# JF17- Handguns CP

### 1NC- CP

**Counterplan text: Resolved: Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech except for symbolic speech protections for carrying guns**

**The presence of handguns on campus chills discussion and should be banned**

**TEB 17:** Times Editorial Board, January 17th, 2017. “Allowing concealed weapons on college campuses is a silly, and dangerous, idea”. Los Angeles Times. <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/editorials/la-ed-colleges-concealed-weapons-nra-20170110-story.html>

“Be careful discussing sensitive topics.” “Drop certain topics from your curriculum.” “[Don’t] ‘go there’ if you sense anger.” A faculty working group at the University of Houston recently [offered](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/02/24/u-houston-faculty-senate-suggests-changes-teaching-under-campus-carry) these recommendations to professors preparing for Texas’s new campus-carry law, set to take effect August 1. The situation to which these recommendations are alluding—gun violence in response to controversial or otherwise difficult classroom discussions—is at this point only a hypothetical worst-case scenario. But critics of the legislation are still appalled: To abide by the law, and keep everyone safe in classrooms with armed students, faculty may ultimately have to resort to self-censorship. Proponents of the legislation, which allows individuals with concealed-carry permits to possess firearms on public-university campuses, argue that fears surrounding campus carry are overblown. In the eight states that have already enacted such a law, none of the predicted nightmares have taken place—students drawing their weapons on professors who fail them, for example, or students firing on one another in heated classroom arguments. In fact, campus-carry supporters maintain that the law will keep the peace, enabling students and faculty to defend themselves effectively, and deter would-be shooters. So long as universities are gun-free zones, gun-rights advocates argue, they are well-advertised targets for prospective attackers. But the potential benefits of the law are slight, and dubious at best. It turns out, for example, there were armed students at Umpqua Community College in Oregon on the day of its shooting last fall. Their presence did not deter the attack, nor did they halt it; the students wisely decided not to jump into the fray for fear it would compound the mayhem. By contrast, campus carry’s potential for harm is quite real. Its principal threat is less than obvious, however; its impact may not be physically manifest at all. I’m counting its cost in terms of what is lost in the classroom—and it is a loss that may be deeply damaging to the country’s democracy. This can be gleaned from the faculty concerns at the University of Houston. In short, they argued that guns in the classroom pose an intolerable threat to free speech. It’s unclear whether campus carry does and will in fact undermine the freedom of expression, but if there’s one place in society where the citizenry must not tolerate such threats, it’s the college classroom. The college classroom is meant to be a special space where all manner of ideas are aired, considered, and debated, and differences negotiated—through speech and argument—with no fear of violent recrimination, no fear of inciting angry students to draw their guns. In my philosophy and politics classes, for example, I—like peers in my field—routinely broach contentious issues: topics such as structural racism, abortion, and gun rights (the most contentious of them all). Few young adults have put significant thought into these kinds of issues; they must experiment with them to understand them properly and deeply, and to develop mature and critical views. It’s important to ensure that students feel free to explore their thoughts and express them—frankly—so they can experiment and develop. They must feel free to push their intellectual limits, and entertain lines of argument that are controversial, probably offensive to some. It is a goal, an often elusive ideal, that the college classroom be that space where the circulation and contest of ideas are freewheeling and dynamic, as ideas are subjected to the close inspection of logic, and measured in the light of history and personal experience. This can—and many will say should—be a raucous affair on occasion. It seems that campus carry stands opposed to these pedagogical goals. Will guns encourage speech and invite people to discussion and debate in the classroom? The reality could be quite to the contrary: Guns could have a chastening effect. If students suspect that neighbors in the classroom may be armed, this may make them less inclined to engage them in frank and open discussion, on potentially uncomfortable or challenging topics. Guns speak; they send a message, which, gun owners and gun rights advocates readily admit, is something like this: Don’t mess with me—be careful—I am armed; I know how to use my weapon, and am prepared to do so if need be. Thanks to Stand Your Ground, they may draw their weapons on merely perceived threats. Stand Your Ground laws protect citizens from prosecution in cases where they feel threatened in public, and fire their weapons. Predictably, the legislation has spawned numerous controversies, and several tragedies, across the country. Gun owners have shot and killed unarmed citizens—and sought Stand Your Ground protections—in cases in which they misjudged or overestimated the threats before them. Or the law emboldened them to wield their weapons when they were just plain angry. In 2014, a Montana man [invoked](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/markus-kaarma-montana-man-convicted-in-german-exchange-students-death/) Stand Your Ground after he shot and killed an unarmed German exchange student trespassing in his garage. That same year, Cyle Quadlin [killed](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2561755/Man-25-shot-killed-unarmed-stranger-fight-suburban-Walmart-booked-police-claim-self-defense.html) an unarmed man with whom he argued in an Arizona Walmart; he drew his weapon when he felt he was losing the fight, and police accepted his plea of self-defense. These are just two of many similar controversies stemming from the law What does Stand Your Ground tell students soon to enter armed classrooms? It may tell them to be wary around those who are armed, or possibly armed, for fear of seeming threatening. Of course, no one knows precisely what is threatening to whom, which could mean the message is more open-ended, and potentially devastating: Curtail your behavior in general—rein it in; watch what you say, to whom, and how. In fact, it may even send the message that it’s best to approach and engage others as little as possible. One University of Houston professor, Maria Gonzalez, [expressed](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/02/24/u-houston-faculty-senate-suggests-changes-teaching-under-campus-carry) her concerns over campus carry in the context of her own classes, which cover Marxist and Queer Theory. In so doing, she invoked the added mission universities have to provide safe harbor for ideas that may be unpopular in society at large, ideas that are radical to some. This is a key reason why universities offer tenure to faculty: to protect academic freedom and defend against censorship. Expansions of civil rights are almost always deeply unpopular at first; this was the case in the fight for women’s rights, suffrage for African Americans, and marriage equality for gays and lesbians. Universities play a key role in early discussions about expanding these rights: Radical ideas must be given a hearing, and require a space to be vetted and honed before emerging into the culture at large, and ultimately the political stage. I fear that campus carry will make students and faculty less inclined to engage in the critical intellectual work that must take place in the classroom, the courageous inquiry and experimentation American democracy requires. As Gonzalez suggests, classes devoted to highly controversial topics could be the most vulnerable in this respect. How many students are going to risk uncomfortable and potentially intrusive lines of inquiry about gender identity, for example, in conservative Texas—when some of their conservative peers may well be armed? Why even go there, if you are an instructor, and can’t hope to have a productive or illuminating conversation? It’s impossible to measure the cost of campus carry. But I wager that the cost will be evidenced in the mounting silence on college campuses, and the trepidation, timidity, and lack of creativity among new generations of voters. American democracy will be the poorer for it

**It's mutually exclusive—open carry is constitutionally protected symbolic speech.**

**Blanchfield 14**: Blanchfield, Patrick ~Freelance Writer; PhD in Comparative Literature, Emory University~. "What do Guns Say?" The New York Times. 04 May 2014. <https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/05/04/what-do-guns-say/.>

According to open carry advocates, their presence in public space represents more than just an expression of their Second Amendment rights, it’s a statement, an “educational,” communicative act — in short, [is] an exercise of their First Amendment freedom of speech. (See [this](http://www.ohiocarry.org/about-ohio-carry.html), from the group Ohio Carry, and [this Michigan lawsuit](http://gunwatch.blogspot.com/2014/01/milawsuit-says-open-carry-is-political.html).) This claim bears serious consideration. The First Amendment has historically been much harder to limit than the Second, and so extending the freedom of speech to the open display of weapons raises several urgent questions about how we understand the relationship between expressing ideas and making threats, between what furthers dialogue and what ends it. But are guns speech? Is carrying a weapon as an act of public protest constitutionally protected under the First Amendment? And if so, what do guns say? The courts have traditionally recognized “symbolic speech” — actions that convey a clear message — as deserving of First Amendment protection (by, for example, protecting the right of students in Des Moines to [wear armbands protesting the Vietnam War](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=393&invol=503)). As “the expression of an idea through an activity,” symbolic speech depends heavily on the context within which it occurs. Unlike pure speech, symbolic speech is more susceptible to limitation, as articulated by the Warren court’s 1968 ruling in [United States v. O’Brien](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=391&invol=367). The outcome of that case, the O’Brien test, establishes a four-pronged series of qualifications for determining when symbolic speech can be limited: (1) Any limitation must be within the state’s constitutional powers; (2) the limitation must be driven by a compelling governmental interest; (3) that countervailing interest must be unrelated to the content of the speech, touching solely on the “non-communicative aspect” of the act in question; and (4) any limitation must be narrowly tailored and prohibit no more speech than absolutely necessary. In practical terms, this litmus test suggests that you can carry a gun as symbolic speech, particularly in the context of a pro-Second Amendment demonstration. The state’s clear interest in maintaining public order can be narrowly satisfied by demanding that protesters either carry guns that are unloaded — at least with an open chamber — or which otherwise have the barrel or action blocked.

**Best data proves open carry on campus increases risk of shootings and suicides—no deterrence**

**Michaels 16:** Samantha Michaels. November 2nd, 2016. “New Research Confirms Guns on College Campuses Are Dangerous”. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/10/campus-carry-laws-guns-mass-shooters>. RW

Eight states currently have laws that [allow people to carry guns on college campuses](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/08/campus-carry-new-texas-law-guns). In 24 others, individual colleges can decide whether to allow firearms on the premises. The primary rationale for these laws, according to their supporters, is safety: School shooters, they say, are less likely to succeed in their attacks if students and teachers are armed and able to fight back. But a [new study](http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-gun-policy-and-research/_pdfs/GunsOnCampus.pdf) from Johns Hopkins University shows that campus carry laws are unlikely to deter rampage shooters and may in fact lead to more injuries and deaths. Here are the main takeaways from the research: Concealed-carry laws do not deter mass shootings [Advocates for looser gun laws](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/07/john-lott-guns-crime-data) have popularized the idea that armed criminals are more likely to attack in "gun free" zones where nobody can fight back against them. Colleges that ban students from carrying weapons are consequently more dangerous, according to proponents of campus carry laws. But this theory is not supported by data, the Johns Hopkins study found. From 1966 to 2015, only 12 percent of 111 high-fatality mass shootings in the United States—at college campuses or elsewhere—took place in "gun free" zones, and only 5 percent took place in "gun restricted" zones, where security guards were armed but civilians were banned from carrying weapons. Another analysis, published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, drew similar conclusions: Only 13 percent of mass shootings from 2009 to 2015 occurred in gun-free or gun-restricted zones. What's more, allowing people to carry concealed weapons has been connected with an increase in violent crime, according to researchers at the Brennan Center for Justice. They noted a 10 percent average increase in violent crime in states that adopted right-to-carry laws. Armed civilians are not likely to stop a rampage shooter When a mass shooting does occur, campus carry advocates say, it helps to have responsible gun-toting civilians in the area, so they can thwart the attacker. Pro-gun economist John Lott and other advocates point to 39 incidents where they say armed civilians have helped stop gunmen. But when the Johns Hopkins researchers looked into the cases, they found that only 4 of 39 actually involved an armed civilian stopping a rampage shooter. What about the other 35 alleged incidents? As with various past cases [debunked by Mother Jones](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/12/armed-civilians-do-not-stop-mass-shootings), they did not stand up to scrutiny: Twenty-two of them weren't actually mass shootings—sometimes a gun was never even fired. In two mass-shooting incidents, an armed security guard or a law enforcement officer, not a civilian, intervened. In two other incidents, armed civilians helped detain a perpetrator after the shooting had already ended, and they didn't use guns to do so. In five mass shootings, armed civilians tried but failed to stop the attacker—and three of them were shot in the process. The FBI study found that unarmed civilians were far more likely than those with guns to stop an active shooting in progress. Separate research from the FBI shows similar results. The bureau looked at 160 active-shooter situations from 2000 to 2013 and found only one case where an armed civilian intervened to stop an attack that was underway. (And that civilian was a US Marine.) In 21 cases, an unarmed civilian interrupted the attack and restrained the gunman. In other words, unarmed civilians were far more likely than those with guns to stop an active shooting in progress. Respond effectively in an active-shooting situation requires extensive training, the Johns Hopkins researchers noted. "There is no reason to believe that college students, faculty and civilian staff will shoot accurately in active shooter situations when they have only passed minimal training requirements for a permit to carry," they wrote. Campus carry could lead to more suicides and other gun violence College students are much less likely to stop a rampage shooter than they are to use firearms to inflict harm on themselves or others, the researchers found. The brains of young adults are still developing, they explain, and that can compromise impulse control and judgment—both of which "are essential for avoiding the circumstances in which firearm access leads to tragedy." That could be one reason why 19- to 21-year-olds have the highest rate of homicide offenses, according to FBI data. The risk of violent confrontations increases when you throw alcohol and binge-drinking into the mix, the researchers added. The risk of suicidal behavior, which peaks at age 16, is also high through the mid-20s, the researchers wrote, noting the prevalence of depression, anxiety, and other mental illnesses on college campuses. "Research demonstrates that access to firearms substantially increases suicide risks, especially among adolescents and young adults, as firearms are the most common method of lethal self-harm," they explained. In one study of 645 college campuses, guns were used in about a third of suicides by male students. The Johns Hopkins study also broke down gun violence on campuses another way: Of 85 shootings or "undesirable discharges of firearms" on colleges from 2013 to June this year, only 2 percent involved rampage shooters. Much more common were interpersonal arguments that turned into gun violence (45 percent), premeditated attacks on a single person (12 percent), suicides or murder/suicides (12 percent), or unintentional discharges (9 percent).

### NB- Gun Culture

**CP solves gun culture—campuses are key**

**Giroux 16:** Henry A. Giroux. “Gun Culture and the American Nightmare of Violence”. Janruary 10th, 2016. <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/34349-gun-culture-and-the-american-nightmare-of-violence>. RW

The predominance of a relatively unchecked gun culture and a morally perverse and politically obscene culture of violence is particularly evident in the power of the gun lobby and its political advocates to pass laws in eight states to allow students and faculty to [carry concealed weapons](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/03/us/texas-lawmakers-approve-bill-allowing-guns-on-campus.html?_r=0) "into classrooms, dormitories and other buildings" on campuses. In spite of the rash of recent shootings on college campuses, Texas lawmakers, for instance, passed one such "campus carry bill," which will take effect in August 2016. To add insult to injury, they also passed an "open carry bill" that allows registered gun owners to carry their guns openly in public. Such laws not only reflect "the seemingly limitless legislative clout of gun interests," but also a rather irrational return to the violence-laden culture of the "Wild West."

#### **American gun culture causes racism, sexism, ableism, neoliberalism, heteronormativity, colonialism, and biopower**

Gahman ’14 (Levi, University of British Columbia, “Gun Rites: Hegemonic Masculinity and Neoliberal Ideology in Rural Kansas,” *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 2014, Academia)

For many of the participants, the tenets of neoliberalism (privatization, deregulation, free enterprise, cuts to social welfare, etc.) have fused with conservative Christianity to manufacture individualistic subjectivities that hold fast to the conviction that what one does in life (or does not do) in relation to Christian dogma, work ethic, and self-reliance determines their social standing as well as what happens to them in the afterlife. As a result, many participants expressed a desire to be ‘successful’, ‘good’, and ‘respectable’. Several men noted that achieving those goals is solely a matter of personal responsibility based upon the decisions they make, which are often closely linked to religious practice. Consequently, these liberal subjectivities leave little room for factoring in larger sociopolitical structures that influence the decisions people are allowed to make. As such, the interlocking influences of race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, age, and nationality often go unnoticed, remain invisible, or are dismissed altogether in favour of blaming or praising individual choices. Accordingly, the role of being ‘head of the household’ typically becomes the duty of the man, and his ability to protect and defend is often seen as an extension of his dedication to his loved ones. The propagation of such patriarchal beliefs is a direct result of the indoctrination that community members receive from socially conservative clergymembers, a colonial education system, and corporatized media/marketing that endorses heteronormative social relationships. The result is the reification of an increasingly atomized mindset in which individuals believe they are solely responsible for their own social position in life. For men in rural Southeast Kansas, this is made manifest in the belief that they are in exclusive control of their own ability to succeed. As the well-being of the family is a core value for many men in the area, the subsequent safeguarding of their wife and children is paramount. In turn, owning a gun is thus reaffirmed as a symbol of masculine conviction and commitment to the family. Various research has also noted that gun ownership is closely tied to the role a man has in providing for his family, bonding with his children, and passing down technical expertise to future generations (Cox 2007; Stroud 2012). The role of the gun for many young children has become a prominent rite of passage and nostalgic symbol of time spent with their father. In Southeast Kansas these narratives of father–son (and sometimes daughter) bonding are usually couched with qualifiers noting that ‘safety and respect’ are first and foremost when handling guns. Several participants mentioned being taught to ‘respect’ guns, learning that firearms are to be used primarily for sport/hunting/protection, and that caution should always be taken in order to ensure safety. At times, these narratives of safety and respect serve to distance guns from their associations as weapons by suggesting they are simply ancestral heirlooms. This rhetorical act of removing violence from guns and framing them as objects used in rites of passage is highlighted by James, a 32-year-old father, when asked about his thoughts on whether guns led to violence: They are just tools, they can be used for good or bad. I have been around guns most of my life, we mainly use them for shooting clay pigeons, target practice, or hunting. Growing up, we took a hunter’s safety course and learned to always treat guns with respect. My granddad and uncle were the ones who got me into hunting and shooting . . . It’s just something that has been passed down through the generations. When we go out hunting we’re on land that’s been in the family since the 1800s . . . so hunting keeps that connection going. I still have a rifle that’s been in the family for decades. Its something I’ll pass on to my son, or my daughter if she’s interested, and it’s probably something my kids will pass down as well. As can be indicted from the quote above, the ownership and use of guns signifies a tie to family history, a connection to past ancestors, a relationship with the land, and a bond to the pioneer spirit of relatives who settled the area. These bucolic, sentimental connotations of guns being tied to the initial stages of colonialism of the area effectively negate the imperialistic genocide that was enacted upon Indigenous people during the time of white settlement. Consequently, such narratives effectively create what Foucault (Rabinow 1991, 74) refers to as a ‘regime of truth’. For men in Southeast Kansas, the existing regime of truth codifies their local history as one in which settler-missionaries tamed a chaotic and wild landscape into tranquil agrarian homesteads.

### Framing

#### Gun control debate needs to happen

#### Particularity is good—prefer specific evidence

Price 98: (RICHARD PRICE is a former prof in the Department of Anthropology at Yale University. Later, he moved to Johns Hopkins University to found the Department of Anthropology, where he served three terms as chair. A decade of freelance teaching (University of Minnesota, Stanford University, Princeton University, University of Florida, Universidade Federal da Bahia), ensued. This article is co-authored with CHRISTIAN REUS-SMIT – Monash University – European Journal of International Relations Copyright © 1998 via SAGE Publications – http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/~courses/PoliticalScience/661B1/documents/PriceReusSmithCriticalInternatlTheoryConstructivism.pdf)

One of the central departures of critical international theory from positivism is the view that we cannot escape the interpretive moment. As George (1994: 24) argues, ‘the world is always an interpreted “thing”, and it is always interpreted in conditions of disagreement and conflict, to one degree or another’. For this reason, ‘there can be no common body of observational or tested data that we can turn to for a neutral, objective knowledge of the world. There can be no ultimate knowledge, for example, that actually corresponds to reality per se.’ This proposition has been endorsed wholeheartedly by constructivists, who are at pains to deny the possibility of making ‘Big-T’ Truth claims about the world and studiously avoid attributing such status to their findings. This having been said, after undertaking sustained empirical analyses of aspects of world politics constructivists do make ‘small-t’ truth claims about the subjects they have investigated. That is, they claim to have arrived at logical and empirically plausible interpretations of actions**,** events or processes**,** and they appeal to the weight of evidence to sustain such claims. While admitting that their claims are always contingent and partial interpretations of a complex world, Price (1995, 1997) claims that his genealogy provides the best account to date to make sense of anomalies surrounding the use of chemical weapons, and Reus-Smit (1997) claims that a culturalist perspective offers the best explanation of institutional differences between historical societies of states. Do such claims contradict the interpretive ethos of critical international theory? For two reasons, we argue that they do not. First, the interpretive ethos of critical international theory is driven, in large measure, by a normative rejection of totalizing discourses, of general theoretical frameworks that privilege certain perspectives over others. One searches constructivist scholarship in vain, though, for such discourses. With the possible exception of Wendt’s problematic flirtation with general systemic theory and professed commitment to ‘science’, constructivist research is at its best when and because it is question driven, with self-consciously contingent claims made specifically in relation to particular phenomena, at a particular time, based on particular evidence, and always open to alternative interpretations. Second, the rejection of totalizing discourses based on ‘big-T’ Truth claims does not foreclose the possibility, or even the inevitability, of making ‘small-t’ truth claims. In fact, we would argue that as soon as one observes and interacts in the world such claims are unavoidable, either as a person engaged in everyday life or as a scholar. As Nietzsche pointed out long ago, we cannot help putting forth truth claims about the world. The individual who does not cannot act, and the genuinely unhypocritical relativist who cannot struggles for something to say and write. In short, if constructivists are not advancing totalizing discourses, and if making ‘small-t’ truth claims is inevitable if one is to talk about how the world works, then it is no more likely that constructivism per se violates the interpretive ethos of critical international theory than does critical theory itself.

### 1NC- DA

#### Most college campuses are prohibiting campus carry in the squo

**Anderson 16** (Nick Anderson – Washington Post, "If You Want to Carry a Gun on Campus, These States Say Yes"). RW

Debate continues to boil in Texas over a new law allowing concealed weapons across college campuses. This week a prominent physicist at the flagship University of Texas at Austin said he would seek to bar guns in his classroom even after the law takes effect in August. “I will put it into my syllabus that the class is not open to students carrying guns,” Steven Weinberg, winner of the Nobel Prize in physics in 1979, [was quoted as saying in the Austin American-Statesman](http://www.mystatesman.com/news/news/state-regional-govt-politics/nobel-laureate-at-ut-says-hell-bar-gun-toting-stud/nqCGK/). “I may wind up in court. I’m willing to accept that possibility.” Texas is one of nine states with affirmative policies allowing guns on campus. A report this week from the Education Commission of the States and NASPA — Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education — provides a map showing how the debate has unfolded across the country. [[The college gun rule that drove a professor emeritus to quit](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2015/10/12/the-college-gun-rule-that-drove-a-professor-emeritus-to-quit/)] In 2004 Utah was the first state to enact a law allowing guns to be carried on campus, the report found. Six others have put similar laws on the books: Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Mississippi, Texas and Wisconsin. In Colorado and Oregon, court rulings have set policies allowing guns on campus. The fine print varies from state to state. Wisconsin requires colleges and universities to allow individuals to carry concealed firearms on campus grounds, the report said, but schools may prohibit guns in certain buildings as long as the ban is advertised through explicit signs posted at every entrance. Meanwhile, 21 states have laws or systemwide policies prohibiting the possession of guns at colleges and universities. California enacted the latest ban last year. Eighteen other states, the report said, have statutory prohibitions: Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington and Wyoming. Two have bans through higher education system policies: Missouri and South Dakota. Here, too, the fine print is worth noting. Eight states with bans have exceptions allowing guns to be stored in locked vehicles on campus: Florida, Georgia, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, South Carolina and Tennessee.

**Open carry is constitutionally protected symbolic speech—means colleges won’t be allowed to restrict it in the world of the aff**

**Blanchfield 14**: Blanchfield, Patrick ~Freelance Writer; PhD in Comparative Literature, Emory University~. "What do Guns Say?" The New York Times. 04 May 2014. <https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/05/04/what-do-guns-say/.>

According to open carry advocates, their presence in public space represents more than just an expression of their Second Amendment rights, it’s a statement, an “educational,” communicative act — in short, [is] an exercise of their First Amendment freedom of speech. (See [this](http://www.ohiocarry.org/about-ohio-carry.html), from the group Ohio Carry, and [this Michigan lawsuit](http://gunwatch.blogspot.com/2014/01/milawsuit-says-open-carry-is-political.html).) This claim bears serious consideration. The First Amendment has historically been much harder to limit than the Second, and so extending the freedom of speech to the open display of weapons raises several urgent questions about how we understand the relationship between expressing ideas and making threats, between what furthers dialogue and what ends it. But are guns speech? Is carrying a weapon as an act of public protest constitutionally protected under the First Amendment? And if so, what do guns say? The courts have traditionally recognized “symbolic speech” — actions that convey a clear message — as deserving of First Amendment protection (by, for example, protecting the right of students in Des Moines to [wear armbands protesting the Vietnam War](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=393&invol=503)). As “the expression of an idea through an activity,” symbolic speech depends heavily on the context within which it occurs. Unlike pure speech, symbolic speech is more susceptible to limitation, as articulated by the Warren court’s 1968 ruling in [United States v. O’Brien](http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=US&vol=391&invol=367). The outcome of that case, the O’Brien test, establishes a four-pronged series of qualifications for determining when symbolic speech can be limited: (1) Any limitation must be within the state’s constitutional powers; (2) the limitation must be driven by a compelling governmental interest; (3) that countervailing interest must be unrelated to the content of the speech, touching solely on the “non-communicative aspect” of the act in question; and (4) any limitation must be narrowly tailored and prohibit no more speech than absolutely necessary. In practical terms, this litmus test suggests that you can carry a gun as symbolic speech, particularly in the context of a pro-Second Amendment demonstration. The state’s clear interest in maintaining public order can be narrowly satisfied by demanding that protesters either carry guns that are unloaded — at least with an open chamber — or which otherwise have the barrel or action blocked.

**Best data proves open carry on campus increases risk of shootings and suicides—no deterrence**

**Michaels 16:** Samantha Michaels. November 2nd, 2016. “New Research Confirms Guns on College Campuses Are Dangerous”. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/10/campus-carry-laws-guns-mass-shooters>. RW

Eight states currently have laws that [allow people to carry guns on college campuses](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/08/campus-carry-new-texas-law-guns). In 24 others, individual colleges can decide whether to allow firearms on the premises. The primary rationale for these laws, according to their supporters, is safety: School shooters, they say, are less likely to succeed in their attacks if students and teachers are armed and able to fight back. But a [new study](http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-gun-policy-and-research/_pdfs/GunsOnCampus.pdf) from Johns Hopkins University shows that campus carry laws are unlikely to deter rampage shooters and may in fact lead to more injuries and deaths. Here are the main takeaways from the research: Concealed-carry laws do not deter mass shootings [Advocates for looser gun laws](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/07/john-lott-guns-crime-data) have popularized the idea that armed criminals are more likely to attack in "gun free" zones where nobody can fight back against them. Colleges that ban students from carrying weapons are consequently more dangerous, according to proponents of campus carry laws. But this theory is not supported by data, the Johns Hopkins study found. From 1966 to 2015, only 12 percent of 111 high-fatality mass shootings in the United States—at college campuses or elsewhere—took place in "gun free" zones, and only 5 percent took place in "gun restricted" zones, where security guards were armed but civilians were banned from carrying weapons. Another analysis, published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, drew similar conclusions: Only 13 percent of mass shootings from 2009 to 2015 occurred in gun-free or gun-restricted zones. What's more, allowing people to carry concealed weapons has been connected with an increase in violent crime, according to researchers at the Brennan Center for Justice. They noted a 10 percent average increase in violent crime in states that adopted right-to-carry laws. Armed civilians are not likely to stop a rampage shooter When a mass shooting does occur, campus carry advocates say, it helps to have responsible gun-toting civilians in the area, so they can thwart the attacker. Pro-gun economist John Lott and other advocates point to 39 incidents where they say armed civilians have helped stop gunmen. But when the Johns Hopkins researchers looked into the cases, they found that only 4 of 39 actually involved an armed civilian stopping a rampage shooter. What about the other 35 alleged incidents? As with various past cases [debunked by Mother Jones](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/12/armed-civilians-do-not-stop-mass-shootings), they did not stand up to scrutiny: Twenty-two of them weren't actually mass shootings—sometimes a gun was never even fired. In two mass-shooting incidents, an armed security guard or a law enforcement officer, not a civilian, intervened. In two other incidents, armed civilians helped detain a perpetrator after the shooting had already ended, and they didn't use guns to do so. In five mass shootings, armed civilians tried but failed to stop the attacker—and three of them were shot in the process. The FBI study found that unarmed civilians were far more likely than those with guns to stop an active shooting in progress. Separate research from the FBI shows similar results. The bureau looked at 160 active-shooter situations from 2000 to 2013 and found only one case where an armed civilian intervened to stop an attack that was underway. (And that civilian was a US Marine.) In 21 cases, an unarmed civilian interrupted the attack and restrained the gunman. In other words, unarmed civilians were far more likely than those with guns to stop an active shooting in progress. Respond effectively in an active-shooting situation requires extensive training, the Johns Hopkins researchers noted. "There is no reason to believe that college students, faculty and civilian staff will shoot accurately in active shooter situations when they have only passed minimal training requirements for a permit to carry," they wrote. Campus carry could lead to more suicides and other gun violence College students are much less likely to stop a rampage shooter than they are to use firearms to inflict harm on themselves or others, the researchers found. The brains of young adults are still developing, they explain, and that can compromise impulse control and judgment—both of which "are essential for avoiding the circumstances in which firearm access leads to tragedy." That could be one reason why 19- to 21-year-olds have the highest rate of homicide offenses, according to FBI data. The risk of violent confrontations increases when you throw alcohol and binge-drinking into the mix, the researchers added. The risk of suicidal behavior, which peaks at age 16, is also high through the mid-20s, the researchers wrote, noting the prevalence of depression, anxiety, and other mental illnesses on college campuses. "Research demonstrates that access to firearms substantially increases suicide risks, especially among adolescents and young adults, as firearms are the most common method of lethal self-harm," they explained. In one study of 645 college campuses, guns were used in about a third of suicides by male students. The Johns Hopkins study also broke down gun violence on campuses another way: Of 85 shootings or "undesirable discharges of firearms" on colleges from 2013 to June this year, only 2 percent involved rampage shooters. Much more common were interpersonal arguments that turned into gun violence (45 percent), premeditated attacks on a single person (12 percent), suicides or murder/suicides (12 percent), or unintentional discharges (9 percent).

### 1NC- Turns Case

**The mere presence of guns on campus undermines effective free discussion.**

**PHW 14**: (public Health Watch Keeping an Eye on the Public Impact of Modern Politics "Point Blank: Guns Don't Belong On College Campuses – Here's Why" March 2014)

In order to foster a healthy learning environment at America’s colleges and universities, it is critical that students and faculty feel safe on campus. If concealed carry were allowed on America’s campuses, there is no doubt that many students would feel uncomfortable about not knowing whether their professors and/or fellow students were carrying handguns. There is even a name for the negative effects of increasing the number of guns in public places: the “weapons effect.” The [weapons effect](http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/get-psyched/201301/the-weapons-effect) is a phenomenon described and evidenced for in the scientific field of social psychology. Originally described by Leonard Berkowitz and Anthony LePage in 1967, the weapons effect refers to the mere presence of a weapon or a picture of a weapon leading to more aggressive behavior in humans. In other words, knowing that people around you are carrying guns makes you more likely to act aggressively and impulsively. Describing his findings, Dr. Berkowitz stated, “Guns not only permit violence, they can stimulate it as well. The finger pulls the trigger, but the trigger may also be pulling the finger.” Since the first study by Drs. Berkowitz and LePage, other researchers have [validated the findings](http://pss.sagepub.com/content/9/4/308) by replicating the original experiment — and in a [review of 56 published studies on the weapons effect, researchers confirmed that the mere sight of weapons increases aggression in both angry and non angry individuals](http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1990-22466-001). Students and teachers must be able to express themselves freely in classroom environments, where discussions frequently touch on controversial topics that arouse passion. The introduction of handguns on our campuses would inhibit this dialogue by creating fear of possible retaliation. Whether it’s a classroom debate, a student-teacher conversation about a grade, or an informal interaction in a dormitory; the presence of hidden handguns would restrain the open exchange of ideas that is so critical to the college experience.