# Black Self-Defense K

## 1NC

### Gun Culture – Long

#### The 1AC’s historical analysis ignores Black historical disciplines grounded in self-defense for communities against Klan members—their framing of guns as tools of aggression and unjustified violence dismisses historical and material realities.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

The erasure of Williams, as both theorist and historical figure, is the product of two disciplinary tendencies. The first is the inability of Eurocentric disciplines to conceptualize the Black radical tradition outside the ahis- torical self-referential nature of (white) theory. The disciplinary resistance of philosophy towards mining the material history (actual archives, testimo- nies, newspapers, etc.) of Black political organizations prevents academic philosophers from seeing Black political organizations as various schools of thought. There is a tendency to reduce Black organizations, regardless of their function as activist or academic, to political forums at odds over spe- cific Black identities. This framing of Black organizations ignores the actual function these entities had as social spaces wherein Black political theories were formulated, debated, and tested as politics in the real world. The disci- plinary view of theory is indicative of philosophy’s failure to grasp the intri- cacies and historical emergence of the Black political tradition throughout the centuries beyond the isolated figures selected to be compatible with the philosophical canon.7 The second disciplinary tendency which has limited the exploration of Williams as a theorist and figure is due to the fear and anxiety caused by militant Black male political resistance involving violence or armed resistance. This anxiety is not race specific. While white disciplines have simply dismissed the armed resistance of Blacks, particularly Black men as hateful; the barbaric Black equivalent of white Klan violence in many cases, Black feminist historiography originating in the Black Macho mythology of Michelle Wallace, and carried forth in subsequent Black feminist works equating militant resistance—the use of the gun—with patriarchy. This rendering has supported an ahistorical determination that carelessly makes all Black male attempts to protect themselves equivalent to their desire to imitate white patriarchy. Though popular, this mythology has failed to hold up to historical scrutiny.8 Simply stated, the Black radical tradition both exceeds and stands in contradiction to the categories pres- ently deployed to demarcate its boundaries as “useful” political theory.

#### Liberation requires bloodshed—white supremacy means that we only view violence as unjustified if it’s killing white people—their commitment to non-violence is just internalized pacifism.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

Following the model of the Black Armed Guard, Williams says “The les- son of Monroe teaches that effective self-defense, on the part of our brutally oppressed and terrorized people requires massive organization with central coordination. External oppressive forces must not be allowed to relieve the besieged racist terrorists. The forces of the state must be kept under pres- sure in many places simultaneously. The white supremacy masses must be forced to retreat to their homes in order to give security to the individual families.”82 The Black oppressed class are already on the losing side of vio- lence regardless of their stance, Williams simply argues that given the same end the oppressed cannot afford to not challenge the violence of the state and its white supremacist masses. In this scenario, “The oppressors have more to lose than the dehumanized and oppressed in such a conflict. Our people have nothing to lose but their chains.”83 This is not to suggest that Williams is driven by a romanticism regarding his use of violence. He accepts that¶ Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights 67¶ there would be great losses on the part of our people. How can we expect liberation without losses? Our people are already being admonished by the nonviolent forces to die for freedom. We are being told to sacrifice our lives in situations of diminishing returns. If we must die, let us die in the only way that our oppressor will feel the weight of our death. Let us die in the tried and proven way of liberation. If we are going to talk about revolution, let us know what revolution means.84¶ Liberation requires bloodshed. The only difference is that Black and white academics, scholars, and theorists are willing to concede this necessity when speaking of the tolls taken on by the oppressed Black peoples of his- tory, but shudder to theorize this stance when the demand is placed upon white lives. Such an insistence is usually met with the idea that violence corrupts, and would destroy such a revolutionary program. This apologetic against the militant Black tradition is fascinating, since an acceptance of the premise that violence morally corrupts cultures and actors would seem to lead one to conclude that ethics and the moralities produced by such frame- works are generally beyond the capacities the white culture asserting them. Is it not the violence of the white oppressor which inspires the oppressed to arm themselves and risk their very lives to resist this imposition of death?¶ Contrary to the moral peril of Blacks caused by pursing an armed re- sistance strategy, Williams does not believe that violence against the white oppressor is sadistic and fueled by the hate of whites. He takes great caution to convey that self-defense is rooted in justice, not revenge, and targets the agents who commit atrocities against Black America—these tyrants could be white and/or Black. Williams insists that “Afroamericans must remem- ber that such a campaign of massive self-defense should not be based upon a lust for sadistical gratification. It cannot be a campaign for vengeance, however, sweet and deserving vengeance may be. Such a campaign of self- defense and survival must be based on the righteous cause of justice. It must not be anti-white but anti-oppression and injustice. Uncle Toms should be as much a target as racist whites.”85 Williams’s movement was not one of violence for the sake of violence, or a way to take out pent-up anger. This revolution had a cause and a goal, and Williams was determined to keep that in the forefront. Williams sought to create a systematic articulation of militant resistance capable of activating the pursuit of rights and justice for Blacks in a system demanding their subservience and oppression. Robert F. Williams undoubtedly established the twentieth century program of mili- tant civil rights, and it was one focused on the realization of justice and lib- eration, not decadent racial identity politics. The militant tradition articu- lated by Williams commits the practitioner to an unflinching paradigmatic analysis of material systems: racial, economic, and historical.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1AC’s framing of guns as inherently militaristic by engaging a black self-defense paradigm.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

Robert F. Williams is a pivotal figure in the history and advancement of Black political theory. It is a great injustice that his seminal work Negroes with Guns remains excluded from examination and analysis due to the fear and anxiety his identity and politics cause within disciplines. His life marks the limits of liberal thought and offers a steadfast challenge to the progressive left. Rather than simply being an example of an imaginary Black Nationalist politics, his life and activism show what a reflective Black (male) mind coun- tering the assassination attempts by the FBI, the terrorism of the Klan, and multiple threats against his life produces as anti-racist revolt. Williams was adamant that he did not lead a political movement, instead he argues that he led “a movement of people who resented oppression.”86 His work aims to in- spire Blacks to actively contemplate the multiplicity of resistance strategies, and not confine themselves to one morally determined course of action. In a twenty-first-century world that looks eerily similar to the 1950s and 1960s regarding the public executions of Black men, and condition of Blacks more generally, Williams’s work allows us to reconceptualize what is at stake in our protests and appeals to the American public. Is it the case that Black men can simply predetermine that all their resistance shall be based on non-violence? Can Black Americans who find themselves at the mercy of the police demand of all protesters that they never arm themselves against the state? Is non-violence truly the only political philosophy Black Americans are obligated to act through when confronting a militarized police state and rampant vigilantism in the white public? Williams would insist the answer to these questions is simply: No. — • —

#### Alt solves the case—inclusion of black historical disciplines disrupts historical narratives of guns and creates cultural shift away from by recognizing the worth of black people—it recognizes multiplicity of self-defense and avoids monolithic narratives of guns. Also, a multiplicity of self-defense strategies checks back the impact to the case—it’s empirically proven.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

One of the Black Armed Guard’s first engagements with the Klan came in 1957 when they sought to protect Dr. Albert E. Perry. When Williams joined the local chapter of the NAACP, it was on the brink of collapse. As Williams re- counts, “When I objected, I was elected president and they withdrew, except for Dr. Albert E. Perry. Dr. Perry was a newcomer who had settled in Monroe and built up a very successful practice, and he became our vice president.”22 In the summer of 1957, after several attempts to disrupt the work of the local NAACP and a number of death threats against Dr. Perry, “An armed motor- cade attacked Dr. Perry’s house, which is situated on the outskirts of the col- ored community. We shot it out with the Klan and repelled their attack and the Klan didn’t have any more stomach for this type of fight. They stopped raiding our community.”23 The night after what was thought to be a victory— Williams and his guard of veterans driving the Klan away from Dr. Perry’s house—Dr. Perry was met by the Monroe police with a warrant for his ar- rest on the charges of “criminal abortion on a white woman.”24 The name of this white woman was Lilly Mae Rape; a powerful symbol of the ideology standing behind the accusation of Dr. Perry. The impoverished and illiterate Rape asked Dr. Perry on multiple occasions for an abortion, but as a devout Catholic he refused. According to Perry, “The last time she came to see him . . . he told [her] that there were too many dangers in a white woman even in his office, reminded her that he had told her already not to come back, and demanded that she get out.”25 Black men were well aware of the readiness of this justification to punish them. As Perry later stated to the executive secre- tary of the NAACP Roy Wilkins, “I would have had to been crazy to have done such an act in the face of all the animosity against me. I am Vice President of the local branch and it is because of this that I have been framed.”26¶ The very next year, in 1958, this peculiar chauvinism was demonstrat- ed again—this time against two young Black boys in Monroe, North Caro- lina. In what has popularly been referred to as the Kissing Case, two young boys David Ezell Simpson (eight) and James Hanover Grissom (ten) were imprisoned, sentenced to reformation, and threatened with death for par- ticipating in a children’s game involving a (white) girl sitting on a boys lap and kissing him. Unfortunately, Simpson and Grissom were Black, and the kiss of a white girl, even that of a child, violated the segregationist white supremacist order of the day. Despite various firsthand accounts by the chil- dren themselves that this was a game created by the group of white boys and girls, the dominant white version suggested the two boys were rapists.27 The “white—and official—version” maintained:¶ Two negro boys trapped the three white girls in a culvert and told them that the price of escape would be a kiss. Two of the girls, according to this rendi- tion of events, managed to elude that levy. The third—a seven year old—ei- ther kissed or was kissed by Hanover Thompson (one of the African Ameri- can boys). White sources asserted that one of the African American boys had held the girl while the other had kissed her or even tried to rape her. Local officials openly accused the boys of “molesting three white girls” and quietly suggested to reporters that what actually had occurred was a rape attempt.28¶ Tyson goes on the explain that the Carolina Times, a local Black newspaper, interviewed separate eyewitnesses, and concluded that “the girls, in a game, had sat voluntarily on the laps of Black and white boys and kissed them playfully.”29 Tyson is undoubtedly correct in pointing out the non-existence of manhood for Black men in the sense that “No Black man could safely pro- tect ‘his’ women from any white man, while the Black male who ventured across the color line represented not merely a threat to a particular white man but to white supremacy generally—and was likely to be dealt with as such,”30 but the boundaries of Black male oppression is not simply had in the denial of what is traditionally thought of as the parameters of white man- hood. Black men and boys are historically targeted for being the representa- tion of sexual savagery. As James Baldwin notes in “The Black Boy Looks at the White Boy,” “to be an American Negro male is also to be a kind of walk- ing phallic symbol: which means that one pays, in one’s own personality, for the sexual insecurity of others.”31 To be Black and male then is having a social genesis rooted in one’s transfiguration as a phobic entity—a living sciaphobia. This was even applicable to eight and ten year old boys. Sexual assault from white men on Black women strengthened and supported white supremacy, and was, therefore, not only tolerated, but commonplace. The mere threat of sex between a white woman and Black man, or the faint idea of a Black man living after offending white womanhood as such, was enough to disrupt the ideological order of white supremacy. Such trespasses against white women could only be met with death. Historically, white supremacy has routinely demonstrated its power to deny Black males social being, pre- cisely in that it denies them the ability to have socially recognizable roles as husbands, fathers, and as the Kissing Case demonstrates, children. However, white supremacy also makes them vulnerable to the whims of women in ways unimaginable to the white male patriarch.

#### Historical framing is a prior question to evaluation of the 1AC’s advocacy—we criticize their epistemic starting point, which shapes their solvency claims—means they don’t get to weigh the case against the K without proving their historical account of gun culture is correct.

Fisher 84 [Fisher, W. R., Professor Emeritus at the USC Annenberg School for Communication. “Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument.” Communications Monographs, 51(1), 1-22.]

The context for what is to follow would not he complete without recognition of the work done by theologians and those interested in religious discourse. The most recent works in this tradition include Goldberg (1982) and Hauerwas (1981). It is worth pausing with these studies as they foreshadow several of the themes to be developed later. Goldberg claims that: a theologian, regardless of the propositional statements he or she may have to make about a community's convictions, must consciously strive to keep those statements in intimate contact with the narratives which give rise to those convictions, within which they gain their sense and meaning, and from which they have been abstracted. (p. 35) The same can be said for those who would understand ordinary experience. The ground for determining meaning, validity, reason, rationality, and truth must be a narrative context: history, culture, biography, and character. Goldberg also argues: Neither "the facts" nor our "experience" come to us in discrete and disconnected packets which simply await the appropriate moral principle to be applied. Rather, they stand in need of some narrative which can bind the facts of our experience together into a coherent pattern and it is thus in virtue of that narrative that our abstracted rules, principles, and notions gain their full intelligibility. (p. 242) Again, the statement is relevant to more than the moral life; it is germane to social and political life as well. He observes, as I would, that "what counts as meeting the various conditions of justification will vary from story to story .... " (p. 246). I will suggest a foundation for such justifications in the discussion of narrative rationality. With some modifications, I would endorse two of Hauerwas' ( 1981) 10 theses. First, he claims that "The social significance of the Gospel requires recognition of the narrative structure of Christian convictions for the life of the church" (p. 9). I would say: The meaning and significance of life in all of its social dimensions require the recognition of its narrative structure. Second, Hauerwas asserts that "Every social ethic involves a narrative, whether it is conceived with the formulation of basic principles of social organization and/or concrete alternatives" (p. 9; see also Alter, 1981; Scult, 1983). The only change that I would make here is to delete the word "social." Any ethic, whether social, political, legal or otherwise, involves narrative.

### Gun Culture – Short

#### The 1AC’s historical analysis ignores Black historical disciplines grounded in self-defense for communities against Klan members—their framing of guns as tools of aggression and unjustified violence dismisses historical and material realities.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

The erasure of Williams, as both theorist and historical figure, is the product of two disciplinary tendencies. The first is the inability of Eurocentric disciplines to conceptualize the Black radical tradition outside the ahis- torical self-referential nature of (white) theory. The disciplinary resistance of philosophy towards mining the material history (actual archives, testimo- nies, newspapers, etc.) of Black political organizations prevents academic philosophers from seeing Black political organizations as various schools of thought. There is a tendency to reduce Black organizations, regardless of their function as activist or academic, to political forums at odds over spe- cific Black identities. This framing of Black organizations ignores the actual function these entities had as social spaces wherein Black political theories were formulated, debated, and tested as politics in the real world. The disci- plinary view of theory is indicative of philosophy’s failure to grasp the intri- cacies and historical emergence of the Black political tradition throughout the centuries beyond the isolated figures selected to be compatible with the philosophical canon.7 The second disciplinary tendency which has limited the exploration of Williams as a theorist and figure is due to the fear and anxiety caused by militant Black male political resistance involving violence or armed resistance. This anxiety is not race specific. While white disciplines have simply dismissed the armed resistance of Blacks, particularly Black men as hateful; the barbaric Black equivalent of white Klan violence in many cases, Black feminist historiography originating in the Black Macho mythology of Michelle Wallace, and carried forth in subsequent Black feminist works equating militant resistance—the use of the gun—with patriarchy. This rendering has supported an ahistorical determination that carelessly makes all Black male attempts to protect themselves equivalent to their desire to imitate white patriarchy. Though popular, this mythology has failed to hold up to historical scrutiny.8 Simply stated, the Black radical tradition both exceeds and stands in contradiction to the categories pres- ently deployed to demarcate its boundaries as “useful” political theory.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1AC’s framing of guns as inherently militaristic by engaging a black self-defense paradigm.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

Robert F. Williams is a pivotal figure in the history and advancement of Black political theory. It is a great injustice that his seminal work Negroes with Guns remains excluded from examination and analysis due to the fear and anxiety his identity and politics cause within disciplines. His life marks the limits of liberal thought and offers a steadfast challenge to the progressive left. Rather than simply being an example of an imaginary Black Nationalist politics, his life and activism show what a reflective Black (male) mind coun- tering the assassination attempts by the FBI, the terrorism of the Klan, and multiple threats against his life produces as anti-racist revolt. Williams was adamant that he did not lead a political movement, instead he argues that he led “a movement of people who resented oppression.”86 His work aims to in- spire Blacks to actively contemplate the multiplicity of resistance strategies, and not confine themselves to one morally determined course of action. In a twenty-first-century world that looks eerily similar to the 1950s and 1960s regarding the public executions of Black men, and condition of Blacks more generally, Williams’s work allows us to reconceptualize what is at stake in our protests and appeals to the American public. Is it the case that Black men can simply predetermine that all their resistance shall be based on non-violence? Can Black Americans who find themselves at the mercy of the police demand of all protesters that they never arm themselves against the state? Is non-violence truly the only political philosophy Black Americans are obligated to act through when confronting a militarized police state and rampant vigilantism in the white public? Williams would insist the answer to these questions is simply: No. — • —

#### Historical framing is a prior question to evaluation of the 1AC’s advocacy—we criticize their epistemic starting point, which shapes their solvency claims—means they don’t get to weigh the case against the K without proving their historical account of gun culture is correct.

Fisher 84 [Fisher, W. R., Professor Emeritus at the USC Annenberg School for Communication. “Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument.” Communications Monographs, 51(1), 1-22.]

The context for what is to follow would not he complete without recognition of the work done by theologians and those interested in religious discourse. The most recent works in this tradition include Goldberg (1982) and Hauerwas (1981). It is worth pausing with these studies as they foreshadow several of the themes to be developed later. Goldberg claims that: a theologian, regardless of the propositional statements he or she may have to make about a community's convictions, must consciously strive to keep those statements in intimate contact with the narratives which give rise to those convictions, within which they gain their sense and meaning, and from which they have been abstracted. (p. 35) The same can be said for those who would understand ordinary experience. The ground for determining meaning, validity, reason, rationality, and truth must be a narrative context: history, culture, biography, and character. Goldberg also argues: Neither "the facts" nor our "experience" come to us in discrete and disconnected packets which simply await the appropriate moral principle to be applied. Rather, they stand in need of some narrative which can bind the facts of our experience together into a coherent pattern and it is thus in virtue of that narrative that our abstracted rules, principles, and notions gain their full intelligibility. (p. 242) Again, the statement is relevant to more than the moral life; it is germane to social and political life as well. He observes, as I would, that "what counts as meeting the various conditions of justification will vary from story to story .... " (p. 246). I will suggest a foundation for such justifications in the discussion of narrative rationality. With some modifications, I would endorse two of Hauerwas' ( 1981) 10 theses. First, he claims that "The social significance of the Gospel requires recognition of the narrative structure of Christian convictions for the life of the church" (p. 9). I would say: The meaning and significance of life in all of its social dimensions require the recognition of its narrative structure. Second, Hauerwas asserts that "Every social ethic involves a narrative, whether it is conceived with the formulation of basic principles of social organization and/or concrete alternatives" (p. 9; see also Alter, 1981; Scult, 1983). The only change that I would make here is to delete the word "social." Any ethic, whether social, political, legal or otherwise, involves narrative.

### Hyper-masculinity/Patriarchy – Long

#### The 1AC’s historical analysis ignores Black historical disciplines grounded in self-defense for communities against Klan members—their framing of guns wielded by men as patriarchal reinforces traditional feminist positions that ignore historical and material realities.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

The erasure of Williams, as both theorist and historical figure, is the product of two disciplinary tendencies. The first is the inability of Eurocen- tric disciplines to conceptualize the Black radical tradition outside the ahis- torical self-referential nature of (white) theory. The disciplinary resistance of philosophy towards mining the material history (actual archives, testimo- nies, newspapers, etc.) of Black political organizations prevents academic philosophers from seeing Black political organizations as various schools of thought. There is a tendency to reduce Black organizations, regardless of their function as activist or academic, to political forums at odds over spe- cific Black identities. This framing of Black organizations ignores the actual function these entities had as social spaces wherein Black political theories were formulated, debated, and tested as politics in the real world. The disci- plinary view of theory is indicative of philosophy’s failure to grasp the intri- cacies and historical emergence of the Black political tradition throughout the centuries beyond the isolated figures selected to be compatible with the philosophical canon.7 The second disciplinary tendency which has limited the exploration of Williams as a theorist and figure is due to the fear and anxiety caused by militant Black male political resistance involving violence or armed resistance. This anxiety is not race specific. While white disciplines have simply dismissed the armed resistance of Blacks, particularly Black men as hateful; the barbaric Black equivalent of white Klan violence in many cases, Black feminist historiography originating in the Black Macho mythology of Michelle Wallace, and carried forth in subsequent Black feminist works equating militant resistance—the use of the gun—with patriarchy. This rendering has supported an ahistorical determination that carelessly makes all Black male attempts to protect themselves equivalent to their desire to imitate white patriarchy. Though popular, this mythology has failed to hold up to historical scrutiny.8 Simply stated, the Black radical tradition both exceeds and stands in contradiction to the categories pres- ently deployed to demarcate its boundaries as “useful” political theory.

#### Liberation requires bloodshed—white supremacy means that we only view violence as “masculine” if it’s killing white people.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

Following the model of the Black Armed Guard, Williams says “The les- son of Monroe teaches that effective self-defense, on the part of our brutally oppressed and terrorized people requires massive organization with central coordination. External oppressive forces must not be allowed to relieve the besieged racist terrorists. The forces of the state must be kept under pres- sure in many places simultaneously. The white supremacy masses must be forced to retreat to their homes in order to give security to the individual families.”82 The Black oppressed class are already on the losing side of vio- lence regardless of their stance, Williams simply argues that given the same end the oppressed cannot afford to not challenge the violence of the state and its white supremacist masses. In this scenario, “The oppressors have more to lose than the dehumanized and oppressed in such a conflict. Our people have nothing to lose but their chains.”83 This is not to suggest that Williams is driven by a romanticism regarding his use of violence. He accepts that¶ Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights 67¶ there would be great losses on the part of our people. How can we expect liberation without losses? Our people are already being admonished by the nonviolent forces to die for freedom. We are being told to sacrifice our lives in situations of diminishing returns. If we must die, let us die in the only way that our oppressor will feel the weight of our death. Let us die in the tried and proven way of liberation. If we are going to talk about revolution, let us know what revolution means.84¶ Liberation requires bloodshed. The only difference is that Black and white academics, scholars, and theorists are willing to concede this necessity when speaking of the tolls taken on by the oppressed Black peoples of his- tory, but shudder to theorize this stance when the demand is placed upon white lives. Such an insistence is usually met with the idea that violence corrupts, and would destroy such a revolutionary program. This apologetic against the militant Black tradition is fascinating, since an acceptance of the premise that violence morally corrupts cultures and actors would seem to lead one to conclude that ethics and the moralities produced by such frame- works are generally beyond the capacities the white culture asserting them. Is it not the violence of the white oppressor which inspires the oppressed to arm themselves and risk their very lives to resist this imposition of death?¶ Contrary to the moral peril of Blacks caused by pursing an armed re- sistance strategy, Williams does not believe that violence against the white oppressor is sadistic and fueled by the hate of whites. He takes great caution to convey that self-defense is rooted in justice, not revenge, and targets the agents who commit atrocities against Black America—these tyrants could be white and/or Black. Williams insists that “Afroamericans must remem- ber that such a campaign of massive self-defense should not be based upon a lust for sadistical gratification. It cannot be a campaign for vengeance, however, sweet and deserving vengeance may be. Such a campaign of self- defense and survival must be based on the righteous cause of justice. It must not be anti-white but anti-oppression and injustice. Uncle Toms should be as much a target as racist whites.”85 Williams’s movement was not one of violence for the sake of violence, or a way to take out pent-up anger. This revolution had a cause and a goal, and Williams was determined to keep that in the forefront. Williams sought to create a systematic articulation of militant resistance capable of activating the pursuit of rights and justice for Blacks in a system demanding their subservience and oppression. Robert F. Williams undoubtedly established the twentieth century program of mili- tant civil rights, and it was one focused on the realization of justice and lib- eration, not decadent racial identity politics. The militant tradition articu- lated by Williams commits the practitioner to an unflinching paradigmatic analysis of material systems: racial, economic, and historical.

#### Black men are regarded outside the realm of human—turns the case since we aren’t able to adequately construct our framing of what masculinitely entails.

CURRY 14 President of Philosophy born of struggle and Prof of Philosophy @ Texas A&M 14 Tommy; “Michael Brown and the Need for a Genre Study of Black Male Death and Dying” <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v017/17.3S.curry.html>

**There is an eerie connection between the deaths of Black males in society and the erasure of Black men from the realm of theory. In reality, Black males are genre-ed as non-human and animalistic in the minds of whites,**[21](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v017/17.3S.curry.html" \l "f21)**but our theories relish assigning the death of Black males to the generic description of racism, a notion not thoroughly analyzed in identity scholarship and unable to inadequately capture the specific kind of oppression and violence that defines Black male existence.** Michael Brown was a victim; a display of the power white life has over this *kind* of Black existence—a demonstration of the seemingly endless limit of white individuals’ power to enforce the anti-Black consensus of society towards these specific Black-male *kinds*. His death—***Black Male Death*—shows that racism is not simply racial antipathy, but the power whites assert over the world, thereby making Black life inconsequential in its rush to acquire ownership over reality**; a dynamic creating the orders of knowledge as an extension of the order of society necessary to maintain anti-Blackness and preserve white supremacy. Because this racist societal architecture is de-emphasized, academic discourse(s) of race-class-gender—presupposing the infinite power of all male bodies—prefigures a conceptual calculus dedicated to eradicating the vulnerability of Black men because they are men. **Black men are thought to be mimetic** (**white) patriarchs; an untenable theoretical position given the empirical evidence of Black male disadvantage, but one that serves to affirm society’s assuredness in holding that *his* death is the only way to remedy the dangers *he* poses to society. We can see the corpse** of Michael Brown, **but do we really understand the vulnerability of Black boys enough to theorize** his **life?**

#### The alternative is to reject the 1AC’s framing of guns as inherently patriarchal by engaging a black self-defense paradigm.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

Robert F. Williams is a pivotal figure in the history and advancement of Black political theory. It is a great injustice that his seminal work Negroes with Guns remains excluded from examination and analysis due to the fear and anxiety his identity and politics cause within disciplines. His life marks the limits of liberal thought and offers a steadfast challenge to the progressive left. Rather than simply being an example of an imaginary Black Nationalist politics, his life and activism show what a reflective Black (male) mind coun- tering the assassination attempts by the FBI, the terrorism of the Klan, and multiple threats against his life produces as anti-racist revolt. Williams was adamant that he did not lead a political movement, instead he argues that he led “a movement of people who resented oppression.”86 His work aims to inspire Blacks to actively contemplate the multiplicity of resistance strategies, and not confine themselves to one morally determined course of action. In a twenty-first-century world that looks eerily similar to the 1950s and 1960s regarding the public executions of Black men, and condition of Blacks more generally, Williams’s work allows us to reconceptualize what is at stake in our protests and appeals to the American public. Is it the case that Black men can simply predetermine that all their resistance shall be based on non-violence? Can Black Americans who find themselves at the mercy of the police demand of all protesters that they never arm themselves against the state? Is non-violence truly the only political philosophy Black Americans are obligated to act through when confronting a militarized police state and rampant vigilantism in the white public? Williams would insist the answer to these questions is simply: No. — • —

#### Alt solves the case—inclusion of black historical disciplines disrupts historical narratives of guns based in hegemonic masculinity and creates cultural shift away from frontierism by recognizing the worth of black people—it recognizes multiplicity of self-defense and avoids monolithic narratives of guns. Also, a multiplicity of self-defense strategies checks back the impact to the case—it’s empirically proven.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

One of the Black Armed Guard’s first engagements with the Klan came in 1957 when they sought to protect Dr. Albert E. Perry. When Williams joined the local chapter of the NAACP, it was on the brink of collapse. As Williams re- counts, “When I objected, I was elected president and they withdrew, except for Dr. Albert E. Perry. Dr. Perry was a newcomer who had settled in Monroe and built up a very successful practice, and he became our vice president.”22 In the summer of 1957, after several attempts to disrupt the work of the local NAACP and a number of death threats against Dr. Perry, “An armed motor- cade attacked Dr. Perry’s house, which is situated on the outskirts of the col- ored community. We shot it out with the Klan and repelled their attack and the Klan didn’t have any more stomach for this type of fight. They stopped raiding our community.”23 The night after what was thought to be a victory— Williams and his guard of veterans driving the Klan away from Dr. Perry’s house—Dr. Perry was met by the Monroe police with a warrant for his ar- rest on the charges of “criminal abortion on a white woman.”24 The name of this white woman was Lilly Mae Rape; a powerful symbol of the ideology standing behind the accusation of Dr. Perry. The impoverished and illiterate Rape asked Dr. Perry on multiple occasions for an abortion, but as a devout Catholic he refused. According to Perry, “The last time she came to see him . . . he told [her] that there were too many dangers in a white woman even in his office, reminded her that he had told her already not to come back, and demanded that she get out.”25 Black men were well aware of the readiness of this justification to punish them. As Perry later stated to the executive secre- tary of the NAACP Roy Wilkins, “I would have had to been crazy to have done such an act in the face of all the animosity against me. I am Vice President of the local branch and it is because of this that I have been framed.”26¶ The very next year, in 1958, this peculiar chauvinism was demonstrat- ed again—this time against two young Black boys in Monroe, North Caro- lina. In what has popularly been referred to as the Kissing Case, two young boys David Ezell Simpson (eight) and James Hanover Grissom (ten) were imprisoned, sentenced to reformation, and threatened with death for par- ticipating in a children’s game involving a (white) girl sitting on a boys lap and kissing him. Unfortunately, Simpson and Grissom were Black, and the kiss of a white girl, even that of a child, violated the segregationist white supremacist order of the day. Despite various firsthand accounts by the chil- dren themselves that this was a game created by the group of white boys and girls, the dominant white version suggested the two boys were rapists.27 The “white—and official—version” maintained:¶ Two negro boys trapped the three white girls in a culvert and told them that the price of escape would be a kiss. Two of the girls, according to this rendi- tion of events, managed to elude that levy. The third—a seven year old—ei- ther kissed or was kissed by Hanover Thompson (one of the African Ameri- can boys). White sources asserted that one of the African American boys had held the girl while the other had kissed her or even tried to rape her. Local officials openly accused the boys of “molesting three white girls” and quietly suggested to reporters that what actually had occurred was a rape attempt.28¶ Tyson goes on the explain that the Carolina Times, a local Black newspaper, interviewed separate eyewitnesses, and concluded that “the girls, in a game, had sat voluntarily on the laps of Black and white boys and kissed them playfully.”29 Tyson is undoubtedly correct in pointing out the non-existence of manhood for Black men in the sense that “No Black man could safely pro- tect ‘his’ women from any white man, while the Black male who ventured across the color line represented not merely a threat to a particular white man but to white supremacy generally—and was likely to be dealt with as such,”30 but the boundaries of Black male oppression is not simply had in the denial of what is traditionally thought of as the parameters of white man- hood. Black men and boys are historically targeted for being the representa- tion of sexual savagery. As James Baldwin notes in “The Black Boy Looks at the White Boy,” “to be an American Negro male is also to be a kind of walk- ing phallic symbol: which means that one pays, in one’s own personality, for the sexual insecurity of others.”31 To be Black and male then is having a social genesis rooted in one’s transfiguration as a phobic entity—a living sciaphobia. This was even applicable to eight and ten year old boys. Sexual assault from white men on Black women strengthened and supported white supremacy, and was, therefore, not only tolerated, but commonplace. The mere threat of sex between a white woman and Black man, or the faint idea of a Black man living after offending white womanhood as such, was enough to disrupt the ideological order of white supremacy. Such trespasses against white women could only be met with death. Historically, white supremacy has routinely demonstrated its power to deny Black males social being, pre- cisely in that it denies them the ability to have socially recognizable roles as husbands, fathers, and as the Kissing Case demonstrates, children. However, white supremacy also makes them vulnerable to the whims of women in ways unimaginable to the white male patriarch.

#### Historical framing is a prior question to evaluation of the 1AC’s advocacy—we criticize their epistemic starting point, which shapes their solvency claims—means they don’t get to weigh the case against the K without proving their historical account of gun culture is correct.

Fisher 84 [Fisher, W. R., Professor Emeritus at the USC Annenberg School for Communication. “Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument.” Communications Monographs, 51(1), 1-22.]

The context for what is to follow would not he complete without recognition of the work done by theologians and those interested in religious discourse. The most recent works in this tradition include Goldberg (1982) and Hauerwas (1981). It is worth pausing with these studies as they foreshadow several of the themes to be developed later. Goldberg claims that: a theologian, regardless of the propositional statements he or she may have to make about a community's convictions, must consciously strive to keep those statements in intimate contact with the narratives which give rise to those convictions, within which they gain their sense and meaning, and from which they have been abstracted. (p. 35) The same can be said for those who would understand ordinary experience. The ground for determining meaning, validity, reason, rationality, and truth must be a narrative context: history, culture, biography, and character. Goldberg also argues: Neither "the facts" nor our "experience" come to us in discrete and disconnected packets which simply await the appropriate moral principle to be applied. Rather, they stand in need of some narrative which can bind the facts of our experience together into a coherent pattern and it is thus in virtue of that narrative that our abstracted rules, principles, and notions gain their full intelligibility. (p. 242) Again, the statement is relevant to more than the moral life; it is germane to social and political life as well. He observes, as I would, that "what counts as meeting the various conditions of justification will vary from story to story .... " (p. 246). I will suggest a foundation for such justifications in the discussion of narrative rationality. With some modifications, I would endorse two of Hauerwas' ( 1981) 10 theses. First, he claims that "The social significance of the Gospel requires recognition of the narrative structure of Christian convictions for the life of the church" (p. 9). I would say: The meaning and significance of life in all of its social dimensions require the recognition of its narrative structure. Second, Hauerwas asserts that "Every social ethic involves a narrative, whether it is conceived with the formulation of basic principles of social organization and/or concrete alternatives" (p. 9; see also Alter, 1981; Scult, 1983). The only change that I would make here is to delete the word "social." Any ethic, whether social, political, legal or otherwise, involves narrative.

### Hyper-masculinity/Patriarchy – Short

#### The 1AC’s historical analysis ignores Black historical disciplines grounded in self-defense for communities against Klan members—their framing of guns wielded by men as patriarchal reinforces traditional feminist positions that ignore historical and material realities.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

The erasure of Williams, as both theorist and historical figure, is the product of two disciplinary tendencies. The first is the inability of Eurocen- tric disciplines to conceptualize the Black radical tradition outside the ahis- torical self-referential nature of (white) theory. The disciplinary resistance of philosophy towards mining the material history (actual archives, testimo- nies, newspapers, etc.) of Black political organizations prevents academic philosophers from seeing Black political organizations as various schools of thought. There is a tendency to reduce Black organizations, regardless of their function as activist or academic, to political forums at odds over spe- cific Black identities. This framing of Black organizations ignores the actual function these entities had as social spaces wherein Black political theories were formulated, debated, and tested as politics in the real world. The disci- plinary view of theory is indicative of philosophy’s failure to grasp the intri- cacies and historical emergence of the Black political tradition throughout the centuries beyond the isolated figures selected to be compatible with the philosophical canon.7 The second disciplinary tendency which has limited the exploration of Williams as a theorist and figure is due to the fear and anxiety caused by militant Black male political resistance involving violence or armed resistance. This anxiety is not race specific. While white disciplines have simply dismissed the armed resistance of Blacks, particularly Black men as hateful; the barbaric Black equivalent of white Klan violence in many cases, Black feminist historiography originating in the Black Macho mythology of Michelle Wallace, and carried forth in subsequent Black feminist works equating militant resistance—the use of the gun—with patriarchy. This rendering has supported an ahistorical determination that carelessly makes all Black male attempts to protect themselves equivalent to their desire to imitate white patriarchy. Though popular, this mythology has failed to hold up to historical scrutiny.8 Simply stated, the Black radical tradition both exceeds and stands in contradiction to the categories pres- ently deployed to demarcate its boundaries as “useful” political theory.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1AC’s framing of guns as inherently patriarchal by engaging a black self-defense paradigm.

Curry and Kelleher 15, Tommy J. Curry [A&M prof] and Max Kelleher “Robert F. Williams and Militant Civil Rights: The Legacy and Philosophy of Pre-emptive Self-Defense”, Radical Philosophy Review, 10 Mar 2015, BE

Robert F. Williams is a pivotal figure in the history and advancement of Black political theory. It is a great injustice that his seminal work Negroes with Guns remains excluded from examination and analysis due to the fear and anxiety his identity and politics cause within disciplines. His life marks the limits of liberal thought and offers a steadfast challenge to the progressive left. Rather than simply being an example of an imaginary Black Nationalist politics, his life and activism show what a reflective Black (male) mind coun- tering the assassination attempts by the FBI, the terrorism of the Klan, and multiple threats against his life produces as anti-racist revolt. Williams was adamant that he did not lead a political movement, instead he argues that he led “a movement of people who resented oppression.”86 His work aims to inspire Blacks to actively contemplate the multiplicity of resistance strategies, and not confine themselves to one morally determined course of action. In a twenty-first-century world that looks eerily similar to the 1950s and 1960s regarding the public executions of Black men, and condition of Blacks more generally, Williams’s work allows us to reconceptualize what is at stake in our protests and appeals to the American public. Is it the case that Black men can simply predetermine that all their resistance shall be based on non-violence? Can Black Americans who find themselves at the mercy of the police demand of all protesters that they never arm themselves against the state? Is non-violence truly the only political philosophy Black Americans are obligated to act through when confronting a militarized police state and rampant vigilantism in the white public? Williams would insist the answer to these questions is simply: No. — • —

#### Historical framing is a prior question to evaluation of the 1AC’s advocacy—we criticize their epistemic starting point, which shapes their solvency claims—means they don’t get to weigh the case against the K without proving their historical account of gun culture is correct.

Fisher 84 [Fisher, W. R., Professor Emeritus at the USC Annenberg School for Communication. “Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument.” Communications Monographs, 51(1), 1-22.]

The context for what is to follow would not he complete without recognition of the work done by theologians and those interested in religious discourse. The most recent works in this tradition include Goldberg (1982) and Hauerwas (1981). It is worth pausing with these studies as they foreshadow several of the themes to be developed later. Goldberg claims that: a theologian, regardless of the propositional statements he or she may have to make about a community's convictions, must consciously strive to keep those statements in intimate contact with the narratives which give rise to those convictions, within which they gain their sense and meaning, and from which they have been abstracted. (p. 35) The same can be said for those who would understand ordinary experience. The ground for determining meaning, validity, reason, rationality, and truth must be a narrative context: history, culture, biography, and character. Goldberg also argues: Neither "the facts" nor our "experience" come to us in discrete and disconnected packets which simply await the appropriate moral principle to be applied. Rather, they stand in need of some narrative which can bind the facts of our experience together into a coherent pattern and it is thus in virtue of that narrative that our abstracted rules, principles, and notions gain their full intelligibility. (p. 242) Again, the statement is relevant to more than the moral life; it is germane to social and political life as well. He observes, as I would, that "what counts as meeting the various conditions of justification will vary from story to story .... " (p. 246). I will suggest a foundation for such justifications in the discussion of narrative rationality. With some modifications, I would endorse two of Hauerwas' ( 1981) 10 theses. First, he claims that "The social significance of the Gospel requires recognition of the narrative structure of Christian convictions for the life of the church" (p. 9). I would say: The meaning and significance of life in all of its social dimensions require the recognition of its narrative structure. Second, Hauerwas asserts that "Every social ethic involves a narrative, whether it is conceived with the formulation of basic principles of social organization and/or concrete alternatives" (p. 9; see also Alter, 1981; Scult, 1983). The only change that I would make here is to delete the word "social." Any ethic, whether social, political, legal or otherwise, involves narrative.

# 2NR FL

## Perms

### PDB

#### 1] Severance—the first part of the alt is “reject the 1AC’s framing of guns as inherently patriarchal”, which means they sever that 1AC framing—our framework argument impacts that AND it makes debate impossible because you can sever parts of the aff to avoid our disads—means you never have to defend your positions to make real change and there’s no neg ground or clash.

#### 2] Our alt is definitionally mutually exclusive with the aff—it says black people should have a multiplicity of self-defense strategies and shouldn’t be limited—the 1AC is a limitation, which means all of the plan and all of the alt cannot happen simultaneously.

### PAOI

#### 1] Guns are key—the 1AC’s critique of guns as tools of liberation is another link and a disad to the aff.

CHARLES E. COBB 14 JR. [journalist, professor, and former activist with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Currently he is a senior analyst at allAfrica.com and a visiting professor at Brown University], “THIS NONVIOLENT STUFF’LL GET YOU KILLED: HOW GUNS MADE THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT POSSIBLE”, Basic Books, 2014 BE

Willingness to engage in armed self-defense played an important role in the southern Freedom Movement, for without it, terrorists would have killed far more people in the movement. “I’m alive today because of the Second Amendment and the natural right to keep and bear arms,” recalled activist John R. “Hunter Bear” Salter in 1994. In the early 1960s, Salter, of Native American descent, was a professor at historically black Tougaloo Southern Christian College in Mississippi and adviser to students nonvi- olently sitting in at segregated lunch counters and other public facilities in downtown Jackson. But he always “traveled armed,” said Salter. “The knowledge that I had these weapons and was willing to use them kept ene- mies at bay.” And the knowledge that guns would be used to defend his Tougaloo campus, well-known as a launching pad for civil rights protest and thus always a target of terrorists, also helped deter assaults against it, although it could not prevent them completely. In one campus attack, Salter remembers a bullet narrowly missing his daughter. yet neither the local nor the federal government offered help to people targeted by this sort of terrorism, so, says Salter, “we guarded our campus—faculty and students together. . . . We let this be known. The racist attacks slackened consider- ably. Night-riders are cowardly people—in any time and place—and they take advantage of fear and weakness.”¶ It cannot be emphasized enough that by asserting their right to defend themselves when attacked, the students and staff of Tougaloo were laying claim to a tradition that has safeguarded and sustained generations of black people in the United States. yet this tradition is almost completely absent from the conventional narrative of southern civil rights struggle. The fact that individuals and organized groups across the South were willing to pro- vide armed protection to nonviolent activists and organizers as well as to black communities targeted by terrorists is barely discussed, although organized self-defense in black communities goes back to the aftermath of the Civil War, and white fear of rebellion and weapons in black hands dates to colonial America. Guns were an integral part of southern life, especially in rural communities, and—as Moses noted in 1964—nonviolence never had a chance of usurping the traditional role of firearms in black rural life; although many rural blacks respected protesters’ use of nonviolence, they also mistrusted it. Hartman Turnbow, a black Mississippi farmer and com- munity leader, was a case in point. Turnbow welcomed the presence of movement organizers in Holmes County and even invited organizers to the area himself, but like Salter, Turnbow also “traveled armed.” With tragic foresight, Turnbow bluntly warned Martin Luther king Jr. in 1964, “This nonviolent stuff ain’t no good. It’ll get ya killed.”2

#### 2] If we win the historical framing arguments, you don’t get the perm—“all other instances” is our link argument—the 1ac actively excludes that discussion, which means the perm severs their dominant narrative regarding the history of gun violence.

#### 3] Black people are buying concealed weapons—proves some are choosing handguns

Martin Kaste 15 [correspondent on NPR's National desk. He covers law enforcement and privacy, as well as news from the Pacific Northwest] “More African-Americans Support Carrying Legal Guns For Self-Defense”, NPR, 6 Apr 2015, BE

According to a survey by the Pew Research Center, 54 percent of blacks now see gun ownership as a good thing, something more likely to protect than harm. That's up from 29 percent just two years ago. In places like Detroit, more African-Americans are getting permits to carry concealed weapons.¶ At a practice range just outside of Detroit, Rick Ector trains new gun owners. He says the new chief's attitude is a welcome change.¶ "He's the only one that I can ever recall who has been fervently in support of 'good Americans,' as he terms it, carrying firearms for personal protection," he says.¶ Ector thinks African-Americans nationally have been slower to embrace concealed-carry because so many of them live in places where it's still more restricted. Both Chief Craig and Ector are black.¶ "When you look at New Jersey, you look at New York, you look at California, D.C. and Chicago, really it's still a foreign experience," he says. "When you really look at the city of Detroit, we're kind of leading the way in terms of urban areas with law-abiding citizens carrying guns."¶ Detroiters are even taking their guns to church. When Rosedale Park Baptist had trouble with drug dealers and car thefts, Pastor Haman Cross Jr. told his congregants from the pulpit that they should consider getting concealed-carry permits.¶ "I love the Lord; I'm a Christian," he says. "But like I told the congregation, let's send a message right in front. I want the word out in the community, if you steal any of our cars, I'm coming after you."¶ At another black church, Greater St. Matthew Baptist, Pastor David Bullock points out the pews that where his armed congregants usually sit.¶ "The chairman of my deacon board, he carries," Bullock says. "And then on the west side, there's a middle-aged woman who also carries."¶ Bullock recalls the day she first told him about it.¶ "She comes to the office, closes the door and pulls up her coat, and she has a firearm," he says. "She says, 'Is this ok?' And I say, 'Yeah, it's fine.'"¶ Bullock doesn't think it's a sin to carry a gun, especially in a town where whole churches have been held up for their offerings. But he's decided he can't recommend it to his congregants, either. For this simple reason: "If you use it, you're going to get prosecuted," he says¶ He's convinced the justice system still tends to see armed black people as aggressors, especially in situations where the facts are murky. If they're going to defend themselves with a gun, he says they better have money for a good lawyer.¶ And there are still people in this community who believe that having more guns in general, both legal and illegal, just increases the likelihood of gun violence. Evelyn Marks is one of those people.¶ "Christina was my only child, I put everything I had into her," she says.¶ Her daughter, Christina Lazzana-Webster, was murdered by someone with a concealed-carry permit: her own husband. He killed her in their home. Marks assumes they'd been having an argument. She says the rise of legal guns doesn't make Detroit feel any safer to her. In fact, it's just the opposite.¶ "Because when people are armed like that and they're threatened, the first thing they want to do is pull out their gun and shoot to kill," Marks says.

#### 4] Handguns key—they’re less expensive

Gabriel Arkles 13 [Associate Academic Specialist at Northeastern University School of Law], “GUN CONTROL, MENTAL ILLNESS, AND BLACK TRANS AND LESBIAN SURVIVAL”, SOUTHWESTERN LAW REVIEW, 2013, BE

Gun laws also make guns more expensive. Many gun control laws have prohibited the selling of handguns or other cheaper guns specifically to make them less accessible to communities of color.110 The cost of running background checks and other requirements of and restrictions on manufacturers and retailers can also be passed on to consumers, again making guns less accessible to poor people and to the groups who are more likely to be poor (such as disabled people, people of color, women, trans people, and immigrants).111

#### 5] The link is still a disad—no reason the perm resolves enough of our impact—black people need a *multiplicity* of self-defense strategies and shouldn’t be confined to any single morally determined courses of action. Even if the perm gives them choices, the aff is necessarily a limitation to self-defense strategies.

## Substance

### Ethic of Love

#### 1] this is just some hippy shit—obviously embracing ethics of love doesn’t do anything—empirically it hasn’t worked and self-defense has become necessary

#### 2] the question of the alt is simple—what do black people do when the klan shows up at their house? Non-violent love warriors clearly aren’t going to be much help then—self-defense is a necessary *option* for black people even without mandating violence

#### 3] your ethic of love will never succeed—white pathology ensures no “love” for black people

DR. WRIGHT 84 Clinical Psychologist 1984 Bobby-Director of the Garfield Park Comprehensive Community Health Center in Chicago (a Mental Health Center); The Psychopathic Racial Personality: and other essays; p. 1-2

**In a bullfight, after being brutalized while making innumerable charges at the movement of a cape, there comes a time when the bull finally turns and faces his adversary with the only movement being his heaving bloody sides. It is believed that for the first time he really sees the matador. This final confrontation is known as the “moment of truth.” For the bull, this moment comes too late.**¶ **The experience of Black people all over the world presents an analogous situation. For hundreds of years, Blacks have been charging at the banners that are held by the European (White) matadors**. Those banners have been represented by concepts such as democracy, capitalism, Marxism, religion, and education. The banners remained constant as long as Blacks were assets. However, with technology and worldwide industrialization on the rampage resulting in a further exploitation of Africa’s resources which in turn produces an increase in Africa’s (Blacks’) national consciousness, Blacks are now a threat and a liability to the White race. **Therefore, the banner held by the matador represents only one concept: genocide.** **As a consequence, the major research that White scientists are involved in today is genocidal in nature (nuclear warfare, population control**, medication control, genetic engineering, psychosurgery, electrical stimulation of the brain, and the high complex science of behavioral technology). **Indeed, it is Blacks’ moment of truth; it is time for Blacks to look at the matador.**¶ This presentation is based upon the following very simple premise: **in their relationship with the Black race, Europeans (Whites) are psychopaths and their behavior reflects an underlying biologically transmitted proclivity with roots deep in their evolutionary history. The psychopath is an individual who is constantly in conflict with other persons or groups. He is unable to experience guilt, is completely selfish and callous, and has a total disregard for the rights of others. This premise is supported by overwhelming scientific evidence** (Delany, 1968; Du Bois, 1896; Fanon, 1963; Garvey, 1967; Welsing, 1991; Williams, 1971).

### Backlash

#### 1] empirically, violent resistance is a necessary *prerequisite* to other movements

CHARLES E. COBB 14 JR. [journalist, professor, and former activist with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Currently he is a senior analyst at allAfrica.com and a visiting professor at Brown University], “THIS NONVIOLENT STUFF’LL GET YOU KILLED: HOW GUNS MADE THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT POSSIBLE”, Basic Books, 2014 BE

But although nonviolence was crucial to the gains made by the freedom struggle of the 1950s and ’60s, those gains could not have been achieved without the complementary and still underappreciated practice of armed self-defense. The claim that armed self-defense was a necessary aspect of the civil rights movement is still controversial. However, wielding weapons, espe- cially firearms, let both participants in nonviolent struggle and their sympa- thizers protect themselves and others under terrorist attack for their civil rights activities. This willingness to use deadly force ensured the survival not only of countless brave men and women but also of the freedom struggle itself.¶ This was nothing new. Armed self-defense (or, to use a term preferred by some, “armed resistance”) as part of black struggle began not in the 1960s with angry “militant” and “radical” young Afro-Americans, but in the earliest years of the United States as one of African people’s responses to oppression. This tradition, which culminates with the civil rights strug- gles and achievements of the mid-1960s, cannot be understood independ- ently or outside its broader historical context. In every decade of the nation’s history, brave and determined black men and women picked up guns to defend themselves and their communities.¶ Thus the tradition of armed self-defense in Afro-American history can- not be disconnected from the successes of what today is called the nonvi- olent civil rights movement. Participants in that movement always saw themselves as part of a centuries-long history of black life and struggle. Guns in no way contradicted the lessons of that history. Indeed, the idea of nonviolent struggle was newer in the black community, and it was pro- tected in many ways by gunfire and the threat of gunfire. Simply put: because nonviolence worked so well as a tactic for effecting change and was demonstrably improving their lives, some black people chose to use weapons to defend the nonviolent Freedom Movement. Although it is counterintuitive, any discussion of guns in the movement must therefore also include substantial discussion of nonviolence, and vice versa. This book does that.¶ I should note that although I sometimes seem to use “civil rights move- ment” and “Freedom Movement” interchangeably, they in fact have two quite separate though closely related meanings. By “civil rights movement” I mean the efforts to secure equal rights under the law, as with the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The “Freedom Movement” is a larger idea whose goal is the achievement of civil rights, civil liberties, and the liber- ated consciousness of self and community. It recognizes that law alone can- not uproot white supremacy, ever creative and insidious in its forms and practices, and that civil rights law alone cannot create a new liberated sense of self and human capacity. In my thinking on the differences between the “civil rights movement” and the “Freedom Movement,” I have been greatly influenced by the “freedom rights” postulation laid out by historian Hasan kwame Jeffries:¶ Framing the civil rights movement as a fight for freedom rights acknowledges the centrality of slavery and emancipation to con- ceptualizations of freedom; incorporates the long history of black protest dating back to the daybreak of freedom and extending beyond the Black Power era; recognizes the African Americans’ civil and human rights objectives; and captures the universality of these goals. Moreover, it allows for regional and temporal dif- ferentiation, moments of ideological radicalization and periods of social movement formation.

#### 2] 1NC Curry and Kelleher evidence empirically proves it’s possible to solve—they can ward off klan violence

#### 3] what’s the alternative?? Black people could either take up arms to defend themselves or they could just let the klan kill them—obviously self-defense is a better strategy—it’s try or die for the alt

### Long Guns Solve

#### 1] Disproves case solvency—means long guns could also be used to perpetuate the violence they criticize and there’s *no reason to do the aff.*

#### 2] Black people are buying concealed weapons—proves some are choosing handguns

Martin Kaste 15 [correspondent on NPR's National desk. He covers law enforcement and privacy, as well as news from the Pacific Northwest] “More African-Americans Support Carrying Legal Guns For Self-Defense”, NPR, 6 Apr 2015, BE

According to a survey by the Pew Research Center, 54 percent of blacks now see gun ownership as a good thing, something more likely to protect than harm. That's up from 29 percent just two years ago. In places like Detroit, more African-Americans are getting permits to carry concealed weapons.¶ At a practice range just outside of Detroit, Rick Ector trains new gun owners. He says the new chief's attitude is a welcome change.¶ "He's the only one that I can ever recall who has been fervently in support of 'good Americans,' as he terms it, carrying firearms for personal protection," he says.¶ Ector thinks African-Americans nationally have been slower to embrace concealed-carry because so many of them live in places where it's still more restricted. Both Chief Craig and Ector are black.¶ "When you look at New Jersey, you look at New York, you look at California, D.C. and Chicago, really it's still a foreign experience," he says. "When you really look at the city of Detroit, we're kind of leading the way in terms of urban areas with law-abiding citizens carrying guns."¶ Detroiters are even taking their guns to church. When Rosedale Park Baptist had trouble with drug dealers and car thefts, Pastor Haman Cross Jr. told his congregants from the pulpit that they should consider getting concealed-carry permits.¶ "I love the Lord; I'm a Christian," he says. "But like I told the congregation, let's send a message right in front. I want the word out in the community, if you steal any of our cars, I'm coming after you."¶ At another black church, Greater St. Matthew Baptist, Pastor David Bullock points out the pews that where his armed congregants usually sit.¶ "The chairman of my deacon board, he carries," Bullock says. "And then on the west side, there's a middle-aged woman who also carries."¶ Bullock recalls the day she first told him about it.¶ "She comes to the office, closes the door and pulls up her coat, and she has a firearm," he says. "She says, 'Is this ok?' And I say, 'Yeah, it's fine.'"¶ Bullock doesn't think it's a sin to carry a gun, especially in a town where whole churches have been held up for their offerings. But he's decided he can't recommend it to his congregants, either. For this simple reason: "If you use it, you're going to get prosecuted," he says¶ He's convinced the justice system still tends to see armed black people as aggressors, especially in situations where the facts are murky. If they're going to defend themselves with a gun, he says they better have money for a good lawyer.¶ And there are still people in this community who believe that having more guns in general, both legal and illegal, just increases the likelihood of gun violence. Evelyn Marks is one of those people.¶ "Christina was my only child, I put everything I had into her," she says.¶ Her daughter, Christina Lazzana-Webster, was murdered by someone with a concealed-carry permit: her own husband. He killed her in their home. Marks assumes they'd been having an argument. She says the rise of legal guns doesn't make Detroit feel any safer to her. In fact, it's just the opposite.¶ "Because when people are armed like that and they're threatened, the first thing they want to do is pull out their gun and shoot to kill," Marks says.

#### 3] Handguns key—they’re less expensive

Gabriel Arkles 13 [Associate Academic Specialist at Northeastern University School of Law], “GUN CONTROL, MENTAL ILLNESS, AND BLACK TRANS AND LESBIAN SURVIVAL”, SOUTHWESTERN LAW REVIEW, 2013, BE

Gun laws also make guns more expensive. Many gun control laws have prohibited the selling of handguns or other cheaper guns specifically to make them less accessible to communities of color.110 The cost of running background checks and other requirements of and restrictions on manufacturers and retailers can also be passed on to consumers, again making guns less accessible to poor people and to the groups who are more likely to be poor (such as disabled people, people of color, women, trans people, and immigrants).111

#### 4] Black people need a *multiplicity* of self-defense strategies and shouldn’t be confined to any single morally determined courses of action—our argument isn’t just that it’s effective, but it’s also independently sufficient to win that black people should be given choices and the state shouldn’t decide how they defend themselves—that’s Curry and Kelleher.

## 2NR to PVP

### Impact OV

#### K turns and outweighs the case—

#### A] Invisibility—exclusion of black male disciplines grounded in self-defense regards black men as outside the realm of human—that’s Curry 14—framing of all gun use as patriarchy results in false historical narratives—black people *do not* *matter*, so the 1ac’s starting point is flawed—guts any other solvency arguments since their description of masculinity excludes the black male perspective—if we win the K, they *cannot* win the case.

#### B] Magnitude—even if you win frontier mindset arguments, we’ve won your historical analysis *directly results in black death*—that’s Curry and Kelleher 15—liberation requires bloodshed—their non-violence approach makes racism impossible.

#### C] Root cause—the frontier mindset is rooted in being afraid of black people—why do you think frontierism happened?

BLACK 9 Pan Africanist Scholar 2k9 Kofi-; The Origin, Ramifications and Rectification of White Supremacy, Racism = White Supremacy = Globalization http://www.scribd.com/doc/16206085/The-Origin-Ramifications-and-Rectification-of-Racism-White-Supremacy-Revised

It's my aim to chronicle the beginnings of racism, and trace them to the present world in which we live. Due to sparse historical data, we have to extrapolate dates and times from what's provided. What we currently know is that every old civilization on Earth, once encountered by the expansionist nature of the European, they ceased to function in their respective natural styles. That goes for each civilization on Earth. From the Kingdom of Hawai'i, to the Iroquois Confederation of Eastern North America, all the way to the old Kingdom of China. Every sovereign nation who the western man touched, was annihilated, subjugated or assimilated, and morphed from a self sufficient entity, to a poor inadequate reflection of the western world

#### Here’s your gahman evidence recut—it goes neg too

Levi Gahman 14 [Centre for Social, Spatial, and Economic Justice, University of British Columbia], “Gun rites: hegemonic masculinity and neoliberal ideology in rural Kansas”, Gender, Place and Culture, 2014, BE

This valorization of the gun, and its association with exerting control over the rural frontier and ‘nation’, still resonates within the many men in Southeast Kansas. Over the span of a few generations, owning guns has produced a shared national identity that extols the virtues of defending individualism, freedom, property, and religion, and has thus become labelled ‘American’. Such discourses, while appearing noble and well intentioned, have paradoxically been used to carry out brutal assimilation projects and acts of war. In turn, the community members I spoke to in Southeast Kansas often noted that ‘doing the right thing’ and being a ‘good American’ was attained by making individual decisions that followed paternalistic moral traditions and adhered to market-based notions of personal work ethic in a fictive nation that is perceived to be meritorious.¶ Over the course of several interviews it became clear that the notion of being a ‘good American’ is a powerful influence for men in Southeast Kansas. From a feminist perspective, it is evident that these narratives are rife with patriarchal overtones; however, these hierarchical discourses often go unnoticed. Several participants performed their ‘American Pride’ by noting an acute distrust of the government. They often pointed to gun control laws, paying taxes, welfare programmes, and restrictions placed on Christian teaching in schools as ‘unfair’, ‘not right’, and being ‘discrimination against good, hardworking, Americans’.¶ A review of past literature shows that notions of white male victimization are quite prevalent when men seek to justify the oppressive and marginalizing practices they engage in (Kimmel and Ferber 2000; McIntosh 2003). These allegations of persecution, while simultaneously claiming innocence from the privileges that interlocking systems of masculinist white supremacy afford white men in settler nations, have been noted by many critical scholars and were present in many conversations that I had in Kansas (Collins 2005; Razack 1998). Harold, a 68-year-old participant, aptly summed up the widespread disillusionment and sense of victimization some men feel:¶ . . . I pay my fair share of taxes, and that is my hard earned money. I busted my ass for it and I need to feed my family with it. I don’t think it should be given to some lazy freeloaders on welfare who are working the system and looking for a handout . . . and the same people taking our money are the ones saying we shouldn’t have guns. Its in our Constitution, we have the right to bear arms, its what the Founding Fathers wanted . . . They were looking to freely practise their Christian beliefs. That’s why they came over here. And now you see ‘under God’ being taken out of the Pledge of Allegiance, you see the Ten Commandments being removed from schools, you see abortion, what I would call murder, being no big deal, and you see the government trying to take our guns – its communist . . . and don’t get me wrong, I love my country, but I don’t trust the government.¶ The emphasis on being a liberal subject, or being ‘individuals who are free to fail or succeed’ as described by one participant, thus serves as a guiding ideal for many men in the community. Such neoliberal subjectivities do not come without repercussions. As Foucault emphasized in his comprehensive analysis of technologies of the self and biopower, nothing is more suited to become influenced and molded by disciplinary power than extreme individualism (Foucault 1998, 1977). As a result, the productive capacities of the USA’ historical pillars of colonialism, capitalism, and patriarchal nationalism (that continue to be maintained predominantly by white, heterosexual, enabled, Christian, male, citizens) create ‘individuals’ who in perceiving themselves as such are paradoxically much more likely to unknowingly submit, conform, and obey. Such accounts can readily be seen in the comments of David, a 30-year-old single male, who when asked to describe his thoughts on the history of gun use in the area stated:¶ Well, the priests came here to help people – they built the church, started educating people, and shared their way of life. I’m sure the guns they had were mainly for protection and hunting. And its still like that to this day . . . we have a safe, tight-knit community. It’s a great place to raise kids and have a family. Its what our country was founded on. The pioneers that came over here were not being treated too well, they were looking for freedom, and they needed guns to protect themselves from some of the Indians and criminals that would attack them. And I know not all the Indians were dangerous, but you cannot say that some innocent Caucasian people were not attacked. Our ancestors were looking for a place to be free, work hard, and own some land to live off of. You can’t fault a guy for that.¶ . . . and when we got here its not like the Indians were all living peacefully with each other anyway . . . it’s a fact. There were tribes stealing and attacking other tribes, and if you look at how big the country is I think they could have done a better job of living with each other. It wasn’t like it was some paradise before our Founding Fathers got here. In the end, pioneers were protecting their families and defending what they believed in.¶ Several scholars have noted how the symbol of the gun is prominently woven into the historical tapestry of the USA (Brown 2008; Slotkin 1973, 1992; Wright 2001). The perceived threat of aggression from Indigenous people on the open plains meant that from its genesis, America was a society that depended upon a populace that was heavily armed (Cornell 2006). Recently, scholars have written how the conception of ‘frontier masculinity’ as a gendered narrative reinforces constructions of American nationalism by emphasizing the gun as a signifier of manhood (Melzer 2009; Via 2010). This point is particularly salient in Southeast Kansas as it was not uncommon to hear participants speak of playing ‘Cowboys and Indians’, or pretending to be admirable heroes from war movies and Westerns they watched growing up. Currently, there is an increase in research noting how the image of the gun is tied to power, security, and independence, and how such representations serve to perpetuate misleading historical accounts of white settlers conquering the frontier (Carrington, McIntosh, and Scott 2010; Melzer 2009; Via 2010).¶ Critical research also points out that the white settler myths of defending property, carrying out Manifest Destiny, and ‘civilizing Indians’ via homesteading, establishing churches and schools, and assimilation projects still permeate much of the cultural landscape of the Great Plains (Smith 2006, 2012; Via 2010). Additionally, recent discussions have suggested that the rationale behind promoting guns for community safety contradictorily erodes away a population’s sense of security (Cornell 2006). This is due to the fact that as gun possession rates increase, it creates a more defensive, heavily armed, and fractured populace that is governed by fear and suspicion, rather than by the free will it claims (Cornell 2006).¶ Despite the semantics that many participants used as being part of a ‘safe’ community, countervailing perspectives regarding the history of area suggests otherwise. The benevolent Christian narratives that dominate Southeast Kansas’ historical record, when viewed through a decolonial lens, show that ‘safe’ may not necessarily be the most accurate descriptor of the region. This can be recognized due to the region’s ongoing marginalization of historical perspectives from the Osage Nation, the chronological attempts at cultural assimilation that took place locally, and the fact that less than 0.03% of the county population identified as Native American (U.S. Census Bureau 2012). Given this information, it is apparent that the local community has been primarily exposed to masculinist narratives of colonial white supremacy at both institutional and cultural levels. Consequently, the practices and ideals that exist in the region reproduce hierarchies along lines of race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, ability, age, and nationality; which serve to covertly, and oftentimes unintentionally, shore up imperialistic discourses of disposses- sion, enclosure, and violence.¶ In looking at the gender regimes that are produced in Southeast Kansas, I borrow from Connell’s theory of hegemonic masculinity that suggests that the discourses surrounding manhood in local contexts produce marginalized, subordinated, and complicit masculinities (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Given the particular (local) version of hegemonic masculinity that permeates most spaces in the area (white, heterosexual, Christian, enabled, citizens), such marginalizing and subordinating processes can be readily observed in routine interactions.¶ Several scholars have noted that the processes of ‘othering’ that exist in settler societies serve to reinforce structural white supremacy and predominantly take place along lines of race, class, gender, sexuality, and nationality (de Leeuw, Greenwood, and Lindsay 2013; hooks 1989; Mohanty 1984; Pease 2010; Razack 2002; Smith 1999). Consequently, discursive formations of who are defined as ‘bad’ guys, and who are marked as ‘criminals’, operate as regulatory measures that allow certain men to attain hegemonic status while prohibiting others from doing so. This policing of masculine status can readily be seen in the statements made by Jeffrey, a 22-year-old participant, when asked about news stories pertaining to gun violence:¶ I mean hell, look at all these crazy people doing all these shootings here lately. The ones I hear about are done by guys from the city, you don’t see a bunch of farmers murdering each other. Most of the people doing the killing are psychopaths or terrorists who hate America. You can’t tell me they had good Christian upbringings. The guns ain’t the problem, it’s the criminals who get them that fuck things up. And think about it, if guns were outlawed, those crazy assholes would still find a way . . .¶ One interesting discursive formation to note in the statement above that is particularly salient to geographers is the positioning of violence being perpetuated by ‘guys in the city’ Jeffrey suggests that being ‘from the city’ is in direct opposition to what many participants referred to as ‘being from the country’. Several critical scholars have noted how the way in which ‘difference’ is constructed can lead to oppressive effects (Berg 2012; Goldberg 2009; Kobayashi 2013; Sibley 2002). While not explicitly stated outright, the connotation of what being ‘from the country’ versus being ‘from the city’ means is often times loaded with racialized undertones. This subordinating rhetoric is further highlighted by a follow- up statement Jeffrey made when asked to elaborate upon what type of people he thought were responsible for gun violence:¶ Its not that I’m a racist, but most those guys are niggers. The others are fucked up in the head, or Mexican drug dealers, or gang bangers from the ghetto. Probably grew up on welfare, came from broken homes, and were never really taught how to treat a gun . . . And when I say nigger I don’t mean all black guys, I’ve worked with some good black guys, so when I say nigger I mean that anyone can be a nigger. It’s more of how someone acts, you know? A white guy can be a nigger, a Mexican can be nigger, an Asian can be a nigger, its not just skin colour . . . its like when you hear the word faggot or bitch – those are not always about homos or women, they are just ways to describe how a guy goes about the way he acts.

### Solve Categories

#### This misunderstands our link—it’s not that you construct a hypermasculine category, but rather that your narrative of guns as exclusively historically linked to unjustified violence and masculinity ignores black historical disciplines that utilized guns as a means of self-defense. The 1ac’s non-violent orientation towards guns makes true liberation impossible—that’s Curry and Kelleher.

### Police Disarm Spillover

#### 1] Doesn’t matter—our impacts are about extralegal racist actions like klan violence, not the police.

#### 2] This is Etzioni describing what should happen after a while but not making a predictive claim that *if* this is implemented *then* police bans will be too—the aff doesn’t have the necessary mandate.

#### 3] This is in the context of a total weapons ban, not the aff, so they don’t get their spillover claim.

### Gun Violence = Racist

#### 1] assumes you win the case and decrease violence, which obviously we’ll go for answers to

#### 2] that’s not relevant under our framing—it’s not purely a question of whether the 1ac policy is good, but rather whether the 1ac’s historical analysis is correct—even if gun control is generally a good idea, the 1ac’s representations regarding it cause anti-Black violence

### PDB

#### 1] Severance—the first part of the alt is “reject the 1AC’s framing of guns as inherently patriarchal”, which means they sever that 1AC framing—our framework argument impacts that AND it makes debate impossible because you can sever parts of the aff to avoid our disads—means you never have to defend your positions to make real change and there’s no neg ground or clash.

#### 2] Our alt is definitionally mutually exclusive with the aff—it says black people should have a multiplicity of self-defense strategies and shouldn’t be limited—the 1AC is a limitation, which means all of the plan and all of the alt cannot happen simultaneously.

### PAOI

#### 1] Guns are key—the 1AC’s critique of guns as tools of liberation is another link and a disad to the aff.

CHARLES E. COBB 14 JR. [journalist, professor, and former activist with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Currently he is a senior analyst at allAfrica.com and a visiting professor at Brown University], “THIS NONVIOLENT STUFF’LL GET YOU KILLED: HOW GUNS MADE THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT POSSIBLE”, Basic Books, 2014 BE

Willingness to engage in armed self-defense played an important role in the southern Freedom Movement, for without it, terrorists would have killed far more people in the movement. “I’m alive today because of the Second Amendment and the natural right to keep and bear arms,” recalled activist John R. “Hunter Bear” Salter in 1994. In the early 1960s, Salter, of Native American descent, was a professor at historically black Tougaloo Southern Christian College in Mississippi and adviser to students nonvi- olently sitting in at segregated lunch counters and other public facilities in downtown Jackson. But he always “traveled armed,” said Salter. “The knowledge that I had these weapons and was willing to use them kept ene- mies at bay.” And the knowledge that guns would be used to defend his Tougaloo campus, well-known as a launching pad for civil rights protest and thus always a target of terrorists, also helped deter assaults against it, although it could not prevent them completely. In one campus attack, Salter remembers a bullet narrowly missing his daughter. yet neither the local nor the federal government offered help to people targeted by this sort of terrorism, so, says Salter, “we guarded our campus—faculty and students together. . . . We let this be known. The racist attacks slackened consider- ably. Night-riders are cowardly people—in any time and place—and they take advantage of fear and weakness.”¶ It cannot be emphasized enough that by asserting their right to defend themselves when attacked, the students and staff of Tougaloo were laying claim to a tradition that has safeguarded and sustained generations of black people in the United States. yet this tradition is almost completely absent from the conventional narrative of southern civil rights struggle. The fact that individuals and organized groups across the South were willing to pro- vide armed protection to nonviolent activists and organizers as well as to black communities targeted by terrorists is barely discussed, although organized self-defense in black communities goes back to the aftermath of the Civil War, and white fear of rebellion and weapons in black hands dates to colonial America. Guns were an integral part of southern life, especially in rural communities, and—as Moses noted in 1964—nonviolence never had a chance of usurping the traditional role of firearms in black rural life; although many rural blacks respected protesters’ use of nonviolence, they also mistrusted it. Hartman Turnbow, a black Mississippi farmer and com- munity leader, was a case in point. Turnbow welcomed the presence of movement organizers in Holmes County and even invited organizers to the area himself, but like Salter, Turnbow also “traveled armed.” With tragic foresight, Turnbow bluntly warned Martin Luther king Jr. in 1964, “This nonviolent stuff ain’t no good. It’ll get ya killed.”2

#### 2] If we win the historical framing arguments, you don’t get the perm—“all other instances” is our link argument—the 1ac actively excludes that discussion, which means the perm severs their dominant narrative regarding the history of gun violence.

#### 3] Black people are buying concealed weapons—proves some are choosing handguns

Martin Kaste 15 [correspondent on NPR's National desk. He covers law enforcement and privacy, as well as news from the Pacific Northwest] “More African-Americans Support Carrying Legal Guns For Self-Defense”, NPR, 6 Apr 2015, BE

According to a survey by the Pew Research Center, 54 percent of blacks now see gun ownership as a good thing, something more likely to protect than harm. That's up from 29 percent just two years ago. In places like Detroit, more African-Americans are getting permits to carry concealed weapons.¶ At a practice range just outside of Detroit, Rick Ector trains new gun owners. He says the new chief's attitude is a welcome change.¶ "He's the only one that I can ever recall who has been fervently in support of 'good Americans,' as he terms it, carrying firearms for personal protection," he says.¶ Ector thinks African-Americans nationally have been slower to embrace concealed-carry because so many of them live in places where it's still more restricted. Both Chief Craig and Ector are black.¶ "When you look at New Jersey, you look at New York, you look at California, D.C. and Chicago, really it's still a foreign experience," he says. "When you really look at the city of Detroit, we're kind of leading the way in terms of urban areas with law-abiding citizens carrying guns."¶ Detroiters are even taking their guns to church. When Rosedale Park Baptist had trouble with drug dealers and car thefts, Pastor Haman Cross Jr. told his congregants from the pulpit that they should consider getting concealed-carry permits.¶ "I love the Lord; I'm a Christian," he says. "But like I told the congregation, let's send a message right in front. I want the word out in the community, if you steal any of our cars, I'm coming after you."¶ At another black church, Greater St. Matthew Baptist, Pastor David Bullock points out the pews that where his armed congregants usually sit.¶ "The chairman of my deacon board, he carries," Bullock says. "And then on the west side, there's a middle-aged woman who also carries."¶ Bullock recalls the day she first told him about it.¶ "She comes to the office, closes the door and pulls up her coat, and she has a firearm," he says. "She says, 'Is this ok?' And I say, 'Yeah, it's fine.'"¶ Bullock doesn't think it's a sin to carry a gun, especially in a town where whole churches have been held up for their offerings. But he's decided he can't recommend it to his congregants, either. For this simple reason: "If you use it, you're going to get prosecuted," he says¶ He's convinced the justice system still tends to see armed black people as aggressors, especially in situations where the facts are murky. If they're going to defend themselves with a gun, he says they better have money for a good lawyer.¶ And there are still people in this community who believe that having more guns in general, both legal and illegal, just increases the likelihood of gun violence. Evelyn Marks is one of those people.¶ "Christina was my only child, I put everything I had into her," she says.¶ Her daughter, Christina Lazzana-Webster, was murdered by someone with a concealed-carry permit: her own husband. He killed her in their home. Marks assumes they'd been having an argument. She says the rise of legal guns doesn't make Detroit feel any safer to her. In fact, it's just the opposite.¶ "Because when people are armed like that and they're threatened, the first thing they want to do is pull out their gun and shoot to kill," Marks says.

#### 4] Handguns key—they’re less expensive

Gabriel Arkles 13 [Associate Academic Specialist at Northeastern University School of Law], “GUN CONTROL, MENTAL ILLNESS, AND BLACK TRANS AND LESBIAN SURVIVAL”, SOUTHWESTERN LAW REVIEW, 2013, BE

Gun laws also make guns more expensive. Many gun control laws have prohibited the selling of handguns or other cheaper guns specifically to make them less accessible to communities of color.110 The cost of running background checks and other requirements of and restrictions on manufacturers and retailers can also be passed on to consumers, again making guns less accessible to poor people and to the groups who are more likely to be poor (such as disabled people, people of color, women, trans people, and immigrants).111

#### 5] The link is still a disad—no reason the perm resolves enough of our impact—black people need a *multiplicity* of self-defense strategies and shouldn’t be confined to any single morally determined courses of action. Even if the perm gives them choices, the aff is necessarily a limitation to self-defense strategies.

### Backlash

#### 1] empirically, violent resistance is a necessary *prerequisite* to other movements

CHARLES E. COBB 14 JR. [journalist, professor, and former activist with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Currently he is a senior analyst at allAfrica.com and a visiting professor at Brown University], “THIS NONVIOLENT STUFF’LL GET YOU KILLED: HOW GUNS MADE THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT POSSIBLE”, Basic Books, 2014 BE

But although nonviolence was crucial to the gains made by the freedom struggle of the 1950s and ’60s, those gains could not have been achieved without the complementary and still underappreciated practice of armed self-defense. The claim that armed self-defense was a necessary aspect of the civil rights movement is still controversial. However, wielding weapons, espe- cially firearms, let both participants in nonviolent struggle and their sympa- thizers protect themselves and others under terrorist attack for their civil rights activities. This willingness to use deadly force ensured the survival not only of countless brave men and women but also of the freedom struggle itself.¶ This was nothing new. Armed self-defense (or, to use a term preferred by some, “armed resistance”) as part of black struggle began not in the 1960s with angry “militant” and “radical” young Afro-Americans, but in the earliest years of the United States as one of African people’s responses to oppression. This tradition, which culminates with the civil rights strug- gles and achievements of the mid-1960s, cannot be understood independ- ently or outside its broader historical context. In every decade of the nation’s history, brave and determined black men and women picked up guns to defend themselves and their communities.¶ Thus the tradition of armed self-defense in Afro-American history can- not be disconnected from the successes of what today is called the nonvi- olent civil rights movement. Participants in that movement always saw themselves as part of a centuries-long history of black life and struggle. Guns in no way contradicted the lessons of that history. Indeed, the idea of nonviolent struggle was newer in the black community, and it was pro- tected in many ways by gunfire and the threat of gunfire. Simply put: because nonviolence worked so well as a tactic for effecting change and was demonstrably improving their lives, some black people chose to use weapons to defend the nonviolent Freedom Movement. Although it is counterintuitive, any discussion of guns in the movement must therefore also include substantial discussion of nonviolence, and vice versa. This book does that.¶ I should note that although I sometimes seem to use “civil rights move- ment” and “Freedom Movement” interchangeably, they in fact have two quite separate though closely related meanings. By “civil rights movement” I mean the efforts to secure equal rights under the law, as with the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The “Freedom Movement” is a larger idea whose goal is the achievement of civil rights, civil liberties, and the liber- ated consciousness of self and community. It recognizes that law alone can- not uproot white supremacy, ever creative and insidious in its forms and practices, and that civil rights law alone cannot create a new liberated sense of self and human capacity. In my thinking on the differences between the “civil rights movement” and the “Freedom Movement,” I have been greatly influenced by the “freedom rights” postulation laid out by historian Hasan kwame Jeffries:¶ Framing the civil rights movement as a fight for freedom rights acknowledges the centrality of slavery and emancipation to con- ceptualizations of freedom; incorporates the long history of black protest dating back to the daybreak of freedom and extending beyond the Black Power era; recognizes the African Americans’ civil and human rights objectives; and captures the universality of these goals. Moreover, it allows for regional and temporal dif- ferentiation, moments of ideological radicalization and periods of social movement formation.

#### 2] 1NC Curry and Kelleher evidence empirically proves it’s possible to solve—they can ward off klan violence

#### 3] what’s the alternative?? Black people could either take up arms to defend themselves or they could just let the klan kill them—obviously self-defense is a better strategy—it’s try or die for the alt

### Love

#### 1] this is just some hippy shit—obviously embracing ethics of love doesn’t do anything—empirically it hasn’t worked and self-defense has become necessary

#### 2] the question of the alt is simple—what do black people do when the klan shows up at their house? Non-violent love warriors clearly aren’t going to be much help then—self-defense is a necessary *option* for black people even without mandating violence

#### 3] your ethic of love will never succeed—white pathology ensures no “love” for black people

DR. WRIGHT 84 Clinical Psychologist 1984 Bobby-Director of the Garfield Park Comprehensive Community Health Center in Chicago (a Mental Health Center); The Psychopathic Racial Personality: and other essays; p. 1-2

**In a bullfight, after being brutalized while making innumerable charges at the movement of a cape, there comes a time when the bull finally turns and faces his adversary with the only movement being his heaving bloody sides. It is believed that for the first time he really sees the matador. This final confrontation is known as the “moment of truth.” For the bull, this moment comes too late.**¶ **The experience of Black people all over the world presents an analogous situation. For hundreds of years, Blacks have been charging at the banners that are held by the European (White) matadors**. Those banners have been represented by concepts such as democracy, capitalism, Marxism, religion, and education. The banners remained constant as long as Blacks were assets. However, with technology and worldwide industrialization on the rampage resulting in a further exploitation of Africa’s resources which in turn produces an increase in Africa’s (Blacks’) national consciousness, Blacks are now a threat and a liability to the White race. **Therefore, the banner held by the matador represents only one concept: genocide.** **As a consequence, the major research that White scientists are involved in today is genocidal in nature (nuclear warfare, population control**, medication control, genetic engineering, psychosurgery, electrical stimulation of the brain, and the high complex science of behavioral technology). **Indeed, it is Blacks’ moment of truth; it is time for Blacks to look at the matador.**¶ This presentation is based upon the following very simple premise: **in their relationship with the Black race, Europeans (Whites) are psychopaths and their behavior reflects an underlying biologically transmitted proclivity with roots deep in their evolutionary history. The psychopath is an individual who is constantly in conflict with other persons or groups. He is unable to experience guilt, is completely selfish and callous, and has a total disregard for the rights of others. This premise is supported by overwhelming scientific evidence** (Delany, 1968; Du Bois, 1896; Fanon, 1963; Garvey, 1967; Welsing, 1991; Williams, 1971).