

Uniqueness: gun manufacturers don't want UBC, they'll pressure the NRA.

Link: The NRA is vehemently opposed to UBCs because it endangers

Internal Link:

Impact:

Serial numbers allow the ATF to trace guns back to their source

Everytown 08 Mayors Against Illegal Guns, 4-15-2008, "Inside Straw Purchasing: How Criminals Get Guns Illegally," EverytownResearch.org,

<https://everytownresearch.org/reports/inside-straw-purchasing-criminals-get-guns-illegally/> //DF

"Virtually every crime gun in the United States starts off as a legal firearm," according to then-Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) director Bradley Buckles in 2000.¹ In a 1997 report, the ATF looked at how guns then "pass through the legitimate distribution system of federally licensed firearms dealers" before ending up in the hands of criminals. The ATF concluded, in part, that, "there is a large problem of diversion to the illegal market from licensed gun establishments."² When a gun is recovered in a crime, the ATF can use the serial number on the gun to trace back to where it first left the legal market – tracing from the first sale of the firearm by an importer or manufacturer, to the wholesaler or retailer, to the first retail purchaser. In some cases, that first retail purchaser is the link between the legal and illegal markets.³

CUT CARD

The NRA controls the gun game. But importantly, the people who control the NRA and set its policy objectives are not its members, but weapons manufacturers. Such companies have a vested interest to sell as many guns as possible, making them opposed to any measure that would limit the flow of guns. Donohue at CNN writes in 2013:

Donohue 13 John J. Donohue, 4-10-2013, "Opinion: Why the NRA fights background checks," CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/04/10/opinion/donohue-background-checks/index.html> //DF

In a new poll, Americans indicated that they support universal background checks by a margin of 91% to 8%. Even in households with guns, the margin was an overwhelming 88% to 11%. "We think it's reasonable to provide mandatory instant criminal background checks for every sale at every gun show. No loopholes anywhere for anyone." Did President Barack Obama say that? No, that's from an advertisement taken out by the NRA in USA Today in 1999. But a more powerful NRA today is in no mood to follow the slogan of their "be reasonable" ad campaign of 14 years ago. This relatively small group -- the NRA boasts that it has 4.5 million members, which is peanuts compared to the roughly 40 million AARP members -- might have the political power to pull it off. Federal law prohibits selling guns to felons or the mentally ill. Background checks are the only way to enforce that law. So, besides criminals and the insane, who could possibly oppose universal background checks? Gun manufacturers. They are the ones who call the shots at the NRA, and they are the most important people in the opposition. The manufacturers don't want anything that interferes with total gun sales and profits. Background checks would impose a minor burden on gun transactions, but more importantly, limit the size of the market (and therefore, profits) in two ways. The direct loss of profit comes because closing the current gaping loophole in the background check system will shut off sales to criminals and the mentally ill who are effectively free to buy all the guns they want at gun shows and through private transactions.

When the NRA does not like a piece of gun control legislation, they use their massive control of Congress to get their way.

The NRA exerts its control over Congress in two ways.

First, by pouring money into campaigns. Moore of American Public University finds in 2015:

Jason M. Moore (American Public University). "The Influence of External Factors (Lobbyists) Regarding Major Policy Decisions on Gun Rights and How they Affect Public Impressions Regarding Federal Government." February 2015.

<http://digitalcommons.apus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1037&context=theses>

With this amount of money pouring into election cycles from pro-gun lobbyists, it is easy to ascertain how the NRA or GOA is able to influence the gun control legislation debate in their favor. Che and Gale (1998) state, There are many reasons why increased campaign spending might be socially harmful. First, increased spending means increased fund-raising, which may keep politicians from their legislative duties. Second, a lobbyist who makes a large campaign contribution may have undue influence on electoral outcomes, on the shaping of legislation, or on the outcome of regulatory proceedings. That is, the socially preferred candidate or legislation may not prevail (p. 643). **This may help to explain why popular gun control legislation is difficult to pass into law. The campaign expenditures that lobbyists groups spend cannot be matched by the ordinary voting constituent.** Wright (1990) states, Most organizations that sponsor political action committees (PACs) also maintain active lobbying operations; as a result, campaign contributions and lobbying often occur together. Sabato (1984, 124), in his survey of multicandidate political committees, found that 68% of the corporations, unions, and associations with PACs also have lobbying offices or representatives in Washington (p. 418). In terms of how these monetary contributions influence legislators, Wright (1990) provides, The sheer magnitude of PAC expenditures, however, and the visibility and public concern about PAC money suggest that the importance of campaign contributions in the legislative process should not be dismissed quickly. Contributions may not influence voting directly, but they may affect lobbying activities. And lobbying activities, at the very least, help to define and to shape legislative agendas and debates (p. 418).

Gun rights groups such as the GOA and NRA significantly outspend gun control lobbyist organizations.

Knowles (2013) states, "Campaign contributions given to 113th Congress from pro-gun interests far outweigh contributions from anti-gun interest" (para. 5). As earlier suggested, if contributions equate to more access to legislators to formulate the political debate, it stands to reason that pro-gun lobbyists have a distinct advantage. Knowles (2013) states, An analysis of data from the Federal Election Commission reveals that the National Rifle Association and its political action committee spent a whopping \$15 million to try and make sure Obama would not be re-elected in 2012, the most the group spent either for, or against, any single candidate (para. 3). According to Lee (2012) the divide between what pro-gun lobbyists organizations and gun control advocates spend is not comparable. In 2012, gun rights groups spent \$3.13 million towards federal campaign contributions while gun control groups spent a total of \$4,036. In terms of independent expenditures or advertisements in 2012, the NRA spent \$18.2 million while the most robust gun control organization, the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun

Violence, spent zero dollars. In regards to 2012 lobbying, gun rights advocates spent \$3.8 million and gun control groups spent \$180,000 (Lee, 2012).

Second, by mobilizing its base. Reston from the New Republic explains in 2017:

Reston 17 Laura Reston, 10-3-2017, "The NRA's New Scare Tactics," New Republic, <https://newrepublic.com/article/145001/nra-new-scare-tactic-gun-lobby-remaking-itself-arm-alt-right> //DF

For the past eight years, Barack Obama provided the National Rifle Association with the perfect liberal bogeyman—an avatar of white anxiety who wanted to deprive gun-toting Americans of their constitutional right to bear arms. Annual gun production skyrocketed 239 percent during his presidency, and the NRA saw its membership hit a record five million. **Last year, the group bet big on Donald Trump,** pouring \$30 million into his campaign and millions more to stack Congress with gun-friendly lawmakers. **The gamble paid off: All but one of its Senate candidates was elected, and Trump has publicly aligned himself with the lobbying group.** "The eight-year assault on your Second Amendment freedoms has come to a crashing end," Trump thundered before cheering throngs at the NRA's annual meeting in April. "You have a true friend and champion in the White House." **But with Obama gone, and Republicans firmly in control, the NRA is suffering. In the first six months after Trump was elected, gun sales tumbled by 9 percent.**

Vista, the firearms manufacturer that owns brands like American Eagle and Bushnell, saw profits drop 27 percent in the first three months of the year—a reversal the company called an "unprecedented decline in demand for ammunition and firearms."

Individual contributions to the NRA, which account for roughly half its revenue, could also take a sharp plunge; the last time a Republican occupied the White House, the NRA's membership flatlined.

"They need a demon," says Robert Spitzer, a political science professor at the State University of New York and author of *The Politics of Gun Control*. Now, with no one in the White House to strike fear in the hearts of its members, the NRA is embarking on a bold new strategy. Instead of sticking solely to its pro-gun agenda—pushing for firearms in schools, allowing gun owners to carry concealed weapons across state lines—the group has joined the ranks of Breitbart and Fox News. Last fall, in the weeks before the election, the NRA launched its very own streaming service called NRATV. Some of the 34 shows it produces—from *Armed & Fabulous* to *Trust the Hunter in Your Blood*—are little more than infomercials for gun manufacturers, who sponsor the programs to drum up business. But many of the shows focus on issues far beyond the NRA's traditional purview, from immigration to the "fake news" media. "We're seeing the rise of a new NRA," says Adam Winkler, a UCLA law professor whose latest book, *Gunfight*, chronicles the battle over gun rights. "It's long been committed to a die-hard approach to gun policy; they focused like a laser beam on Second Amendment issues. Now it's focused on immigration, race, health care. We're seeing the NRA become an extreme right-wing media outlet, not just a protector of guns."

Universal Background Checks provide the NRA with the perfect scapegoat, and allows them to mobilize gun-rights voters. Winkler at UCLA Law School writes in 2015:

Winkler 15 Adam Winkler, 10-7-2015, "How to Change the Gun Debate," HuffPost, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/adam-winkler/how-to-change-the-gun-debate_b_8258246.html //DF

The NRA's piles of money and armies of lobbyists certainly help spread the organization's no-compromises, anti-gun-control message. But **elected officials ultimately vote the NRA's way because they believe the NRA can sway voters on Election Day. The NRA's influence, in other words, comes from voters.** After the 2000 presidential election, when Al Gore failed to carry his home state of Tennessee in part because of opposition by the NRA, candidates have lived in fear of pro-gun voters. Supporters of strict gun laws ran away from gun control. President Obama, for example, downplayed the issue in both his campaigns, emphasizing instead his support for the Second Amendment. These candidates recognized that **the primary reason gun rights have been ascendant over the past 30 years is because gun enthusiasts are far more politically engaged than gun control proponents.** One in five gun owners say they have called, written, or e-mailed a public official about gun laws, compared to 1 in 10 people who don't own a gun. Four percent of non-gun owners have contributed money to

an advocacy group working on guns, in contrast to nearly 20 percent of gun owners. **Opponents of gun control are also often single-issue voters; they decide who to vote for based solely on a candidate's position on guns. Support for gun control, by contrast, has been broad but not deep. While many people tell pollsters they support effective new gun laws, like universal background checks, few actually make gun control the sole issue determining their vote. This was evident when Congress last considered gun control, in the wake of the Newtown shooting. Polls showed 90 percent in favor of universal background checks but the measure failed, losing the support of key swing-state Democrats.** As Sen. Heidi Heitkamp of North Dakota explained, calls to her office from constituents were "at least 7 to 1 against that bill." **Someone who goes through the effort of calling about guns is likely to vote on guns. Candidates kowtow to the NRA because the gun group can mobilize voters in tight races. In close elections, being able to turn out even two or three percent of voters makes a huge difference.**

This is why, in the past, the NRA has been able to defeat background checks, despite their popularity. Winkler continues:

Winkler 15 Adam Winkler, 10-7-2015, "How to Change the Gun Debate," HuffPost, ><https://www.huffingtonpost.com/adam-winkler/how-to-change-the-gun-debate> [b_b_8258246.html](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/adam-winkler/how-to-change-the-gun-debate) //DF

The NRA's piles of money and armies of lobbyists certainly help spread the organization's no-compromises, anti-gun-control message. But elected officials ultimately vote the NRA's way because they believe the NRA can sway voters on Election Day. The NRA's influence, in other words, comes from voters. After the 2000 presidential election, when Al Gore failed to carry his home state of Tennessee in part because of opposition by the NRA, candidates have lived in fear of pro-gun voters. Supporters of strict gun laws ran away from gun control. President Obama, for example, downplayed the issue in both his campaigns, emphasizing instead his support for the Second Amendment. These candidates recognized that the primary reason gun rights have been ascendant over the past 30 years is because gun enthusiasts are far more politically engaged than gun control proponents. One in five gun owners say they have called, written, or e-mailed a public official about gun laws, compared to 1 in 10 people who don't own a gun. Four percent of non-gun owners have contributed money to an advocacy group working on guns, in contrast to nearly 20 percent of gun owners. Opponents of gun control are also often single-issue voters; they decide who to vote for based solely on a candidate's position on guns. Support for gun control, by contrast, has been broad but not deep. While many people tell pollsters they support effective new gun laws, like universal background checks, few actually make gun control the sole issue determining their vote. This was evident when **Congress last considered gun control, in the wake of the Newtown shooting. Polls showed 90 percent in favor of universal background checks but the measure failed, losing the support of key swing-state Democrats.** As Sen. Heidi Heitkamp of North Dakota explained, calls to her office from constituents were "at least 7 to 1 against that bill." **Someone who goes through the effort of calling about guns is likely to vote on guns. Candidates kowtow to the NRA because the gun group can mobilize voters in tight races. In close elections, being able to turn out even two or three percent of voters makes a huge difference.**

One of the largest consequences of an NRA backlash against universal background checks would befall the ATF. The NRA loves to hate the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, which is in charge of fighting gun crime and trafficking.

Walk at NBC in 2017 reports:

Alex Seitz-Wald (NBC News). "ATF Unlikely to Crack Down on Rapid-Fire Bump Stocks." October 6, 2017.

<https://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/las-vegas-shooting/atf-unlikely-crack-down-rapid-fire-bump-stocks-n808441>

But bump stocks leave the mechanics of a gun untouched and the trigger is still technically activated on each shot, just at a much faster rate than is possible without the modifications. That leaves the ATF with little choice but to deem bump stocks legal under current law, said David

Chipman, a former ATF agent. "It's a case where technology has overwhelmed the law," said Chipman, who now works for Americans for Responsible Solutions. Some experts said the ATF is unlikely to change its ruling. **The agency is under constant pressure from congressional gun-rights advocates, who regularly threaten to cut funding and have refused to confirm a director for years at a time.** The agency has been without a Senate-confirmed leader since 2015. "You have to understand how cautious ATF is," said Chipman, who spent 25 years at the agency. "They're not an organization that has the political backing to be aggressive in their rulings. It's just, keep your head down. ... That's the culture." That's why even a growing number of Republicans have said the only way to deal with bump stocks is through new laws.

The ATF has survived in the last several years, and is actually on the way up. According to the House Appropriations Committee from earlier this year:

NA (U.S. House of Representatives - Committee on Appropriations). "Committee Releases Fiscal Year 2018 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Bill." June 28, 2017. <https://appropriations.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=394951>

Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) – The bill includes \$8.8 billion for FBI operations – an increase of \$48 million above the fiscal year 2017 enacted level. This funding maintains critical functions of the FBI, including anti-cybercrime, counterintelligence, counterterrorism, and violent crime reduction programs. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) – The DEA is funded at \$2.6 billion – \$98 million above the fiscal year 2017 enacted level and equal to the request. Within the DEA, priority is placed on anti-opioid and other illegal drug enforcement efforts. This includes enhancements for heroin enforcement, and additional resources to combat transnational organized crime and violent crimes. This also includes a \$37 million increase in the Diversion Control Program to enhance opioid diversion investigations and prosecutions. In addition, the bill provides \$526 million for the Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Forces, a \$9 million increase over the current level. **Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) – The legislation contains \$1.3 billion for the ATF, \$35 million above the fiscal year 2017 enacted level. This funding will provide additional resources to reduce violent crime and expedite licensing applications.** The bill continues all legislative provisions carried in previous years to protect the Second Amendment rights of all Americans, and goes a step further to make four of these provisions permanent law. These four provisions relate to import applications on shotguns for sporting purposes, the importation of "curios and relics" firearms, the export of firearms to Canada, and a prohibition on "gun-walking," such as the disastrous "Fast and Furious" operation. Also included is a prohibition on forcing an unauthorized reporting and registration requirement on consumers purchasing multiple rifles or shotguns. Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) – Funding for the EOIR is increased by \$64.5 million, for a total of \$505 million. This increase will provide for 65 additional immigration judge teams to process immigration reviews more quickly, and reduce the backlog of pending cases.

However, the NRA retaliates against new gun control by punishing the agency set to enforce it. Gambino at the Guardian explains in 2016:

Gambino 16 Lauren Gambino, 1-6-2016, "Agency tasked with enforcing Obama's gun control measures has been gutted," Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/jan/06/bureau-alcohol-tobacco-firearms-obama-gun-control-measures-funding-understaffing//DF>

The ATF is charged with regulating America's multibillion-dollar gun industry. But many say it is the industry that dominates the agency. **"If you can strangle the chief agency charged with carrying out gun laws, it's the equivalent of not having those laws in place,"** said Robert Spitzer, author of *The Politics of Gun Control* and a political science professor at the State University of New York. **"It's a backdoor way to reduce gun regulations."** Critics of the ATF, in particular the nation's largest gun organization, the National Rifle Association, have successfully lobbied for laws and regulations that have effectively "crippled" the agency, Spitzer said. Spitzer pointed to the series of "riders" attached to annual appropriations legislation at the behest of the gun lobby, he said, that have effectively hobbled the agency from completing even core functions of its mission. One rider, for example, restricts the ATF from consolidating and computerizing its data in a modern manner. Another imposes prohibitions on its ability to regulate and oversee firearms dealers. **If you can strangle the agency charged with carrying out gun laws, it's the equivalent of not having those laws in place** Robert Spitzer **"ATF is the 'whipping boy' of the gun community,"** Spitzer said. **"And that's how it's been for decades." The ATF has long drawn the ire of conservative lawmakers and the gun lobby.** Wayne LaPierre, the executive vice-president of the NRA, once referred to ATF agents as "jack-booted thugs" and compared them to Nazis, prompting former US president George HW Bush, a lifetime member, to resign from the organization in outrage. In 1980, Ronald Reagan pledged during his first presidential campaign to abolish ATF. More than 35 years later, such calls are still circulating. Last year, Representative Jim Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin called the agency an "affront to the second amendment" when he reintroduced legislation that would abolish the ATF and transfer its core functions to other

agencies. **There is now fresh concern that some conservative members of Congress would retaliate against Obama's actions by trying to strip funding from the bureau. "In the past, at times, when Congress didn't like something that was proposed in gun legislation or regulation, they actually took money from the bureau's budget and really hurt them more than anything else,"** said Joseph Vince, a former ATF special agent and a partner at the Maryland-based consulting firm Crime Gun Solutions. "That's a possibility and that could occur." Comparisons have been drawn between the ATF and family-planning organization Planned Parenthood, which has periodically had its federal funding threatened by conservative members of Congress amid controversy. The agency's reputation was further imperiled after the botched gun operation, known as "Fast and Furious", when ATF agents lost track of nearly 2,000 guns, two of which were recovered at the scene of a murdered US border patrol agent. But many of Obama's measures outlined in an emotional speech on Tuesday, including his proposal to hire 200 ATF agents and investigators, will require funding increases that the Republican-led Congress is almost certain to deny. **"Whenever the ATF tries to move the ball forward and better enforce the laws and regulate the industry, you often see a response from some members of Congress to try to prevent them from doing so,"** said Chelsea Parsons, vice-president for guns and crime policy at the Center for American Progress (CAP), a left-leaning thinktank in Washington.

Defunding the ATF is a dangerous decision. Parsons at the Center for American Progress writes in 2015:

Chelsea Parsons (Center for American Progress). "The Bureau and the Bureau." May 19, 2015.

<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/guns-crime/reports/2015/05/19/111386/the-bureau-and-the-bureau/>

Highlighting the challenges that ATF faces is not just another idle exercise in criticizing the inefficient bureaucracy of the federal government.

The problem of gun violence in the United States is urgent: Every day in America, assailants using guns murder 33 people. **It is imperative that the federal government takes action to enforce the laws designed to stem the tide of this violence** and that it does more to ensure that guns do not end up in the hands of criminals and other dangerous individuals. ATF is the agency charged with that responsibility, and it is well past time for the administration and Congress to take a serious look at ATF and other federal law enforcement agencies to come up with a comprehensive plan to create a strong federal framework to combat gun violence and the illegal trafficking of firearms. While there have been remarkable reductions in violent crime across the country—driven in part by federal law enforcement's partnerships with local police—illegal gun access continues to contribute to murder rates in the United States that far outpace those in comparable countries. The problem of gun crime in the United States and the daily toll of gun deaths on our communities warrant something new—a large-scale rethinking of how the federal government should address gun violence and illegal firearms trafficking and what ATF's role should be in that effort. As reformers in Congress and the administration consider options for how to make ATF function better, it is important to recognize that the agency is composed of dedicated, hardworking agents and civilian staff who do many things very well. In some respects, **ATF has been a remarkably successful agency in recent decades. ATF agents as a group are exceptionally productive by traditional measures, especially when compared with agents at other federal law enforcement agencies. In 2013, ATF agents were remarkably productive in the development of cases for prosecution—outperforming Federal Bureau of Investigation, or FBI, agents 3-to-1—averaging 3.4 cases per agent referred to the U.S. Attorneys' Office for prosecution for every 1 case per FBI agent. ATF agents, more so than most others in federal law enforcement, also have a strong reputation across the country for being assets and effective partners to local law enforcement agencies. ATF agents consistently offer real value and support to local police departments in their efforts to combat local gun crime. Furthermore, ATF has played a role in the overall decline in crime in recent years—the violent crime rate declined 19 percent between 2003 and 2012, and the murder rate declined 17 percent during that period—by taking thousands of violent criminals and gun and drug traffickers off the streets.** Between 2005 and 2012, ATF referred more than 13,000 cases involving more than 27,000 defendants suspected of firearms trafficking to the U.S. Attorneys' Office for prosecution. Despite these areas of success, ATF has faced some serious challenges in its efforts to be the federal agency charged with enforcing the nation's gun laws, combating gun crime, and regulating the firearms industry. This report seeks to offer recommendations for how to improve federal enforcement and regulation of guns that recognize and build on the formidable assets that ATF already has—but it does so while recognizing that the status quo is not enough. Although ATF has had many successes, its capabilities are inadequate in relation to the scope of the gun crime challenge in the United States. Therefore, this report does not

focus on a series of piecemeal recommendations to improve ATF's current operations. Prior evaluations, including ones written by authors of this report, make such recommendations; some of them have been acted upon, and others would certainly offer substantial benefits to the functionality and success of the agency. But this report finds that something bigger needs to happen to address the challenges that ATF faces.

In fact, Berlow, writing in Salon magazine, finds in 2012:

Berlow 12 Alan Berlow, 7-23-2012, "NRA: A lobby for criminals," https://www.salon.com/2012/07/23/nra_a_lobby_for_criminals/ //DF
Operation Fast and Furious may yet prove to be the scandal LaPierre clearly hopes it is. But NRA members might be interested in knowing that since 2006, the BATF has intercepted more than 10,000 guns and nearly a million rounds of ammunition destined for Mexico, and it has arrested 800 trafficking suspects. **Between 2003 and 2010 the BATF was responsible for sending more than 66,000 violent criminals to prison for an average of 14 years each. In the same period, it recommended prosecution of more than 26,000 defendants for firearms trafficking-related offenses involving an estimated 441,000 weapons.** If, as LaPierre claims, "government has failed in enforcing ... our laws against violent criminals with guns," he might tell his members which of those 66,000 criminals he'd rather the ATF hadn't put away. And he might explain why the NRA opposes making gun-trafficking and straw purchases a crime.

Laws

The NRA creates legal loopholes

Berlow 12 Alan Berlow, 7-23-2012, "NRA: A lobby for criminals," https://www.salon.com/2012/07/23/nra_a_lobby_for_criminals/ //DF
We can't link the NRA directly to the hideous acts of alleged Aurora gunman James Holmes, 24, or to any one of the nation's 9,000 to 10,000 annual gun murders and 338,000 rapes, robberies and other non-fatal assaults, or to the actions of the "deranged madmen" whom the NRA loves to demonize. What we can say with absolute certainty is that **where there are loopholes in gun laws, laws that make it more difficult to get thugs off the streets and laws that endanger the lives of police and ordinary citizens alike, you will invariably find the fingerprints of the NRA.** Wayne LaPierre, the NRA's CEO and public face, may call his group "one of the largest law enforcement organizations in the country," but under his leadership **the NRA** -- with a 2010 budget of more than \$240 million -- **has become the nation's de facto lobby for street criminals,** criminal gun dealers and an industry that reaps a sizable percentage of its income from criminal gun use. The NRA, says Pittsburgh police detective Joseph Bielevicz, "takes every chance it gets to stymie even reasonable efforts to combat gun violence." No one honestly doubts that the NRA is the reason there is no serious debate about guns in Congress. So **today we live under a series of laws written or advanced by the NRA.** Today a state can impose a death sentence or life in prison on someone who commits murder with a firearm. But the "What, me worry?" gun dealer, who supplies multiple murderers with guns he claims were "stolen" from his inventory, guns he never recorded on his books, or guns he sold to straw buyers with a wink and a nod, can operate with virtual impunity, thanks to laws written by the NRA. One of these, passed in 1986, drastically reduced penalties for dealers who violate record-keeping laws, making violations misdemeanors rather than felonies. Another established an absurdly high standard of proof to convict dealers who sell to criminals. In 2003, Congress, at the NRA's urging, barred the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, the much-maligned agency responsible for enforcing federal gun laws, from forcing dealers to conduct inventory inspections that would detect lost and stolen guns. Car dealers like to know when inventory goes missing. Gun dealers? Not so curious. Most astonishingly, **the same NRA-inspired law forces the FBI to destroy Brady background checks for gun purchases within 24 hours, which makes it harder for law enforcement to identify dealers who falsify their records and makes it impossible to cross-check purchases made by gun traffickers from multiple dealers.** Although federal law requires a dealer who sells more than one handgun to a single individual in a five-day period to file a special report with the BATF, the agency is unable to cross-check purchases from multiple dealers, so gun traffickers can simply hop from one gun store to the next, buying a single handgun at each until they accumulate the arsenals they want. Put another way, **the NRA and its**

backers in Congress created a law that forces the FBI to destroy evidence of crimes, evidence of illegal multiple gun purchases.

Passing a universal background check, despite its popularity with the public, would unleash massive backlash from the NRA, the group that really calls the shots.

Mardeusz at Trinity College in 2016 concludes that gun control policy:

later faces backlash from gun rights groups and their supporters, diminishing the effectiveness of the policy and increasing the level of difficulty that gun control advocates face the next time policy regulation on guns is sought

Progress writes in 2015:

Chelsea Parsons (Center for American Progress). "The Bureau and the Bureau." May 19, 2015.

<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/guns-crime/reports/2015/05/19/111386/the-bureau-and-the-bureau/>

Highlighting the challenges that ATF faces is not just another idle exercise in criticizing the inefficient bureaucracy of the federal government.

The problem of gun violence in the United States is urgent: Every day in America, assailants using guns murder 33 people. **It is imperative that the federal government takes action to enforce the laws designed to stem the tide of this violence** and that it does more to ensure that guns do not end up in the hands of criminals and other dangerous individuals. ATF is the agency charged with that responsibility, and it is well past time for the administration and Congress to take a serious look at ATF and other federal law enforcement agencies to come up with a comprehensive plan to create a strong federal framework to combat gun violence and the illegal trafficking of firearms. While there have been remarkable reductions in violent crime across the country—driven in part by federal law enforcement’s partnerships with local police—illegal gun access continues to contribute to murder rates in the United States that far outpace those in comparable countries. The problem of gun crime in the United States and the daily toll of gun deaths on our communities warrant something new—a large-scale rethinking of how the federal government should address gun violence and illegal firearms trafficking and what ATF’s role should be in that effort. As reformers in Congress and the administration consider options for how to make ATF function better, it is important to recognize that the agency is composed of dedicated, hardworking agents and civilian staff who do many things very well. In some respects, **ATF has been a remarkably successful agency in recent decades. ATF agents as a group are exceptionally productive by traditional measures, especially when compared with agents at other federal law enforcement agencies. In 2013, ATF agents were remarkably productive in the development of cases for prosecution—outperforming Federal Bureau of Investigation, or FBI, agents 3-to-1—averaging 3.4 cases per agent referred to the U.S. Attorneys’ Office for prosecution for every 1 case per FBI agent. ATF agents, more so than most others in federal law enforcement, also have a strong reputation across the country for being assets and effective partners to local law enforcement agencies. ATF agents consistently offer real value and support to local police departments in their efforts to combat local gun crime. Furthermore, ATF has played a role in the overall decline in crime in recent years—the violent crime rate declined 19 percent between 2003 and 2012, and the murder rate declined 17 percent during that period—by taking thousands of violent criminals and gun and drug traffickers off the streets.** Between 2005 and 2012, ATF referred more than 13,000 cases involving more than 27,000 defendants suspected of firearms trafficking to the U.S. Attorneys’ Office for prosecution. Despite these areas of success, ATF has faced some serious challenges in its efforts to be the federal agency charged with enforcing the nation’s gun laws, combating gun crime, and regulating the firearms industry. This report seeks to offer recommendations for how to improve federal enforcement and regulation of guns that recognize and build on the formidable assets that ATF already has—but it does so while recognizing that the status quo is not enough. Although ATF has had many

successes, its capabilities are inadequate in relation to the scope of the gun crime challenge in the United States. Therefore, this report does not focus on a series of piecemeal recommendations to improve ATF's current operations. Prior evaluations, including ones written by authors of this report, make such recommendations; some of them have been acted upon, and others would certainly offer substantial benefits to the functionality and success of the agency. But this report finds that something bigger needs to happen to address the challenges that ATF faces.

READY TO READ! (actually)

We negate, resolved: The United States should require universal background checks for all gun sales and transfers of ownership.

Our Seoul Contention is the Gun Lobby Strikes Back.

The NRA controls the gun game – it is the most powerful lobbying group in America. However, the people who control the NRA and set its policy objectives are not its members, but weapons manufacturers. Donohue at CNN writes in 2013:

Gun manufacturers are the ones who call the shots at the NRA, and they are the most important people in the opposition to universal background checks. The manufacturers don't want anything that interferes with total gun sales and profits. Background checks would limit the size of the market, and therefore, profits.

When firearms companies oppose gun control legislation, they use their commanding control of Congress to beat those bills back

The NRA exerts its control over Congress in two ways.

First, holding campaign funds hostage. Moore of American Public University finds in 2015:

Gun rights groups such as the NRA significantly outspend gun control lobbyist organizations.

The NRA's disproportionate spending results in disproportionate representation. Moore furthers:

The campaign expenditures that lobbyist groups spend cannot be matched by the ordinary voting constituent, explaining why popular gun control legislation is difficult to pass into law.

The NRA pressures lawmakers into opposing gun control by threatening to pour money into their opponent's campaigns. This keeps Congressmen in the NRA's pocket.

Second, by mobilizing its base. Reston from the New Republic explains in 2017:

For the past eight years, Barack Obama provided the National Rifle Association with the perfect liberal bogeyman, a gun rights scapegoat. But with Obama gone, and Republicans firmly in control, the NRA is suffering. In the first six months after Trump was elected, gun sales tumbled and individual contributions to the NRA could take a sharp plunge. The NRA needs a new demon.

Universal Background Checks provide the NRA with a scapegoat, and allows them to mobilize gun-rights voters. Winkler at UCLA Law School writes in 2015:

elected officials ultimately vote the NRA's way because they believe the NRA can sway voters on Election Day. Opponents of gun control often decide who to vote for based solely on a candidate's position on guns. Support for gun control, by contrast, has been broad but not deep. While many people tell pollsters they support universal background checks, few actually make gun control the sole issue determining their vote.

This is why, in the past, the NRA has been able to defeat background check bills, despite their popularity. Winkler continues:

This was evident when Congress last considered gun control, in the wake of the Newtown shooting. Polls showed 90 percent in favor of universal background checks but the measure failed, losing the support of key swing-state Democrats.

If universal background checks were actually passed, the NRA would make sure to nullify their effectiveness by preventing effective enforcement of the bill. Their main target, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, the agency tasked with enforcing gun control laws. Gambino at the Guardian explains in 2016:

ATF is the whipping boy of the gun community. In the past, at times, when Congress didn't like something that was proposed in gun legislation or regulation, they actually took money from the bureau's budget, severely hurting the agency.

That's why he finds:

If you can strangle the chief agency charged with carrying out gun laws, it's the same thing as not having those laws in place.

Defunding the ATF is a dangerous decision. Berlow, writing in Salon magazine, finds in 2012:

The ATF is the most important government agency to combat gun trafficking. Between 2003 and 2010 the ATF was responsible for sending more than 66,000 violent criminals to prison, and confiscating 441,000 weapons.

AND, Parsons finds that the efforts of the ATF were instrumental in reducing crime in the 1990s'

Thus, we negate.

READY TO READ? (no)

We negate, resolved: The United States should require universal background checks for all gun sales and transfers of ownership.

Contention One is the Gun Lobby Strikes Back.

The NRA controls the gun game – it is the most powerful lobbying group in America. However, the people who control the NRA and set its policy objectives are not its members, but weapons manufacturers. Donohue at CNN writes in 2013:

Gun manufacturers are the ones who call the shots at the NRA, and they are the most important people in the opposition to universal background checks. This is because background checks would limit the size of the market, and therefore, profits.

When firearms companies oppose gun control legislation, they use their commanding control of Congress to beat those bills back

Universal Background Checks provide the NRA with a scapegoat, and allows them to mobilize gun-rights voters. Winkler at UCLA Law School writes in 2015:

elected officials ultimately vote the NRA's way because they believe the NRA can sway voters on Election Day. Support for gun control has been broad but not deep. While many people tell pollsters they support universal background checks, few actually make gun control the sole issue determining their vote.

This is why, in the past, the NRA has been able to defeat background check bills, despite their popularity. Winkler continues:

This was evident when Congress last considered gun control, in the wake of the Newtown shooting. Polls showed 90 percent in favor of universal background checks but the measure failed, losing the support of key swing-state Democrats.

If universal background checks were actually passed, the NRA would make sure to nullify their effectiveness by preventing effective enforcement of the bill. Their main target would be the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, (or the ATF), the agency tasked with enforcing gun control laws. Gambino at the Guardian explains in 2016:

ATF is the scapegoat of the gun community. In the past, at times, when Congress didn't like something that was proposed in gun legislation or regulation, they actually took money from the bureau's budget.

Defunding the ATF is a dangerous decision. Berlow, writing in Salon magazine, finds in 2012:

The ATF is the most important government agency to combat gun trafficking. the ATF was responsible for sending more than 66,000 violent criminals to prison, and confiscating 441,000 weapons.

Contention Two: the black market strikes back.

Most criminals acquire guns through a large number of small-scale sales: Wintemute of the Violence Prevention Research Program describes that,

Most crime-involved firearms come from many small-volume transactions between individuals, dispersed in time and place, such as gun shows or the internet. However, a Universal Background Check would eliminate the many diffuse sources that criminals use.

If criminals cannot get guns through legal means, they will turn to the black market.

Sieberg at the University of Binghamton writes in 2016:

by restricting gun ownership, the government creates a black market. Serious restrictions on gun ownership might not increase the problem. Because criminals will be willing to pay large amounts in order to obtain guns, it becomes profitable for others to supply them. Thus, in our attempt to control and decrease crime, gun control laws can actually create the opportunities for more crime.

A black market worsens gun crime for two reasons.

First, it makes gun crimes harder to police. Patterson at CNN writes in 2015:

to make these guns hard to trace, gun runners take off their serial numbers. This increases the incentive to commit crime, because criminals feel like they can get away with law-breaking.

Second, it fuels violence.

Sieberg furthers:

because gun control creates the incentives for the formation of a black market, the laws could be contributing to more crime in a way similar to effects of the infamous alcohol Prohibition in the U.S. By creating a situation in which it is mutually advantageous for groups to break the law.

Thus, we negate.

Frontlines and Weighing

R/T Most people want UBCs

1. The evidence they bring up only shows that regular people “would favor” a UBC, but those people are not very active as politicians and won’t actually lobby against them
2. **This is why, in the past, the NRA has been able to defeat background check bills, despite their popularity. Winkler: when Congress last considered gun control in the wake of the Newtown shooting, Polls showed 90 percent in favor of universal background checks but the measure failed, losing the support of key swing-state Democrats.**

UBC Bolsters gun control movement

1. Manufacturers have the real power
2. NRA can outspend every social movement and will have more influence over Congress

Concedes less guns

1. Same amount of guns, but now they have shifted to the black market, which is even worse because it is a market unregulated by authority, so it breeds dangerous gang and cartel violence and trafficking

ATF Funding comes back

One day, Michael Andrew Ryan sat down at a computer, hopped onto a hidden part of the Internet known as the dark Web, called himself "Gunrunner" and opened for business.

Black market makes guns harder to trace

Patterson 15 Thom Patterson, Cnn, 8-11-2016, "Inside the illegal online weapons trade," CNN,

<http://www.cnn.com/2016/08/10/us/declassified-illegal-online-weapons-trade/index.html> //DF

His international weapons operation offered anyone a virtual laundry list of weapons with brand names that have become disturbingly familiar:

Glock Beretta Uzi Highpoint Walther. To make these guns hard to trace, Gunrunner took off their serial numbers

and shipped them to countries where buying these guns was difficult -- if not altogether banned by law. And it was all happening under the noses of the residents of the sleepy little town of Manhattan, Kansas, population: about 56,000. Gunrunner wasn't some dramatic villain like you might see in a Hollywood comic book thriller. He was just a 35-year-old guy in America's Heartland, illegally exporting semi-automatic rifles, handguns and ammunition to Ireland, Scotland, Australia and England. It just so happened that Ryan's online gun-selling operation got busted by the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. "The fact that international firearms trafficking has reached Kansas shows the power of the Internet," said Acting U.S. Attorney Tom Beall in a statement.

EXTRAS

Uniqueness

The National Rifle Association is the most powerful lobby group in America.

Surowiecki at the New Yorker explains in 2015:

Surowiecki 15 James Surowiecki, 10-19-2015, "Why Is the N.R.A. So Powerful?," New Yorker,

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/10/19/taking-on-the-n-r-a> //DF

In the wake of the massacre at Umpqua Community College, in Oregon, Hillary Clinton promised that if she is elected President she will use executive power to make it harder for people to buy guns without background checks. Meanwhile, Ben Carson, one of the Republican Presidential candidates, said, "I never saw a body with bullet holes that was more devastating than taking the right to arm ourselves away." The two responses could hardly have been more different, but both were testaments to the power of a single organization: the National Rifle Association. Clinton invoked executive action because **the N.R.A. has made it unthinkable that a**

Republican-controlled Congress could pass meaningful gun-control legislation. Carson found it expedient to make his comment **because the N.R.A. has shaped the public discourse around guns, in one of the most successful P.R.** (or propaganda, depending on your perspective) **campaigns of all time**. In many accounts, the power of the N.R.A.

comes down to money. The organization has an annual operating budget of some quarter of a billion dollars, and between 2000 and 2010 **it spent fifteen times as much on campaign contributions as gun-control advocates did**. But money is less crucial than you'd think. The N.R.A.'s annual lobbying budget is around three million dollars, which is about a fifteenth of what, say, the National Association of Realtors spends. **The N.R.A.'s biggest asset isn't cash but the devotion of its members**. Adam Winkler, a law professor at U.C.L.A. and the author of the 2011 book "Gunfight," told me, "**N.R.A. members are politically engaged and politically active. They call and write elected officials, they show up to vote, and they vote based on the gun issue.**" In one revealing study, people who were in favor of permits for gun owners described themselves as more invested in the issue than gun-rights supporters did. Yet people in the latter group were four times as likely to have donated money and written a politician about the issue. The N.R.A.'s ability to mobilize is a classic example of what the advertising guru David Ogilvy called the power of one "big idea."

Beginning in the nineteen-seventies, the N.R.A. relentlessly promoted the view that the right to own a gun is sacrosanct. Playing on fear of rising crime rates and distrust of government, it transformed the terms of the debate. As Ladd Everitt, of the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence, told me, "Gun-control people were rattling off public-health statistics to make their case, while the N.R.A. was connecting gun rights to core American values like individualism and personal liberty." The success of this strategy explains things that otherwise look anomalous, such as the refusal to be conciliatory even after killings that you'd think would be P.R. disasters. After the massacre of schoolchildren in Newtown, Connecticut, the N.R.A.'s C.E.O. sent a series of e-mails to his members warning them that anti-gun forces were going to use it to "ban your guns" and "destroy the Second Amendment."

Even though universal background checks are universally popular, the NRA calls the shots when it comes to policy. Moore at American Public University explains in 2015:

Jason M. Moore (American Public University). "The Influence of External Factors (Lobbyists) Regarding Major Policy Decisions on Gun Rights and How they Affect Public Impressions Regarding Federal Government." February 2015.

<http://digitalcommons.apus.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1037&context=theses>

In terms of monies raised as an interest group, gun rights activists dwarf gun control advocates considerably. In business as well as life, the term cash is king is prevalent and in the lobbying sector just as important. For instance, the NRA's ability to raise money through dues paying members and donations give their organization solid footing within Congress and a voice that every politician must listen to. The example of the Tennessee House Republican Caucus Chairwoman serves as notice that even a strong supporter of gun rights can become a political target if not totally in line with the NRA's message and pass or sack legislation accordingly. Also as an example, consider the unwillingness from Republican

legislators and despite the extensive public support for the bill requiring background checks prior to firearm purchase continually cannot be passed into law. It is safe to assume that these legislators are reluctant because of the influence from the NRA and other pro-gun lobbyists' organizations. This reluctance can be contributed to funding for elections from pro-gun lobbyists organizations and fear of political reprisal. The ability to raise a surplus of money also contributes to the pro-gun lobby's ability to use direct and grassroots lobbying effectively. **With sources citing anywhere from four to five million members, the NRA could easily incite a massive movement by reaching out to legislators regarding any particular piece of gun legislation at the state or federal level.** As previously observed, **pro-gun rights enthusiasts are more passionate regarding their cause and interests, which makes a grassroots campaign more likely to succeed and be effective at raising the expectations for legislators to consider their views and ideology.** Conversely, the gun control lobby has backing but is lacking the dedicated membership that most pro-gun lobbies enjoy. Past national tragedies that spark national outrage and desires for more gun control, has and will continue to heighten the issue salience for more gun control legislation. When this occurs, we see that pro-gun lobbyists dig in and hammer their message publicly and with lawmakers, while gun control enthusiast's motivation often subsides with the passing of time between horrific events and potential gun control legislation, such as background checks, is stalled during the legislative process. This motivation is defined as monetary donations as well as pressing legislators for more gun control laws through the use of grassroots tactics. Again, the pro-gun lobby has the unequivocal advantage over gun control lobbyists.

NRA has a firm grip on lawmakers

Berlow 12 Alan Berlow, 7-23-2012, "NRA: A lobby for criminals," https://www.salon.com/2012/07/23/nra_a_lobby_for_criminals/ //DF
We've read the sickening script before. Following virtually every mass shooting in the United States, the news media focuses briefly on the question of whether anything can be done to prevent such incidents in the future. Soon, a softly spoken "no" infiltrates the coverage, either out of sheer hopelessness or the certain knowledge that **our elected officials are so firmly in the thrall of the gun lobby that they quiver in fear at the mere thought of contemplating even tepid measures advanced by gun control advocates** in the wake of the latest atrocity. If the aftermath of Aurora (12 dead, 58 wounded) plays out as others of recent or fading memory -- Tuscaloosa, two weeks ago (18 wounded), Tucson in 2011 (six dead, 14 wounded), Binghamton in 2009 (13 dead, four wounded), Ft. Hood also in 2009 (13 dead, 29 wounded), Virginia Tech in 2007 (32 dead, 17 wounded), Northern Illinois University in 2008 (five dead, 21 wounded), Columbine in 1999 (12 dead, 21 wounded), etc. -- the role of the National Rifle Association will be lightly brushed over, then dismissed.

Link

Passing a universal background check, despite its popularity with the public, would unleash massive backlash from the NRA, the group that really calls the shots.

Mardeusz at Trinity College in 2016 concludes that gun control policy:

Julia Mardeusz (Trinity College). An Intractable Issue? Gun Control in America, 1968-Present. Published 2016.

<http://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1595&context=theses>.

Gun control belongs to a uniquely contentious category of policy that is characterized by strongly-held convictions and emotions on both sides of the issue. Its status as social regulatory policy, which seeks to restrain or regulate individual conduct, means that the NRA and other gun rights groups have an advantage when trying to sway both lawmakers and the general public. Because people have a tendency to dislike policy that seeks to regulate their behavior, the pro-gun-control side of the debate has faced far more difficulty in swaying lawmakers and the public, which means that the impetus for federal gun control policy has come from tragic situations where public outrage over gun violence is at a sufficiently high level to override concerns of governmental restriction of individual rights and behavior. This outrage-action-reaction cycle has led to incremental policy that **later faces backlash from gun rights groups and their supporters, diminishing the effectiveness of the policy and increasing the level of difficulty that gun control advocates face the next time policy regulation on guns is sought** on the federal level.

Reston 17 Laura Reston, 10-3-2017, "The NRA's New Scare Tactics," New Republic,

<https://newrepublic.com/article/145001/nra-new-scare-tactic-gun-lobby-remaking-itself-arm-alt-right>

//DF

NRATV does have one black host: Colion Noir, an eloquent gun aficionado and former YouTube star whom the lobbying group recruited during Obama's second term. But as Trump proved that the GOP could still win elections by stoking the fear and hatred of its core supporters, Noir, like the NRA as a whole, has adopted the rhetoric of the alt-right. Once a supporter of Black Lives Matter, he now denounces it as a "weaponized race-baiting machine pushing the extreme liberal Democratic agenda." As a marketing arm of the gun industry, the NRA has long understood that fear sells—but now it has a new media platform from which to broadcast a daily drumbeat of extremism and paranoia. "I'm not even sure it's a dog whistle anymore," says Watts, the gun control advocate. "It's just a whistle—to anyone in their base who's willing to listen. They see the future: They're selling guns to fewer people. Their demographic is older, white men. They have to create a culture war—to make Americans afraid of each other."

Due to the NRA's opposition to background checks, they have opposed and defeated every proposed bill put on the House floor. Hughes at the Trace writes in 2015:

Defilippis 15 EVAN DEFILIPPIS AND DEVIN HUGHES, 9-18-2015, "Gun-Rights Advocates Claim Criminals Don't Follow Gun Laws. Here's the Research That Shows They're Wrong.,"

<https://www.thetrace.org/2015/09/gun-laws-work-criminals-effectiveness-research/> //DF

Probably the most glaring loophole carved out by the gun lobby, however, is the virtually unregulated market of private transfers. The NRA was first able to successfully stall and eventually kill an attempt at expanded background checks in the aftermath of the 1999 mass shooting in Columbine, Colorado. The NRA replicated this feat in wake of the massacre in Newtown, Connecticut, defeating a universal background check measure with overwhelming public support. (You can read more about this saga here.) However, despite the NRA's protestations that these measures will accomplish little, the evidence clearly demonstrates that it's this loophole through which many criminals obtain their firearms. One study that looked at criminal offenders legally prohibited from owning firearms found that 96 percent had obtained their firearms from sources that don't conduct background checks, which includes all aspects of the gray market, from legitimate private sales to illegal transactions.

Laws

The NRA reaction to a universal background check would likely take two forms.

First, a new call for concealed carry. Henigan at the Huffington Post in 2016 writes:

Henigan 16 Dennis A. Henigan, 11-22-2016, "What The NRA Wants (And What To Do About It)," HuffPost, https://www.huffingtonpost.com/dennis-a-henigan/what-does-the-nra-want-_b_13135086.html //DF

In Congress, it is likely that the first item on the NRA's wish list will be national "concealed carry reciprocity" legislation, which would force states to recognize the concealed-carry permits of visitors from other states. Under this legislation, states could enforce their concealed-carry restrictions on their own residents, but not against visitors from other states with less restrictive laws. This would allow persons with concealed carry licenses from other states to carry concealed in Times Square, even if New York would never have allowed the same person to possess a gun, much less carry it concealed. In effect, states would be deprived of the authority to determine who the "good guys" are that should be allowed to carry concealed weapons, an extraordinary invasion of state prerogatives. Yet some of the strongest supporters of this idea in Congress are vociferous advocates of states' rights in countless other contexts. For these fair-weather federalists, state autonomy must give way to the overarching goal of more guns carried in more public places. Gun control forces have been able to block this legislation in past years. The gun lobby is likely to redouble its efforts to pass it now.

The NRA sunk money into destroying UBCs in Nevada

Spies 17 Mike Spies, 10-2-2017, "The NRA Spent Millions Last Year to Fight Background Checks in Nevada," Trace,

<https://www.thetrace.org/rounds/nra-spending-nevada-universal-background-checks-las-vegas/> //DF

Last year, the National Rifle Association spent more money fighting a push for a universal background check for gun purchases in Nevada than it did on any Senate or House race. There's no indication that Question 1, which passed by a razor-thin margin, would have factored into Sunday night's rifle attack on the Las Vegas Strip, which left 59 people dead and an estimated 527 injured in the worst mass shooting in American history. The gunman, identified as Stephen Paddock, purchased at least some of his guns from a licensed dealer and passed a background check; it does not appear that he was the sort of prohibited purchaser, seeking unvetted gun show deals, that expanded background checks are meant to thwart. **But the NRA's all-out effort to sink the ballot initiative shows just how far it will go to try to beat back new gun restrictions.** The group's state-level operation tends to fly below the radar, but is key to its power, continually expanding the boundaries of where it's acceptable to carry guns. Over the last decade, the NRA has successfully worked to allow firearms on college campuses, and into bars, churches, day care centers, and government buildings. The gun group poured more than \$6.6 million into opposing Question 1, making it the NRA's second-largest campaign expenditure of 2016. The only contest that drew more funds from the gun-rights group was the presidential election, in which it invested over \$30 million in support of Donald Trump. **After the measure passed, the state's attorney general, Adam Laxalt, a Republican, issued an opinion stating that the law was "unenforceable."** The law was supposed to go into effect in January, but so far this year **the FBI has not conducted a single background check on a private gun sale in the state.**

ATF

The NRA tries to stop the ATF when its role is enhanced

USA Today 13 2-7-2013, "NRA actively worked to weaken gun law enforcement," USA TODAY,

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/02/07/nra-interferes-with-atf-operations/1894355/> //DF

A review of congressional legislative records, federal lobbying disclosure forms, as well as interviews with former ATF agents, shows how **the NRA has repeatedly supported legislation to weaken several of the nation's gun laws and opposed any attempt to boost the ability of the Bureau of the Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) to enforce current laws,** including: The Firearms Owners' Protection Act of 1986. This law mandated that the ATF could only inspect firearms dealers once a year. It reduced record-keeping penalties from felonies to misdemeanors, prohibited the ATF from computerizing purchase records for firearms and required the government to prove that a gun dealer was "willful" if they sold a firearm to a prohibited person. The Tiahrt amendments. Beginning in 2003, the amendments by then-representative Todd Tiahrt, R-Kan., to the Justice Department's appropriation bill included requirements such as the same-day destruction of FBI background check documents and limits on the sharing of data from traces. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives Reform and Firearms Modernization Act. Most recently introduced in 2011, the bill proposed changing several regulations, including redefining the burden of proof for agents investigating firearms dealers accused of selling to prohibited individuals and capping fines for other violations. The NRA didn't do anything to weaken the ATF, which is responsible for its inability to enforce the laws, NRA spokesman Andrew Arulanandam said.

The ATF hasn't had a real director for a long time

Givens 17 Ann Givens, 4-19-2017, "Congress Keeps Scolding the ATF for Botching Operations. Experts Say Lawmakers are Partially to Blame," Trace, <https://www.thetrace.org/2017/04/congress-atf-permanent-director-fast-and-furious/> //DF

Many law enforcement officials say the scandals that have enveloped the ATF have stemmed, at least in part, from a lack of institutional control, with branch offices acting without proper oversight from Washington. Congress deserves a healthy share of the blame, these critics say.

For eight of the last 10 years, the agency has not had a Senate-approved director. Its budget has grown much more slowly than those of its law-enforcement counterparts like the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The ATF is operating now under a continuing resolution extending the 2016 budget, which amounts to a budget cut because of built-in rent and salary increases, officials say. "If you have permanent leadership, that person can establish the values of the organization, and build a framework in which to make decisions," said Darrel Stephens, the executive director of the Major Cities Chiefs Police Association, a professional association of police chiefs and sheriffs representing the largest cities in the United States and Canada. With Acting Director Brandon still on the stand last month, Representative Gerry Connolly, a Democrat from Virginia, said that Congress had played a role in the ATF's failings. "It seems to me that we can't have it both ways in Congress," Connolly said. "If we want you to do your job, and do it well . . . it seems to me we have to do our jobs, and I'm not sure we've consistently done that."

NRA will make it harder to trace guns used in crimes (Henigan - Huffington Post).

Dennis Henigan (Huffington Post). "What Does The NRA Want? (And What To Do About It)." 11/22/16.

https://www.huffingtonpost.com/dennis-a-henigan/what-does-the-nra-want- b_13135086.html

But the Tiahrt Amendments still allow law enforcement access to the trace database. The database recently was used in a report issued by New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman showing that three out of every four guns traced to crime in New York State, during the period 2005-2010, originated with gun dealers in other states, primarily from states with weak gun laws, like Virginia, the Carolinas, Florida and Georgia. This pattern suggests that strong state gun laws, as in New York, make it harder for criminals to get guns, making it necessary for the illegal market in those states to be supplied by dealers in states with weak gun laws. This interstate movement of guns into crime also argues for stronger federal gun laws to prevent the states with weak gun laws from undercutting the strong laws of other states. Thus, **the gun lobby has more than enough reason to suppress the ATF data by even further limiting its use by law enforcement authorities. The NRA may push the Trump Administration to further restrict use of the crime gun trace data by simply changing ATF policy; or it may seek to expand the scope of the Tiahrt Amendments through an amended appropriations rider or other legislation.** Just as it has sought to suppress all CDC-funded research into gun violence, the gun lobby may seek to close all avenues to the use of ATF crime gun trace data to inform gun policy. Congressional Action In Congress, it is likely that the first item on the NRA's wish list will be national "concealed carry reciprocity" legislation, which would force states to recognize the concealed-carry permits of visitors from other states. Under this legislation, states could enforce their concealed-carry restrictions on their own residents, but not against visitors from other states with less restrictive laws. This would allow persons with concealed carry licenses from other states to carry concealed in Times Square, even if New York would never have allowed the same person to possess a gun, much less carry it concealed. In effect, states would be deprived of the authority to determine who the "good guys" are that should be allowed to carry concealed weapons, an extraordinary invasion of state prerogatives. Yet some of the strongest supporters of this idea in Congress are vociferous advocates of states' rights in countless other contexts. For these fair-weather federalists, state autonomy must give way to the overarching goal of more guns carried in more public places. Gun control forces have been able to block this legislation in past years. The gun lobby is likely to redouble its efforts to pass it now.

Impact: ATF necessary to enforce existing gun laws, work with local police on gun crime, and overall reduce violent crime in America (Parsons - Center for American Progress).

Second, breaking the ATF.