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### 1AC—refocus

#### Welcome to the United States of the twenty-first century. No longer the Welfare state, but the Warfare state.

#### Today, as Henry Giroux says, “Murdering children in schools, the streets, in jails, detention centers and other places increasingly deemed unsafe has become something of a national pastime.”

#### This tragic militarism can’t be detached from the survival-of-the-fittest ethos underlying our society. Any effective movement against gun violence must be part of a broader movement to retake democracy from the stranglehold of corporate interests.

Giroux 15 (Henry A. Giroux, pretty badass dude, anti-neoliberal activist, “Murder, Incorporated: Guns and the Growing Culture of Violence in the US”, 2015)//Miro

Nine people were killed and seven wounded recently in a mass shooting at a community college in Roseburg, Oregon. Such shootings are more than another tragic expression of unchecked violence in the United States; they are symptomatic of a society engulfed in fear, militarism, a survival-of-the-fittest ethos and a growing disdain for human life. Sadly, this shooting is not an isolated incident. Over 270 mass shootings have taken place in the United States this year alone, proving once again that the economic, political and social conditions that underlie such violence are not being addressed. In the United States, calls for liberal, Band-Aid reforms do not work in the face of the carnage taking place. "The United States sees an average of 92 gun deaths per day - and more preschoolers are shot dead each year than police officers are killed in the line of duty." (1) Mass violence in the United States has to be understood within a larger construction of the totality of the forces that produce it. Focusing merely on the more dramatic shootings misses the extent of the needless violence and murders that are taking place daily. State repression, unbridled self-interest, an empty consumerist ethos and war-like values have become the organizing principles of US society, producing an indifference to the common good, compassion, a concern for others and equality. As the public collapses into the individualized values of a banal consumer culture and the lure of private obsessions, US society flirts with forms of irrationality that are at the heart of everyday aggression and the withering of public life. US society is driven by unrestrained market values in which economic actions and financial exchanges are divorced from social costs, further undermining any sense of social responsibility. In addition, a wasteful, giant military-industrial-surveillance complex fueled by the war on terror, along with the United States' endless consumption of violence as entertainment and its celebration of a pervasive gun culture, normalizes the everyday violence waged against Black youth, immigrants, children fed into the school-to-prison pipeline and others considered disposable. US politicians now attempt to govern the effects of systemic violence while ignoring its underlying causes. Under such circumstances, a society saturated in violence gains credence when its political leaders have given up on the notion of the common good, social justice and equality, all of which appear to have become relics of history in the United States. In the face of mass shootings, the public relations disimagination machine goes into overdrive claiming that guns are not the problem, and that the causes of such violence can be largely attributed to people living with mentally illness. When in actuality, as two Vanderbilt University researchers, Dr. Jonathan Metzl and Kenneth T. MacLeish, publishing in the American Journal of Public Health, observed that: Fewer than 6 percent of the 120,000 gun-related killings in the United States between 2001 and 2010 were perpetrated by people diagnosed with mental illness. Our research finds that across the board, the mentally ill are 60 to 120 percent more likely than the average person to be the victims of violent crime rather than the perpetrators.... There are 32,000 gun deaths in the United States on average every year, and people are far more likely to be shot by relatives, friends or acquaintances than they are by lone violent psychopaths. (2) It may not be an exaggeration to claim that the US government has blood on its hands because of the refusal of Congress to rein in a gun lobby that produces a growing militarism that sanctions a love affair with the unbridled corporate institutions, financial interests and mass-produced cultures of violence. The Oregon community college shooting is the 41st school shooting this year while there have been 142 incidents of violence on school properties since 2012. Yet, the violence continues unchecked, all the while legitimated by the cowardly acts of politicians who refuse to enact legislation to curb the proliferation of guns or support measures as elementary as background checks - which 88 percent of the American people support - or for that matter, ban large-capacity ammunition magazines and assault rifles. In part, this cowardly refusal on the part of politicians is due to the fact that gun lobbyists pour huge amounts of money into the campaigns of politicians who support their interests. For example, in 2015, the gun lobby spent $5,697,429 while those supporting gun control paid out $867,601. In a New York Times op-ed, Gabrielle Giffords pointed out that the National Rifle Association (NRA) in the 2012 election cycle "spent around $25 million on contributions, lobbying and outside spending." (3) Outside money does more than corrupt politics; it is also responsible for people being shot and killed. The culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Many Americans are obsessed with violence. They not only own nearly 300 million firearms, but also have a love affair with powerful weaponry such as 9mm Glock semiautomatic pistols and AR-15 assault rifles. Collective anger, frustration, fear and resentment increasingly characterize a society in which people are out of work, young people cannot imagine a decent future, everyday behaviors are criminalized, inequality in wealth and income are soaring and the police are viewed as occupying armies. This is not only a recipe for both random violence and mass shootings; it makes such acts appear routine and commonplace. Fear has become a public relations strategy used not only by the national security state but also by the gun industry. When you live in a country in which you are constantly bombarded by the assumption that the government is the enemy of democracy and you are told that nobody can be trusted, and the discourse of hate, particularly against Black youth, immigrants and gun control advocates, spews out daily from thousands of conservative radio stations and major TV networks, a climate of fear engulfs the country reinforcing the belief that gun ownership is the only notion of safety in which people can believe in order to live as free human beings. Under such circumstances, genuine fears and concerns for safety are undermined. These include the fear of poverty, lack of meaningful employment, the absence of decent health care, poor schools, police violence and the militarization of society, all of which further legitimate and fuel the machinery of insecurity, violence and death. Fear degenerates into willful ignorance while any semblance of rationality is erased, especially around the logic of gun control. As Adam Gopnik observes: Gun control ends gun violence as surely an antibiotics end bacterial infections, as surely as vaccines end childhood measles - not perfectly and in every case, but overwhelmingly and everywhere that it's been taken seriously and tried at length. These lives can be saved. Kids continue to die en masse because one political party won't allow that to change, and the party won't allow it to change because of the irrational and often paranoid fixations that make the massacre of students and children an acceptable cost of fetishizing guns. (4) President Obama is right in stating that the violence we see in the United States is "a political choice we make that allows this to happen." While taking aim at the gun lobby, especially the NRA, what Obama fails to address is that extreme violence is systemic in US society, has become the foundation of politics and must be understood within a broader historical, economic, cultural and political context. To be precise, politics has become an extension of violence driven by a culture of fear, cruelty and hatred legitimated by the politicians bought and sold by the gun lobby and other related militaristic interests. Moreover, violence is now treated as a sport, a pleasure-producing form of commerce, a source of major profits for the defense industries and a corrosive influence upon US democracy. And as such it is an expression of a deeper political and ethical corruption in US society. As Rich Broderick insists, US society "embraces a soulless free-market idolatry in which the value of everything, including human beings, is determined by the bottom line" and in doing so this market fundamentalism and its theater of cruelty and greed perpetuate a spectacle of violence fed by an echo chamber "of paranoia, racism, and apocalyptic fantasies rampant in the gun culture." (5) The lesson here is that the culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Murdering children in schools, the streets, in jails, detention centers and other places increasingly deemed unsafe has become something of a national pastime. One wonders how many innocent children have to die in the United States before it becomes clear that the revenue made by the $13.5 billion gun industry, with a $1.5 billion profit, are fueling a national bloodbath by using lobbyists to pay off politicians, wage a mammoth propaganda campaign and induct young children into the culture of violence. (6) What is clear is that as more guns are on the streets and in the hands of people a savage killing machine is unleashed on those who are largely poor, Black and vulnerable. The widespread availability of guns is the reason for the shooting and killing of children and adults in Chicago, Boston, Ferguson, New York City and in other major cities. The Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence reports that "in 2010, guns took the lives of 31,076 Americans in homicides, suicides and unintentional shootings. This is the equivalent of more than 85 deaths each day and more than three deaths each hour. [In addition], 73,505 Americans were treated in hospital emergency departments for non-fatal gunshot wounds in 2010." (7) And the toll of gun violence on young people is truly heartbreaking with almost 30,000 young people killed in a 10-year period, which amounts "to nearly 3,000 kids shot to death in a typical year." (8) According to a Carnegie-Knight News21 program investigation, For every US soldier killed in Afghanistan during 11 years of war, at least 13 children were shot and killed in the United States. More than 450 kids didn't make it to kindergarten. Another 2,700 or more were killed by a firearm before they could sit behind the wheel of a car. Every day, on average, seven children were shot dead. A News21 investigation of child and youth deaths in the United States between 2002 and 2012 found that at least 28,000 children and teens 19-years-old and younger were killed with guns. Teenagers between the ages of 15 and 19 made up over two-thirds of all youth gun deaths in the United States. (9) Even worse, the firearms industry is pouring millions into recruiting and educational campaigns designed to both expose children to guns at an early age and to recruit them as lifelong gun enthusiasts. Reporting on such efforts for The New York Times, Mike McIntire writes: The industry's strategies include giving firearms, ammunition and cash to youth groups; weakening state restrictions on hunting by young children; marketing an affordable military-style rifle for "junior shooters" and sponsoring semiautomatic-handgun competitions for youths; and developing a target-shooting video game that promotes brand-name weapons, with links to the Web sites of their makers.... Newer initiatives by other organizations go further, seeking to introduce children to high-powered rifles and handguns while invoking the same rationale of those older, more traditional programs: that firearms can teach "life skills" like responsibility, ethics and citizenship. (10) As the United States moves from a welfare state to a warfare state, state violence becomes normalized. The United States' moral compass and its highest democratic ideals have begun to wither, and the institutions that were once designed to help people now serve to largely suppress them. Gun laws, social responsibility and a government responsive to its people matter. We must end the dominance of gun lobbyists, the reign of money-controlled politics, the proliferation of high levels of violence in popular culture and the ongoing militarization of US society. At the same time, it is crucial, as many in the movement for Black lives have stated, that we refuse to endorse the kind of gun control that criminalizes young people of color.

#### This gun violence is founded upon the fantasy of “rugged individualism”—the lone wolf defending his property and family against unseen threats. When we leave this narrative unchallenged, violence will remain—no matter what policy we implement. The aff functions as a destabilization of this atomistic view of the world.

Finley 14 (Esposito, Luigi; Finley, Laura L, associate professor of sociology and criminology @ Barry U, Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States, 2014)//Miro

In a neoliberal world, a virtuous citizen is one that is self-reliant, assumes personal responsibility for his/her own problems, and demands or expects as little as possible from others, especially from government. This ideal version of a neoliberal subject is consistent with the notion of "rugged individualism"-i.e., the type of individual who embodies the American pioneer ethic, steps up to any challenge, and lifts him/herself "up by his/her boot straps." In contrast, any person who fails to display these qualities is assumed to fail not only as an economic actor, but also as a moral being (Soss, Fording, and Schram 2009, p. 4). Indeed, those who rely on welfare assistance and other "government hand-outs" are regarded as morally corrupt individuals who live off tax payers and lack proper values. Personal virtue and responsibility, therefore, is expressed in behavior aimed at meeting one's personal needs and resolving one's own personal problems. Among many in the pro-gun community, support for this neoliberal tendency to associate virtue with rugged individualism and to emphasize private/personal solutions to all social problems is easily discernible. In his book Gun Crusaders, Scott Melzer interviews members of the NRA and described the following: [A] do-it-it-yourself attitude is the basic philosophy of most NRA members. Need protection? Buy a gun and learn to shoot. Not earning enough money to make ends meet? Work harder. Can't afford child care or health care? Don't expect government to bail you out. Freedom and self-reliance are indivisible. A country whose citizens have to rely on government for personal safety or basic needs is a country that is lazy and apathetic, and ultimately undemocratic (Melzer, 2009, p. 28). The parallel between Neoliberal ideology and what Melzer described as the "do-it-yourself' philosophy embraced by members of the NRA cannot be clearer. Not only freedom but democracy is assumed to be synonymous with self-reliance. Both neoliberal and pro-gun philosophy reinforce one another in that both presuppose an atomistic view of the world in which people are not understood as part of an interconnected community. Instead, all individuals are assumed to be autarkic subjects concerned almost exclusively with their own private lives. Far from supporting freedom and democracy, therefore, critics argue that what easily results from this social imagery is a depoliticized citizenry that is anathema to an effective democracy (e.g., McChesney 1999). As is well known, a viable democracy requires that people have a strong sense of connection to their fellow citizens. Yet because of the emphasis on self-interest/self-reliance, neoliberalism attenuates democracy by giving individuals a green light to prioritize their self-serving interest over those of a community (e.g., Giroux 2008). The fanatical-like zeal with which many gun supporters prioritize Second Amendment rights over all other rights is consistent with this tendency. While those who support the Second Amendment emphasize the individual's right to own firearms in order to protect his/her personal liberty, safety, or property, this right ignores the fact that individuals are also members of a community. More specifically, an emphasis on the individual's right to own firearms overlooks how that right might infringe on other people's right to live without fear of unprovoked gun violence or unintended gun-related tragedies. And while ardent Second Amendment supporters might argue that guns are a tool to protect human life, there should be little doubt that the logic behind pro-gun/ anti-gun control politics-much like the logic advanced by neoliberal ideology presupposes an "every person to him/herself' type of order as normal and even virtuous. At most, armed individuals might decide to take "heroic" action and come to the rescue of others during incidents such as mass shootings (much like neoliberals suggest that private charity should replace the welfare state as the primary mechanism for dealing with people in need, but the individual's right to own firearms supersedes any communal/societal concern associated with gun violence. Violence, according to many gun supporters, is an unavoidable fact of human life and getting increasingly worse (a common assumption not supported by the evidence). Accordingly, it is ultimately the responsibility of mature, sane individuals to take the necessary measures to protect themselves and their families against this presumed reality. As an example of this, consider a recent radio advertisement in which Milwaukee County Sheriff, David Clarke, gives citizens the following message: I'm Sheriff David Clarke, and I want to talk to you about something personal...your safety. It's no longer a spectator sport.... simply calling 911 and waiting is no longer your best option.. ..You can beg for mercy from a violent criminal, hide under the bed, or you can fight back; but are you prepared? Consider taking a certified safety course in handling a firearm so you can defend yourself until we get there. You have a duty to protect yourself and your family. We're partners now. Can I count on you? (quoted in Cirilli, 2013). Although the Sheriff invites law-abiding community members to be "partners" in the fight against crime, what is ultimately proposed is an every person to him/herself type of crime control. Rather than supporting measures that might minimize violence by addressing its root causes, people are encouraged to be personally responsible for their own safety. Therefore, owning a firearm and being competent at using them becomes a requisite for being a virtuous and responsible member of society. This sort of virtue is also gendered and associated most closely with dominant American understandings of masculinity.

#### This militaristic focus on violence has rendered entire populations “human waste,” no longer useful in a society where all that is sacred is profit and security. As our democracy withers, fear politics have come to dominate the public sphere.

Giroux 7 (Henry A. Giroux, an American scholar and cultural critic and one of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, “Violence, Katrina, and the Biopolitics of Disposability”, 2007)//Miro

The bodies that repeatedly appeared all over New Orleans days and weeks after it was struck by Hurricane Katrina laid bare the racial and class fault lines that mark an increasingly damaged and withering democracy and revealed the emergence of a new kind of politics, one in which entire populations are now considered disposable, an unnecessary burden on state coffers, and consigned to fend for themselves. The deeply existential and material questions regarding who is going to die and who is going to live in this society are now centrally determined by race and class. Katrina lays bare what many people in the United States do not want to see: large numbers of poor black and brown people struggling to make ends meet, benefiting very little from a social system that makes it difficult to obtain health insurance, child care, social assistance, cars, savings, and minimum-wage jobs if lucky, and instead offers to black and brown youth bad schools, poor public services, and no future, except a possible stint in the penitentiary. As Janet Pelz (2005) rightly insists, ‘These are the people the Republicans have been teaching us to disdain, if not hate, since President Reagan decried the moral laxness of the Welfare mom.’ While Pelz’s comments provide a crucial context for much of the death and devas-tation of Katrina, I think to more fully understand this calamity it is important to grasp how the confluence of race and poverty has become part of a new and more insidious set of forces based on a revised set of biopolitical commitments, which have largely given up on the sanctity of human life for those populations rendered ‘at risk’ by global neoliberal economies and have instead embraced an emergent security state founded on fear, class privilege, and updated notions of racial purity. This is a state that no longer provides Americans with dreams; instead, it has been reduced largely to protecting its citizens from a range of possible nightmares. In this instance, a biopolitics of disposability and bare life has combined with ‘the imploding history of biocapital’ (Comaroff, n.d.:37). Within the last few decades, matters of state sovereignty in the new world order have been retheorized so as to provide a range of theoretical insights about the relationship between power and politics, the political nature of social and cultural life, and the merging of life and politics as a new form of biopolitics, that is, a politics that attempts to think through the convergence of life and politics. Central here is the task of reformulating the meaning of contemporary politics and how it functions now to regulate matters of life and death, and how such issues are intimately related to both the articulation of community and the social, and the regulation, care, and development of human life. Within this discourse, politics is no longer understood exclusively through a disciplinary technology centered on the individual body – a body to be measured, surveilled, managed, included in forecasts, surveys, and statistical projections. Under the new biopolitical regimes, the body is understood primarily as an object of power, but it is a body that is social and multiple, scientific and ideological. Biopolitics points to new relations of power that are more capacious, concerned with not only the body as an object of disciplinary techniques that render it ‘both useful and docile’ but a body that needs to be ‘regularized’, subject to those immaterial means of production that produce ways of life that enlarge the targets of control and regulation (Foucault, 1997: 249). While biopolitics, as taken up in the work of theorists such as Michel Foucault, on the one hand, and Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, on the other hand, emphasizes the relations between politics and death, biopolitics, in their views, is less concerned with the primacy of death than with the production of life both as an individual and a social category. In Giorgio Agamben’s formulation, the new biopolitics is the deadly administration of what he calls ‘bare life’ and its ultimate incarnation is the Holocaust with its ominous specter of the concentration camp. In this formulation, the Nazi death camps become the primary exemplar of control, the new space of contemporary politics in which individuals are no longer viewed as citizens but are now seen as inmates, stripped of everything, including their right to live. The uniting of power and bare life, the reduction of the individual to homo sacer – the sacred man, who, under certain states of exception and without fear of punishment, ‘may be killed and yet not sacrificed’ – no longer represent the far end of political life (Agamben, 1998: 8). As modern states increasingly suspend their democratic structures, laws, and principles, the very nature of governance changes as ‘the rule of law is routinely displaced by the state of exception, or emergency, and people are increasingly subject to extra-judicial state violence’ (Bull, 2004: 3). The life unfit for life, unworthy of being lived, as the central category of homo sacer, is no longer marginal to sovereign power but is now central to its form of governance. Modern politics in this instance, as Jean Comaroff (n.d.: 22) puts it, ‘reveals how modern government stages itself by dealing directly in the power over life: the power to exclude, to declare exceptions, to strip human existence of civic rights and social value’. State violence and totalitarian power, which, in the past, either were generally short-lived or existed on the fringe of politics and history, have now become the rule, as life is more ruthlessly regulated and placed in the hands of military and state power. For Agamben, the coupling of the state of exception with the metaphor of bare life points to a biopolitics in which ‘all subjects are at least potentially if not actually abandoned by the law and exposed to violence as a constitutive condition of political existence’ (Mills, 2004: 47). Nicholas Mirzoeff has observed that all over the world there is a growing resentment of immigrants and refugees, matched by the emergence of detain and deport strategies coupled with the rise of the camp as the key institution and social model of the new millennium. The ‘empire of camps’, according to Mirzoeff, has become the ‘exemplary institution of a system of global capitalism that supports the West in its high consumption, lowprice consumer lifestyle’ (Mirzoeff, 2005: 145). Zygmunt Bauman calls such camps ‘garrisons of extraterritoriality’ and argues that they have become ‘the dumping grounds for the indisposed of and as yet unrecycled waste of the global frontier-land’ (Bauman, 2003: 136). The regime of the camp has increasingly become a key index of modernity and the new world order. The politics of disposability not only generates widespread violence and ever-expanding ‘garrisons of extraterritoriality’ but also has taken on a powerful new significance as a foundation for political sovereignty. Biopolitical commitments to ‘let die’ by abandoning citizens appear increasingly credible in light of the growing authoritarianism in the United States under the Bush administration. Under the logic of modernization, neoliberalism, and militarization, the category ‘waste’ includes no longer simply material goods but also human beings, particularly those rendered redundant in the new global economy, that is, those who are no longer capable of making a living, who are unable to consume goods, and who depend upon others for the most basic needs. Defined primarily through the combined discourses of character, personal responsibility, and cultural homogeneity, entire populations expelled from the benefits of the marketplace are reified as products without any value to be disposed of as ‘leftovers in the most radical and effective way: we make them invisible by not looking and unthinkable by not thinking’ (Bauman, 2004: 27). Even when young black and brown youth try to escape the biopolitics of disposability by joining the military, the seduction of economic security is quickly negated by the horror of senseless violence compounded daily in the streets, roads, and battlefields in Iraq and Afghanistan and made concrete in the form of body bags, mangled bodies, and amputated limbs – rarely to be seen in the narrow ocular vision of the dominant media.

#### The aff advocacy comes in two parts. First, yes, I endorse the idea that private ownership of handguns ought to be banned, but second, and perhaps more importantly, it is also a rupture of our neoliberal addiction to violence.

#### The aff refocuses the debate: When we spend endless time focusing on what policy to implement, rather than addressing the problem, we obscure the way in which militarism and profit have come to dictate everything in our society. Thus, the role of the judge is to act as a critical educator combating oppression—while obviously signing the ballot won’t make violence disappear, voting for strategies to combat oppression *in this round* makes us better activists in the future.

Giroux 12 (Henry A. Giroux, pretty badass dude, anti-neoliberal activist, “Colorado Shooting Is About More Than Gun Culture”, 2012)//Miro

The current reporting about the recent tragic shooting in Aurora, Colorado, is very discouraging. The media response to the alleged murderous rampage by James Holmes largely focuses on the guns he used, the easy availability of the ammunition he stockpiled, the booby trapping of his apartment and the ways in which he meticulously prepared for the carnage he allegedly produced. This is a similar script we saw unfold after the massacres at Columbine high school; Virginia Tech; Fort Hood; the supermarket in Tucson, Arizona; and the more recent gang shootings in Chicago. Immediately following such events, there is the expected call for gun control, new legislation to limit the sale of assault rifles and a justifiable critique of the pernicious policies of the National Rifle Association. One consequence is that the American public is being inundated with figures about gun violence ranging from the fact that more than 84 people are killed daily with guns to the shocking statistic that there are more than 30,000 gun-related deaths annually. To bring home the deadly nature of firearms in America, Juan Cole has noted that in 2010 there were 8,775 murders by firearms in the US, while in Britain there were 638. These are startling figures, but they do not tell us enough about the cult and spectacle of violence in American society. Another emerging criticism is that neither President Obama nor Mitt Romney has spoken out about gun control in the aftermath of the Aurora shooting. Gun control matters, but it is only one factor in the culture of symbolic and institutional violence that has such a powerful grip on the everyday workings of American society. The issue of violence in America goes far beyond the issue of gun control, and in actuality, when removed from a broader narrative about violence in the United States, it can serve to deflect the most important questions that need to be raised. Violence saturates our culture both domestically and in our approach to foreign policy. Domestically, violence weaves through the culture like a highly charged electric current burning everything in its path. Popular culture, extending from Hollywood films and sports thuggery to video games, embraces the spectacle of violence as the primary medium of entrainment. Brutal masculine authority and the celebration of violence it embraces have become the new norm in America. Representations of violence dominate the media and often parade before viewers less as an object of critique than as a for-profit spectacle, just as the language of violence now shapes our political discourse. The registers of violence now shape school zero-tolerance policies, a bulging prison-industrial complex and a growing militarization of local police forces. State violence wages its ghastly influence through a concept of permanent war, targeted assassinations, an assault on civil liberties and the use of drone technologies that justifies the killing of innocent civilians as collateral damage. Just as body counts increase in the United States, so do acts of violent barbarism take place abroad. Increasingly, we are inundated with stories about American soldiers committing horrendous acts of violence against civilians in Afghanistan, with the most recent being the murders committed by the self-named "kill team" and the slaughter of men, women and children allegedly by Staff Sgt. Robert Bales. The United States has become addicted to war and a war economy just as we increasingly have become addicted to building prisons and incarcerating minorities marginalized by class and race. And, moreover, we have become immune to the fact of such violence. Violence in the United States is a commodity mined for profit, a practice that has become normalized and a spectacle that extends the limits of the pleasure quotient in ways that should be labeled as both pathological and dangerous. We are not just voyeurs to such horrors; we have become complicit and reliant on violence as a mediating force that increasingly shapes our daily experiences. The culture of violence makes it increasingly difficult to imagine pleasure in any other terms except through the relentless spectacle of gratuitous violence and cruelty, even as we mourn its tragic effects in everyday life when it emerges in horrifying ways such as the senseless killing in Colorado. Increasingly, institutions are organized for the production of violence such as schools, prisons, detention centers and our major economic institutions. Rather than promote democratic values, a respect for others and embrace social responsibility, they often function largely to humiliate, punish and demonize any vestige of social responsibility. Our political system is now run by a financial oligarchy that is comparable to what Alain Badiou calls a "regime of gangsters." And as he rightly argues, the message we get from the apostles of casino capitalism carries with it another form of social violence: "Privatize everything. Abolish help for the weak, the solitary, the sick and the unemployed. Abolish all aid for everyone except the banks. Don't look after the poor; let the elderly die. Reduce the wages of the poor, but reduce the taxes on the rich. Make everyone work until they are ninety. Only teach mathematics to traders, reading to big property-owners and history to on-duty ideologues. And the execution of these commands will in fact ruin the life of millions of people."(1) It is precisely this culture of cruelty that has spread throughout America that makes the larger public not merely susceptible to violence, but also luxuriates in its alleged pleasures. We are a country gripped in a survival of the fittest ethic and one consequence is not merely a form of hyper masculinity and a new-found indulgence in the pleasure of violence, but the toxic emergence of a formative culture in which matters of ethics, justice and social responsibility are absent from what it means to create the conditions for a citizenry able to hold power accountable, produce citizens capable of caring for others and offer the conditions for young and old alike to be able to think critically and act compassionately. Justice in the United States has taken a bad hit and its absence can be measured not only in the vast inequalities that characterize all facets of everyday life from the workings of the justice system to the limited access poor and middle-class people now have to decent health care, schools and social protections, but also in a government that separates economics from social costs while selling its power and resources to the highest bidder. America needs to talk more about how and why violence is so central to its national identity, what it might mean to address this educationally and tackle the necessity of understanding this collective pathology of violence not just through psychological and isolated personal narratives, but through the wider ideological and structural forces that both produce such violence and are sustained by it.(2) But, of course, the American public needs to do more than talk, it needs to organize educators, students, workers, and anyone else interested in democracy in order to create social movements capable of changing the power relations that create the conditions for symbolic and systemic violence in American society.

#### This is 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.

#### Refuse the false objectivity of debate. Theory is no longer used to ensure true fairness but rather to silence challenges to the status quo. Debate has become a training ground for policymakers using procedural concerns to allowed the continued exploitation of millions.

Spanos 4 (William V. Spanos, available online cross-x.com url: <http://www.crossx.com/vb/showthread.php?t=945110&highlight=Spanos+Email> Nov. 18)

Dear Joe Miller, Yes, the statement about the American debate circuit you refer to was made by me, though some years ago. I strongly believed then --and still do, even though a certain uneasiness about "objectivity" has crept into the "philosophy of debate" -- that **debate** in both the high schools and colleges in this country **is assumed to take place nowhere**, even though the issues that are debated are profoundly historical, which means that **positions are always represented from the perspective of power,** and a matter of life and death. I find it grotesque that **in the debate world, it doesn't matter which position you take on an issue** -- say, the United States' unilateral wars of preemption -- **as long as you "score points".** The world we live in is a world entirely dominated by an "exceptionalist" America which has perennially claimed that it has been chosen by God or History to fulfill his/its "errand in the wilderness." That claim is powerful because American economic and military power lies behind it. And any alternative position in such a world is virtually powerless. Given this inexorable historical reality, to assume, as the protocols of debate do, that all positions are equal is to efface the imbalances of power that are the fundamental condition of history and to annul the Moral authority inhering in the position of the oppressed. This is why I have said that the appropriation of my interested work on education and empire to this transcendental debate world constitute a travesty of my intentions. My **scholarship is not "disinterested."** It is militant and intended to ameliorate as much as possible the pain and suffering of those who have been oppressed by the "democratic" institutions that have power precisely by way of showing that their language of "truth," far from being "disinterested" or "objective" as it is always claimed, is informed by the will to power over all manner of "others." This is also why I told my interlocutor that he and **those in** **the** **debate** **world** who felt like him **should** **call into** **question the traditional "objective" debate protocols and** **the** **instrumentalist language they privilege in favor of a concept of debate and of language in which** life and death mattered**. I am** very much **aware that the arrogant neocons who now saturate the government** **of the Bush administration -- judges, pentagon planners, state department officials, etc.** **learned their "disinterested" argumentative skills in the high school** **and college** **debate** **societies** **and** **that**, **accordingly, they** **have become masters at disarming the just causes of the oppressed. This** **kind** **leadership will reproduce itself** (along with the invisible oppression it perpetrates) **as long as the training ground and the debate protocols from which it emerges remains in tact. A revolution in** **the** **debate** **world** **must occur. It must force that** **unworldly** **world down into the historical arena where positions make a difference.** To invoke the late Edward Said, **only such a revolution will be capable of "deterring democracy"** (in Noam Chomsky's ironic phrase), **of instigating the secular critical consciousness** **that is**, **in my mind**, **the sine qua non for avoiding the** immanent global disaster **towards which the blind arrogance of** **Bush Administration and his** **neocon policy makers is leading**.

#### Ban is key—it reshifts our cultural conception of violence. Overfocus on feasibility and policymaking allows for unabated violence. The Aff opens previously unforeseen possibilities.

Bovy 15 (PHOEBE MALTZ BOVY, writer for the New Republic, “It’s Time to Ban Guns. Yes, All of Them.”, 2015)//Miro

Ban guns. All guns. Get rid of guns in homes, and on the streets, and, as much as possible, on police. Not just because of San Bernardino, or whichever mass shooting may pop up next, but also not not because of those. Don’t sort the population into those who might do something evil or foolish or self-destructive with a gun and those who surely will not. As if this could be known—as if it could be assessed without massively violating civil liberties and stigmatizing the mentally ill. Ban guns! Not just gun violence. Not just certain guns. Not just already-technically-illegal guns. All of them. I used to refer to my position on this issue as being in favor of gun control. Which is true, except that “gun control” at its most radical still tends to refer to bans on certain weapons and closing loopholes. The recent New York Times front-page editorial, as much as it infuriated some, was still too tentative. “Certain kinds of weapons, like the slightly modified combat rifles used in California, and certain kinds of ammunition, must be outlawed for civilian ownership,” the paper argued, making the case for “reasonable regulation,” nothing more. Even the rare ban-guns arguments involve prefacing and hedging and disclaimers. “We shouldn’t ‘take them away’ from people who currently own them, necessarily,” writes Hollis Phelps in Salon. Oh, but we should. I say this not to win some sort of ideological purity contest, but because banning guns urgently needs to become a rhetorical and conceptual possibility. The national conversation needs to shift from one extreme—an acceptance, ranging from complacent to enthusiastic, of an individual right to own guns—to another, which requires people who are not politicians to speak their minds. And this will only happen if the Americans who are quietly convinced that guns are terrible speak out. Their wariness, as far as I can tell, comes from two issues: a readiness to accept the Second Amendment as a refutation, and a reluctance to impose “elite” culture on parts of the country where guns are popular. (There are other reasons as well, not least a fear of getting shot.) And there’s the extent to which it’s just so ingrained that banning guns is impossible, legislatively and pragmatically, which dramatically weakens the anti-gun position. The first issue shouldn’t be so complicated. It doesn’t take specialized expertise in constitutional law to understand that current U.S. gun law gets its parameters from Supreme Court interpretations of the Second Amendment. But it’s right there in the First Amendment that we don’t have to simply nod along with what follows. That the Second Amendment has been liberally interpreted doesn’t prevent any of us from saying it’s been misinterpreted, or that it should be repealed. When you find yourself assuming that everyone who has a more nuanced (or just pro-gun) argument is simply better read on the topic, remember that opponents of abortion aren’t wondering whether they should have a more nuanced view of abortion because of Roe v. Wade. They’re not keeping their opinions to themselves until they’ve got a term paper’s worth of material proving that they’ve studied the relevant case law. Then there is the privilege argument. If you grew up somewhere in America where gun culture wasn’t a thing (as is my situation; I’m an American living in Canada), or even just in a family that would have never considered gun ownership, you’ll probably be accused of looking down your nose at gun culture. As if gun ownership were simply a cultural tradition to be respected, and not, you know, about owning guns. Guns… I mean, must it really be spelled out what’s different? It’s absurd to reduce an anti-gun position to a snooty aesthetic preference. There’s also a more progressive version of this argument, and a more contrarian one, which involves suggesting that an anti-gun position is racist, because crackdowns on guns are criminal-justice interventions. Progressives who might have been able to brush off accusations of anti-rural-white classism may have a tougher time confronting arguments about the disparate impact gun control policies can have on marginalized communities. These, however, are criticisms of certain tentative, insufficient gun control measures—the ones that would leave small-town white families with legally-acquired guns well enough alone, allowing them to shoot themselves or one another and to let their guns enter the general population. Ban Guns, meanwhile, is not discriminatory in this way. It’s not about dividing society into “good” and “bad” gun owners. It’s about placing gun ownership itself in the “bad” category. It’s worth adding that the anti-gun position is ultimately about police not carrying guns, either. That could never happen, right? Well, certainly not if we keep on insisting on its impossibility. Ask yourself this: Is the pro-gun side concerned with how it comes across? More to the point: Does the fact that someone opposes gun control demonstrate that they’re culturally sensitive to the concerns of small-town whites, as well as deeply committed to fighting police brutality against blacks nationwide? I’m going to go with no and no on these. (The NRA exists!) On the pro-gun-control side of things, there’s far too much timidity. What’s needed to stop all gun violence is a vocal ban guns contingent. Getting bogged down in discussions of what’s feasible keeps what needs to happen—no more guns—from entering the realm of possibility. Public opinion needs to shift. The no-guns stance needs to be an identifiable place on the spectrum, embraced unapologetically, if it’s to be reckoned with.

#### Effective activism requires recognizing our conceptual fragility. Instead of fighting for an ideal utopia where oppressed populations use guns to defend themselves, we should recognize that guns in fact replicate state violence. The aff is a broader strategy against corporate power.

Culp 14 (Andrew Culp, Visiting Assistant Professor of Rhetoric Studies at Whitman College, Darwin Bond-Graham, sociologist and investigative journalist, “Left Gun Nuts”, 2014)//Miro

Of course gun control will not eliminate America’s patriarchal power structure, or pacify the culture of violence, or undo racism. But 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. The government should not have a legitimate monopoly on the use of force. Some Lefties oppose gun control on the grounds that the state’s violence is illegitimate, and they argue that it is a question of power – that “the people” should never cede power to the state. Of course government violence is never legitimate, even if it is popular and sanctioned by many of its citizens. Wars, executions, and structural violence such as starving children or denying million basic healthcare are but a sliver of the illegitimate violence for which the American government is responsible. But 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”? In what world does gun ownership delegitimize or even reduce the state’s use of violence? And how would such a place be less authoritarian and violent? The relationship between guns and American government at the present moment is clear: our lax gun laws buttress state violence. The political economy of guns shows how weapons manufacturing is an important part of American corporate and political power. This is because the military industrial complex serves as an engine for the national economy. The firearms industry employs few workers, but it is part of a larger arms manufacturing sector responsible for over 1 million jobs. As “defense” manufacturers, the gun industry’s political interests lie in arming the police at home and fighting imperialist wars abroad. The same gun companies that benefit from the American government’s hunger for small arms and ammo, which it sprays both here and in foreign lands, benefit doubly from the lack of laws restricting gun ownership. On the other side of the equation, the American military has reciprocally benefitted from popular gun ownership. The NRA, after all, was considered a boon to the U.S. military in its early history, as it provided the Army with enlistees already familiar with firearms. Just prior to World War I, the NRA even partnered with the federal government to give guns to the population and to sponsor shooting contests. 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. The Reagan administration, for instance, slashed child food programs, Medicaid, family welfare, food stamps, and low-income energy assistance to feed the military industrial complex. Confronting the gun industry on the national stage could be part of a larger strategy of opposing the war industry as a whole, which produces nothing of consumable value and whose political interests directly oppose the Left. Only then can the Left shift the terrain of struggle away from apocalyptic fantasies of armed insurrection to areas where it has historically drawn strength, such as cultural politics.

#### <<opt>>

#### Refuse the simplistic binary between reformism and radicalism—doing so stunts politics and cedes the electoral sphere to conservatives—the Aff’s experimental approach is key to a revolutionary ethos

Connolly ‘13 William E. Connolly, “The Dilemma of Electoral Politics,” The Contemporary Condition, 3/20/2013, http://contemporarycondition.blogspot.com/2013/03/the-dilemma-of-electoral-politics.html

There is, nonetheless, a dilemma of electoral politics confronting the Left: 1) It is tempting to forgo electoral politics because it is so dysfunctional. But to do so cedes even more power both to independent corporate action and to the radical right within the state. The right loves to make electoral politics dysfunctional so that people lose confidence in it and transfer confidence to the private sector. (2) Nonetheless, the logic of the media-electoral-corporate system does spawn a restrictive grid of power and electoral intelligibility that makes it difficult to think, experiment, and organize outside its parameters. Think of how corporations and financial institutions initiate actions in the private sector and then use intensive lobbying to veto efforts to reverse those initiatives in Congress or the courts, just as financial elites invented derivatives and then lobbied intensively to stop their regulation; think of how media talking heads concentrate on candidates rather than fundamental issues; recall the central role of scandal in the media and electoral politics; consider the decisive electoral position of inattentive “undecided voters”; note how states under Republican rule work relentlessly to reduce the minority and poor vote; recall those billionaire super pacs; and so on. The electoral grid cannot be ignored or ceded to the right, but it also sucks experimental pursuits and bold ventures out of politics. Can we renegotiate the dilemma of electoral politics? That is the problematic within which I am working. I do not have a perfect response to it. Perfect answers are suspect. Perhaps it is wise to forge multimodal strategies that start outside the electoral grid and then return to it as one venue among others. Strategic role experimentations at multiple sites joined to the activation of new social movements provide possibilities. Indeed, these two modes are related. Consider merely a few examples of role experimentation tied to climate change and consumption available to many people in the shrinking middle class. We may support the farm-to-table movement in the restaurants we visit; we may participate in the slow food movement; we may frequent stores that offer food based on sustainable processes; we may buy hybrid cars, or, if feasible, join an urban zip-car collective, explaining to friends, family, and neighbors the effects such choices could have on late modern ecology if a majority of the populace did so; we may press our workplace to install solar panels and consider them ourselves if we can afford to do so; we may use writing and media skills to write graffiti, or produce provocative artistic installations, or write for a blog; we may shift a large portion of our retirement accounts into investments that support sustainable energy, withdrawing from aggressive investments that presuppose unsustainable growth or threaten economic collapse; we may bring new issues and visitors to our churches, temples, or mosques to support rethinking interdenominational issues and the contemporary fragility of things; we may found, join, or frequent repair clubs, at which volunteers collect and repair old appliances, furniture, and bikes to cut back on urban waste, to make them available to low income people and to increase the longevity of the items; we may probe and publicize the multimodal tactics by which twenty-four-hour news stations work on the visceral register of viewers, as we explain on blogs how to counter those techniques; we may travel to places where unconscious American assumptions about world entitlement are challenged on a regular basis; we may augment the pattern of films and artistic exhibits we visit to stretch our habitual powers of perception and to challenge some affect-imbued prejudgments embedded in them. A series of intercalated role experiments, often pursued by clusters of participants together. But don’t such activities merely make the participants “feel better”? Well, many who pursue such experiments do feel good about them, particularly those who accept a tragic image of possibility in which there is no inevitability that either large scale politics, God, or nature will come to our rescue. Also, could such role experiments ever make a sufficient difference on their own? No. These, however, may be the wrong questions to pose. What such experiments can do as they expand is to crack the ice in and around us. First, we may now find ourselves a bit less implicated in the practices and policies that are sources of the problems. Second, the shaky perceptions, feelings, and beliefs that authorized them may thus now become more entrenched as we act upon them. Third, we now find ourselves in more favorable positions to forge connections with larger constituencies pursuing similar experiments. Fourth, we may thus become more inspired to seed and join macropolitical movements that speak to these issues. Fifth, as we now participate in protests, slowdowns, work “according to rule” and more confrontational meetings with corporate managers, church leaders, union officials, university officers, and neighborhood leaders, we may become even more alert to the creeds, institutional pressures and options that propel these constituencies too. They, too, are both enmeshed in a web of roles and more than mere role bearers. Many will maintain an intransigence of viewpoint and insistence of interpretation that we may now be in a better position to counter by words and deeds with those outside or at the edge of the intransigent community. One advantage of forging links between role experimentations and social movements is that both speak to a time in which the drive to significant change must be pursued by a large, pluralist assemblage rather than by any single class or other core constituency. Such an assemblage must today be primed and loaded by several constituencies in diverse ways at numerous sites. It is necessary here to condense linkages that may unfold. But perhaps movement back and forth between role experiments, social movements, occasional shifts in the priorities of some strategic institutions, and a discernible shift in the contours of electoral politics will promote the emergence of a new, more activist pluralist assemblage. Now, say, a new, surprising event occurs. Some such event or crisis is surely bound to erupt: an urban uprising, a destructive storm, a wild executive overreach, a wide spread interruption in electrical service, a bank melt down, a crisis in oil supply, etc. Perhaps the conjunction of this new event with the preparatory actions that preceded it will prime a large constellation to resist the protofascist responses the intransigent Right will pursue at that very moment. Perhaps the event will now become an occasion to mobilize large scale, intensive support for progressive change on some of the fronts noted at the start of this piece. It is important to remember that the advent of a crisis does not alone determine the response to it. So waiting for the next one to occur is not enough. The Great Depression was followed by the intensification of fascist movements in several countries. Those with strong labor movements and progressive elected leaders proved best at resisting them. The most recent economic melt-down was met in many places by the self-defeating response of austerity, and worse. That is why the quality and depth of the political ethos preceding such events is important. The use of the “perhaps” in the above formulations suggests that there are no guarantees at any of these junctures. Uncertainties abound. These points, however, also apply to any radical perspective that counsels waiting for the revolution, as it surrounds its critiques of militant reform with an aura of certainty. Today the need is to curtail the aura of certainty of all perspectives on the Left. The examples posed here, of course, are focused on primarily one constituency. But others could be invoked. The larger idea is to draw energy from multiple sources and constituencies. The formula is to move back and forth between the proliferation of role experiments, forging social movements on several fronts, helping to shift the constituency weight of the heavy electoral machinery now in place, and participating in cross-country citizen movements that put pressure on states, corporations, churches, universities and unions from inside and outside simultaneously. Indeed, perhaps the severity of the issues facing us means that we should prepare for the day when we are strong enough in several countries to launch a cross-country general strike. The proliferating approach adopted here, again, is replete with uncertain connections. That’s politics. The point is to resist falling into the familiar game of optimism vs. pessimism and to minimize that tempting blame-game within the Left, folding more attraction and inspiration into our activities. The point is to appraise the severity of the needs of the day and to attract people to join in different ways and degrees a multifaceted movement to respond to them.

#### Challenging neoliberal discourse in the debate space is uniquely productive—the Aff counter-narrative of institutionalized violence takes back notions of rationality and efficiency

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.

#### Refuse the false objectivity of debate.

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.

## 1AR

### 1AR O/V—! framing

#### I control the largest impact in the round—disposability. In the squo, people in the way of profit are viewed as literal human waste—it is this logic that perpetuates racism, patriarchy, and imperialism globally. This will only get worse.

### 1AR O/V—method

#### Method debate—

#### Gun bans are important and I will defend that, yet when all we focus on is the implementation of these band aid reforms, we normalize the way in which we, as a society, have become addicted to violence—that’s the Giroux evidence. The AC serves to refocus the debate towards an analysis of the way in which our drive for profit leaves millions in the margins.

### 1AR O/V—ROTJ

#### The role of the judge is to act as a critical educator voting for methods to combat oppression *in this round*, this is key because of activism—that’s Giroux.

#### <<for kuo>>

#### This *does not* mean that simply speaking about the issue led to a change of your heart—what it means is that we should have a debate focused on grassroot activism. I think that my affirmative methodology of reshifting our focus from gun control to a culture of violence is productive. If they disprove that, they win.

<<opt>>

The role of the judge is a central framing question for the methodologies introduced in this round--focus on ideal theory and what “ought to” be is a form of fantasy roleplaying that ignores changing knowledge production in this round. As a critical educator combatting oppression, 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. – that’s Giroux.

### 1AR !—Deutsch

#### Neolib 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."

### 1AR !—Vltchek

#### 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.

### 1AR DA—Fear

#### <<Go for ROTB over Fear DA>>

#### Fear DA—they are exactly the sort of “security enframing” that our Giroux evidence criticizes, claiming ridiculous impacts with extremely low probabilities like <<insert impacts>> in order to defend the status quo disenfranchisement of entire communities—replicates oppression.

#### <<opt>>

#### You should value these structural impacts over the disads 1% chance of actually happening—especially when I have my role of the judge claim—two more reasons:

#### 1AC Giroux evidence says that you must prioritize slow violence—we are cognitively biased against structural problems

#### Spanos evidence turns your calculating decisionmaking—makes us become experts at disenfranchising the oppressed.

### 1AR DA—Policy Focus

#### 2 independent disads to their policy focus—

#### Giroux— focus on band-aid solutions to gun control measures like simply “regulation” rather than bans obscures neoliberal violence—we become focused on what policy to pass and ignore what is causing the problem in the first place—means only the Aff’s refocusing solves.

#### Spanos— focus on policymaking makes debate into a training ground for the very same people who use their disinterested argumentative skills to continue oppression—only a forefronting of in-round activism solves.

### 1AR DA—nowhere view

#### The 1NC is a strategy of disembodied perspective—they read <<contrasting arg 1>> which clearly contradicts with <<contrasting arg 2>>.

#### It is exactly this sort of disembodied politics—where you assume yourself to speak from “nowhere” and take whatever position you want as long as you score points that Spanos says perpetuates disposability. These strategies in debate teach debaters who later go on to become pentagon planners, judges, and neocons how to disarm the causes of the oppressed—means case is an independent disad to their performance.

### 1AR—AT: gun control good

#### Their evidence is epistemically flawed—defenses of the lone wolf mentality rely on neoliberal discourse.

#### Even if gun bans lead to uptick in crime, neoliberal reduction in violence is bad.

#### Best meta-study proves that gun control reduces violence.

Mounteaux et al. 15 [Michael C. Monuteaux, ScD, Lois K. Lee, MD, David Hemenway, PhD, Rebekah Mannix, MD, Eric W. Fleegler, MD “Firearm Ownership and Violent Crime in the U.S.: An Ecologic Study” American Journal of Preventive Medicine, Volume 49, Issue 2, August 2015, 207–214 ] RDK

This study tested the hypothesis that private firearm ownership at the state level serves as a deterrent to criminal activity, with firearm ownership measured by a nationally representative self-report survey and crime measured by official law enforcement agency reports. These results do not support the hypothesis that higher rates of firearm ownership are associated with lower firearm-related assault, robbery, or homicide rates. To the contrary, evidence was found for a positive association, in which states with greater levels of private firearm ownership experienced greater rates of firearm-related violent crimes. These results are consistent with studies finding a positive association between city-level gun availability, the individual risk for gun-related assault and robbery,[14](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib14) and [23](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib23) and an increased risk for firearm assault victimization and possessing a firearm at the time of the crime.[24](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib24) The present findings are partially consistent with a study of gun availability in South Carolina in 1991–1994,[13](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib13) which found an association between illegal gun availability and gun crime, but not with lawful gun availability. This discrepancy may be the result of methodologic differences in the measures of gun prevalence (a survey measure of ownership versus a count of concealed weapon permits). These findings are also partially consistent with a study of 21 developed countries (including the U.S.) that found an association between firearm ownership and rates of gun-related assault, but not robbery.[11](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib11) These findings are similar to studies examining the link between firearm ownership and firearm-related homicide, despite methodologic differences. Miller and colleagues [5](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib5) and [6](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib6) reported a positive relationship between firearm ownership and overall homicide as well as firearm homicide across states and regions. Another study found that stronger state-level firearm control legislation was associated with decreased firearm-related suicides and homicides.[25](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib25) Whereas homicides were measured using death certificate data in Miller et al.[5](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib5) and [6](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib6) and Fleegler and colleagues,[25](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib25) law enforcement crime reports were used in the present study. This study is also consistent with that of Siegel et al.,[26](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib26) which found a positive association between state-level non-stranger homicide and firearm ownership. Another study found an association between the repeal of Missouri’s handgun purchaser licensing law (thereby increasing firearm availability) and an increase in firearm homicides, using both death certificate data and UCR data to measure homicide.[27](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib27) Also, a study using a proxy of state-level firearm ownership (i.e., a composite of a firearm suicide measure and the hunting license rate) found an association with total homicides and firearm-related homicides.[28](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0749379715000720#bib28)

#### 

### 1AR—generic

The most recent and best-warranted study shows carrying guns increases crime.

Aneja et al 14

Aneja, Abhay, John J. Donohue III, and Alexandria Zhang. *The Impact of Right to Carry Laws and the NRC Report: The Latest Lessons for the Empirical Evaluation of Law and Policy*. No. w18294. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012. [Aneja, Abhay, John J. Donohue III, and Alexandria Zhang. *The Impact of Right to Carry Laws and the National Research Council Report: The Latest Lessons for the Empirical Evaluation of Law and Policy*. No. w18294. National Bureau of Economic Research, 2012.] PESH AK

Across the basic seven Index I crime categories, the strongest evidence of a statistically significant effect would be for aggravated assault, with 11 of 28 estimates suggesting that [right to carry] RTC laws increase this crime at the [ten percent] .10 confidence[.] level. An omitted variable bias test on our preferred Table 8a results suggests that our estimated percent increase in aggravated assaults from RTC laws may understate the true harmful impact of RTC laws on aggravated assault, which may explain why this finding is only significant at the .10 level in many of our models. Our analysis of the year-by-year impact of RTC laws also suggests that RTC laws increase aggravated assaults. Our analysis of admittedly imperfect gun aggravated assaults provides suggestive evidence that RTC laws may be associated with large increases in this crime, perhaps increasing such gun assaults by almost 33 percent. In addition to aggravated assault, the most plausible state models conducted over the entire 1979-2010 period provide evidence that RTC laws increase rape and robbery[,] (but usually only at the .10 level). In contrast, for the period from 1999-2010 (which seeks to remove the confounding influence of the crack cocaine epidemic), the preferred state model (for those who accept the Wolfers proposition that one should not control for state trends) yields statistically significant evidence for only one crime – suggesting that RTC laws [and] increase the rate of murder at [five percent.] the .05 significance level.

**Panel data is the most accurate, and our study adjusts for systematic flaws—Aneja’s data is corrected so that panel data’s before and after results give us a stronger correlation—most neg studies do not deal with outliers.**

Aneja 2

We evaluate the NRC evidence, and improve and expand on the report’s county data analysis by analyzing an additional six years of [both] county [and] data as well as state panel data for the period 1979-2010 [seventy-nine to twenty-ten]. We also present evidence using both a more plausible version of the Lott and Mustard specification, as well as our own preferred specification (which, unlike the Lott and Mustard model presented in the NRC report, does [Our study] control[s] for rates of incarceration and police). While we have considerable sympathy with the NRC’s majority view about the difficulty of drawing conclusions from simple panel data models and re-affirm its finding that the conclusion of the dissenting panel member that RTC laws reduce murder has no statistical support, we disagree with the NRC report’s judgment on one methodological point: the NRC report states that cluster adjustments to correct for serial correlation are not needed in these panel data regressions, but our randomization tests show that **without such adjustments the Type 1 error soars to** 22 - **73 percent.** Our paper highlights some important questions to consider when using panel data methods to resolve questions of law and policy effectiveness. We buttress the NRC’s cautious conclusion regarding the effects of RTC laws by showing how sensitive the estimated impact of RTC laws [are **sensitive**] is to different data periods, the use of state versus county data, [and] particular specifications (especially the Lott-Mustard inclusion of 36 highly collinear demographic variables), and the decision to control for state trends.

### 1AR—AT: substitution

#### Wrong.

Dixon 93 (NICHOLAS DIXON, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College, Alma, Michigan, WHY WE SHOULD BAN HANDGUNS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1993)//Miro

One has to doubt the reliability of the statements of prisoners as to what firearms they would carry in certain circumstances. Macho bragging and outright lying are very likely in such situations, and relegate Kleck's projections to the status of unsupported conjecture. In view of the fact that such a small percentage of the actual murders in the United States in 1990 were committed with long guns,' the burden on Kleck to prove his hypothetical speculation is even heavier. As for Kates and Benenson, their projections are based on the unsupported assertion that the 70% of handgun killers who do not turn to long guns would instead use knives, the most lethal weapon other than firearms. It is more probable that at least some potential murderers would turn to less lethal weapons or their bare hands, and that some would be deterred from assaults altogether. Since Kates and Benenson ignore these probable scenarios, and since their substitution predictions are in any case purely speculative, it is safe to conclude that their estimate of the increase in the homicide rate in the event of a handgun-only ban is inflated. The conjectures offered in support of the substitution hypothesis are inadequate and fail to meet the burden of proof encumbent on opponents of my proposal. Another reason to doubt that long guns would be used in great numbers to replace handguns in robberies, assaults, and homicides is that long guns are obviously much more difficult to conceal. A potential mugger roaming the streets wielding a long gun will cause everyone in sight to flee, and is likely to be quickly arrested when alarmed people call the police. Similarly, a bank robber carrying a long gun will be immediately detected by security guards, alarm systems will be triggered, and the chances of a successful robbery greatly diminished. Handguns are obviously much more convenient for the commission of such crimes. Kates and Benenson point out that most homicides occur in the home, where concealability is "irrelevant." 95 However, concealability would seem to be an important factor even in the home. Since the victim may well be unaware that the killer is carrying a concealed weapon, the "surprise factor" which is peculiar to handguns can still apply even in the home. In contrast, people can hardly be unaware that the person they are with is carrying a shotgun or rifle. Moreover, in any argument or domestic quarrel, regardless of whether the potential victim knows that the assaulter is carrying a handgun, the ease of pulling out the gun and shooting makes such arguments more likely to spill over into murder. In contrast, by the time the assaulter has gone into another room to retrieve their long gun and loaded it, the potential victim has crucial seconds in which to escape.

### 1AR—AT: black market

#### Assumes band-aid solution—my aff leads to a culture shift by refocusing the conversation to profit—that’s Giroux.

#### US is source of illegal weapons.

Mehalko 12 (Laura Mehalko, Executive Comments Editor for the Boston College International & Comparative Law Review, “The International Implications of U.S. Gun Control Policy”, 2012)//Miro

Mexican drug trafficking organizations are the largest providers of illicit drugs to the United States. They have also grown to rely on advanced, high-power weaponry and to use their nearly military-grade armament to maintain control over smuggling corridors, and local drug production areas. Cartels are also linked to nearly 40,000 deaths over the last five years, many of which were committed with guns originating in the United States. The United States is likely the most prevalent source of weapons for the increasingly violent cartels. The U.S. government estimates that nearly ninety percent of all weapons used in the drug war originate in the United States. An analysis of current gun control policy in the United States and Mexico suggests this is likely the case; Mexico has particularly strict gun control laws in contrast to the relatively lenient gun control regulation in the United States. Both countries have implemented domestic policies aimed at reducing the southward flow of arms into Mexico, yet so far have had little success. This Note argues that arms trafficking has been facilitated by current U.S. gun control policy, and it will likely continue without a foundational shift in either U.S. or international policy.

# Aff—Theory

## Policy T

### 1AR—T F/L

#### ROTJ takes out T— You must first know your role— if your role as judge is to be a critical education combatting oppression that takes out their jurisdiction and fairness claims.

#### I meet— I defend the resolution on balance. You should evaluate this debate based on reasonability—theory prolif sets a non-arbitrary voting threshold, means good is good enough—I could always spec more.

#### Counter-interp— Aff can critically engage with the resolution as long as they defend resolution on-balance

#### This argument is a question of models for debate—fairness claims collapse because they presume one model of debate is good which can only be judged by the external impact it has.

#### <<Offense >>

#### Hoops DA— LD trains people to use theory in order to silence challenges to the squo— it is these very people who go on to become judges, pentagon planners, policy makers and others who used formalistic appeals to the law to continue oppression—the damage is done—that’s Spanos.

#### Case is a disad— focus on policy trades off with the Aff’s refocusing—that’s Giroux. Case outweighs their fairness claims—cross-apply the impact overview.

#### Activism standard in the AC means it’s try-or-die for the Aff ROTJ—without activism, all of their education and fairness claims are meaningless, no matter what we learn, unless we have the ability to take it out of the round and use it, it is, by definition, useless.

#### <<Their Standards>>

#### Normal means solves—they could have cut a definition card because I’m bound to topic.

### 1AR—AT: topical version of aff

#### My aff is the T version

#### Cross-apply the analysis as to why case is a disad from above—policy focus trades off with the aff, means no T version.

### 1AR—AT: policymaking

#### I don’t trade off with policymaking—you have other rounds.

#### TURN: Cross-apply Spanos—policymaking education is training for neocons, replicates aff impacts. Only Aff combines policymaking with critical reflection.

### 1AR—AT: ground

#### They have ground—I defend whole rez and I’m predictable, Giroux says neolib is at the core of the rez.

#### Ground loss inevitable— all teams try to write their aff strategically to deny neg ground, at least I don’t have shitty theory spikes

#### Ground claims replicate exclusion and are wrong

Harrigan 12 (Casey Harrigan, Director of Debate @ MSU previously at UGA and Wake, <http://msudebate.blogspot.com/2012/11/1ar-ssd.html>, 20th November 2012)//Miro

Appeals to fairness and Neg ground prove your model is little different than old school White SSD hegemony. Honestly, I don't see too many women, minorities, or hippies getting upset about the teams that have chosen to reject SSD. Mostly, I see elite schools, traditional policy teams that fear change, and people of privilege who object using the claim of fairness to paper over their personal unwillingness to engage with difference. Debate will not fall apart. Some of the most meaningful ground emerges from points of stasis between teams arguing from conviction. There are always places to disagree. And, chaos is pretty much the status quo, in case you haven’t noticed. Loyola EM made the damn semis of the NDT. Not unique.

### 1AR—AT: jurisdiction

#### Cross-apply the ROTJ analysis from above—this entire debate is a question of what your role should be—questions of judge jurisdiction miss the point.

### 1AR—AT: fairness

#### K turns fairness—

#### Their claims of how to best preserve debate beg the question. Why is the form of debate they defend one that deserves to be preferred—if I win that my methodology is productive for combatting oppressive knowledge, this is an external impact justifying my form of debate.

#### Extend Giroux— utilizing fairness as a factor in decision making prioritizes self-interest over the educational value of the public sphere which coopts and destroys debate making flawed ideology replicate itself causing the violent norms. We’ve mechanized debate to the point that we’re stuck in the same repetitious cycle.

#### Fairness is not a voter—just an internal link to education, if I win I promote new forms of knowledge, that outweighs fairness.

# Aff—CP

## Gen CP

### 1AR—Gen CP

#### Perm: Do both—no reason we can’t destabilize our neoliberal addiction to violence and <<do the counterplan>>

#### <<Counterplan links to the net benefit—explain>>

#### 2 independent disads to their policy focus—

#### Giroux— focus on band-aid solutions to gun control measures rather than bans obscures neoliberal violence—we become focused on what policy to pass and ignore what is causing the problem in the first place—means only the Aff’s refocusing solves.

#### Spanos— focus on policymaking makes debate into a training ground for the very same people who use their disinterested argumentative skills to continue oppression—only a forefronting of in-round activism solves.

#### Only the Aff solves—

#### Discrimination— Any alternative to a full ban entails separation into “good” and “bad” owners which inevitably collapses into racist policing and stigmatizing mental illness—ROTJ means you reject.

#### any attempt to regulate guns without first challenging neoliberalism is doomed to failure, we will continue to oppress people viewed as disposable—weigh the aff against the CP—Giroux.

#### CP doesn’t function under the role of the judge—it’s not an in-round methodology, it simply fiats that some actor will do something—means it has no solvency.

## States CP

### 1AR—States CP

#### Perm: Do both—no reason we can’t destabilize our neoliberal addiction to violence and <<do the counterplan>>

#### Perm: Do CP—not textually competitive with the rez.

#### <<Counterplan links to the net benefit—explain>>

#### 2 independent disads to their policy focus—

#### Giroux— focus on band-aid solutions to gun control measures rather than bans obscures neoliberal violence—we become focused on what policy to pass and ignore what is causing the problem in the first place—means only the Aff’s refocusing solves.

#### Spanos— focus on policymaking makes debate into a training ground for the very same people who use their disinterested argumentative skills to continue oppression—only a forefronting of in-round activism solves.

#### Only the Aff solves—

#### Discrimination— Any alternative to a full ban entails separation into “good” and “bad” owners which inevitably collapses into racist policing and stigmatizing mental illness—ROTJ means you reject.

#### any attempt to regulate guns without first challenging neoliberalism is doomed to failure, we will continue to oppress people viewed as disposable—weigh the aff against the CP—Giroux.

#### CP doesn’t function under the role of the judge—it’s not an in-round methodology, it simply fiats that some actor will do something—means it has no solvency.

#### States fail— no uniform implementation, budget tradeoffs, and inequality.

Burness 12 (Jeff, electric vehicle infrastructure expert and former Director at ClearEnergy. Interview Conducted with Kevin Bertram (GW Debater) on September 15, 2012, journalx.com) KJS

Q. Why a federal standard? Wouldn't it be simpler for each state to adopt the same standard on their own? The notion that all fifty states and however many thousands of counties and municipalities would all adopt the same standard is pure fantasy. However, even if that were to be done, there are still a number of reasons that you would still want federal involvement. First, the states are broke. Their resources are already stretched to the breaking point and some beyond. Even if every state took positive action, without federal funding and support, these programs would quickly fall by the wayside because of budget constraints. Second is that the average citizen is simply more aware of federal programs than state programs. Think about it - the Forest Service wanted to build awareness about forest fires and now we all know who Smokey the Bear is. State and local governments, partly because of lack of resources and partly because of lack of expertise, simply are not geared toward developing effective awareness campaigns. And then there are some of the more traditional problems with state programs. Q. Such as? Well, some states are hostile to renewable energy so the programs would be implemented poorly.  And some states are notorious for funneling financial incentives to special interest groups and these special interest groups rarely include those most in need of assistance.  While the federal government is hardly perfect, it has a much better track record as regards its ability to structure and implement incentive programs in an equitable fashion.  And then, of course, when budget shortfalls surface, the program will either be discontinued or the most connected citizens will be the ones who will continue to benefit most.

#### These budget cuts constitute a continuation of business-as-usual disposability.

PJALS 12 (Peace and Justice Action League of Spokane, “Facing Race: How Budget Cuts are Increasing Racial Disparities,” January 12, 2012, <http://pjals.org/2012/01/facing-race-budget-cuts-increasing-racial-disparities/>) KJS

The report Facing Race: How Budget Cuts Are Increasing Racial Disparities highlights how the cuts made to the 2011-2013 biennial budget disproportionately affect communities of color in Washington State and worsen existing racial disparities. The full report, published by Washington Community Action Network with endorsers including PJALS, is available at: http://washingtoncan.org/wordpress/reports/. Washington State gives away $6.5 billion every year on tax breaks for special interests (see insert for examples). At a time when the demand for state services is increasing as a result of unemployment, the recession and the previous rounds of state budget cuts, cuts to lifeline programs for the most vulnerable families in our state are not a solution. Our Legislature needs to close corporate tax loopholes and bring in revenue in order to expand opportunities and reduce racial and economic disparities. Key Findings: Health Care \* Cuts made to Basic Health and community clinics will make it harder for communities of color to receive affordable health care, which will lead to increased disparities in health. Basic Health enrollees are disproportionately people of color; Latinos represent 36% of community health center patients though they only make up 9.3% of the state population. \* People of color also suffer greater health risks at birth. Cuts made to Maternity Support Services will jeopardize the health of 65,000 at-risk pregnant women and infants through the critical first year of life. \* 19,000 interpreter appointments are scheduled every month and over 80,000 Washington residents rely on these services. The cuts to interpreter services will result in thousands of families being lost in translation. Key Findings: Human & Social Services \* People of color are 58% more likely than whites to rely on home care services, and cuts made to Home Care resulted in an average 10% reduction in personal care hours. Cuts \* Time limits and cuts to TANF also disproportionately affect communities of color, as they are more likely to be low-income. \* With a 61.5% reduction in funding for the Housing Trust Fund, low-income families in need of housing support are more likely to become homeless.

#### 50 state fiat is bad—

#### 1. Reciprocal— allowing 50 different agents kills fairness

#### 2. They can’t fiat uniformity— not in the lit and no mechanism for fiating past collective action problems

#### Reject the arg

# Aff—K

## Gen K

### 1AR—Gen K

#### No link—

#### AC Giroux evidence says that by combining gun control with a broader strategy against neoliberalism, we avoid problematic reformist policies like Stop and Frisk which your K is critiquing.

#### The NC links describe status quo gun policies that focus on dividing “good” and “bad” owners—a full ban reverses discriminatory enforcement—that’s Bovy.

#### Aff solves— it is our addiction to violence that is the root cause of <<their impacts>>—Giroux.

#### Perm: Do both.

#### AC Connolly evidence slays the alt—we must have a *multimodal approach* to activism, that means experimenting in different sites: including the state. The familiar debate between optimism and pessimism is empirically what has led to the collapse of the Left in the status quo—which is an independent turn. *Even if* all of her arguments are true, we can’t engage with the alt unless we get the state to take its foot off of oppressed people’s neck—means the perm is key.

### 1AR—Culp Ext.

#### AC Culp evidence takes out the K—3 warrants that your K has *no* answer to:

#### Gun control reduces the lethality of violent acts stemming from what you critique.

#### Gun manufacturing finances imperial wars abroad and finances corporate power which replicates your impacts.

#### Gun spending trades off with welfare—the alt leaves the worst off to die.

### 1AR—nonv

#### The move towards violence ensures subjugation of those seen as “weak.”

Bartkowski 13, Senior Director at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 339)

Changing entrenched views about the effectiveness of armed resistance is particularly hard as they are usually rooted in a warrior psychology that is shaped by violent masculinity and patriarchy. Struggles for independence typically have privileged male leadership. As a consequence, conspiracies of belligerent men plotting in small, secretive circles in an atmosphere that congratulates violent bravery and rewards machismo, leave little room for recognizing the importance of nonviolent alternatives or the contributions of women or non-fighting-age young men to the struggle. In fact, the discourse of hegemonic victors tends to conform to a masculinist construct that, as Jean Bethke Elshtain maintains, from antiquity though to the present has divided society into “just warriors” (male fighters and protectors) and “beautiful souls” (female victims and noncombatants). The circle of just warriors is also limited as it would normally exclude men who wanted to play other roles (i.e., gays) or their virility did not conform to the prevailing warrior achetype. Furthermore, teaching history, including the rise of nations, formation of state institutions, conduct of state politics, and development and implementation of public policies, shapes a nation’s commemorative landscape and punctuates it with stories of military battles, patriotic risings, wars and violent defeats – all dominated by men, be they soldiers, scholars, politicians, or other elite actors. This has inhibited people from remembering, acknowledging, and understanding the presence and efficacy of civil resistance, including the central place of women engaged in writing and distributing petitions; organizing and leading demonstrations and protests; setting up and running autonomous associations and educational institutions; and supporting and participating in social and economic boycotts, strikes and sit-ins. Masculinity and Civil Resistance. While armed struggle and violent masculinity are almost symbiotically joined in the historical imagination, the question of systemic male domination in civil resistance is more complex and ambiguous. Foreign occupation and colonization has frequently been based on economic exploitation and has often involved cultural genocide or extreme forms of coercion such as slavery, forced migration, resettlement, and conscription. Often a systematic part of foreign domination has been sexual exploitation of women and (as mentioned in Chapter 7 on Egypt) humiliation of indigenous men. In conditions where a foreign colonizer’s racist stereotypes affected both a symbolic and real emasculation, the oppressed population – particularly its men – often saw “regaining manhood” as a basic element of independence equivalent to self-respect or dignity. Becoming men is thus a common theme to be found in both armed and nonviolence anticolonial stuggles, as indeed in other struggles against other kinds of oppression.

#### Belief in the necessity of violent struggle to overcome oppression is not a neutral conception grounded in fact – it’s the result of an intentionally distorted history that privileges armed combat.

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 1)

Most people look to historical accounts to understand how their own nations emerged and fought for their freedom. Such explanations, whether found in books or imparted though public ceremonies and national memories, often tell of violent battles and insurrections, victories and defeats in wars, and fallen heroes in armed struggles. These narratives support the common belief that violence is the indispensable weapon to win freedom from foreign subjugation, but they ignore the power and historical role that nonviolent civilian-led resistance has played in many national quests for liberation. This book brings to light the existence and impact of nonviolent organizing and defiance where it has not commonly been noticed. It argues that a number of historical struggles for national self-determination might not necessarily, or even primarily, have been won through violence. Instead, these struggles were decisively waged through diverse methods of nonviolent resistance led by ordinary people. Furthermore, during the unfolding process of civil resistance, it was often the force of population-driven, bottom-up, nonviolent mobilization that shaped nations’ collective identities (i.e., nationhood) and formed nascent national institutions and authorities (i.e., statehood). These processes were critical for an independent nation-state – more so than structural changes or violent revolutions that dominate the history of revolutionary struggles and nation making. Recovering Civil Resistance. This book reveals little-known, but important, histories of civil resistance in national struggles for independence and against foreign domination throughout the world in the past 200 years. Often, these histories have been misinterpreted or erased altogether from collective memory, buried beneath nationally eulogized violence, commemorative rituals of glorified death, martyred heroes, and romanticized violent insurrections. In recovering hidden stories of civil resistance that involve diverse types of direct defiance and more subtle forms of everyday, relentless endurance and refusal to submit, this book shows how the actions of ordinary people have undermined the authority and control of foreign hegemons – colonizers and occupiers – and their domestic surrogates. Despite extreme oppression, the repertoire of nonviolent action has often helped societies survive and strengthen their social and cultural fabric, build economic and political institutions, shape national identities, and pace the way to independence. The narrative of the book contains a heuristic inquiry into forgotten or ignored accounts of civil resistance, showing how knowledge about historical events and processes is generated, distorted, and even ideologized in favor of violence-driven, structure-based, or powerholder-centric interpretations. Glorified violence in the annals of nations, the gendered nature of violence wielded by men, state independence that is seen as having been founded largely on violence (the view reinforced by a state monopoly on violence as way to maintain that independence), and human attention and media focus (both centered on dramatic and spectacular stories of violence and heroic achievements of single individuals) all dim the light on the quiet, nonviolent resistance of millions. This type of struggle neither captures the headlines nor sinks into people’s memories unless it provokes the regime’s response and, more often that not, a violent one. The outcomes of seemingly violent struggles with foreign adversaries have depended to a large degree on the use of political – nonviolent – means rather than arms. Materially and militarily powerful empires and states have been defeated by poorly armed or even completely unarmed opponents not because they met irresistibly violent force, but because the nations found another source of strength – the total mobilization of the population via political, administrative, and ideological tools. Thus, political organizing has been the key ingredient in the people’s revolutions that have helped the militarily weaker successfully challenge powerful enemies. Examples include, among others, the Spanish insurrectionists against Napoleon, the Chinese revolutionaries against the Japanese Army, and the North Vietnamese against the United States and its South Vietnamese allies. In all of these supposedly violence-dominated conflicts, military tools were subordinated to a broader political struggle for the “hearts and minds” of ordinary people. By recovering the stories of nonviolent actions, this book goes against a tide of prevailing views about struggles against foreign domination that fail to recognize and take into account the role and contribution of civil resistance.

#### In Ghana - nonviolent resistance was able to quickly and successfully overthrow imperialist repression

Bartkowski 13, Senior Director at the International Center on Nonviolent Conflict

(Maciej, Recovering Nonviolent History: Civil Resistance in Liberation Struggles, pg. 63)

The newly independent state of Ghana took a leading role in advocating and using civil resistance. In Deember 1958 independent Ghana hosted the All-African Peoples’ Conference, a follow-up to the 1945 Pan-African Congress. Patrice Lumumba and Tom Mboya were there along with a large Algerian contingent. In his opening speech, Nkrumah attributed the success of the Ghanaian independence movement to nonviolent positive action. Kojo Botsio, who led the CPP delegation, told countries still struggle for liberation that, “with the united will of the people behind you, the power of the imperialists can be destroyed without the use of violence.” Some delegations were unhappy with the emphasis on nonviolent resistance, especially the Algerians and Egyptians who “regarded the very word ‘nonviolence’ as an insult to brothers fighting and dying for freedom.” Ultimately, the congress declared its support for peaceful means in territories where democratic means were available but also supported those in circumstances where arms were the only protection from colonial violence. In 1959, after hearing that France planned to test nuclear weapons in the Sahara Desert at Regan, Algeria, a group of eleven Ghanaians along with British and other international activists attempted to intervene nonviolently, but were ejected from French territory in Upper Volta and ended up back in Ghana. Another conference to discuss the way forward for positive action was held in Accra in April 1960, Positive Action for Peace and Security in Africa. While Nkrumah opened the conference with a speech advocating “nonviolent positive action” as the main tactic, after the criticism of Frantz Fanon and pressure from some other African delegates, the conference’s emphasis on continent –wide nonviolent positive action was muted. Nevertheless, Bill Sutherland and Matt Meyer describe positive action as being “a phenomenal success for Gandhian strategy.” Nonviolent tactics were used as part of a self-conscious overall nonviolent strategy that led Ghana quickly to independence with minimal casualities. They included consciousness-raising among the people about their right to self-government, a determination to act in concert with each other through a variety of associations, and a willingness to accept imprisonment. Boycotts and strikes showed the people that withdrawing cooperation leaves colonial forces powerless (and that cooperation reinforces subjection). Many marginalized sectors of society were mobilized in a common cause, including the youth, market women, and elementary school graduates. Newspapers and popular songs spread the message of the movement and the leaders emphasis on the need for nonviolent discipline resonated with people’s deeply held value systems. There was the grace to accept compromise in certain situations as well as the determination to go the harder way of strikes and imprisonment when sacrifice was required. The impact of mass nonviolent civil resistance on shaping Ghanaian nationalism needs further exploration, but it is clear – if rarely acknowledged – that if facilitated this process of nation building.

### 1AR—Culp

#### Yes, police violence is bad, but only the perm solves. Loose guns justifies further policing. Don’t kid yourself, we *will lose* the arms race.

Culp 14 (Andrew Culp, Visiting Assistant Professor of Rhetoric Studies at Whitman College, Darwin Bond-Graham, sociologist and investigative journalist, “Left Gun Nuts”, 2014)//Miro

Yes, the police should be disarmed. Police violence is intolerable and oppressive, particularly for communities of color. But here, quite a few Leftists extend their critique against police brutality to claim that “the people” can defend themselves against the police with guns. The Black Panthers’ armed patrols shadowing police in the 1960s is the most common example trotted out to demonstrate how armed communities defended themselves against unaccountable cops. Groups like the Deacons for Defense, or revolutionaries like Malcolm X and Robert Williams are also also mentioned as proof that guns help the democratic Left fight the power, and that without guns we will be increasingly victimized by the police. But guns hardly keep away the police or help communities fight back against the cops. In fact, the proliferation of guns in America has provided an excuse for police to further intrude in our lives. The police use the ubiquity of guns in America to justify their brutality, seen especially clearly in the extrajudicial killings they commit. It is difficult to see how arming communities translates into a reduced police presence. Furthermore, carrying a weapon certainly would not have assisted victims of recent lethal police violence, and would have instead have worked in the favor of officers under official review. American police militarizing themselves with tanks, drones, SWAT teams, and mass surveillance systems say that they have to do so because the American public has access to super deadly types of guns and ammunition. Aggressive new police policies treat nearly everyone as a gun owner (armed or not), leading to the pervasive use of SWAT raids, ‘shoot first and ask questions later’ no-knock warrant searches, invasive automobile searches, stop and frisk, excessive use of force, and the implementation of ever-more powerful surveillance systems. In sum, an armed citizenry only encourages the police to arm themselves more heavily. It is true that radicals, especially African American revolutionaries, have used guns to symbolically protest power in America and call out the hypocrisy of white supremacy and lax gun laws that selectively apply to dominant social groups. Yet the power of armed protest is only enhanced by laws that restrict ownership of assault rifles, special ammunition, and even handguns, and should not be confused for revolutionary violence, of which there are scant encouraging examples of in recent United States history. Finally, it is necessary to note that America’s most oppressed communities are already flooded with guns, especially pistols and assault weapons designed for close quarter combat. The ready availability of these weapons has in no way empowered these communities to fight back against the cops, at least not in any obvious way. The prevalence of firearms has instead magnified America’s radicalized inequality, poverty, and structural violence to produce an epidemic level of shootings among youth of color in places like Chicago, Oakland, Detroit, and Newark. Guns hurt working-class communities of color. The gun industry, weakly regulated as it is, has long prospered off the illegal market for firearms in inner cities.

#### The K is a leftist fantasy—taking guns away would do more for the revolution and their thesis is disproven by empirics. This card *ends the debate.*

\*Vast majority of gun owners are white reactionary men—squo disproves the thesis of the K

\*Gun culture would inevitably co-opt any revolution—even if they start with good intentions masculinity, racism and provincialism

\*Warlords would be empowered by guns, turning the rev

\*We would lose the arms race with the US govt.

\*The K is just “radical posturing”, it allows the continued exploitation and death of thousands every year.

Culp 14 (Andrew Culp, Visiting Assistant Professor of Rhetoric Studies at Whitman College, Darwin Bond-Graham, sociologist and investigative journalist, “Left Gun Nuts”, 2014)//Miro

But there is another quarter from which we are already hearing rote objections to gun control: the Left. All sorts of Lefties—anarchists, socialists, Black and Latino nationalists, and even quite a few Democratic Party-voting liberals—cling to guns just as tightly as the far Right. They use surprisingly similar language to justify their objections to gun control proposals. They either sit on the sidelines after each new massacre and wring their hands about the daily slaughter, or worse still, they actively oppose gun control. Here are a few reasons why some on the Left oppose gun control and reasons why they are wrong. The people need to defend themselves against the government. The more radical variant of this argument is that “the people” need guns to wage an eventual revolution and liberate themselves from the shackles of the state and corporate America. Gun control need not dampen the spirit of those still hoping for a revolution, even if such a revolution is highly unlikely to happen in our lifetimes. What stands in the way of such leftist dreams are the vast majority of current gun owners. Over-represented among current gun owners are white reactionary men, the types who regularly expresses their desire to shoot on sight the “Muslim socialist” president of the United States, and who “muster” along the U.S.-Mexico border with their weaponry to defend the nation against “alien” immigrants. As it stands, toxic gun culture would coopt any new American revolution with a lethal cocktail of supercharged masculinity, racism, and provincialism fantasized about in post-apocalyptic scenes. If the United States ever comes to another civil war, the first thing to die under a barrage of lead will be our hope for a more just and democratic society; guns would empower warlords with petty political agendas, not egalitarian-minded freedom fighters. The most likely cultural shift away from reactionary gun ownership will not happen in cooperation with the Right and their politics, but against it. Gun control is the best place to start. Disarming the Right will do more to advance goals toward a revolutionary democratic transformation of America than trying to beat the Right-wingers (and the U.S. government!) in an arms race. Of course Left insurrectionists who advocate the right to bear arms are more focused on the U.S. Government as the singular impediment to their variant of utopia. 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. In the real world, guns kill upwards of 30,000 Americans every year, virtually all of these deaths serving absolutely no political purpose in the fight for a more democratic society. Most of these deaths are just tragic accidents or suicides, many of which would not end in death if guns were not in the mix. Left fantasies about armed struggle are the same half-baked ideas as those held by the secessionist Right. What varies for Leftists is the template of decolonial struggles; yet a leftist revolution in the United States would not kick out a small minority of foreign occupiers, as happened in India and Vietnam, but would be a fight amongst settler colonialists for political authority. This is why the worn “Zapatistas defense” touted by the radical left is a bad analogy for the United States context – the Zapatistas started a peasant rebellion that kicked outsiders off their landbase, a task for which wooden cutouts of guns turned out to be more effective than the real thing.

### 1AR—at: Pratt

#### The alt is complicit with reactionary gun politics that drive continued disposability—their author predicts that white people will need guns in the coming race war and that Trayvon Martin was killed because of his broken family—you should hold him to this.

SPLC 13 (SPLC, Southern Poverty Law Center—categorizing hate groups (like your K author) since 1971, “Larry Pratt”, 2013)//Miro

An “anti-Christian" government such as the United States cannot be counted on to protect the population, and by restricting gun ownership it is "trying to enslave the citizenry," Pratt reasons. He is fond of citing a biblical passage from the Book of Samuel as justification for a heavily armed American populace. As the story goes, only two people in Israel had swords, because the Philistines had banned them. After their empty-handed soldiers lost a battle, God permitted the Israelites to rearm and win a rematch. “Today, the same goals of the Philistines would be carried out by an oppressor who would ban gunsmiths from the land. The sword of today is the handgun, rifle or shotgun,” Pratt wrote in a 1999 GOA column. “The sword control of the Philistines is today’s gun control of those governments that do not trust their people with guns.” "The Old Testament also tells us a great deal about the positive relationship between righteousness, which exalts a nation, and self defense," Pratt continued. "It makes clear that in times of national rebellion against the Lord God, the rulers of the nation will reflect the spiritual degradation of the people and the result is a denial of God's commandments, an arrogance of officialdom, disarmament and oppression." As a soldier defending "righteousness," Pratt sees guns as essential to that fight, which might come in the form of a race war. During a 2013 appearance on the "Talk to Solomon Show," posted on YouTube by Right Wing Watch, Pratt envisioned "some sort of social implosion" during President Obama's second term. "These folks in power are seeking that kind of confrontation, and it would be a wonderful surprise if it did not happen," Pratt said. The show's host, Stan Solomon, predicted a coming race war that would take the form of attacks “on Christian, heterosexual white haves by black, Muslim and/or atheist — not that there’s much difference — black have-nots.” Any "white, heterosexual, Christian, working, married person" who doesn't have a gun faces "a substantial chance of being hurt and/or killed," Solomon said. "I don't think there's anything stretching to say that," Pratt replied. "I think there are people that really want to bring violence about, because they see that as the engine of social change. That's exactly the target for the Alinskyites [a reference to social reformer Saul Alinsky]. And I think they must figure that they've got their guy in power, and they will then have at least some of the agencies of the police powers of the state at their back, and this is the time to go for it." Defending American society from the "arrogance of officialdom, disarmament and oppression" is a busy job. When he's not hobnobbing with avowed racists and theocrats, Pratt makes regular mass media appearances, often in the wake of a mass shooting, or on the anniversary of one. Dour, contentious, and evasive, he argues against any form of gun control. He suggested to CNN's Wolf Blitzer that instead of background checks for mentally ill people seeking to buy guns, those people should simply be institutionalized. CNN host Piers Morgan confronted Pratt with retired Army Gen. Stanley McChrystal's call for restrictions on assault-style weapons. Pratt was unmoved, replying that "the general and his troops are not going to be there to protect the average American, the military nor the police after social order implodes, after a hurricane, after an earthquake, during riots." Appearing on MSNBC's "Hardball" with host Chris Matthews, Pratt said teachers at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newton, Mass., where a mass murder took place in late 2012, should have been armed. On "Fox News Sunday" with Chris Wallace, Pratt argued for rolling back existing gun laws because they are too restrictive. Pratt saves his most inflammatory rhetoric for interviews with right-wing media figures such as Alex Jones, Stan Solomon, and NewsMax's Steve Malzberg. Discussing the Trayvon Martin "Stand Your Ground" shooting with Malzberg, Pratt said the unarmed 17-year-old African American youth was killed because he had a "broken family."

## Race K

### 1AR—Race K

#### No link—

#### AC Giroux evidence says that by combining gun control with a broader strategy against neoliberalism, we avoid problematic reformist policies like Stop and Frisk which your K is critiquing.

#### The NC links describe status quo gun policies that focus on dividing “good” and “bad” owners—a full ban reverses discriminatory enforcement—that’s Bovy.

#### I address gun violence on the supply side—I attack the neoliberal industry, not the owners.

#### <<AT: self-defense>>

#### Your self-defense links don’t apply—no reason they couldn’t use tasers or literally any alternative.

#### Aff solves— it is our addiction to violence that is the root cause of the growth of prison-industrial complex and a racist criminal justice system—Giroux.

#### Perm: Do both.

#### Multimodalism— Connoly evidence slays the alternative- we have to work both in and outside of the state. *Even if* all of her arguments are true, we can’t engage with the alt unless we get the state to take its foot of off oppressed people’s neck.

#### Yes, police violence is bad, but only the perm solves. Loose guns justifies further policing. Don’t kid yourself, we *will lose* the arms race.

Culp 14 (Andrew Culp, Visiting Assistant Professor of Rhetoric Studies at Whitman College, Darwin Bond-Graham, sociologist and investigative journalist, “Left Gun Nuts”, 2014)//Miro

Yes, the police should be disarmed. Police violence is intolerable and oppressive, particularly for communities of color. But here, quite a few Leftists extend their critique against police brutality to claim that “the people” can defend themselves against the police with guns. The Black Panthers’ armed patrols shadowing police in the 1960s is the most common example trotted out to demonstrate how armed communities defended themselves against unaccountable cops. Groups like the Deacons for Defense, or revolutionaries like Malcolm X and Robert Williams are also also mentioned as proof that guns help the democratic Left fight the power, and that without guns we will be increasingly victimized by the police. But guns hardly keep away the police or help communities fight back against the cops. In fact, the proliferation of guns in America has provided an excuse for police to further intrude in our lives. The police use the ubiquity of guns in America to justify their brutality, seen especially clearly in the extrajudicial killings they commit. It is difficult to see how arming communities translates into a reduced police presence. Furthermore, carrying a weapon certainly would not have assisted victims of recent lethal police violence, and would have instead have worked in the favor of officers under official review. American police militarizing themselves with tanks, drones, SWAT teams, and mass surveillance systems say that they have to do so because the American public has access to super deadly types of guns and ammunition. Aggressive new police policies treat nearly everyone as a gun owner (armed or not), leading to the pervasive use of SWAT raids, ‘shoot first and ask questions later’ no-knock warrant searches, invasive automobile searches, stop and frisk, excessive use of force, and the implementation of ever-more powerful surveillance systems. In sum, an armed citizenry only encourages the police to arm themselves more heavily. It is true that radicals, especially African American revolutionaries, have used guns to symbolically protest power in America and call out the hypocrisy of white supremacy and lax gun laws that selectively apply to dominant social groups. Yet the power of armed protest is only enhanced by laws that restrict ownership of assault rifles, special ammunition, and even handguns, and should not be confused for revolutionary violence, of which there are scant encouraging examples of in recent United States history. Finally, it is necessary to note that America’s most oppressed communities are already flooded with guns, especially pistols and assault weapons designed for close quarter combat. The ready availability of these weapons has in no way empowered these communities to fight back against the cops, at least not in any obvious way. The prevalence of firearms has instead magnified America’s radicalized inequality, poverty, and structural violence to produce an epidemic level of shootings among youth of color in places like Chicago, Oakland, Detroit, and Newark. Guns hurt working-class communities of color. The gun industry, weakly regulated as it is, has long prospered off the illegal market for firearms in inner cities.

#### The K is a leftist fantasy—taking guns away would do more for the revolution and their thesis is disproven by empirics. This card *ends the debate.*

\*Vast majority of gun owners are white reactionary men—squo disproves the thesis of the K

\*Gun culture would inevitably co-opt any revolution—even if they start with good intentions masculinity, racism and provincialism

\*Warlords would be empowered by guns, turning the rev

\*We would lose the arms race with the US govt.

\*The K is just “radical posturing”, it allows the continued exploitation and death of thousands every year.

Culp 14 (Andrew Culp, Visiting Assistant Professor of Rhetoric Studies at Whitman College, Darwin Bond-Graham, sociologist and investigative journalist, “Left Gun Nuts”, 2014)//Miro

But there is another quarter from which we are already hearing rote objections to gun control: the Left. All sorts of Lefties—anarchists, socialists, Black and Latino nationalists, and even quite a few Democratic Party-voting liberals—cling to guns just as tightly as the far Right. They use surprisingly similar language to justify their objections to gun control proposals. They either sit on the sidelines after each new massacre and wring their hands about the daily slaughter, or worse still, they actively oppose gun control. Here are a few reasons why some on the Left oppose gun control and reasons why they are wrong. The people need to defend themselves against the government. The more radical variant of this argument is that “the people” need guns to wage an eventual revolution and liberate themselves from the shackles of the state and corporate America. Gun control need not dampen the spirit of those still hoping for a revolution, even if such a revolution is highly unlikely to happen in our lifetimes. What stands in the way of such leftist dreams are the vast majority of current gun owners. Over-represented among current gun owners are white reactionary men, the types who regularly expresses their desire to shoot on sight the “Muslim socialist” president of the United States, and who “muster” along the U.S.-Mexico border with their weaponry to defend the nation against “alien” immigrants. As it stands, toxic gun culture would coopt any new American revolution with a lethal cocktail of supercharged masculinity, racism, and provincialism fantasized about in post-apocalyptic scenes. If the United States ever comes to another civil war, the first thing to die under a barrage of lead will be our hope for a more just and democratic society; guns would empower warlords with petty political agendas, not egalitarian-minded freedom fighters. The most likely cultural shift away from reactionary gun ownership will not happen in cooperation with the Right and their politics, but against it. Gun control is the best place to start. Disarming the Right will do more to advance goals toward a revolutionary democratic transformation of America than trying to beat the Right-wingers (and the U.S. government!) in an arms race. Of course Left insurrectionists who advocate the right to bear arms are more focused on the U.S. Government as the singular impediment to their variant of utopia. 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. In the real world, guns kill upwards of 30,000 Americans every year, virtually all of these deaths serving absolutely no political purpose in the fight for a more democratic society. Most of these deaths are just tragic accidents or suicides, many of which would not end in death if guns were not in the mix. Left fantasies about armed struggle are the same half-baked ideas as those held by the secessionist Right. What varies for Leftists is the template of decolonial struggles; yet a leftist revolution in the United States would not kick out a small minority of foreign occupiers, as happened in India and Vietnam, but would be a fight amongst settler colonialists for political authority. This is why the worn “Zapatistas defense” touted by the radical left is a bad analogy for the United States context – the Zapatistas started a peasant rebellion that kicked outsiders off their landbase, a task for which wooden cutouts of guns turned out to be more effective than the real thing.

### 1AR—at: arkles

#### Arkles concedes alternative to gun ban is conservative fill-in and more disproportionate policing:

Arkles 13:

In the last several years, a conservative majority of the Supreme Court has struck down some criminal gun control laws as violating the Second Amendment, first in Heller114 and then in McDonald. 115 While I believe that these laws are bad for trans people of color and queer women of color, these decisions are not triumphs for racial, gender, or sexual justice. While I suspect both laws were disproportionately enforced against people of color, trans people, immigrants, and other marginalized groups, the text of the laws do not facially require such discrimination to the extent that other laws focused on history of criminal convictions, immigration status, and treatment for mental illness do. The laws were broad enough to affect white, cisgender, straight, US citizen able-bodied men—the core group Scalia identified as deserving access to these weapons.116 In fact, in Heller the Court cautioned: “nothing in our opinion should be taken to cast doubt on longstanding prohibitions on the possession of firearms by felons and the mentally ill.” 117 Also, Heller and McDonald do nothing to address the deeper problems around violence, the politics of self-defense, and differential valuing of lives based on race, class, gender, sexuality, and disability. They certainly do nothing to grapple with the extent of state and institutional violence against marginalized communities.

## Afropess K

### 1AR—Afropess K

#### <<Maybe read some of the Race K stuff from above>>

#### S/he misidentifies the enemy— nowhere in the AC do I uphold civil society—in fact my strategy against neoliberal violence is part of a broader struggle to challenge racial matrixs of power—that’s Giroux. Threshold for a link should be that I reaffirm civil society.

#### <<Explain no link>>

#### Aff solves— it is our addiction to violence that is the root cause of the growth of prison-industrial complex and a racist criminal justice system—Giroux.

#### Perm: Do both—

#### Connoly evidence slays the alternative- we have to work both in and outside of the state. *Even if* all of her arguments are true, we can’t engage with the alt unless we get the state to take its foot of off oppressed people’s neck.

#### Guns only buttress state power and antiblackness—the negatives refusal to engage cedes politics and ensures furthered oppression of racial minorities—that’s Culp.

#### <<Maybe drop Culp here>>

#### <<Thesis level card dump>>

#### I’ll turn the ontological thesis of the K—ontologically opposing blackness to whiteness makes black structurally dependent on wounded attachments to suffering.

Pinn 4 /Anthony, Anthony B. Pinn is an American professor and writer whose work focuses on liberation theology, Black religion, and Black humanism. Pinn is the Agnes Cullen Arnold Professor of Humanities and Professor of Religious Studies at Rice University, “‘‘Black Is, Black Ain’t’’: Victor Anderson, African American Theological Thought, and Identity,” Dialog: A Journal of Theology, Volume 43, Number 1 . Spring 2004/ (We don’t endorse the usage of the term African-American)

This connection between ontological blackness and¶ religion is natural because: ‘‘ontological blackness signifies¶ the totality of black existence, a binding together¶ of black life and experience. In its root, religio, religion¶ denotes tying together, fastening behind, and binding together. Ontological blackness renders black life and experience a totality.’’13 According to Anderson, Black¶ theological discussions are entangled in ontological¶ blackness. And accordingly, discussions of black life¶ revolve around a theological understanding of Black¶ experience limited to suffering and survival in a racist¶ system. The goal of this theology is to find the ‘‘meaning¶ of black faith’’ in the merger of black cultural¶ consciousness, icons of genius, and post-World War¶ II Black defiance. An admirable goal to be sure, but¶ here is the rub: Black theologians speak, according to¶ Anderson, in opposition to ontological whiteness¶ when they are actually dependent upon whiteness for¶ the legitimacy of their agenda. Furthermore, ontological blackness’s strong ties to suffering and survival result in blackness being dependent on suffering,¶ and as a result social transformation brings into¶ question what it means to be black and religious.¶ Liberative outcomes ultimately force an identity¶ crisis, a crisis of legitimation and utility. In¶ Anderson’s words:¶ Talk about liberation becomes hard to justify where freedom appears as nothing more than defiant self-assertion of a revolutionary racial consciousness that requires for its legitimacy the opposition of white racism. Where there exists no possibility of transcending the blackness¶ that whiteness created, African American¶ theologies of liberation must be seen not only¶ as crisis theologies; they remain theologies in a crisis of legitimation.14¶ This conversation becomes more ‘‘refined’’ as new¶ cultural resources are unpacked and various religious¶ alternatives acknowledged. Yet the bottom line¶ remains racialization of issues and agendas, life and¶ love. Falsehood is perpetuated through the ‘‘hermeneutic of return,’’ by which ontological blackness is the paradigm of Black existence and thereby sets the agenda of Black liberation within the ‘‘post revolutionary context’’ of present day USA. One ever finds the traces of the Black aesthetic which pushes for a dwarfed understanding of Black life and a sacrifice of individuality for the sake of a unified Black ‘faith’.¶ Yet differing experiences of racial oppression (the¶ stuff of ontological blackness) combined with varying experiences of class, gender and sexual oppression call into question the value of their racialized formulations. Implicit in all of this is a crisis of faith,¶ an unwillingness to address both the glory and guts of Black existence—nihilistic tendencies that, unless held in tension with claims of transcendence, have the potential to overwhelm and to suffocate.

#### Cooption DA— whiteness likes the idea that black people are socially dead because it means they don’t have to feel guilty about disposing of them or shooting them down.

Walker 12 /Tracey, Masters in Psychosocial Studies at Birkbeck University, “The Future of Slavery: From Cultural Trauma to Ethical Remembrance”, Graduate Journal of Social Science July 2012, Vol. 9, Issue 2/

To argue that there is more to the ¶ popular conception of slaves as victims who experienced social death ¶ within the abusive regime of transatlantic slavery is not to say that these ¶ subjectivities did not exist. When ¶ considering the institution of slavery ¶ we can quite confidently rely on the ¶ assumption that it did indeed destroy the self-hood and the lives of ¶ millions of Africans. Scholar Vincent ¶ Brown (2009) however, has criticised ¶ Orlando Patterson’s (1982) seminal ¶ book Slavery and Social Death for positioning the slave as a subject without agency and maintains that those who managed to dislocate from the nightmare of plantation life ‘were not in fact the living dead’, but ‘the mothers of gasping new societies’ (Brown 2009, 1241). ¶ The Jamaican Maroons were one such disparate group of Africans who managed to band together and flee the Jamaican plantations in order to create a new mode of living under their own rule. These ‘runaways’ were in fact ‘ferocious fighters and master strategists’, building towns and military bases which enabled them to fight and successfully win the war against the British army ¶ after 200 years of battle (Gotlieb ¶ 2000,16). In addition, the story of ¶ the Windward Jamaican Maroons ¶ disrupts the phallocentricism inherent within the story of the slave ¶ ‘hero’ by the very revelation that ¶ their leader, ‘Queen Nanny’ was a ¶ woman (Gotlieb 2000). As a leader, she was often ignored by early ¶ white historians who dismissed her ¶ as an ‘old hagg’ or ‘obeah’ woman ¶ (possessor of evil magic powers) ¶ (Gotlieb 2000, xvi). Yet, despite ¶ these negative descriptors, Nanny ¶ presents an interesting image of an ¶ African woman in the time of slavery ¶ who cultivated an exceptional army ¶ and used psychological as well as ¶ military force against the English ¶ despite not owning sophisticated ¶ weapons (Gotlieb 2000). As an oral ¶ tale, her story speaks to post-slavery ¶ generations through its representation of a figure whose gender defying acts challenged the patriarchal ¶ fantasies of the Eurocentric imaginary and as such ‘the study of her ¶ experiences might change the lives ¶ of people living under paternalistic, ¶ racist, classist and gender based ¶ oppression’ (Gotlieb 2000, 84).¶ The label of ‘social death’ is rejected here on the grounds that it is a narrative which is positioned from the vantage point of a European hegemonic ideology. Against the social symbolic and its gaze, black slaves were indeed regarded as non-humans since their lives were stunted, diminished and deemed less valuable in comparison to the ¶ Europeans. However, Fanon’s ¶ (1967) assertion that ‘not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man’ ¶ (Fanon 1967, 110) helps us to understand that this classification can only have meaning relative to the symbolic which represents the alive ness of whiteness against the backdrop of the dead black slave (Dyer ¶ 1997). Butler (2005) makes it clear ¶ that the ‘death’ one suffers relative to the social symbolic is imbued with the fantasy that having constructed the Other and interpellated her into ‘life’, one now holds the sovereignty of determining the subject’s right to live or die: this death, if it is a death, is only the death of a certain kind of subject, one that was never possible to begin with, the death of the fantasy of impossible mastery, and so a loss of what one never had, in other words it is a necessary grief (Butler 2005, 65).¶ The point to make here is that although the concept of social death has proved useful for theorists to describe the metaphysical experience of those who live antagonistically in relation to the social symbolic, it is nevertheless a colonial narrative within which the slaves are confined to a one dimensional story of terror. In keeping with Gilroy’s (1993b) ¶ argument that the memory of slavery must be constructed from the slaves’ point of view, we might instead concentrate, not on the way in which the slaves are figured within the European social imaginary, but on how they negotiated their own ideas about self and identity. We might therefore find some value in studying a group like the Maroons who not only managed to create an autonomous world outside of the hegemonic discourse which negated them, but also, due to their unique circumstances, were forced to create new modes of communication which would include a myriad of African cultures, languages and creeds (Gottlieb 2000). This creative and resistive energy of slave subjectivity not only disrupts the colonial paradigm of socially dead slaves, but also implies the ethical tropes of creation, renewal and mutual recognition. ¶ In contrast, the passive slave ¶ proved to feature heavily in the ¶ 2007 bicentenary commemorations ¶ causing journalist Toyin Agbetu to ¶ interrupt the official speeches and ¶ exclaim that it had turned into a discourse of freedom engineered mostly by whites with stories of black agency excluded 8¶ . Young’s argument that ‘one of the damaging side effects of the focus on white people’s role in abolition is that Africans are represented as being passive in the face of oppression’, appears to ¶ echo the behaviour in the UK today ¶ given that a recent research poll reveals that the black vote turnout is ¶ significantly lower than for the white ¶ majority electorate and that forty ¶ percent of second generation ‘immigrants’ believe that voting ‘doesn’t ¶ matter’.¶ 9¶ Yet, Gilroy (1993a) argues ¶ that this political passivity may not ¶ simply be a self fulfilling prophecy, ¶ but might allude to the ‘lived contradiction’ of being black and English ¶ which affects one’s confidence about ¶ whether opinions will be validated in a society that, at its core, still holds ¶ on to the fantasy of European superiority (Gilroy 1993a). Without considering the slaves’ capacity for survival and their fundamental role in overthrowing the European regime of slavery, we limit the use–value of the memory and risk becoming overly attached to singular slave subjectivities seeped in death and passivity. The Maroons story however, enables slave consciousness to rise above the mire of slavery’s abject victims and establishes an ethical relation with our ancestors who lived and survived in the time of slavery.

#### The K is a leftist fantasy—taking guns away would do more for the revolution and their thesis is disproven by empirics. This card *ends the debate.*

\*Vast majority of gun owners are white reactionary men—squo disproves the thesis of the K

\*Gun culture would inevitably co-opt any revolution—even if they start with good intentions masculinity, racism and provincialism

\*Warlords would be empowered by guns, turning the rev

\*We would lose the arms race with the US govt.

\*The K is just “radical posturing”, it allows the continued exploitation and death of thousands every year.

Culp 14 (Andrew Culp, Visiting Assistant Professor of Rhetoric Studies at Whitman College, Darwin Bond-Graham, sociologist and investigative journalist, “Left Gun Nuts”, 2014)//Miro

But there is another quarter from which we are already hearing rote objections to gun control: the Left. All sorts of Lefties—anarchists, socialists, Black and Latino nationalists, and even quite a few Democratic Party-voting liberals—cling to guns just as tightly as the far Right. They use surprisingly similar language to justify their objections to gun control proposals. They either sit on the sidelines after each new massacre and wring their hands about the daily slaughter, or worse still, they actively oppose gun control. Here are a few reasons why some on the Left oppose gun control and reasons why they are wrong. The people need to defend themselves against the government. The more radical variant of this argument is that “the people” need guns to wage an eventual revolution and liberate themselves from the shackles of the state and corporate America. Gun control need not dampen the spirit of those still hoping for a revolution, even if such a revolution is highly unlikely to happen in our lifetimes. What stands in the way of such leftist dreams are the vast majority of current gun owners. Over-represented among current gun owners are white reactionary men, the types who regularly expresses their desire to shoot on sight the “Muslim socialist” president of the United States, and who “muster” along the U.S.-Mexico border with their weaponry to defend the nation against “alien” immigrants. As it stands, toxic gun culture would coopt any new American revolution with a lethal cocktail of supercharged masculinity, racism, and provincialism fantasized about in post-apocalyptic scenes. If the United States ever comes to another civil war, the first thing to die under a barrage of lead will be our hope for a more just and democratic society; guns would empower warlords with petty political agendas, not egalitarian-minded freedom fighters. The most likely cultural shift away from reactionary gun ownership will not happen in cooperation with the Right and their politics, but against it. Gun control is the best place to start. Disarming the Right will do more to advance goals toward a revolutionary democratic transformation of America than trying to beat the Right-wingers (and the U.S. government!) in an arms race. Of course Left insurrectionists who advocate the right to bear arms are more focused on the U.S. Government as the singular impediment to their variant of utopia. 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. In the real world, guns kill upwards of 30,000 Americans every year, virtually all of these deaths serving absolutely no political purpose in the fight for a more democratic society. Most of these deaths are just tragic accidents or suicides, many of which would not end in death if guns were not in the mix. Left fantasies about armed struggle are the same half-baked ideas as those held by the secessionist Right. What varies for Leftists is the template of decolonial struggles; yet a leftist revolution in the United States would not kick out a small minority of foreign occupiers, as happened in India and Vietnam, but would be a fight amongst settler colonialists for political authority. This is why the worn “Zapatistas defense” touted by the radical left is a bad analogy for the United States context – the Zapatistas started a peasant rebellion that kicked outsiders off their landbase, a task for which wooden cutouts of guns turned out to be more effective than the real thing.

#### The radical chaos of the world demands theory which is honest about its own conceptual fragility—this means being willing to shed theoretical purity and intervening in specific struggles for political improvement

Connolly ’12 William E. Connolly, Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, “Steps toward an Ecology of Late Capitalism,” Theory & Event, Vol. 15, Issue 1, 2012, Muse

Today we inhabit a world in which the fragility of things—from the perspective of the endurance and quality of life available to the human estate in its entanglements with other force-fields—becomes apparent while the categories and sensibilities through which we habitually come to grips with the world make it difficult to fold that sense deeply into theory and practice. Sixty-five million years ago, body surfing on a few favorable force-fields, two smart dinosaurs, interpreting the world through an efficient concept of cause and a simple metric of probability within a fixed set of possibilities, examined past trends and tendencies to gauge the probable future of their species. Their favorable assessment missed the huge asteroid hurtling toward them, set on its own tier of time. Nor did they realize that a massive volcano was about to erupt in India. Dinosaurs were smarter and more adaptable (more brightly colored, too) than they were said to be when I studied them as a young boy, but still not perhaps sensitive enough to the cosmos in which they were set. Is neoliberal political economy a dinosaur science?15 Neoliberal ideology is organized around the simplicity of a two slot system: self-organizing markets with beautiful powers of rational self-adjustment and states as clumsy agents of collective decision. It thus inflates the self-organizing power of markets by implicitly deflating the self-organizing powers and capacities of metamorphosis of all other systems. And it treats the state as necessarily clumsy and inept by comparison to its singular, utopian image of markets. It protects this ideological combination in part by downplaying the self-organizing powers of multiple other systems highly relevant to the performance of economic markets and states. Other familiar theories of political economy also deflate the importance of nonhuman force fields. True, Marx flirted with an aleatory image of nature in Epicurus before scrapping it.16 And some post-Marxists now reach in that direction. But, still, the fragility of the late modern order seems insufficiently articulated in radical theory today. Is that because radical theorists fear that coming to terms with fragility would undercut the political militance needed to respond to it? Perhaps. The issue, at least, is real, since a focus on the fragility of things is often associated with a drive to conserve what we already have. My sense, however, is that the contemporary condition requires both appreciation of the real fragility of things and political action on multiple fronts to act with resolution to change our patterns of identity, investment, consumption, income distribution, energy use, health care and the like. This, to me, is the living paradox of our time to engage and negotiate rather than a contradiction that vitiates one reading of the contemporary condition.

### 2AR – Walker

#### Extend the Walker evidence:

1. Historically, Wilderson is wrong. Slaves could have agency--those who were able to break away were not “dead” but the “mothers of new societies” such as Jamaican Maroons who broke away from Jamaican plantations to create their own rule and society. His theory is wrong because the social death is only the death of something that was never possible to begin with—the death of mastery over your ability to live or die.

2. Wilderson’s narrative is colonial: It stems from the European view of black slaves as non human and dead. Wilderson essentializes all black experience to a one dimensional story of terror. Wilderson’s passivity, his refusal engage, historically turned into a discourse of freedom engineered by whites while excluding black agency—the narrative of white abolitionists ending slavery, for example.

3. Instead, of viewing all blacks as social dead, we can focus on how there is possibility, some have escaped this negative social construction. This creative energy disrupts the colonial paradigm. Counter-storytelling is the best way to do this because it allows marginalized people to tell stories about their experiences, the good and the bad, that have been traditionally washed over by the colonialist narrative.

### 2AR—Pinn

#### Extend the Pinn evidence:

1. Ontological blackness relies on the idea of suffering implicit in the black existence. This means that concepts of black identity and liberation is always dependent on the idea of White racism—they only exist in opposition to white racism and they are able to imagine liberation by working against whiteness---there is no overall goal or identity outside of it.

2. The black aesthetic embedded in this movement essentializes all black experience and urges individuals to make sacrifices for the overall movement while ignoring different experiences of race, class, gender, and sexual oppression.

3. These nihilistic tendencies—beliefs that we can never engage, that they will always be dead, overwhelm and suffocate movements.

4. A better methodology is to put blackness along other indicators of identity, this means that individual blacks can work towards their own version of progress while stil being part of their communities. So, in the aff, we can recognize indicators of class, race, and gender in the oppression of federally assisted housing and allow individuals to make their own choices by merely lifting restrictions.

# Aff—DA

## Gen DA

### 1AR—gen da

#### No link— <<explain why you don’t link/Giroux evidence says blah>>

#### Aff solves back— your aff assumes status quo gun bans—not gun bans as part of a broader strategy to retake our society from the stranglehold of corporate interests.

#### <<Read neolib turns>>

#### <<Read security links>>

#### <<Go for ROTB over Fear DA>>

#### Fear DA—they are exactly the sort of “security enframing” that our Giroux evidence criticizes, claiming ridiculous impacts with extremely low probabilities like <<insert impacts>> in order to defend the status quo disenfranchisement of entire communities—replicates oppression.

#### You should value these structural impacts over the disads 1% chance of actually happening—especially when I have my role of the judge claim—two more reasons:

#### 1AC Giroux evidence says that you must prioritize slow violence—we are cognitively biased against structural problems

#### Spanos evidence turns your calculating decisionmaking—makes us become experts at disenfranchising the oppressed.

## Econ DA

### 1AR—Econ DA

#### The gun industry is worth $42.9 billion

NSSF 14 [National Shooting Sports Foundation economic impact report for 2014 http://nssf.org/impact/] RDK

Not only does the manufacture and sale of firearms and hunting supplies create good jobs in the United States but the industry also contributes to the economy as a whole. In fact, in 2014 the firearms and ammunition industry was responsible for as much as $42.9 billion in total economic activity in the country.

#### US GDP is $16.77 trillion that means guns are worth 0.2%

#### Gun violence causes $229 billion in damage in direct and indirect damage

Follman 15 [Mark Follman, national affairs editor at Mother Jones, “What does gun violence really cost?” May/June 2015 issue, <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2015/04/true-cost-of-gun-violence-in-america>] RDK

In collaboration with Miller, Mother Jones crunched data from 2012 and found that the annual cost of gun violence in America exceeds $229 billion. Direct costs account for $8.6 billion—including long-term prison costs for people who commit assault and homicide using guns, which at $5.2 billion a year is the largest direct expense. Even before accounting for the more intangible costs of the violence, in other words, the average cost to taxpayers for a single gun homicide in America is nearly $400,000. And we pay for 32 of them every single day.

#### 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."

#### Fear DA—they are exactly the sort of “security enframing” that our Giroux evidence criticizes, claiming ridiculous impacts with extremely low probabilities like <<insert impacts>> in order to defend the status quo disenfranchisement of entire communities—replicates oppression.

#### You should value these structural impacts over the disads 1% chance of actually happening—especially when I have my role of the judge claim—two more reasons:

#### 1AC Giroux evidence says that you must prioritize slow violence—we are cognitively biased against structural problems

#### Spanos evidence turns your calculating decisionmaking—makes us become experts at disenfranchising the oppressed.

## Ptx

### 1AR—CJS DA

#### <<Drop fear politics stuff>>

#### No link—

#### Recent XOs on gun control should have triggered the link- doublebind

#### Voting Aff isn’t an immediate passage, but rather an affirmation of my in-round methodology to combat gun violence and neoliberalism—means politics is incoherent.

#### Non-unique—Won’t pass this year, coalition is breaking up, and elections kill it.

Isquith 1/28 [Elias Isquith, daily columnist at Salon, focuses on politics and inequality, “Criminal justice reform will have to wait: How Ted Cruz and Mitch McConnell sunk a bipartisan dream” January 28, 2016 <http://www.salon.com/2016/01/28/criminal_justice_reform_will_have_to_wait_how_ted_cruz_and_mitch_mcconnell_sunk_a_bipartisan_dream/>] RDK

The chances were slim already, but with his recent statement to the Associated Press, Texas Sen. John Cornyn [removed](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/cornyn-peacemaker-gop-rift-criminal-justice-widens-36524536) any lingering doubt: Congress will not be passing a major criminal justice reform bill while Barack Obama is president. “I am hopeful, but I don’t think it’s critical we do it this year,” Cornyn, a Republican, said of the bipartisan reform that’s been working its way through Congress for more than a year, but which has recently [lost momentum](http://www.salon.com/2016/01/12/reforms_perilous_moment_why_an_elite_driven_strategy_may_sink_obamas_push_to_fix_the_justice_system/). “”I have been involved in a lot of fights around here that have taken us years to get things done,” Cornyn continued. “And ultimately the question is, can you get it done at some point?” For anyone who hoped to see real legislative reforms come out of D.C. before the next president takes the oath of office, this is a disappointment — one far too bitter to be made palatable by the president’s most recent executive action, his [banning](https://www.themarshallproject.org/2016/01/27/there-are-practically-no-juveniles-in-federal-prison-here-s-why?ref=hp-4-122#.4KPmKTjen) the use of solitary confinement on juveniles in federal prisons. It is not, however, especially surprising. As difficult and volatile as the politics of criminal justice reform is in any circumstance, it’s exponentially more vulnerable in the toxic atmosphere that always accompanies a presidential election. So when Congress failed to pass reform in 2014, and then did so again the year after, it was easy to predict that the window had closed on criminal justice reform — at least for the time being. You don’t need to take my word for it. You can simply look at how the 2016 campaign has affected reform’s chances already. For much of the Obama presidency, changing the country’s criminal justice system wasn’t front-page material for American politics. It was a major interest on the grassroots level and on the elite level, to be sure. For the most part, though, it wasn’t a political football. It enjoyed a kind of benign neglect. But now that there’s a presidential campaign in full-swing, incentives have changed. Which is why Sen. Ted Cruz, Cornyn’s ostensible ally, has increasingly tried to merge an attack on reform into his campaign’s larger anti-establishment narrative. And because [the general public’s support](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/politics/2015/01/public_apathy_has_helped_criminal_justice_reform_republicans_and_democrats.html) for reform was always weaker than that of activists or elites, Cruz is to some degree pushing on an open door. The specter of Willie Horton still haunts American politics. [The New York Times](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/26/us/politics/before-rise-as-outsider-ted-cruz-played-inside-role-in-2000-recount.html) and [Mother Jones](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/01/ted-cruz-jerk-hated) have recently confirmed, beyond all doubt, that disliking Cruz comes so easily to most people, you might suspect it’s some heretofore unrecognized evolutionary advantage. But as tempting as it is to lay the dysfunction entirely at his feet, it wouldn’t be accurate. Because Cruz isn’t the reason why Congress — the Senate, to be specific — is putting reform on the back-burner. That distinction belongs to Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell. As a [good recent piece](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/01/kelly-ayotte-mitch-mcconnell/426561/) from the Atlantic’s Michelle Cottle makes clear, McConnell’s reluctance to bring reform up for a vote doesn’t stem from conviction, but raw politics. (Indeed, [it’s unclear](http://www.apple.com/) that McConnell has any convictions.) Reform may be a winner among the young and well-educated; but it’s not a topic swing-state politicians — like New Hampshire’s Kelly Ayotte, for example — want to talk about during an election. That Senate majority isn’t going to maintain itself! And this, ultimately, is why not passing reform before 2016 — before 2015, even — was such an enormous missed opportunity. Because if reform is going to pass in 2017, it will not only require a sympathetic president (much more likely to be a Democrat than Republican), but will also need its bipartisan coalition to survive the ravages of a year-plus-long presidential campaign; and for record-low rates of violent crime to continue.

#### Not intrinsic. A logical policymaker can do the plan and solve the DA.

#### Fights build PC

Green 10 – professor of political science at Hofstra University (David Michael Green, 6/11/10, " The Do-Nothing 44th President ", http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html)

Moreover, **there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. This is** absolutely **a matter of perception**, **and you can see it best in the way that Congress** **and** especially the Washington **press** corps **fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and** George W. **Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so**, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what **they did**.

#### <<opt>>

#### **No spillover.**

Edwards 2k [Distinguished Professor of Political Science, director of the Center for Presidential Studies, Texas A&M University (George C. III, March. “Building Coalitions.” Presidential Studies Quarterly, Vol. 30, Iss. 1.)]

Besides not considering the full range of available views, members of Congress are not generally in a position to make trade-offs between policies. Because of its decentralization, Congress usually considers policies serially, that is, without reference to other policies. Without an integrating mechanism, members have few means by which to set and enforce priorities and to emphasize the policies with which the president is most concerned. This latter point is especially true when the opposition party controls Congress

### 1AR—ptx da

#### Winners win, pc’s not real, and the neg’s approach to politics causes violence

Ruby-Sachs 8 (Emma Ruby-Sachs, lawyer, president of Avaaz, a global advocacy organization, 11-24-08, “Ranking the Issues: Gay Rights in an Economic Crisis,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/emma-rubysachs/ranking-the-issues-gay-ri_b_146023.html>)

On Friday, the Washington Times reported that Barack Obama will be waiting until 2010 to push for the end of Don't Ask Don't Tell. Obama staffers say the delay is necessary to allow for consensus building. The move raises a number of questions and concerns. At first brush it seems like smart politics: avoid a Clintonesque botch and give yourself some time to get support before taking on the gay issues. In fact, as a person as well as a lesbian, I find myself worrying more about health care and the economy than the ability of LGBT people to serve openly in the military. But just how should we be ranking identity politics in this grab bag moment of crisis and transition? The classic approach to politics is to rank priorities and measure the finite bowl of political capital. If Obama pushes hard on a green new deal, he likely won't have much left for universal health care. If he backs off of serious economic regulation, then he might get more support for social programs from Republicans. Because gay civil rights struggles affect fewer individuals and relate to less quantifiable harms, it's hard to justify putting them at the top of the list. The alternative is to reject the ranked priorities political model altogether. There is little evidence that sway and support is finite in the American political system. Political capital relates to the actions of the leader, yes, but can be infinitely large or non-existent at any point in time. In some ways, the more you get done, the more the bowl of capital swells. Ranking America's problems to conserve political influence is a narrow minded approach to solving this crisis. Putting banks at the top of the list avoids the plight of large employers (like car companies - as much as we love to hate their executives). Sending health care and other social programs to second or third place, leaves those immediately affected by the crisis with nothing to fall back on. Finally, ignoring the disenfranchisement of a segment of the population breeds discontent, encourages protest, boycotts (a definite harm in this economy) and violence. It divides families (especially those who are still unable to sponsor their partner into the United States), imposes higher tax burdens on gay couples, denies benefits to gay spouses in many employment situations and polarizes social conservatives and social liberals in a time when consensus is essential. The first years of the Obama presidency cannot be about determining who and what matters and who and what doesn't. There should be no ranking of political promises and political objectives. As President of the United States, we expect Obama to be able to multitask. As LGBT people, we should not stop fighting for the end of DADT, but also the repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act and the implementation of hate crime legislation that recognizes LGBT victims. Identity politics do not need to fall to the back burner just because times are tough. Working towards full LGBT rights should, and hopefully will, remain a priority for all of us.

# Aff—NC

## Gen NC

### 1AR—Gen NC

#### Extend Giroux—their focus on meta-ethical questions obscures disposability and is exactly the sort of false objectivity that Giroux is critiquing. We know that our activity is problematic when it forces us to justify why oppression is bad—this is an independent reason to reject their ethical framework. Substantive impacts must preclude theoretical ones.

#### AC Spanos evidence *supercharges* this impact—focus on the rules of morality at the expense of oppressed populations trains debaters with exactly the sort of disinterested skills used by neocons who perpetuate the affs impacts. This is a question of what debate should look like which comes before her metaethical concerns.

#### Aff is a pre-req—

#### The way we formulate ethics is all shaped via neoliberal imagination, only rupturing that political imagination can allow us to really understand ethics—that’s Finley.

#### Power relations need to be analyzed as a prerequisite to ethics because that’s the only way to produce effective education—that’s Giroux.

#### Only by first challenging the concept of the “atomistic self” underlying their moral theory can we engage in anti-neoliberal ethics, otherwise the NC replicates the structures of oppression the aff criticizes.

## Libertarianism NC

### 1AR—Libertarianism NC

#### Extend Giroux—their focus on meta-ethical questions obscures disposability and is exactly the sort of false objectivity that Giroux is critiquing. We know that our activity is problematic when it forces us to justify why oppression is bad—this is an independent reason to reject their ethical framework. Substantive impacts must preclude theoretical ones.

#### AC Spanos evidence *supercharges* this impact—focus on the rules of morality at the expense of oppressed populations trains debaters with exactly the sort of disinterested skills used by neocons who perpetuate the affs impacts. This is a question of what debate should look like which comes before her metaethical concerns.

#### The AC was an impact turn to their atomistic ethical theory—allowing complete freedom of choice justifies neoliberal slavery of the working class—that’s Finley from the Aff.

#### Their claim that only fully autonomous people are moral agents is epistemically flawed, which means that the Aff is a pre-req to their ethical framework:

#### The way we formulate ethics is all shaped via neoliberal imagination, only rupturing that political imagination can allow us to really understand ethics—that’s Finley.

#### Power relations need to be analyzed as a prerequisite to ethics because that’s the only way to produce effective education—that’s Giroux.