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## 1NC Psychoanalysis Kritik

#### A is the Link and Impact -

#### The roadblock to solving gun violence in America is a psychological complex. As a result of its uncertain identity, relative young age, frontierism, and a fetish for democracy, America’s collective unconscious views the gun as something with religious qualities. This non-rational fixation on guns is the root cause of the country’s inability to rationally approach the issue and dooms solvency. Peay 2k15:

Pythia Peay. [depth journalist on psychology, spirituality and the American psyche. She is the author of American Icarus: A Memoir of Father and Country (Lantern Books, 2015), the iconic American story of her troubled, alcoholic, aviator father, the American myths that shaped him, and his ultimately redemptive death; and America on the Couch: Psychological Perspectives on American Politics and Culture (Lantern Books, 2015), a collection of 37 interviews with some of the world's leading psychologists, including Robert Jay Lifton, Michael Eigen, Judith V. Jordan, and James Hillman.] “Analyzing America's ‘Gun Complex’. Why guns have a grip on the American psyche.” Psychology Today. 12 October 2015. Accessed 1 December 2015. Web. https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/america-the-couch/201510/analyzing-americas-gun-complex SHSBR

The fact that **America has been unable to reach a cultural "breakthrough"** moment **around guns**—the way it did around gay rights with the recent passage of the Gay Marriage Rights Act, for instance—is psychologically telling. So is the question that few are asking, but that begs to be asked: why is this happening in America? **In wondering why America continues to suffer** the **unrelenting tragedy** of repeated mass shootings **and** why the country has **a higher rate of gun violence compared to other countries**, **I was reminded of** the Swiss psychiatrist Carl **Jung's** famed word association tests in the early 20th Century, from which he developed the **theory of a "complex": a constellation of unconscious emotions, images, and memories that can suddenly erupt in an individual, interfering with everyday life**. Psychologists today understand that **when individuals act against their own better interests, unconscious processes** in the form of a complex **are** most likely **at work**. These same **unconscious processes can also operate in a nation's psyche**: that force field **made up of symbols and historical memories** accumulated by a people over time. Certainly by that definition, **America could be said to have a "gun complex**." As **each senseless shooting blurs into the next** (Umpqua Community College was the 294th mass shooting event in 2015 (link is external)) **and still the country cannot come together to find** a way to prevent guns from falling into the hands of the mentally ill, enact stronger background checks and sensible legislation that will keep assault weapons off our streets—**protective measures** that a majority of Americans would like to see (link is external)—then **the American body politic is in the grip of a stubborn cultural complex. When logic and reason fail, psychology's standpoint can prove useful**, as it works from the baseline of what is rather than what should be. When **trying to gain** some **control over** the hidden hand of **a complex** as it wields its influence over an individual's life, for example, psychologists will first acknowledge its power, and then seek to trace its roots in a person's history. For nations, this process **falls under** the domain of **psychohistory**. One of psychohistory's principle founders is Robert Jay Lifton, M.D. Now 89, Lifton is notable for his research into war and genocide. It was in an interview with Lifton that I gained new insight into certain traits ingrained early in the nation's developing character that, in his observation, continues to influence contemporary American attitudes toward the gun. In Lifton's view, for instance, **[1] America's relative youth when measured against older cultures has had much to do with its relationship with guns**. The country's foundation on patterns of continuous immigration and a "constantly moving frontier," he told me, has contributed to the fact that "**our identity has always been shaky**." That **uneasiness around who we are**, he said, **has made us emphasize what history we do have** all the more strongly. Together with the nation's constitutional right to self-defense as set forth in the Second Amendment, **the gun has filled that gap**, he continued, **functioning as a "major compensation" for the nation's lack of tradition**. America's gun complex could also be called our "John Wayne complex," as **[2] the gun**, according to Lifton, "**is also tied up with our American ideal of the heroic**." From the start **we saw ourselves**, he said, "**as conquering the wilderness and the native peoples**. And the gun was key to that." Also frequently referred to as the "great equalizer," Lifton pointed out that **the gun became as well an expression of "personal power that gave individuals some sense of control over life and death**," also compensating the "terror and fear that many people must have felt in this country in its early decades" upon arriving on the shores of a raw wilderness. Thus **the gun in American culture**, Lifton continued, **became** over time "**a symbol on many levels of a kind of organizing principle; as an expression of individualism and individual power; and as a way of dealing with anxieties about death and vulnerability**." For all these reasons, in Lifton's words, "the gun became more important to us than perhaps to any other culture." In terms of American violence, he regretfully and mournfully concluded, "much begins with... the near deification of the gun in terms of American violence." Now, deification seems a strong word to use in connection with guns. And yet **according to** Italian psychoanalyst Luigi **Zoja**, Ph.D., **who has written widely on violence and the psychotherapy of modern Western culture, a gun is not just any ordinary object**, such as "a toaster or a camera," **but has a universal dimension independent of a specific culture**. In general, this means, said Zoja, echoing Lifton, that **there is something "almost religious" about guns**. In his view, **we cannot deal with the topic in a logical way, because people "feel as if you're taking something sacred away from them**." This is even more complicated in America, observed Zoja, because **[3] in the absence of a state religion, democracy has become our religion**—**and "the gun is a symbol of democracy, and therefore sensitive in the American unconscious**." Thus partly because of its history in our country's development, he said, "guns in America are imbued with a mythic, religious quality." **It is this non-rational**, mythic **current** described by both Lifton and Zoja **that continuously** erupts and **disrupts any attempt around common sense gun legislation**, and that is conveniently exploited by the NRA to its own ends. Indeed these psychological perspectives shifted my own thinking away from the charged topic of increased gun regulations to the idea that there ought to be more gun consciousness—more psychologically oriented debates in the media, not just about the mental health of individual shooters, but about the psychology of America and the gun's place in our culture.

#### Thus, the aff can never solve gun violence as the gun is inseparable from the collective unconscious of the United States. The aff obscures and masks the gun complex instead of acknowledging it as being irreconcilable. This dooms any hope of coming to rational solutions about gun culture.

#### B is the Alt -

#### The alternative is to refrain from conceiving of the gun as a good or evil object, shift away from the morally charged topic of increasing gun regulations, and instead engage in the psychotherapeutic act of acknowledging the impossibility of deidentifying with the gun complex. This gun consciousness is key to solving gun violence and reconciling polarized politics. Peay 2:

Ibid.

It is this non-rational, mythic current described by both Lifton and Zoja that continuously erupts and disrupts any attempt around common sense gun legislation, and that is conveniently exploited by the NRA to its own ends. Indeed these psychological perspectives **shift**ed my own **thinking away from the charged topic of increased gun regulations to the idea that there ought to be more gun consciousness—more psychologically oriented debates** in the media, not just about the mental health of individual shooters, but **about the psychology of America and the gun's place in our culture**. And in fact there's an argument to be made, I have come to believe, for taking seriously the notion of the gun as one of America's dominant symbols that no amount of moral exhortations or recitation of statistics around its tragic misuses can strip out of our cultural fabric. **If the gun became less polarized into a good or evil object**, for instance, and **became accepted instead as a part of our American history with deep cultural roots and imbued with** patriotic **symbolism**, **then** maybe those **gunmen who mow down innocents would be judged not only guilty of mass murder, but publicly shamed as treasonous cowards for desecrating** a part of **our heritage**: the equivalent, say, of splattering paint on the Washington Monument, trampling on the flag, or spitting on veterans. Nothing about this sea change in attitude, I should add, would come easy to me personally. Not since my father put a .22 rifle in my hands as a 13-year-old and had me and my three younger siblings practice target shooting at a row of empty Budweiser beer cans have I ever liked anything about guns. I don't own one; the sight of one repulses me; and in fact I feel far less safe with a gun in the house or in my purse. But if we are going to continue on our path of being a gun-loving, gun-toting country, as it seems we are, then maybe **it's time that pro-and anti-gun legislation proponents came together and accepted guns, not only as weapons for self-protection, or as emblems of our cowboy bravado, but as a psychological fact about America, inseparably woven into our historical origins and our national identity**. Maybe **then we could move beyond the stalled debates around legislation, and begin generating as much heightened cultural awareness, pragmatic solutions, and even creative imagination around guns as we have brought to other social issues** that have bedeviled and divided our democracy.

#### C is the Framework –

#### 1. Roleplaying is bad—it overlooks our own role in manufacturing violence **Kappeler 95:**

(Susanne, The Will to Violence, p. 10-11)

We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of `collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equival­ent of a universal acquittal.' On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective `assumption' of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility leading to the well-known illusion of our apparent `powerlessness’ and its accompanying phe­nomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single citizens even more so those of other nations have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgement, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls `organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually or­ganized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers: For we tend to think that we cannot ‘do’ anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of `What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as `virtually no possibilities': what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like `I want to stop this war', `I want military intervention', `I want to stop this backlash', or `I want a moral revolution." 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our `non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we `are' the war in our `unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the `fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' our readiness, in other words, to build ident­ities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the `others'. We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape `our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence. “destining” of revealing insofar as it “pushes” us in a certain direction. Heidegger does not regard destining as determination (he says it is not a “fate which compels”), but rather as the implicit project within the field of modern practices to subject all aspects of reality to the principles of order and efficiency, and to pursue reality down to the finest detail. Thus, insofar as modern technology aims to order and render calculable, the objectification of reality tends to take the form of an increasing classification, differentiation, and fragmentation of reality. The possibilities for how things appear are increasingly reduced to those that enhance calculative activities. Heidegger perceives the real danger in the modern age to be that human beings will continue to regard technology as a mere instrument and fail to inquire into its essence. He fears that all revealing will become calculative and all relations technical, that the unthought horizon of revealing, namely the “concealed” background practices that make technological thinking possible, will be forgotten. He remarks: The coming to presence of technology threatens revealing, threatens it with the possibility that all revealing will be consumed in ordering and that everything will present itself only in the unconcealedness of standing-reserve. (QT, 33) 10 Therefore, it is not technology, or science, but rather the essence of technology as a way of revealing that constitutes the danger; for the essence of technology is existential, not technological. 11 It is a matter of how human beings are fundamentally oriented toward their world vis a vis their practices, skills, habits, customs, and so forth. Humanism contributes to this danger insofar as it fosters the illusion that technology is the result of a collective human choice and therefore subject to human control.

#### 2. Omitted

#### 3. Solving value polarization is uniquely key to gun control discussion and is a prerequisite to predictive empirics because value-orientations shape which facts we think are true. Kahan 2k3:

Dan M. Kahan. The Gun Control Debate: A Culture-Theory Manifesto, 60 Wash. and Lee L. Rev. 3 (2003), http://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol60/iss1/2 Ellipses were already in the paragraph from the article.

Gun control fits the same expressive pattern. As one southern Democratic senator recently put it in urging his party to back off the issue, **the** gun **debate is "about values** ... about who you are and who you aren't." 3 **Those who share an egalitarian** and solidaristic world **view, on the one hand, and those who adhere to a more** hierarchical and **individualistic one, on the other, both see the extent of gun regulation as a measure of their** (and their social groups') relative **status** in American society. 4 **What makes the gun control debate so intense is not** a **disagreement about** the **facts-does private ownership of guns promote or deter violent crime?-but** a **disagreement about** "alternative **views of what America** is and **ought to be**."' 5 Of course, to all of this the econometricians might simply demur. Sure, they might say, the gun controversy reflects a conflict in cultural world views. But **they cannot hope to make the two sides agree about the nature of a good society**. They do both profess, however, to agree about the value of protecting innocent persons from harm. So let us continue to focus our attention on the empirical issue-whether more guns produce more crime or less-as our best hope to negotiate a peace between the cultural combatants. The problem with this reasoning, I want to suggest, is that it misconceives the relationship between cultural orientations and beliefs about empirical facts, such as whether gun control reduces or in fact increases crime. **Beliefs about** the **causes and effective responses to societal risks**, I want to argue, **derive from cultural world views**. As a result, **we cannot reach agreement about** the **consequences of gun control unless we have** first come to some **common ground about what values gun laws ought to express**.

# \*\*\*2NR Section\*\*\*

## AT: Perm

### AT: Perm

#### The aff and the alt are mutually exclusive.

#### 1. Peay 2 says that we have to stop seeing the gun as good or evil, but the aff passes moral judgement on it by advocating banning private ownership.

#### 2. Peay 2 says that we need more psychologically oriented debates with regards to being conscious of the gun complex, but the aff is a proposed policy action, which obscures psychological focus.

#### 3. Peay 2 advocates acknowledging the inevitability of the gun as a part of American culture, but the aff represents a hollow attempt to lash out against the complex, which means they’re impossible to reconcile.

#### There are no net benefits to the perm.

#### 1. The aff still links – by attempting to eliminate private ownership, the aff obscures the fact that American culture and gun culture are inseparable, and Peay isolates that as the reason the aff can’t solve.

#### 2. The alt solves the aff – Peay 2 indicates that gun consciousness can solve political and moral polarization of guns and move past such roadblocks to allow for socially innovative approaches that solve better than just “ban guns.”

#### 3. The alt solves the aff – moral polarization is what prevents both pro and anti-gun people from appropriately condemning gun atrocities in the status quo, but gun consciousness allows common ground to do so.

#### 4. Peay indicates that psychological and non-rational urges prevent people from objectively understanding the topic, so there can be no net benefit to including the aff.

### AT: Aff then Alt

Omitted

### AT: Alt then Aff

Omitted

### AT: Alt in Every Other Instance

Omitted

### AT: Just the Alt

Omitted

### AT: Juxtaposition

Omitted

### Sev and Int Theory

Omitted

### Multiple Perms Bad

Omitted

### Time Ordered Perms Bad

Omitted

## AT: Cede the Political

#### No uniqueness – the political is already ceded – that’s the first Peay card. The psychological gun complex prevents people from actually engaging in rational debates about gun control.

#### The K is a prereq to political engagement - only the alt’s change in orientation from guns can solve. A political solution comes too soon and feeds the gun complex. That also further demonstrates the link. Marche 2k13:

Stephen Marche. “Guns are beautiful”. Esquire. 12 February 2013. Accessed 29 December 2015. Web. http://www.esquire.com/news-politics/a19335/guns-are-beautiful-0313/

In the Renaissance epic poem Orlando Furioso, the noble hero warrior throws a gun into the sea; for the knights of old, the gun represented the end of martial virtue, of nobles facing each other man against man. But the New World is not like the Old. In the New World, the peasants can shoot the lords. That's the whole idea, the substance of the revolution. **The** possession of a **gun has always stood for independence**, for the democratic spirit, for a country where anyone with a little property (the Bushmaster AR-15 goes for about a grand) can have literally **the most powerful force on earth, to take life** both in the wilderness and in society. Guns are also **the** world's **most obvious phallic symbol**. Bushmaster (note the name) pulled an ad after Newtown that said, "Consider your man card reissued." Jacques **Lacan**, the great French psychoanalyst of the 1950s, **defined phallic symbols as a reaction to the threat of castration**. The possibility of phallic privation is what causes the flight into symbolism. That's just a fancy way of explaining why guys who drive Lamborghinis have small cocks. It also explains why **the simple passing of legislation will inevitably be counterproductive**. Lacan understood it: **You buy a gun because you're threatened that they're going to deny you one**. It makes perfect sense to me, too. Whenever any government bans a book or a movie, I buy it immediately, on principle. It's my right. And the idea of the government keeping tabs on who has what book fills my soul with cries of "death to tyrants." Politically, 2013 will be a year consumed by legislative struggles to define what limits, if any, are going to be placed on guns in American life. These debates, even if they result in new laws, are mostly irrelevant. Only a groundswell from the masses of gun lovers, from those who understand the beauty of guns, will bring the necessary change. The gun is no longer a phallic replacement for individuals, but for an entire culture, an entire political world, that is collapsing — a world in which masculinity and freedom were easy to understand. That simplicity has vanished. A black man is president. Working-class factory jobs are falling away. More women are moving up the corporate ladder. You don't need a French psychoanalyst to tell you that guns are disproportionately owned by aging white men. The horrors of the Newtown massacre may well transform the AR-15 from a symbol of health and strength and community spirit into one of sickness and weakness and isolation, but **it will take a** true **transformation of the spirit**. Such broad cultural changes aren't unprecedented. **One** interesting **case is the defeat of** crack **cocaine, which** has slowly **disappeared** from urban America. **Not because of the** tens of billions of dollars spent on the **war on drugs**, which has resulted only in drugs becoming cheaper and more accessible than ever. **But because it became clear that** smoking **crack was** the same as committing **suicide. Crack evolved from a sign of pleasure to one of death. The same transformation may** well **happen with** assault **weapons**. Less than a week after Newtown, Walmart stopped promoting the AR-15 in online ads and the Discovery Channel canceled American Guns and Ted Nugent's Gun Country. Since neither do anything out of the goodness of their hearts, we can assume they believe the appetite for weapons is declining. The president's comment from 2008 that rural people were clinging to guns was tasteless, offensive even, but that doesn't mean it's not true. The deeper point is this: We're all clinging to something. What can we find to cling to that isn't machinery of death?