## 1

**Counterplan Text:** The United States federal government ought to implement laws requiring a waiting period of 10 days between when a handgun is purchased and when it’s physically given to the purchaser. **LCPGV 15**

\*\*CA and other states have a ten day waiting period

“Waiting Periods Policy Summary,” Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, September 15, 2015.

Laws imposing waiting periods require that a specified number of days elapse between the time a firearm is purchased and it is physically transferred to the purchaser. The goals of a waiting period are to: (1) give law enforcement officials sufficient time to perform a background check; and (2) provide a “cooling off” period to help guard against impulsive acts of violence.

And the CP is key to reduce suicide rates – solves the AFF. **LCPGV 15**

“Waiting Periods Policy Summary,” Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, September 15, 2015.

Waiting periods also help reduce suicides and other impulsive acts of violence. Suicides are frequently impulsive acts, and approximately 90% of people who have lived through a suicide attempt do not subsequently die in suicides.4 A person who attempts suicide by a method other than a firearm is much more likely to live than a person who uses a firearm.5Approximately 50% of suicides in the U.S. are committed with a gun.6 More than 90% of all suicide attempts with a firearm, if serious enough to require hospital treatment, result in death.7 Suicide attempts by jumping, by comparison, carry a 34% fatality rate; suicide attempts by drug poisoning carry a 2% fatality rate.8 States with firearm waiting period laws have significantly lower rates of suicide. Research published in the American Journal of Public Health showed that states with a law in place that required a waiting period for the completion of handgun sales had 27% fewer suicides per capita and 51% fewer firearm suicides.9

Majority of suicides occur impulsively – CP solves. **Miller and Hemenway 08**

“Guns and Suicide in the United States,” Matthew Miller (M.D., Sc.D.) and David Hemenway (Ph.D), The New England Journal of Medicine, September 4, 2008.

In 2005, the most recent year for which mortality data are available, suicide was the second-leading cause of death among Americans 40 years of age or younger. Among Americans of all ages, more than half of all suicides are gun suicides. In 2005, an average of 46 Americans per day committed suicide with a firearm, accounting for 53% of all completed suicides. Gun suicide during this period accounted for 40% more deaths than gun homicide. Why might the availability of firearms increase the risk of suicide in the United States? First, many suicidal acts — one third to four fifths of all suicide attempts, according to studies — are impulsive. Among people who made near-lethal suicide attempts, for example, 24% took less than 5 minutes between the decision to kill themselves and the actual attempt, and 70% took less than 1 hour.2 Second, many suicidal crises are self-limiting. Such crises are often caused by an immediate stressor, such as the breakup of a romantic relationship, the loss of a job, or a run-in with police. As the acute phase of the crisis passes, so does the urge to attempt suicide. The temporary nature and fleeting sway of many suicidal crises is evident in the fact that more than 90% of people who survive a suicide attempt, including attempts that were expected to be lethal (such as shooting oneself in the head or jumping in front of a train), do not go on to die by suicide. Indeed, recognizing the self-limiting nature of suicidal crises, penal and psychiatric institutions restrict access to lethal means for persons identified as potentially suicidal.

## 2

PTX

Empirics prove suicide rates go up during economic downturns. **Murray 11**

“Suicide Rates Spike During Recessions,” Sara Murray, The Wall Street Journal, 2011.

Suicide rates tend to rise in a bad economy and decline in periods of economic expansion, new research shows. From the Great Depression to the double-dip recession of the 1980s, suicide rates have shown a spike in economic downturns, according to a study the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention released last week. And early data suggest that’s likely to be the case in the most recent economic shock as well. In 11 of the 13 recessions that occurred between 1928 and 2007, the rate of suicides ticked up, according to the study. Meanwhile, as the economy improved, the suicide rate usually dropped, falling in 10 of the 13 expansions. The largest jump in the suicide rate took place during the Great Depression, when it soared to an all-time high of 22.1 suicides per 100,000 individuals. That was a 22.8% increase in 1932 from 1928.

More empirics prove – declining econ directly leads to increased suicide. **Oxford University 14**

http://www.ox.ac.uk/news/2014-06-12-recession-link-over-10000-suicides-west “Recession 'link' with over 10,000 suicides in the West,” 2014, University of Oxford.

The findings, published in the British Journal of Psychiatry, show that suicide rates rose significantly in the EU, Canada and the USA after 2007, with the increase being four times higher among men. The research team analysed recently released suicide data from the World Health Organization covering 24 EU countries and two North American countries. They observe that the downward trend in suicide rates in the EU reversed when the economic crisis began in 2007, rising by 6.5% by 2009 and remaining at the higher level through to 2011. In Canada, suicides rose by 4.5% between 2007 and 2010, while in the USA, the rate increased by 4.8% over the same period. Report authors Aaron Reeves, Martin McKee and David Stuckler argue that there were at least 10,000 additional suicides due to the economic hardship experienced in EU countries, Canada and the USA. They describe their figure as a 'conservative' estimate and say the rise in suicides is substantially over and above what would be expected. They found that there were 'marked' differences in suicide rates across countries affected by the same recession. This leads them to conclude that, in theory, increased suicides during an economic crisis are 'avoidable'. The study finds that job loss, home repossession and debt are the main risk factors leading to suicide during economic downturns.

## 3

Guns are key to resistance against the total system of capitalism. **Lee 13**

Daniel Lee (Writer on Civil Rights, Gun Control, and Culture), A Marxist-Leninist response to Gun Control, Daily Kos, 2013. NS

In a recent editorial piece published by Peoples World, the newspaper of the CPUSA, titled “Guns, profits and Sandy Hook” – the article started by opening with the need for the country to “get serious about regulating guns.” It pontificates further, giving a perfunctory nod to universal health access as “a piece of the puzzle” to preventing the epidemic of gun violence. The editorial then issues a call for a “broad enough coalition to confront and curb those who profit from manufacturing and dealing in these individual weapons of mass destruction”. It places the blame squarely on the gun lobbyists, and the corporations that profit from the sale of guns. The article ends finally in demanding a “Ban [of] assault weapons and high capacity bullet clips”. This article, which could have been written by any bourgeois Democrat or liberal group from Nancy Pelosi to Moveon.org, buys into the reactionary “liberal” approach of treating the symptom without curing the disease. Certainly those profiting off of the sale of weapons through the promotion of violence and racism must be made accountable for their exploitation and oppression of our fellow workers – and let us not forget that the US Government is one of the largest gun runners in the world, fueling instability, murder, and genocide of the proletariat around the globe, a fact PW conveniently leaves out. The article fails to mention that nearly 2,000 civilians were wounded in our War of Imperialism in Afghanistan , Pakistan, and Iraq during the first six months of 2012. About 1,145 civilians were killed in that same time period, according to U.N. totals. James Holmes’, Adam Lanza’s, and other serial killers’ crimes are dwarfed by this monstrosity in comparison, making the US government by far the most psychotic killer, still at large and continuing to slaughter men, women and children by the thousands. These figures don’t even take into account the hundreds of unarmed civilians slaughtered by uniformed bourgeois Police gangs across the country. Where is PW’s outrage to this crime? Where is the demand to confiscate the government’s guns? As Marxist-Leninists, we must approach the issue of gun control as we do any other issue – under the scientific principles of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and practice. We affirm first and foremost the absolute supremacy of the interests of the working class, and the necessity of revolution for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat to completely overthrow the oppression of the Bourgeois state and its minions. As Marx and Engels famously wrote at the end of the Communist Manifesto, "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.” When we talk about gun ownership then, we must talk about the rights of the workers to bear arms. One way or another, the bourgeois will exert their will through force either directly or indirectly, and usually through the cats-paw of the government and its military and police institutions to repress the working class and protect their own property interests. How then shall the workers protect their interests? As Marx writes, "The arming of the whole proletariat with rifles, guns, and ammunition should be carried out at once [and] the workers must ... organize themselves into an independent guard, with their own chiefs and general staff. ... [The aim is] that the bourgeois democratic Government not only immediately loses all backing among the workers, but from the commencement finds itself under the supervision and threats of authorities behind whom stands the entire mass of the working class. ...As soon as the new Government is established they will commence to fight the workers. In order that this party (i.e., the democrats) whose betrayal of the workers will begin with the first hour of victory, should be frustrated in its nefarious work, it is necessary to organize and arm the proletariat." - Karl Marx, Address to the Communist League (1850). This quote sounds as if it were written for the times we are facing today! However, Dialectical Materialism teaches us that the issues and struggles of history are cyclical, and though taking new forms, at the heart of the struggle remains the eternal war for class dominance. Moving forward to Lenin, the great leader of the October Revolution in Russia, we see that he too advocated arming the workers: “The minimum programme of the Social-Democrats calls for the replacement of the standing army by a universal arming of the people. Most of the official Social-Democrats in Europe and most of our own Menshevik leaders, however, have “forgotten” or put aside the Party’s programme, substituting chauvinism (“defencism”) for internationalism, reformism for revolutionary tactics. Yet now of all times, at the present revolutionary moment, it is most urgent and essential that there be a universal arming of the people. To assert that, while we have a revolutionary army, there is no need to arm the proletariat, or that there would “not be enough” arms to go round, is mere deception and trickery. The thing is to begin organizing a universal militia straight away, so that everyone should learn the use of arms even if there is “not enough” to go round, for it is not at all necessary that the people have enough weapons to arm everybody. The people must learn, one and all, how to use arms, they must belong, one and all, to the militia which is to replace the police and the standing army. The workers do not want an army standing apart from the people; what they want is that the workers and soldiers should merge into a single militia consisting of all the people.” - A Proletarian Militia by VI Lenin Comrade Stalin, the fierce defender of the fledgling workers’ Soviet democracy and the Champion against Nazi aggression, said that the “most important countermeasure against counterrevolution is the arming of the workers and peasants.” Finally, from the writings of the revered leader and liberator of the Chinese people, Mao Zedong, we find this important commentary on the role of the Red Army: "The Chinese Red Army is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. Especially at present, the Red Army should certainly not confine itself to fighting; besides fighting to destroy the enemy's military strength, it should shoulder such important tasks as doing propaganda among the masses, organizing the masses, arming them, helping them to establish revolutionary political power and setting up Party organizations." Certainly, each statement above applies to a particular instance in time at that particular stage of revolution in each writer’s respective countries. However, the principle remains the same. The workers must be made able to protect and defend themselves. In some cases, such as in 1916 Russia, the bourgeois were even willing to finance a workers militia - to protect their own interests – which Lenin said should be paid for by the bourgeoisie, but that the militia must above all protect the workers both from external threats, and from the bourgeois within the gates. At this point in time, the bourgeois state is not in a state of flux which would necessitate them calling upon the workers to form militias – in fact, such a thing is considered a threat to the Imperialist State’s hegemonic domination. Thus we can expect no checks to be coming in the mail from the rich for the funding of workers’ protection. However, we must still encourage the exercising of such rights still granted to all people by the Bourgeoisie state for the protection of the working class and minorities. We can take a lesson from the Black Panthers, who encouraged black communities to arm and protect themselves instead of relying on the unpredictable and brutal police forces and judicial system for protection. We can encourage the formation of community defense groups which are founded along class lines, upholding and protecting the rights of oppressed minorities. We can encourage and sponsor gun safety training, and work to create the best conditions possible for working class neighborhoods to protect themselves. We can encourage organized labor to stand together in solidarity to help protect the schools and surrounding communities, creating a “thin red line” of our own which acts as a deterrent against crimes from any source. And in the center must be the party, directing, protecting, and organizing the workers defense. Lenin would do no less.

Cap is the root cause – creates the conditions for suicide. **Haiphong 14**

“Death, US Capitalism, and Huey Newton’s Theory of Suicide,” Danny Haiphong (black activist), 2014.

Newton's examination brought him to analyze two forms of suicide: reactionary suicide and revolutionary suicide. Reactionary suicide is most commonly known as the act of killing oneself. The indignities of US capitalism produce severe internal strife. Racism and patriarchy exacerbates class exploitation and tears apart communities. Reactionary suicide peaks during capitalist economic crises and imperialist wars, where economic conditions and trauma are most severe. Huey Newton understood that Black America was a dispossessed community whose wealth, culture, and history were stolen as a result of racist and capitalist exploitation. This historical condition increased the tendency of reactionary suicide in the Black community. Thus, Newton and the BPP leadership organized with the intent of empowering the Black community through collective work. Each concrete medical clinic, free breakfast program, and Panther school were organized to move community to confront the racist, capitalist power structure and embrace revolutionary socialism and communalism. The BPP concluded that only confidence, discipline, and concrete political education could build a powerful movement against the forces that cause reactionary suicide. Revolutionary suicide, in contrast, develops out of the recognition that one is a "doomed man" after making the conscious choice to participate in the struggle for self-determination and freedom. Newton's theory of revolutionary suicide placed the utmost importance not on death itself, but how it occurs. US government repression killed many Black Panther Party members in an attempt to weaken the growing spirit of resistance in the Black community. Newton's theory of revolutionary suicide connected suicide and death to the fight for a dignified, collective humanity. The person or movement partaking in revolutionary suicide has chosen to confront death by fighting for liberation. Those who commit revolutionary suicide live on through the concrete fight for freedom, self-determination, socialism and Black Power. In other words, a revolutionary can be killed, but not the revolution. Huey Newton's work on suicide was produced in a period of time where revolutionary upheaval was at a high point in the US. Today, we must find a way to apply theories of suicide and pre-mature death in a way that fights the forces that cause them. The potential of being brutally murdered by US imperialism while we struggle to meet our individual and collective needs creates the perfect conditions for reactionary suicide. The US ruling class exploits feelings of purposelessness, depression, and confusion to manufacture consent to their rule. Death and suicide are two of the most uncomfortable, yet inevitable, consequences of US capitalism. However, as Huey Newton teaches us, to confront the meaning of our mortality in the face of a powerful enemy can give us positive direction in the fight to free ourselves from the chains of this system.

Neolib causes extinction and massive structural violence – the aff’s single issue solution sustains neolib by producing symbolic victories that let the root cause go unquestioned - try or die for the alt. **Farbod 15**

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

We must entirely withdraw the logic of capital—individual criticism is key to solve. The AFF uniquely coopts the movement. **Johnston 04**

(Adrian [interdisciplinary research fellow in psychoanalysis at Emory University], “The Cynic’s Fetish: Slavoj Žižek and the Dynamics of Belief” Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society, December p259)

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Zizek's recent writings isn't a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, **the most important task is** simply **the negativity** of the critical struggle, the effort **to cure** an intellectual constipation resulting from **capitalist ideology and** thereby to truly **open up the space for imagining** authentic **alternatives** to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Zizek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance (Zizek, 2001d, pp 22-23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Zizek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by **learning** how **to think** again **outside the confines of current restrictions has**, in and of itself, **the potential to operate as a** form of real **revolutionary practice** (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of "magic," that is, the belief in money's social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since **the value of currency is**, at bottom, **reducible to the belief that it has** the **value** attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), **derailing capitalism** by destroying its essential financial substance **is**, in a certain respect, **as easy as dissolving the mere** belief in this substance's powers. **The "**external" obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, "internally" **believe in it.**

The AFF’s single issue legalistic solution fails and will be coopted by cap. **Meszaros 95**

Meszaros, 95 (Istivan, professor emeritus at the University of Sussex, Beyond Capital, pg. 39-40)

To aggravate the situation, everything is further complicated by the fact that it is not feasible to find partial solutions to the problems that must be faced. Thus, no ‘single issue’ can be realistically considered a ‘single issue.’ If nothing else, this circumstance has been forcefully highlighted by the disconcerting marginalization of the Green movement on the success of which so much hope has been placed in recent times, even among former socialists. In the past up to a few decades ago it was possible to squeeze out of capital what appeared to be significant concessions—such as relative gains for the socialist movement (which later turned out to be reversible both as legislative measures for working class action and as gradually improving standard of living), obtained through the defensive organizations of labour: its trades unions and parliamentary parties. These gains could be conceded by capital so long as they could be assimilated and integrated by the system as a whole and turned to its productive advantage in the course of its self-expansion. Today, by contrast, confronting even partial issues with any hope of success implies the necessity of challenging the capital system as such. For in our own historical epoch, when productive self-expansion is no longer a readily available way out of the accumulating difficulties and contradictions (hence the purely wishful thinking of getting rid of the black hope of indebtedness by ‘growing out of it’), the global capital system of necessity frustrates all attempts at interfering even to a minimal extent with its structural parameters. In this respect the obstacles to be overcome are actually shared by labour—that is, labour as the radical alternative to capital’s social metabolic order—and the ‘single issue’ movements. For the historic failure of social democracy clearly underlined that only integrable demands can gain legitimacy under the rule of capital. Environmentalism by its very nature—just like the great historic cause of women’s liberation—is non-integrable. Consequently no such cause will for the capital system conveniently fade way, irrespective of how many setbacks and defeats the politically organized forms of ‘single issue’ movements might have to suffer in the foreseeable future. However, historically/epochally defined non-integrability, no matter how important for the future, cannot guarantee success on its own. Switching the allegiance of disappointed socialists from the working class to so-called ‘new social movements’ (praised now in opposition to, and by discarding altogether the emancipatory potential of, labour) must be considered, therefore, far too premature and naïve. Single issue movements, even if they fight for non-integrable issue, can be picked off and marginalized one by one, because they cannot lay claim to representing a coherent and comprehensive alternative to the given order as a mode of social metabolic control and system of societal reproduction. This is what makes focusing on the socialist emancipatory potential of labour more important today than ever before. For labour is not only non-integrable (in contrast to some historically specific political manifestations of labour, like reformist social democracy, which may be rightly characterized as integrable and indeed in the last few decades also completely integrated), but—precisely as the only feasible structural alternative to capital—can provide the comprehensive strategic framework within which all ‘single issue’ emancipatory movements can successfully make their common cause for the survival of humanity.

## Case

Gun control doesn’t solve suicide. **McAllister 16**

DC McAllister 16 [journalist based in Charlotte, North Carolina, and a senior contributor to The Federalist], “No, Goldie Taylor, Gun Control Won’t Reduce Suicide”, The Federalist, 12 Jan 2016

This is a point made in a National Academies’ Firearms and Violence report, which thoroughly examines studies such as those Taylor cites in light of direct causality. From all the evidence gathered, the committee came to the following conclusions:¶ States, regions, and countries with higher rates of household gun ownership have higher rates of gun suicide. There is also cross-sectional, ecological association between gun ownership and overall risk of suicide, but this association is more modest than the association between gun ownership and gun suicide; it is less consistently observed across time, place, and persons; and the causal relation remains unclear.¶ The risk of suicide is highest immediately after the purchase of a handgun, suggesting that some firearms are specifically purchased for the purpose of committing suicide.¶ Some gun control policies may reduce the number of gun suicides, but they have not yet been shown to reduce the overall risk of suicide in any population.¶ An important point the report makes—and one Taylor glosses over—is that even if you remove guns from a home, a person who wants to commit suicide will still find other means. As previously mentioned, women mostly kill themselves with poison. Removing guns will do nothing to help most women who struggle with depression that leads to suicide. And while it is true that guns are more lethal, and men use guns more than any other method, suicide statistics in countries that have tight gun control laws don’t support the argument that removing guns will reduce suicide rates on the whole.¶ Mark Antonio Wright makes this point in “Ezra Klein is Wrong: Gun Control Doesn’t Reduce Suicide Rates.” Like Taylor, Klein argues that reducing gun availability would decrease the suicide rate. But when you look at countries with the world’s strictest gun laws, this argument doesn’t hold up.¶ Wright first takes us to Australia, where there seems to be a relationship between its buy-back gun program and a drop in the suicide rate. But “the reduction occurred at the same time as an overall reduction in the Australian suicide rate. What’s more, firearm-related suicides had been declining in Australia for nearly ten years before the 1996 restrictions on gun ownership.”¶ Next, we go to Japan, which has the world’s most restrictive gun-control laws. While the country does have low homicide rates, it has one of the highest suicide rates in the world, nearly twice the U.S. rate! The same is true in South Korea, where handguns are practically nonexistent, but the country has the highest suicide rate in the developed world. The reason for the high rates of suicide are social and cultural factors, not the availability of guns.¶ “Guns are certainly not a factor in the suicide rate,” Wright says. “Along with hanging, drowning, and jumping off of buildings, ingesting pesticides was the method of choice for nearly 25 percent of South Korean suicides between 2006 and 2010. In 2012, more than 14,000 South Koreans took their own lives.”¶ The same is true for other nations, such as Hungary, Poland, France, Cuba, Belgium, and Austria. They all have higher suicide rates than the United States but have stricter gun control policies. Granted, there are countries with strict gun laws that have slightly lower suicide rates than America (e.g., New Zealand, Canada, Sweden, and Ireland), but given that this is not the case across the board, cultural variations, and not gun laws, must be taken into account.

Squo solves. **OPS 16**

OPS 16 [Office of the Press Secretary] “FACT SHEET: New Executive Actions to Reduce Gun Violence and Make Our Communities Safer”, The White House, 4 Jan 2016,

The Administration is committed to improving care for Americans experiencing mental health issues. In the last seven years, our country has made extraordinary progress in expanding mental health coverage for millions of Americans. This includes the Affordable Care Act’s end to insurance company discrimination based on pre-existing conditions, required coverage of mental health and substance use disorder services in the individual and small group markets, and an expansion of mental health and substance use disorder parity policies, all of which are estimated to help more than 60 million Americans. About 13.5 million more Americans have gained Medicaid coverage since October 2013, significantly improving access to mental health care. And thanks to more than $100 million in funding from the Affordable Care Act, community health centers have expanded behavioral health services for nearly 900,000 people nationwide over the past two years. We must continue to remove the stigma around mental illness and its treatment—and make sure that these individuals and their families know they are not alone. While individuals with mental illness are more likely to be victims of violence than perpetrators, incidents of violence continue to highlight a crisis in America’s mental health system. In addition to helping people get the treatment they need, we must make sure we keep guns out of the hands of those who are prohibited by law from having them. Today, the Administration is announcing the following steps to help achieve these goals:¶ Dedicate significant new resources to increase access to mental health care. Despite our recent significant gains, less than half of children and adults with diagnosable mental health problems receive the treatment they need. To address this, the Administration is proposing a new $500 million investment to help engage individuals with serious mental illness in care, improve access to care by increasing service capacity and the behavioral health workforce, and ensure that behavioral health care systems work for everyone. This effort would increase access to mental health services to protect the health of children and communities, prevent suicide, and promote mental health as a top priority.¶ Include information from the Social Security Administration in the background check system about beneficiaries who are prohibited from possessing a firearm. Current law prohibits individuals from buying a gun if, because of a mental health issue, they are either a danger to themselves or others or are unable to manage their own affairs. The Social Security Administration (SSA) has indicated that it will begin the rulemaking process to ensure that appropriate information in its records is reported to NICS. The reporting that SSA, in consultation with the Department of Justice, is expected to require will cover appropriate records of the approximately 75,000 people each year who have a documented mental health issue, receive disability benefits, and are unable to manage those benefits because of their mental impairment, or who have been found by a state or federal court to be legally incompetent. The rulemaking will also provide a mechanism for people to seek relief from the federal prohibition on possessing a firearm for reasons related to mental health.¶ Remove unnecessary legal barriers preventing States from reporting relevant information to the background check system. Although States generally report criminal history information to NICS, many continue to report little information about individuals who are prohibited by Federal law from possessing or receiving a gun for specific mental health reasons. Some State officials raised concerns about whether such reporting would be precluded by the Privacy Rule issued under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA). Today, the Department of Health and Human Services issued a final rule expressly permitting certain HIPAA covered entities to provide to the NICS limited demographic and other necessary information about these individuals.

Bans do nothing - people will commit suicide in other ways. **Kates and Mauser 07**

(Don B. Kates (LL.B., Yale, 1966) is an American criminologist and constitutional lawyer associated with the Pacific Research Institute, Gary Mauser (Ph.D., University of California, Irvine, 1970), WOULD BANNING FIREARMS REDUCE MURDER AND SUICIDE?, Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy [Vol. 30 No. 2], 2007. NS

The mantra more guns equal more death and fewer guns equal less death is also used to argue that “limiting access to firearms could prevent many suicides.” 141 Once again, this assertion is directly contradicted by the studies of 36 and 21 nations (respectively) which find no statistical relationship. Overall suicide rates were no worse in nations with many firearms than in those where firearms were far less widespread.142 Consider the data about European nations in Tables 5 and 6. Sweden, with over twice as much gun ownership as neighboring Germany and a third more gun suicide, nevertheless has the lower overall suicide rate. Greece has nearly three times more gun ownership than the Czech Republic and somewhat more gun suicide, yet the overall Czech suicide rate is over 175% higher than the Greek rate. Spain has over 12 times more gun ownership than Poland, yet the latter’s overall suicide rate is more than double the former’s. Tragically, Finland has over 14 times more gun owner‐ ship than neighboring Estonia, and a great deal more gun‐related suicide. Estonia, however, turns out to have a much higher suicide rate than Finland overall. There is simply no relationship evident between the extent of suicide and the extent of gun ownership. People do not commit suicide because they have guns available. In the absence of firearms, people who are inclined to commit suicide kill themselves some other way.143 Two examples seem as pertinent as they are poignant. The first concerns the 1980s increase in suicide among young American males, an increase that, although relatively modest, inspired perfervid denunciations of gun ownership.144 What these denunciations failed to mention was that suicide of teenagers and young adults was increasing throughout the entire industrialized world, regardless of gun availability, and often much more rapidly than in the United States. The only unusual aspect of suicide in the United States was that it involved guns. The irrelevancy of guns to the increase in American suicide is evident because suicide among English youth actually increased 10 times more sharply, with “car exhaust poisoning [being] the method of suicide used most often.”145 By omitting such facts, the articles blaming guns for increasing American suicide evaded the inconvenience of having to explain exactly what social benefit nations with few guns received from having their youth suicides occur in other ways. Even more poignant are the suicides of many young Indian women born and raised on the island of Fiji. In general, women are much less likely to commit suicide than are men.146 This statistic is true of Fijian women overall as well, but not of women in the large part of Fiji’s population that is of Indian ancestry. As children, these Indian women are raised in more-or-less loving and supportive homes. But upon marriage they are dispersed across the island to remote areas where they live with their husbands’ families, an often overtly hostile situation the husbands do little to mitigate. Indian women on Fiji have a suicide rate nearly as high as that of Indian men, a rate many times greater than that of non‐Indian Fijian women.147 It also bears emphasis that the overall Fijian suicide rate far exceeds that of the United States. The method of suicide is particularly significant. Fijian women of Indian ancestry commit suicide without using guns, perhaps because guns are unavailable. About three-quarters of these women hang themselves, while virtually all the rest die from consuming the agricultural pesticide paraquat. The recommendation of the author whose article chronicles all these suicides is so myopic as to almost caricature the more guns equal more death mindset: to reduce suicide by Indian women, she recommends that the Fijian state stringently control paraquat.148 Apparently she believes de creased access to a means of death will reconcile these women to a life situation they regard as unendurable. At the risk of belaboring what should be all too obvious, restricting paraquat will not improve the lives of these poor women. It will only reorient them towards hanging, drowning, or some other means of suicide. Guns are just one among numerous available deadly instruments. Thus, banning guns cannot reduce the amount of suicides. Such measures only reduce the number of suicides by firearms. Suicides committed in other ways increase to make up the difference. People do not commit suicide because they have guns available. They kill themselves for reasons they deem sufficient, and in the absence of firearms they just kill themselves in some other way.

Gun bans don’t reduce suicide rates. **Wright 15**

“Ezra Klein Is Wrong: Gun Control Doesn’t Reduce Suicide Rates,” Mark Antonio Wright, 2015, The National Review.

Japan has long had one of the world’s most restrictive national gun-control policies. The Council on Foreign Relations reports that, “Gun-control advocates regularly cite Japan’s highly restrictive firearm regulations in tandem with its extraordinarily low gun homicide rate.” This is true. Because most guns are illegal in Japan and gun-ownership rates are extremely low, the country has the lowest gun-homicide rate in the world at one in 10 million. According to Vox’s theory, Japan should have a similarly low suicide rate — but that’s not what you see at all. Japan has one of the highest suicide rates in the world, nearly twice the U.S. rate. Just last month, the BBC reported that nearly 25,000 Japanese took their own lives in 2014 alone, more than 70 people every day. The scarcity of firearms in Japan has not prevented an extremely high occurrence of suicide. South Korea South Korea has gun-control laws so strict almost all guns are illegal; the few available hunting rifles must be “stored at police stations” when not in use. Handguns are practically non-existent and “advertising guns or ammunition is banned.” But while shooting incidents “are rare,” South Korea has the highest suicide rate in the developed world according to the World Health Organization. As in Japan, social and cultural factors are probably to blame: 14-hour days in the classroom with relentless pressure to ace exams, a “higher percentage of stressed out kids than in any of the 30 other developed nations,” and expectations of success made more difficult to meet in moribund economic times. Guns are certainly not a factor in the suicide rate. Along with hanging, drowning, and jumping off of buildings, ingesting pesticides was the method of choice for nearly 25 percent of South Korean suicides between 2006 and 2010. In 2012, more than 14,000 South Koreans took their own lives. Gun-control is not a causal factor in reducing suicide rates. According to the data compiled by the World Health Organization, the story is much the same elsewhere: Developed Western nations such as Hungary, Poland, France, Belgium, and Austria all have higher suicide rates than the United States — and all have stricter gun-control regimes. As much as Ezra Klein and Vox want to use suicide rates as a tool to attack American’s Second Amendment rights, the data don’t support their case.