### Registry CP

#### Counterplan: The United States ought to create a national gun registry, ban private gun sales, and after six months ban private ownership of handguns.

#### Mutually exclusive-fiat is immediate so implementation of the aff cannot wait any amount of time.

#### Aff can’t solve without a national registry—people won’t comply with the laws. Six month waiting period is key to getting people on the books for an effective ban.

Sporks 12 “How to Ban Guns: A step by step, long term process” Daily Kos December 21st 2012 <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/12/21/1172661/-How-to-Ban-Guns-A-step-by-step-long-term-process> JW

The only way we can truly be safe and prevent further gun violence is to ban civilian ownership of all guns. That means everything. No pistols, no revolvers, no semiautomatic or automatic rifles. No bolt action. No breaking actions or falling blocks. Nothing. This is the only thing that we can possibly do to keep our children safe from both mass murder and common street violence. Unfortunately, right now we can't. The political will is there, but the institutions are not. Honestly, this is a good thing. If we passed a law tomorrow banning all firearms, we would have massive noncompliance. What we need to do is establish the regulatory and informational institutions first. This is how we do it: The very first thing we need is national registry. We need to know where the guns are, and who has them. Canada has a national firearms registry. We need to copy their model. We need a law demanding all firearms be registered to a national database. We need to know who has them and where they are. We need to make this as easy as possible for gun owners. The federal government provides the money and technical expertise, and the State police carry it out. Like a funded mandate. Most firearms already have a serial number on them, so it would really be a matter of taking the information already on the ATF form 4473 and putting it in a national database. I think about 6 months should be enough time. Along with this, make private sales illegal. When a firearm is transferred, make it law that the registration must be updated. Again, make it super easy to do. Perhaps over, the internet. Dealers can log in by their FFLs and update the registration. Additionally, new guns are to be registered by the manufacturer. The object here is to create a clear paper trail from factory to distributor to dealer to owner. We want to encourage as much voluntary compliance as possible. Now we get down to it. The registration period has passed. Now we have criminals without registered guns running around. Probably kooky types that "lost" them on a boat or something. So remember those ATF form 4473s? Those record every firearm sale, going back twenty years. And those have to be surrendered to the ATF on demand. So, we get those logbooks, and cross reference the names and addresses with the new national registry. Since most NRA types own two or (many) more guns, we can get an idea of who properly registered their guns and who didn't. For example, if we have a guy who purchased 6 guns over the course of 10 years, but only registered two of them, that raises a red flag. Now, maybe he sold them or they got lost or something. But it gives us a good target for investigation. A nice visit by the ATF or state police to find out if he really does still have those guns would be certainly warranted. It's certainly not perfect. People may have gotten guns from parents or family, and not registered them. Perfect is the enemy of pretty darn good, as they say. This exercise isn't so much to track down every gun ever sold; the main idea would be to profile and investigate people that may not have registered their guns. As an example, I'm not so concerned with the guy who bought that bolt action Mauser a decade ago and doesn't have anything registered to his name. It's a pretty good possibility that he sold it, gave it away, or got rid of it somehow. And even if he didn't, that guy is not who I'm concerned with. I'm concerned that other guy who bought a half dozen assault weapons, registered two hunting rifles, and belongs to the NRA/GOA. He's the guy who warrants a raid. So registration is the first step. Now that the vast majority are registered, we can do what we will. One good first step would be to close the registry to new registrations. This would, in effect, prevent new guns from being made or imported. This would put the murder machine corporations out of business for good, and cut the money supply to the NRA/GOA. As money dries up, the political capital needed for new controls will be greatly reduced. There are a few other things I would suggest. I would suggest an immediate, national ban on concealed carry. A ban on internet sales of guns and ammunition is a no brainer. Microstamping would also be a very good thing. Even if the only thing it does is drive up costs, it could still lead to crimes being solved. I'm willing to try every advantage we can get. A national Firearms Owner Identification Card might be good, but I'm not sure if it's necessary if we have a national database. We should also insist on comprehensive insurance and mandatory gun safes, subject to random, spot checks by local and federal law enforcement. We must make guns expensive and unpopular, just like cigarettes. A nationwide, antigun campaign paid for by a per gun yearly tax paid by owners, dealers, and manufacturers would work well in this regard. We should also segway into an anti-hunting campaign, like those in the UK. By making hunting expensive and unpopular, we can make the transition to a gun free society much less of a headache for us. I know this seems harsh, but this is the only way we can be truly safe. I don't want my kids being shot at by a deranged NRA member. I'm sure you don't either. So lets stop looking for short term solutions and start looking long term. Registration is the first step. Tell Pres. Obama and democrats in congress to demand mandatory, comprehensive gun registration. It's the only way we can ban guns with any effectiveness.

#### We solve case AND lessen the illicit market.

PVG ’13 Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence “Registration of Firearms Policy Summary” October 1st 2013 <http://smartgunlaws.org/registration-of-firearms-policy-summary/> JW

Firearm registration laws require individuals to record their ownership of a firearm with a designated law enforcement agency. These laws enable law enforcement to identify, disarm, and prosecute violent criminals and people illegally in possession of firearms. Registration systems also create accountability for firearm owners and discourage illegal sales. Firearm registration laws can lead to the identification and prosecution of violent criminals by helping law enforcement quickly and reliably “trace” (identify the source of) firearms recovered from crime scenes. Firearm registration laws create comprehensive records of firearm ownership, which include a full description of each firearm and identify the owner. Comprehensive registration laws also require a firearm to be re-registered whenever title to the firearm is transferred, and law enforcement to be notified whenever the weapon is lost or stolen. As a result, registration laws help law enforcement quickly and reliably identify the owner of any firearm used in a crime. Additional information on crime gun tracing, firearm sales reporting requirements and retention of firearm sales records is contained in our summary on Maintaining Records & Reporting Gun Sales. Firearm registration laws also help law enforcement retrieve firearms from persons who have become legally prohibited from possessing them through criminal convictions or other prohibitions. Comprehensive registration laws require gun owners to renew their registration annually or explain why they should no longer be legally responsible for the weapon. During the renewal process, owners undergo additional background checks to ensure that they have not fallen into a class prohibited from possessing firearms. The renewal process, therefore, creates an opportunity for law enforcement to remove illegally possessed firearms. In addition, registration laws help reduce illegal firearm sales and transfers by creating accountability for gun owners. A firearm owner who knows that law enforcement has the ability to trace the firearm back to him or her may be deterred from transferring the firearm to a potentially dangerous individual, and may be encouraged to store his or her firearm safely so as to prevent unauthorized access or theft. Registration laws also help deter “straw purchases,” in which an eligible person purchases a firearm on behalf of an ineligible person or a person who wants to avoid having the gun traced back to him or her. For more information about straw purchases, see our summary on Gun Trafficking & Straw Purchases. Information generated by firearm registration systems can also help protect law enforcement officers responding to an incident by providing them with information about whether firearms may be present at the scene and, if so, how many and what types. Registration laws are most effective when combined with laws requiring licensing of firearm owners and purchasers.1 A 2001 study analyzing the firearm tracing data of crime guns recovered in 25 U.S. cities revealed that states with some form of both registration and licensing have greater success keeping firearms initially sold by dealers in the state from being recovered in crimes than states without such systems in place.2 This data suggests that licensing and registration laws make it more difficult for criminals, juveniles and other prohibited purchasers to obtain guns, and help ensure that firearm owners remain eligible to possess their weapons. For more information on licensing laws, see our summary on Licensing Gun Owners & Purchasers. The American public strongly supports laws requiring gun registration. A nationwide survey conducted in January 2011 found that 66% of respondents favor laws requiring every gun owner to register each gun he or she owns as part of a national gun registry.3 A poll conducted in May 2001 found that 70% of respondents mistakenly believe that a registration system already exists in the United States.4

#### The plan causes a huge illicit market-that’s worse than the squo since it can’t be regulated.

Cook et al 06

Philip J. Cook – professor at Duke University and NBER; Jens Ludwig – professor at Georgetown University and NBER ; Sudhir Venkatesh - professor at Columbia University; Anthony A. Braga – professor at Harvard University: “Underground Gun Markets” research was supported by a grant from the Joyce Foundation and written in part while Cook and Ludwig were resident fellows at the Rockefeller Foundation’s Bellagio Study and Research Center; August 2, 2006 Don Terry – staff reporter, “How Criminals Get Their Guns: In Short, All Too Easily,” The New York Times, March 11, 1992, p. A1IG 12/16/15

**Underground gun markets have developed in America in response to regulations that seek to prohibit ownership** and possession by that sub-set of the population deemed to be at unacceptably high risk of misusing guns – primarily youth and adults with serious prior criminal records – while preserving easy access for everyone else. Whether 1 Most of what is known about the underground gun market comes from interviews with incarcerated prisoners or inner-city youth (for example Wright and Rossi, 1994, Webster et al., 2002, Sheley and Wright, 1993, Callahan and Rivara, 1992). However such interviews can at best shed light on how a subset of the retail market operates, and are not informative about other aspects of market structure or conduct. 3 the gun market can be segmented in this way remains the topic of spirited debate in U.S. policy circles. In Section 1 we review this regulatory system and note that **a few jurisdictions**, including Chicago, go further and essentially **prohibit the private possession of handguns**, the type of gun most commonly used in crime and violence. The fact that Chicago has unusually restrictive regulations makes the city an interesting case study. Economists and other skeptics like to point out that **government prohibitions on transactions are difficult to enforce; the** ingenuity of the marketplace**, motivated by profit, will overcome whatever legal obstacles are put in place.** If true for handguns in Chicago, then we would expect to find that **youths and criminals are able to acquire them with little trouble** (low transaction costs) at prices not that much higher from those in the legal market. As New York University law professor James Jacobs observes in this regard, “Some criminals claim that it is as easy to buy a gun on the streets as it is to buy fast food. One Chicago gang member stated, ‘It’s like going through the drive-through window. Give me some fries, a Coke, and a 9-millimeter” (2002, p. 150).2

#### No backlash-America wants the counterplan.

Kiely 13 Eugene “NRA Misfires on Federal Gun Registry” January 25th 2013 <http://www.factcheck.org/2013/01/nra-misfires-on-federal-gun-registry/> JW

Well, here’s a sad poll regarding the Second Amendment: there is a consensus that gun owners should have to register their firearms into a national database. In fact, it’s an overwhelming consensus, according to the YouGov poll. In all, 64 percent of Americans support a registry. Of that figure, 59 percent of men and 68 percent of women agree. Additionally, concerning race, 61 percent of whites, 75 percent of blacks, and 68 percent of Hispanics also agree. Regarding income, from under $40k to over $80k, on average, 63 percent support a national database.

#### Backlash is at best non unique-whether you do the plan now or later some people will be angry- we minimize non-compliance better which solves your impacts.

#### Prohibition and the drug war proves the plan fails- it will only be enforced by random stop and frisk.

Jacobs 02 James B. Jacobs, Chief Justice Warren E. Burger Professor of Constitutional Law and the Courts Director, Center for Research in Crime and Justice @ NYU Law, “Can Gun Control Work?” 2002 OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Who would enforce handgun disarmament and with what degree of vigor? National Alcohol Prohibition was enforced by a small number of US. Treasury Department agents and by state and local police departments. Criminal justice and organized crime scholar Humbert S. Nelli writes that “Prohibition overburdened the criminal justice system and undermined respect for the nation’s law.” Another author recalled that “organization and methods . . . were hopelessly inadequate.”20 Professor McBain of Co- lumbia Law School wrote in 1928 that “the large-liquor drinking public has been indifferent to, if not positively in favor of, the corruption that helps to keep the stimulating stream flowing without interruption . . . the [police] force from the beginning has been thoroughly spoils-ridden.”21 In many cities, the police were contemptuous of alcohol prohibition and did not enforce it; corruption flourished. History has repeated itself with the contemporary drug war. After the Supreme Court’s decision in Printz, rejecting federal authority to order state and local officials to conduct background checks, National Handgun Prohibition might have to be a completely federal program.22 What kind of a federal enforcement agency would be needed to investigate and deter unlawful handgun possession? Currently, most illegal handguns are seized as a consequence of street or car stops made by local law enforcement agents; a frisk reveals the gun.23 Routine car and street stops are not the province of federal agents, who lack general street-level policing authority and experience. Perhaps BATF could be expanded into a super nationwide street-level police agency with tens of thousands of new agents? Such a move would have to overcome the opposition of the NRA, gun owners, some members of Congress, and others who excoriate BATF agents as “jack-booted minions.”\* It would also have to overcome those who oppose expanding federal power and expending a great deal of federal funds. Undoubtedly, there would be opposition and resistance from fringe elements, who for years have warned of a colossal and despotic federal government. The number of militia groups would probably grow, with the potential for Waco-type standoffs and shootouts.24

#### We solve stop and frisk- a gun registry ensures we know exactly where to go to find the guns-we don’t have to look to random people on the street.

#### Stop and frisk is an independent reason to prefer the CP- the plan causes more racist enforcement because police just get to pick who they want to check.

Gourevitch 15 Alex (assistant professor of political science at Brown University) “Gun control’s racist reality: The liberal argument against giving police more power” Salon June 24th 2015 <http://www.salon.com/2015/06/24/gun_controls_racist_reality_the_liberal_argument_against_giving_police_more_power/> JW

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.

### Australia/Buyback NB

#### Registration was an integral part of that Australia’s buyback policy.

Neill 10 Andrew Leigh, Research School of Economics, Australian National University and Christine Neill, Department of Economics , Wilfrid Laurier University. Do Gun Buybacks Save Lives? Evidence from Panel Data Author(s): Andrew Leigh and Christine Neill Source: American Law and Economics Review, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Fall 2010), pp. 509-557 Published by: Oxford University Press Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42705584> NP

Several factors are important in assessing the extent to which the results from the Australian buyback can be extrapolated to other countries. **Australian borders are more easily controlled than in countries that have land borders.** In addition, Australia's government in general and its policing and customs services in particular are highly organized and effective. The NFA also had an extremely high degree of political support and was quite competently executed. And the buyback was accompanied by a uniform national system for licensing and registration of firearms. These factors should be borne in mind in considering the extent to which the results from the Australian NFA might generalize to other countries.

## A2 Delay CPs Bad

### Counter Interp

Counter interp: the neg may read a counterplan that delays the aff if a) the delay period is six months, b) there is a solvency advocate, c) it’s unconditional, and d) the CP also creates a national gun registry. I meet. Prefer my interp:

1. Depth-the CP collapses the debate into the specifics of the best way to go about doing the aff. This forces nuanced util argumentation about domestic policy. That’s uniquely key on this topic because it specifies the United States whereas most topics are generic. Also key because methods of banning are specific to success of the policy-you deny all solvency discussions about how different policies will pass and fail. Depth is key to education and outweighs breadth: A. in depth focus on issues is most useful since we can get a breadth of info by reading articles but only back and forth in debate can provide us unique debate education, B. breadth is non unique-if we go on depth on different issues every round we’ll get a breadth of info anyway. C. not everyone reads delay CPs which means we’ll still get to cover other topics in other rounds which solves your offense.

Education outweighs fairness. A. Schools fund debate-without education we wouldn’t be able to participate. B. No one will care in seven years if this round was fair but we will care if we get portable skills. C. I control the link to the value of debate-flipping a coin is by definition fair but nobody would participate in that world.

2. Ground. Process CPs like this are core neg ground since they check back against unpredictable affs. Outweighs: A. the aff will always be at a structural advantage if I don’t get generic util args because they can pick a hyper specific plan with poor division of ground, B. other generics don’t solve-engaging in the util debate without up-layering ensures I can debate the aff on its own terms without having to resort to framework which can be answered heavily.

### A2 Ground

1. T-the CP is just less of the aff so any reason why the aff is a good thing would answer the CP. This outweighs since you can use the exact rhetoric of the aff to generate offense against the CP.

2. T-the CP waits six months so you get offense about any systemic harm that the aff solves for as a solvency deficit to the CP.

3. T-I don’t just delay, I also add a registry so you get a ton of disads to the CP about that specific policy.

4. T-You get perm ground about why normal means isn’t immediate, that outweighs since devastating for me-if you win perm, do the CP because then I lose.

5. Solvency advocate proves that there’s discussion in the literature and you can just cut cards.

6. You get to pick the area of the debate so you can pick a plan that has immediate benefits a delay CP wouldn’t solve. No excuses for picking a shitty aff-I shouldn’t be blamed.

7. T-the best divider of the ground is textual competition based on the aff. A. it’s most predictable since the plan text is what we base all debate off of-any further norming makes it hard for me to know what I should be allowed to read which kills fairness since you can always read theory against me. B. the framers design the resolution to create ground for both sides so adhering to that division creates fair and educational debates.

8. T-Unconditionality means you can read 4 minutes of perms and turns and make the 2NR super hard-whatever I undercover you can go for which gives you a quantitative ground advantage over me. That outweighs since I only spent a small portion of the 1NC on the CP strategy but you can devote all of your time to it.