38%) reported shooting a gun at someone. Over half owned three or more guns, and the age of first acquisition was 14 years old. The preferred type of gun among respondents was a ―well-made handgun‖ of large caliber (the 9mm was the most popular). Both the inmate and student samples described in more detail the ecology of guns within the social organization of their neighborhoods. They claimed that firearms were widely available at low costs in their neighborhoods. Distribution was informal, with guns bought and sold through family, friends, and street sources. Among incarcerated young males, 45% reported that they ―had bought, sold, or traded ‗lots‘ of guns.‖ Stealing guns and using surrogate buyers in gun shops were infrequent sources for obtaining guns. Motivation for owning and carrying guns was reported to be more for self-protection than for status. The drug business was a critical context for gun possession: 89% of inmate drug dealers and 75% of student dealers had carried guns. So too was gang membership: 68% of inmates and 22% of students were affiliated with a gang or quasi-gang, and 72% of inmates were involved in the instrumental use of guns. Although the Sheley et al (1993) study focused on inner cities, the voluntary samples raise concerns regarding selection bias and other measurement error. The study sampled disproportionately from states and cities with concentrations of gang activity, perhaps overstating the importance of gangs as a context for gun use. Like the LH Research survey, this study did not focus on events where guns were used, only on individuals and their patterns of gun possession and gun use.

Some of the limitations in the LH Research survey were addressed in research by Sheley et al. (1993) and reanalyzed in Sheley and Wright (1995). They conducted anonymous surveys of 1591 (758 male and 833 female) students from 10 inner-city high schools in four States during the spring of 1991. They interviewed 835 male inmates in three juveniles correctional institutions in four states, complemented by surveys of 758 male high school students from ten inner-city public schools in the largest cities in each state. Both student and inmate samples were voluntary, and non-incarcerated dropouts were not included. These student surveys supplemented a larger study of incarcerated juvenile offenders allowing for important comparisons (Sheley & Wright, 1995). The results of student only surveys are summarized below for both males and females first, followed by the descriptive results for the male only sample. The sample was 75% African American, 16% Hispanic, 2% white, and 7% other. The average age for the sample was sixteen years old. Twenty-five percent of the sample reported carrying a weapon while in school while 44% carried a weapon outside of school property. Reported carrying behavior of fellow students was much higher than self-reported carrying patterns. Specifically, 80% reported that other students carried weapons to school, 66% knew someone personally who had brought a weapon to school, 39% had a male relative that carried guns, and 35% had friends that carried guns outside the home. Among high school students in the sample 23% thought it would be easy to get a gun in their neighborhood. Twenty percent of high school students in the sample had been threatened with a gun and twelve percent had been shot at. Among males in the sample, 22% reported possessing a gun of his own. Twelve percent of males carried a gun all or most of the time. Thirty-five percent of males thought it would be a lot of trouble to get a gun. Victimization rates were higher for males compared to females. Forty-five percent of 11 males reported that they had been threatened with a gun or shot at en route to/from school, 10% had been stabbed, and 33% had been beaten up en route to/from school (Sheley & Wright, 1995).

### M – Decker and Pennell

Using a similar approach to the Drug Use Forecasting study, Decker and colleague studied gun acquisition, carrying, and use among 856 juvenile arrestees from 11 U.S. cities during the first 3 months of 1995. They found that 40% of juveniles had ever possessed a firearm. Twenty-two percent of juveniles carried a gun all or most of the time. Carry rates were higher for drug dealers and gang members. Thirty-two percent of juvenile arrestees admitted to using a gun in crime. The rates of gun victimization were extremely high with 55% having experienced gun victimization at some point in time. Fifty percent had been shot at. The researchers also measured respondents‘ beliefs about the acceptance of gun violence as a remedy for a disrespectful action of another. Specifically, 38% of juvenile arrestees supported the belief that ―it is okay to shoot someone who has disrespected you‖ (Decker et al., 1995).

### M – Zawitz

How often are guns used in violent crimes? According to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), almost 43.6 million criminal victimizations occurred in 1993, including 4.4 million violent crimes of rape and sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault. Of the victims of these violent crimes, 1.3 million (29%) stated that they faced an offender with a firearm.\* In 1993, the FBI's Crime in the United States estimated that almost 2 million violent crimes of murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault were reported to the police by citizens. About 582,000 of these reported murders, robberies, and aggravated assaults were committed with firearms. Murder was the crime that most frequently involved firearms; 70% of the 24,526 murders in 1993 were committed with firearms. How do we know about the guns used by criminals? No national collection of data contains detailed information about all of the guns used in crimes. Snapshots of information about the guns used by criminals are available from  official police records concerning the guns recovered in crimes and reports gathered from victims surveys that interview criminals surveys that interview victims of crime. From these sources, we know how often guns are involved in crime, how guns are used in crime, what general categories of firearms are most often used in crime, and, to a limited extent, the specific types of guns most frequently used by criminals. Bureau of Justice Statistics Selected Findings Although most crime is not committed with guns, most gun crime is committed with handguns. pages 1 & 2 Although most available guns are not used in crime, information about the 223 million guns available to the general public provides a context for evaluating criminal preferences for guns. page 2 By definition, stolen guns are available to criminals. The FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) stolen gun file contains over 2 million reports; 60% are reports of stolen handguns. page 3 In 1994, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) received over 85,132 requests from law enforcement agencies for traces of guns used in crime. Over threequarters of the guns traced by the ATF in 1994 were handguns (mostly pistols), and almost a third were less than 3 years old. page 4 Surveys of inmates show that they prefer concealable, large caliber guns. Juvenile offenders appear to be more likely to possess guns than adults. page 5 Studies of the guns used in homicides show that large caliber revolvers are the most frequent type of gun used in homicides, but the number of large caliber semiautomatic guns used in murders is increasing. page 5 Little information exists about the use of assault weapons in crime. The information that does exist uses varying definitions of assault weapons that were developed before the Federal assault weapons ban was enacted. page 6 Highlights U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs July 1995, NCJ-148201 Firearms, crime, and criminal justice Guns Used in Crime \* See note on page 7. Handguns are most often the type of firearm used in crime According to the Victim Survey (NCVS), 25% of the victims of rape and sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault in 1993 faced an offender armed with a handgun. Of all firearm-related crime reported to the survey, 86% involved handguns. The FBI's Supplemental Homicide Reports show that 57% of all murders in 1993 were committed with handguns, 3% with rifles, 5% with shotguns, and 5% with firearms where the type was unknown. The 1991 Survey of State Prison Inmates found that violent inmates who used a weapon were more likely to use a handgun than any other weapon; 24% of all violent inmates reported that they used a handgun. Of all inmates, 13% reported carrying a handgun when they committed the offense for which they were serving time. What types of guns do criminals prefer? Research by Wright and Rossi in the 1980's found that most criminals prefer guns that are easily concealable, large caliber, and well made. Their studies also found that the handguns used by the felons interviewed were similar to the handguns available to the general public, except that the criminals preferred larger caliber guns. What types of guns are available generally? The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) estimates that from 1899 to 1993 about 223 million guns became available in the United States, including over 79 million rifles, 77 million handguns, and 66 million shotguns. The number of guns seized, destroyed, lost, or not working is unknown. The number of new handguns added to those available has exceeded the number of new shotguns and rifles in recent years. More than half of the guns added in 1993 were handguns. 2 Guns Used in Crime What are the different types of firearms? Types Handgun A weapon designed to fire a small projectile from one or more barrels when held in one hand with a short stock designed to be gripped by one hand. Revolver A handgun that contains its ammunition in a revolving cylinder that typically holds five to nine cartridges, each within a separate chamber. Before a revolver fires, the cylinder rotates, and the next chamber is aligned with the barrel. Pistol Any handgun that does not contain its ammunition in a revolving cylinder. Pistols can be manually operated or semiautomatic. A semiautomatic pistol generally contains cartridges in a magazine located in the grip of the gun. When the semiautomatic pistol is fired, the spent cartridge that contained the bullet and propellant is ejected, the firing mechanism is cocked, and a new cartridge is chambered. Derringer A small single- or multiple-shot handgun other than a revolver or semiautomatic pistol. Rifle A weapon intended to be fired from the shoulder that uses the energy of the explosive in a fixed metallic cartridge to fire only a single projectile through a rifled bore for each single pull of the trigger. Shotgun A weapon intended to be fired from the shoulder that uses the energy of the explosive in a fixed shotgun shell to fire through a smooth bore either a number of ball shot or a single projectile for each single pull of the trigger. Firing action Fully automatic Capability to fire a succession of cartridges so long as the trigger is depressed or until the ammunition supply is exhausted. Automatic weapons are considered machineguns subject to the provisions of the National Firearms Act. Semiautomatic An autoloading action that will fire only a single shot for each single function of a trigger. Machinegun Any weapon that shoots, is designed to shoot, or can be readily restored to shoot automatically more than one shot without manual reloading by a single function of the trigger. Submachinegun A simple fully automatic weapon that fires a pistol cartridge that is also referred to as a machine pistol. Ammunition Caliber The size of the ammunition that a weapon is designed to shoot, as measured by the bullet's approximate diameter in inches in the United States and in millimeters in other countries. In some instances, ammunition is described with additional terms, such as the year of its introduction (.30/06) or the name of the designer (.30 Newton). In some countries, ammunition is also described in terms of the length of the cartridge case (7.62 x 63 mm). Gauge For shotguns, the number of spherical balls of pure lead, each exactly fitting the bore, that equals one pound. Sources: ATF, Firearms & Explosives Tracing Guidebook, September 1993, pp. 35-40, and Paul C. Giannelli, "Ballistics Evidence: Firearms Identification," Criminal Law Bulletin, May-June 1991, pp. 195-215. Over 40 million handguns have been produced in the United States since 1973. Since over 80% of the guns available in the United States are manufactured here, gun production is a reasonable indicator of the guns made available. From 1973 to 1993, U.S. manufacturers produced  6.6 million .357 Magnum revolvers 6.5 million .38 Special revolvers 5.4 million .22 caliber pistols 5.3 million .22 caliber revolvers 4.5 million .25 caliber pistols 3.1 million 9 millimeter pistols 2.4 million .380 caliber pistols 2.2 million .44 Magnum revolvers 1.7 million .45 caliber pistols 1.2 million .32 caliber revolvers. During the two decades from 1973 to 1993, the types of handguns most frequently produced have changed. Most new handguns are pistols rather than revolvers. Pistol production grew from 28% of the handguns produced in the United States in 1973 to 80% in 1993. The number of large caliber pistols produced annually increased substantially after 1986. Until the mid-1980's, most pistols produced in the United States were .22 and .25 caliber models. Production of .380 caliber and 9 millimeter pistols began to increase substantially in 1987, so that by 1993 they became the most frequently produced pistols. From 1991 to 1993, the last 3 years for which data are available, the most frequently produced handguns were  .380 caliber pistols (20%) 9 millimeter pistols (19%) .22 caliber pistols (17%) .25 caliber pistols (13%) .50 caliber pistols (8%). Stolen guns are a source of weapons for criminals All stolen guns are available to criminals by definition. Recent studies of adult and juvenile offenders show that many have either stolen a firearm or kept, sold, or traded a stolen firearm: According to the 1991 Survey of State Prison Inmates, among those inmates who possessed a handgun, 9% had acquired it through theft, and 28% had acquired it through an illegal market such as a drug dealer or fence. Of all inmates, 10% had stolen at least one gun, and 11% had sold or traded stolen guns. Studies of adult and juvenile offenders that the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services conducted in 1992 and 1993 found that 15% of the adult offenders and 19% of the juvenile offenders had stolen guns; 16% of the adults and 24% of the juveniles had kept a stolen gun; and 20% of the adults and 30% of the juveniles had sold or traded a stolen gun. From a sample of juvenile inmates in four States, Sheley and Wright found that more than 50% had stolen a gun at least once in their lives and 24% had stolen their most recently obtained handgun. They concluded that theft and burglary were the original, not always the proximate, source of many guns acquired by the juveniles. How many guns are stolen? The Victim Survey (NCVS) estimates that there were 341,000 incidents of firearm theft from private citizens annually from 1987 to 1992. Because the survey does not ask how many guns were stolen, the number of guns stolen probably exceeds the number of incidents of gun theft. The FBI's National Crime Information Center (NCIC) stolen gun file contained over 2 million reports as of March 1995. In 1994, over 306,000 entries were added to this file including a variety of guns, ammunition, cannons, and grenades. Reports of stolen guns are included in the NCIC files when citizens report a theft to law enforcement agencies that submit a report to the FBI. All entries must include make, caliber, and serial number. Initiated in 1967, the NCIC stolen gun file retains all entries indefinitely unless a recovery is reported. Most stolen guns are handguns Victims report to the Victim Survey that handguns were stolen in 53% of the thefts of guns. The FBI's stolen gun file's 2 million reports include information on  1.26 million handguns (almost 60%) 470,000 rifles (22%) 356,000 shotguns (17%). Guns Used in Crime 3 From 1985 to 1994, the FBI received an annual average of over 274,000 reports of stolen guns Source: FBI, National Crime Information Center, 1995. 1968 1970 1972 1974 1976 1978 1980 1982 1984 1986 1988 1990 1992 1994 0 100,000 200,000 300,000 Number of stolen gun entries into NCIC How many automatic weapons are stolen? Under the provisions of the National Firearms Act, all automatic weapons such as machine guns must be registered with the ATF. In 1995, over 240,000 automatic weapons were registered with the ATF. As of March 1995, the NCIC stolen gun file contained reports on about 7,700 machine guns and submachine guns. What types of handguns are most frequently stolen? Most frequently reported handguns in the NCIC stolen gun file Percent of stolen handguns Number Caliber Type 20.5% 259,184 .38 Revolver 11.7 147,681 .22 Revolver 11.6 146,474 .357 Revolver 8.8 111,558 9 mm Semiautomatic 7.0 87,714 .25 Semiautomatic 6.7 84,474 .22 Semiautomatic 5.4 68,112 .380 Semiautomatic 3.7 46,503 .45 Semiautomatic 3.3 41,318 .32 Revolver 3.1 39,254 .44 Revolver 1.5 18,377 .32 Semiautomatic 1.3 16,214 .45 Revolver Upon request, the ATF traces some guns used in crime to their origin The National Tracing Center of ATF traces firearms to their original point of sale upon the request of police agencies. The requesting agency can use this information to assist in identifying suspects, providing evidence for subsequent prosecution, establishing stolen status, and proving ownership. The number of requests for firearms traces increased from 37,181 in 1990 to 85,132 in 1994. Trace requests represent an unknown portion of all the guns used in crimes. ATF is not able to trace guns manufactured before 1968, most surplus military weapons, imported guns without the importer's name, stolen guns, and guns missing a legible serial number. Police agencies do not request traces on all firearms used in crimes. Not all firearms used in crimes are recovered so that a trace could be done and, in some States and localities, the police agencies may be able to establish ownership locally without going to the ATF. Most trace requests concern handguns Over half of the guns that police agencies asked ATF to trace were pistols and another quarter were revolvers. While trace requests for all types of guns increased in recent years, the number of pistols traced increased the most, doubling from 1990 to 1994. What are the countries of origin of the guns that are traced? Traced guns come from many countries across the globe. However, 78% of the guns that were traced in 1994 originated in the United States and most of the rest were from  Brazil (5%) Germany (3%) China (3%) Austria (3%) Italy (2%) Spain (2%). Almost a third of the guns traced by ATF in 1994 were 3 years old or less Age of traced guns Traces completed in 1994 Number Percent Total 83,362 100% Less than 1 year 4,072 5 1 year 11,617 14 2 years 6,764 8 3 years 4,369 5 Type of gun Percent of all 1994 traces Total 100.0% Handgun 79.1 Pistol 53.0 Pistol Revolver 24.7 Pistol Derringer 1.4 Rifle 11.1 Shotgun 9.7 Other including machinegun 0.1 4 Guns Used in Crime What crimes are most likely to result in a gun-tracing request? Percent of all 1994 traces Percent of traces by crime type Handgun Crime type Total Total Pistol Pistol Derringer Pistol Revolver Rifle Shotgun Weapons offenses 72% 100% 81% 55% 1% 25% 10% 9% Drug offenses 12 100 75 50 2 23 14 11 Homicide 6 100 79 49 1 29 11 10 Assault 5 100 80 50 1 28 10 11 Burglary 2 100 57 34 1 22 24 19 Robbery 2 100 84 53 1 29 7 10 Other 2 100 76 54 1 21 14 10 Note: Detail may not add to total because of rounding. Source: ATF, unpublished data, May 1995. What caliber guns do criminals prefer? In their 1983 study, Wright, Rossi, and Daly asked a sample of felons about the handgun they had most recently acquired. Of the felons sampled  29% had acquired a .38 caliber handgun 20% had acquired a .357 caliber handgun 16% had acquired a .22 caliber handgun. Sheley and Wright found that the juvenile inmates in their 1991 sample in four States preferred large caliber, high quality handguns. Just prior to their confinement  58% owned a revolver, usually a .38 or .357 caliber gun 55% owned a semiautomatic handgun, usually a 9 millimeter or .45 caliber gun 51% owned a sawed-off shotgun 35% owned a military-style automatic or semiautomatic rifle. Do juvenile offenders use different types of guns than adult offenders? A study of adult and juvenile offenders by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services found that juvenile offenders were more likely than adults to have carried a semiautomatic pistol at the crime scene (18% versus 7%). They were also more likely to have carried a revolver (10% versus 7%). The same proportion of adults and juveniles (3%) carried a shotgun or rifle at the crime scene. Some studies of guns used in homicides provide information about caliber McGonigal and colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania Medical Center studied firearm homicides that occurred in Philadelphia: 145 in 1985 and 324 in 1990. Most of the firearms used in the homicides studied were handguns: 90% in 1985 and 95% in 1990. In both years, revolvers were the predominant type of handgun used; however, the use of semiautomatic pistols increased from 24% in 1985 to 38% in 1990. The caliber of the handguns used also changed: In Philadelphia, handguns most often used: In 1985, of 91 homicides In 1990, of 204 homicides 44% .38 caliber revolver 23% 9 mm pistol 19% .25 caliber pistol 18% .38 caliber revolver 14% .22 caliber revolver 16% .357 caliber revolver 14% .32 caliber revolver 16% .22 caliber revolver 3% 9 mm pistol 10% .32 caliber revolver 2% .357 caliber revolver 6% .380 caliber pistol The Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services studied 844 homicides that occurred in 18 jurisdictions from 1989 through 1991. Firearms were identified as the murder weapon in 600 cases. Over 70% of the firearms used were handguns. Of those handguns for which the caliber and firing action could be identified, 19% were .38 caliber revolvers, 10% were .22 caliber revolvers, and 9% were 9 millimeter semiautomatic pistols. The Hawaii Department of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention Division, studied 59 firearm-related homicides in Honolulu from 1988 to 1992. Handguns were used in 48 homicides (over 80%) including 11 handguns of 9 millimeter caliber, 10 of .357 caliber, 10 of .38 caliber, and 5 of .25 caliber. What caliber guns are used in the killings of law enforcement officers? From 1982 to 1993, of the 687 officers who were killed by firearms other than their own guns, more were killed by .38 caliber handguns than by any other type of weapon. Type of firearm Percent of law enforcement officers killed with a firearm .38 caliber handgun 25.2% .357 Magnum handgun 12.1 9 millimeter handgun 9.5 12 gauge shotgun 7.4 .22 caliber handgun 5.4 .22 caliber rifle 4.4 Guns Used in Crime 5 What guns are the most frequently traced? The most frequently traced guns vary from year to year. The ATF publishes a list of the 10 specific guns most frequently traced annually. The total number of traced guns on the top 10 list was 18% of the total traced from 1991 to 1994. Most of the top 10 guns were pistols (over 30% were .25 caliber pistols), although a number of revolvers and a few shotguns and rifles were also included. The most frequently traced gun was a Smith and Wesson .38 caliber revolver in 1990, the Raven Arms P25 (a .25 caliber pistol) from 1991 through 1993, and the Lorcin P25 in 1994. 10 most frequently traced guns in 1994 Rank Manufacturer Model Caliber Type Number traced 1 Lorcin P25 .25 Pistol 3,223 2 Davis Industries P380 .38 Pistol 2,454 3 Raven Arms MP25 .25 Pistol 2,107 4 Lorcin L25 .25 Pistol 1,258 5 Mossburg 500 12G Shotgun 1,015 6 Phoenix Arms Raven .25 Pistol 959 7 Jennings J22 .22 Pistol 929 8 Ruger P89 9 mm Pistol 895 9 Glock 17 9 mm Pistol 843 10 Bryco 38 .38 Pistol 820 Source: ATF, May 1995. Sources Assault Weapons and Homicide in New York City, Office of Justice Systems Analysis, New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services, May 1994. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, ATF Facts, November 1994. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Firearms & Explosives Tracing Guidebook, September 1993. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, unpublished data. BJS, Criminal Victimization 1993, Bulletin, NCJ-151658, May 1995. BJS, Guns and Crime, Crime Data Brief, NCJ-147003, April 1994. BJS, National Crime Victimization Survey, 1992, unpublished data. BJS, Survey of State Prison Inmates, 1991, NCJ-136949, March 1993. "Crimes Committed with Firearms in the State of Hawaii, 1983-1992," Crime Trends Series, Department of the Attorney General, Crime Prevention Division, Vol. 2, Issue 1, April 1994. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States 1993, October 4, 1994. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted, annually 1987 to 1992. Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Crime Information Center, unpublished data. Giannelli, Paul C., "Ballistics Evidence: Firearms Identification," Criminal Law Bulletin, May-June 1991. Guns and Violent Crime, Criminal Justice Research Center, Commonwealth of Virginia, Department of Criminal Justice Services, January 1994 with updated data for homicide study. McGonigal, Michael D., MD, John Cole, BS, C. William Schwab, MD, Donald R. Kauder, MD, Michael R. Rotondo, MD, and Peter B. Angood, "Urban Firearm Deaths: A Five-year Perspective," The Journal of Trauma, Vol. 35, No. 4, October 1993, pp. 532-37. Sheley, Joseph F., and James D. Wright, "Gun Acquisition and Possession in Selected Juvenile Samples," National Institute of Justice and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Research in Brief, NCJ-145326, December 1993. Wright, James D., and Peter H. Rossi, Armed and Considered Dangerous (New York: Adline de Gruyter) 1986. Wright, James D., Peter H. Rossi, and Kathleen Daly, Under the Gun: Weapons, Crime, and Violence in America (New York: Adline de Gruyter) 1983. 6 Guns Used in Crime Little information exists about the use of assault weapons in crime. The information that does exist uses varying definitions of assault weapons that were developed before the Federal assault weapons ban was enacted. In general, assault weapons are semiautomatic firearms with a large magazine of ammunition that were designed and configured for rapid fire and combat use. An assault weapon can be a pistol, a rifle, or a shotgun. The Federal Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 bans the manufacture and sale of 19 specific assault weapons identified by make and manufacturer. It also provides for a ban on those weapons that have a combination of features such as flash suppressors and grenade launchers. The ban does not cover those weapons legally possessed before the law was enacted. The National Institute of Justice will be evaluating the effect of the ban and reporting to Congress in 1997. In 1993 prior to the passage of the assault weapons ban, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), reported that about 1% of the estimated 200 million guns in circulation were assault weapons. Of the gun-tracing requests received that year by ATF from law enforcement agencies, 8% involved assault weapons. Assault weapons and homicide A New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services study of homicides in 1993 in New York City found that assault weapons were involved in 16% of the homicides studied. The definition of assault weapons used was from proposed but not enacted State legislation that was more expansive than the Federal legislation. By matching ballistics records and homicide files, the study found information on 366 firearms recovered in the homicides of 271 victims. Assault weapons were linked to the deaths of 43 victims (16% of those studied). A study by the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services reviewed the files of 600 firearm murders that occurred in 18 jurisdictions from 1989 to 1991. The study found that handguns were used in 72% of the murders (431 murders). Ten guns were identified as assault weapons, including five pistols, four rifles, and one shotgun. Assault weapons and offenders In the 1991 BJS Survey of State Inmates, about 8% of the inmates reported that they had owned a military-type weapon, such as an Uzi, AK-47, AR-15, or M-16. Less than 1% said that they carried such a weapon when they committed the incident for which they were incarcerated. A Virginia inmate survey conducted between November 1992 and May 1993 found similar results: About 10% of the adult inmates reported that they had ever possessed an assault rifle, but none had carried it at the scene of a crime. Two studies indicate higher proportions of juvenile offenders reporting possession and use of assault rifles. The Virginia inmate survey also covered 192 juvenile offenders. About 20% reported that they had possessed an assault rifle and 1% said that they had carried it at the scene of a crime. In 1991, Sheley and Wright surveyed 835 serious juvenile offenders incarcerated in 6 facilities in 4 States. In the Sheley and Wright study, 35% of the juvenile inmates reported that they had owned a military-style automatic or semiautomatic rifle just prior to confinement. How often are assault weapons used in crime? Note Data in this report from the 1993 National Crime Victimization Survey are the first released on this topic since the survey was redesigned. Because of changes in the methodology, direct comparisons with BJS's victim survey data from prior years are not appropriate. Additional information about the survey's redesign can be obtained from the Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse at 1-800-732-3277

### M – Chamberlain

This report presents the most detailed analysis of student fear in schools published thus far. As previously noted, the underlying data were gathered by the National Institute of Education as part of a Congressionally mandated. study71, 1 The report to Congress is available free of charge from the Public Affairs Office, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C. 20208 11. The Study sample consisted of 31,373 questionnaires (an 82% response rate) filled out by students attending 582 public secondary schools (a 91% response rate). Additionally, 6,283 of the students (an 83% response rate) participated in follow-up interviews. We have treated.thesp:data with the aim of developing information about student fear in schools. 1 The Safe Schools Study contains neither physiological nor observational °, data on individual students;.hence, preoccupation with dangr of.physical harm or harassment was inferred from answers to questionnaire items focusing on avbidance, fear- impelled absence, and self reports of fear .\ Analysis of patterns of questionnaire responses permitted us to measure the degree/Of students° fear of being hurt or bothered while in school settings -- as expressed by the students themselves. It is our hope that educators will be able to use the newly-developed measuring 'instrument and the information presented here in planning.effective programs aimed at reduding fear and violence in schools.