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## 1NC

### 1NC—Gun Control (short)

#### <<opt>>

#### The year is 1976, and in California, Governor Reagan has just banned the open-carry of firearms. Yes. That Reagan—y’know, the conservative hero one. Why would he of all people institute gun control? Because revolutionary forces like the Black Panther Party had started arming themselves to challenge the state’s monopoly on violence. This is not an isolated instance—gun control has historically been used to disenfranchise the most oppressed: from the Black Codes to modern day Stop and Frisk.

#### <<Links>>

#### The Aff’s law and order politics leave the fundamental matrix of capitalism underlying gun violence *untouched.* Bougie gun control is coopted and allows the capitalist class to reassert its hegemony over the oppressed.

WIL 13 (WIL/Socialist Appeal, bombass anticaps, “Gun Control and Class Struggle”, September 13, 2013)//Miro

The recent attacks in Colorado, Connecticut, Boston, and across the country have shocked everyone. As has been previously explained in the pages of Socialist Appeal, these repeated incidents of violence signify the decay of American capitalism. The decline of capitalism offers no future for today’s youth, only distractions, desperation, and escapism. High unemployment, debt, lack of health care facilities, alienation, and a widespread feeling of insecurity is enough to push some over the edge. Only by changing society to one which will give everyone hope of a better future, only by engaging people in a way that they will want to live their lives rather than escape from them, can we put an end to these horrible crimes. However, many capitalist politicians are telling us that there is a quick and easy solution: stricter gun control laws. This “solution” flies in the face of actual experience. Alcoholism is as prevalent and intractable a problem today as it was in the 1920s. In January 1920, the 18th Amendment was put into effect, prohibiting the production and sale of alcohol. The argument was put forward that by banning alcohol, alcoholism would fade away. Nothing of the kind happened. Prohibition strengthened organized crime, giving criminal gangs a monopoly over all aspects of the production and distribution of alcohol, and alcoholism continued as before. Today, states with tough gun control laws like New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and California are still among those that experience the most violent crime involving firearms. Illegal guns are most commonly acquired from other states, by individuals who can legally purchase firearms, and from the illegal sale of guns by licensed dealers. Although this seems like an argument to broaden the strict gun laws to the federal level, there is no reason to assume firearms won’t make their way into the hands of those with malicious intent. There is already an underground market for firearms, and like the prohibition of alcohol in the 1920s, stricter gun control laws would only bolster this lucrative black market. There are already designs on the internet that would allow someone to use a 3D printer to produce a fully functioning handgun out of plastic. And one look at the Mexican drug cartels, which are often better armed than the police and army, shows how ineffective efforts to curb access to guns have been (or the illicit drugs they trade in, for that matter). The “right to bear arms” is a right that has been championed perhaps more in the U.S. than in any other country in the world. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, along with the other nine Amendments that make up the “Bill of Rights,” were a concession on the part of the early American ruling class, in order to pass the less democratic aspects of the constitution such as the creation of the Senate and Supreme Court. At the time of the signing of the Constitution, despite the reining in of the revolutionary energy of the masses by the ruling class, the capitalist system was still young and historically progressive. A strong state apparatus had not yet been developed. The ruling class did not yet need one, as the proletariat had not yet developed into a powerful and massive force constituting the vast majority of society, as is the case today. It could depend on geography and local armed militas for national defense and to put down local uprisings, supplemented by a small standing army, and above all, a strong navy. But things have changed in the United States. The slogan “we are the 99%” is a close approximation to the actual class balance of forces today, with a tiny minority of capitalists on one side, and a mass of workers on the other. The working class has tremendous potential power in its hands—the ability to bring production and society as a whole to a grinding halt. With the capitalist crisis deepening, the ruling class can no longer rely on ideology or a few concessions to keep class peace. In the face of such a threat, the capitalists have developed an imposing state apparatus in order to maintain their rule. Frederick Engels, in his classic work The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, explains the role of the state: “The state is therefore by no means a power imposed on society from without... Rather, it is a product of society at a particular stage of development; it is the admission that this society has involved itself in insoluble self-contradiction and is cleft into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to exorcise. But in order that these antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interests, shall not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, a power, apparently standing above society, has become necessary to moderate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of ‘order’; and this power, arisen out of society, but placing itself above it and increasingly alienating itself from it, is the state.” When capitalist politicians call for “gun control,” they are really saying that the working class majority should give more power to the bourgeois state in determining who should have access to arms. The capitalist class would breathe a sigh of relief at the complete disarmament of the working class. The capitalist state would then have a complete monopoly of arms, on top of its monopoly of the courts, prisons, police, spy agencies, military, etc. Therefore, from the point of view of the capitalist class, the real essence of “gun control” is not the disarming of criminal elements or unstable individuals—who would still have access to guns through illegal channels—it is the disarming of the working class on the whole. We have seen how this has been used in the past. When the Black Panthers had arms for self-defense, the bourgeois state violently attacked them. Far-right groups, on the other hand, are armed to the teeth and the state typically looks the other way. The United States has a long history of gun violence on the part of the state against immigrants, blacks, and against the working class on the whole, especially when they dare to struggle. Nearly every major labor battle in the U.S. has been marked with violent attacks by the state against the striking workers. As one boss infamously put it, his striking workers needed to be “shot back to work.” Against this overwhelming force of the capitalist state, the working class must defend its basic democratic right to defend itself and its organizations, including its right to access arms. There are no quick fixes to the problem of gun violence, and no solutions within the limits of capitalism, a system based on the organized exploitation and violence of one class against another. Only the organized and united working class can offer a solution to the violence of class society, whether it be perpetrated by the capitalist state when breaking a strike, or by unstable and alienated individuals on a killing rampage. The labor movement, by organizing a political party of its own, could begin to deal with the ills of our society—but only if that party is armed with a socialist program. Corporations like Colt and Smith & Wesson make huge profits from the sale of weapons. A workers’ government would nationalize the arms industry and place it under democratic workers’ control. Under a workers’ government, the working class would democratically organize itself to protect society. As socialism spreads worldwide, and relations between nations are increasingly based on solidarity, not expoitation, the need for national defense and the military will fade away, along with national borders themselves. Here at home, the need for a special police force standing above society, with special powers and privileges, would likewise disappear.

#### Gun violence cannot be divorced from the war on people of color. Any efforts to extend the capitalist monopoly of violence must be resisted. Government security forces aren’t neutral—they are enforcers of a system that leaves billions of people disposable

Sherman 12 (Vince Sherman, writer for Return 2 Source, ML Journal, “Three Positions on Gun Control”, 2012)//Miro

The capitalist class and the white middle class in the large cities in the North, West, and Midwest that live in more constricted confines with the working class and oppressed nations push forward this “law and order” gun control policy. Indeed, the US government already has massive gun control measures in place, especially in the major cities like New York and Chicago and states across the nation, which represent the extreme end of this policy, where it’s practically unheard of for average citizens to own firearms legally. These measures don’t restrict mass murderers like Jared Lee Loughner – the shooter in Arizona last year – or Neo-Nazis like Wade Michael Page, who murdered six people at a Sikh Temple in Wisconsin this summer, from acquiring firearms. Instead, they largely restrict the rights of oppressed people who face violence from vigilantes or police from owning guns. It is no surprise then that billionaire Mayor of New York City Michael Bloomberg and his coalition, “Mayors Against Illegal Guns,” are quickly becoming the leading force advancing this agenda. Principally, they support gun control for the same reason the Republican opposed gun control: they are afraid of oppressed nationalities. We quote the website of “Mayors Against Illegal Guns”: “We support the Second Amendment and the rights of citizens to own guns. We recognize the vast majority of gun dealers and gun owners carefully follow the law…But what binds us together is a determination to fight crime, and a belief that we can do more to stop criminals from getting guns while also protecting the rights of citizens to freely own them.” (2) This is a common theme among the liberal gun control advocates: a heavy focus on “crime” and keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, especially in big cities. This position cannot be divorced from the war on drugs and the war on Black and Latino youth, who find themselves disportionately criminalized and imprisoned. Capitalist leaders like Mayor Bloomberg in no way seek to limit the violence visited on working class and oppressed communities. Remember that Bloomberg is responsible for spearheading the blatantly racist “stop and frisk” policies carried out by the NYPD. (3) The NAACP has said of these policies: “Bloomberg’s massive street-level racial profiling program is a civil rights and human rights catastrophe that both hurts our children and makes our communities less safe.” (4) Are we to trust the liberals like Bloomberg, chiefly responsible and complicit in waging the war on black and brown communities, with ending gun violence with new criminal restrictions? Are we to trust the racist criminal justice system and groups like the NYPD whom Bloomberg has called “his army, the 7th largest in the world?” (5) It is no coincidence that liberal bourgeoisie like Bloomberg are silent about gun control for their “private army” when it comes to police violence and murder committed by police, like in the case of unarmed 17 year old Ramarley Graham in New York City. (6) The gun control policies of Bloomberg and reactionary allies, like Chicago Mayor Rahm Emmanuel, are efforts to extend national oppression and the capitalist monopoly on violence, especially over Black and Latino communities. This also serves to keep the working class and discontented elements of society passive in the face of foreclosures, austerity, voter suppression, legislative attacks like Right-to-Work initiatives, and efforts to use state repression to silence social movements like Occupy Wall Street and trade union protesters in Michigan. After all, unarmed protesters are entirely at the mercy of the capitalist class’ “personal army,” leaving them subject to violent repression at protests or on picket lines. It is only natural that these forces support such measures to strip oppressed nationalities and workers from their democratic rights to bear arms: They have their own arms, their own personal security, their own “personal armies”, their police, their courts, their prisons; in other words, the “special bodies of armed men” talked of by Lenin in State & Revolution. They live in gated communities and mansions, while most Black and Latino people live in occupied territory not unlike occupied Afghanistan. The agenda of the liberal Democrats is to strengthen the apparatus of state repression – to increase arms and weapons in the hands of their “personal army” – while keeping guns out of the hands of “criminals” and other “undesirable elements”. This agenda is reflected in the expansion of billions of dollars in state funding to arm police with military hardware to the tune of $34 billion dollars over the past decade. (7) There seems to be no talk of gun control or preventing gun violence when it comes to the army of the capitalist class. There’s no talk of assault weapon bans for the police, who are upgrading to tanks in many cities! (8) Middle class white liberals who live in gated communities, or the “nice” sections of town also don’t have the same worries as our class and our allies. They want to strip “the common rabble” and criminals of their means of self-defense. After all, the police and the ruling class of the United States are their friends. They’re not the ones getting imprisoned, stopped and frisked, or having their homes foreclosed on. However, comrades cannot ignore that gun violence does have a disproportionate and devastating impact in the communities of oppressed people and working class communities. African-Americans are the victim of 54% of all firearm homicides, despite making up just 13% of the population, according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (9) It’s no surprise that gun-related violence disproportionately occurs in the US South, the historical home of Jim Crow and Ku Klux Klan terrorism against Black and Latino people, according to Zara Matheson at the Martin Prosperity Institute. (10) This provides some material appeal to elements of the oppressed nations in regards to these gun control policy. Still, comrades should combat this wolf in sheep’s clothing. The enforcers of this violence are the American capitalist class and white supremacist forces that work to uphold the established order. Trusting them to end violence in the oppressed communities with gun control is the equivalent to entrusting the United States to help Syria and Libya with “humanitarian intervention.” Malcolm X understood the nature of violence by the US government and police, as well as the need for African-Americans to defend themselves from these attacks. We quote him at some length: “Last but not least, I must say this concerning the great controversy over rifles and shotguns. White people been buying rifles all their lives…no commotion. The only thing I’ve ever said is that in areas where the government has proven itself either unwilling or unable to defend the lives and the property of Negroes, it’s time for Negroes to defend themselves. Article number two of the Constitutional amendments provides you and me the right to own a rifle or a shotgun. It is constitutionally legal to own a shotgun or a rifle. This doesn’t mean you’re going to get a rifle and form battalions and go out looking for white folks, although you’d be within your rights – I mean, you’d be justified; but that would be illegal and we don’t do anything illegal. If the white man doesn’t want the black man buying rifles and shotguns, then let the government do its job.” (11) There’s a reason that the Sanford police covered up the shooting of Trayvon Martin this past February, and it was only after massive protests that his killer, George Zimmerman, was arrested. Across this country, the system of white supremacy is reinforced by the underlying threat of violence, whether it comes from police brutality or vigilante terrorism. The response is not to buckle to the pressures of liberals, who trust the very purveyors of violence to protect oppressed people, but for oppressed people to have the ability to defend themselves. Sensible policy on guns for working class and oppressed people in America can only come from a Marxist position. But to do that, we must first analyze and pull apart the muddled position carried by the advanced, progressives, and some of our comrades. The Left-Second Amendment Position In response to the liberal gun control proposals, many people on the US Left embrace a position similar to that espoused by the Right. This “Left-Second Amendment” position unites with the views put forth by the National Rifle Association by dismissing guns as incidental to mass murders like yesterday’s tragedy in Connecticut. In this view, something else – an external cause like mental health or the culture of violence in the US – is chiefly to blame. This is not incorrect. The US is an incredibly violent society, with the greatest purveyor of violence being the US government itself – and that’s not our opinion; that’s the opinion of Martin Luther King Junior, who used those exact words to describe the government on April 4, 1967. We see the evidence of this ‘cultural violence’ everywhere, from movies like Act of Valor, financed by the US military to glorify violence committed against other countries, to police violence inflicted on children and the innocent, like we saw in Anaheim, California, this year. Along the same lines, mental health services in the US are stigmatized and woefully underfunded. It’s no coincidence that many of the perpetrators of these mass killings have had severe mental health crises; crises that were more often than not identified but not adequately treated. The Left-Second Amendment position boils down to the pressing concern over the state having a monopoly on violence. When we look back in history, oppressed people have never won their freedom without armed struggle. In many cases, the lack of an armed populace has led directly to the rise of brutal fascist regimes, like in Chile and Spain. In 1973, the workers in Chile were underprepared to defeat the fascist coup d’etat that overthrew elected President Salvador Allende because of the government’s refusal to arm the people. During the Spanish Civil War almost four decades earlier, the social democratic government was similarly reluctant to arm the workers to resist Franco’s fascist brigades. And of course everyone knows of Adolf Hitler’s infamous ban on citizens owning guns after the rise of the Nazis. In essence, many leftists view guns as a means of self-defense for oppressed people and a safeguard against fascism. This leads them to oppose gun control measures, i.e. the liberal position on gun control. However, the Left-Second Amendment position mistakenly adopts the Right’s view of the right to bear arms as a philosophical abstraction, rather than a material reality. In practice, the Constitution does not protect the rights of oppressed people to bear arms. Even the most vocal advocates of the Second Amendment have no objection to regulations on firearm ownership by the people who need it most to defend their class and national interests from right-wing vigilantes and state power.

#### <<Impact>>

#### Capitalism drives *all* existential scenarios—best empirical evidence

Deutsch 9 (Judith, president, Science for Peace. Member of Canadian psychoanalytic society, “Pestilence, Famine, War, Neoliberalism, and Premature Deaths,” Peace Magazine, <http://peacemagazine.org/archive/v25n3p18.htm>)//Miro

At present, threats to human existence come from at least four directions: climate change with its consequences of catastrophic climate events and of drastic water and food shortages; from nuclear war; from pandemics; from the severe impoverishment and destruction of society that is a result of neo-liberal restructuring. All are due to human error. All are preventable. But the time factor is most crucial around climate change. The lack of attention to the time scale is tantamount to believing that "it can't happen here."¶ Currently, most attempts to counter these dangers address the issues in isolation even though the main perpetrators implement a unified, relatively coherent programme that unites these threats. Neo-liberal plutocrats are the controlling shareholders of the large agri-business, weapons, water privatization, pharmaceutical (anti national health care), mining, non-renewable energy companies. It is their economic practices that decimate water resources, deplete soil, pollute air, and increase greenhouse gas emissions. The culpable individuals, their think tanks, the supportive government bureaucracies, and the specific methods of control are well-documented in a number of recent works.1¶ From recent history it is readily apparent that mass extinction "can happen here." A similar confluence of climate events and exploitive socio-economic re-structuring occurred in the late-Victorian period. Retrospective statistical studies established that worldwide droughts between 1876 and 1902 were caused by El Nino weather events. Based on the British Empire's laissez-faire approach to famine that enjoined against state "interference" in the for-profit trade in wheat, between 13 million and 29 million people died in India alone.¶ True to the precepts of liberalism, the British converted small subsistence farms in India into large scale monocrop farming for export on a world market. The new globally integrated grain trade meant that disturbances in distant parts of the world affected Indian farmers. Advances in technology actually made things worse, for steam-driven trains were used to transport grains to England while locals starved, and telegraph communication was used to process international monetary transactions that destroyed local communities. Gone were the traditional social institutions for managing food shortages and hardship.¶ The Victorian world view also bequeathed us the myth of the inferior Third World and denial of British responsibility for the de-development of tropical countries. Mike Davis points out the compelling evidence that South Indian laborers had higher earnings than their British counterparts in the 18th century and lived lives of greater financial security, including better diets and lower unemployment. "If the history of British rule in India were to be condensed into a single fact, it is this: there was no increase in India's per capita income from 1757 to 1947. Indeed, in the last half of the nineteenth century [due to colonial structural adjustment], income probably declined by more than 50% There was no economic development at all in the usual sense of the term."( Davis, p. 311).¶ In today's world, neo-liberalism continues to increase global misery and poverty and the dehumanization and invisibility of millions of "warehoused" people. Whatever conditions increase poverty also increase premature deaths. In the US, a 1% rise in unemployment increases the mortality rate by 2%, homicides and imprisonments by 6%, and infant mortality by 5%. The 225 richest individuals worldwide have a combined wealth of over $1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47% of the world's population, or 2.5 billion people. By comparison, it is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and safe water and sanitation for all is roughly $40 billion a year. This is less than 4% of the combined wealth of these 225 richest people.2¶ NEO-LIBERALISM¶ Neo-liberal policies have mandated the destruction of the social safety net that would be the lifesaver in climate disaster, epidemics, and war. The International Monetary Fund has required countless countries to dismantle public education, health, water, and sanitation infrastructure. Neo-liberalism strenuously opposes government intervention on behalf of the common good while hypocritically and deceptively protecting narrow class interests and investments in the military, non-renewable energy, privatized health care.¶ The powerful and wealthy few control the military-industrial complex, surveillance, and the media. The connections with climate change are manifold. Already there is military preparedness for the potential impacts on peace and security posed by climate change -- not to help victims but to keep refugees out. Ominously, there are now overt racist overtones to the discussion of "environmental refugees" and the closing of borders. The model of response to disasters is most likely Hurricane Katrina, namely, protection of the wealthy and outright cruelty to the poor.¶ Wars are tremendously costly to the public but highly profitable to powerful elites. "The arms trade has expanded by more than 20% worldwide in the past five years" (The Guardian Weekly 01.05.09, p. 11). The military itself emits enormous amounts of greenhouse gases and brutally protects the extractive industries of the wealthy. There are innumerable unreported incidents: In May 2009, alone, the Nigerian army razed villages in the oil-rich Niger delta to protect oil companies, killing many civilians; in Papua New Guinea, 200 heavily armed soldiers and police were sent to the Barrick Gold Porgera area to destroy indigenous villages. In the 20th century, it is estimated that as many as 360 million people died prematurely due to state terrorism--"terrorism from above."¶ BESIDES PROLIFERATION¶ The use of nuclear weapons in wars would appear to be increasingly acceptable. "We have created a situation in the world where we have a very small number of people in control of nuclear arsenals - people whose competence is not necessarily proven, whose rationality is not necessarily at a high level, and whose ethical standards may or may not be acceptable. These people are in charge of making decisions about the use of weapons that could destroy civilization and most life on earth" (p. 245). In their recent collection of papers on nuclear weapons, Falk and Krieger further suggest that the grand military strategy is "largely to project power in order to reap the benefits of profitability for the few. To take control of resources, and to place our military bases strategically around the world in order to have greater degrees of control, sounds like a strategy to benefit corporate interests." They state that the power elite has cleverly manipulated the public by focusing almost exclusive attention on the issue of proliferation, "with corresponding inattention to possession, continuing weapons development, and thinly disguised reliance on threatened use."

#### <<Alt>>

#### The alternative is to uphold gun ownership as a *right of the working class*—this rejects reactionary gun politics but also liberal disenfranchisement.

Sherman 12 (Vince Sherman, writer for Return 2 Source, ML Journal, “Three Positions on Gun Control”, 2012)//Miro

The Marxist position on gun control is unequivocally upholding the right of workers and oppressed nationalities to bear arms. In direct refutation of the Left-Second Amendment position, which upholds the right to bear arms as an abstract constitutional right, the Marxist position upholds gun ownership as a class right. Similarly, class rights directly confront the liberal belief that the state should be the predominant or sole trustee of firearms. By classifying the right to bear arms as a class right, rather than a ‘human’, ‘constitutional’, or ‘natural’ right, the Marxist position upholds the social character of gun ownership. The Second Amendment enshrines the right to bear arms as an individual right set in place to protect individuals and their property from threats. Under capitalism, this translates into principally a ruling class and petty-bourgeois right since these are the classes that own “property,” i.e. capital, businesses, the means of production. ‘Open-Carry’ or ‘Concealed-Carry’? We see further evidence of the reactionary character of the Second Amendment when looking at the prevalence of ‘concealed-carry’ state laws versus ‘open-carry’ state laws. ‘Open-Carry’ – allowing people to publicly carry firearms – is a social means of exercising the right to bear arms. As the Black Panther Party understood, the known presence of firearms allows oppressed people to better police their own communities and challenge the authority of the state without firing a single shot. The right to bear arms thereby becomes ‘social’ because it is a public exercise of power. Consider why the police openly carry their firearms. The state allows its officers and agents to publicly display their firearms to deter confrontations with said agents. It is a silent exercise of state power. Reagan banned the open-carry of loaded firearms in California precisely in reaction to the Black Panthers’ practices. If an African-American was stopped and harassed by a police officer, an openly armed Panther cadre would enter the scene to give legal counsel to the person facing police harassment. The Panthers challenged the state’s perceived monopoly on violence by acting as “a well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free [Black] State.” In fact, California is one of seven states in the US to have outright bans on open-carry. Not surprisingly, the other six states with these bans – Illinois, Texas, New York, Florida, South Carolina, and Arkansas – are either the most populous and multinational, or located in the heart of the Black Belt South. Not coincidentally, though, all 50 states in the US allow the concealed-carry of firearms. Illinois was the one state that upheld a ban on concealed-carry, but the US Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals struck down that ban a week ago. (15) Concealed-carry caters to the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois class nature of the Second Amendment, which allows individuals to ‘protect themselves from attacks in public’. From Bernhard Goetz in 1984 to George Zimmerman in 2012, this right has generally manifested itself in white men gunning down Blacks and Latinos on the basis that they ‘felt threatened’. Concealed-carry individualizes, rather than socializes, the right to bear arms. The Right uses concealed-carry laws to expand the legal basis for the murder of African-Americans and Latinos through Stand Your Ground laws. Even the NRA backhandedly agrees with bans on open-carry, calling the repeal of these bans “not a priority.” (16) Instead, the NRA’s far-right membership dedicatedly works to expand concealed-carry, which offers no legal basis for oppressed people to socially exercise the right to bear arms. The Social Organization of the Right to Bear Arms On picket lines, strikers in the 1930s regularly had to defend themselves and their fellow workers from company-hired paramilitaries. As far back as the Homestead Strike in 1892 involving Steelworkers and the Battle of Blair Mountain involving Coal Miners, the capitalist class has openly resorted to violence in order to crush the demands of striking workers. Looking at restoring a militant strike movement as one of the main objectives of the progressive labor movement, it would be a folly to support increased gun control, which would allow the state, the capitalist class and its supporters to monopolize guns. While not all proposed gun control methods would completely curb access to firearms, Marxists should oppose any restrictions that further reduce the ability of oppressed people and workers to defend themselves or deter violence. The disastrous consequences of gun control on the workers’ movement came full-circle during the South African Miner’s strike this year, in which state police opened fire killing 34 miners, armed mostly with clubs and other such weapons. A modern picket line with workers legally and openly carrying arms in self-defense would represent a strong deterrent to violent attempts to break up the strike by management, vigilantes or illegal police actions, like the ones that occurred in South Africa. Many comrades will find that workers, and especially people of the oppressed nations in the US instinctively understand that the police force represents the ruling class and not their interests. Presenting the question of gun ownership in terms of class opens up workers to realizing that gun control is a question of democratic and class rights. Many workers understand reasonable gun rights and even gun control, but they will also reject the idea when presented with the prospect of surrendering their democratic right while the rich and their personal army get to hold onto this right. In a March 1850 Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League, Karl Marx described the need for workers to exercise the right to bear arms through social organization independent of the state. We will quote him at some length: To be able forcefully and threateningly to oppose this party, whose betrayal of the workers will begin with the very first hour of victory, the workers must be armed and organized. The whole proletariat must be armed at once with muskets, rifles, cannon and ammunition, and the revival of the old-style citizens’ militia, directed against the workers, must be opposed. Where the formation of this militia cannot be prevented, the workers must try to organize themselves independently as a proletarian guard, with elected leaders and with their own elected general staff; they must try to place themselves not under the orders of the state authority but of the revolutionary local councils set up by the workers. Where the workers are employed by the state, they must arm and organize themselves into special corps with elected leaders, or as a part of the proletarian guard. Under no pretext should arms and ammunition be surrendered; any attempt to disarm the workers must be frustrated, by force if necessary. The destruction of the bourgeois democrats’ influence over the workers, and the enforcement of conditions which will compromise the rule of bourgeois democracy, which is for the moment inevitable, and make it as difficult as possible – these are the main points which the proletariat and therefore the League must keep in mind during and after the approaching uprising. (17) In the underlined portion of the quote selected above, Marx describes the security functions of what the Bolsheviks would later call ‘Soviets’, or workers councils. Writing in London, Marx was warning against English attempts to co-opt independent armed bodies of workers by reviving citizens militias, which were directed and organized by the state to supposedly police communities. In actuality, these bodies served the interest of the capitalist state, making them functionally analogous to the gun control demands of the liberals today. Marx instead recognized the necessity of workers organizing themselves and defending the right to bear arms through political struggle. This right would not be exercised individually through concealed-carry or for personal security, but it was instead a social right of the working class to defend their gains and interests. In the oppressed nations within the United States, open-carry and the class right to bear arms has a rich history in America of forwarding national liberation. From countering white terrorism during Reconstruction, to the CPUSA again fighting off the Klan in the 1930’s, to the Black Panthers patrolling black communities, the right of Black armed organizations has been a guarantor of their democratic rights. Every instance of this has been organized, not on individual basis of “concealed-carrying” a handgun for individual defense, but as disciplined groups acting practically as the police force or army of the black nation itself. This, in essence, is the social right to bear arms. The American working class and the Black and Chican@ nations should have the right and authority in their respective organizations to decide how to best manage gun rights in their communities. The answers lie in organizations and successful practices of the past, in contrast to the white liberal proposal to rely on the capitalist police forces’ monopoly on violence for protection.

#### <<ROTJ>>

#### The role of the judge is to act as a critical educator combating oppression—while obviously signing the ballot won’t make neoliberalism disappear, voting for strategies to combat oppression *in this round* makes us better activists in the future.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Best for activism— Talking about methodologies to combat oppressive structures makes us better advocates in the future—this is a key pre-requisite to education and fairness claims, even if we learn from debate, that education is useless without the ability to put it to use.

### 1NC—Gun Control K (phil)

#### The Aff’s law and order politics leave the fundamental matrix of capitalism underlying gun violence *untouched.* Bougie gun control is coopted and allows the capitalist class to reassert its hegemony over the oppressed.

WIL 13 (WIL/Socialist Appeal, bombass anticaps, “Gun Control and Class Struggle”, September 13, 2013)//Miro

The recent attacks in Colorado, Connecticut, Boston, and across the country have shocked everyone. As has been previously explained in the pages of Socialist Appeal, these repeated incidents of violence signify the decay of American capitalism. The decline of capitalism offers no future for today’s youth, only distractions, desperation, and escapism. High unemployment, debt, lack of health care facilities, alienation, and a widespread feeling of insecurity is enough to push some over the edge. Only by changing society to one which will give everyone hope of a better future, only by engaging people in a way that they will want to live their lives rather than escape from them, can we put an end to these horrible crimes. However, many capitalist politicians are telling us that there is a quick and easy solution: stricter gun control laws. This “solution” flies in the face of actual experience. Alcoholism is as prevalent and intractable a problem today as it was in the 1920s. In January 1920, the 18th Amendment was put into effect, prohibiting the production and sale of alcohol. The argument was put forward that by banning alcohol, alcoholism would fade away. Nothing of the kind happened. Prohibition strengthened organized crime, giving criminal gangs a monopoly over all aspects of the production and distribution of alcohol, and alcoholism continued as before. Today, states with tough gun control laws like New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and California are still among those that experience the most violent crime involving firearms. Illegal guns are most commonly acquired from other states, by individuals who can legally purchase firearms, and from the illegal sale of guns by licensed dealers. Although this seems like an argument to broaden the strict gun laws to the federal level, there is no reason to assume firearms won’t make their way into the hands of those with malicious intent. There is already an underground market for firearms, and like the prohibition of alcohol in the 1920s, stricter gun control laws would only bolster this lucrative black market. There are already designs on the internet that would allow someone to use a 3D printer to produce a fully functioning handgun out of plastic. And one look at the Mexican drug cartels, which are often better armed than the police and army, shows how ineffective efforts to curb access to guns have been (or the illicit drugs they trade in, for that matter). The “right to bear arms” is a right that has been championed perhaps more in the U.S. than in any other country in the world. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, along with the other nine Amendments that make up the “Bill of Rights,” were a concession on the part of the early American ruling class, in order to pass the less democratic aspects of the constitution such as the creation of the Senate and Supreme Court. At the time of the signing of the Constitution, despite the reining in of the revolutionary energy of the masses by the ruling class, the capitalist system was still young and historically progressive. A strong state apparatus had not yet been developed. The ruling class did not yet need one, as the proletariat had not yet developed into a powerful and massive force constituting the vast majority of society, as is the case today. It could depend on geography and local armed militas for national defense and to put down local uprisings, supplemented by a small standing army, and above all, a strong navy. But things have changed in the United States. The slogan “we are the 99%” is a close approximation to the actual class balance of forces today, with a tiny minority of capitalists on one side, and a mass of workers on the other. The working class has tremendous potential power in its hands—the ability to bring production and society as a whole to a grinding halt. With the capitalist crisis deepening, the ruling class can no longer rely on ideology or a few concessions to keep class peace. In the face of such a threat, the capitalists have developed an imposing state apparatus in order to maintain their rule. Frederick Engels, in his classic work The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, explains the role of the state: “The state is therefore by no means a power imposed on society from without... Rather, it is a product of society at a particular stage of development; it is the admission that this society has involved itself in insoluble self-contradiction and is cleft into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to exorcise. But in order that these antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interests, shall not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, a power, apparently standing above society, has become necessary to moderate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of ‘order’; and this power, arisen out of society, but placing itself above it and increasingly alienating itself from it, is the state.” When capitalist politicians call for “gun control,” they are really saying that the working class majority should give more power to the bourgeois state in determining who should have access to arms. The capitalist class would breathe a sigh of relief at the complete disarmament of the working class. The capitalist state would then have a complete monopoly of arms, on top of its monopoly of the courts, prisons, police, spy agencies, military, etc. Therefore, from the point of view of the capitalist class, the real essence of “gun control” is not the disarming of criminal elements or unstable individuals—who would still have access to guns through illegal channels—it is the disarming of the working class on the whole. We have seen how this has been used in the past. When the Black Panthers had arms for self-defense, the bourgeois state violently attacked them. Far-right groups, on the other hand, are armed to the teeth and the state typically looks the other way. The United States has a long history of gun violence on the part of the state against immigrants, blacks, and against the working class on the whole, especially when they dare to struggle. Nearly every major labor battle in the U.S. has been marked with violent attacks by the state against the striking workers. As one boss infamously put it, his striking workers needed to be “shot back to work.” Against this overwhelming force of the capitalist state, the working class must defend its basic democratic right to defend itself and its organizations, including its right to access arms. There are no quick fixes to the problem of gun violence, and no solutions within the limits of capitalism, a system based on the organized exploitation and violence of one class against another. Only the organized and united working class can offer a solution to the violence of class society, whether it be perpetrated by the capitalist state when breaking a strike, or by unstable and alienated individuals on a killing rampage. The labor movement, by organizing a political party of its own, could begin to deal with the ills of our society—but only if that party is armed with a socialist program. Corporations like Colt and Smith & Wesson make huge profits from the sale of weapons. A workers’ government would nationalize the arms industry and place it under democratic workers’ control. Under a workers’ government, the working class would democratically organize itself to protect society. As socialism spreads worldwide, and relations between nations are increasingly based on solidarity, not expoitation, the need for national defense and the military will fade away, along with national borders themselves. Here at home, the need for a special police force standing above society, with special powers and privileges, would likewise disappear.

#### <<opt>> Gun violence cannot be divorced from the war on people of color. Any efforts to extend the capitalist monopoly of violence must be resisted. Government security forces aren’t neutral—they are enforcers of a system that leaves billions of people disposable

Sherman 12 (Vince Sherman, writer for Return 2 Source, ML Journal, “Three Positions on Gun Control”, 2012)//Miro

The capitalist class and the white middle class in the large cities in the North, West, and Midwest that live in more constricted confines with the working class and oppressed nations push forward this “law and order” gun control policy. Indeed, the US government already has massive gun control measures in place, especially in the major cities like New York and Chicago and states across the nation, which represent the extreme end of this policy, where it’s practically unheard of for average citizens to own firearms legally. These measures don’t restrict mass murderers like Jared Lee Loughner – the shooter in Arizona last year – or Neo-Nazis like Wade Michael Page, who murdered six people at a Sikh Temple in Wisconsin this summer, from acquiring firearms. Instead, they largely restrict the rights of oppressed people who face violence from vigilantes or police from owning guns. It is no surprise then that billionaire Mayor of New York City Michael Bloomberg and his coalition, “Mayors Against Illegal Guns,” are quickly becoming the leading force advancing this agenda. Principally, they support gun control for the same reason the Republican opposed gun control: they are afraid of oppressed nationalities. We quote the website of “Mayors Against Illegal Guns”: “We support the Second Amendment and the rights of citizens to own guns. We recognize the vast majority of gun dealers and gun owners carefully follow the law…But what binds us together is a determination to fight crime, and a belief that we can do more to stop criminals from getting guns while also protecting the rights of citizens to freely own them.” (2) This is a common theme among the liberal gun control advocates: a heavy focus on “crime” and keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, especially in big cities. This position cannot be divorced from the war on drugs and the war on Black and Latino youth, who find themselves disportionately criminalized and imprisoned. Capitalist leaders like Mayor Bloomberg in no way seek to limit the violence visited on working class and oppressed communities. Remember that Bloomberg is responsible for spearheading the blatantly racist “stop and frisk” policies carried out by the NYPD. (3) The NAACP has said of these policies: “Bloomberg’s massive street-level racial profiling program is a civil rights and human rights catastrophe that both hurts our children and makes our communities less safe.” (4) Are we to trust the liberals like Bloomberg, chiefly responsible and complicit in waging the war on black and brown communities, with ending gun violence with new criminal restrictions? Are we to trust the racist criminal justice system and groups like the NYPD whom Bloomberg has called “his army, the 7th largest in the world?” (5) It is no coincidence that liberal bourgeoisie like Bloomberg are silent about gun control for their “private army” when it comes to police violence and murder committed by police, like in the case of unarmed 17 year old Ramarley Graham in New York City. (6) The gun control policies of Bloomberg and reactionary allies, like Chicago Mayor Rahm Emmanuel, are efforts to extend national oppression and the capitalist monopoly on violence, especially over Black and Latino communities. This also serves to keep the working class and discontented elements of society passive in the face of foreclosures, austerity, voter suppression, legislative attacks like Right-to-Work initiatives, and efforts to use state repression to silence social movements like Occupy Wall Street and trade union protesters in Michigan. After all, unarmed protesters are entirely at the mercy of the capitalist class’ “personal army,” leaving them subject to violent repression at protests or on picket lines. It is only natural that these forces support such measures to strip oppressed nationalities and workers from their democratic rights to bear arms: They have their own arms, their own personal security, their own “personal armies”, their police, their courts, their prisons; in other words, the “special bodies of armed men” talked of by Lenin in State & Revolution. They live in gated communities and mansions, while most Black and Latino people live in occupied territory not unlike occupied Afghanistan. The agenda of the liberal Democrats is to strengthen the apparatus of state repression – to increase arms and weapons in the hands of their “personal army” – while keeping guns out of the hands of “criminals” and other “undesirable elements”. This agenda is reflected in the expansion of billions of dollars in state funding to arm police with military hardware to the tune of $34 billion dollars over the past decade. (7) There seems to be no talk of gun control or preventing gun violence when it comes to the army of the capitalist class. There’s no talk of assault weapon bans for the police, who are upgrading to tanks in many cities! (8) Middle class white liberals who live in gated communities, or the “nice” sections of town also don’t have the same worries as our class and our allies. They want to strip “the common rabble” and criminals of their means of self-defense. After all, the police and the ruling class of the United States are their friends. They’re not the ones getting imprisoned, stopped and frisked, or having their homes foreclosed on. However, comrades cannot ignore that gun violence does have a disproportionate and devastating impact in the communities of oppressed people and working class communities. African-Americans are the victim of 54% of all firearm homicides, despite making up just 13% of the population, according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (9) It’s no surprise that gun-related violence disproportionately occurs in the US South, the historical home of Jim Crow and Ku Klux Klan terrorism against Black and Latino people, according to Zara Matheson at the Martin Prosperity Institute. (10) This provides some material appeal to elements of the oppressed nations in regards to these gun control policy. Still, comrades should combat this wolf in sheep’s clothing. The enforcers of this violence are the American capitalist class and white supremacist forces that work to uphold the established order. Trusting them to end violence in the oppressed communities with gun control is the equivalent to entrusting the United States to help Syria and Libya with “humanitarian intervention.” Malcolm X understood the nature of violence by the US government and police, as well as the need for African-Americans to defend themselves from these attacks. We quote him at some length: “Last but not least, I must say this concerning the great controversy over rifles and shotguns. White people been buying rifles all their lives…no commotion. The only thing I’ve ever said is that in areas where the government has proven itself either unwilling or unable to defend the lives and the property of Negroes, it’s time for Negroes to defend themselves. Article number two of the Constitutional amendments provides you and me the right to own a rifle or a shotgun. It is constitutionally legal to own a shotgun or a rifle. This doesn’t mean you’re going to get a rifle and form battalions and go out looking for white folks, although you’d be within your rights – I mean, you’d be justified; but that would be illegal and we don’t do anything illegal. If the white man doesn’t want the black man buying rifles and shotguns, then let the government do its job.” (11) There’s a reason that the Sanford police covered up the shooting of Trayvon Martin this past February, and it was only after massive protests that his killer, George Zimmerman, was arrested. Across this country, the system of white supremacy is reinforced by the underlying threat of violence, whether it comes from police brutality or vigilante terrorism. The response is not to buckle to the pressures of liberals, who trust the very purveyors of violence to protect oppressed people, but for oppressed people to have the ability to defend themselves. Sensible policy on guns for working class and oppressed people in America can only come from a Marxist position. But to do that, we must first analyze and pull apart the muddled position carried by the advanced, progressives, and some of our comrades. The Left-Second Amendment Position In response to the liberal gun control proposals, many people on the US Left embrace a position similar to that espoused by the Right. This “Left-Second Amendment” position unites with the views put forth by the National Rifle Association by dismissing guns as incidental to mass murders like yesterday’s tragedy in Connecticut. In this view, something else – an external cause like mental health or the culture of violence in the US – is chiefly to blame. This is not incorrect. The US is an incredibly violent society, with the greatest purveyor of violence being the US government itself – and that’s not our opinion; that’s the opinion of Martin Luther King Junior, who used those exact words to describe the government on April 4, 1967. We see the evidence of this ‘cultural violence’ everywhere, from movies like Act of Valor, financed by the US military to glorify violence committed against other countries, to police violence inflicted on children and the innocent, like we saw in Anaheim, California, this year. Along the same lines, mental health services in the US are stigmatized and woefully underfunded. It’s no coincidence that many of the perpetrators of these mass killings have had severe mental health crises; crises that were more often than not identified but not adequately treated. The Left-Second Amendment position boils down to the pressing concern over the state having a monopoly on violence. When we look back in history, oppressed people have never won their freedom without armed struggle. In many cases, the lack of an armed populace has led directly to the rise of brutal fascist regimes, like in Chile and Spain. In 1973, the workers in Chile were underprepared to defeat the fascist coup d’etat that overthrew elected President Salvador Allende because of the government’s refusal to arm the people. During the Spanish Civil War almost four decades earlier, the social democratic government was similarly reluctant to arm the workers to resist Franco’s fascist brigades. And of course everyone knows of Adolf Hitler’s infamous ban on citizens owning guns after the rise of the Nazis. In essence, many leftists view guns as a means of self-defense for oppressed people and a safeguard against fascism. This leads them to oppose gun control measures, i.e. the liberal position on gun control. However, the Left-Second Amendment position mistakenly adopts the Right’s view of the right to bear arms as a philosophical abstraction, rather than a material reality. In practice, the Constitution does not protect the rights of oppressed people to bear arms. Even the most vocal advocates of the Second Amendment have no objection to regulations on firearm ownership by the people who need it most to defend their class and national interests from right-wing vigilantes and state power.

#### Capitalism is the driving force of planetary crisis—war, brutality, dehumanization, warming. Focus on ideal theory is a tool to quell dissent.

Vltchek 16 (Andre Vltchek, a philosopher, novelist, filmmaker and investigative journalist. He covered wars and conflicts in dozens of countries. His latest books are: “Exposing Lies Of The Empire” and “Fighting Against Western Imperialism”, “Academia: Hands off Revolutionary Philosophy!”, Feb 26 2016)//Miro I DO NOT ENDORSE ANY OF THE GENDERED LANGUAGE IN THIS CARD. IT IS UNACCEPTABLE AND ONLY KEPT HERE TO PRESERVE THE ORIGINAL SOURCE.

Philosophers have been muzzled by the Western global regime; most of great modern philosophy concealed from the masses. What has been left of it, allowed to float on the surface is toothless, irrelevant and incomprehensible: a foolish outdated theoretical field for those few remaining intellectual snobs. Philosophy used to be the most precious crown jewel of human intellectual achievement. It stood at the vanguard of almost all fights for a better world. Gramsci was a philosopher, and so were Lenin, Mao Tse-tung, Ho-Chi-Minh, Guevara, Castro, Frantz Fanon, Senghors, Cabral, Nyerere and Lumumba, to name just a few. To be a thinker, a philosopher, in ancient China, Japan or even in some parts of the West, was the most respected human ‘occupation’. In all ‘normally’ developing societies, knowledge has been valued much higher than material possessions or naked power. In ancient Greece and China, people were able to understand the majority of their philosophers. There was nothing “exclusive” in the desire to know and interpret the world. Philosophers spoke to the people, for the people. Some still do. But that whoring and servile Western academic gang, which has locked philosophy behind the university walls, viciously sidelines such men and women. Instead of leading people to the barricades, instead of addressing the most urgent issues our world is now facing, official philosophers are fighting amongst themselves for tenures, offering their brains and bodies to the Empire. At best, they are endlessly recycling each other, spoiling millions of pages of paper with footnotes, comparing conclusions made by Derrida and Nietzsche, hopelessly stuck at exhausted ideas of Kant and Hegel. At worst, they are outrightly evil – making still relevant revolutionary philosophical concepts totally incomprehensible, attacking them, and even disappearing them from the face of the Earth. \*\*\* Only the official breed, consisting of almost exclusively white/Western ‘thought recyclers’, is now awarded the right to be called ‘philosophers’. My friends in all corners of the world, some of the brightest people on earth, are never defined as such. The word ‘philosopher’ still carries at least some great theoretical prestige, and god forbid if those who are now fighting against Western terror, for social justice or true freedom of thought, were to be labeled as such! But they are, of course, all great philosophers! And they don’t recycle – they go forward, advancing brilliant new concepts that can improve life on our Planet. Some have fallen, some are still alive, and some are still relatively young: Eduardo Galeano – one of the greatest storytellers of all times, and a dedicated fighter against Western imperialism. Noam Chomsky – renowned linguist and relentless fighter against Western fascism. Pramoedya Ananta Toer – former prisoner of conscience in Suharto’s camps and the greatest novelist of Southeast Asia. John Steppling – brilliant American playwright and thinker. Christopher Black – Canadian international lawyer and fighter against illegal neo-colonialist concepts of the Empire. Peter Koenig – renowned economist and thinker. Milan Kohout, thinker and performer, fighter against European racism. Yes – all these great thinkers; all of them, philosophers! And many more that I know and love – in Africa and Latin America and Asia especially… For those who insist that in order to be called a philosopher, one has to be equipped with some stamp that shows that the person has passed a test and is allowed to serve the Empire, here is proof to the contrary: Even according to the Dictionary of Modern American philosophers (online ed.). New York: Oxford University Press: “The label of “philosopher” has been broadly applied in this Dictionary to intellectuals who have made philosophical contributions regardless of academic career or professional title. The wide scope of philosophical activity across the time-span of this Dictionary would now be classed among the various humanities and social sciences which gradually separated from philosophy over the last one hundred and fifty years. Many figures included were not academic philosophers but did work at philosophical foundations of such fields as pedagogy, rhetoric, the arts, history, politics, economics, sociology, psychology, linguistics, anthropology, religion, and theology.” \*\*\* In his brilliant upcoming book Aesthetic Resistance and Dis-Interest, my friend John Steppling quotes, Hullot-Kentor: “If art – when art is art – understands us better than we can intentionally understand ourselves, then a philosophy of art would need to comprehend what understands us. Thinking would need to become critically imminent to that object; subjectivity would become the capacity of its object, not simply its manipulation. That’s the center of Adorno’s aesthetics. It’s an idea of thought that is considerably different from the sense of contemporary “theory”, where everyone feels urged to compare Derrida with Nietzsche, the two of them with Levinas, and all of them now with Badiou, Žižek and Agamben. That kind of thinking is primarily manipulation. It’s the bureaucratic mind unconsciously flexing the form of social control it has internalized and wants to turn on others.” Western academia is rigidly defining, which lines of thought are acceptable for philosophers to use, as well as what analyses, and what forms. Those who refuse to comply are ‘not true philosophers’. They are dilettantes, ‘amateurs’. And those who are not embraced by some ‘reputable’ institution are not to be taken seriously at all (especially if they are carrying Russian, Asian, African, Middle Eastern or Latino names). It is a little bit like with journalism. Unless you have an ‘important’ media outlet behind you (preferably a Western one), unless you can show that the Empire truly trusts you, your press card is worth nothing, and you would not even be allowed to board a UN or a military flight to a war zone. Your readers, even if numbering millions, may see you as an important philosopher. But let’s be frank: unless the Empire stamps its seal of acceptance on your forehead of backside, in the West you are really nothing more than worthless shit! \*\*\* BLURRING THE WORK OF REVOLUTIONARY PHILOSOPHERS After all that I have witnessed and written, I am increasingly convinced that Western imperialism and neo-colonialism are the most urgent and dangerous challenges facing our Planet. Perhaps the only challenges… I have seen 160 countries in all corners of the Globe. I have witnessed wars, conflicts, imperialist theft and indescribable brutality of white tyrants. And so, recently, I sensed that it is time to revisit two great thinkers of the 20th Century, two determined fighters against Western imperialist fascism: Frantz Fanon and Jean-Paul Sartre. The Wretched of the Earth, and Black Skin, White Masks – two essential books by Frantz Omar Fanon, a Martinique-born Afro-Caribbean psychiatrist, philosopher, revolutionary, and writer, and a dedicated fighter against Western colonialism. And Colonialism and Neocolonialism, a still greatly relevant book by Jean-Paul Sartre, a prominent French resistance fighter, philosopher, playwright and novelist… I had all three books in my library and, after many years, it was time to read them again. But my English edition of Colonialism and Neocolonialism was wrapped in dozens of pages of prefaces and introductions. The ‘intellectual cushioning’ was too thick and at some point I lost interest, leaving the book in Japan. Then in Kerala I picked up another, this time Indian edition. Again, some 60 pages of prefaces and introductions, pre-chewed intrusive and patronizing explanations of how I am supposed to perceive both Sartre and his interactions with Fanon, Memmi and others. And yes, it all suddenly began moving again into that pre-chewed but still indigestible “Derrida-Nietzsche” swamp. Instead of evoking outrage and wrath, instead of inspiring me into taking concrete revolutionary action, those prefaces, back covers, introductions and comments were clearly castrating and choking the great messages of both Sartre and Fanon. They were preventing readers and fellow philosophers from getting to the core. Then finally, when reaching the real text of Sartre, it all becomes clear – why exactly is the regime so determined to “protect” readers from the originals. It is because the core, the original, is extremely simple and powerful. The words are relevant, and easy to understand. They are describing both old French colonialist barbarities, as the current Western neo-colonialism. God forbid someone puts two and two together! Philosopher Sartre on China and Western fascist cultural propaganda: “As a child, I was a victim of the picturesque: everything had been done to make the Chinese intimidating. I was told about rotten eggs… of men sawn between two planks of wood, of piping and discordant music… [The Chinese] were tiny and terrible, slipping between your fingers, attacked from behind, burst out suddenly in a ridiculous din… There was also the Chinese soul, which I was simply told was inscrutable. ‘Orientals, you see…’ The Negroes did not worry me; I had been taught that they were good dogs. With them, we were still among mammals. But the Asians frightened me…” Sartre on Western colonialism and racism: “Racism is inscribed in the events themselves, in the institutions, in the nature of the exchange and the production. The political and social statuses reinforce one another: since the natives are sub-human, the Declaration of Human Rights does not apply to them; conversely, since they have no rights, they are abandoned without protection to the inhuman forces of nature, to the ‘iron laws’ of economics…” And Sartre goes further: “Western humanism and rights discourse had worked by excluding a majority of the world’s population from the category of humans.” I address the same issues and so is Chomsky. But the Empire does not want people to know that Sartre, Memmi and Fanon spoke ‘the same language’ as we do, already more than half a century ago! Albert Memmi: “Conservatism engenders the selection of mediocre people. How can this elite of usurpers, conscious of their mediocrity, justify their privileges? Only one way: diminish the colonized in order to exult themselves, deny the status of human beings to the natives, and deprive them of basic rights…” Sartre on Western ignorance: “It is not cynicism, it is not hatred that is demoralizing us: no, it is only the state of false ignorance in which we are made to live and which we ourselves contribute to maintaining…” The way the West ‘educates’ the world, Sartre again: “The European elite set about fabricating a native elite; they selected adolescents, marked on their foreheads, with a branding iron, the principles of Western culture, stuffed into their mouths verbal gags, grand turgid words which stuck to their teeth; after a brief stay in the mother country, they were sent back, interfered with…” \*\*\* It is actually easy to learn how to recycle the thoughts of others, how to compare them and at the end, how to compile footnotes. It takes time, it is boring, tedious and generally useless, but not really too difficult. On the other hand, it is difficult to create brand new concepts, to revolutionize the way our societies, and our world are arranged. If our brains recycle too much and try to create too little, they get lazy and sclerotic – chronically sclerotic. Intellectual servility is a degenerative disease. Western art has deteriorated to ugly psychedelic beats, to excessively bright colors and infantile geometric drawings, to cartoons and nightmarish and violent films as well as “fiction”. It is all very convenient – with all that noise, one cannot hear anymore the screams of the victims, one cannot understand loneliness, and comprehend emptiness. In bookstores, all over the world, poetry and philosophy sections are shrinking or outright disappearing. Now what? Is it going to be Althusser (mostly not even real Althusser, but a recycled and abbreviated one), or Lévi-Strauss or Derrida, each wrapped in endless litanies of academic talk? No! Comrades, philosophers, not that! Down with the sclerotic, whoring academia and their interpretation of philosophy! Down with the assassins of Philosophy! Philosophy is supposed to be the intellectual vanguard. It is synonymous with revolution, humanism, and rebellion.

#### The alternative is to uphold gun ownership as a *right of the working class*—this rejects reactionary gun politics but also liberal disenfranchisement.

Sherman 12 (Vince Sherman, writer for Return 2 Source, ML Journal, “Three Positions on Gun Control”, 2012)//Miro

The Marxist position on gun control is unequivocally upholding the right of workers and oppressed nationalities to bear arms. In direct refutation of the Left-Second Amendment position, which upholds the right to bear arms as an abstract constitutional right, the Marxist position upholds gun ownership as a class right. Similarly, class rights directly confront the liberal belief that the state should be the predominant or sole trustee of firearms. By classifying the right to bear arms as a class right, rather than a ‘human’, ‘constitutional’, or ‘natural’ right, the Marxist position upholds the social character of gun ownership. The Second Amendment enshrines the right to bear arms as an individual right set in place to protect individuals and their property from threats. Under capitalism, this translates into principally a ruling class and petty-bourgeois right since these are the classes that own “property,” i.e. capital, businesses, the means of production. ‘Open-Carry’ or ‘Concealed-Carry’? We see further evidence of the reactionary character of the Second Amendment when looking at the prevalence of ‘concealed-carry’ state laws versus ‘open-carry’ state laws. ‘Open-Carry’ – allowing people to publicly carry firearms – is a social means of exercising the right to bear arms. As the Black Panther Party understood, the known presence of firearms allows oppressed people to better police their own communities and challenge the authority of the state without firing a single shot. The right to bear arms thereby becomes ‘social’ because it is a public exercise of power. Consider why the police openly carry their firearms. The state allows its officers and agents to publicly display their firearms to deter confrontations with said agents. It is a silent exercise of state power. Reagan banned the open-carry of loaded firearms in California precisely in reaction to the Black Panthers’ practices. If an African-American was stopped and harassed by a police officer, an openly armed Panther cadre would enter the scene to give legal counsel to the person facing police harassment. The Panthers challenged the state’s perceived monopoly on violence by acting as “a well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free [Black] State.” In fact, California is one of seven states in the US to have outright bans on open-carry. Not surprisingly, the other six states with these bans – Illinois, Texas, New York, Florida, South Carolina, and Arkansas – are either the most populous and multinational, or located in the heart of the Black Belt South. Not coincidentally, though, all 50 states in the US allow the concealed-carry of firearms. Illinois was the one state that upheld a ban on concealed-carry, but the US Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals struck down that ban a week ago. (15) Concealed-carry caters to the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois class nature of the Second Amendment, which allows individuals to ‘protect themselves from attacks in public’. From Bernhard Goetz in 1984 to George Zimmerman in 2012, this right has generally manifested itself in white men gunning down Blacks and Latinos on the basis that they ‘felt threatened’. Concealed-carry individualizes, rather than socializes, the right to bear arms. The Right uses concealed-carry laws to expand the legal basis for the murder of African-Americans and Latinos through Stand Your Ground laws. Even the NRA backhandedly agrees with bans on open-carry, calling the repeal of these bans “not a priority.” (16) Instead, the NRA’s far-right membership dedicatedly works to expand concealed-carry, which offers no legal basis for oppressed people to socially exercise the right to bear arms. The Social Organization of the Right to Bear Arms On picket lines, strikers in the 1930s regularly had to defend themselves and their fellow workers from company-hired paramilitaries. As far back as the Homestead Strike in 1892 involving Steelworkers and the Battle of Blair Mountain involving Coal Miners, the capitalist class has openly resorted to violence in order to crush the demands of striking workers. Looking at restoring a militant strike movement as one of the main objectives of the progressive labor movement, it would be a folly to support increased gun control, which would allow the state, the capitalist class and its supporters to monopolize guns. While not all proposed gun control methods would completely curb access to firearms, Marxists should oppose any restrictions that further reduce the ability of oppressed people and workers to defend themselves or deter violence. The disastrous consequences of gun control on the workers’ movement came full-circle during the South African Miner’s strike this year, in which state police opened fire killing 34 miners, armed mostly with clubs and other such weapons. A modern picket line with workers legally and openly carrying arms in self-defense would represent a strong deterrent to violent attempts to break up the strike by management, vigilantes or illegal police actions, like the ones that occurred in South Africa. Many comrades will find that workers, and especially people of the oppressed nations in the US instinctively understand that the police force represents the ruling class and not their interests. Presenting the question of gun ownership in terms of class opens up workers to realizing that gun control is a question of democratic and class rights. Many workers understand reasonable gun rights and even gun control, but they will also reject the idea when presented with the prospect of surrendering their democratic right while the rich and their personal army get to hold onto this right. In a March 1850 Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League, Karl Marx described the need for workers to exercise the right to bear arms through social organization independent of the state. We will quote him at some length: To be able forcefully and threateningly to oppose this party, whose betrayal of the workers will begin with the very first hour of victory, the workers must be armed and organized. The whole proletariat must be armed at once with muskets, rifles, cannon and ammunition, and the revival of the old-style citizens’ militia, directed against the workers, must be opposed. Where the formation of this militia cannot be prevented, the workers must try to organize themselves independently as a proletarian guard, with elected leaders and with their own elected general staff; they must try to place themselves not under the orders of the state authority but of the revolutionary local councils set up by the workers. Where the workers are employed by the state, they must arm and organize themselves into special corps with elected leaders, or as a part of the proletarian guard. Under no pretext should arms and ammunition be surrendered; any attempt to disarm the workers must be frustrated, by force if necessary. The destruction of the bourgeois democrats’ influence over the workers, and the enforcement of conditions which will compromise the rule of bourgeois democracy, which is for the moment inevitable, and make it as difficult as possible – these are the main points which the proletariat and therefore the League must keep in mind during and after the approaching uprising. (17) In the underlined portion of the quote selected above, Marx describes the security functions of what the Bolsheviks would later call ‘Soviets’, or workers councils. Writing in London, Marx was warning against English attempts to co-opt independent armed bodies of workers by reviving citizens militias, which were directed and organized by the state to supposedly police communities. In actuality, these bodies served the interest of the capitalist state, making them functionally analogous to the gun control demands of the liberals today. Marx instead recognized the necessity of workers organizing themselves and defending the right to bear arms through political struggle. This right would not be exercised individually through concealed-carry or for personal security, but it was instead a social right of the working class to defend their gains and interests. In the oppressed nations within the United States, open-carry and the class right to bear arms has a rich history in America of forwarding national liberation. From countering white terrorism during Reconstruction, to the CPUSA again fighting off the Klan in the 1930’s, to the Black Panthers patrolling black communities, the right of Black armed organizations has been a guarantor of their democratic rights. Every instance of this has been organized, not on individual basis of “concealed-carrying” a handgun for individual defense, but as disciplined groups acting practically as the police force or army of the black nation itself. This, in essence, is the social right to bear arms. The American working class and the Black and Chican@ nations should have the right and authority in their respective organizations to decide how to best manage gun rights in their communities. The answers lie in organizations and successful practices of the past, in contrast to the white liberal proposal to rely on the capitalist police forces’ monopoly on violence for protection.

#### The role of the judge is to act as a critical educator combating oppression—while obviously signing the ballot won’t make neoliberalism disappear, voting for strategies to combat oppression *in this round* makes us better activists in the future.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Best for activism— Talking about methodologies to combat oppressive structures makes us better advocates in the future—this is a key pre-requisite to education and fairness claims, even if we learn from debate, that education is useless without the ability to put it to use.

### 1NC—Gun Control K (main)

#### <<opt>>

#### The year is 1976, and in California, Governor Reagan has just banned the open-carry of firearms. Yes. That Reagan—y’know, the conservative hero one. Why would he of all people institute gun control? Because revolutionary forces like the Black Panther Party had started arming themselves to challenge the state’s monopoly on violence. This is not an isolated instance—gun control has historically been used to disenfranchise the most oppressed: from the Black Codes to modern day Stop and Frisk.

#### <<Links>>

#### The Aff’s law and order politics leave the fundamental matrix of capitalism underlying gun violence *untouched.* Bougie gun control is coopted and allows the capitalist class to reassert its hegemony over the oppressed.

WIL 13 (WIL/Socialist Appeal, bombass anticaps, “Gun Control and Class Struggle”, September 13, 2013)//Miro

The recent attacks in Colorado, Connecticut, Boston, and across the country have shocked everyone. As has been previously explained in the pages of Socialist Appeal, these repeated incidents of violence signify the decay of American capitalism. The decline of capitalism offers no future for today’s youth, only distractions, desperation, and escapism. High unemployment, debt, lack of health care facilities, alienation, and a widespread feeling of insecurity is enough to push some over the edge. Only by changing society to one which will give everyone hope of a better future, only by engaging people in a way that they will want to live their lives rather than escape from them, can we put an end to these horrible crimes. However, many capitalist politicians are telling us that there is a quick and easy solution: stricter gun control laws. This “solution” flies in the face of actual experience. Alcoholism is as prevalent and intractable a problem today as it was in the 1920s. In January 1920, the 18th Amendment was put into effect, prohibiting the production and sale of alcohol. The argument was put forward that by banning alcohol, alcoholism would fade away. Nothing of the kind happened. Prohibition strengthened organized crime, giving criminal gangs a monopoly over all aspects of the production and distribution of alcohol, and alcoholism continued as before. Today, states with tough gun control laws like New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and California are still among those that experience the most violent crime involving firearms. Illegal guns are most commonly acquired from other states, by individuals who can legally purchase firearms, and from the illegal sale of guns by licensed dealers. Although this seems like an argument to broaden the strict gun laws to the federal level, there is no reason to assume firearms won’t make their way into the hands of those with malicious intent. There is already an underground market for firearms, and like the prohibition of alcohol in the 1920s, stricter gun control laws would only bolster this lucrative black market. There are already designs on the internet that would allow someone to use a 3D printer to produce a fully functioning handgun out of plastic. And one look at the Mexican drug cartels, which are often better armed than the police and army, shows how ineffective efforts to curb access to guns have been (or the illicit drugs they trade in, for that matter). The “right to bear arms” is a right that has been championed perhaps more in the U.S. than in any other country in the world. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, along with the other nine Amendments that make up the “Bill of Rights,” were a concession on the part of the early American ruling class, in order to pass the less democratic aspects of the constitution such as the creation of the Senate and Supreme Court. At the time of the signing of the Constitution, despite the reining in of the revolutionary energy of the masses by the ruling class, the capitalist system was still young and historically progressive. A strong state apparatus had not yet been developed. The ruling class did not yet need one, as the proletariat had not yet developed into a powerful and massive force constituting the vast majority of society, as is the case today. It could depend on geography and local armed militas for national defense and to put down local uprisings, supplemented by a small standing army, and above all, a strong navy. But things have changed in the United States. The slogan “we are the 99%” is a close approximation to the actual class balance of forces today, with a tiny minority of capitalists on one side, and a mass of workers on the other. The working class has tremendous potential power in its hands—the ability to bring production and society as a whole to a grinding halt. With the capitalist crisis deepening, the ruling class can no longer rely on ideology or a few concessions to keep class peace. In the face of such a threat, the capitalists have developed an imposing state apparatus in order to maintain their rule. Frederick Engels, in his classic work The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, explains the role of the state: “The state is therefore by no means a power imposed on society from without... Rather, it is a product of society at a particular stage of development; it is the admission that this society has involved itself in insoluble self-contradiction and is cleft into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to exorcise. But in order that these antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interests, shall not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, a power, apparently standing above society, has become necessary to moderate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of ‘order’; and this power, arisen out of society, but placing itself above it and increasingly alienating itself from it, is the state.” When capitalist politicians call for “gun control,” they are really saying that the working class majority should give more power to the bourgeois state in determining who should have access to arms. The capitalist class would breathe a sigh of relief at the complete disarmament of the working class. The capitalist state would then have a complete monopoly of arms, on top of its monopoly of the courts, prisons, police, spy agencies, military, etc. Therefore, from the point of view of the capitalist class, the real essence of “gun control” is not the disarming of criminal elements or unstable individuals—who would still have access to guns through illegal channels—it is the disarming of the working class on the whole. We have seen how this has been used in the past. When the Black Panthers had arms for self-defense, the bourgeois state violently attacked them. Far-right groups, on the other hand, are armed to the teeth and the state typically looks the other way. The United States has a long history of gun violence on the part of the state against immigrants, blacks, and against the working class on the whole, especially when they dare to struggle. Nearly every major labor battle in the U.S. has been marked with violent attacks by the state against the striking workers. As one boss infamously put it, his striking workers needed to be “shot back to work.” Against this overwhelming force of the capitalist state, the working class must defend its basic democratic right to defend itself and its organizations, including its right to access arms. There are no quick fixes to the problem of gun violence, and no solutions within the limits of capitalism, a system based on the organized exploitation and violence of one class against another. Only the organized and united working class can offer a solution to the violence of class society, whether it be perpetrated by the capitalist state when breaking a strike, or by unstable and alienated individuals on a killing rampage. The labor movement, by organizing a political party of its own, could begin to deal with the ills of our society—but only if that party is armed with a socialist program. Corporations like Colt and Smith & Wesson make huge profits from the sale of weapons. A workers’ government would nationalize the arms industry and place it under democratic workers’ control. Under a workers’ government, the working class would democratically organize itself to protect society. As socialism spreads worldwide, and relations between nations are increasingly based on solidarity, not expoitation, the need for national defense and the military will fade away, along with national borders themselves. Here at home, the need for a special police force standing above society, with special powers and privileges, would likewise disappear.

#### Gun violence cannot be divorced from the war on people of color. Any efforts to extend the capitalist monopoly of violence must be resisted. Government security forces aren’t neutral—they are enforcers of a system that leaves billions of people disposable

Sherman 12 (Vince Sherman, writer for Return 2 Source, ML Journal, “Three Positions on Gun Control”, 2012)//Miro

The capitalist class and the white middle class in the large cities in the North, West, and Midwest that live in more constricted confines with the working class and oppressed nations push forward this “law and order” gun control policy. Indeed, the US government already has massive gun control measures in place, especially in the major cities like New York and Chicago and states across the nation, which represent the extreme end of this policy, where it’s practically unheard of for average citizens to own firearms legally. These measures don’t restrict mass murderers like Jared Lee Loughner – the shooter in Arizona last year – or Neo-Nazis like Wade Michael Page, who murdered six people at a Sikh Temple in Wisconsin this summer, from acquiring firearms. Instead, they largely restrict the rights of oppressed people who face violence from vigilantes or police from owning guns. It is no surprise then that billionaire Mayor of New York City Michael Bloomberg and his coalition, “Mayors Against Illegal Guns,” are quickly becoming the leading force advancing this agenda. Principally, they support gun control for the same reason the Republican opposed gun control: they are afraid of oppressed nationalities. We quote the website of “Mayors Against Illegal Guns”: “We support the Second Amendment and the rights of citizens to own guns. We recognize the vast majority of gun dealers and gun owners carefully follow the law…But what binds us together is a determination to fight crime, and a belief that we can do more to stop criminals from getting guns while also protecting the rights of citizens to freely own them.” (2) This is a common theme among the liberal gun control advocates: a heavy focus on “crime” and keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, especially in big cities. This position cannot be divorced from the war on drugs and the war on Black and Latino youth, who find themselves disportionately criminalized and imprisoned. Capitalist leaders like Mayor Bloomberg in no way seek to limit the violence visited on working class and oppressed communities. Remember that Bloomberg is responsible for spearheading the blatantly racist “stop and frisk” policies carried out by the NYPD. (3) The NAACP has said of these policies: “Bloomberg’s massive street-level racial profiling program is a civil rights and human rights catastrophe that both hurts our children and makes our communities less safe.” (4) Are we to trust the liberals like Bloomberg, chiefly responsible and complicit in waging the war on black and brown communities, with ending gun violence with new criminal restrictions? Are we to trust the racist criminal justice system and groups like the NYPD whom Bloomberg has called “his army, the 7th largest in the world?” (5) It is no coincidence that liberal bourgeoisie like Bloomberg are silent about gun control for their “private army” when it comes to police violence and murder committed by police, like in the case of unarmed 17 year old Ramarley Graham in New York City. (6) The gun control policies of Bloomberg and reactionary allies, like Chicago Mayor Rahm Emmanuel, are efforts to extend national oppression and the capitalist monopoly on violence, especially over Black and Latino communities. This also serves to keep the working class and discontented elements of society passive in the face of foreclosures, austerity, voter suppression, legislative attacks like Right-to-Work initiatives, and efforts to use state repression to silence social movements like Occupy Wall Street and trade union protesters in Michigan. After all, unarmed protesters are entirely at the mercy of the capitalist class’ “personal army,” leaving them subject to violent repression at protests or on picket lines. It is only natural that these forces support such measures to strip oppressed nationalities and workers from their democratic rights to bear arms: They have their own arms, their own personal security, their own “personal armies”, their police, their courts, their prisons; in other words, the “special bodies of armed men” talked of by Lenin in State & Revolution. They live in gated communities and mansions, while most Black and Latino people live in occupied territory not unlike occupied Afghanistan. The agenda of the liberal Democrats is to strengthen the apparatus of state repression – to increase arms and weapons in the hands of their “personal army” – while keeping guns out of the hands of “criminals” and other “undesirable elements”. This agenda is reflected in the expansion of billions of dollars in state funding to arm police with military hardware to the tune of $34 billion dollars over the past decade. (7) There seems to be no talk of gun control or preventing gun violence when it comes to the army of the capitalist class. There’s no talk of assault weapon bans for the police, who are upgrading to tanks in many cities! (8) Middle class white liberals who live in gated communities, or the “nice” sections of town also don’t have the same worries as our class and our allies. They want to strip “the common rabble” and criminals of their means of self-defense. After all, the police and the ruling class of the United States are their friends. They’re not the ones getting imprisoned, stopped and frisked, or having their homes foreclosed on. However, comrades cannot ignore that gun violence does have a disproportionate and devastating impact in the communities of oppressed people and working class communities. African-Americans are the victim of 54% of all firearm homicides, despite making up just 13% of the population, according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (9) It’s no surprise that gun-related violence disproportionately occurs in the US South, the historical home of Jim Crow and Ku Klux Klan terrorism against Black and Latino people, according to Zara Matheson at the Martin Prosperity Institute. (10) This provides some material appeal to elements of the oppressed nations in regards to these gun control policy. Still, comrades should combat this wolf in sheep’s clothing. The enforcers of this violence are the American capitalist class and white supremacist forces that work to uphold the established order. Trusting them to end violence in the oppressed communities with gun control is the equivalent to entrusting the United States to help Syria and Libya with “humanitarian intervention.” Malcolm X understood the nature of violence by the US government and police, as well as the need for African-Americans to defend themselves from these attacks. We quote him at some length: “Last but not least, I must say this concerning the great controversy over rifles and shotguns. White people been buying rifles all their lives…no commotion. The only thing I’ve ever said is that in areas where the government has proven itself either unwilling or unable to defend the lives and the property of Negroes, it’s time for Negroes to defend themselves. Article number two of the Constitutional amendments provides you and me the right to own a rifle or a shotgun. It is constitutionally legal to own a shotgun or a rifle. This doesn’t mean you’re going to get a rifle and form battalions and go out looking for white folks, although you’d be within your rights – I mean, you’d be justified; but that would be illegal and we don’t do anything illegal. If the white man doesn’t want the black man buying rifles and shotguns, then let the government do its job.” (11) There’s a reason that the Sanford police covered up the shooting of Trayvon Martin this past February, and it was only after massive protests that his killer, George Zimmerman, was arrested. Across this country, the system of white supremacy is reinforced by the underlying threat of violence, whether it comes from police brutality or vigilante terrorism. The response is not to buckle to the pressures of liberals, who trust the very purveyors of violence to protect oppressed people, but for oppressed people to have the ability to defend themselves. Sensible policy on guns for working class and oppressed people in America can only come from a Marxist position. But to do that, we must first analyze and pull apart the muddled position carried by the advanced, progressives, and some of our comrades. The Left-Second Amendment Position In response to the liberal gun control proposals, many people on the US Left embrace a position similar to that espoused by the Right. This “Left-Second Amendment” position unites with the views put forth by the National Rifle Association by dismissing guns as incidental to mass murders like yesterday’s tragedy in Connecticut. In this view, something else – an external cause like mental health or the culture of violence in the US – is chiefly to blame. This is not incorrect. The US is an incredibly violent society, with the greatest purveyor of violence being the US government itself – and that’s not our opinion; that’s the opinion of Martin Luther King Junior, who used those exact words to describe the government on April 4, 1967. We see the evidence of this ‘cultural violence’ everywhere, from movies like Act of Valor, financed by the US military to glorify violence committed against other countries, to police violence inflicted on children and the innocent, like we saw in Anaheim, California, this year. Along the same lines, mental health services in the US are stigmatized and woefully underfunded. It’s no coincidence that many of the perpetrators of these mass killings have had severe mental health crises; crises that were more often than not identified but not adequately treated. The Left-Second Amendment position boils down to the pressing concern over the state having a monopoly on violence. When we look back in history, oppressed people have never won their freedom without armed struggle. In many cases, the lack of an armed populace has led directly to the rise of brutal fascist regimes, like in Chile and Spain. In 1973, the workers in Chile were underprepared to defeat the fascist coup d’etat that overthrew elected President Salvador Allende because of the government’s refusal to arm the people. During the Spanish Civil War almost four decades earlier, the social democratic government was similarly reluctant to arm the workers to resist Franco’s fascist brigades. And of course everyone knows of Adolf Hitler’s infamous ban on citizens owning guns after the rise of the Nazis. In essence, many leftists view guns as a means of self-defense for oppressed people and a safeguard against fascism. This leads them to oppose gun control measures, i.e. the liberal position on gun control. However, the Left-Second Amendment position mistakenly adopts the Right’s view of the right to bear arms as a philosophical abstraction, rather than a material reality. In practice, the Constitution does not protect the rights of oppressed people to bear arms. Even the most vocal advocates of the Second Amendment have no objection to regulations on firearm ownership by the people who need it most to defend their class and national interests from right-wing vigilantes and state power.

#### <<opt>>

#### The affirmative relies upon the unquestioned assumption that gun control will leave the guns in the hands of those who are supposed to have it: the Police. But police aren’t neutral defenders of society—they protect property and continued wage slavery.

Martin 13 (Louis Martin, Writer for the militant, ‘A Marxist view of "gun control"’, 2013)//Miro

And many want to restrict workers' access to guns, seeking a monopoly on arms in the hands of their cops and military forces. The Second Amendment to the Constitution—like the rest of the Bill of Rights won in struggle by workers and farmers that serve as restrictions on and protections from the government—guarantees the "right of the people to keep and bear arms" against government infringement. Opponents of the Second Amendment argue that "public safety" necessitates scrapping that right as a relic of the past enacted in a different period when popular militias existed and before the invention of automatic weapons. But working people are not safer with a monopoly of firearms in the hands of cops and other armed bodies whose job is to protect property and prerogatives of the capitalist exploiters. Defending all workers' rights against stepped-up encroachments by the bosses and their government become more, not less important today, as the employing class mounts assaults on our wages and working conditions. The Second Amendment is among the constitutional protections that working people wielded as part of the mass proletarian fight for Black rights in the 1960s. Groups like the Deacons for Defense and Justice and Robert Williams' NAACP chapter in Monroe, N.C., maintained their right to bear arms and used them to stay the hand of racist thugs and cops, protect social protest actions and Black communities and prevent bloodshed. At the same time, the working-class movement has nothing in common with the gun-rights politics of rightist militia outfits or with vigilante "justice" and so-called Stand Your Ground laws that promote them. But the working-class political battle against such reactionary movements and laws cannot be advanced by calls for government restrictions on any rights of working people. Anti-social violence and senseless murder do not come from video games or legal rights to own guns. They are not a product of too many constitutional rights or too few armed cops at every corner. They are first and foremost a by-product of social relations under capitalism—buttressed by cop brutality, deaths and maimings on the job, and bloody wars of conquest abroad. And violent crimes within the working class can be exacerbated by the myriad social pressures that mount under the grinding effects of the capitalist crisis. At the same time, the rise of mass working-class struggles to come will replace capitalism's dog-eat-dog values with social solidarity, just as they always have in the past. It's this solidarity and the transformation of working people and their view of themselves that develops in the course of struggle against capitalist exploitation that is the most powerful weapon against anti-social behavior of all kinds.

#### Gun control is a band-aid reform that only serves to legitimate the state as purveyor of violence while ignoring the fact that the US government is the largest gun runner in the world.

Lee 13 (Daniel Lee, writer for the Oklahoma Workers' Monthly, “A Marxist-Leninist response to Gun Control”, 2013)//Miro

In a recent editorial piece published by Peoples World, the newspaper of the CPUSA, titled “Guns, profits and Sandy Hook” – the article started by opening with the need for the country to “get serious about regulating guns.” It pontificates further, giving a perfunctory nod to universal health access as “a piece of the puzzle” to preventing the epidemic of gun violence. The editorial then issues a call for a “broad enough coalition to confront and curb those who profit from manufacturing and dealing in these individual weapons of mass destruction”. It places the blame squarely on the gun lobbyists, and the corporations that profit from the sale of guns. The article ends finally in demanding a “Ban [of] assault weapons and high capacity bullet clips”. This article, which could have been written by any bourgeois Democrat or liberal group from Nancy Pelosi to Moveon.org, buys into the reactionary “liberal” approach of treating the symptom without curing the disease. Certainly those profiting off of the sale of weapons through the promotion of violence and racism must be made accountable for their exploitation and oppression of our fellow workers – and let us not forget that the US Government is one of the largest gun runners in the world, fueling instability, murder, and genocide of the proletariat around the globe, a fact PW conveniently leaves out. The article fails to mention that nearly 2,000 civilians were wounded in our War of Imperialism in Afghanistan , Pakistan, and Iraq during the first six months of 2012. About 1,145 civilians were killed in that same time period, according to U.N. totals. James Holmes’, Adam Lanza’s, and other serial killers’ crimes are dwarfed by this monstrosity in comparison, making the US government by far the most psychotic killer, still at large and continuing to slaughter men, women and children by the thousands. These figures don’t even take into account the hundreds of unarmed civilians slaughtered by uniformed bourgeois Police gangs across the country. Where is PW’s outrage to this crime? Where is the demand to confiscate the government’s guns? As Marxist-Leninists, we must approach the issue of gun control as we do any other issue – under the scientific principles of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and practice. We affirm first and foremost the absolute supremacy of the interests of the working class, and the necessity of revolution for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat to completely overthrow the oppression of the Bourgeois state and its minions. As Marx and Engels famously wrote at the end of the Communist Manifesto, "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.” When we talk about gun ownership then, we must talk about the rights of the workers to bear arms. One way or another, the bourgeois will exert their will through force either directly or indirectly, and usually through the cats-paw of the government and its military and police institutions to repress the working class and protect their own property interests. How then shall the workers protect their interests? As Marx writes, "The arming of the whole proletariat with rifles, guns, and ammunition should be carried out at once [and] the workers must ... organize themselves into an independent guard, with their own chiefs and general staff. ... [The aim is] that the bourgeois democratic Government not only immediately loses all backing among the workers, but from the commencement finds itself under the supervision and threats of authorities behind whom stands the entire mass of the working class. ...As soon as the new Government is established they will commence to fight the workers. In order that this party (i.e., the democrats) whose betrayal of the workers will begin with the first hour of victory, should be frustrated in its nefarious work, it is necessary to organize and arm the proletariat." - Karl Marx, Address to the Communist League (1850) This quote sounds as if it were written for the times we are facing today! However, Dialectical Materialism teaches us that the issues and struggles of history are cyclical, and though taking new forms, at the heart of the struggle remains the eternal war for class dominance. Moving forward to Lenin, the great leader of the October Revolution in Russia, we see that he too advocated arming the workers: “The minimum programme of the Social-Democrats calls for the replacement of the standing army by a universal arming of the people. Most of the official Social-Democrats in Europe and most of our own Menshevik leaders, however, have “forgotten” or put aside the Party’s programme, substituting chauvinism (“defencism”) for internationalism, reformism for revolutionary tactics. Yet now of all times, at the present revolutionary moment, it is most urgent and essential that there be a universal arming of the people. To assert that, while we have a revolutionary army, there is no need to arm the proletariat, or that there would “not be enough” arms to go round, is mere deception and trickery. The thing is to begin organizing a universal militia straight away, so that everyone should learn the use of arms even if there is “not enough” to go round, for it is not at all necessary that the people have enough weapons to arm everybody. The people must learn, one and all, how to use arms, they must belong, one and all, to the militia which is to replace the police and the standing army. The workers do not want an army standing apart from the people; what they want is that the workers and soldiers should merge into a single militia consisting of all the people.” - A Proletarian Militia by VI Lenin Comrade Stalin, the fierce defender of the fledgling workers’ Soviet democracy and the Champion against Nazi aggression, said that the “most important countermeasure against counterrevolution is the arming of the workers and peasants.” Finally, from the writings of the revered leader and liberator of the Chinese people, Mao Zedong, we find this important commentary on the role of the Red Army: "The Chinese Red Army is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. Especially at present, the Red Army should certainly not confine itself to fighting; besides fighting to destroy the enemy's military strength, it should shoulder such important tasks as doing propaganda among the masses, organizing the masses, arming them, helping them to establish revolutionary political power and setting up Party organizations." Certainly, each statement above applies to a particular instance in time at that particular stage of revolution in each writer’s respective countries. However, the principle remains the same. The workers must be made able to protect and defend themselves. In some cases, such as in 1916 Russia, the bourgeois were even willing to finance a workers militia - to protect their own interests – which Lenin said should be paid for by the bourgeoisie, but that the militia must above all protect the workers both from external threats, and from the bourgeois within the gates. At this point in time, the bourgeois state is not in a state of flux which would necessitate them calling upon the workers to form militias – in fact, such a thing is considered a threat to the Imperialist State’s hegemonic domination. Thus we can expect no checks to be coming in the mail from the rich for the funding of workers’ protection. However, we must still encourage the exercising of such rights still granted to all people by the Bourgeoisie state for the protection of the working class and minorities. We can take a lesson from the Black Panthers, who encouraged black communities to arm and protect themselves instead of relying on the unpredictable and brutal police forces and judicial system for protection. We can encourage the formation of community defense groups which are founded along class lines, upholding and protecting the rights of oppressed minorities. We can encourage and sponsor gun safety training, and work to create the best conditions possible for working class neighborhoods to protect themselves. We can encourage organized labor to stand together in solidarity to help protect the schools and surrounding communities, creating a “thin red line” of our own which acts as a deterrent against crimes from any source. And in the center must be the party, directing, protecting, and organizing the workers defense. Lenin would do no less.

#### <<Impact>>

#### Capitalism drives *all* existential scenarios—best empirical evidence

Deutsch 9 (Judith, president, Science for Peace. Member of Canadian psychoanalytic society, “Pestilence, Famine, War, Neoliberalism, and Premature Deaths,” Peace Magazine, <http://peacemagazine.org/archive/v25n3p18.htm>)//Miro

At present, threats to human existence come from at least four directions: climate change with its consequences of catastrophic climate events and of drastic water and food shortages; from nuclear war; from pandemics; from the severe impoverishment and destruction of society that is a result of neo-liberal restructuring. All are due to human error. All are preventable. But the time factor is most crucial around climate change. The lack of attention to the time scale is tantamount to believing that "it can't happen here."¶ Currently, most attempts to counter these dangers address the issues in isolation even though the main perpetrators implement a unified, relatively coherent programme that unites these threats. Neo-liberal plutocrats are the controlling shareholders of the large agri-business, weapons, water privatization, pharmaceutical (anti national health care), mining, non-renewable energy companies. It is their economic practices that decimate water resources, deplete soil, pollute air, and increase greenhouse gas emissions. The culpable individuals, their think tanks, the supportive government bureaucracies, and the specific methods of control are well-documented in a number of recent works.1¶ From recent history it is readily apparent that mass extinction "can happen here." A similar confluence of climate events and exploitive socio-economic re-structuring occurred in the late-Victorian period. Retrospective statistical studies established that worldwide droughts between 1876 and 1902 were caused by El Nino weather events. Based on the British Empire's laissez-faire approach to famine that enjoined against state "interference" in the for-profit trade in wheat, between 13 million and 29 million people died in India alone.¶ True to the precepts of liberalism, the British converted small subsistence farms in India into large scale monocrop farming for export on a world market. The new globally integrated grain trade meant that disturbances in distant parts of the world affected Indian farmers. Advances in technology actually made things worse, for steam-driven trains were used to transport grains to England while locals starved, and telegraph communication was used to process international monetary transactions that destroyed local communities. Gone were the traditional social institutions for managing food shortages and hardship.¶ The Victorian world view also bequeathed us the myth of the inferior Third World and denial of British responsibility for the de-development of tropical countries. Mike Davis points out the compelling evidence that South Indian laborers had higher earnings than their British counterparts in the 18th century and lived lives of greater financial security, including better diets and lower unemployment. "If the history of British rule in India were to be condensed into a single fact, it is this: there was no increase in India's per capita income from 1757 to 1947. Indeed, in the last half of the nineteenth century [due to colonial structural adjustment], income probably declined by more than 50% There was no economic development at all in the usual sense of the term."( Davis, p. 311).¶ In today's world, neo-liberalism continues to increase global misery and poverty and the dehumanization and invisibility of millions of "warehoused" people. Whatever conditions increase poverty also increase premature deaths. In the US, a 1% rise in unemployment increases the mortality rate by 2%, homicides and imprisonments by 6%, and infant mortality by 5%. The 225 richest individuals worldwide have a combined wealth of over $1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47% of the world's population, or 2.5 billion people. By comparison, it is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and safe water and sanitation for all is roughly $40 billion a year. This is less than 4% of the combined wealth of these 225 richest people.2¶ NEO-LIBERALISM¶ Neo-liberal policies have mandated the destruction of the social safety net that would be the lifesaver in climate disaster, epidemics, and war. The International Monetary Fund has required countless countries to dismantle public education, health, water, and sanitation infrastructure. Neo-liberalism strenuously opposes government intervention on behalf of the common good while hypocritically and deceptively protecting narrow class interests and investments in the military, non-renewable energy, privatized health care.¶ The powerful and wealthy few control the military-industrial complex, surveillance, and the media. The connections with climate change are manifold. Already there is military preparedness for the potential impacts on peace and security posed by climate change -- not to help victims but to keep refugees out. Ominously, there are now overt racist overtones to the discussion of "environmental refugees" and the closing of borders. The model of response to disasters is most likely Hurricane Katrina, namely, protection of the wealthy and outright cruelty to the poor.¶ Wars are tremendously costly to the public but highly profitable to powerful elites. "The arms trade has expanded by more than 20% worldwide in the past five years" (The Guardian Weekly 01.05.09, p. 11). The military itself emits enormous amounts of greenhouse gases and brutally protects the extractive industries of the wealthy. There are innumerable unreported incidents: In May 2009, alone, the Nigerian army razed villages in the oil-rich Niger delta to protect oil companies, killing many civilians; in Papua New Guinea, 200 heavily armed soldiers and police were sent to the Barrick Gold Porgera area to destroy indigenous villages. In the 20th century, it is estimated that as many as 360 million people died prematurely due to state terrorism--"terrorism from above."¶ BESIDES PROLIFERATION¶ The use of nuclear weapons in wars would appear to be increasingly acceptable. "We have created a situation in the world where we have a very small number of people in control of nuclear arsenals - people whose competence is not necessarily proven, whose rationality is not necessarily at a high level, and whose ethical standards may or may not be acceptable. These people are in charge of making decisions about the use of weapons that could destroy civilization and most life on earth" (p. 245). In their recent collection of papers on nuclear weapons, Falk and Krieger further suggest that the grand military strategy is "largely to project power in order to reap the benefits of profitability for the few. To take control of resources, and to place our military bases strategically around the world in order to have greater degrees of control, sounds like a strategy to benefit corporate interests." They state that the power elite has cleverly manipulated the public by focusing almost exclusive attention on the issue of proliferation, "with corresponding inattention to possession, continuing weapons development, and thinly disguised reliance on threatened use."

#### <<Alt>>

#### The alternative is to uphold gun ownership as a *right of the working class*—this rejects reactionary gun politics but also liberal disenfranchisement.

Sherman 12 (Vince Sherman, writer for Return 2 Source, ML Journal, “Three Positions on Gun Control”, 2012)//Miro

The Marxist position on gun control is unequivocally upholding the right of workers and oppressed nationalities to bear arms. In direct refutation of the Left-Second Amendment position, which upholds the right to bear arms as an abstract constitutional right, the Marxist position upholds gun ownership as a class right. Similarly, class rights directly confront the liberal belief that the state should be the predominant or sole trustee of firearms. By classifying the right to bear arms as a class right, rather than a ‘human’, ‘constitutional’, or ‘natural’ right, the Marxist position upholds the social character of gun ownership. The Second Amendment enshrines the right to bear arms as an individual right set in place to protect individuals and their property from threats. Under capitalism, this translates into principally a ruling class and petty-bourgeois right since these are the classes that own “property,” i.e. capital, businesses, the means of production. ‘Open-Carry’ or ‘Concealed-Carry’? We see further evidence of the reactionary character of the Second Amendment when looking at the prevalence of ‘concealed-carry’ state laws versus ‘open-carry’ state laws. ‘Open-Carry’ – allowing people to publicly carry firearms – is a social means of exercising the right to bear arms. As the Black Panther Party understood, the known presence of firearms allows oppressed people to better police their own communities and challenge the authority of the state without firing a single shot. The right to bear arms thereby becomes ‘social’ because it is a public exercise of power. Consider why the police openly carry their firearms. The state allows its officers and agents to publicly display their firearms to deter confrontations with said agents. It is a silent exercise of state power. Reagan banned the open-carry of loaded firearms in California precisely in reaction to the Black Panthers’ practices. If an African-American was stopped and harassed by a police officer, an openly armed Panther cadre would enter the scene to give legal counsel to the person facing police harassment. The Panthers challenged the state’s perceived monopoly on violence by acting as “a well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free [Black] State.” In fact, California is one of seven states in the US to have outright bans on open-carry. Not surprisingly, the other six states with these bans – Illinois, Texas, New York, Florida, South Carolina, and Arkansas – are either the most populous and multinational, or located in the heart of the Black Belt South. Not coincidentally, though, all 50 states in the US allow the concealed-carry of firearms. Illinois was the one state that upheld a ban on concealed-carry, but the US Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals struck down that ban a week ago. (15) Concealed-carry caters to the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois class nature of the Second Amendment, which allows individuals to ‘protect themselves from attacks in public’. From Bernhard Goetz in 1984 to George Zimmerman in 2012, this right has generally manifested itself in white men gunning down Blacks and Latinos on the basis that they ‘felt threatened’. Concealed-carry individualizes, rather than socializes, the right to bear arms. The Right uses concealed-carry laws to expand the legal basis for the murder of African-Americans and Latinos through Stand Your Ground laws. Even the NRA backhandedly agrees with bans on open-carry, calling the repeal of these bans “not a priority.” (16) Instead, the NRA’s far-right membership dedicatedly works to expand concealed-carry, which offers no legal basis for oppressed people to socially exercise the right to bear arms. The Social Organization of the Right to Bear Arms On picket lines, strikers in the 1930s regularly had to defend themselves and their fellow workers from company-hired paramilitaries. As far back as the Homestead Strike in 1892 involving Steelworkers and the Battle of Blair Mountain involving Coal Miners, the capitalist class has openly resorted to violence in order to crush the demands of striking workers. Looking at restoring a militant strike movement as one of the main objectives of the progressive labor movement, it would be a folly to support increased gun control, which would allow the state, the capitalist class and its supporters to monopolize guns. While not all proposed gun control methods would completely curb access to firearms, Marxists should oppose any restrictions that further reduce the ability of oppressed people and workers to defend themselves or deter violence. The disastrous consequences of gun control on the workers’ movement came full-circle during the South African Miner’s strike this year, in which state police opened fire killing 34 miners, armed mostly with clubs and other such weapons. A modern picket line with workers legally and openly carrying arms in self-defense would represent a strong deterrent to violent attempts to break up the strike by management, vigilantes or illegal police actions, like the ones that occurred in South Africa. Many comrades will find that workers, and especially people of the oppressed nations in the US instinctively understand that the police force represents the ruling class and not their interests. Presenting the question of gun ownership in terms of class opens up workers to realizing that gun control is a question of democratic and class rights. Many workers understand reasonable gun rights and even gun control, but they will also reject the idea when presented with the prospect of surrendering their democratic right while the rich and their personal army get to hold onto this right. In a March 1850 Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League, Karl Marx described the need for workers to exercise the right to bear arms through social organization independent of the state. We will quote him at some length: To be able forcefully and threateningly to oppose this party, whose betrayal of the workers will begin with the very first hour of victory, the workers must be armed and organized. The whole proletariat must be armed at once with muskets, rifles, cannon and ammunition, and the revival of the old-style citizens’ militia, directed against the workers, must be opposed. Where the formation of this militia cannot be prevented, the workers must try to organize themselves independently as a proletarian guard, with elected leaders and with their own elected general staff; they must try to place themselves not under the orders of the state authority but of the revolutionary local councils set up by the workers. Where the workers are employed by the state, they must arm and organize themselves into special corps with elected leaders, or as a part of the proletarian guard. Under no pretext should arms and ammunition be surrendered; any attempt to disarm the workers must be frustrated, by force if necessary. The destruction of the bourgeois democrats’ influence over the workers, and the enforcement of conditions which will compromise the rule of bourgeois democracy, which is for the moment inevitable, and make it as difficult as possible – these are the main points which the proletariat and therefore the League must keep in mind during and after the approaching uprising. (17) In the underlined portion of the quote selected above, Marx describes the security functions of what the Bolsheviks would later call ‘Soviets’, or workers councils. Writing in London, Marx was warning against English attempts to co-opt independent armed bodies of workers by reviving citizens militias, which were directed and organized by the state to supposedly police communities. In actuality, these bodies served the interest of the capitalist state, making them functionally analogous to the gun control demands of the liberals today. Marx instead recognized the necessity of workers organizing themselves and defending the right to bear arms through political struggle. This right would not be exercised individually through concealed-carry or for personal security, but it was instead a social right of the working class to defend their gains and interests. In the oppressed nations within the United States, open-carry and the class right to bear arms has a rich history in America of forwarding national liberation. From countering white terrorism during Reconstruction, to the CPUSA again fighting off the Klan in the 1930’s, to the Black Panthers patrolling black communities, the right of Black armed organizations has been a guarantor of their democratic rights. Every instance of this has been organized, not on individual basis of “concealed-carrying” a handgun for individual defense, but as disciplined groups acting practically as the police force or army of the black nation itself. This, in essence, is the social right to bear arms. The American working class and the Black and Chican@ nations should have the right and authority in their respective organizations to decide how to best manage gun rights in their communities. The answers lie in organizations and successful practices of the past, in contrast to the white liberal proposal to rely on the capitalist police forces’ monopoly on violence for protection.

#### <<ROTJ>>

#### The role of the judge is to act as a critical educator combating oppression—while obviously signing the ballot won’t make neoliberalism disappear, voting for strategies to combat oppression *in this round* makes us better activists in the future.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Best for activism— Talking about methodologies to combat oppressive structures makes us better advocates in the future—this is a key pre-requisite to education and fairness claims, even if we learn from debate, that education is useless without the ability to put it to use.

### 1NC—Gun Control K (all)

#### “A war between the races would help nobody and free nobody and should be avoided at all costs. But a one-sided race war with Black people as the targets and white people shooting the guns is worse.”

#### – Assata Shakur

#### <<Links>>

#### The Aff’s law and order politics leave the fundamental matrix of capitalism underlying gun violence *untouched.* Bougie gun control is coopted and allows the capitalist class to reassert its hegemony over the oppressed.

WIL 13 (WIL/Socialist Appeal, bombass anticaps, “Gun Control and Class Struggle”, September 13, 2013)//Miro

The recent attacks in Colorado, Connecticut, Boston, and across the country have shocked everyone. As has been previously explained in the pages of Socialist Appeal, these repeated incidents of violence signify the decay of American capitalism. The decline of capitalism offers no future for today’s youth, only distractions, desperation, and escapism. High unemployment, debt, lack of health care facilities, alienation, and a widespread feeling of insecurity is enough to push some over the edge. Only by changing society to one which will give everyone hope of a better future, only by engaging people in a way that they will want to live their lives rather than escape from them, can we put an end to these horrible crimes. However, many capitalist politicians are telling us that there is a quick and easy solution: stricter gun control laws. This “solution” flies in the face of actual experience. Alcoholism is as prevalent and intractable a problem today as it was in the 1920s. In January 1920, the 18th Amendment was put into effect, prohibiting the production and sale of alcohol. The argument was put forward that by banning alcohol, alcoholism would fade away. Nothing of the kind happened. Prohibition strengthened organized crime, giving criminal gangs a monopoly over all aspects of the production and distribution of alcohol, and alcoholism continued as before. Today, states with tough gun control laws like New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and California are still among those that experience the most violent crime involving firearms. Illegal guns are most commonly acquired from other states, by individuals who can legally purchase firearms, and from the illegal sale of guns by licensed dealers. Although this seems like an argument to broaden the strict gun laws to the federal level, there is no reason to assume firearms won’t make their way into the hands of those with malicious intent. There is already an underground market for firearms, and like the prohibition of alcohol in the 1920s, stricter gun control laws would only bolster this lucrative black market. There are already designs on the internet that would allow someone to use a 3D printer to produce a fully functioning handgun out of plastic. And one look at the Mexican drug cartels, which are often better armed than the police and army, shows how ineffective efforts to curb access to guns have been (or the illicit drugs they trade in, for that matter). The “right to bear arms” is a right that has been championed perhaps more in the U.S. than in any other country in the world. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, along with the other nine Amendments that make up the “Bill of Rights,” were a concession on the part of the early American ruling class, in order to pass the less democratic aspects of the constitution such as the creation of the Senate and Supreme Court. At the time of the signing of the Constitution, despite the reining in of the revolutionary energy of the masses by the ruling class, the capitalist system was still young and historically progressive. A strong state apparatus had not yet been developed. The ruling class did not yet need one, as the proletariat had not yet developed into a powerful and massive force constituting the vast majority of society, as is the case today. It could depend on geography and local armed militas for national defense and to put down local uprisings, supplemented by a small standing army, and above all, a strong navy. But things have changed in the United States. The slogan “we are the 99%” is a close approximation to the actual class balance of forces today, with a tiny minority of capitalists on one side, and a mass of workers on the other. The working class has tremendous potential power in its hands—the ability to bring production and society as a whole to a grinding halt. With the capitalist crisis deepening, the ruling class can no longer rely on ideology or a few concessions to keep class peace. In the face of such a threat, the capitalists have developed an imposing state apparatus in order to maintain their rule. Frederick Engels, in his classic work The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, explains the role of the state: “The state is therefore by no means a power imposed on society from without... Rather, it is a product of society at a particular stage of development; it is the admission that this society has involved itself in insoluble self-contradiction and is cleft into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to exorcise. But in order that these antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interests, shall not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, a power, apparently standing above society, has become necessary to moderate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of ‘order’; and this power, arisen out of society, but placing itself above it and increasingly alienating itself from it, is the state.” When capitalist politicians call for “gun control,” they are really saying that the working class majority should give more power to the bourgeois state in determining who should have access to arms. The capitalist class would breathe a sigh of relief at the complete disarmament of the working class. The capitalist state would then have a complete monopoly of arms, on top of its monopoly of the courts, prisons, police, spy agencies, military, etc. Therefore, from the point of view of the capitalist class, the real essence of “gun control” is not the disarming of criminal elements or unstable individuals—who would still have access to guns through illegal channels—it is the disarming of the working class on the whole. We have seen how this has been used in the past. When the Black Panthers had arms for self-defense, the bourgeois state violently attacked them. Far-right groups, on the other hand, are armed to the teeth and the state typically looks the other way. The United States has a long history of gun violence on the part of the state against immigrants, blacks, and against the working class on the whole, especially when they dare to struggle. Nearly every major labor battle in the U.S. has been marked with violent attacks by the state against the striking workers. As one boss infamously put it, his striking workers needed to be “shot back to work.” Against this overwhelming force of the capitalist state, the working class must defend its basic democratic right to defend itself and its organizations, including its right to access arms. There are no quick fixes to the problem of gun violence, and no solutions within the limits of capitalism, a system based on the organized exploitation and violence of one class against another. Only the organized and united working class can offer a solution to the violence of class society, whether it be perpetrated by the capitalist state when breaking a strike, or by unstable and alienated individuals on a killing rampage. The labor movement, by organizing a political party of its own, could begin to deal with the ills of our society—but only if that party is armed with a socialist program. Corporations like Colt and Smith & Wesson make huge profits from the sale of weapons. A workers’ government would nationalize the arms industry and place it under democratic workers’ control. Under a workers’ government, the working class would democratically organize itself to protect society. As socialism spreads worldwide, and relations between nations are increasingly based on solidarity, not expoitation, the need for national defense and the military will fade away, along with national borders themselves. Here at home, the need for a special police force standing above society, with special powers and privileges, would likewise disappear.

#### Gun violence cannot be divorced from the war on people of color. Any efforts to extend the capitalist monopoly of violence must be resisted. Government security forces aren’t neutral—they are enforcers of a system that leaves billions of people disenfranchised.

Sherman 12 (Vince Sherman, writer for Return 2 Source, ML Journal, “Three Positions on Gun Control”, 2012)//Miro

The capitalist class and the white middle class in the large cities in the North, West, and Midwest that live in more constricted confines with the working class and oppressed nations push forward this “law and order” gun control policy. Indeed, the US government already has massive gun control measures in place, especially in the major cities like New York and Chicago and states across the nation, which represent the extreme end of this policy, where it’s practically unheard of for average citizens to own firearms legally. These measures don’t restrict mass murderers like Jared Lee Loughner – the shooter in Arizona last year – or Neo-Nazis like Wade Michael Page, who murdered six people at a Sikh Temple in Wisconsin this summer, from acquiring firearms. Instead, they largely restrict the rights of oppressed people who face violence from vigilantes or police from owning guns. It is no surprise then that billionaire Mayor of New York City Michael Bloomberg and his coalition, “Mayors Against Illegal Guns,” are quickly becoming the leading force advancing this agenda. Principally, they support gun control for the same reason the Republican opposed gun control: they are afraid of oppressed nationalities. We quote the website of “Mayors Against Illegal Guns”: “We support the Second Amendment and the rights of citizens to own guns. We recognize the vast majority of gun dealers and gun owners carefully follow the law…But what binds us together is a determination to fight crime, and a belief that we can do more to stop criminals from getting guns while also protecting the rights of citizens to freely own them.” (2) This is a common theme among the liberal gun control advocates: a heavy focus on “crime” and keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, especially in big cities. This position cannot be divorced from the war on drugs and the war on Black and Latino youth, who find themselves disportionately criminalized and imprisoned. Capitalist leaders like Mayor Bloomberg in no way seek to limit the violence visited on working class and oppressed communities. Remember that Bloomberg is responsible for spearheading the blatantly racist “stop and frisk” policies carried out by the NYPD. (3) The NAACP has said of these policies: “Bloomberg’s massive street-level racial profiling program is a civil rights and human rights catastrophe that both hurts our children and makes our communities less safe.” (4) Are we to trust the liberals like Bloomberg, chiefly responsible and complicit in waging the war on black and brown communities, with ending gun violence with new criminal restrictions? Are we to trust the racist criminal justice system and groups like the NYPD whom Bloomberg has called “his army, the 7th largest in the world?” (5) It is no coincidence that liberal bourgeoisie like Bloomberg are silent about gun control for their “private army” when it comes to police violence and murder committed by police, like in the case of unarmed 17 year old Ramarley Graham in New York City. (6) The gun control policies of Bloomberg and reactionary allies, like Chicago Mayor Rahm Emmanuel, are efforts to extend national oppression and the capitalist monopoly on violence, especially over Black and Latino communities. This also serves to keep the working class and discontented elements of society passive in the face of foreclosures, austerity, voter suppression, legislative attacks like Right-to-Work initiatives, and efforts to use state repression to silence social movements like Occupy Wall Street and trade union protesters in Michigan. After all, unarmed protesters are entirely at the mercy of the capitalist class’ “personal army,” leaving them subject to violent repression at protests or on picket lines. It is only natural that these forces support such measures to strip oppressed nationalities and workers from their democratic rights to bear arms: They have their own arms, their own personal security, their own “personal armies”, their police, their courts, their prisons; in other words, the “special bodies of armed men” talked of by Lenin in State & Revolution. They live in gated communities and mansions, while most Black and Latino people live in occupied territory not unlike occupied Afghanistan. The agenda of the liberal Democrats is to strengthen the apparatus of state repression – to increase arms and weapons in the hands of their “personal army” – while keeping guns out of the hands of “criminals” and other “undesirable elements”. This agenda is reflected in the expansion of billions of dollars in state funding to arm police with military hardware to the tune of $34 billion dollars over the past decade. (7) There seems to be no talk of gun control or preventing gun violence when it comes to the army of the capitalist class. There’s no talk of assault weapon bans for the police, who are upgrading to tanks in many cities! (8) Middle class white liberals who live in gated communities, or the “nice” sections of town also don’t have the same worries as our class and our allies. They want to strip “the common rabble” and criminals of their means of self-defense. After all, the police and the ruling class of the United States are their friends. They’re not the ones getting imprisoned, stopped and frisked, or having their homes foreclosed on. However, comrades cannot ignore that gun violence does have a disproportionate and devastating impact in the communities of oppressed people and working class communities. African-Americans are the victim of 54% of all firearm homicides, despite making up just 13% of the population, according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (9) It’s no surprise that gun-related violence disproportionately occurs in the US South, the historical home of Jim Crow and Ku Klux Klan terrorism against Black and Latino people, according to Zara Matheson at the Martin Prosperity Institute. (10) This provides some material appeal to elements of the oppressed nations in regards to these gun control policy. Still, comrades should combat this wolf in sheep’s clothing. The enforcers of this violence are the American capitalist class and white supremacist forces that work to uphold the established order. Trusting them to end violence in the oppressed communities with gun control is the equivalent to entrusting the United States to help Syria and Libya with “humanitarian intervention.” Malcolm X understood the nature of violence by the US government and police, as well as the need for African-Americans to defend themselves from these attacks. We quote him at some length: “Last but not least, I must say this concerning the great controversy over rifles and shotguns. White people been buying rifles all their lives…no commotion. The only thing I’ve ever said is that in areas where the government has proven itself either unwilling or unable to defend the lives and the property of Negroes, it’s time for Negroes to defend themselves. Article number two of the Constitutional amendments provides you and me the right to own a rifle or a shotgun. It is constitutionally legal to own a shotgun or a rifle. This doesn’t mean you’re going to get a rifle and form battalions and go out looking for white folks, although you’d be within your rights – I mean, you’d be justified; but that would be illegal and we don’t do anything illegal. If the white man doesn’t want the black man buying rifles and shotguns, then let the government do its job.” (11) There’s a reason that the Sanford police covered up the shooting of Trayvon Martin this past February, and it was only after massive protests that his killer, George Zimmerman, was arrested. Across this country, the system of white supremacy is reinforced by the underlying threat of violence, whether it comes from police brutality or vigilante terrorism. The response is not to buckle to the pressures of liberals, who trust the very purveyors of violence to protect oppressed people, but for oppressed people to have the ability to defend themselves. Sensible policy on guns for working class and oppressed people in America can only come from a Marxist position. But to do that, we must first analyze and pull apart the muddled position carried by the advanced, progressives, and some of our comrades. The Left-Second Amendment Position In response to the liberal gun control proposals, many people on the US Left embrace a position similar to that espoused by the Right. This “Left-Second Amendment” position unites with the views put forth by the National Rifle Association by dismissing guns as incidental to mass murders like yesterday’s tragedy in Connecticut. In this view, something else – an external cause like mental health or the culture of violence in the US – is chiefly to blame. This is not incorrect. The US is an incredibly violent society, with the greatest purveyor of violence being the US government itself – and that’s not our opinion; that’s the opinion of Martin Luther King Junior, who used those exact words to describe the government on April 4, 1967. We see the evidence of this ‘cultural violence’ everywhere, from movies like Act of Valor, financed by the US military to glorify violence committed against other countries, to police violence inflicted on children and the innocent, like we saw in Anaheim, California, this year. Along the same lines, mental health services in the US are stigmatized and woefully underfunded. It’s no coincidence that many of the perpetrators of these mass killings have had severe mental health crises; crises that were more often than not identified but not adequately treated. The Left-Second Amendment position boils down to the pressing concern over the state having a monopoly on violence. When we look back in history, oppressed people have never won their freedom without armed struggle. In many cases, the lack of an armed populace has led directly to the rise of brutal fascist regimes, like in Chile and Spain. In 1973, the workers in Chile were underprepared to defeat the fascist coup d’etat that overthrew elected President Salvador Allende because of the government’s refusal to arm the people. During the Spanish Civil War almost four decades earlier, the social democratic government was similarly reluctant to arm the workers to resist Franco’s fascist brigades. And of course everyone knows of Adolf Hitler’s infamous ban on citizens owning guns after the rise of the Nazis. In essence, many leftists view guns as a means of self-defense for oppressed people and a safeguard against fascism. This leads them to oppose gun control measures, i.e. the liberal position on gun control. However, the Left-Second Amendment position mistakenly adopts the Right’s view of the right to bear arms as a philosophical abstraction, rather than a material reality. In practice, the Constitution does not protect the rights of oppressed people to bear arms. Even the most vocal advocates of the Second Amendment have no objection to regulations on firearm ownership by the people who need it most to defend their class and national interests from right-wing vigilantes and state power.

#### The affirmative relies upon the unquestioned assumption that gun control will leave the guns in the hands of those who are supposed to have it: the Police. But police aren’t neutral defenders of society—they protect property and continued wage slavery.

Martin 13 (Louis Martin, Writer for the militant, ‘A Marxist view of "gun control"’, 2013)//Miro

And many want to restrict workers' access to guns, seeking a monopoly on arms in the hands of their cops and military forces. The Second Amendment to the Constitution—like the rest of the Bill of Rights won in struggle by workers and farmers that serve as restrictions on and protections from the government—guarantees the "right of the people to keep and bear arms" against government infringement. Opponents of the Second Amendment argue that "public safety" necessitates scrapping that right as a relic of the past enacted in a different period when popular militias existed and before the invention of automatic weapons. But working people are not safer with a monopoly of firearms in the hands of cops and other armed bodies whose job is to protect property and prerogatives of the capitalist exploiters. Defending all workers' rights against stepped-up encroachments by the bosses and their government become more, not less important today, as the employing class mounts assaults on our wages and working conditions. The Second Amendment is among the constitutional protections that working people wielded as part of the mass proletarian fight for Black rights in the 1960s. Groups like the Deacons for Defense and Justice and Robert Williams' NAACP chapter in Monroe, N.C., maintained their right to bear arms and used them to stay the hand of racist thugs and cops, protect social protest actions and Black communities and prevent bloodshed. At the same time, the working-class movement has nothing in common with the gun-rights politics of rightist militia outfits or with vigilante "justice" and so-called Stand Your Ground laws that promote them. But the working-class political battle against such reactionary movements and laws cannot be advanced by calls for government restrictions on any rights of working people. Anti-social violence and senseless murder do not come from video games or legal rights to own guns. They are not a product of too many constitutional rights or too few armed cops at every corner. They are first and foremost a by-product of social relations under capitalism—buttressed by cop brutality, deaths and maimings on the job, and bloody wars of conquest abroad. And violent crimes within the working class can be exacerbated by the myriad social pressures that mount under the grinding effects of the capitalist crisis. At the same time, the rise of mass working-class struggles to come will replace capitalism's dog-eat-dog values with social solidarity, just as they always have in the past. It's this solidarity and the transformation of working people and their view of themselves that develops in the course of struggle against capitalist exploitation that is the most powerful weapon against anti-social behavior of all kinds.

#### Gun control is a band-aid reform that only serves to legitimate the state as purveyor of violence while ignoring the fact that the US government is the largest gun runner in the world.

Lee 13 (Daniel Lee, writer for the Oklahoma Workers' Monthly, “A Marxist-Leninist response to Gun Control”, 2013)//Miro

In a recent editorial piece published by Peoples World, the newspaper of the CPUSA, titled “Guns, profits and Sandy Hook” – the article started by opening with the need for the country to “get serious about regulating guns.” It pontificates further, giving a perfunctory nod to universal health access as “a piece of the puzzle” to preventing the epidemic of gun violence. The editorial then issues a call for a “broad enough coalition to confront and curb those who profit from manufacturing and dealing in these individual weapons of mass destruction”. It places the blame squarely on the gun lobbyists, and the corporations that profit from the sale of guns. The article ends finally in demanding a “Ban [of] assault weapons and high capacity bullet clips”. This article, which could have been written by any bourgeois Democrat or liberal group from Nancy Pelosi to Moveon.org, buys into the reactionary “liberal” approach of treating the symptom without curing the disease. Certainly those profiting off of the sale of weapons through the promotion of violence and racism must be made accountable for their exploitation and oppression of our fellow workers – and let us not forget that the US Government is one of the largest gun runners in the world, fueling instability, murder, and genocide of the proletariat around the globe, a fact PW conveniently leaves out. The article fails to mention that nearly 2,000 civilians were wounded in our War of Imperialism in Afghanistan , Pakistan, and Iraq during the first six months of 2012. About 1,145 civilians were killed in that same time period, according to U.N. totals. James Holmes’, Adam Lanza’s, and other serial killers’ crimes are dwarfed by this monstrosity in comparison, making the US government by far the most psychotic killer, still at large and continuing to slaughter men, women and children by the thousands. These figures don’t even take into account the hundreds of unarmed civilians slaughtered by uniformed bourgeois Police gangs across the country. Where is PW’s outrage to this crime? Where is the demand to confiscate the government’s guns? As Marxist-Leninists, we must approach the issue of gun control as we do any other issue – under the scientific principles of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and practice. We affirm first and foremost the absolute supremacy of the interests of the working class, and the necessity of revolution for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat to completely overthrow the oppression of the Bourgeois state and its minions. As Marx and Engels famously wrote at the end of the Communist Manifesto, "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.” When we talk about gun ownership then, we must talk about the rights of the workers to bear arms. One way or another, the bourgeois will exert their will through force either directly or indirectly, and usually through the cats-paw of the government and its military and police institutions to repress the working class and protect their own property interests. How then shall the workers protect their interests? As Marx writes, "The arming of the whole proletariat with rifles, guns, and ammunition should be carried out at once [and] the workers must ... organize themselves into an independent guard, with their own chiefs and general staff. ... [The aim is] that the bourgeois democratic Government not only immediately loses all backing among the workers, but from the commencement finds itself under the supervision and threats of authorities behind whom stands the entire mass of the working class. ...As soon as the new Government is established they will commence to fight the workers. In order that this party (i.e., the democrats) whose betrayal of the workers will begin with the first hour of victory, should be frustrated in its nefarious work, it is necessary to organize and arm the proletariat." - Karl Marx, Address to the Communist League (1850) This quote sounds as if it were written for the times we are facing today! However, Dialectical Materialism teaches us that the issues and struggles of history are cyclical, and though taking new forms, at the heart of the struggle remains the eternal war for class dominance. Moving forward to Lenin, the great leader of the October Revolution in Russia, we see that he too advocated arming the workers: “The minimum programme of the Social-Democrats calls for the replacement of the standing army by a universal arming of the people. Most of the official Social-Democrats in Europe and most of our own Menshevik leaders, however, have “forgotten” or put aside the Party’s programme, substituting chauvinism (“defencism”) for internationalism, reformism for revolutionary tactics. Yet now of all times, at the present revolutionary moment, it is most urgent and essential that there be a universal arming of the people. To assert that, while we have a revolutionary army, there is no need to arm the proletariat, or that there would “not be enough” arms to go round, is mere deception and trickery. The thing is to begin organizing a universal militia straight away, so that everyone should learn the use of arms even if there is “not enough” to go round, for it is not at all necessary that the people have enough weapons to arm everybody. The people must learn, one and all, how to use arms, they must belong, one and all, to the militia which is to replace the police and the standing army. The workers do not want an army standing apart from the people; what they want is that the workers and soldiers should merge into a single militia consisting of all the people.” - A Proletarian Militia by VI Lenin Comrade Stalin, the fierce defender of the fledgling workers’ Soviet democracy and the Champion against Nazi aggression, said that the “most important countermeasure against counterrevolution is the arming of the workers and peasants.” Finally, from the writings of the revered leader and liberator of the Chinese people, Mao Zedong, we find this important commentary on the role of the Red Army: "The Chinese Red Army is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. Especially at present, the Red Army should certainly not confine itself to fighting; besides fighting to destroy the enemy's military strength, it should shoulder such important tasks as doing propaganda among the masses, organizing the masses, arming them, helping them to establish revolutionary political power and setting up Party organizations." Certainly, each statement above applies to a particular instance in time at that particular stage of revolution in each writer’s respective countries. However, the principle remains the same. The workers must be made able to protect and defend themselves. In some cases, such as in 1916 Russia, the bourgeois were even willing to finance a workers militia - to protect their own interests – which Lenin said should be paid for by the bourgeoisie, but that the militia must above all protect the workers both from external threats, and from the bourgeois within the gates. At this point in time, the bourgeois state is not in a state of flux which would necessitate them calling upon the workers to form militias – in fact, such a thing is considered a threat to the Imperialist State’s hegemonic domination. Thus we can expect no checks to be coming in the mail from the rich for the funding of workers’ protection. However, we must still encourage the exercising of such rights still granted to all people by the Bourgeoisie state for the protection of the working class and minorities. We can take a lesson from the Black Panthers, who encouraged black communities to arm and protect themselves instead of relying on the unpredictable and brutal police forces and judicial system for protection. We can encourage the formation of community defense groups which are founded along class lines, upholding and protecting the rights of oppressed minorities. We can encourage and sponsor gun safety training, and work to create the best conditions possible for working class neighborhoods to protect themselves. We can encourage organized labor to stand together in solidarity to help protect the schools and surrounding communities, creating a “thin red line” of our own which acts as a deterrent against crimes from any source. And in the center must be the party, directing, protecting, and organizing the workers defense. Lenin would do no less.

#### IPV Link!!!

#### This is not some generic gun control K. Using the state as the solution to domestic abuse further criminalizes black and brown people at the margins of society and essentializes black women.

Rutrenberg 94 (MIRIAM H. RUTrENBERG J.D. candidate, Washington College of Law at The American University, 1994; B.A., Hampshire College, 1990. A FEMINIST CRITIQUE OF MANDATORY ARREST: AN ANALYSIS OF RACE AND GENDER IN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE POLICY)//Miro

The racist legacy of the criminal justice system" cannot be ignored when battered women's advocates propose to use that system as a solution to the problem of violence against women. The relationship of Black men and women to the criminal justice and legal system continues to be quite antagonistic. Since the days of slavery, the conduct of Black men has been criminalized, while sympathetic police have permitted white men to escape arrest.12 The criminal justice system continues to provide Black women with less protection than white women. Black women suffer greater harm at the hand of the judicial system in various contexts. When a Black woman is raped, regardless of whether the accused is white or Black, the police do not take her case as seriously as when the victim is a white woman.3 " Likewise, a pregnant Black woman who is found to be addicted to drugs or alcohol when arrested or arraigned is much more likely to be convicted of a crime than a similarly situated white woman. 34 In contrast, white women's relationship to the criminal justice system is ambivalent because the patriarchal law serves as both oppressor and protector of white women. 5 The criminal justice system has protected white women in cases of stranger rape when the accused perpetrator was Black, 6 but offered little relief in cases when the accused was white.' Mandatory arrest laws will inevitably result in increased prosecution and consequently, increased oppression for Black men and women in the criminal justice system. Some advocates argue that mandatory arrest policies benefit all women equally because women suffer discrimination based on their gender and not their ethnic or racial identity. A bitter debate has ensued over whether women can be stripped bare of their race and class, to be left with a gender identity that is essentially "woman," transcending all other socially constructed identities.' Feminists refer to the reduction of women's experiences to those based only on gender as gender essentialism. 9 When theorizing about women, one must avoid the tendency to understand "woman" as an "essential" identity; reducing gender to an "essential" form, devoid of any ethnic or racial identities, hinders one's ability to see the oppression that women can impose on other women by virtue of their race. Proponents of mandatory arrest policy, who are also gender essentialists, do not fully acknowledge that white women can indeed be the oppressors of Black men and women in their alliance with the state.' The interconnection of racial and sexual domination means that white women can simultaneously be oppressed and be oppressors. This is apparent in the context of current domestic violence policy, where white women can be oppressed in their abusive relationships, and at the same time, participate in the state's oppression of Black men by calling on the criminal justice system to mandate arrest in intrafamily abuse situations. Support for mandatory arrest statutes excludes Black women because these statutes conflict with the goals of eradicating racism and violence against women. Women demand protection from a male-controlled patriarchal state; and as this demand is met, it appears as if "women" are gaining equality. Black women, however, do not have the same access to the protections of the state, and, in fact, are often themselves the victims of zealous police and prosecutors.'

#### <<Impact>>

#### Capitalism drives *all* existential scenarios—best empirical evidence

Deutsch 9 (Judith, president, Science for Peace. Member of Canadian psychoanalytic society, “Pestilence, Famine, War, Neoliberalism, and Premature Deaths,” Peace Magazine, <http://peacemagazine.org/archive/v25n3p18.htm>)//Miro

At present, threats to human existence come from at least four directions: climate change with its consequences of catastrophic climate events and of drastic water and food shortages; from nuclear war; from pandemics; from the severe impoverishment and destruction of society that is a result of neo-liberal restructuring. All are due to human error. All are preventable. But the time factor is most crucial around climate change. The lack of attention to the time scale is tantamount to believing that "it can't happen here."¶ Currently, most attempts to counter these dangers address the issues in isolation even though the main perpetrators implement a unified, relatively coherent programme that unites these threats. Neo-liberal plutocrats are the controlling shareholders of the large agri-business, weapons, water privatization, pharmaceutical (anti national health care), mining, non-renewable energy companies. It is their economic practices that decimate water resources, deplete soil, pollute air, and increase greenhouse gas emissions. The culpable individuals, their think tanks, the supportive government bureaucracies, and the specific methods of control are well-documented in a number of recent works.1¶ From recent history it is readily apparent that mass extinction "can happen here." A similar confluence of climate events and exploitive socio-economic re-structuring occurred in the late-Victorian period. Retrospective statistical studies established that worldwide droughts between 1876 and 1902 were caused by El Nino weather events. Based on the British Empire's laissez-faire approach to famine that enjoined against state "interference" in the for-profit trade in wheat, between 13 million and 29 million people died in India alone.¶ True to the precepts of liberalism, the British converted small subsistence farms in India into large scale monocrop farming for export on a world market. The new globally integrated grain trade meant that disturbances in distant parts of the world affected Indian farmers. Advances in technology actually made things worse, for steam-driven trains were used to transport grains to England while locals starved, and telegraph communication was used to process international monetary transactions that destroyed local communities. Gone were the traditional social institutions for managing food shortages and hardship.¶ The Victorian world view also bequeathed us the myth of the inferior Third World and denial of British responsibility for the de-development of tropical countries. Mike Davis points out the compelling evidence that South Indian laborers had higher earnings than their British counterparts in the 18th century and lived lives of greater financial security, including better diets and lower unemployment. "If the history of British rule in India were to be condensed into a single fact, it is this: there was no increase in India's per capita income from 1757 to 1947. Indeed, in the last half of the nineteenth century [due to colonial structural adjustment], income probably declined by more than 50% There was no economic development at all in the usual sense of the term."( Davis, p. 311).¶ In today's world, neo-liberalism continues to increase global misery and poverty and the dehumanization and invisibility of millions of "warehoused" people. Whatever conditions increase poverty also increase premature deaths. In the US, a 1% rise in unemployment increases the mortality rate by 2%, homicides and imprisonments by 6%, and infant mortality by 5%. The 225 richest individuals worldwide have a combined wealth of over $1 trillion, equal to the annual income of the poorest 47% of the world's population, or 2.5 billion people. By comparison, it is estimated that the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic education for all, reproductive health care for all women, adequate food for all and safe water and sanitation for all is roughly $40 billion a year. This is less than 4% of the combined wealth of these 225 richest people.2¶ NEO-LIBERALISM¶ Neo-liberal policies have mandated the destruction of the social safety net that would be the lifesaver in climate disaster, epidemics, and war. The International Monetary Fund has required countless countries to dismantle public education, health, water, and sanitation infrastructure. Neo-liberalism strenuously opposes government intervention on behalf of the common good while hypocritically and deceptively protecting narrow class interests and investments in the military, non-renewable energy, privatized health care.¶ The powerful and wealthy few control the military-industrial complex, surveillance, and the media. The connections with climate change are manifold. Already there is military preparedness for the potential impacts on peace and security posed by climate change -- not to help victims but to keep refugees out. Ominously, there are now overt racist overtones to the discussion of "environmental refugees" and the closing of borders. The model of response to disasters is most likely Hurricane Katrina, namely, protection of the wealthy and outright cruelty to the poor.¶ Wars are tremendously costly to the public but highly profitable to powerful elites. "The arms trade has expanded by more than 20% worldwide in the past five years" (The Guardian Weekly 01.05.09, p. 11). The military itself emits enormous amounts of greenhouse gases and brutally protects the extractive industries of the wealthy. There are innumerable unreported incidents: In May 2009, alone, the Nigerian army razed villages in the oil-rich Niger delta to protect oil companies, killing many civilians; in Papua New Guinea, 200 heavily armed soldiers and police were sent to the Barrick Gold Porgera area to destroy indigenous villages. In the 20th century, it is estimated that as many as 360 million people died prematurely due to state terrorism--"terrorism from above."¶ BESIDES PROLIFERATION¶ The use of nuclear weapons in wars would appear to be increasingly acceptable. "We have created a situation in the world where we have a very small number of people in control of nuclear arsenals - people whose competence is not necessarily proven, whose rationality is not necessarily at a high level, and whose ethical standards may or may not be acceptable. These people are in charge of making decisions about the use of weapons that could destroy civilization and most life on earth" (p. 245). In their recent collection of papers on nuclear weapons, Falk and Krieger further suggest that the grand military strategy is "largely to project power in order to reap the benefits of profitability for the few. To take control of resources, and to place our military bases strategically around the world in order to have greater degrees of control, sounds like a strategy to benefit corporate interests." They state that the power elite has cleverly manipulated the public by focusing almost exclusive attention on the issue of proliferation, "with corresponding inattention to possession, continuing weapons development, and thinly disguised reliance on threatened use."

#### Resisting capitalist ideology is our ultimate ethical obligation. Status quo modes of thought only serve to legitimize the system.

Zizek and Daly 4(Slavoj Zizek and Glyn Daly, Conversations with Zizek, 2004 page 14-16)

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront** the constitutive violence of today’s global **capitalism and its obscene** naturalization / **anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it** throughout the world. […] [Full text available] In this way, **neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as** if they were simply **a matter of** chance and **sound judgment in a neutral market place.** Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.

#### <<Alt>>

#### The alternative is to *lay siege*- this strategy allows us to resist the defining stories of injustice as *naturally occurring* in favor of an investigation of the way the drive for profit fuels it.

Nix-Stevenson 13 (Dara Nilajah Nix-Stevenson, PhD in philosophy @ UNC Greensboro, A QUERY INTO THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF (UN)NATURAL DISASTERS: TEACHING (ABOUT) THE BIOPOLITICS OF DISPOSABILITY, 2013)//Miro

These realities underscore the predominant vision that guides disaster relief and reconstruction, a vision that is “familiar” and rooted in Empire. Such a vision utilizes disasters as tools to accelerate preexisting economic, social, and political inequities that ensure suffering of the most vulnerable ultimately fueling the biopolitics of disposability. In this way, disasters become what Arundhati Roy characterizes as avatars of Empire suggesting that “what Empire does is to further entrench and exacerbate already existing inequalities” (Roy, 2004, 28). With this understanding that disaster exacerbates pre-existing inequality, it is clear that Empire affects both the production of disaster and the experience of recovery. Particularly as it relates to Hurricane Katrina and Haiti, languages of Empire are rooted in the global paradigm of colonialism, a macro discourse, that illuminates some of the micro dimensions of the post-hurricane recovery. In the North American context, colonialism refers to several transhistorical processes: the original and repeated European colonization of the indigenous land that would become the United States, the establishment of colonies abroad, and the ongoing internal colonization of people of African descent on American soil (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967) that have normalized the existence of Empire. In order to change Empire’s outcome, the defining stories which breed a ‘politics of complicity’ must also change such that counter narratives of mass resistance movements come to frame public policy outcomes. These stories then become the determinant of who benefits in post-disaster or crisis recovery environments. According to Mohanty (2006, p. 8), “one way to address the politics of complicity is to analyze the languages of imperialism and Empire deployed explicitly by the US State”. Seizing this opportunity to address the languages of imperialism is a way to utilize disaster or crisis as a lens for addressing social vulnerability and recovery as it relates to the ways in which recovery is stratified in both its delivery, and in how it is received according to the ascribed and achieved identity of the recipient. As Haiti and Katrina exemplify, institutions of Empire cannot be solely relied upon to lead the way towards disaster relief, recovery, and reconstruction. Instead they must be replaced with “mass resistance movements, individual activists, journalists, artists, and film makers [who’ve] come together to strip Empire of its sheen” (Roy, 2004, p. 29). Though a new critique, David Korten and Vandana Shiva ground mass resistance movements in what they respectively refer to as partnership cultures and Earth Community as a counter-pedagogical strategy to Empire Partnership cultures and Earth Communities employ pedagogical strategies that elevate subaltern voices deemed biopolitically disposable by privileging them in public policy decision making governing post-disaster resource allocation and “recovery” (Trujillo-Pagan, 2010, p. 35). This is a counter-neoliberal strategy that realigns who or what should assign rationality, efficiency, and success in an age of Empire while simultaneously disrupting existing racialized patriarchies and inequities of gender, class, and nation which can be considered the normal routine functioning of neoliberal capitalist economies embedded in Empire. As conceptualized by Arundhati Roy, Our strategy should be not only to confront Empire, but to lay siege to it. To deprive it of oxygen. To shame it. To mock it. With our art, our music, our literature, our stubbornness, our joy, our brilliance, our sheer relentlessness – and our ability to tell our own stories. Stories that are different from the ones we’re being brainwashed to believe. The corporate revolution will collapse if we refuse to buy what they are selling – their ideas, their version of history, their ways, their weapons, their notion of inevitability. Remember this: We be many and they be few. They need us more than we need them. Another world is not only possible, she is on her way. On a quiet day, I can hear her breathing (Roy, 2003, p. 112). From this vantage point, art, music, literature, stubbornness, joy, brilliance, and relentlessness embedded in the counterstory of the subaltern becomes the tool of mass resistance.

#### <<ROTJ>>

#### The role of the judge is to act as a critical educator combating oppression—while obviously signing the ballot won’t make neoliberalism disappear, voting for strategies to combat oppression *in this round* makes us better activists in the future.

Giroux 13 (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)//ghs-VA

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Best for activism— Talking about methodologies to combat oppressive structures makes us better advocates in the future—this is a key pre-requisite to education and fairness claims, even if we learn from debate, that education is useless without the ability to put it to use.

### 1NC—AT: pragmatism

#### All of their arguments about reformism and statism don’t disprove the K—even if we should work within the system, we shouldn’t work within the system to take away guns from the working class—even if the State is redeemable in the abstract all of my links are about why the Aff world is a bad one.

#### And I’m more pragmatic—

#### I have isolated historical examples of grassroots succeeding using the strategies I have isolated: look at Deacons for Justice or the Black Panthers.

#### There is nothing pragmatic about pretending that a judges ballot will pass some sort of hypothetical plan—my alternative challenges the narrative of “benevolent policeman” in this space.

### 1NC—AT: K Theory

#### Counter-interp: The NC gets to question the philosophical underpinnings of the AC.

#### Reasons to prefer:

#### Best for critical education: refusing to challenge the underpinnings of our thought makes it impossible to affirm any position. <<There’s no intrinsic reason their constructions are key to the plan which means *they can’t weigh the aff.*>>

#### Middle ground on fairness: The AC was 10 seconds advocacy, 7:50 value judgments- forcing the debate to be over those 10 seconds guts core neg ground.

#### Cross-apply Giroux here—in order to become more ethical citizens and participants in political activism, we must critically question the underpinnings of our own thought.

### 1NC – Hotbeds K

#### The affirmatives creation of particular places as unstable hotbeds for violence ignores the spacial nature of violence within neoliberalism. The affirmatives imaginative geographies create self-fulfilling prophecies which guarantee the expansion of neoliberal violence. Only the negative interrogation of neoliberal violence can solve colonial wars.

Springer 11 /Simon, Department of Geography, University of Otago, New Zealand, “Violence sits in places? Cultural practice, neoliberal rationalism, and virulent imaginative geographies”, Political Geography 30 (2011) 90-98/

The idea that violence might be integral to cultural practice is¶ difficult to accept. In concert with the abuse that the concept of¶ culture has been subjected to as of late, where in keeping with geopolitical hegemony (see Harrison & Huntington, 2000), or¶ perhaps more surprisingly in an attempt to argue against such¶ hegemonic might (see Roberts, 2001), some cultures, particularly¶ ‘Asian’, ‘African’, or ‘Islamic’ cultures, are conferred with a supposedly¶ inherent predilection towards violence. Yet the relationship between culture and violence is also axiomatic, since violence is part of human activity. Thus, it is not the call for violence to be understood as a social process informed by culture that is problematic; rather it is the potential to colonize this observation with imaginative geographies that distort it in such a fashion that deliberately or inadvertently enable particular geostrategic aims to gain validity. The principal method of distortion is Orientalism,¶ which as ‘a distribution of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic,¶ scholarly, economic, sociological, historical, and philological texts’,¶ is ‘an elaboration not only of a basic geographical distinction’ but¶ a whole series of ‘interests’ which create, maintain, and have the¶ intention to understand, control, manipulate, and incorporate that¶ which is manifestly different through a discourse that is produced¶ and exists in an uneven exchange with various kinds of power:¶ political, intellectual, cultural, and moral (Said, 2003: 12). At base,¶ Orientalism is a form of paranoia that feeds on cartographies of fear by producing ‘our’ world negatively through the construction of a perverse ‘Other’. This is precisely the discourse colonialism mobilized to construct its exploitative authority in the past. In the¶ current context, a relatively new geostrategic aim appeals to the same discursive principles for valorization in its quest to impose an econometric version of global sovereignty (Hart, 2006; Pieterse,¶ 2004; Sparke, 2004). Neoliberalism is on the move, and in the¶ context of the global south, Orientalism is its latitude inasmuch as it affords neoliberalism a powerful discursive space to manuver.¶ This paper has two interrelated central aims. First, building on¶ the work of Arturo Escobar (2001) and Doreen Massey (2005), I¶ contribute to re-theorizations of place as a relational assemblage,¶ rather than as an isolated container, by calling into question the¶ relationship between place and violence. Second, informed by an understanding of Orientalism as performative (Said, 2003), and power/knowledge as productive (Foucault, 1977), I set out to¶ challenge how neoliberalism discursively assigns violence to particular peoples and cultures through its employment of the problematic notions of place that I dispute. I argue that Orientalism maintains an underlying assumption that violence sits in places,¶ and as an affect and effect of discourse, this Orientalist view is¶ enabled because the production of space and place is largely¶ a discursive enterprise (Bachelard, 1964; Lefebvre, 1991). But while violence can bind itself to our somatic geographies and lived experiences of place, in the same way that culture is not confined to¶ any particular place, so too do violent geographies stretch inwards and outwards to reveal the inherent dynamism of space as multiple sites are repeatedly entwined by violence. Thus, following Michel¶ Foucault’s (1977, 1980) insights on power, I am not interested in the why of violence, but rather the how and where of violence. A culturally sensitive critical political economy approach alerts us¶ to the power/knowledge-geometries at play (Hart, 2002; Peet,¶ 2000; Sayer, 2001), so that while violence is clearly mediated¶ through and informed by local cultural norms, it is equally¶ enmeshed in the logic of globalized capital.¶ In the setting of the global south, where and upon which the global north’s caricatural vision of violence repeatedly turns, authoritarian leaders may appropriate neoliberal concerns for market security as a rationale for their violent and repressive actions (Canterbury, 2005; Springer, 2009c). At the same time,¶ because of the performative nature of Orientalism, an exasperated populace may follow their ‘scripted’ roles and resort to violent means in their attempts to cope with the festering poverty and mounting inequality wrought by their state’s deepening neoliberalization¶ (Uvin, 2003). Far from being a symptom of an innate¶ cultural proclivity for violence, state-sponsored violence and systemic social strife can be seen as outcomes of both a state made ‘differently powerful’ via the ongoing ‘roll-out’ of neoliberal reforms (Peck, 2001: 447), and the discourses that support this¶ process (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2001; Springer, 2010b). Thus, when applied to the context of ‘the Other’, neoliberalism maintains¶ e in the double sense of both incessant reproduction and the construction of alterity as ‘Self’-perpetuating logic. Through the circulation of a discourse that posits violence as an exclusive¶ cultural preserve, and by inextricably linking itself to democracy, neoliberalism presents itself as the harbinger of rationality and the only guarantor of peace. Yet neoliberalism’s structural effects of poverty and inequality often (re)produce violence (Escobar,¶ 2004; Springer, 2008), and as such, neoliberalism perpetually renews its own license by suggesting it will cure that which neoliberalization ails.¶ To be clear from the outset, this paper is decidedly theoretical.¶ While writing about violence directly in empirical terms is¶ a worthwhile endeavor to be sure, it is one that e without significant¶ attention and attachment to social theory e risks lending itself to problematic and even Orientalist readings of place. Thus,¶ the purpose here is to critique the limitations of a placed-based¶ approach to violence that merely catalogs in situ, rather than appropriately recognizing the relational geographies of both violence and place. Accordingly, I do not offer empirical accounts of particular places, as my intention is to call such particularized interpretations of ‘place’ into question. The punctuation in the title¶ is very much purposeful in this regard. While violence sits in places in terms of the way in which we perceive its manifestation as a localized and embodied experience, this very idea is challenged when place is reconsidered as a relational assemblage. This re-theorization opens up the supposed fixity, separation, and immutability of place to recognize it instead as always co-constituted by, mediated through, and integrated within the wider experiences of space. Such a radical rethinking of place fundamentally transforms the way we understand violence. No longer confined to its material expression as an isolated ‘event’ or localized ‘thing’, violence can more appropriately be understood as an unfolding process, arising from the broader geographical phenomena and temporal patterns of the social world. In short,¶ through such a reinterpretation of place, geographers are much better positioned to dismiss Orientalist accounts that bind violence to particular peoples, cultures, and places, as was the mandate of colonial geography. We can instead initiate a more emancipatory geography that challenges such colonial imaginings by questioning how seemingly local expressions of violence are instead always imbricated within wider socio-spatial and political economic patterns. This allows geographers to recognize with more theoretical force how ongoing (neo)colonial frameworks, like neoliberalism, are woven between, within, and across places in ways that facilitate and (re)produce violence.

#### Neoliberalism produces crises to justify the expansion of the war machine. The aff impacts are hype which will be used to justify war.

Featherstone 2009

/Mark, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at Keele University, “Appetite for Destruction: On Naomi Klein’s Neo-liberal Utopia-Dystopia”, Fast Capitalism 5.2, http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/5\_2/Featherstone5\_2.html/

Given the existence of the corporate class, it is clear that there is no freedom of competition in the disaster capitalist state. Thus we might conclude that the official ideology of neo-liberalism, which turns off the idea that we should celebrate brutal conflict and natural inequality in civilized society, is a sham. As such, it is not only that we now have no welfare state, since the World Bank and IMF tell us that management of the economy is corruption of the economy, but that the start of the 21st century has seen the emergence of the welfare state’s evil twin, the warfare state, which regards war and natural catastrophe as opportunities to engage in plunder, corruption, and the redistribution of wealth from the poorest to the richest sectors of society. This is Klein’s thesis in a nutshell. In terms of her conclusion that the warfare state is committed to the redistribution of wealth from poor to rich, she is in agreement with David Harvey (2005), whose history of neo-liberalism summarises the rise of this new form of capitalism, but where Klein extends Harvey’s work is in her connection of neo-liberalism to warfare, catastrophe, and chaos. In her view chaos is today’s big business. Chaos opens up the Hobbesian state of nature, which is in itself the natural model of pure capitalism and enables the champions of neo-liberalism to fill its institutionless void with regulation set on the legalisation of brutal struggle. Although Hobbes name never appears in The Shock Doctrine, I think he is the philosophical father of Klein’s central concept, disaster capitalism. Consider Hobbes’ key work Leviathan (2007). Is disaster capitalism not about the destruction of the Keynesian state and the creation of a neo-liberal world system through the endless repetition of Hobbes’ theory of the birth of society? Hobbes tells us that before society existed there was chaos, the state of nature. The Leviathan, sovereign power, imposed law upon the state of nature in order to regulate the behaviour of men. Beyond the prevention of total violence, which would lead to the collapse of political society, the Leviathan would allow men freedoms, but what he would not allow would be the freedom to change the system itself.¶ In neo-liberalism Hobbes’ pre-social chaos is produced by either war or some natural catastrophe. Sovereign power, the neo-liberal elite, then roll into town to impose new order onto the chaotic situation. They impose neo-liberalism upon the native population, who have by this time become natural savages, and then legalise this ideology on the basis that it is the best way to manage society. The sticking point is, of course, that Hobbes’ theory of the state of nature was only ever a thought-experiment meant to apply to some originary condition before society had been invented in the first place. How, then, can this model be applied to neo-liberalism, which seems committed to regime change in order to further its objective of a worldwide corporate utopia? The answer to this question is that we have to think about Locke’s (2003) key addition to Hobbes’ original model of the liberal society. Locke took Hobbes’ original theory of the Leviathan and provided men with the right to overthrow the sovereign and install a new regime if the living God violated their natural rights to life, liberty, and property. What we have here is the model for neo-liberal ideology and the theory of regime change with Empire installed as representative of the people oppressed by the violent Leviathan. Although the necessary theory of political economy was introduced later by Adam Smith (1998), who spoke about the invisible hand of the market and the idea that individual greed could somehow benefit everybody, Friedrich Hayek (2001), who opposed the notion of the free market to the reality of Communist unfreedom, and Milton Friedman (2002), who repackaged these ideas in a theory of the scientific validity of laissez faire capitalism and then tried to sell it to successive American presidents, I maintain that the ideological roots of Klein’s theory of disaster capitalism reside in the strange fusion of Hobbes and Locke expressed in the works of Hayek and Friedman.¶ It may be that for the best part of the 20th century disaster capitalism was more or less held in check by the existence of Communism and the capitalist elite’s recognition that it need to appease the have nots to prevent them turning red, but as the century drew to a close this barrier was no longer effective. In the wake of the failure of the left, Klein explains that the capitalist elite embarked on their plan to neo-liberalise the entire world through the medium of chaos. She begins with a consideration of New Orleans and the effects of Hurricane Katrina. In her view Katrina presented the neo-liberal utopians, who are committed to the creation of a pure capitalist world, with the perfect opportunity to impose a new Hobbesian settlement upon the people of New Orleans. In other words, the catastrophe of Katrina transformed New Orleans into a state of nature, or tabula rasa, and the disaster capitalists were quick to exploit the situation. As the reconstruction effort took effect state schools became private schools and the entire infrastructure of the city was privatized under cover of public trauma. This later point about the ‘cover of trauma’ is essential because it explains the title of Klein’s book. Klein’s thesis is not simply that chaos is the new market for corporate utopians. The first step in Klein’s theory is that chaos is necessary to the transformation of social welfare states that limit extremes of poverty and wealth through legislation and regulation into warfare states that create extremes of poverty and wealth through legislation and regulation which institutionalise the state of everyday war that feeds the neo-liberal disaster capitalist complex. Her point here is to suggest that explosions of chaos and catastrophe tend to undermine the ability of people to resist processes of neo-liberalism and that the corporate utopians have understood that shock is a useful tool for the implementation of catastrophic reform.¶ In many ways this idea suggests a new theory of the ways in which neo-liberal, or totalitarian, capitalism has achieved mastery over the diverse scalings of contemporary reality, since what Klein’s thesis offers is a theory of the ways that the ideology of neo-liberal globalisation feeds through state policy to the psychological transformations of individuals who must then endure the new neo-liberal reality they find themselves occupying. Although I am not sure Klein is wholly successful in this effort to provide a comprehensive theory of the connections between of scalings of our novel neo-liberal reality, simply because she is clearly not versed in the works of Lacan and thus cannot offer an integrated theory of the ways in which our lives are ordered by the symbolic systems that surround us, I think she presents an interesting analysis of processes of subjective transformation under neo-liberal capitalism. The Lacanian thinker Dany-Robert Dufour (2008) covers similar terrain in his book The Art of Shrinking Heads, but where Dufour connects the evolution of neo-liberal culture, which destroys people’s ability to think critically about the world, to the rise of shopping and consumerism, Klein links the emergence of neo-liberal man to torture and the production of schizophrenic subjectivity. That is to say that where Dufour focuses on expansion of the culture industries and the commodification of everything, Klein considers a series of CIA experiments conducted in the 1950s set on the discovery of the psychological techniques necessary to re-pattern individuals.¶ In this way Klein shifts from a discussion of a particular episode of psychological torment, which caused the collapse of the psychic structures of particular individuals, through large scale shock therapy, meant to de-pattern individuals on a mass scale, to the emergence of what Lieven De Cauter (2004) calls entropic Empire, a convulsive world system that produces individuals who are either in a state of constant shock or evolve into perfect schizo capitalists able to roll with the blows of the new world dis-order. Reading Klein’s book it seems clear that neo-liberal man is a miserable, tortured, creature. In Klein’s work there is no happy schizo who, in Deleuze and Guattari’s language, takes flight whenever it appears that they are likely to find themselves stuck in some molar formation or other, but rather millions of old style Freudian (1989) subjects who need civilization to structure their lives. For evidence of the continued existence of the Freudian subject we simply need to consider how neo-liberal man has responded to the privatisation of civilization. He has not welcomed this process by transforming himself into a desiring machine, even though champions of the culture industry would say that that is exactly what the excessive subject of contemporary late capitalism has become, but has instead fallen into a state of paranoia. Of course, this is exactly what Klein’s monstrous system requires of neo-liberal man. The schizo subject, fearful of the outside world, in need of consolation, turns to the universe of commodities produced by the culture industry, and his specially constructed fortified community produced by the security industry, for comfort and protection from those less fortunate schizos, who want similar relief and protection from the endless shocks of convulsive capitalism. Perhaps I have mis-understood Deleuze and Guattari’s Schizophrenia and Capitalism (1983, 1984), but I am sure that this desperate situation is not what they had in mind when they wrote about the potential of the schizo to escape the paranoid formations of capitalism.¶ Far from transgressing paranoid formations it is clear that the contemporary neo-liberal schizo produces bunkers, walls, fortified communities, panic rooms, and surveillance systems in excess. In light of this explosion of paranoia the Belgian urbanist Lieven De Cauter (2004) claims that we live in a capsular civilization. In his view this paranoid culture, characterised by expressions of anxiety and fear, is perfectly suited to the new brand of capitalism, which is geared to the creation and management of chaos. Consider the contemporary global homeland security industry. Klein explains that this industry, which takes in the most unequal societies in the world, America, South Africa, Brazil, and Israel, is now even more profitable than the home of Adorno and Horkheimer’s (1997) culture industry, Hollywood. Moreover, she tells us that the masters of security, the Israelis, have proven that the traditional rule, which suggests that chaos and economic vitality are opposites that cannot co-exist, is no longer operative in the contemporary world. In 2007 the performance of the Israeli economy was comparable to that of the Chinese and Indian boom economies because, in her view, the security corporations, such as the wall builders Magal and Elbit, were so profitable. Thus we live in a security bubble, conditioned by mass surveillance, mass incarceration, urban warfare, eroded civil liberties, and legitimate torture, which requires the production of catastrophe to ensure its continued vitality.¶ Given this view, let us once more emphasise the problem with Retort’s (2005) idea that the situation in Israel-Palestine is somehow detrimental to the symbolic coherence of Empire. The endless war between Israel and Hamas is clearly not problematic to either Israel or the American Empire because it enables Israel to maintain its ‘competitive advantage’ in the homeland security market and America to keep its foot in the door of the same market. Where would the war on terror be without Israel-Palestine? All of this sounds like an enormous conspiracy theory. Surely it is insane to suggest that the situation in the Middle East is driven by economic considerations and that American interest in the area is conditioned by its desire to stimulate profitable chaos? The truth is that to see the rise of the disaster capitalism complex in the Middle East as a vast conspiracy theory thins out the evolution of the situation, underestimates the deep cultural connections between Israel, America, the idea of the frontier, and capitalist ideology suggested above, and misses the ways in which the new catastrophic form of capitalism emerged as an adaptation to already existing chaos in the region. What does this mean? Klein’s thesis is that disaster capitalism was extended to the Middle East in its completed state to take advantage of pre-existing chaos and expand American influence in the area. In other words, her view is that disaster capitalism came to Israel, Iraq, and the Middle East late, but that when it did emerge it took the form of a fully integrated system set on the extraction of surplus value from the production and exploitation of violence, destruction, and misery. In this respect discussions of the exploitation of urban war in Israel and Iraq and natural catastrophe in Indonesia, Thailand, the Maldives, and New Orleans represent the pinnacle of contemporary disaster capitalism in Klein’s account. But what about the origins of this new brand of capitalism? Where did disaster capitalism begin?¶ Beyond her consideration of the CIA’s experiments in torture, which set the scene for discussions of social deconstruction-reconstruction in the service of American capitalism, Klein focuses on Latin America in the post World War II period and in particular American fear of the potential of developmentalism to foster pro-communist sentiments in the Latin American masses. In response to these fears Klein shows how the CIA sponsored military dictatorships in Chile, Argentina, and Brazil and encouraged these regimes to implement neo-liberal economic reform. Since the Friedmanite reform programmes of the so-called Chicago Boys, the Chicago trained economists put in place to neo-liberalise the Latin economies, caused wide-spread poverty, misery, and hardship Klein explains that it was necessary for the military regimes to support them with brutal violence and indiscriminate terrorism. Thus the first example of the implementation of the shock doctrine entailed economic transformation through planned violence and organised terrorism. Violence became the means to the end of economic re-organisation and the redistribution of wealth from the poorest classes to the rich elites. But by the 1980s state violence was no longer the only engine of the American sponsored process of neo-liberalisation. In the early 1980s Margaret Thatcher embarked on the privatization of British society on the basis of success in the Falklands War. As the decade wore on Thatcher’s policy of privatisation was coupled with attacks on organised labour, the de-regulation of business, and the reduction of state welfare.¶ As the 1980s became the 1990s Klein tells us the neo-liberal system was ready to begin the transformation into full scale disaster capitalism. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, first Russia, then China, Poland, Mexico, South Africa, and the Asian Tigers fell foul of the neo-liberal system set on the exploitation of chaos. Although in Klein’s view it would be a mistake to imagine that the viral infections of the globalised neo-liberal system in the 1990s, most clearly evident in the economic collapse of the Asian Tigers which was correctly titled ‘Asian Flu’, were somehow natural catastrophes, since in the Friedmanite view the global economy needs convulsions, crashes, and shocks to drive innovation, creativity, and the production of surplus value, she does not think this is enough to qualify these episodes as examples of the intervention of disaster capitalism. The reason for this is that even though the notion of the productivity of chaos, which is perfectly symmetrical with Schumpeter’s (1984) idea of creative destruction, was present in the 1990s there was no clear sense that chaos could be engineered for the sake of the creation of surplus value. Thus Klein suggests that the final step in the emergence of the fully reflexive entropic empire was the invention of disaster capitalism proper, a complete social, political, cultural, and economic form set on the promotion, production, and exploitation of chaos on a global scale. Does this mean, then, that we should regard the Iraq War as the classic example of the disaster capitalism complex? I think that we must support this conclusion because it is only really in Iraq that we find the complete package of the promotion, production, and exploitation of chaos without outside intervention from natural catastrophe, quasi-natural economic crash, or entrenched political conflict ripe for insertion into the disaster capitalism complex.

### 1NC—Herod Reformism K

#### The Aff is liberal naivite—they act as if the government is making a mistake when it allows domestic abusers to continue to purchase guns. This is false. There are no mistake policies, the government knows what its doing and wants it to continue. The government supports, relies on and propagates war, torture, and massacres for its continued existence, and any attempt for reform will be ignored and circumvented by those in power.

Herod 1**,** James, anarchist writer and thinker, “A Stake, Not a Mistake: On Not Seeing the Enemy”, October 2001. http://www.jamesherod.info/index.php?sec=paper&id=9 ES

In subsequent decades there has been no end to the commentators who take the 'this is a mistake' line. Throughout the low intensity (i.e., terrorist) wars against Nicaragua and El Salvador in the 1980s we heard this complaint again and again. It is currently seen in the constant stream of commentaries on the US assault on Colombia. It has been heard repeatedly during the past two years in the demonstrations against the World Bank and the World Trade Organization. Protesters complain that the WTO's policies of structural adjustment are having the opposite effect of what they're suppose to. That is, they are hindering, not facilitating, development, and causing poverty, not alleviating it.¶ Two years ago, in 1999, throughout the 78 day bombing attack on Yugoslavia, much of the outpouring of progressive commentary on the event (that which didn't actually endorse the bombing that is) argued that "this is a mistake".[1] My favorite quote from that episode, was from Robert Hayden, Director of the Center for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Pittsburgh, being interviewed by Amy Goodman on Democracy Now, April 19, 1999. He said: "But we have the Clinton administration that developed a diplomacy that seems to have been intended to have produced this war, and now the Clinton administration's actions seem determined to produce a wider war." Amy Goodman: "Why would the Clinton Administration want to produce a war?" Hayden: "Boy, you know what? You've got me there. And as I say, you have to go back to the simple principles of incompetence. Never assume competence on the part of these guys." This was surely the bottom of the pit for the 'this is a mistake' crowd. I could cite quotes like this by the dozen, but instead let me turn to our current "war".¶ So what has been the response of the 'progressive community' to the bombing of Afghanistan? As usual, they just don't get it. They just can't seem to grasp the simple fact that the government does this stuff on purpose. Endlessly, progressives talk as if the government is just making a mistake, does not see the real consequences of its actions, or is acting irrationally, and they hope to correct the government's course by pointing out the errors of its ways. Progressives assume that their goals -- peace, justice, well-being -- are also the government's goals. So when they look at what the government is doing, they get alarmed and puzzled, because it is obvious that the government's actions are not achieving these goals. So they cry out: "Hey, this policy doesn't lead to peace!" or "Hey, this policy doesn't achieve justice (or democracy, or development)!" By pointing this out, they hope to educate the government, to help it to see its mistakes, to convince it that its policies are not having the desired results.[2]¶ How can they not see that the US government acts deliberately, and that it knows what it is doing? How can they not see that the government's goals are not peace and justice, but empire and profit. It wants these wars, this repression. These policies are not mistakes; they are not irrational; they are not based on a failure of moral insight (since morality is not even a factor in their considerations); they are not aberrations; they are not based on a failure to analyze the situation correctly; they are not based on ignorance. This repression, these bombings, wars, massacres, assassinations, and covert actions are the coldly calculated, rational, consistent, intelligent, and informed actions of a ruling class determined at all costs to keep its power and wealth and preserve its way of life (capitalism). It has demonstrated great historical presence, persistence, and continuity in pursuing this objective. This ruling class knows that it is committing atrocities, knows that it is destroying democracy, hope, welfare, peace, and justice, knows that it is murdering, massacring, slaughtering, poisoning, torturing, lying, stealing, and it doesn't care. Yet most progressives seem to believe that if only they point out often enough and loud enough that the ruling class is murdering people, that it will wake up, take notice, apologize, and stop doing it.

#### EVERY TIME THE STATE DOES SHIT IT MAKES STUFF WORSE

Woan (Master of Arts in Philosophy, Politics, and Law in the Graduate School of Binghamton University) 2011

(Tansy, “The value of resistance in a permanently white, civil society,” <http://gradworks.umi.com/14/96/1496586.html>, August 2011, pg 9-19)

Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton, in then influential Black Power, describe reformist strategies as "playing ball" with the white man. They argue that reform plays the white man's game in order to gain rights, i.e. appeal to a white supremacist government that is the precise agent responsible for the original harms they are seeking to alleviate.9 While this may very well result in the granting of new rights previously denied, it maintains a hierarchical system between whites and nonwhites, since the latter will have to continue to appeal to the former to ask for rights they never should have been denied in the first place. This places the former in a position of power to accept or deny such requests. Thus, in Carmichael and Hamilton's view, attempting to resist white supremacy by working within white supremacist institutions maintains a dangerous system of power relations that lock in place the hierarchy between whites and nonwhites. / It is unfortunate enough that members of minority groups face public and private racial discrimination. It is worse, however, to place the burden of combating this discrimination on them. What Carmichael and Hamilton aptly point out is that the hierarchy between races mentioned above is what is responsible for this undue burden. There is not only the constant physical struggle of protesting, writing letters, and being dragged through litigation that can often get expensive, but there is the psychological struggle as well. Why am I not worthy of equal protection under the law? Why is it that others do not even notice the disparate impact of the law? Or, even worse, why is it that those who do notice, seem to not care? / What inevitably comes with these types of reformist strategies is an emotional struggle, namely, an inferiority complex that makes the victimized individual stop and wonder — who put the white man in charge of my body? Appeals to the federal government to repeal discriminatory acts that deny minorities rights becomes analogous to asking whites to eliminate such policies and to allow others access to the same rights they enjoy every day. The racial state becomes in charge of what nonwhites can and cannot do, and when nonwhites continue to go to whites asking them to pass certain policies, nonwhites further legitimate this system of power relations. It is difficult to see how true equality can be achieved wider such a system. / B. Missing the Root Cause: The Racial State / Omi and Winant further support this claim and explain that it is not merely individual policies passed by the United States federal government that are racist, but that racial oppression is a structure of the government itself.10 They describe this structure as the "racial state" to show that the state does not merely support racism, but rather, it supports the concept of race itself. As will be discussed later in this paper, Omi and Winant explain how the state is the agent that has defined race, and that this definition has evolved over time, to maintain the concept of race and support racism. / Given the existence of the racial state, Omi and Winant critique reformist strategies as falling short of achieving normative goals of eliminating racism since the reforms merely get re-equilibriated. A look at the history of racial victories in the United States further supports this critique. Racial victories for one minority were often made possible only with the entrapment of another racial minority. For example, while many celebrate the racial victory of the 1954 Brown v. Board decision, many fail to see this happened the same year as Operation Wetback, which shifted the racial discrimination to a different population, removing close to one million illegal immigrants, mostly Mexicans, from the United States.11 Moreover, soon after the ratification of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments granting citizenship and suffrage to Blacks. Congress chose to deny citizenship to Chinese immigrants.12 In 1941, shortly after the establishment of the Committee on Fair Employment Practices permitted Blacks into defense industries, Japanese Americans were taken from their homes and sent off to internment camps. Pei-te Lien argues that all of these "coincidences" support critiques of reformist strategies that merely target individual policies, since without challenging the racial state as a whole, even the elimination of these individual policies will fail to eliminate racism, as they will simply replicate themselves or shift elsewhere and target racial minorities in different ways.14 / C. Separatist Movements / This helps to explain why political activists began adopting other more revolutionary strategies. Contrary to Martin Luther King Jr. and many of his followers during the Civil Rights Movement, the Black Power Movement emerged and began advocating for more separatist strategies that rejected making reformist appeals to the United States federal government. In his speech "The Ballot or the Bullet," Malcolm X argued: / When you take your case to Washington D.C., you're taking it to the criminal who's responsible: it's like miming from the wolf to the fox. They're all in cahoots together. They all work political chicanery and make you look like a chump before the eyes of the world. Here you are walking around in America, getting ready to be drafted and sent abroad, like a tin soldier, and when you get over there, people ask you what you are fighting for, and you have to stick your tongue in your cheek. No, take Uncle Sam to court, take him before the world. / Critics of reformist strategies, such as Malcolm X, understood the United States as being inherently racial and thus incapable of reform. They use the "coincidences" listed above as evidence to support this claim. They view the United States federal government as a racial state that will merely continue to define race in new and more modernized ways, ensuring the permanence of racism with the passage of new policies supporting these definitions. This is why they believe reformists are wrong to attack individual policies, rather than the racial state itself. / For example, the legal enforcement of a racially discriminatory housing covenant may have been justified due to a racist belief that members of the minority race restricted from acquiring title within that neighborhood is inferior to the Caucasian race. More specifically, one might support said covenant because one believes the inferiority of that minority race and the potential they might become your neighbor will result in a decrease in the fair market value of your property. After vigorous ongoing protests from civil rights activists, that particular law enforcing those covenants might get repealed. However, the reason for the repeal of that law might arise not from an ethical epiphany, but rather an economic rationale in which the homeowner is shown his property value will remain unaffected, or perhaps even increase. Thus, that particular act may get repealed, but the policymakers responsible for its original draft will still be in power, and will maintain the same beliefs that motivated that piece of legislation in the first place. Because there has been no ethical realization of the injustice in their conduct, the chances remain high that they will construct new, apparently different but equally discriminatory policies that will force activists to join forces once again and continue the same fight. / This is why it is not the individual policies, but the government itself that is the "preeminent site of racial conflict."17 Omi and Winant's proposal of the "racial state" views the government as "inherently racial," meaning it does not simply intervene in racial conflicts, but it is the locus of racial conflict.18 In addition to structuring conceptions of race, the government in the United States is in and of itself racially structured.19 State policies govern racial politics, heavily influencing the public on how race should be viewed. The ways in which it does so changes over time, often taking on a more invisible nature. For example, Omi and Winant describe the racial state as treating race in different ways throughout different periods of time, first as a biologically based essence, and then as an ideology, etc. These policies are followed by racial remedies offered by government institutions, in response to political pressures and in accordance to these different treatments of race, varying in degree depending on the magnitude of the threats those pressures pose to the order of society. Notable achievements during the Civil Rights Movement have served as a double-edged sword. While the reformist strategies utilized during that period helped make certain advances possible, it also drove other more overt expressions of racism underground. These more invisible instantiations of racial injustice are far more difficult to identify than its previously more explicit forms. Praising these victories risks giving off the illusion that the fight is over and that racism is a description of the past. / For example, the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment gave off the illusion that all citizens thereafter had equal access to the right to vote. Those who supported its ratification now felt entitled to the moral credentials necessary to legitimize their ability to express racially prejudiced attitudes.21 For example, voter turnout today remains relatively low for Asian-Americans, and many blame this on cultural differences between Asians and Americans.22 Asian-Americans are labeled as apathetic in the political community and they themselves have been attributed the blame for relatively low representation of Asian-Americans in the government today.23 This however, ignores the way in which other more invisible practices serve to obstruct Asian-Americans from being able to exercise their right to vote. / Research by the United States Election Assistance Commission by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, for example, indicates that restrictive voter identification requirements have effectively served to disenfranchise Asian Pacific Islanders (APIs) from voting.24 In the 2004 election, researchers found APIs in states where voters were required to present proper identification at the polls were 8.5% less likely to vote.25 This study confirmed that voter ID requirements prevented a large number of APIs from voting.26 / Voter suppression tactics also play a large role in the disenfranchisement of APIs. According to a Voter Intimidation and Vote Suppression briefing paper by Demos, a national public policy center, an estimated 50 Asian Americans were selectively challenged at the polls in Alabama during August of 2004, as being ineligible to vote due to insufficient English-speaking skills.27 Many states have allowed this selective challenging of voters to take place at the polls, resulting in a feeling of fear, intimidation, and embarrassment among APIs, driving them away from the polls. / The danger in treasuring monumental victories such as the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment becomes apparent when people interpret this ratification as an indication that voting discrimination is no longer a problem, and that if the voter turnout of Asian-Americans is consistently low, it must be because they are politically apathetic or disinterested in American ideals. Because they originally supported the ratification of the amendment, whites can now feel as if they have the moral credentials to make conclusions such as the cultural differences rationale. The same can be seen after courts ordered the desegregation of public schools and after affirmative action programs became more widespread. People began assuming African-Americans now had an equal opportunity for education and that if they did not succeed, it must be a reflection of their intelligence or work-ethic, failing to see the ways the problem has not been solved, but rather disguised itself in other costumes, such as tracking programs in schools or teachers who view their presence as merely "affirmative action babies" and expect them to fail. / One might ask, then, why can we not change the racial state one policy at a time? Perhaps one could first work to gain the right to vote, and then move on to combat discriminatory identification requirements and political scare tactics. It would not seem entirely implausible to assume that the success of individual piecemeal reforms within the government could eventually result in a transformation of the institution itself. However, simply eliminating discriminatory policies is insufficient for an overhaul of a racial institution. / Understanding the motivating reasons for the elimination of individual racist policies is a critical factor in determining the success of a movement. While one justification for passing the Fifteenth Amendment might consist of arguments in favor of equality and exposing racial injustice, another justification might involve maintaining order and minimizing disruption, which is important to the federal government and its ability to run smoothly. Thus, the government often seeks out ways to normalize society through eliminating disruptions to preserve order. When those being denied certain rights grow significantly discontent, they rebel and become disruptions to the functioning of white, civil society. This can take the form of civil disobedience, such as protests, peaceful demonstrations, petitions, letters to the government, etc., or more revolutionary measures, such as damaging government offices or violently harassing officials to acknowledge the injustices and change policy. / All of these measures, however peaceful or violent, disrupt society. A town cannot run smoothly if protesters are filling up the streets or blocking frequently-used road paths, and most certainly cannot run smoothly if town halls are being lit on fire. Thus, in order to return to the desired homeostasis, those in power may often compromise and offer to rectify the situation at hand by granting rights to individuals through changes in legislation in order to appease them and "eliminate" the disruption (the protests, demonstrations, etc.). The lack of effort made towards protecting these rights bolsters Bell's argument that these reforms serve more of a symbolic value rather than functional. If still operating under the racial state, these piecemeal reforms will fail to solve the original racial injustices in the long term, as they will only succeed in establishing a new unstable equilibrium, only to be followed with the replication of new racial problems.28 These new problems will once again create resentment, generate protest, and the cycle will begin to replicate itself, ensuring the permanence of racism. Omi and Winant term this cycle of continuous disruption and restoration of order as the trajectory of racial politics.29 This trajectory supports the treatment of racism as inevitable since even if the racial state mitigates racial disruption over a particular policy and "restores order," another policy based off a new definition of race will emerge triggering another racial disruption, continuing this cycle of racial politics.

#### Faith in American government makes White Supremacy impossible to overcome.

Tansy Woan, 2011, Master of Arts in Philosophy, Politics, and Law in the Graduate School of Binghamton University, “THE VALUE OF RESISTANCE IN A PERMANENTLY WHITE, CIVIL SOCIETY,” http://gradworks.umi.com/14/96/1496586.html, p. 1-3

The effects of our political participation are profound. We have come a way over the last few centuries. The election of a nonwhite President says a great deal of what we have accomplished. And yet, what exactly is it that these engagements with the political process have helped us to accomplish? / A great barrier to racial equality has been this faith in the ability of our American government to effect real change. The government's treatment of race has often deceivingly convinced us that we have achieved what has been promised. In 1954, the United States Supreme Court overruled the separate but equal doctrine of racial segregation as unconstitutional.2 Many American civil rights activists prematurely celebrated what was thought to be the end of segregation. However, due to the passive, indirect nature of racism, segregation persisted through loopholes provided by the American legal system. / Twenty years after the Brown v. Board of Education decision, in spite of the clearly segregated result of Detroit public school busing systems. Milliken v. Bradley ruled that there was "no showing of significant violation" because the racism that arose in the Milliken decision was passive and indirect.3 It was ruled that the disparate impact shown through evidence submitted in court could not prove acmal intent of racial discrimination, and therefore could not warrant judicial remedy. Moreover, the Supreme Court decision in Brown could do little to prevent white flight from rendering desegregation practicably impossible, or the in-classroom segregation that results when special education placement programs result in classrooms that are predominantly African-American and gifted student programs result in classrooms that are predominantly white. The highest law in the land proved incapable of prohibiting these less explicitly but equally insidious instances of racial segregation. / This increasing invisibility of whiteness that has permeated society has blinded many Americans from recognizing racial injustices today. Derrick Bell warns that to interpret civil rights "victories" (such as the Brown decision) as signals that we have achieved what we wanted and that our work is now done runs the risk of masking the way in which many treasure these events merely as symbols to alleviate white guilt.4 For example, one might find value in them not based on material gains, but because of the ability they have to make one feel as if one is no longer a guilty participant of white supremacy and giving one the moral credentials to feel justified in making other racially prejudiced statements.5 / Recognizing the limits of traditional forms of political participation (such as civil protests, writing letters to local officials, and voting on Election Day) is a prerequisite for any activist seeking to eliminate racial injustice. Our faith in the American legal system has blinded us to its shortcomings and fooled us into believing that working with the government is the best, and only, venue for change.

### 1NC – dedev

#### The best models are pointing to an environmental and economic collapse *in the next decade*- culminating in extinction. Economic decline now allows for a stable transition to a sustainable society.

Ahmed 14 (Nafeez, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex, 2014, “Scientists vindicate 'Limits to Growth' – urge investment in 'circular economy',” http://www.theguardian.com/environment/earth-insight/2014/jun/04/scientists-limits-to-growth-vindicated-investment-transition-circular-economy/AKG) \*Added isn’t

According to a new peer-reviewed scientific report, industrial civilisation is likely to deplete its low-cost mineral resources within the next century, with debilitating impacts for the global economy and key infrastructures within the coming decade. The study, the 33rd report to the Club of Rome, is authored by Prof Ugo Bardi of the University of Florence's Earth Sciences Department, and includes contributions from a wide range of senior scientists across relevant disciplines. The Club of Rome is a Swiss-based global think tank consisting of current and former heads of state, UN bureaucrats, government officials, diplomats, scientists, economists and business leaders. Its first report in 1972, The Limits to Growth, was conducted by a scientific team at the Massachusetts Institute for Technology (MIT), and warned that limited availability of natural resources relative to rising costs would undermine continued economic growth by around the second decade of the 21st century. Although widely ridiculed, recent scientific reviews confirm that the original report's projections in its 'base scenario' remain robust. In 2008, Australia's federal government scientific research agency CSIRO concluded that The Limits to Growth forecast of potential "global ecological and economic collapse coming up in the middle of the 21st Century" due to convergence of "peak oil, climate change, and food and water security", is "on-track." Actual current trends in these areas "resonate strongly with the overshoot and collapse displayed in the book's 'business-as-usual scenario.'" In 2009, American Scientist published similar findings by other scientists. That review, by leading systems ecologists Prof Charles Hall of State University of New York and Prof John W Day of Louisiana State University, concluded that while the limits-to-growth model's "predictions of extreme pollution and population decline have not come true", the model results are: "... almost exactly on course some 35 years later in 2008 (with a few appropriate assumptions)... it is important to recognise that its predictions have not been invalidated and in fact seem quite on target. We are not aware of any model made by economists that is as accurate over such a long time span." The new Club of Rome report says that: "The phase of mining by humans is a spectacular but very brief episode in the geological history of the planet… The limits to mineral extraction are not limits of quantity; they are limits of energy. Extracting minerals takes energy, and the more dispersed the minerals are, the more energy is needed… Only conventional ores can be profitably mined with the amounts of energy we can produce today." The combination of mineral depletion, associated radioactive and heavy metal pollution, and the accumulation of greenhouse gases from fossil fuel exploitation is leaving our descendants the "heavy legacy" of a virtually terraformed world: "The Earth will never be the same; it is being transformed into a new and different planet." Drawing on the work of leading climate scientists including James Hansen, the former head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, the report warns that a continuation of 'business as usual' exploitation of the world's fossil fuels could potentially trigger runaway global warming that, in several centuries or thousands of years, permanently destroy the planet's capacity to host life. Despite this verdict, the report argues that neither a "collapse" of the current structure of civilisation, nor the "extinction" of the human species are [isn’t]\* unavoidable. A fundamental reorganisation of the way societies produce, manage and consume resources could support a new high-technology civilisation, but this would entail a new "circular economy" premised on wide-scale practices of recycling across production and consumption chains, a wholesale shift to renewable energy, application of agro-ecological methods to food production, and with all that, very different types of social structures. In the absence of a major technological breakthrough in clean energy production such as nuclear fusion – which so far seems improbable - recycling, conservation and efficiency in the management of the planet's remaining accessible mineral resources will need to be undertaken carefully and cooperatively, with the assistance of cutting-edge science. Limits to economic growth, or even "degrowth", the report says, do not need to imply an end to prosperity, but rather require a conscious decision by societies to lower their environmental impacts, reduce wasteful consumption, and increase efficiency – changes which could in fact increase quality of life while lowering inequality. These findings of the new Club of Rome report have been confirmed by other major research projects. In January last year, a detailed scientific study by Anglia Ruskin University's Global Sustainability Institute commissioned by the Institute and Faculty of Actuaries, found "overwhelming" evidence for resource constraints: "... across a range of resources over the short (years) and medium (decades) term… Resource constraints will, at best, increase energy and commodity prices over the next century and, at worse, trigger a long term decline in the global economy and civil unrest." The good news, though is that "If governments and economic agents anticipate resource constraints and act in a constructive manner, many of the worst affects can be avoided." According to Dr Aled Jones, lead author of the study and head of the Global Sustainability Institute: "Resource constraints will, at best, steadily increase energy and commodity prices over the next century and, at worst, could represent financial disaster, with the assets of pension schemes effectively wiped out and pensions reduced to negligible levels." It is imperative to recognise that "dwindling resources raise the possibility of a limit to economic growth in the medium term." In his 2014 report to the Club of Rome, Prof Bardi takes a long-term view of the prospects for humanity, noting that the many technological achievements of industrial societies mean there is still a chance now to ensure the survival and prosperity of a future post-industrial civilization: "It is not easy to imagine the details of the society that will emerge on an Earth stripped of its mineral ores but still maintaining a high technological level. We can say, however, that most of the crucial technologies for our society can function without rare minerals or with very small amounts of them, although with modifications and at lower efficiency." Although expensive and environmentally intrusive industrial structures "like highways and plane travel" would become obsolete, technologies like "the Internet, computers, robotics, long-range communications, public transportation, comfortable homes, food security, and more" could remain attainable with the right approach - even if societies undergo disastrous crises in the short-run. Bardi is surprisingly matter-of-fact about the import of his study. "I am not a doomster," he told me. "Unfortunately, depletion is a fact of life, not unlike death and taxes. We cannot ignore depletion - just like it is not a good idea to ignore death and taxes… "If we insist in investing most of what remains for fossil fuels; then we are truly doomed. Yet I think that we still have time to manage the transition. To counter depletion, we must invest a substantial amount of the remaining resources in renewable energy and efficient recycling technologies - things which are not subjected to depletion. And we need to do that before is too late, that is before the energy return on investment of fossil fuels has declined so much that we have nothing left to invest."

## 2NR

### 2NR O/V—L

#### <<WIL 13>>

#### The Affirmative’s law and order politics only give the capitalist class a complete monopoly on guns. It is their government, their police, their industries, not the peoples, and they want to keep it that way. Even gun control that is meant to be anti-neoliberal is coopted, which takes out solvency. Look at the Oregon militia and Bundy crisis—fascists are all but coddled by the government while revolutionary movements like the Black Panther Party were violently attacked on the basis of “gun control.”

#### Capitalists would breathe a sigh of relief if the workers were to be disarmed.

#### <<Sherman 12>>

#### The Affirmative’s law and order politics and call to reduce violence by restricting the rights of workers parallels the war on Black and Latino youth (otherwise known as the war on drugs) Reformers remain silent about gun control for their “private armies”, the police, responsible for putting down strikes, enforcing right to work policies, killing unarmed black civilians.

#### <<Martin>>

#### Take away their ability to defend themselves so we can keep on killing them on the job with worse and worse working conditions.

### 2NR O/V—Alt

#### The alternative is a strategy of social solidarity around workers gun rights. In this round, the Aff perpetuates capitalist knowledge production—they uphold the notion of the “benevolent state” protecting the people from themselves—that’s the link debate. The alternative means disrupting the narrative that if we take away worker’s guns, everyone will be safer. Taking away workers guns allows continued degradation of workers in the workplace, continued exploitation of the environment, and continuation of a fundamentally unjust system founded upon alienation—that’s Sherman. This is not abstract philosophy—empirically workers have organized using guns to defend their rights—from the black panther party to deacons for justice.

### 2NR A—solvency top

#### I’m winning the solvency debate—

#### Cooption: Gun control will be used to further criminalize black and latino youth, empirically this can be seen by Stand Your Ground laws and the disproportionate policing of the Black Panther Party when compared to modern day reaction militia groups like in Oregon—that’s Sherman. <<Means even if they win that with perfect implementation, they solve, implementation wouldn’t be perfect>>

#### Root cause: Gun control addresses the symptom not disease, only the alternative addresses a society that is based upon violence. The number of deaths due to gun homicides is *nothing* compared to deaths due to lower and lower worker conditions. Only by addressing the violence at the heart of the system can we solve this senseless tragedy.

### 2NR A—AT: no rev anything shit

#### Nah—TOD.

Fablo 15 (Syd Fablo, writer for Rock Salted and radical Marxist, <http://rocksalted.com/2015/08/liberals-go-wrong/>, 2015)//Miro

Had to chuckle a little when reading the drivel that Darwin Bond-Graham and Andrew Culp published a while back as “Left Gun Nuts: Opposition to Gun Control Comes from Many on the Left Also. Here’s Why They’re Wrong.” Most of their arguments are flawed, and some even support the conclusions they claim are “wrong”. They use loaded and pejorative language in place of actual argument or evidence most of the time, which is why they reach such naive conclusions (see, I can use pejoratives in place of argument too!). Mostly, though, they presuppose a liberal conclusion and simply reject all left and right outcomes a priori and then work backwards to support their “extreme center” position — while pretending to do the opposite. This leads them to seek small short- or medium-term gains by sacrificing long-term or more abstract ones (the kind of approach criticized among environmental conservationists in the article “Historical Lessons of Successful Conservation Movements” published on the same web site). Let’s go through their points one by one: The people need to defend themselves against the government. More broadly this might be phrased as “The people need to defend themselves against the powerful.” The authors state this position is wrong because, supposedly, “This dream is sadly a classic example of radical posturing done in the name of some distant hypothetical moment, and it ignores the actual harm that guns cause each and every day. ” Sadly, Bond-Graham and Culp are ignorant of history here. They live in a fantasy world in which progressive change is possible through the mechanisms of government established by vested interests to entrench their own power. Guns are inanimate objects, tools that place a degree of power in the hands of those who wield them. These authors apparently think it is proper to restrict that power to the hands of the elite. This is an authoritarian position. While I applaud the authors for their concern over the current material circumstances of the poor — though few on the left are “ignoring” those conditions — I disagree that those material interests can meaningfully be advanced by limiting the poor’s access to the tools of power. The authors’ suggestion merely reinforces the moral claim of elites to exclusive control over the instruments of power more generally, and fosters the legitimation of unequal treatment of different populations. This creates a negative feedback loop, and, in the end, reinforces the degraded material conditions of the poor. There is a symbolic aspect to access to the tools of power that must be considered alongside the material conditions of the poor and powerless today. Any material gains will quickly erode if the symbolic gains are not achieved first (or at the same time). The authors acknowledge, “Of course gun control will not eliminate America’s patriarchal power structure, or pacify the culture of violence, or undo racism.” Yes! Sadly, they don’t stop with that valid point, and instead make an unrelated argument — not supported by that point — that, “gun control can do one thing very effectively: reduce the lethality of violent acts that stem from patriarchy, racism, and inequality. Instead of dying in a hail of bullets, victims will be survivors and can more effectively fight back. Indeed, in our present political context, gun control is fighting back against patriarchy and other forms of oppression.” This is where the article falters empirically, as discussed further below. The authors’ car analogy (“Cars are a great example of how regulation reduces harm while creating a more equal society.”) is false. While cars are and should be regulated, no auto regulations take away the ability of the poor to access transportation. A better analogy would be airline security, which places onerous burdens upon travellers using commercial airlines, requiring them to submit to invasive, degrading, dragnet searches, while private and charter flight passengers face no such humiliations or invasions of privacy. The cops should be disarmed, not the people. The authors, in their very first sentence, agree: “Yes, the police should be disarmed.” Yet, strangely, they continue to argue in another direction. They note that “the proliferation of guns in America has provided an excuse for police to further intrude in our lives.” Maybe, but this is a disingenuous argument. Police should not be granted power on pretextual “excuses”. While the authors seem to agree, they return to a sort of path-of-least-resistance discourse that is premised more on expediency within existing structural conditions than viability of change to a new structural configuration. They throw up their hands saying that the real problems can’t be solved, so we’ll merely mitigate what (smaller) problems we can. This type of reductionist thinking is repeatedly disproved in history. For one, the same web site published a piece that illustrates how killings by police are excised from statistical reports. There is classification that presupposes the legitimacy of certain shootings and killings in the very manner of collection of the data. It’s a little hard to say how this factors into the specific analysis by Bond-Graham and Culp, because the authors provide no citations to the source of their data. There are plenty of specific instances to back up this view. Bill Black wrote a short piece, “The 80th Anniversary of the Strike that Freed Minnesota from Tyranny,” about the famous 1934 Minneapolis Teamsters Strike. He noted that the government colluded with business to create a police state that suppressed worker’s wages (and by extension, living conditions). The government attacked a protest for better conditions by the Teamsters, using “deputy” agents. “How can one take on a police state like the [business-run Citizens] Alliance ran in Minnesota that uses violence under the color of law as one of its many core tactics? If [the truck-driver’s union Teamsters] Local 574 had not responded in kind to the Alliance’s attack on unarmed workers the strike would have been broken and the Alliance’s police state would have persisted.” Although not mentioned by Black, a public commission found that “Police took direct aim at the pickets and fired to kill. Physical safety of the police was at no time endangered. No weapons were in possession of the pickets.” This suggests that indeed guns are more dangerous in the hands of police than ordinary citizens. The authors make no mention of a closely related argument that guns should be taken from the hands of the military. Lenin wrote in Pravda in 1917 in favor of “Abolition of the police, the army and the bureaucracy . . . to be replaced by the arming of the whole people.” As François Mitterrand said in the 1980s, as he capitulated on meaningful change in France, “Either you are a Leninist. Or you won’t change anything.” Should we also ban knives and cars and bombs and bleach and acid? “Some pro-gun Lefties sideline the obvious [sic] merits of gun control and argue that supposedly ‘deeper’ systemic issues should be our true focus.” They say, “Far from representing ‘state power’ over our lives, federal regulations often represent democratic rejection of the capitalist profit motive for the public good.” This absurd argument runs entirely counter to available evidence. Don Kates and Gary Mauser wrote “Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide? A Review of International and Some Domestic Evidence” and concluded that when guns are not available, other types of tools are used to commit violence. Knives, poisons, improvised explosive devices, clubs, etc. are all tools that can be used to kill someone. There isn’t much support for the idea that death from a gunshot is worse than other types of murder. And it is hard to see how the ability to “effectively fight back” against improvised explosive devices, poisons, etc. is materially greater. Bond-Graham and Culp are merely arguing that the symptoms should be treated and the root causes ignored, because nothing can really be done about the root causes so why not compromise, like worker unions did with healthcare and wages in the last half of the 20th Century (not to mention Mitterand in France)? Moreover, the idea that regulation is ever done in America for the purpose of “rejection of the capitalist profit motive for the public good” requires a bit more than such a casual, conclusory statement. The late Gabriel Kolko wrote The Triumph of Conservatism and Railroads and Regulation to underscore how regulation is only really implemented when it serves the interests of business, and realistically never without business consent. More recently, Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page wrote “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens.” The conclusion? Average citizens have basically no influence in American politics. In other words, Bond-Graham and Culp’s thesis is manifestly false. It comprises nothing more than tautology. At best it presumes that the poor and powerless have already won by overcoming the barriers to their participation in the regulatory apparatus of government. And that is absurd. But wait, “should we ban bombs”? Don’t we already….? This brings up another argument not raised by the authors. When you “ban guns” this usually is not a deterrent to the really bad people, who will have them anyway. Murder is already illegal, just as is speeding in an automobile. It still happens. These bans generally only impact the people who are not the problem. The government should not have a legitimate monopoly on the use of force. The authors ask rhetorically, “is opposing gun control an effective way to challenge the violence of the American state? Does anyone honestly think that the abstract notion of gun rights is what keeps alive dreams of an armed struggle toward democratic emancipation, or imparts those who own guns with some mystical quality of ‘autonomy’ or ‘power’?” Apparently the authors do not inhabit the real world where these philosophically superior arguments are voiced (albeit in a more serious tone, minus the authors’ condescending “strawman” reference to “mystical” qualities) and supported. In the ghetto of their authoritarian liberal dogma, maybe it’s hard to blame them. They probably just don’t understand. Finally, they argue, not so much in response to any existing arguments but sua sponte, “Confronting the gun industry on the national stage could be part of a larger strategy of opposing the war industry as a whole . . . .” Sorry, but no. The authors claim, “On a structural level, the federal budget is often decided through ‘guns versus butter’ tradeoffs whereby every dollar of military spending is taken from the mouths of the needy.” While, certainly, the federal budget is presented in such a manner, the reality is that a sovereign issuer of currency is not bound in this manner (only by other, political and inflationary, constraints). Proponents of Modern Monetary Theory have explained this. Adopting a viewpoint of guns vs. butter tradeoffs means accepting the basic terms of neoliberalism, and arguing solely on those terms. That represents a profound capitulation, and one that places the authors clearly on the far right of the political spectrum — despite pretenses of the article toward “correcting” the “leftist” perspective on guns. But again, maybe it is simply a naive mistake on their part due to ignorance of economic matters.

### 2NR A—AT: alt = reactionary

#### The alt is not reactionary gun politics—two reasons:

#### Individualism— contemporary gun politics is premised on neoliberal individualism. Social solidarity in gun ownership as described by the NC Sherman evidence is in stark contrast.

#### Intention— the alternative enshrines gun rights to be used in the protection of the most vulnerable populations that have been exploited by capitalism, not for the protection of private property interests and hunting.

### 2NR A—Theory Good (Bowman)

#### Here’s our theory good net benefit. Aversion to meta-narratives is itself a meta-narrative, and a potentially Maoist one at that.

Bowman 10. Paul Bowman, professor of cultural studies at Cardiff University, “Reading Rey Chow,” Postcolonial Studies, Vol. 13, No. 3, pg. 248

Thus, Chow recasts the investments and orientations of cultural studies, poststructuralism, and other politicized ‘suffix-studies’ subjects in terms of the unacknowledged but constitutive ‘Chinese prejudice’, first identified by Spivak. According to Chow, ‘China’ has a multiple status in Western discourses, including cultural studies. As well as representing, for so long, the Other of capitalism, of freedom, of democracy, and so on, ‘China’ has also offered ‘radical thought’ in the West a promissory image of alterity, revolution, difference, alternativeness, and hence resistance as such. And, as Chow also observes, one of the most enduring metanarratives that has long organized cultural studies and cultural theory (plus much more besides) is the discourse of ‘resistance’. ‘If there is a metanarrative that continues to thrive in these times of metanarrative bashing’, argues Chow, ‘it is that of ‘‘resistance’’’: ‘Seldom do we attend a conference or turn to an article in an academic journal of the humanities or the social sciences without encountering some call for ‘‘resistance’’ to some such metanarrativized power as ‘‘global capitalism’’, ‘‘Western imperialism’’, ‘‘patriarchy’’, ‘‘compulsory heterosexuality’’, and so forth’.41

The discourses of cultural theory and cultural studies more widely do seem to be structured by keywords or (worse) buzzwords like ‘resistance’, ‘struggle’, ‘difference’, ‘hybridity’ and ‘multiculturalism’. And many have interpreted this as evidence that such putatively ‘radical’ work is, basically, nothing more than fashionable nonsense. But, rather than writing it off, Chow proposes that one of the key problems with the notion of resistance resides in the consequences of its rhetorical construction. She argues that the popular rhetoric of resistance is itself implicitly organized and underwritten by a subject/object divide in which ‘we’ speak against that which oppresses (capital, patriarchy, the West, etc.) and for (or ‘in the name of’) the oppressed other. Thus, ‘we’ rhetorically position ourselves as somehow ‘with’ the oppressed and ‘against’ the oppressors, even when ‘we’ are more often than not much more obviously at some distance from sites and scenes of oppression.42

Of course, the aim of ‘speaking out’ and publicizing the plight of the oppressed may be regarded as responsibility itself. It is certainly the case that a dominant interpretation of what academic-political responsibility is boils down to the idea that to be responsible we should speak out. Yet it is nevertheless equally the case that, unless the distances, relations, aporias and irrelations are acknowledged and interrogated, there is a strong possibility that ‘our’ discourse will become what Chow calls a version of Maoism. She explains:

Although the excessive admiration of the 1970s has since been replaced by an oftentimes equally excessive denigration of China, the Maoist is very much alive among us, and her significance goes far beyond the China and East Asian fields. Typically, the Maoist is a cultural critic who lives in a capitalist society but who is fed up with capitalism – a cultural critic, in other words, who wants a social order opposed to the one that is supporting her own undertaking. The Maoist is thus a supreme example of the way desire works: What she wants is always located in the other, resulting in an identification with and valorization of that which she is not/ does not have. Since what is valorized is often the other’s deprivation – ‘having’ poverty or ‘having’ nothing – the Maoist’s strategy becomes in the main a rhetorical renunciation of the material power that enables her rhetoric.43

In other words, such rhetoric claims a ‘position of powerlessness’ in order to claim a particular form of ‘moral power’:44 a heady conceptual and rhetorical mix that can be seen to underpin an awful lot of academic work today. Derrida regularly referred to this position as ‘clear-consciencism’: namely, the belief that speaking out, speaking for, speaking against, etc. equals Being Responsible. However, quite apart from tub-thumping and mantra-reciting, Derrida believed in the promise of the ‘most classical of protocols’ of questioning and critical vigilance as ways to avoid the greater violence of essentialist fundamentalisms. Of course, Derrida’s attempts to draw such questions as how to interpret ‘responsibility’, how to establish who ‘we’ are, in what relations ‘we’ exist, and what our responsibilities might be, into the crisis of undecidability were equally regularly regarded as an advocation of theoretical obscurantism and irresponsibility. This charge was – and remains – the most typical type of ‘resistance’ to deconstruction. Despite the clarity and urgency of Derrida’s reasons for subjecting all presumed certainties to the harrowing ordeal of undecidability, the resistance to deconstruction surely boils down to a distaste for the complexity of Derrida’s ensuing close readings/rewritings of texts.45

Such resistance to deconstruction is familiar. It is often couched as a resistance to theory made in the name of a resistance to ‘disengagement’; a resistance to ‘theory’ for the sake of ‘keeping it real’. Such a rationale for the rejection of deconstruction (or indeed ‘Theory’ as such) is widespread. But when ‘keeping it real’ relies upon a refusal to interrogate the ethical and political implications of one’s own rhetorical and conceptual coordinates – one’s own ‘key terms’ – the price is too high. Chow points to some of the ways and places that this high price is paid, and reflects on the palpable consequences of it. For instance, in politicized contexts such as postcolonial cultural studies, there are times when ‘deconstruction’ and ‘theory’ are classified (reductively) as being ‘Western’, and therefore as being just another cog in the Western hegemonic (colonial, imperial) apparatus. As she puts it, in studies of non-Western cultural others, organized by postcolonial anti-imperialism, all things putatively ‘Western’ easily become suspect. Thus, ‘the general criticism of Western imperialism’ can lead to the rejection of ‘Western’ approaches, at the same time as ‘the study of non- Western cultures easily assumes a kind of moral superiority, since such cultures are often also those that have been colonized and ideologically dominated by the West’.46 In other words, ‘theory’ – ‘for all its fundamental questioning of Western logocentrism’ – is too hastily ‘lumped together with everything ‘‘Western’’ and facilely rejected as a non-necessity’.47 Unfortunately, therefore:

In the name of studying the West’s ‘others’, then, the critique of cultural politics that is an inherent part of both poststructural theory and cultural studies is pushed aside, and ‘culture’ returns to a coherent, idealist essence that is outside language and outside mediation. Pursued in a morally complacent, antitheoretical mode, ‘culture’ now functions as a shield that hides the positivism, essentialism, and nativism – and with them the continual acts of hierarchization, subordination, and marginalization – that have persistently accompanied the pedagogical practices of area studies; ‘cultural studies’ now becomes a means of legitimizing continual conceptual and methodological irresponsibility in the name of cultural otherness.48

What is at stake here is the surely significant fact that even the honest and principled or declared aim of studying others can actually amount to a positive working for the very forces one avowedly opposes or seeks to resist. Chow clarifies this in terms of considering the uncanny proximity but absolute difference between cultural studies and area studies. For, area studies is a disciplinary field which ‘has long been producing ‘‘specialists’’ who report to North American political and civil arenas about ‘‘other’’ civilizations, ‘‘other’’ regimes, ‘‘other’’ ways of life, and so forth’.49 However, quite unlike cultural studies and postcolonial studies’ declared aims and affiliative interests in alterity and ‘other cultures’, within area studies ‘others’ (‘defined by way of particular geographical areas and nation states, such as South Asia, the Middle East, East Asia, Latin America, and countries of Africa’) are studied as if potential threats, challenges and – hence – ultimately ‘information target fields’.50

Thus, says Chow, there is ‘a major difference’ between cultural studies and area studies – and indeed between cultural studies and ‘normal’ academic disciplines per se.51 This difference boils down to a paradigmatic decision – itself an act or effort of resistance. This is the resistance to ‘proper’ disciplinarity; the resistance to becoming ‘normal’ or ‘normalized’, wherever it might equal allowing power inequalities, untranslatables and heterogeneities to evaporate in the production of universalistic ‘objective’ knowledge. This is why Chow’s attitude is always that:

In the classroom [...] students should not be told simply to reject ‘metadiscourses’ in the belief that by turning to the ‘other’ cultures – by turning to ‘culture’ as the ‘other’ of metadiscourses – they would be able to overturn existing boundaries of knowledge production that, in fact, continue to define and dictate their own discourses. Questions of authority, and with them hegemony, representation, and right, can be dealt with adequately only if we insist on the careful analyses of texts, on responsibly engaged rather than facilely dismissive judgments, and on deconstructing the ideological assumptions in discourses of ‘opposition’ and ‘resistance’ as well as in discourses of mainstream power. Most of all, as a form of exercise in ‘cultural literacy’, we need to continue to train our students to read – to read arguments on their own terms rather than discarding them perfunctorily and prematurely – not in order to find out about authors’ original intent but in order to ask, ‘Under what circumstances would such an argument – no matter how preposterous – make sense? With what assumptions does it produce meanings? In what ways and to what extent does it legitimize certain kinds of cultures while subordinating or outlawing others?’ Such are the questions of power and domination as they relate, ever asymmetrically, to the dissemination of knowledge. Old-fashioned questions of pedagogy as they are, they nonetheless demand frequent reiteration in order for cultural studies to retain its critical and political impetus in the current intellectual climate.52

### 2NR A—AT: university discussion

#### I control root cause—intellegensia talking in universities isn’t key to resisting capitalism and capitalism is the driving force for the evacuation of the public sphere—intellectuals are increasingly encouraged to be more “productive” to society.

#### Debrander is another link—he presupposes a liberal conclusion and thinks that guns get in the way of white students airing controversial views about black protest--the entire K is an impact turn to this thesis. This is antithetical for campus democracy.

Debrander:

Many academics will contend that, at least ideally, classroom debate should be lively, even heated at times. Emotions may run high. As a case in point, I think of the many uncomfortable discussions following the Ferguson and Staten Island police killings last year. Differing views of what constituted racism -- and especially, whether racism lingered and was still entrenched -- elicited highly personal conversations, sharp comments and campus protest. In frank discussions, ugliness, racist undertones and deep cultural mistrust were exposed. Honest exchange is the only way forward amid such controversies; different perspectives and experiences, even if they cause resentment in the short run, must be uncovered and understood if we hope to expand the bounds of empathy. Unpopular views must get a hearing in the classroom. Professors are obligated to foster a setting where students feel comfortable airing their most deep-seated fears and prejudices -- which may not be looked on kindly by others. Guns in the classroom threaten this dynamic. Will students feel so safe and free when surrounded by other students who may be, secretly, arms bearers? Will they feel emboldened to take moral and political risks? Will they feel inclined to air potentially offensive views? I doubt it.

### 2NR A—AT: Transition Wars

#### The alt isn’t a grand upheaval or totalized rejection, it’s a continued process of rejecting redactions and questioning the state of exception. This avoids the large scale paradigm shifts assumed by their impact scenarios.

#### They have no uniqueness: the status quo ARE the transition wars: Iraq, Afghanistan, continued drone strikes are all indicative of our desperate attempts to keep the system going after the post 9/11 shock. Their impacts are inevitable thus the only way to escape transition wars is to reject the neolib which makes the competition and war drive present in the first place.

### 2NR—ROTJ

#### The role of the judge is a *central framing question* in this round—the affirmative’s attempt to hide behind “objectivity” and reduce the judge to a “functionary engaged in a formalistic ritual” are strategies of neoliberalism. The judge must first consider the implications of the knowledge that we present in round before some imagined post-fiat impact—you must refuse neutrality in favor of voting for the methodology that best combats oppressive knowledge in this round. Academia has a unique role in cultivating forms of knowledge that counter neolib—that’s Giroux.

### 2NR—AT: ethics > activism

#### The role of the judge takes out their ethical focus—it is exactly this focus on metaethics and philosophical pondering on deontology that abstracts the very real reality faced by oppressed people—your role is to refuse this neutrality and vote for the best methodology to combat oppression in this round.

#### And forcing debaters to justify why oppression is a bad practice for debate—it excludes those with less privilege and makes it seem inaccessible—introduction of complex metathics over common sense that oppression is bad is one of the largest barriers to participation in LD which is a pre-req to education and fairness.

#### Capitalism is the driving forces of planetary crisis—war, brutality, dehumanization, warming. Focus on ideal theory is a tool to quell dissent.

Vltchek 16 (Andre Vltchek, a philosopher, novelist, filmmaker and investigative journalist. He covered wars and conflicts in dozens of countries. His latest books are: “Exposing Lies Of The Empire” and “Fighting Against Western Imperialism”, “Academia: Hands off Revolutionary Philosophy!”, Feb 26 2016)//Miro I DO NOT ENDORSE ANY OF THE GENDERED LANGUAGE IN THIS CARD. IT IS UNACCEPTABLE AND ONLY KEPT HERE TO PRESERVE THE ORIGINAL SOURCE.

Philosophers have been muzzled by the Western global regime; most of great modern philosophy concealed from the masses. What has been left of it, allowed to float on the surface is toothless, irrelevant and incomprehensible: a foolish outdated theoretical field for those few remaining intellectual snobs. Philosophy used to be the most precious crown jewel of human intellectual achievement. It stood at the vanguard of almost all fights for a better world. Gramsci was a philosopher, and so were Lenin, Mao Tse-tung, Ho-Chi-Minh, Guevara, Castro, Frantz Fanon, Senghors, Cabral, Nyerere and Lumumba, to name just a few. To be a thinker, a philosopher, in ancient China, Japan or even in some parts of the West, was the most respected human ‘occupation’. In all ‘normally’ developing societies, knowledge has been valued much higher than material possessions or naked power. In ancient Greece and China, people were able to understand the majority of their philosophers. There was nothing “exclusive” in the desire to know and interpret the world. Philosophers spoke to the people, for the people. Some still do. But that whoring and servile Western academic gang, which has locked philosophy behind the university walls, viciously sidelines such men and women. Instead of leading people to the barricades, instead of addressing the most urgent issues our world is now facing, official philosophers are fighting amongst themselves for tenures, offering their brains and bodies to the Empire. At best, they are endlessly recycling each other, spoiling millions of pages of paper with footnotes, comparing conclusions made by Derrida and Nietzsche, hopelessly stuck at exhausted ideas of Kant and Hegel. At worst, they are outrightly evil – making still relevant revolutionary philosophical concepts totally incomprehensible, attacking them, and even disappearing them from the face of the Earth. \*\*\* Only the official breed, consisting of almost exclusively white/Western ‘thought recyclers’, is now awarded the right to be called ‘philosophers’. My friends in all corners of the world, some of the brightest people on earth, are never defined as such. The word ‘philosopher’ still carries at least some great theoretical prestige, and god forbid if those who are now fighting against Western terror, for social justice or true freedom of thought, were to be labeled as such! But they are, of course, all great philosophers! And they don’t recycle – they go forward, advancing brilliant new concepts that can improve life on our Planet. Some have fallen, some are still alive, and some are still relatively young: Eduardo Galeano – one of the greatest storytellers of all times, and a dedicated fighter against Western imperialism. Noam Chomsky – renowned linguist and relentless fighter against Western fascism. Pramoedya Ananta Toer – former prisoner of conscience in Suharto’s camps and the greatest novelist of Southeast Asia. John Steppling – brilliant American playwright and thinker. Christopher Black – Canadian international lawyer and fighter against illegal neo-colonialist concepts of the Empire. Peter Koenig – renowned economist and thinker. Milan Kohout, thinker and performer, fighter against European racism. Yes – all these great thinkers; all of them, philosophers! And many more that I know and love – in Africa and Latin America and Asia especially… For those who insist that in order to be called a philosopher, one has to be equipped with some stamp that shows that the person has passed a test and is allowed to serve the Empire, here is proof to the contrary: Even according to the Dictionary of Modern American philosophers (online ed.). New York: Oxford University Press: “The label of “philosopher” has been broadly applied in this Dictionary to intellectuals who have made philosophical contributions regardless of academic career or professional title. The wide scope of philosophical activity across the time-span of this Dictionary would now be classed among the various humanities and social sciences which gradually separated from philosophy over the last one hundred and fifty years. Many figures included were not academic philosophers but did work at philosophical foundations of such fields as pedagogy, rhetoric, the arts, history, politics, economics, sociology, psychology, linguistics, anthropology, religion, and theology.” \*\*\* In his brilliant upcoming book Aesthetic Resistance and Dis-Interest, my friend John Steppling quotes, Hullot-Kentor: “If art – when art is art – understands us better than we can intentionally understand ourselves, then a philosophy of art would need to comprehend what understands us. Thinking would need to become critically imminent to that object; subjectivity would become the capacity of its object, not simply its manipulation. That’s the center of Adorno’s aesthetics. It’s an idea of thought that is considerably different from the sense of contemporary “theory”, where everyone feels urged to compare Derrida with Nietzsche, the two of them with Levinas, and all of them now with Badiou, Žižek and Agamben. That kind of thinking is primarily manipulation. It’s the bureaucratic mind unconsciously flexing the form of social control it has internalized and wants to turn on others.” Western academia is rigidly defining, which lines of thought are acceptable for philosophers to use, as well as what analyses, and what forms. Those who refuse to comply are ‘not true philosophers’. They are dilettantes, ‘amateurs’. And those who are not embraced by some ‘reputable’ institution are not to be taken seriously at all (especially if they are carrying Russian, Asian, African, Middle Eastern or Latino names). It is a little bit like with journalism. Unless you have an ‘important’ media outlet behind you (preferably a Western one), unless you can show that the Empire truly trusts you, your press card is worth nothing, and you would not even be allowed to board a UN or a military flight to a war zone. Your readers, even if numbering millions, may see you as an important philosopher. But let’s be frank: unless the Empire stamps its seal of acceptance on your forehead of backside, in the West you are really nothing more than worthless shit! \*\*\* BLURRING THE WORK OF REVOLUTIONARY PHILOSOPHERS After all that I have witnessed and written, I am increasingly convinced that Western imperialism and neo-colonialism are the most urgent and dangerous challenges facing our Planet. Perhaps the only challenges… I have seen 160 countries in all corners of the Globe. I have witnessed wars, conflicts, imperialist theft and indescribable brutality of white tyrants. And so, recently, I sensed that it is time to revisit two great thinkers of the 20th Century, two determined fighters against Western imperialist fascism: Frantz Fanon and Jean-Paul Sartre. The Wretched of the Earth, and Black Skin, White Masks – two essential books by Frantz Omar Fanon, a Martinique-born Afro-Caribbean psychiatrist, philosopher, revolutionary, and writer, and a dedicated fighter against Western colonialism. And Colonialism and Neocolonialism, a still greatly relevant book by Jean-Paul Sartre, a prominent French resistance fighter, philosopher, playwright and novelist… I had all three books in my library and, after many years, it was time to read them again. But my English edition of Colonialism and Neocolonialism was wrapped in dozens of pages of prefaces and introductions. The ‘intellectual cushioning’ was too thick and at some point I lost interest, leaving the book in Japan. Then in Kerala I picked up another, this time Indian edition. Again, some 60 pages of prefaces and introductions, pre-chewed intrusive and patronizing explanations of how I am supposed to perceive both Sartre and his interactions with Fanon, Memmi and others. And yes, it all suddenly began moving again into that pre-chewed but still indigestible “Derrida-Nietzsche” swamp. Instead of evoking outrage and wrath, instead of inspiring me into taking concrete revolutionary action, those prefaces, back covers, introductions and comments were clearly castrating and choking the great messages of both Sartre and Fanon. They were preventing readers and fellow philosophers from getting to the core. Then finally, when reaching the real text of Sartre, it all becomes clear – why exactly is the regime so determined to “protect” readers from the originals. It is because the core, the original, is extremely simple and powerful. The words are relevant, and easy to understand. They are describing both old French colonialist barbarities, as the current Western neo-colonialism. God forbid someone puts two and two together! Philosopher Sartre on China and Western fascist cultural propaganda: “As a child, I was a victim of the picturesque: everything had been done to make the Chinese intimidating. I was told about rotten eggs… of men sawn between two planks of wood, of piping and discordant music… [The Chinese] were tiny and terrible, slipping between your fingers, attacked from behind, burst out suddenly in a ridiculous din… There was also the Chinese soul, which I was simply told was inscrutable. ‘Orientals, you see…’ The Negroes did not worry me; I had been taught that they were good dogs. With them, we were still among mammals. But the Asians frightened me…” Sartre on Western colonialism and racism: “Racism is inscribed in the events themselves, in the institutions, in the nature of the exchange and the production. The political and social statuses reinforce one another: since the natives are sub-human, the Declaration of Human Rights does not apply to them; conversely, since they have no rights, they are abandoned without protection to the inhuman forces of nature, to the ‘iron laws’ of economics…” And Sartre goes further: “Western humanism and rights discourse had worked by excluding a majority of the world’s population from the category of humans.” I address the same issues and so is Chomsky. But the Empire does not want people to know that Sartre, Memmi and Fanon spoke ‘the same language’ as we do, already more than half a century ago! Albert Memmi: “Conservatism engenders the selection of mediocre people. How can this elite of usurpers, conscious of their mediocrity, justify their privileges? Only one way: diminish the colonized in order to exult themselves, deny the status of human beings to the natives, and deprive them of basic rights…” Sartre on Western ignorance: “It is not cynicism, it is not hatred that is demoralizing us: no, it is only the state of false ignorance in which we are made to live and which we ourselves contribute to maintaining…” The way the West ‘educates’ the world, Sartre again: “The European elite set about fabricating a native elite; they selected adolescents, marked on their foreheads, with a branding iron, the principles of Western culture, stuffed into their mouths verbal gags, grand turgid words which stuck to their teeth; after a brief stay in the mother country, they were sent back, interfered with…” \*\*\* It is actually easy to learn how to recycle the thoughts of others, how to compare them and at the end, how to compile footnotes. It takes time, it is boring, tedious and generally useless, but not really too difficult. On the other hand, it is difficult to create brand new concepts, to revolutionize the way our societies, and our world are arranged. If our brains recycle too much and try to create too little, they get lazy and sclerotic – chronically sclerotic. Intellectual servility is a degenerative disease. Western art has deteriorated to ugly psychedelic beats, to excessively bright colors and infantile geometric drawings, to cartoons and nightmarish and violent films as well as “fiction”. It is all very convenient – with all that noise, one cannot hear anymore the screams of the victims, one cannot understand loneliness, and comprehend emptiness. In bookstores, all over the world, poetry and philosophy sections are shrinking or outright disappearing. Now what? Is it going to be Althusser (mostly not even real Althusser, but a recycled and abbreviated one), or Lévi-Strauss or Derrida, each wrapped in endless litanies of academic talk? No! Comrades, philosophers, not that! Down with the sclerotic, whoring academia and their interpretation of philosophy! Down with the assassins of Philosophy! Philosophy is supposed to be the intellectual vanguard. It is synonymous with revolution, humanism, and rebellion.

### 2NR P—AT:/ All

#### Group the perms—All perms that aren’t do both are intrinsic or severance—this makes the Aff into a moving target which guts my ground—without checks no advocacy is competitive—reject the arg.

#### <<Analytics on why the perms that aren’t do both are just bad>>

#### NC Sherman alt wrecks the permutation—Increased gun control in the United States necessarily produces a monopoly of guns in the hands of capitalists, which is mutually exclusive with working class organizing.

#### There’s no way to simultaneously uphold workers right to arms while banning their ability to own them.

#### All the links are disads to the permutations—

#### <<Extend links here>>

#### It’s impossible to simultaneously recognize gun ownership as a class right while engaging in the capitalist practices that disenfranchise the working class.

#### It’s a question of *sequencing*— even if gun control bans are good in the abstract, we have to first resist the capitalist social relations that are driving the violence before we can give up weapons. As long as wage-slavery exists, our fight is not done.

#### <<AT: double bind>>

#### Questions of double-bind are meaningless for a non-fiated alt: the only instance is what we can talk about and do *in this round—*we can’t simply fiat away that we do the alt in all other instances. Either way this collapses because every aff is going to say all other instances, which translates to never.

### 2NR P—AT: class right affirms

#### They say that a class right affirms because it’s not private ownership, but that’s wrong—

#### Most weapons owned by workers are privately owned in the status quo. Even if private property is bad in the abstract, by removing workers ability to privately own weapons, the Aff leads to net more property—that’s the link debate.

#### It’s a question of *sequencing*—We have to first resist the capitalist social relations that are driving the violence before we can give up private ownership of weapons. As long as wage-slavery exists, our fight is not done.

### 2NR !—Deutsch Ext

#### <<TURNS WARMING>>

#### Neoliberalism causes warming because the people and corporations who benefit from neoliberalism are the same ones who benefit from warming. They reap profits off of the mining companies that destroy the earth, the non renewable energy companies, the military and security companies that emit greenhouse gases, and the agriculture companies that destroy food resources by depleting soil.

#### Neoliberalism also demonizes social welfare programs, thus ensuring that projects that would reduce the impact of natural disasters don’t go into affect and thus magnify the impact of warming.

#### <<TURNS DISEASE>>

#### Neoliberalism causes disease because they demonize social safety nets while pushing for the privatization of health care and drug companies. This ensures that we will always have to pay more and more for healthcare to drive big corporations profits. This means that many will not have access to healthcare, ensuring the spread of pandemics.

#### <<TURNS POVERTY>>

#### Neoliberalism turns poverty because it creates a false narrative of improvement while glossing over the poverty and dehumanization of millions of people who work in the sweatshops and dirty mines that fuel corporations profits. It demonizes social safety nets, ensuring more poverty and increased social strife as the poor have no way to deal with poverty’s affects.

#### <<TURNS WAR>>

#### Neoliberalism turns war because the companies that produce weapons and military equipment have a vested interest in making sure the military constantly needs more and more of these products. Thus, they encourage the government to build more military bases, increase intervention, and drop more bombs. Even nuclear weapons use would be more likely as long as it is profitable.

### 2NR !—Turns oppression

#### Ending oppression is impossible without analyzing capitalism---clarity of root causes is necessary to resolve it

Katz-Fishman 14, W. Katz-Fishman -- Howard University, J. Scott -- Founder and Former Director, Project South K. Haltinner (ed.), Editor of Teaching Race and Anti-Racism in Contemporary America Adding Context to Colorblindness, Race, Class and Transformation: Confronting Our History to Move Forward, <http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/934/chp%253A10.1007%252F978-94-007-7101-7_26.pdf?auth66=1390670850_4076387ffba6f17ddf3a828859827d80&ext=.pdf>

From inside today’s bottom-up movement for equality, justice, democracy and social transformation, we share experiences and lessons for understanding race and class in the context of historical and contemporary U.S. capitalism and social struggle.**We cannot resolve a problem unless there is clarity about its root cause. America at its inceptionwas a Southern nation grounded in genocide and slavery. The colonial occupation and stealth of the land and resources of the western hemisphere from Indigenous peoples combined with the super-exploitation of Africanslave labor in the plantation system was extraordinarily proﬁtable for capital. To continue to produce and reproduce this source of capital accumulation and wealth, white supremacy and institutional racism were embedded in U.S.law, ideology, and society. Though no longer de jure, the content of white supremacy and racism remains de facto in every aspect of social life, even in the so-called “post-racial era” of the late twentieth and twenty-ﬁrst centuries**. (Bonilla-Silva 2010; Feagin 2006; Heagerty and Peery 2000). **The question of race in America – from Indigenous genocide and the slave system, to the attack on immigrant communities and the state execution of Troy Davis – inextricably links race and a racially exploitative and oppressive system to the very core of American class exploitation and super-exploitation, State power andrepression, ideological hegemony, and social and environmental crises.Based on this history of** U.S. **capitalism and the deep interpenetration of race and class**, we argue **that it is not possible to resolve** the fundamental problems of capitalism, especially**white supremacy and institutional racism, without ending capitalism** (Katz-Fishman and Scott 2004; Peery 2002). In the classroom of life – whether formal education settings, or the movement itself – theory, practice, and study around these questions is increasingly converging. **We offer as a pedagogical tool the critical study of social history – the debunking of historical myth and the claiming of ourreal history of domination, oppression, exploitation, and of resistance and social struggle. This means gaining clarity around the victories of past movements, what has and has not been won, where we are today and why, and the path forward** (Katz-Fishman et al. 2007).

### 2NR—! AT: cap good

#### Group their cap good args—

#### No offense—their authors assume ideal capitalism in theory, not the way it actually manifests itself in the real world. The NC deutsch evidence indicates that the endless profit motive in neoliberalism is at the root cause of environmental destruction and inequality—it is neoliberal plutocrats who are the controlling shareholders of the corporations destroying the earth. Means it try-or-die neg, cap will collapse inevitably, its only a question of whether we have to destroy the environment first.

### 2NR—! AT: cap good

#### Group their cap good and inevitable args--

#### No offense- we’re not critiquing the ideal capitalism that their authors are talking about but rather the newer, neo-classical model of globalized neoliberalism--- while capitalism in the United States may be controlled by regulations, globalized capitalism circumvents these restrictions, vastly magnifying the bad - that’s Deutsch.

#### The goods still outweigh the bad— Deutsch indicates that the endless profit motive in neoliberalism is at the root cause of environmental destruction and inequality that reduces millions to bare life.

#### None of their evidence engages in *comparative analysis-* the innovations they attribute to neolib occur *in spite of* this world order, not because of them.

Fleming 13 (Peter Fleming, Highly acclaimed author and writer for Ephemera Journal, “Common as Silence”, <http://www.ephemerajournal.org/contribution/common-silence>, August 2013)//Miro

Hobbes’ ghost still haunts us. Even much critical inquiry still thinks the Master makes the (albeit exploitative) world in which the Slave dwells. Corporations rule the world. The state is still the ultimate director. Fight the cuts! The only thing worse about having a job is the thought of not having one, of being abandoned by power. Yes, it’s harmful, but without capitalism there would be no aeroplanes, penicillin or internet! These curious presumptions echo the Slave’s belief that they are nothing without their Master. Much of Bauman’s (2004) recent work, for example, exemplifies this rationale. He deplores the millions of ‘wasted lives’ spat out by the global production/consumption system since they have been truly abandoned. To be forgotten by power, according to this line of thought, is the same as having no power. Even in more radical circles, the same logic is subtly present. Whether power lies in the means of production, the state or the private enterprise, it must be seized and turned towards non-capitalist ends. For this to occur we must first be recognized as important players in the statist game of realpolitik. Others, however, are rethinking this Hobbesian model of power and resistance. Instead of struggling for recognition, a kind of post-recognition politics is animating the disparate refusal movement (for an overview see Fleming, 2012). It is underpinned by a new understanding of corporate and statist hegemony, one that doesn’t gift it so many constitutive powers. The corporation[s] and private property do not create value or wealth. We do, often working around the rules of neoliberal property rights. Innovations and inventions are more often developed despite private property rights and commodification (Perelman, 2002). It’s the corporation that resists, not workers. In the realm of employment studies, it is astounding how many employees in large enterprise complain about how useless or superfluous most management is. The boss gets in the way more than anything else. This is because capitalist enterprises were never designed to be functional social systems. They are first and foremost class structures – highly irrational machines of capture that seldom ‘work’ for majority involved. Old-school pro-business writers are funny in this regard because they thought management was about achieving common objectives.

## Links

### L—Gun Control

#### The Aff’s law and order politics leave the fundamental matrix of capitalism underlying gun violence *untouched.* Bougie gun control is coopted and allows the capitalist class to reassert its hegemony over the oppressed.

WIL 13 (WIL/Socialist Appeal, bombass anticaps, “Gun Control and Class Struggle”, September 13, 2013)//Miro

The recent attacks in Colorado, Connecticut, Boston, and across the country have shocked everyone. As has been previously explained in the pages of Socialist Appeal, these repeated incidents of violence signify the decay of American capitalism. The decline of capitalism offers no future for today’s youth, only distractions, desperation, and escapism. High unemployment, debt, lack of health care facilities, alienation, and a widespread feeling of insecurity is enough to push some over the edge. Only by changing society to one which will give everyone hope of a better future, only by engaging people in a way that they will want to live their lives rather than escape from them, can we put an end to these horrible crimes. However, many capitalist politicians are telling us that there is a quick and easy solution: stricter gun control laws. This “solution” flies in the face of actual experience. Alcoholism is as prevalent and intractable a problem today as it was in the 1920s. In January 1920, the 18th Amendment was put into effect, prohibiting the production and sale of alcohol. The argument was put forward that by banning alcohol, alcoholism would fade away. Nothing of the kind happened. Prohibition strengthened organized crime, giving criminal gangs a monopoly over all aspects of the production and distribution of alcohol, and alcoholism continued as before. Today, states with tough gun control laws like New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and California are still among those that experience the most violent crime involving firearms. Illegal guns are most commonly acquired from other states, by individuals who can legally purchase firearms, and from the illegal sale of guns by licensed dealers. Although this seems like an argument to broaden the strict gun laws to the federal level, there is no reason to assume firearms won’t make their way into the hands of those with malicious intent. There is already an underground market for firearms, and like the prohibition of alcohol in the 1920s, stricter gun control laws would only bolster this lucrative black market. There are already designs on the internet that would allow someone to use a 3D printer to produce a fully functioning handgun out of plastic. And one look at the Mexican drug cartels, which are often better armed than the police and army, shows how ineffective efforts to curb access to guns have been (or the illicit drugs they trade in, for that matter). The “right to bear arms” is a right that has been championed perhaps more in the U.S. than in any other country in the world. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, along with the other nine Amendments that make up the “Bill of Rights,” were a concession on the part of the early American ruling class, in order to pass the less democratic aspects of the constitution such as the creation of the Senate and Supreme Court. At the time of the signing of the Constitution, despite the reining in of the revolutionary energy of the masses by the ruling class, the capitalist system was still young and historically progressive. A strong state apparatus had not yet been developed. The ruling class did not yet need one, as the proletariat had not yet developed into a powerful and massive force constituting the vast majority of society, as is the case today. It could depend on geography and local armed militas for national defense and to put down local uprisings, supplemented by a small standing army, and above all, a strong navy. But things have changed in the United States. The slogan “we are the 99%” is a close approximation to the actual class balance of forces today, with a tiny minority of capitalists on one side, and a mass of workers on the other. The working class has tremendous potential power in its hands—the ability to bring production and society as a whole to a grinding halt. With the capitalist crisis deepening, the ruling class can no longer rely on ideology or a few concessions to keep class peace. In the face of such a threat, the capitalists have developed an imposing state apparatus in order to maintain their rule. Frederick Engels, in his classic work The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, explains the role of the state: “The state is therefore by no means a power imposed on society from without... Rather, it is a product of society at a particular stage of development; it is the admission that this society has involved itself in insoluble self-contradiction and is cleft into irreconcilable antagonisms which it is powerless to exorcise. But in order that these antagonisms, classes with conflicting economic interests, shall not consume themselves and society in fruitless struggle, a power, apparently standing above society, has become necessary to moderate the conflict and keep it within the bounds of ‘order’; and this power, arisen out of society, but placing itself above it and increasingly alienating itself from it, is the state.” When capitalist politicians call for “gun control,” they are really saying that the working class majority should give more power to the bourgeois state in determining who should have access to arms. The capitalist class would breathe a sigh of relief at the complete disarmament of the working class. The capitalist state would then have a complete monopoly of arms, on top of its monopoly of the courts, prisons, police, spy agencies, military, etc. Therefore, from the point of view of the capitalist class, the real essence of “gun control” is not the disarming of criminal elements or unstable individuals—who would still have access to guns through illegal channels—it is the disarming of the working class on the whole. We have seen how this has been used in the past. When the Black Panthers had arms for self-defense, the bourgeois state violently attacked them. Far-right groups, on the other hand, are armed to the teeth and the state typically looks the other way. The United States has a long history of gun violence on the part of the state against immigrants, blacks, and against the working class on the whole, especially when they dare to struggle. Nearly every major labor battle in the U.S. has been marked with violent attacks by the state against the striking workers. As one boss infamously put it, his striking workers needed to be “shot back to work.” Against this overwhelming force of the capitalist state, the working class must defend its basic democratic right to defend itself and its organizations, including its right to access arms. There are no quick fixes to the problem of gun violence, and no solutions within the limits of capitalism, a system based on the organized exploitation and violence of one class against another. Only the organized and united working class can offer a solution to the violence of class society, whether it be perpetrated by the capitalist state when breaking a strike, or by unstable and alienated individuals on a killing rampage. The labor movement, by organizing a political party of its own, could begin to deal with the ills of our society—but only if that party is armed with a socialist program. Corporations like Colt and Smith & Wesson make huge profits from the sale of weapons. A workers’ government would nationalize the arms industry and place it under democratic workers’ control. Under a workers’ government, the working class would democratically organize itself to protect society. As socialism spreads worldwide, and relations between nations are increasingly based on solidarity, not expoitation, the need for national defense and the military will fade away, along with national borders themselves. Here at home, the need for a special police force standing above society, with special powers and privileges, would likewise disappear.

#### Gun violence cannot be divorced from the war on people of color. Any efforts to extend the capitalist monopoly of violence must be resisted. Government security forces aren’t neutral—they are enforcers of a system that leaves billions of people disenfranchised.

Sherman 12 (Vince Sherman, writer for Return 2 Source, ML Journal, “Three Positions on Gun Control”, 2012)//Miro

The capitalist class and the white middle class in the large cities in the North, West, and Midwest that live in more constricted confines with the working class and oppressed nations push forward this “law and order” gun control policy. Indeed, the US government already has massive gun control measures in place, especially in the major cities like New York and Chicago and states across the nation, which represent the extreme end of this policy, where it’s practically unheard of for average citizens to own firearms legally. These measures don’t restrict mass murderers like Jared Lee Loughner – the shooter in Arizona last year – or Neo-Nazis like Wade Michael Page, who murdered six people at a Sikh Temple in Wisconsin this summer, from acquiring firearms. Instead, they largely restrict the rights of oppressed people who face violence from vigilantes or police from owning guns. It is no surprise then that billionaire Mayor of New York City Michael Bloomberg and his coalition, “Mayors Against Illegal Guns,” are quickly becoming the leading force advancing this agenda. Principally, they support gun control for the same reason the Republican opposed gun control: they are afraid of oppressed nationalities. We quote the website of “Mayors Against Illegal Guns”: “We support the Second Amendment and the rights of citizens to own guns. We recognize the vast majority of gun dealers and gun owners carefully follow the law…But what binds us together is a determination to fight crime, and a belief that we can do more to stop criminals from getting guns while also protecting the rights of citizens to freely own them.” (2) This is a common theme among the liberal gun control advocates: a heavy focus on “crime” and keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, especially in big cities. This position cannot be divorced from the war on drugs and the war on Black and Latino youth, who find themselves disportionately criminalized and imprisoned. Capitalist leaders like Mayor Bloomberg in no way seek to limit the violence visited on working class and oppressed communities. Remember that Bloomberg is responsible for spearheading the blatantly racist “stop and frisk” policies carried out by the NYPD. (3) The NAACP has said of these policies: “Bloomberg’s massive street-level racial profiling program is a civil rights and human rights catastrophe that both hurts our children and makes our communities less safe.” (4) Are we to trust the liberals like Bloomberg, chiefly responsible and complicit in waging the war on black and brown communities, with ending gun violence with new criminal restrictions? Are we to trust the racist criminal justice system and groups like the NYPD whom Bloomberg has called “his army, the 7th largest in the world?” (5) It is no coincidence that liberal bourgeoisie like Bloomberg are silent about gun control for their “private army” when it comes to police violence and murder committed by police, like in the case of unarmed 17 year old Ramarley Graham in New York City. (6) The gun control policies of Bloomberg and reactionary allies, like Chicago Mayor Rahm Emmanuel, are efforts to extend national oppression and the capitalist monopoly on violence, especially over Black and Latino communities. This also serves to keep the working class and discontented elements of society passive in the face of foreclosures, austerity, voter suppression, legislative attacks like Right-to-Work initiatives, and efforts to use state repression to silence social movements like Occupy Wall Street and trade union protesters in Michigan. After all, unarmed protesters are entirely at the mercy of the capitalist class’ “personal army,” leaving them subject to violent repression at protests or on picket lines. It is only natural that these forces support such measures to strip oppressed nationalities and workers from their democratic rights to bear arms: They have their own arms, their own personal security, their own “personal armies”, their police, their courts, their prisons; in other words, the “special bodies of armed men” talked of by Lenin in State & Revolution. They live in gated communities and mansions, while most Black and Latino people live in occupied territory not unlike occupied Afghanistan. The agenda of the liberal Democrats is to strengthen the apparatus of state repression – to increase arms and weapons in the hands of their “personal army” – while keeping guns out of the hands of “criminals” and other “undesirable elements”. This agenda is reflected in the expansion of billions of dollars in state funding to arm police with military hardware to the tune of $34 billion dollars over the past decade. (7) There seems to be no talk of gun control or preventing gun violence when it comes to the army of the capitalist class. There’s no talk of assault weapon bans for the police, who are upgrading to tanks in many cities! (8) Middle class white liberals who live in gated communities, or the “nice” sections of town also don’t have the same worries as our class and our allies. They want to strip “the common rabble” and criminals of their means of self-defense. After all, the police and the ruling class of the United States are their friends. They’re not the ones getting imprisoned, stopped and frisked, or having their homes foreclosed on. However, comrades cannot ignore that gun violence does have a disproportionate and devastating impact in the communities of oppressed people and working class communities. African-Americans are the victim of 54% of all firearm homicides, despite making up just 13% of the population, according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (9) It’s no surprise that gun-related violence disproportionately occurs in the US South, the historical home of Jim Crow and Ku Klux Klan terrorism against Black and Latino people, according to Zara Matheson at the Martin Prosperity Institute. (10) This provides some material appeal to elements of the oppressed nations in regards to these gun control policy. Still, comrades should combat this wolf in sheep’s clothing. The enforcers of this violence are the American capitalist class and white supremacist forces that work to uphold the established order. Trusting them to end violence in the oppressed communities with gun control is the equivalent to entrusting the United States to help Syria and Libya with “humanitarian intervention.” Malcolm X understood the nature of violence by the US government and police, as well as the need for African-Americans to defend themselves from these attacks. We quote him at some length: “Last but not least, I must say this concerning the great controversy over rifles and shotguns. White people been buying rifles all their lives…no commotion. The only thing I’ve ever said is that in areas where the government has proven itself either unwilling or unable to defend the lives and the property of Negroes, it’s time for Negroes to defend themselves. Article number two of the Constitutional amendments provides you and me the right to own a rifle or a shotgun. It is constitutionally legal to own a shotgun or a rifle. This doesn’t mean you’re going to get a rifle and form battalions and go out looking for white folks, although you’d be within your rights – I mean, you’d be justified; but that would be illegal and we don’t do anything illegal. If the white man doesn’t want the black man buying rifles and shotguns, then let the government do its job.” (11) There’s a reason that the Sanford police covered up the shooting of Trayvon Martin this past February, and it was only after massive protests that his killer, George Zimmerman, was arrested. Across this country, the system of white supremacy is reinforced by the underlying threat of violence, whether it comes from police brutality or vigilante terrorism. The response is not to buckle to the pressures of liberals, who trust the very purveyors of violence to protect oppressed people, but for oppressed people to have the ability to defend themselves. Sensible policy on guns for working class and oppressed people in America can only come from a Marxist position. But to do that, we must first analyze and pull apart the muddled position carried by the advanced, progressives, and some of our comrades. The Left-Second Amendment Position In response to the liberal gun control proposals, many people on the US Left embrace a position similar to that espoused by the Right. This “Left-Second Amendment” position unites with the views put forth by the National Rifle Association by dismissing guns as incidental to mass murders like yesterday’s tragedy in Connecticut. In this view, something else – an external cause like mental health or the culture of violence in the US – is chiefly to blame. This is not incorrect. The US is an incredibly violent society, with the greatest purveyor of violence being the US government itself – and that’s not our opinion; that’s the opinion of Martin Luther King Junior, who used those exact words to describe the government on April 4, 1967. We see the evidence of this ‘cultural violence’ everywhere, from movies like Act of Valor, financed by the US military to glorify violence committed against other countries, to police violence inflicted on children and the innocent, like we saw in Anaheim, California, this year. Along the same lines, mental health services in the US are stigmatized and woefully underfunded. It’s no coincidence that many of the perpetrators of these mass killings have had severe mental health crises; crises that were more often than not identified but not adequately treated. The Left-Second Amendment position boils down to the pressing concern over the state having a monopoly on violence. When we look back in history, oppressed people have never won their freedom without armed struggle. In many cases, the lack of an armed populace has led directly to the rise of brutal fascist regimes, like in Chile and Spain. In 1973, the workers in Chile were underprepared to defeat the fascist coup d’etat that overthrew elected President Salvador Allende because of the government’s refusal to arm the people. During the Spanish Civil War almost four decades earlier, the social democratic government was similarly reluctant to arm the workers to resist Franco’s fascist brigades. And of course everyone knows of Adolf Hitler’s infamous ban on citizens owning guns after the rise of the Nazis. In essence, many leftists view guns as a means of self-defense for oppressed people and a safeguard against fascism. This leads them to oppose gun control measures, i.e. the liberal position on gun control. However, the Left-Second Amendment position mistakenly adopts the Right’s view of the right to bear arms as a philosophical abstraction, rather than a material reality. In practice, the Constitution does not protect the rights of oppressed people to bear arms. Even the most vocal advocates of the Second Amendment have no objection to regulations on firearm ownership by the people who need it most to defend their class and national interests from right-wing vigilantes and state power.

#### The affirmative relies upon the unquestioned assumption that gun control will leave the guns in the hands of those who are supposed to have it: the Police. But police aren’t neutral defenders of society—they protect property and continued wage slavery.

Martin 13 (Louis Martin, Writer for the militant, ‘A Marxist view of "gun control"’, 2013)//Miro

And many want to restrict workers' access to guns, seeking a monopoly on arms in the hands of their cops and military forces. The Second Amendment to the Constitution—like the rest of the Bill of Rights won in struggle by workers and farmers that serve as restrictions on and protections from the government—guarantees the "right of the people to keep and bear arms" against government infringement. Opponents of the Second Amendment argue that "public safety" necessitates scrapping that right as a relic of the past enacted in a different period when popular militias existed and before the invention of automatic weapons. But working people are not safer with a monopoly of firearms in the hands of cops and other armed bodies whose job is to protect property and prerogatives of the capitalist exploiters. Defending all workers' rights against stepped-up encroachments by the bosses and their government become more, not less important today, as the employing class mounts assaults on our wages and working conditions. The Second Amendment is among the constitutional protections that working people wielded as part of the mass proletarian fight for Black rights in the 1960s. Groups like the Deacons for Defense and Justice and Robert Williams' NAACP chapter in Monroe, N.C., maintained their right to bear arms and used them to stay the hand of racist thugs and cops, protect social protest actions and Black communities and prevent bloodshed. At the same time, the working-class movement has nothing in common with the gun-rights politics of rightist militia outfits or with vigilante "justice" and so-called Stand Your Ground laws that promote them. But the working-class political battle against such reactionary movements and laws cannot be advanced by calls for government restrictions on any rights of working people. Anti-social violence and senseless murder do not come from video games or legal rights to own guns. They are not a product of too many constitutional rights or too few armed cops at every corner. They are first and foremost a by-product of social relations under capitalism—buttressed by cop brutality, deaths and maimings on the job, and bloody wars of conquest abroad. And violent crimes within the working class can be exacerbated by the myriad social pressures that mount under the grinding effects of the capitalist crisis. At the same time, the rise of mass working-class struggles to come will replace capitalism's dog-eat-dog values with social solidarity, just as they always have in the past. It's this solidarity and the transformation of working people and their view of themselves that develops in the course of struggle against capitalist exploitation that is the most powerful weapon against anti-social behavior of all kinds.

#### Gun control is a band-aid reform that only serves to legitimate the state as purveyor of violence while ignoring the fact that the US government is the largest gun runner in the world.

Lee 13 (Daniel Lee, writer for the Oklahoma Workers' Monthly, “A Marxist-Leninist response to Gun Control”, 2013)//Miro

In a recent editorial piece published by Peoples World, the newspaper of the CPUSA, titled “Guns, profits and Sandy Hook” – the article started by opening with the need for the country to “get serious about regulating guns.” It pontificates further, giving a perfunctory nod to universal health access as “a piece of the puzzle” to preventing the epidemic of gun violence. The editorial then issues a call for a “broad enough coalition to confront and curb those who profit from manufacturing and dealing in these individual weapons of mass destruction”. It places the blame squarely on the gun lobbyists, and the corporations that profit from the sale of guns. The article ends finally in demanding a “Ban [of] assault weapons and high capacity bullet clips”. This article, which could have been written by any bourgeois Democrat or liberal group from Nancy Pelosi to Moveon.org, buys into the reactionary “liberal” approach of treating the symptom without curing the disease. Certainly those profiting off of the sale of weapons through the promotion of violence and racism must be made accountable for their exploitation and oppression of our fellow workers – and let us not forget that the US Government is one of the largest gun runners in the world, fueling instability, murder, and genocide of the proletariat around the globe, a fact PW conveniently leaves out. The article fails to mention that nearly 2,000 civilians were wounded in our War of Imperialism in Afghanistan , Pakistan, and Iraq during the first six months of 2012. About 1,145 civilians were killed in that same time period, according to U.N. totals. James Holmes’, Adam Lanza’s, and other serial killers’ crimes are dwarfed by this monstrosity in comparison, making the US government by far the most psychotic killer, still at large and continuing to slaughter men, women and children by the thousands. These figures don’t even take into account the hundreds of unarmed civilians slaughtered by uniformed bourgeois Police gangs across the country. Where is PW’s outrage to this crime? Where is the demand to confiscate the government’s guns? As Marxist-Leninists, we must approach the issue of gun control as we do any other issue – under the scientific principles of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and practice. We affirm first and foremost the absolute supremacy of the interests of the working class, and the necessity of revolution for the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat to completely overthrow the oppression of the Bourgeois state and its minions. As Marx and Engels famously wrote at the end of the Communist Manifesto, "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains.” When we talk about gun ownership then, we must talk about the rights of the workers to bear arms. One way or another, the bourgeois will exert their will through force either directly or indirectly, and usually through the cats-paw of the government and its military and police institutions to repress the working class and protect their own property interests. How then shall the workers protect their interests? As Marx writes, "The arming of the whole proletariat with rifles, guns, and ammunition should be carried out at once [and] the workers must ... organize themselves into an independent guard, with their own chiefs and general staff. ... [The aim is] that the bourgeois democratic Government not only immediately loses all backing among the workers, but from the commencement finds itself under the supervision and threats of authorities behind whom stands the entire mass of the working class. ...As soon as the new Government is established they will commence to fight the workers. In order that this party (i.e., the democrats) whose betrayal of the workers will begin with the first hour of victory, should be frustrated in its nefarious work, it is necessary to organize and arm the proletariat." - Karl Marx, Address to the Communist League (1850) This quote sounds as if it were written for the times we are facing today! However, Dialectical Materialism teaches us that the issues and struggles of history are cyclical, and though taking new forms, at the heart of the struggle remains the eternal war for class dominance. Moving forward to Lenin, the great leader of the October Revolution in Russia, we see that he too advocated arming the workers: “The minimum programme of the Social-Democrats calls for the replacement of the standing army by a universal arming of the people. Most of the official Social-Democrats in Europe and most of our own Menshevik leaders, however, have “forgotten” or put aside the Party’s programme, substituting chauvinism (“defencism”) for internationalism, reformism for revolutionary tactics. Yet now of all times, at the present revolutionary moment, it is most urgent and essential that there be a universal arming of the people. To assert that, while we have a revolutionary army, there is no need to arm the proletariat, or that there would “not be enough” arms to go round, is mere deception and trickery. The thing is to begin organizing a universal militia straight away, so that everyone should learn the use of arms even if there is “not enough” to go round, for it is not at all necessary that the people have enough weapons to arm everybody. The people must learn, one and all, how to use arms, they must belong, one and all, to the militia which is to replace the police and the standing army. The workers do not want an army standing apart from the people; what they want is that the workers and soldiers should merge into a single militia consisting of all the people.” - A Proletarian Militia by VI Lenin Comrade Stalin, the fierce defender of the fledgling workers’ Soviet democracy and the Champion against Nazi aggression, said that the “most important countermeasure against counterrevolution is the arming of the workers and peasants.” Finally, from the writings of the revered leader and liberator of the Chinese people, Mao Zedong, we find this important commentary on the role of the Red Army: "The Chinese Red Army is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. Especially at present, the Red Army should certainly not confine itself to fighting; besides fighting to destroy the enemy's military strength, it should shoulder such important tasks as doing propaganda among the masses, organizing the masses, arming them, helping them to establish revolutionary political power and setting up Party organizations." Certainly, each statement above applies to a particular instance in time at that particular stage of revolution in each writer’s respective countries. However, the principle remains the same. The workers must be made able to protect and defend themselves. In some cases, such as in 1916 Russia, the bourgeois were even willing to finance a workers militia - to protect their own interests – which Lenin said should be paid for by the bourgeoisie, but that the militia must above all protect the workers both from external threats, and from the bourgeois within the gates. At this point in time, the bourgeois state is not in a state of flux which would necessitate them calling upon the workers to form militias – in fact, such a thing is considered a threat to the Imperialist State’s hegemonic domination. Thus we can expect no checks to be coming in the mail from the rich for the funding of workers’ protection. However, we must still encourage the exercising of such rights still granted to all people by the Bourgeoisie state for the protection of the working class and minorities. We can take a lesson from the Black Panthers, who encouraged black communities to arm and protect themselves instead of relying on the unpredictable and brutal police forces and judicial system for protection. We can encourage the formation of community defense groups which are founded along class lines, upholding and protecting the rights of oppressed minorities. We can encourage and sponsor gun safety training, and work to create the best conditions possible for working class neighborhoods to protect themselves. We can encourage organized labor to stand together in solidarity to help protect the schools and surrounding communities, creating a “thin red line” of our own which acts as a deterrent against crimes from any source. And in the center must be the party, directing, protecting, and organizing the workers defense. Lenin would do no less.

### L—IPV

#### This is not some generic gun control K. Using the state as the solution to domestic abuse further criminalizes black and brown people at the margins of society and essentializes black women.

Rutrenberg 94 (MIRIAM H. RUTrENBERG J.D. candidate, Washington College of Law at The American University, 1994; B.A., Hampshire College, 1990. A FEMINIST CRITIQUE OF MANDATORY ARREST: AN ANALYSIS OF RACE AND GENDER IN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE POLICY)//Miro

The racist legacy of the criminal justice system" cannot be ignored when battered women's advocates propose to use that system as a solution to the problem of violence against women. The relationship of Black men and women to the criminal justice and legal system continues to be quite antagonistic. Since the days of slavery, the conduct of Black men has been criminalized, while sympathetic police have permitted white men to escape arrest.12 The criminal justice system continues to provide Black women with less protection than white women. Black women suffer greater harm at the hand of the judicial system in various contexts. When a Black woman is raped, regardless of whether the accused is white or Black, the police do not take her case as seriously as when the victim is a white woman.3 " Likewise, a pregnant Black woman who is found to be addicted to drugs or alcohol when arrested or arraigned is much more likely to be convicted of a crime than a similarly situated white woman. 34 In contrast, white women's relationship to the criminal justice system is ambivalent because the patriarchal law serves as both oppressor and protector of white women. 5 The criminal justice system has protected white women in cases of stranger rape when the accused perpetrator was Black, 6 but offered little relief in cases when the accused was white.' Mandatory arrest laws will inevitably result in increased prosecution and consequently, increased oppression for Black men and women in the criminal justice system. Some advocates argue that mandatory arrest policies benefit all women equally because women suffer discrimination based on their gender and not their ethnic or racial identity. A bitter debate has ensued over whether women can be stripped bare of their race and class, to be left with a gender identity that is essentially "woman," transcending all other socially constructed identities.' Feminists refer to the reduction of women's experiences to those based only on gender as gender essentialism. 9 When theorizing about women, one must avoid the tendency to understand "woman" as an "essential" identity; reducing gender to an "essential" form, devoid of any ethnic or racial identities, hinders one's ability to see the oppression that women can impose on other women by virtue of their race. Proponents of mandatory arrest policy, who are also gender essentialists, do not fully acknowledge that white women can indeed be the oppressors of Black men and women in their alliance with the state.' The interconnection of racial and sexual domination means that white women can simultaneously be oppressed and be oppressors. This is apparent in the context of current domestic violence policy, where white women can be oppressed in their abusive relationships, and at the same time, participate in the state's oppression of Black men by calling on the criminal justice system to mandate arrest in intrafamily abuse situations. Support for mandatory arrest statutes excludes Black women because these statutes conflict with the goals of eradicating racism and violence against women. Women demand protection from a male-controlled patriarchal state; and as this demand is met, it appears as if "women" are gaining equality. Black women, however, do not have the same access to the protections of the state, and, in fact, are often themselves the victims of zealous police and prosecutors.'

#### Domestic violence discourse has been coopted by reactionary rhetoric. Crime control strategies replicate racial hierarchy and ignore antagonistic relationships with the police.

Ferraro 96 (Kathleen J. Ferraro, professor of sociology at Northern Arizona University, “The Dance of Dependency: A Genealogy of Domestic Violence Discourse”, 1996)//Miro

No one group is responsible for the shift in focus that occurred over the 1980s. The relationships and ideologies which intermingled in that decade drew from the demands of battering advocates and the reactionary rhetoric of family values. They coincided in a crime control rhetoric that echoed previous campaigns to "bring back the whipping post" (Pleck 1987). These echoes carried with them the traces of racism and classism permeating the desire to discipline those who transgressed Anglo-Saxon definitions of the "family ideal." Crime control rhetoric not only eclipsed feminist efforts to alter the misogynistic foundations of that ideal. It also reinforced the boundaries between "good" and "bad" families, between men who batter and those who simply enforce a normative order of male-dominated households. In the 1970s, construction of a category "battered woman" empowered individual women to locate their personal situations in a political context, as a social problem. However, the homogenization of this category through academic, and especially legal, boundary-setting worked to erase the possibilities of discourses of intersectionality (Crenshaw 1991). That is, the intersecting forces of race, class, and sexual orientation that impinge on the experiences of battering were not included in positivist research, and are not accessible through legal definitions of perpetrator and victim. Women's relationships to men who batter them and to law enforcement are transversed by racial, class, and sexual locations. Women whose familial and personal histories instruct a view of police as agents of repression will not embrace mandatory arrest policies as a solution to battering. Within a context of frequent occurrences of police brutality and high rates of incarceration of young men of color, many women will not feel empowered by policies which give greater authority to police officers (for example, warrantless arrests) or which rely on police to provide protection. Women also have reason to worry that "mandatory arrest" will lead to their own incarceration. "Dual arrests" of both victim and perpetrator have become common in most cities where mandatory arrest policies are in place. In several investigations (Ferraro 1989; Norris 1994; Oberweis 1995), women report they will never call the police again, because when they did, they were arrested. The crime control model may decrease immediate physical danger to women, although even that has not been demonstrated. It does nothing, however, to increase women's material and emotional resources for surviving outside of an abusive relationship. Child support and daycare, affordable housing, and educational loans have all suffered funding cuts. The domestic violence discourse articulated by feminists in the early 1970s argued that police should play a minor role in assisting battered women. Shelters were also viewed as intermediate, band-aid interventions on the road to liberation. Co-optation of the movement has resulted in almost exclusive focus on these limited strategies and abandonment of broad-based feminist demands. IV The construction of domestic violence discourse between 1970 and 1996 is an example of the deployment of power within liberatory discourses. As a challenge to male violence, it exemplifies the potential for resistance through recasting the meanings of gender relationships. The ascendence of crime control strategies within the discourse, however, tends to replicate gendered, as well as racialized and class-based hierarchies. The domestic violence discourse is not outside of, but is constituted by the power dynamics it confronts. The shift from liberatory to crime control discourse has enhanced some possibilities for change and foreclosed others. One possibility which has been enhanced is the recognition of battered women as victims. In the early 1970s, there was no specific language for battering. Women who were violently assaulted in intimate relationships were not recognized as legitimate victims by legal, social, or religious authorities or by the general public. The problem was considered rare, and women who experienced it were not afforded sympathy or support, but usually advice on how to improve their marriages. Within this context, resignification of victimization was a positive resource for women. Resignification of victimization, however, is not free from cultural and moral baggage. Younger "post-feminists," such as Roiphe (1994) and Denfeld (1995) argue that feminism has created a "victim mythology," which portrays all women as victims of male violence. The early battering discourse did not focus on women as victims, but the criminal justice discourse defines individuals as either victims or perpetrators. The 1978 Civil Rights Commission's consultation does not list witnesses as "victims." The 1984 Attorey General's report lists witnesses in the back, using women's first names, followed by "victim," interspersed with experts' full names and institutional affiliations. The use of first names only is an effort to protect anonymity. Employed with the adjective "victim," however, the list serves to elevate the victim role to an identity. Victimization carries cultural notions of deservedness. Victims are subject to interrogation of their conduct, motives, and efforts to protect themselves and often their children. The public and legal image of victim is influenced by race, class, and sexual orientation factors. Now that there is a culturally constructed image of real battered women victims, women compare themselves and are compared to the image. The comparison can serve as a basis for offering aid or for condemnation for collusion in her own, or more unacceptably, her children's suffering. The possibilities which have been obscured by the crime control discourse are the ideals expressed by feminists in the 1970s. Establishment of a guaranteed minimum annual wage, broad-based changes in our economic system, revaluing women's work, and elimination of male privilege within the family are goals which have no language within the system of criminal law. These are goals involving the elimination of women's dependency on men. They belong to a discourse of liberation which does not constrict women's pain to a legal or scientific category. A discourse of liberation entails an understanding of the interlocking ideas, practices, and institutions which perpetuate subordination and those that set us free.