# Ban Bullets CP

## 1NC Shells

### 1NC Ban All Bullets

#### The 50 states of the United States ought to ban private ownership of handgun bullets.

#### Counterplan solves—it’s a functional regulation of handgun ownership.

Griffiths 75 (Patti, reporter @ Ocala Star-Banner, “Plan to Ban Handgun Bullets studied By Unit,” 1975, https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=1356&dat=19750413&id=j3hPAAAAIBAJ&sjid=hAUEAAAAIBAJ&pg=7188,2066455&hl=en)//ghs-VA

While Congress considers legislation to impose new handgun controls, the Consumer Product Safety Commission is moving ahead on a related issue that it says could virtually ban the weapons in America. Its five commissioners, under federal court order begin deliberations Monday on a petition to ban handgun bullets as a hazardous substance. If the agency outlaws pistol bullets, the commission has said, “the practical effect … would be a virtual ban on handguns,” a prohibition unlikely to be enacted by Congress this session. Some long guns also would be affected, firearm 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 projectiles. Casings, primers and powder are not under consideration. This back-door approach to 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 Rifle 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 commission. The committee says its effort to ban bullets stems from an inability to obtain federal gun control legislation. The movement has generated more mail to the commission than any other subject, including products dangerous to infants and children. The ban is opposed by the National Rifle Association. Susan Sullivan, a founder and president of the Chicago organization, said that the idea for the bullet ban came from an article in an NRA magazine expressing concern that the commission might feel it had the authority to outlaw pistol bullets as hazardous substances. “There was the NRA fussing about the federal government being able to outlaw the sale of ammunition under a loophole in the Hazardous Substances Act. We figured that if the NRA was nervous about it, we really ought to look into it,” she said. Mrs. Sullivan’s group petitioned the safety commission, asking for a ban on the sale of handgun bullets, except for use by policemen, the military and licensed security guards. The commission at first agreed to consider the proposal, but reversed itself Sept. 5, 1974. It decided that while it had jurisdiction to outlaw bullets, the practical effect of that ruling would be to regulate handguns, which it said Congress had not intended it to do. The Chicago organization took the commission to court. On Dec. 19, 1974, U.S. District Judge Thomas A. Flannery ruled that the commission had the authority to declare handgun ammunition a “banned hazardous substance” and ordered it to consider the proposal. That’s where the matters stand now.

## Frontlines

### 2NR Solvency Overview

#### Two framing issues on the counterplans

#### The counterplan results in a functional banning of handguns which means that any solvency deficit that applies to the counterplan applies equally to the AFF – the link differential is insignificant enough to where any disad I generate outweighs.

#### View counterplan solvency through a lens of sufficiency – even if I am not able to resolve all of the case offense resolving most of it means any net benefit generated significantly outweighs.

### 2NR Bullets solve guns

#### CP doesn’t link to politics and no risk of guns key offense – the CP would result in an end of gun production

Bedard 15

(Paul Bedard, D.C. reporter joined the Washington Examiner in 2012 after penning U.S. News & World Report's premiere political column, "Washington Whispers," for more than a decade, 2/27/15, "Obama to ban bullets by executive action, threatens top-selling AR-15 rifle," pg. online @ www.washingtonexaminer.com/article/2560750//ghs-DM)

It's starting. As promised, President Obama is using executive actions to impose gun control on the nation, targeting the top-selling rifle in the country, the AR-15 style semi-automatic, with a ban on one of the most-used AR bullets by sportsmen and target shooters. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives this month revealed that it is proposing to put the ban on 5.56 mm ammo on a fast track, immediately driving up the price of the bullets and prompting retailers, including the huge outdoors company Cabela's, to urge sportsmen to urge Congress to stop the president. Wednesday night, Rep. Bob Goodlatte, the Republican chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, stepped in with a critical letter to the bureau demanding it explain the surprise and abrupt bullet ban. The letter is shown below. The National Rifle Association, which is working with Goodlatte to gather co-signers, told Secrets that30 House members have already co-signed the letter and Goodlatte and the NRA are hoping to get a total of 100 fast. "The Obama administration was unable to ban America's most popular sporting rifle through the legislative process, so now it's trying to ban commonly owned and used ammunition through regulation," said Chris W. Cox, executive director of the NRA-ILA, the group's policy and lobby shop. "The NRA and our tens of millions of supporters across the country will fight to stop President Obama's latest attack on our Second Amendment freedoms." At issue is so-called "armor-piercing" ammunition, an exemption for those bullets mostly used for sport by AR-15 owners, and the recent popularity of pistol-style ARs that use the ammo. The inexpensive 5.56 M855 ammo, commonly called lightgreen tips, have been exempt for years, as have higher-caliber ammunition that also easily pierces the type of soft armor worn by police, because it's mostly used by target shooters, not criminals. The agency proposes to reclassify it as armor-piercing and not exempt. But now BATFE says that since the bullets can be used in semi-automatic handguns they pose a threat to police and must be banned from production, sale and use. But, as Goodlatte noted, the agency offered no proof. Federal agencies will still be allowed to buy the ammo. "This round is amongst the most commonly used in the most popular rifle design in America, the AR-15. Millions upon millions of M855 rounds have been sold and used in the U.S., yet ATF has not even alleged — much less offered evidence — that even one such round has ever been fired from a handgun at a police officer," said Goodlatte's letter. Even some police don't buy the administration's claim. "Criminals aren't going to go out and buy a $1,000 AR pistol," Brent Ball, owner of 417 Guns in Springfield, Mo., and a 17-year veteran police officer told the Springfield News-Leader. "As a police officer I'm not worried about AR pistols because you can see them. It's the small gun in a guy's hand you can't see that kills you." Many see the bullet ban as an assault on the AR-15 and Obama's back-door bid to end production and sale.

### AT: Perm

Perm do both doesn’t solve

1. No Net benefit- perm includes federal action – means it links to the net benefit. If it doesn’t its severance and a voter for fairness.
2. Doesn’t shield the link
   1. Make them read specific evidence to the CP that it would cause too much controversy to override the popularity of the plan

#### States have political cover – this means even if they win a sequencing question only the aff’s popularity goes through *[[warrant is that congress people think states don’t do anything, but this doesn’t implicate solvency because it’s a question of perception]]*

Barry G. Rabe, Professor of Environmental Policy, University of Michigan, and Director, Program in the Environment, University of Michigan, 2004 (Statehouse and Greenhouse: The Emerging Politics of American Climate Change) p. xi-xii

What has been missing in these state policy processes is the kind of anguished, often moralistic, rhetoric that has polarized national debate and made any semblance of consensus at that level so elusive. Instead, state policy deliberations over climate change may have benefited from a kind of political cover provided by the widely held presumption that states had neither incentives nor resources to play any serious role.

1. Doing both fails – **duplicate action increases implementation problems and undermines solvency**

Leman and Nelson 82 (Christopher K., Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C., and Professor of Politics, Brandeis University, and Robert H., Economics Staff, Office of Policy Analysis, United States Department of the Interior, Summer, “The Rise of Managerial Federalism” – Environmental Law, p. lexis)

When federal policy had limited goals, the hitches and compromises occasioned by intergovernmental bargaining were tolerable; today, however, when more social resources and values are at stake, the costs of joint action are much greater. Efforts to implement intergovernmental programs demonstrate that these programs are prone to disappointing results because of the complexity of joint action and the profusion of opportunities for participants to veto or alter results. The cost of joint action between levels of government may be too high when results are paramount. These views challenge the system of managerial federalism that has emerged since the New Deal. Joint intergovernmental program results may be worse than what either the states or the federal government would produce alone. Is the intergovernmental system, as it is currently conceived, simply unworkable? Would it be better to return to the classical federalism concept with a clear division of responsibilities, with most areas strictly assigned to the states? Or, conceivably, are the states anachronisms that should be replaced by a unified federal system with decentralization taking place through federal administrative regions designed for modern circumstances?

### AT: 2nd Amendment

#### They have it backwards – only the CP avoids 2nd amendment concerns

Blodget 12

(Henry Blodget is cofounder, CEO, and editor-in-chief of Business Insider, 12/24/12, "How About Banning Bullets? The Constitution Doesn't Say Anything About Those..." pg. online @ www.businessinsider.com/second-amendment-bullets-2012-12//ghs-DM)

One of the arguments invoked by those who think we should keep assault weapons freely available in this country is that the Constitution says we have a right to own and buy them. The Constitution actually doesn't say that. All the Constitution says is that we have the right to "bear arms." And that "right to bear arms" is actually supposed to support the existence of a "well-regulated militia," an important qualifying clause in the Second Amendment that those in favor of free access to assault weapons usually ignore. But even leaving aside the "well-regulated militia" clause, the Constitution doesn't specify what "arms" we're allowed to bear. And we have long set limits on the type of arms we are allowed to bear, thus establishing clearly that we have the Constitutional right to do that. For example, we're not (individually) allowed to own aircraft carriers, tanks, ballistic nuclear missiles, fighter aircraft, or attack submarines. We're not even allowed to own fully automatic machine guns.\* All of those are "arms." And yet we have established that, despite the Second Amendment, we're not individually allowed to bear them. So if we decided to establish that we are not individually allowed to bear semi-automatic assault rifles and pistols while still being allowed to own single-shot hunting guns, this would be perfectly in keeping with how we have interpreted our Second Amendment rights under the Constitution. But it will still make lots of people scream that we have tromped all over the Constitution, even if we haven't. So, how about if we limit access to something that factors into every gun massacre that the Constitution doesn't address at all: Ammunition. What if we keep semi-automatic weapons freely available but strictly control the manufacture, distribution, and sales of bullets?

### AT: Don’t Ban All Bullets

#### Crooks will just find other bullets which means a total national ban is key

Chapman 94 (Stephen, reporter @ the Chicago Tribune, “If Gun Control Has Failed, Why Not Try Bullet Control?” September 23, 1994, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1994-09-23/news/9409230037\_1\_ammunition-sales-assault-weapons-bullet-control)//ghs-VA

`Guns don't kill; bullets do," says Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the New York Democrat, who wants to curb access to ammunition, not just firearms. He has plenty of disciples in the Chicago City Council, who last week made this the first city in the country to ban the sale of so-called handgun bullets. The measure goes beyond Moynihan's proposal, which is simply to raise taxes on ammunition sales. Ald. Michael Wojcik, who came up with the bill after seeing some suspected gang members buy shells over the counter, says the ban "will put a roadblock" in the way of local criminals. Of course, they already face an array of legal obstacles, which in the real world don't even rise to the level of speed bumps. Why it is necessary to ban ammunition for weapons that theoretically do not exist is one of those questions that only the impolite would ask. Ownership of a handgun is already illegal in Chicago, unless you registered it before the law took effect in 1983. Anyone who wants to buy ammunition of any kind in Illinois has to present a state-issued Firearm Owners Identification card, which is not available to minors (except with parental consent) or convicted felons-two groups that are over-represented in street gangs. These regulations have not brought about peace and order. From 1982 (the last year before the handgun ban took effect) to 1993, the annual number of murders in Chicago rose from 668 to 850, increasing 27 percent as the city's population was falling. Even more embarrassing for gun control advocates, the annual number of handgun killings more than doubled, from 254 to 551. The latest bright idea was approved just one day after President Clinton signed a crime bill that outlaws 19 types of "assault weapons." These fearsome guns were supposed to be a big cause of the crime problem, but apparently, no one wants to wait and see if the prohibition makes any difference before finding something else to legislate against. Assault weapons were last season's rage; fashion has moved on. Chicago's new ordinance will probably be even less effective than the old laws, since bullets will remain available in abundance just across the city line. But it is no answer to say, as the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence does, that this merely proves the need for a national law. Neither Moynihan's 50 percent tax nor an outright federal ban on certain types of bullets is likely to reduce the volume of violence. Why not? If some bullets are banned, and the ban actually works, crooks will turn to guns of other calibers. Or they will find illegal supplies of ammunition. If we can't keep drugs and people from being smuggled across the border, after all, it is absurd to think we can shut out tiny metal projectiles. Even if we could, criminals can easily make their own bullets using recycled materials. Millions of gun owners already do.

### AT: Smuggling

#### This is not an answer, the evidence just says they go south of the border, not that they can come to the U.S and not specific to IPV

#### Nice try, the first line of their article says guns ALSO get smuggled

#### Anglen 11

http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/world/story/2011-10-09/ammo-us-mexico/50707742/1

Every year, thousands of guns are smuggled into Mexico from the United States, fueling the brutal drug-cartel wars and stirring outrage on both sides of the border. But often overlooked in the controversy are the tons of bullets that also make their way south of the border.

### AT: Don’t Ban All Bullets

#### Crooks will just find other bullets which means a total national ban is key

Chapman 94 (Stephen, reporter @ the Chicago Tribune, “If Gun Control Has Failed, Why Not Try Bullet Control?” September 23, 1994, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1994-09-23/news/9409230037\_1\_ammunition-sales-assault-weapons-bullet-control)//ghs-VA

`Guns don't kill; bullets do," says Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the New York Democrat, who wants to curb access to ammunition, not just firearms. He has plenty of disciples in the Chicago City Council, who last week made this the first city in the country to ban the sale of so-called handgun bullets. The measure goes beyond Moynihan's proposal, which is simply to raise taxes on ammunition sales. Ald. Michael Wojcik, who came up with the bill after seeing some suspected gang members buy shells over the counter, says the ban "will put a roadblock" in the way of local criminals. Of course, they already face an array of legal obstacles, which in the real world don't even rise to the level of speed bumps. Why it is necessary to ban ammunition for weapons that theoretically do not exist is one of those questions that only the impolite would ask. Ownership of a handgun is already illegal in Chicago, unless you registered it before the law took effect in 1983. Anyone who wants to buy ammunition of any kind in Illinois has to present a state-issued Firearm Owners Identification card, which is not available to minors (except with parental consent) or convicted felons-two groups that are over-represented in street gangs. These regulations have not brought about peace and order. From 1982 (the last year before the handgun ban took effect) to 1993, the annual number of murders in Chicago rose from 668 to 850, increasing 27 percent as the city's population was falling. Even more embarrassing for gun control advocates, the annual number of handgun killings more than doubled, from 254 to 551. The latest bright idea was approved just one day after President Clinton signed a crime bill that outlaws 19 types of "assault weapons." These fearsome guns were supposed to be a big cause of the crime problem, but apparently, no one wants to wait and see if the prohibition makes any difference before finding something else to legislate against. Assault weapons were last season's rage; fashion has moved on. Chicago's new ordinance will probably be even less effective than the old laws, since bullets will remain available in abundance just across the city line. But it is no answer to say, as the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence does, that this merely proves the need for a national law. Neither Moynihan's 50 percent tax nor an outright federal ban on certain types of bullets is likely to reduce the volume of violence. Why not? If some bullets are banned, and the ban actually works, crooks will turn to guns of other calibers. Or they will find illegal supplies of ammunition. If we can't keep drugs and people from being smuggled across the border, after all, it is absurd to think we can shut out tiny metal projectiles. Even if we could, criminals can easily make their own bullets using recycled materials. Millions of gun owners already do.

# Ban Armor Piercing Bullets CP

### 1NC Ban Armor Piercing Bullets

#### The counterplan would ban bullets that pose the greatest threats

Devaney 15 (Tim, writer @ the hill, “Handgun owners face new bullet ban bill,” March 16th, 2015, http://thehill.com/regulation/legislation/235815-handgun-owners-facing-another-bullet-ban-bill)//ghs-VA

House Democrats will introduce legislation this week that would block handguns from firing any sort of ammunition that can penetrate body armor worn by police officers. The Modernize Law Enforcement Protection Act is expected to be introduced later this week by Rep. Jackie Speier (D-Calif.). “The Second Amendment does not give anyone the right to use a bullet that is specifically designed to pierce the protective gear worn by police officers,” Rep. Steve Israel (D-N.Y.), who is co-sponsoring the bill, told The Hill. “The Second Amendment, which I support, had well intended 18th century protections, but we live in a world with 21st century criminals and increasingly lethal weapons,” he added. Democrats are offering the legislation after the Obama administration backed down last week from a controversial plan to prohibit certain types of armor-piercing ammunition amid pressure from Republicans and gun rights groups. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) had proposed to prohibit gun companies from manufacturing 5.56mm projectiles for M855 cartridges commonly used in AR-15 hunting rifles. These bullets have traditionally been exempted from regulations that prohibit armor-piercing ammunition, because they are used primarily by hunters and sportsmen. But now that they can be used in high-powered handguns, critics say they are easier to conceal and pose a greater threat to police. “An armor-piercing bullet in a concealable handgun is not for sport — unless the sport is shooting cops,” Israel said. Republicans and gun rights groups suggested the ATF’s proposal was a “backdoor” ban on AR-15 hunting rifles that would open the door for more types of bullets to be banned. “We’re not banning other bullets, we’re not banning guns, we’re not banning the Second Amendment,” Israel said. This is the second piece of legislation Democrats have offered to revive the controversial bullet ban. Rep. Eliot Engel (D-N.Y.) introduced the Armor Piercing Bullets Act last Friday. But the Modernized Law Enforcement Officers Protection Act will ban even more forms of armor-piercing ammunition, said Israel, who held a press conference Monday in New York to tout the bill. The bill would close loopholes in the current law, Democrats say. Currently, the metals used to make a bullet are how regulators determine whether it is armor-piercing. But this bill would adjust the definition to any handgun bullet that can shoot through even the weakest body armor worn by police. Therefore, the bullet ban legislation would encompass all forms of armor-piercing ammunition that can be used in handguns, even if the ammunition is also popular with hunters, Israel said. “You don’t have to use an armor-piercing bullet in a hunting rifle,” Israel said. “That’s the point. There are other bullets you could use.” The legislation was introduced in the previous Congress, but Israel said there is more “urgency” now that the ATF has backed down from its proposed bullet ban. The immediate effect would be banning the same bullet the ATF was targeting.