# A2 Militarism Aff – Berkeley Update

## Public Health CP

#### The United States federal government will adopt a public health approach to guns. Solves the aff – reduces gun deaths and shows the public that politicians will NO LONGER be passive

Kristof 15 – Nicholas, A New Way to Tackle Gun Deaths, oct. 3, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/04/opinion/sunday/nicholas-kristof-a-new-way-to-tackle-gun-deaths.html?smid=tw-nytopinion&smtyp=cur&\_r=1

One problem is that the gun lobby has largely blocked research on making guns safer. Between 1973 and 2012, the National Institutes of Health awarded 89 grants for the study of rabies and 212 for cholera — and only three for firearms injuries.¶ Daniel Webster, a public health expert at Johns Hopkins University, notes that in 1999, the government listed the gun stores that had sold the most weapons later linked to crimes. The gun store at the top of the list was so embarrassed that it voluntarily took measures to reduce its use by criminals — and the rate at which new guns from the store were diverted to crime dropped 77 percent.¶ But in 2003, Congress barred the government from publishing such information.¶ Why is Congress enabling pipelines of guns to criminals?¶ Public health experts cite many ways we could live more safely with guns, and many of them have broad popular support.¶ A poll this year found that majorities even of gun-owners favor universal background checks; tighter regulation of gun dealers; safe storage requirements in homes; and a 10-year prohibition on possessing guns for anyone convicted of domestic violence, assault or similar offenses.¶ We should also be investing in “smart gun” technology, such as weapons that fire only with a PIN or fingerprint. We should adopt microstamping that allows a bullet casing to be traced back to a particular gun. We can require liability insurance for guns, as we do for cars.¶ It’s not clear that these steps would have prevented the Oregon shooting. But Professor Webster argues that smarter gun policies could reduce murder rates by up to 50 percent — and that’s thousands of lives a year. Right now, the passivity of politicians is simply enabling shooters.¶ The gun lobby argues that the problem isn’t firearms; it’s crazy people. Yes, America’s mental health system is a disgrace. But to me, it seems that we’re all crazy if we as a country can’t take modest steps to reduce the carnage that leaves America resembling a battlefield.

## Politics DA

\*note we updated the uniqueness and stuff in the elections da file.

### Militarization Version

#### Hillary wins the nomination now

Adam Edelman, April 17, 2016, Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump hope N.Y. primary wins lead to nominations, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are hoping that if they can make it here, they can make it anywhere.¶ With just a day to go before the Empire State's first meaningful presidential primaries in decades, the former secretary of state and bombastic billionaire are poised for victories that could ultimately help propel them to their parties' respective nominations.¶ Aided by a strong debate performance, an endorsement from the Daily News' editorial board and a damning transcript from the same editorial board's meeting with her competitor, Clinton has opened up a substantial 12-point lead over Sanders in the latest RealClearPolitics polling average in New York, beating the progressive Vermont senator ¶ 53%-41%.¶ Throughout the final debate between the duo, last Thursday from the Brooklyn Navy Yard, Clinton repeatedly hammered her progressive rival over his perceived allegiance to gun-makers and well as his inability to articulate a plan to break up "too big to fail" U.S. banks — both which surfaced during his April 1 sit-down with The News and have appeared to affect his standing in the Empire State in polls — leading experts to wonder, not whether Clinton will win, but by how much.¶ "If she beats him by more than 10 points, and all of the polls show her there by a comfortable margin, the math becomes completely implausible for Sanders to win the nomination," David Birdsell, dean of the Public Affairs School at Baruch College, explained to The News.¶ "Hillary probably doesn't put this away with pledged delegates alone, but that's more likely after a double-digit Clinton win on Tuesday," he added. "And assuming Pennsylvania (where 210 delegates will be at stake on April 26) goes for Hilly too, Sanders would have to win everything else by wide margins to come out on top," he added.

#### Trump wins the Republican nomination

Brian Beutler, April 19, 2016. https://newrepublic.com/article/132832/gop-cant-legitimately-deny-trump-nomination

No matter how the Republican presidential primary unfolds from here, all the factions of the #NeverTrump movement—the party operatives attacking him; the conservative opinion leaders holding the line against him; the Republican delegates loyal to Ted Cruz after the first ballot at the party’s July convention—face severe conundrums.¶ Since March, Trump has been the only candidate with a traditional path to winning an outright majority of 1,237 pledged delegates before the Republican National Convention in Cleveland. More recently, it became mathematically impossible for John Kasich to win a delegate majority, and Ted Cruz would now probably have to rely on unpledged delegates to clear the victory threshold. But that already forbidding situation became even more challenging Tuesday night after Donald Trump won the New York primary in dominating fashion.¶ In the aftermath of Cruz’s victory in the Wisconsin primary, when the Trump campaign seemed to be floundering, it was tempting to imagine that Republicans could keep Trump far enough from 1,237 to justify denying him the nomination: Yes, Trump won vote and delegate pluralities, they could say. But he also has relatively high unfavorables within the GOP, and Republican voters are more supportive, in sum, of a Cruz-Kasich ticket, or a Cruz-Marco Rubio ticket, than they are of Trump winning the nomination.¶ Now that it looks like he’ll be at least close to an outright delegate majority, it’s difficult to see how anti-Trump conservatives can deny him the nomination and avoid accusations that they have rejected the discernible will of the Republican electorate.¶ No matter how short of 1,237 Trump falls, his argument at the convention will be simple, and completely intuitive: I might not have won in a way that requires the Republican Party to give me the nomination—but I won a moral victory. It’s in your power to deny me the nomination, but woe betide the GOP if you do. This will ring true both to his own supporters, and to GOP voters who perhaps supported a different candidate but are amenable to Trump and believe instinctually that in an election, the person with the most votes should win.

#### Hillary only has a slim lead against Trump – could go either way

Ryu Spaeth Feb 2016, https://newrepublic.com/minutes/130434/donald-trump-beat-hillary-clinton-general-election

According to RCP’s average of polls, Clinton enjoys only a slim lead over Trump in a head-to-head match-up. You have to think that her lead will climb once the Democratic Party revs up the Trump attack machine, which the GOP has so far mysteriously declined to use. But at the same time, in a polarized, nearly evenly divided electorate, there’s only so much the Democratic Party can do to expand its coalition. It’s unlikely that the editors of National Review and other anti-Trumpists will flock to Clinton. The real question is whether Trump can consolidate the GOP and perhaps even make inroads with blue-collar workers who have traditionally voted Democratic. As Noam Scheiber reported, even labor unions are interested in Trump, given his idiosyncratic position on trade. So, maybe?

#### The dems have a slight edge, but it’s close – best model confirms. Obama’s popularity is the deciding factor. Long ’15:

Time-tested model says a Democrat will win in 2016 by Heather Long @byHeatherLong August 6, 2015: 4:15 PM ET money.cnn.com/2015/08/06/news/economy/2016-democratic-victory-moodys-analystics/

Republicans might be in the spotlight this week with their first big debate, but Democrats received some very encouraging news. Moody's Analytics, which has correctly predicted every presidential race since Ronald Reagan's victory in 1980, just came out with its forecast for 2016. It will be an extremely close race, but the next president will be a Democrat, according to Moody's. This doesn't mean that Hillary Clinton is on her way back to the White House. The model that Moody's uses doesn't focus on individual candidates. Instead, it predicts which party will win in every state, so it forecasts the results of the Electoral College. Related: Look out, Trump. Bush and Christie vow to double economic growth Moody's says the Democratic nominee will get [with] 270 electoral votes -- the minimum number of votes needed to win -- while the Republican nominee will accumulate 268 votes. The model correctly predicted every state in the 2012 election and has a nearly 90% success rate in forecasting each state accurately since 1980. It will all come down to Virginia and Ohio this time because Moody's predicts that Republicans will win Florida. At the moment, Moody's says Virginia will go Democratic and Ohio will swing Republican, but that could change. "If President Obama's approval rating falls by any more than 2 percentage points by Election Day, Virginia will swing and the Republicans will win the president," the report says. Related: Bush stumbles into debate night So what is the key to such accurate predictions? Moody's says it's all about economics. The model takes into account how the economy is doing in each state. The researchers have tested a lot of variables over the years, but the best ones are family ("household") income, home values and gas prices. If those three variables are going up, it favors the incumbent party. If they're not, people want change in Washington. "The economy's performance strongly favors the Democratic nominee for president," says Moody's. Moody's points out that household incomes have been steadily improving lately and are likely to go up further before Election Day. "The only missing ingredient is stronger wage growth, which is expected to pick up in the coming months as the job market approaches full employment," the authors wrote.

#### A handgun ban is wildly unpopular – it’s the tipping point for competitive states. This also means Republicans would undo the aff if they win, so the aff has zero solvency. Scher ’15:

Will Any Presidential Candidate Support Banning Handguns? OCTOBER 2, 2015 Bill Scher Bill Scher https://ourfuture.org/20151002/will-any-presidential-candidate-support-banning-all-handguns

Politicians generally avoid proposing handgun bans because the position doesn’t fit into the frame of exempting “responsible gun owners” from new regulations. No one needs an assault rifle to hunt or to protect themselves. But plenty of Americans keep handguns thinking that it will protect them from harm. Politicians are loathe to advocate that the government “take their guns away.” However, the reality is, as physicist David Robert Grimes put it, “actually owning and using a firearm hugely increases the risk of being shot.” Of course, this is a political impossibility for the foreseeable future. The current Republican Congress won’t even pass an expan[d]sion of background checks, and a previous Republican Congress allowed the Clinton-era assault weapons ban to expire. A handgun ban also could run afoul of the Supreme Court, as it is currently constituted. But will any presidential candidate be willing to push the envelope, shake up the debate, and put a handgun ban on the table? It’s unlikely to be Sen. Bernie Sanders. Gun control is pretty much the only area where Sanders, long-time representative of rural hunting state, could be classified as a moderate. He opposed background checks in 1993, though supported them in 2013. He once supported a law protecting gun manufacturers from lawsuits, but he also voted for the assault weapons ban and supports closing the so-called gun show loophole. His rhetoric on the subject involves a bit of triangulation, “I think that urban America has got to respect what rural America is about, where 99 percent of the people in my state who hunt are law abiding people.” It’s unlikely to be Hillary Clinton. While she is stressing gun control in her campaign — a rare opportunity for her to get to Bernie’s left — she is a pragmatist at heart. Democrats for years have been careful to avoid sounding like “gun grabbers,” skirting the gun control issue so they can be competitive in states with high gun ownership like Colorado, Iowa and Nevada. In fact, if Democrats had not pursued this strategy, arguably Barack Obama never would have become president. For Clinton to push the issue now is shift left from where Obama was rhetorically in 2008 and 2012. But what’s on the table are provisions like “universal background checks, cracking down on illegal gun traffickers, and keeping guns out of the hands of domestic abusers and stalkers.” A handgun ban is not in the cards.

#### Trump would cause rampant militarism. Outweighs the aff on scope – these are policy changes that affect the entire population

Shikha Dalmia 15, The Dangers of Trump's Militaristic Isolationalism, http://reason.com/archives/2015/11/11/the-dangers-of-trumps-militaristic-isola

Trump wants to do the opposite. Sure, he calls himself the "most militaristic person" there is, and promises to make America's already strong military even bigger and stronger and greater. But what precisely does he want to use it for? He says he has no intention of spreading American democracy at gunpoint—a la George W. Bush's Iraq debacle (Trump rightly calls rivals like Marco Rubio, who want to escalate America's involvement in Syria to counter Vladimir Putin, not "hawks but fools"). Trump also has no interest in engaging in humanitarian interventions to protect vulnerable populations—a la Obama's Libya disaster.¶ Trump's military would be used as leverage to strong arm the world into doing America's bidding—whether that means forcing Mexico to build a wall on the Rio Grande, forcibly taking Iraqi oil as payment for getting rid of Saddam Hussein, imposing massive tariffs on companies that shift operations abroad, stopping China from "manipulating" its currency, or forcing South Korea and Europe to pay for America's security guarantee. In his universe, there is no win-win. It is either exploit or be exploited.¶ Everything on that wish list is bonkers, with the possible exception of the last item. But what's genuinely unhinged about it is that Trump is convinced that such policies can painlessly restore the American middle class. "All the Republicans are talking about, 'We're gonna cut, we're gonna raise the age, we're gonna do this, your Medicare, your Medicaid, your Social Security,'" he thunders. "I can bring wealth in so that we can save your Social Security without cuts."¶ In short, Americans don't have to compete for jobs or endure cuts to old-age entitlement programs; they just have to keep thuggish foreigners from bilking their wealth or taking advantage of them. This might be a comforting vision—but it is also cartoonish and dangerous.¶ The last time America tried Trump-style protectionism and imposed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley tariffs, it triggered a global trade war that turned an economic downturn into the Great Depression. His plans to shake down Mexico to pay for a wall would incense all of Latin America. And his proposal to forcibly take away Iraqi oil would breed even more anti-American hatred around the world—not to mention terrorism.¶ If Trump's challengers want to prevent his loopy ideas from permanently poisoning the policy conversation, they'll have to stop pussyfooting around—and start exposing Trump for the snake-oil salesman he is. He is dangerous for America and the world.

#### A republican president would cause rampant militarism. Outweighs the aff on scope – these are policy changes that affect the entire population

Sean Illing 2015, The GOP’s pathological militarism: These dangerous neocons belong nowhere near the White House, http://www.salon.com/2015/11/11/the\_gops\_pathological\_militarism\_these\_dangerous\_neocons\_belong\_nowhere\_near\_the\_white\_house/

But what doesn’t get discussed enough is their pathological militarism and their historical amnesia. In debate after debate, Republican presidential candidates speak as though the last fifteen years never happened. We’re still mired in two quagmires in the Middle East, one of which is largely responsible for creating the menace that is ISIS, and none of them, with the exception of Rand Paul, appears to have learned anything from our mistakes.¶ At the last Republican presidential debate in Milwaukee, you heard almost everyone on stage competing to out-hawk one another. Trump bragged about how “militaristic” he is. (Although, to Trump’s credit, he acknowledged our foolhardiness in waging war in Iraq.) Carson wants more troops in Syria and Iraq and so we can “take their energy field” and “all of that land from them.”¶ Jeb Bush thinks the “lesson of history” is that America has to “exercise leadership” (read: intervene) in the Middle East in order to preserve world order, which means arming “moderates” in Syria and enforcing no fly zones over sovereign countries even though that’s impossible to do without risking full-scale war.¶ Jeb also argued that when we fail to intervene in foreign countries, we create a dangerous power vacuum. And yet creating a power vacuum, which was filled by Iran and ISIS, is precisely what our failed experiment in Iraq accomplished. But in Jeb’s world, none of this happened. ISIS only exists because we didn’t stay in Iraq long enough, because we didn’t occupy the country interminably.¶ Carly Fiorina, arguably the most enthusiastic warmonger in the Republican field, gave a rehearsed speech about our need to “rebuild the Sixth Fleet” and “the missile defense program in Poland” and to “conduct very aggressive military exercises in the Baltic States.” She also wants “put in a few more thousand troops in Germany, not to start a war, but to make sure that Putin understands that the United States of America” means business.¶ Marco Rubio wants to cut spending across the board except, of course, on defense, where the budget is the most bloated and where we spend more than the next seven countries combined. And he sees no connection whatsoever between our military misadventures in the Middle East and the pervasive anti-American sentiment in the region. “They hate us because of our values,” Rubio said. “They hate us because our girls go to school. They hate us because women drive in the United States.”¶ This is a stupid, Manichean ideology that reduces the world into the simplest terms possible. It’s also a convenient way to avoid acknowledging our own follies, which is necessary if we’re to learn anything from them.¶ The Democratic Party was also complicit in our Iraq blunder. The difference is that the Democratic candidates all accept this. There’s no historical revisionism or blustering talk about doubling down on failed policies. For the GOP candidates, however, history starts in 2008, when Obama was elected. It’s Obama’s economy, Obama’s wars and Obama’s blunders. They simply refuse to see what went wrong before 2008 and how those errors shaped the political realities today.

## Case

### Selective enforcement

#### Gun control gives racist law enforcement more power- reentrenches the racism already present in mass incarceration

Alex Gourevitch. June 24, 2015. “Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power”. Assistant professor of political science at Brown University. Author of From Slavery to the Cooperative Commonwealth: Labor and Republican Liberty in the Nineteenth Century

The dead are buried, the murderer apprehended, and the shock has started to wear off. Now comes the public reaction to the massacre in Charleston. Soon after the shootings at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, the first black president of the United States offered some thoughts on Dylan Roof’s racist attack. First and foremost, President Obama said, recent events were about how “innocent people were killed in part because someone who wanted to inflict harm had no trouble getting their hand on a gun.” The killings were also about a “dark chapter in our history,” namely racial slavery and Jim Crow. Obama only suggested practical action regarding the first issue, namely gun control. He did not consider that such measures will make the persistence of the second problem even worse. It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of gun control means writing more criminal laws, creating new crimes, and therefore creating more criminals or more reasons for police to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice. As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority. While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence. This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.” In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following: “I had an [assistant U.S. attorney who] wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant [in a case which] there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.” This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. No matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the policing involved would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations. Once individuals find themselves arrested gun control reappears as a reason for increasing punishment. Gun possession can be used to enhance sentences for other crimes and even functions as a kind of double punishment when that possession becomes the reason for also tacking on an extra criminal charge. Gun charges are also a part of the excessive and racially unequal over-charging practices that not only contribute to rising incarceration rates but also ends force numerous individuals away from trial and into plea bargains. Poor Blacks and Latinos are easily intimidated by charge-happy prosecutors into accepting plea deals, meaning they never see their day in court. Some even end up admitting to crimes they did not commit just to avoid the possibility of more severe punishments. More criminal gun laws would only feed this deeply unjust system. There is an unrecognized gap between the justification for gun control and its most likely effect. There is no reason to expect fair enforcement of gun control laws, or even that they will mainly be used to someone prevent these massacres. That is because how our society polices depends not on the laws themselves but on how the police – and prosecutors and courts – decide to enforce the law. Especially given how many guns there are in the U.S., gun law enforcement will be selective. That is to say, they will be unfairly enforced, only deepening the injustices daily committed against poor minorities in the name of law and order. It is hard to imagine any feasible gun control laws doing much to decrease mass shootings. But it is easy to see how they will become part of the system of social control of mostly black, mostly poor people. There are already too many crimes, there is too much criminal law, and there is far too much incarceration — especially of black people. To the degree that all that is part of the “dark chapter in our history,” given the deep injustice of our society, and especially its policing practices, the actual practice of gun control will continue that dark chapter, not resolve it. Of course, a reasonable gun control regime is logically possible. We can imagine one in our heads. But it is not politically possible in the United States right now. And it is a great error to think that gun control is the path to racial justice. More likely, it is the other way around. Racial justice is a precondition for any reasonable gun control regime. That, perhaps, is why the demands that have emerged from the #blacklivesmatter movement focus not on gun control but instead on demilitarizing the police and investing in “jobs, housing, and schools” for those “black communities most devastated by poverty.” What happened in Charleston is a horrific tragedy. The criminal law will not solve it. I wish I had a better solution ready at hand. I don’t, though I think it would start by freeing our political imagination from instinctively reaching for the criminal law

### Rape Culture

#### Turn: the plan is anti-guns, which prevents ending rape culture through a key intersection for Feminism. Charles 11'

Charles, Lindsey K. "Feminist and Firearms: Why are so many women Anti-Choice?" 2011

Some women's issues affect only a particular class of women: maternity leave and parental benefits affect only women who choose to become mothers, access to abortion affects only women of child-bearing age, and pay discrepancies affect only women in the work force. However, the fear of violence affects all women.27 Some women may respond to this fear with denial or a pacifist determination to succumb rather than fight back, and that is their choice. Others may decide, after careful consideration, that their bodies and lives are worth defending. These women must have a full range of self-defense tools in order for their choice to be meaningful. Pervasive acceptance of women's armed self-defense could help change the current rape culture and encourage women to take responsibility for their own safety, while working for equality and an end to patriarchy. Guns are safe when used by responsible adults, and are the most effective tool for self-defense.28 Furthermore, removing restrictions on women's choices increases individual freedom and can lead to greater personal autonomy

### Giroux Turn

#### Gun control focus forecloses possibility of true change

Giroux 13 [Violence is Deeply Rooted in American Culture:](http://truth-out.org/news/item/13982-violence-is-deeply-rooted-in-american-culture-interview-with-henry-a-giroux) [An Interview With Henry A. Giroux](http://truth-out.org/news/item/13982-violence-is-deeply-rooted-in-american-culture-interview-with-henry-a-giroux) <http://www.leolienne.com/bamablog/index.php/categories/28-learning/essatorials/1158-henry-giroux-violence-deeply-routed-in-american-culture> 23 January 2013 Truthout

There is little doubt that the role of the NRA is instrumental in the violence haunting American culture, or that gun control is important, but it is only one factor in the culture of symbolic and institutional violence that has such a powerful grip on the everyday cultural apparatuses and workings of American society. The issue of violence in America goes far beyond the issue of gun control. When gun control is the focus — instead of a broader consideration of violence — it can actually serve to deflect the most important questions that need to be raised. The grave reality is that violence saturates almost every aspect of North American culture. Domestically, violence weaves through the cultural and social landscape like a highly charged forest fire burning everything in its path. Popular culture, extending from Hollywood films and sports thuggery, to video games, embraces the spectacle of violence as the primary medium of entertainment. The real issue here is the existence of a pedagogy of violence that actually makes the power of deadly violence attractive. Representations of violence dominate the media and often parade before viewers less as an object of critique than as a for-profit spectacle, just as the language of violence and punishment now shapes the U.S. culture — with various registers of violence now informing school zero-tolerance policies, a bulging prison-industrial complex, and the growing militarization of everyday life. There is also the fact that as neoliberalism and its culture of cruelty weaves its way through the culture it makes the work place, schools, and other public spheres sites of rage, anger, humiliation, and misery, creating the foundation for blind rebellion against what might be termed intolerable conditions. Accepting the logic of radical individual responsibility, too many Americans blame themselves for being unemployed, homeless, and isolated and end up perceiving their misery as an individual failing and hence are vulnerable to forms of existential depression and collective rage. We have seen such violence among students reacting to bullying and among postal workers responding to intolerable work conditions. There is no one cause of violence, but a series of a number of causes that range from the war on drugs and the militarization of police departments to mass incarcerations in prisons to the return from brutal wars of many trained killers suffering with PTSD.[2] All of these factors combine in an explosive mix to create an dangerous culture of violence and cruelty and as Jeff Sparrow points out a “willingness of ordinary people to commit unthinkable atrocities.”[3]

### General turns

#### Empirics prove—handgun bans in the US cause more murder.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

Finished with international comparisons, Dixon turns to interstate analysis. If gun controls reduced crime, then it would be expected that states with stricter gun laws would have lower gun crime rates. But as Dixon acknowledges, states with stricter gun laws have higher crime rates. [113] There are several possible explanations. First, the states which enacted the strict gun laws had high crime to begin with; that it why the stricter laws were enacted. A second, not inconsistent explanation, is that gun control itself causes higher crime, making the already high-crime states even worse than they would otherwise be. Dixon deals with the explanation by dismissing it as "perverse." [114] Argument by epithet is not persuasive, and (as will be discussed below), there are plausible reasons to believe that some gun controls may increase crime, and that Dixon's proposed handgun ban would substantially aggravate crime. [115] Dixon admits that at least sometimes handguns prevent crime, [116] so it is hardly "perverse" to suggest that it could be possible that states which weaken the deterrent effect of civilian handgun ownership suffer increased crime. A third explanation for why states with stern gun laws have more crime than other states is that guns from other states, with looser laws, are smuggled into the high crime states, thus reducing or eliminating the crime-reductive effect of the strict state's law. This explanation is not inconsistent with the first two explanations. Dixon devotes the rest of his interstate discussion to arguing for this third explanation. Even if Dixon's explanation about leakage is generally true, it remains difficult to account for the dismal performance of many gun controls. For example, in 1976 the Washington, D.C. murder rate stood at 26.9 per 100,000 population, according to FBI statistics. The city council enacted a handgun ban which went into effect in February \*316 1977, and since then the Washington rate has always been higher than 26.9 (except in 1985). [117] Today, the rate is three times higher than it was before the ban was enacted. [118] If handgun bans work, why would the homicide rate rise after 1977 (which was years before the "war on drugs" made Washington's homicide problem even worse)? Smuggling guns into Washington, D.C. from other states was no easier in 1980 than it was in 1976. The ban on possession by law-abiding citizens should have reduced the supply of handguns available for Washington, D.C. criminals to steal, and should have prevented law-abiding citizens from shooting each other with handguns in heat-of-passion homicides. The D.C. handgun ban's impact on law-abiding citizens would not be defeated by interstate smuggling, since law- abiding citizens would, be definition, not buy an illegal gun. And yet the Washington homicide rate rose. Similar increases in gun crime in other jurisdictions, such as Chicago after its own handgun ban, [119] and New York City after its severe "Sullivan" handgun licensing law, [120] at least raise doubt about the complete sufficiency of interstate gun smuggling as an explanation for the failure of the gun laws. If interstate smuggling were the whole story, then it would not be expected that crime rates would rise immediately after gun laws were enacted.

#### Handgun ban forces criminals to switch to deadlier weapons—substantially increases murder rates.

Kopel 93 David B. (Director of the Firearms Research Project at the Independence Institute, a Denver, Colorado think-tank. He also serves as an Associate Policy Analyst with the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and as a techincal consultant to the International Wound Ballistics Association. J.D. 1985, University of Michigan Law School; B.A. Brown University, 1982. Kopel's book, THE SAMURAI, THE MOUNTIE AND THE COWBOY: SHOULD AMERICA ADOPT THE GUN CONTROLS OF OTHER DEMOCRACIES? was awarded the Comparative Criminology Prize by the American Society of Criminology's Division of International Criminology) “PERIL OR PROTECTION? THE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF HANDGUN PROHIBITION” Saint Louis University Public Law Review Volume 12, 1993 <http://www.constitution.org/2ll/2ndschol/63perilo.htm> JW

If handguns were somehow removed from the hands of malfeasants, would the death toll actually increase? Some gun misusers would switch to knives (not much less deadly than small handguns), while others would switch to rifles and shotguns (much more likely to kill than handguns). If enough misusers switched from handguns to long guns, the death toll might therefore increase, or so the "substitution argument" goes. Dixon confronts the substitution argument carefully, and provides one of the most comprehensive critiques of substitution theory ever offered by a handgun prohibitionist. \*327 Dixon is right to take the substitution argument seriously. While handgun wounds are usually survivable, especially if the victim gets medical attention quickly, shotgun blasts at close range are much more likely to be fatal. The shotgun fires a large slug, or from six to more than sixty pellets, with one trigger squeeze. A single shotgun pellet, because it may be of a diameter equal to a small handgun bullet, can inflict nearly as much damage as a small handgun bullet. [177] Wound ballistics and firearms experts concur that at short range, a shotgun is by far the deadliest weapon. [178] Anti-prohibition writers such as David Hardy, Gary Kleck, and Don Kates have argued that a high level of substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in the case of a hypothetical American handgun ban. Dixon offers a careful rebuttal of their arguments, and concludes that (since he has placed the burden of proof on prohibition opponents) the case for a substitution effect has not been proven convincingly enough to overcome what he considers the strong evidence for handgun prohibition. Overlooked in the discussion of a substitution effect resulting from a hypothetical American handgun ban is non- hypothetical evidence from other countries. As Dixon showed earlier in his article, countries with more handguns per capita tend to have more handgun homicides per capita. [179] Switzerland, which has, by world standards, relatively lenient handgun laws, has more handgun homicides per capita than countries where handgun laws are tougher. [180] From the handgun density/handgun homicide correlation in Switzerland and other nations (as well as from other evidence detailed supra), Dixon concludes that handgun density strictly correlates with handgun homicide. [181] Let us \*328 assume that Dixon is right. In countries such as Australia and Canada, where handgun laws are much stricter than in Switzerland, the handgun homicide rate is lower than in Switzerland, but the total homicide rate is over 100 percent greater. [182] The reason cannot be that Australians and Canadians are more prone to want to kill somebody than the Swiss are - Dixon has explicitly assumed that human nature in developed countries is roughly similar everywhere. [183] So why then do Canada and Australia have more murders, even though they have stricter handgun laws, and fewer handgun murders? One plausible explanation is the substitution effect. A sufficiently large number of Australians and Canadians, unable to obtain handguns, do their shooting with rifles or shotguns; their victims die, whereas if they had been shot with handguns, many would have survived. Although some Australian and Canadian assailants, unable to obtain handguns, switched to less deadly weapons (such as clubs), the number of assailants who switched to rifles and shotguns was sufficiently large to increase the overall death toll. If we have plausible evidence to suggest that a substitution effect may have occurred in Australia and Canada, could a similar effect occur in the United States? [184] \*329 Dixon quotes research developed by Don Kates and Mark Benenson that if 30% of persons attempting homicide switched from handguns to long guns, while the other 70% switched to knives, total homicide would increase substantially. If 50% switched to long guns, the homicide rate could double, even if none of the persons switching to knives killed anyone. [185] A National Institute of Justice study of felons in state prisons found that 72% of the handgun criminals said they would switch to sawed-off shotguns if handguns became unavailable. [186] A 72% substitution rate would lead to an enormous multiplication of the current homicide rate, and Kleck expects that substitution would occur at about 70%. Dixon retorts that criminals are apt to be braggarts and liars, and might claim that nothing, including a handgun ban, could stop them from committing any crime they chose. Accordingly, the 72% substitution figure might be too high. True enough. But at the same time, at least some criminals may be highly suspicious and mistrustful of authority. Although the National Institute of Justice polling, conducted through written response to written questions, offered the respondents anonymity, some of the prisoners might have believed that their responses would not in fact be anonymous; the polling might be a "setup" to discern their plans after release, and provide a reason for denying parole. Thus, some handgun criminals might have falsely said that they would not substitute sawed-off shotguns for unavailable handguns. Do the number of braggart criminals who falsely said that they would use sawed-off shotguns outnumber the number of mistrustful criminals who falsely said they would not? It is difficult to say with certainty. But since 72% of the criminals said they would substitute, and since only 30% substitution is needed to increase substantially the homicide rate, there is a wide margin for error to assume that bragging criminals outnumber suspicious ones. Dixon critiques the Benenson and Kates estimate of a homicide rate increase because Benenson and Kates assumed that handgun users who did not switch to long guns would switch "downward" to the next most deadly weapon, knives. Almost certainly, some handgun users would, rather than using knives, turn to even less deadly weapons, such as fists, or would not attempt murder in the first place, absent a handgun. [187] But when calculating expected deaths resulting from substitution, Kates and Benenson assumed that none of the persons who switched to knives would kill anyone; in terms of resulting deaths, therefore, Kates and Benenson underestimated the \*330 deaths that would be caused by murderers who switched downward to less lethal weapons. Even assuming that none of the persons who switched down killed anyone, the homicide rate would double if half of the handgun-deprived criminals switched "up" to long guns. [188] Another tack taken by Dixon is to argue that high rates of substitution are unlikely because long guns are so inferior for most criminal purposes. He notes first of all that less than 10% of murders are currently perpetrated with long guns. [189] This is true, but, as Dixon strenuously argues, handguns are widely preferred as murder weapons, and widely available. Thus, it should not be surprising that more than 6 out of 7 gun murderers chose the "best" tool, a handgun. But what people choose when the "best" option is available does not prove how they would behave if only inferior options were available. Today, virtually all hard liquor drinkers consume the "best" hard liquor available - namely legally-produced hard liquor whose production is regulated by the government to guarantee standards of safety. Probably less than 5% of American hard liquor consumers drink bathtub gin, moonshine, and other home- brewed liquors whose safety cannot be guaranteed. Does the fact prove that very few liquor drinkers would, if legal liquor became unavailable, substitute home-brewed liquor? To the contrary, the experience of alcohol prohibition showed that a large percentage of liquor consumers, if unable to obtain safe, legal liquor, will switch to inferior, dangerous homemade liquor. [190] That murderers only rarely use long guns today does not prove that murders would eschew long guns if handguns were unavailable, any more than drinkers of legal liquor would eschew bathtub gin. [191] As another argument against substitution, Dixon points out that long guns are less concealable than handguns. Even when sawed off, a shotgun is still about 11 inches long, making it slightly larger than big handguns, and much larger than the small, low-caliber handguns which are frequently used in crime. Would sawed-off shotguns frequently be substituted in a \*331 robberies? Putting an 11 inch shotgun in one's front pocket would not be very effective concealment. On the other hand, sticking the shotgun in the inner pocket of a large coat or jacket would seem reasonably effective. Accordingly, it is plausible to infer that persons who execute planned robberies would substitute concealed shotguns. At the same time, criminals who simply carried handguns with them, and spontaneously perpetrated robberies when the opportunity arose, might not be able to carry concealed shotguns so frequently. Thus, impulsive handgun robberies would suffer less of a substitution effect than would planned robberies. Since casual carrying of firearms in general might decrease, so might the shootings that result from the casual insults and provocations that can occur on the street. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that an effective handgun ban might prevent some shootings. But again, only a 30% substitution rate would be necessary for total homicides to rise substantially. What about in the home? It is the home, after all, rather than in robberies of stores, where the larger number of handgun homicides currently occur. Dixon argues that even in the home, the concealability of handguns is important. He asserts that substantial portion of the murders in 1989 involved "friends or acquaintances who may have been unaware that the person they are visiting is carrying a concealed weapon." [192] First of all, there is no evidence as to how many of those murderers actually were carrying a concealed weapon of which the victim was unaware. For the sake of argument, assume that all of the murders would have been prevented had handguns not been available; there is still a long way to go for the substitution ratio to be reduced below 30%, and thus not cause a net increase in homicides. Next, Dixon writes that "the ease of pulling out the [hand]gun and shooting makes such arguments far more likely to spill over into murder. In contrast, by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their [sic] long gun and loaded it, the potential victim has crucial seconds in which to escape." [193] Here, Dixon assumes that the domestic handgun murderers were carrying the handgun on their body, rather than storing the handgun in another room. He likewise assumes that the substituted long gun would be stored in "another room" rather than the room in which the argument was taking place. He further assumes that the handguns used in the domestic shootings were loaded, but the substituted long guns would not be loaded. All of these assumptions may be simultaneously true some of the time, thus making Dixon's escape scenario plausible in \*332 some instances. (Although not every potential victim would know that the potential murderer was loading a long gun in the other room, and even then, some might not run away.) [194] But it is highly speculative to assume that Dixon's scenario of the unloaded long gun in the other room replacing the loaded handgun carried on the person would be the predominant scenario. Even if we speculatively assume that the unloaded long gun scenario would transpire more than 50% of the time, all that is needed for an increase in the death rate is a 30% substitution rate. While Dixon argues convincingly that substitution would not be universal, the evidence easily supports the conclusion that substitution of long guns for handguns would occur in at least 30% of current handgun murder situations, thus leading to a substantial increase in total deaths.

#### Risk of the turn outweighs the case solvency – people parading around with AR15’s is a lot worse than handguns, larger example of militarism

### Defense/a2 australia

#### Literature review proves no solvency. 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

In this connection, two recent studies are pertinent. In 2004, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences released its evaluation from a review of 253 journal articles, 99 books, 43 government publications, and some original empirical research. It failed to identify any gun control that had reduced violent crime, suicide, or gun accidents.15 The same conclusion was reached in 2003 by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control’s review of then-extant studies.16

#### This shuts down their Australia solvency

CLAUDETTE YAZBEK DEC 8 2015, “4 reasons Australia's success with tackling gun problems can't transfer to the US, http://www.businessinsider.com.au/4-reasons-australias-success-with-tackling-gun-problems-cant-transfer-to-the-us-2015-12

America’s unwavering love of guns perplexes Australians. We contrast the situation in the US with how we reformed our gun laws in response to one unhinged individual’s shooting spree, and how this reduced the incidences of mass shootings from 13 between 1979-1996, to zero in the following 19 years. In doing so, we simultaneously attempt to shame the United States into reforming its gun laws by highlighting deficiencies in their response, and try to inspire change by providing an example of a conservative national government successfully implementing tough, new gun control laws.¶ Neither is likely to be an effective strategy in shifting US thinking on gun laws.¶ Understanding America’s unrequited romance with guns begins with recognising that in 1996, we did not need to grapple with an institutionalised gun culture. And we did not have a political landscape characterised by unworkable polarisation. So what exactly interferes with America following Australia’s lead on gun reform?¶ 1. Both Republicans and Democrats Love Guns¶ Americans love guns. It is a love that transcends party lines. The Democratic Party Platform acknowledges the right to bear arms as an important part of the American tradition. Steven Hill and Robert Richie in The Atlantic go so far as to explain how Democrats now pander to the issue and remind their readers how in 2004, Presidential hopeful, John Kerry trumpeted his own prowess as a gun owner. Now as Secretary of State, Kerry’s attempt at swaying gun owners has been unsuccessful. Despite his hunting photos and camouflage, he lost gun owners nationally by 28 votes.¶ It also remains unclear what catalyst is needed in the United States for a change in gun culture. In 2011, Congresswoman Gabrielle Gifford attended an event with her constituents in Tucson. She was shot in the head at point blank range. Following her courageous recovery, she and her husband started “Americans for Responsible Gun Solutions”. Her profile describes her long-time gun ownership and belief in the constitutional right of all Americans to safe and responsible gun ownership.¶ Gifford’s experience best illustrates that the point of tension between the two parties is what, if any, constitutes reasonable regulations around this right – not the more basic question of whether guns have a legitimate place in a democratic society. Couching the gun debate in terms of reasonable regulation, however, overlooks that the type of gun safety in countries that has had dramatic results involves no guns. And not even liberal Democrats would support this position.¶ 2. The Lobbying Power of the National Rifle Association¶ In 1996, Australia did not need to grapple with the National Rifle Association (NRA). The NRA contributed $810,462 to candidates in the 2014 election cycle and has raised $165,200 so far for the 2016 campaign. The top recipients in 2014 were the Republican National Committee and the National Republican Congressional Committee. Of the 46 candidates who voted against expanding background checks in 2013, 43 received political contributions from pro-gun interests.¶ Their pervasive influence through campaign contributions is now a permanent fixture on America’s democratic landscape.¶ Critically, the NRA mobilises voters in a handful of swing districts that can determine which party controls the House of Representatives. Hill and Richie go on to explain that who controls the House comes down to 35 districts, or eight per cent. Generally, these swing states are rural and conservative leaning. With the majority of NRA members living in swing districts, this set up gives enormous power to the NRA. It can target its resources to these areas, which are key voting battlegrounds for the President and for Congressional members.¶ Australia’s gun lobby simply did not exercise the same levels of power, nor political astuteness.¶ 3. Blurred Lines: Partisan Gerrymandering¶ The majority of individual Americans support common sense gun reform. However, America’s geography has a Republican Bias. Every state elects a certain number of people to the House Representatives. This number is based on a state’s population count, and the state is then divided into congressional districts with roughly equal populations.¶ Partisan gerrymandering occurs when political parties opportunistically use this map drawing process of geographically dividing boundaries to advance their interests. You pack an opponent’s supporters together in a few districts, and make the others relatively more balanced. The result? You lose a few districts big, and win the majority of districts comfortably.¶ America’s “winner takes all” elections allow gun safety opponents to form a powerful, single-issue voting bloc that secures large numbers of seats in elections. Australia’s political system, by contrast, tends to push parties toward the centre political ground as they fight to win swing seats where voters can be convinced to shift support from one party to another.¶ 4. The Second Amendment is a Constitutional Right¶ The United States Supreme Court in 2008 ruled that the Constitution confers on an individual the right to possess a firearm for a traditionally lawful purpose (i.e. self-defence). In doing so, they overturned two Washington D.C. provisions: one that banned handguns, and another that required lawful firearms in the home to be disassembled, or trigger-locked.¶ Justice Elena Kegan explained in 2013 that the NRA had become “quite a presence” in judicial confirmations. She went on to describe how she would go to the office, meet with 80 senators, and answer questions about her views on the Second Amendment. Congressman Patrick Lehay asked Kegan during her Senate Confirmation hearing if there was any doubt that the Second Amendment secures a fundamental right for an individual to own a firearm.¶ The United States is one of two other countries (along with Mexico and Guatemala) that constitutionally protect the right to bear arms. The Constitution is notoriously and deliberately difficult to amend. And this will be even more so when looking at the Court’s current 5-4 conservative leaning. In the foreseeable future, with life-appointments for Supreme Court justices, we are unlikely to see a reading down of the “right to bear arms”.¶ \*\*\*¶ Previously thought safe spaces are no longer safe including primary schools, community college, churches, health clinics and cinemas. Americans talk about mass shootings in the same way we talk about natural disasters – inevitable. But they are not.¶ There is a gun for every man, woman and child in America. And they are easy to obtain. Australia is not a comparable case study for the United States. We cannot pretend we faced the same entrenched institutional obstacles, and a fear-driven political climate. How do you implement a buy-back scheme for 300 million guns, and aggressive, unwilling gun-owners?¶ America faces self-created barriers to effective gun safety reform. Australia’s success in this area does not mean it automatically presents a model for a developed, democratic nation changing its laws. It didn’t work when it was tried on us. Change needs to come from within.

#### Australia solvency not applicable – no constitutional guarantee and different levels of violence

Laura Smith Spark 2015, This is what happened when Australia introduced tight gun controls

Can America follow it? The gun culture in the United States is a powerful factor that can't be ignored. Howard acknowledged those key differences in an interview with CNN's Christiane Amanpour in 2013. "I don't come here with any lectures," he said. Australia started with a much lower gun death rate, he said, and "we don't have constitutional guarantees in relation to these things."

#### Aff can't solve – culture is intractable, and it's nonfalsifiable which takes out their “empirical solvency” from Australia. Masket 15

SETH MASKET, OCT 5, 2015, "You Can Change Laws Without Changing Hearts and Minds" http://www.psmag.com/politics-and-law/you-can-change-laws-without-changing-hearts-and-minds

But another issue frequently raised is that gun culture runs deep in our nation. America, that is, has a fiercely individualistic culture and access to firearms is a part of that, dating back to the nation's founding and earlier. Gun violence is a deeply complex and intractable issue in the United States that is rooted in region, faith, race, poverty, and family. You can't just change the laws without changing our hearts and minds first.¶ Let's not assume that an issue is untouchable because it's complex or has deep cultural roots. So does every social issue.¶ To hear this reminds me of a fascinating and surprisingly revealing recent exchange between Hillary Clinton and activists from the Black Lives Matter movement. Wary of her support for their movement, activists asked Clinton on what issues she had changed in her heart that had brought her around. "I don’t believe you change hearts," Clinton responded. "I believe you change laws, you change allocation of resources, you change the way systems operate."¶ Clinton's response, while perhaps harsh, was basically correct. Actually changing the political culture can take decades, or it may never even happen. It's not even clear how one does it or how we would measure it.

#### Tons of alt causes to gun culture – your author – takes out your solvency but you still make gun culture worse

Henry A. Giroux 15, Murder, Incorporated: Guns and the Growing Culture of Violence in the US, October 2015

Even worse, the firearms industry is pouring millions into recruiting and educational campaigns designed to both expose children to guns at an early age and to recruit them as lifelong gun enthusiasts. Reporting on such efforts for The New York Times, Mike McIntire writes:¶ The industry's strategies include giving firearms, ammunition and cash to youth groups; weakening state restrictions on hunting by young children; marketing an affordable military-style rifle for "junior shooters" and sponsoring semiautomatic-handgun competitions for youths; and developing a target-shooting video game that promotes brand-name weapons, with links to the Web sites of their makers.... Newer initiatives by other organizations go further, seeking to introduce children to high-powered rifles and handguns while invoking the same rationale of those older, more traditional programs: that firearms can teach "life skills" like responsibility, ethics and citizenship. (10)¶ As the United States moves from a welfare state to a warfare state, state violence becomes normalized. The United States' moral compass and its highest democratic ideals have begun to wither, and the institutions that were once designed to help people now serve to largely suppress them. Gun laws, social responsibility and a government responsive to its people matter. We must end the dominance of gun lobbyists, the reign of money-controlled politics, the proliferation of high levels of violence in popular culture and the ongoing militarization of US society. At the same time, it is crucial, as many in the movement for Black lives have stated, that we refuse to endorse the kind of gun control that criminalizes young people of color.

### Cap turn?

#### Cap is the root of militarism. No aff solvency.

AW 08 – Anarchist Writers, “D.8 What causes militarism and what are its effects?” http://anarchism.pageabode.com/afaq/secD8.html

There are three main causes of capitalist militarism.¶ Firstly, there is the need to contain the domestic enemy - the oppressed and exploited sections of the population. As Emma Goldman argued, the military machine "is not directed only against the external enemy; it aims much more at the internal enemy. It concerns that element of labour which has learned not to hope for anything from our institutions, that awakened part of the working people which has realised that the war of classes underlies all wars among nations, and that if war is justified at all it is the war against economic dependence and political slavery, the two dominant issues involved in the struggle of the classes." In other words, the nation "which is to be protected by a huge military force is not" that "of the people, but that of the privileged class; the class which robs and exploits the masses, and controls their lives from the cradle to the grave." [Red Emma Speaks, p. 352 and p. 348]¶ The second, as noted in the section on imperialism, is that a strong military is necessary in order for a ruling class to pursue an aggressive and expansionist foreign policy in order to defend its interests globally. For most developed capitalist nations, this kind of foreign policy becomes more and more important because of economic forces, i.e. in order to provide outlets for its goods and capital to prevent the system from collapsing by expanding the market continually outward. This outward expansion of, and so competition between, capital needs military force to protect its interests (particularly those invested in other countries) and give it added clout in the economic jungle of the world market. This need has resulted in, for example, "hundreds of US bases [being] placed all over the world to ensure global domination." [Chomsky, Failed States, p. 11]¶ The third major reason for militarism is to bolster a state's economy. Capitalist militarism promotes the development of a specially favoured group of companies which includes "all those engaged in the manufacture and sale of munitions and in military equipment for personal gain and profit." [Goldman, Op. Cit., p. 354] These armaments companies ("defence" contractors) have a direct interest in the maximum expansion of military production. Since this group is particularly wealthy, it exerts great pressure on government to pursue the type of state intervention and, often, the aggressive foreign policies it wants. As Chomsky noted with respect to the US invasion and occupation of Iraq:¶ "Empires are costly. Running Iraq is not cheap. Somebody's paying. Somebody's paying the corporations that destroyed Iraq and the corporations that are rebuilding it. in both cases, they're getting paid by the U.S. taxpayer. Those are gifts from U.S. taxpayers to U.S. Corporations . . . The same tax-payers fund the military-corporate system of weapons manufacturers and technology companies that bombed Iraq . . . It's a transfer of wealth from the general population to narrow sectors of the population." [Imperial Ambitions, pp. 56-7]¶ This "special relationship" between state and Big Business also has the advantage that it allows the ordinary citizen to pay for industrial Research and Development. As Noam Chomsky points out in many of his works, the "Pentagon System," in which the public is forced to subsidise research and development of high tech industry through subsidies to defence contractors, is a covert substitute in the US for the overt industrial planning policies of other "advanced" capitalist nations, like Germany and Japan. Government subsidies provide an important way for companies to fund their research and development at taxpayer expense, which often yields "spin-offs" with great commercial potential as consumer products (e.g. computers). Needless to say, all the profits go to the defence contractors and to the commercial companies who buy licences to patented technologies from them, rather than being shared with the public which funded the R&D that made the profits possible. Thus militarism is a key means of securing technological advances within capitalism.

#### The aff disarms working class revolutionaries that need guns for self defense and violent revolution against capitalism.

LRP 94 League for the Revolutionary Party “Gun Control Is No Answer to Crime” Proletarian Revolution No. 46 (Spring 1994) https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/newspape/socialistvoice/guncontrol.html

For months the ruling class has subjected the American people to an unrelenting propaganda barrage about the dangers of crime and especially guns in U.S. cities. Right-wing politicians and tabloid media have been in the forefront—not surprisingly, since a major purpose of the campaign is to scapegoat Blacks for the ills of the system and justify increasing repression. But liberal leaders, starting from Bill Clinton with his vindictive crime legislation, have gone along, as have Black spokesmen from Jackson to Farrakhan.¶ Stop Gun Control!¶ Crime in the cities is indeed mounting, bred by the miseries of decaying capitalism. The ruling class, society’s biggest criminals, foster misery and the plagues of drugs and violent crime in poor communities. The favorite panaceas of liberals of all hues is gun control: take weapons away from everyone but the cops and the military, plus a handful of “respectable” (i.e., upper middle-class) types.¶ At the time of its revolutionary origins, the U.S. had to grant its citizens the right to bear arms. Now in its epoch of imperialist decay, it tries to remove that right. By using the crime campaign to hide its own, far greater violence, it denies the right of the oppressed masses to defend themselves.¶ In the absence of proletarian leadership that provides a real answer, the initiative has been handed to reactionaries. The National Rifle Association, a right-wing outfit, takes the lead in defending the Second Amendment, while left, union, and Black leaders go along with the gun-control mania.¶ Working-class revolutionaries recognize the need for measures of self-defense—not only against crime in the streets but also against the violence of the ruling class. It will take revolution to achieve a socialist world, the only answer to capitalism’s horrors. Yet the working class needs to survive today to fight in the mass struggles on the horizon.¶ For starters, we say to working people: defend your constitutional right to bear arms! The NRA says that individual gun ownership is the answer. But what’s needed is organized, mass, self-defense. Another article in this issue, “Black Struggle Arms Itself,” sketches the history of Black self-defense efforts and details the reasons why a class-based strategy is crucial.¶ At the moment the U.S. ruling class is trying to build support for a major attack against the working class at home. But unable to take on the whole class frontally yet, it uses the old divide-and-conquer tool of racism. It first heats up its crusade against Blacks and Latinos who have fought capitalist immiseration through rebellions against capitalist police and property from Los Angeles to Washington Heights.¶ Anti-Gun Campaign¶ It is no surprise that the anti-gun campaign in New York originated against the rebellious Dominican neighborhood of Washington Heights and then moved to the seething Black community in Brooklyn. The media hero of the day is a Dominican businessman, Fernando Mateo, who started the “Toys for Guns” program. Owners of illegal guns were encouraged to bring them in to the local police station in exchange for a $100 gift certificate at their local “Toys ’R’ Us” store. That program has become a permanent “Goods for Guns” program across the country.¶ A few facts show that the program is pure deception. The $100 incentive will obviously not persuade big-time criminals to throw down their guns and adopt pacifism. Nor will it attract the drug gangs who shoot bystanders in the streets. Sure, some will turn in a spare peashooter or two, but they know the value of real weapons. According to the New York press, many gun traders admitted to owning other guns; some even planned to use the cash reward toward the purchase of better weapons!¶ Even Mateo, the founder of Goods for Guns, said that he had no intention of giving up his gun. People with legal connections can get guns; people with illegal connections can, too. But not if you are a working woman or man liable to be mugged on the street, robbed at home or subject to unprovoked attacks by the cops (see our article on the James Frazier case). The media won’t admit that many people who are not criminals need to keep guns for self-protection.¶ At the other end of the scale, Clinton, accurately described by the Boston Globe as the “Earth’s top pusher of arms,” has no intention of surrendering his guns. Those he needs for future mass slaughters, as in Panama and Iraq. Nor do the capitalists’ cops and National Guard ever disarm themselves.¶ The gun-control program is not about protecting the honest working person. Clinton and his cops and phony programs like “Toys for Guns” do nothing to deter the petty criminals who plague us. That is not their intention.¶ The aim is to reinforce the lie that working and oppressed people must rely not on themselves but on the cops to protect them. That way we will be deluded into supporting a further buildup of the state’s armed forces. The cops say they will protect us. But as the ruling class has itself documented, cops more often than not protect (and join) the drug dealers and do nothing to protect ordinary people, especially Blacks and Latinos, from petty criminals. (See “Race, Class and Cop Brutality,” PR 45.)¶ Armed Self-Defense: A Working-Class Policy¶ The capitalist classes of all countries defend their power through their states, institutions holding a legal monopoly of armed force. The liberal’s remedy for crime is to rely on the state to prevent it. Most working people know that doesn’t work--especially Blacks and Latinos, who more often than not see the state’s agents, the cops, fighting against them.¶ The far right-wingers have a different answer. They see Blacks, Latinos and other militant workers as the real (or at best potential) criminals and don’t trust even the bosses’ state to keep them down. They will look to armies of fascists when the time is ripe. Even with gun-control laws, these thugs will get weapons (plus quite a few members) from the cops. This has always been the case when fascism rises.¶ For all sections of the bourgeois class, the notion of working people, especially Blacks and Latinos, arming themselves is a great threat. Capitalism wouldn’t last a moment if working people were armed and organized. That is why the right to armed self-defense today is a working-class demand.¶ Certainly the working class is concerned to get rid of the criminal elements in our communities once and for all. We will stop these elements most effectively through a mass struggle to build a revolutionary movement and leadership to do away with the criminal system altogether.¶

### A2 Volokh

#### This card is 1] quoting the court’s opinion on handguns, not a statistical survey and it has no warrant

#### 2] says It’s the quintessential self defense weapon – not the quintessential weapon means banning it probably wont affect the culture at large