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# Black Self Defense

## 1NC – Black Self Defense (Long)

### 1nc

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Black men are regarded outside the realm of human—their death doesn’t matter and their history ignored. The move to associate their actions with the white patriarch only serve to rationalize their criminality.

CURRY 14 President of Philosophy born of struggle and Prof of Philosophy @ Texas AandM 14 Tommy; “Michael Brown and the Need for a Genre Study of Black Male Death and Dying” http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory\_and\_event/v017/17.3S.curry.html

In “No Humans Involved,” Sylvia Wynter urges the reader to consider the relationship between the paradigms of dehumanization that resulted in the genocide of Armenians by Turkish pan-nationalists, the holocaust inflicted upon Jews by the Germans, and the language used to describe Black men as a species deserving death. Because Black men are thought to be “not human,” there is a tendency to embrace their sociological condition as their essential characteristics. Black males are thought to be the origins of their conditions rather than their conditions being the origin of their problems. The designation of Black males as problems in society, simultaneously enforced by our academic theories demanding the de-emphasis of their plight allows such ideologies to operate without challenge. Such conceptualizations, contends Wynter, “while not overtly genocidal, are clearly serving to achieve parallel results: the incarceration and elimination of young Black males by ostensibly normal and everyday means.”18 Similarly, Huey P. Newton has argued in “Fear and Doubt” that “society responds to [the lower socioeconomic Black man] as a thing, a beast, a nonentity, something to be ignored or stepped on. He is asked to respect laws that do not respect him.”19 Ultimately, it is the Black men and boys who remain isolated, condemned, and ignored by theory that “have been made to pay the ‘sacrificial costs’ for the relatively improved conditions since the 1960s that have impelled many black Americans out of the ghettos and into the suburbs.”20 Black males are the depositories of the negativity traditional associated with Blackness that makes transcendence, socially, politically and conceptually, possible for other Black bodies. There is an eerie connection between the deaths of Black males in society and the erasure of Black men from the realm of theory. In reality, Black males are genreed as non-human and animalistic in the minds of whites,21 but our theories relish assigning the death of Black males to the generic description of racism, a notion not thoroughly analyzed in identity scholarship and unable to inadequately capture the specific kind of oppression and violence that defines Black male existence. Michael Brown was a victim; a display of the power white life has over this kind of Black existence—a demonstration of the seemingly endless limit of white individuals’ power to enforce the anti-Black consensus of society towards these specific Black-male kinds. His death—Black Male Death—shows that racism is not simply racial antipathy, but the power whites assert over the world, thereby making Black life inconsequential in its rush to acquire ownership over reality; a dynamic creating the orders of knowledge as an extension of the order of society necessary to maintain anti-Blackness and preserve white supremacy. Because this racist societal architecture is de-emphasized, academic discourse(s) of race-class-gender—presupposing the infinite power of all male bodies—prefigures a conceptual calculus dedicated to eradicating the vulnerability of Black men because they are men. Black men are thought to be mimetic (white) patriarchs; an untenable theoretical position given the empirical evidence of Black male disadvantage, but one that serves to affirm society’s assuredness in holding that his death is the only way to remedy the dangers he poses to society. We can see the corpse of Michael Brown, but do we really understand the vulnerability of Black boys enough to theorize his life?

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

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

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

### rob

#### The role of the ballot is to question the 1AC’s scholarship prior to the consequences of the plan – faulty understanding of historical and material realities shape political strategies and foreclose liberation – this means they do not get to weigh the case – we question their starting point

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

Introduction Though considered by historians and Black Studies scholars to be among the forefathers of Black self-determination struggles, anti-colonialism, and Black Studies paradigms, Robert F. Williams as well as his philosophy of self-defense remain inexplicably absent—having never been engaged— in the discipline of philosophy.1 Despite the various works of scholars in history, law, and political theory over the last several decades attempting to disabuse multiple publics of the popular dogma holding segregation to be the bedrock of American racism in light of the ever-changing dynamic of white supremacy, academic philosophy remains dogmatically affixed to a racial origin story which continues declare that American racism was ameliorated by the integrationist policies generated as a response to the American civil rights movement.2

[2] It takes only a brief survey of the various works by Black scholars across disciplines to see the failure of this popular view. In law we have Derrick Bell’s idea that racial equality is fundamentally bankrupt, see Derrick Bell, And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Quest for Racial Justice (New York: Basic Books, 1987); Derrick Bell, Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism (New York: Basic Books, 1992). And desegregation worsened the education and economic viability of Black communities, see Derrick Bell, Silent Covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the Unfilled Hopes for Racial Reform (New York: Oxford, 2004). In fact, Derrick Bell’s “Racial Remediation: A Historical Perspective on Current Conditions” (Notre Dame Lawyer 52 [1976– 1977]: 5–29) repeats the thesis of his mentor Robert L. Carter’s “The Warren Court and Desegregation” (Michigan Law Review 67 [1968]: 237–48), which argues that post–civil rights law and commentary has continued to mistakenly emphasize the extent to which integration has not been achieved rather than the economic and cultural reach of white supremacy. This view is specifically referred to as a mistake. Gary Peller’s Critical Race Consciousness: Reconsidering American Ideologies of Racial Justice (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2012) makes a similar point showing that integrationism has dominated and in many ways flatted a robust and dynamic Black Nationalist paradigm. Similarly, contemporary sociological studies reinforce the unchanged state of white anti-Black racism. Leslie H. Picca and Joe Feagin’s Two-Faced Racism: Whites in the Backstage and Frontstage (New York: Routledge, 2007) and Joe Feagin’s Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations (New York: Routledge, 2014) both make the point that white racist attitudes and the social institutions have changed little since the 1960s. Even more surprising is the work of Phillip Attiba Goff et al. “Not Yet Human: Implicit Knowledge, Historical Dehumanization, and Contemporary Consequences” (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 94 [2008]: 292–306) in implicit bias, which argues that white Americans conceptualize Blacks, specifically Black males, as animals (gorillas) and more deserving of violence. The themes and research found within this small listing of research can, of course, be extended backwards for several decades, if not a century.

The integrationist narrative endorsed throughout academic philosophy has not only been shown to be false by historians and social scientists, but also [and] theoretically incomplete.3 Contrary to the popular mantra suggesting that the hearts and minds of white Americans were changed by the societal reorganization caused by desegregation and subsequently integration, where today we are only dealing with the (less racist) remnants of white ignorance which respond to moral and rational appeal, some Black political theorists have rejected the idea that white racism can be dealt with non-violently and have instead endorsed armed self-defense and militant responses against white terrorism (lynching, rape, castration, KKK/WKKK intimidation). In a very important sense, Robert F. Williams’s publication of Negroes with Guns (1962) is a testament to the continuation, not the birth, of the militant civil rights strategies introduced with T. Thomas Fortune’s agitationist philosophy and further developed by Ida B. Wells-Barnett in the late 1800s.4 The history of civil rights and American race relations proceeds from a romantic view of racial change which erroneously presupposes that appealing to a virtuous white character is the basis of all attempts to solve or respond to anti-Black racism. This presupposition demands nonviolence to be the only strategy made available to oppressed people that challenges racism while honoring the personhood and humanity of white Americans. This view has led many scholars and laypersons alike to idolize the nonviolent strategy of [MLK] Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. over and against his more radical contemporaries like Malcolm X or the Black Panther Party. This “Cliff’s Notes” version of history however grossly exaggerates and overlooks the interdependence nonviolence has historically shared with militant armed revolt(s) during the same period. Charles E. Cobb Jr., for instance, remarks in This Non-Violent Stuff will get you Killed: How Guns Made the Civil Rights Movement Possible that though controversial: “armed self-defense was a necessary aspect of the civil rights movement . . . wielding weapons, especially firearms, let both participants in nonviolent struggle and their sympathizers protect themselves and others under terrorist attack for their civil rights activities. This willingness to use deadly force ensured the survival not only of countless brave men and women but also the freedom of the struggle itself.”5 Akinyele O. Umoja’s We Will Shoot Back: Armed Resistance in the Mississippi Freedom Movement continues the recent focus on grassroots self-defense efforts by Black political organizations throughout the country as proof of the necessity armed resistance had to the isolated successes of nonviolence throughout the country. Umoja’s work shows that poor Black Southern people, specifically Black men, created progressive and revolutionary political organizations from the ground up and became advocates of programs and philosophies that stood in sharp contrast to more bourgeois and now canonical(-lized) thinking about civil rights organizations like the NAACP. Commenting on the rise of the Deacons for Defense, Lance Hill argues “Although the Deacons began as a simple self-defense guard to compensate for the lack of police protection, they soon developed into a highly visible political organization with a clear and compelling alternative to the pacifist strategies promoted by national civil rights organizations.”6 Far from being exceptions, these organizations were local and prolific. They were created by Black communities, organized specifically by Black men, to protect and enable the activism of Blacks (men, women and children) politically given the absence of the (white) state’s ability to recognize Black civil and constitutional rights.

## 1NC – Cards

### Alt solves

\*\* Careful – b/c it valorizes civil rights as indicative of change which answers part of the original K’s thesis.

#### Civil rights progression for blacks happened since black people were armed- gun control denies protection and a level of intimidation black people need to not be taken advantage of by whites.

Blade ’14: (John Blake Does race shape Americans' passion for guns? John Blake is a native of Baltimore, Maryland. He writes about race, religion, politics, and other assorted topics. CNN Enterprise writer/producer October 12, 2014//FT)

It's a mistake to think that our gun culture is lily-white, historians say. Contemporary blacks may be some of the strongest supporters of gun control, but the black community has a strong gun rights tradition, particularly in the South. Guns helped spawn the civil rights movement, says Cottrol, the history professor at George Washington University. White vigilantes who tried to attack black communities were met at times by gunfire. The Deacons for Self-Defense, an armed black group, protected civil rights activists, says Cottrol, author of "The Long, Lingering Shadow: Slavery, Race and Law in the American Hemisphere." Southern blacks in particular recognized the value of owning guns because they couldn't depend on anyone else to protect them during a time when the sheriff could be a member of the Klan, historians say. "The civil rights movement was made possible because the Klan knew that black communities were armed," Cottrol says. Even King, the apostle of nonviolence, once armed himself, says Adam Winkler, author of "Gunfight: The Battle Over the Right to Bear Arms in America." King applied for a concealed gun permit after his house in Alabama was bombed during his first civil rights campaign.

### Racism = Psychosis

#### Racism is a creative psychosis that guarantees black men will be regarded disposable— democracy is fundamentally structured on Black Death.

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

Throughout Robert F. Williams’s corpus, racism emerges as the lynchpin sustaining America’s societal order and enabling-justifying-permitting the savagery of white America towards Blacks. Racism is not one’s undesirable or mistaken set of beliefs; some constellation of erroneous ideas or stereotypes about the character of Black people, rather racism is a “mass psychosis”58 allowing whites to have no regard for the life of Blacks as humans or citizens. This distance from the reality of Black humanity (in the white mind) is the cultural foundation of white America’s barbarism towards Black citizens, and sustains the mythology from which American values like justice, fairness, and democracy are denied to Blacks who represent the non-human in the geopolitical binary determined by what is white-human-citizen and what is not. The destruction and repression of Blacks is the architecture of American society—the dehumanization of Black Americans allows white society to fulfill its obligation towards civilization. Insofar as whites perceive the nature of Blacks (their evilness, their danger, their uncivilized character) as threatening to destroy America and erode democracy (civilized governance), whites can rationalize the separation and suppression of Black life as necessary to the preservation and propagation of the ideals that sustain America as a white republic. The necessity of Black death to the sustaining of this order means that Black Americans experience social and political life as a struggle for physical survival against the bedrocks of America’s democratic structure (white citizens, police, and courts). This inevitably denies the Black American their humanity and ability to flourish. As Williams states: It is not the nature of things that grow, to flower and bloom in perfection when the twisted jungle of the battle of survival shuts out the sunlight and chokes off the very substance of life. This is a law of nature. A human being is a much more delicate thing of growth and the Afroamerican is no exception. The Afroamerican’s stance of growth in the social jungle of the USA has left some weird and distorted figures of the human species. The social conditions, created to dehumanize the Negro, have become a vicious circle rotating a double cuffing edge.59 This is the condition of the Black American: a thing defined by the caricatures of whites, an entity whose life is measured solely by the distance it achieves from the creature birthed by the white imagination rather than what it contributes to the memory and history of the actual world. Black being is condemned to live and die striving to be absolved of the Nigger—an ontology that stains the soul of Blacks from birth like that of first sin—rather than flourishing in a self-actualized life as a human being. This shows us that racism is a creative psychosis. It grows, reinvents, and persuades generation after generation of its veracity by establishing as fact that the sociological conditions of Black Americans arise from some natural essence in Blackness. This is how Black inferiority comes to mean that which is animalistic, criminal, and violent; a threat to whites and white society. It obligates that which is white to preserve itself, and the society to confine and repress that which is Black. In this sense, the white American is both origin and interpreter of the narratives invented to advance the anti-Black mythos which serves as the socio-cultural framework from which American ideals emerge. The white American, not as an individual but as a function of its political design, lives out democracy through creating and protecting the anti-Black rationalizations of the society. For example, while the history of the Ku Klux Klan (both men’s and women’s organizations) have become synonymous with violence and terrorism in American history, there was a deliberate attempt to justify such violence through white womanhood.60 Williams recognized this as central to the legitimacy given by whites to make terrorism against Blacks, specifically Black men, permissible. Williams notes: People have asked why a racist would take his wife into a riot-torn community like ours on that Sunday. But this is nothing new to those who know the nature of Klan raiding. Many Southern racists consider white women a form of insulation because of the old tradition that a Negro is supposed to be intimidated by a white woman and will not dare to offend her. White women are taken along on Klan raids so that if anything develops into a fight it will appear that the Negro attacked a woman and the Klansman will of course be her protector.61 This violence against the Black community, engineered upon the sacredness of white womanhood—the stratagems deployed to justify its execution— identifies a meaningful aspect of white savagery towards Black people. There is an appeal to the caricatures of the white public—the shared mythology learned by white individuals as children—as if the figments/ pigments of their imagination are real. When violence is committed against Black Americans, especially Black men as in the case of Michael Brown, Trayvon Martin, Tamir Rice, etc., the act of killing the Black beast reassures the white public of the reality of their phobias. As Williams argues: “The architect of the social jungle has been caught in the spiral of his own web. Thus, in his brutal handiwork to reduce the Black man to a miserable bundle of docile and submissive inferiority complexes, the white man has become a victim of his own brutality. He has transformed his nature to that of a raging, ferocious beast. His very conduct has given him a hate complex tempered with guilt.”62 This is the complexity obstructing moral appeal and sympathy towards Blacks. Blacks merely become disposable things—the conquering of the whites’ fear of these haunting shadows.

### AC = Internalized Pacifism

#### The 1ac is just internalized pacifism—non-violent activism is a ruse that justifies black death.

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

Appeals to the conscience of the white oppressor class were useless and politically ineffective given the history of white domination the world over, according to Williams. Echoing the sentiments of W. E. B. Du Bois’s “Whites in Africa after Negro Autonomy,” which was published the same year as Negroes with Guns, Williams did not pretend to love the white race. He believed, as Du Bois did, that “as a race they are the most selfish of any on earth.”63 This ethnocentric partiality was the reason Williams argued that “The white racist has built up a process of immunization to human compassion where the Negro is concerned.”64 The lack of compassion, the inability of whites to even contemplate or imagine the Black as human, is what makes the violence directed towards Blacks and their deaths appear unremarkable and necessary to America’s social order. This violence taught Black Americans to accept their condition—to rationalize the deaths, lynchings, and terrorism aimed at their people—as the practical path to equality. Non-violent activists and theorists accepted that the lives of the oppressed must be sacrificed so that whites can eventually grasp the brutality of American racism. Williams saw this proposition as unacceptable; he rejected that the deaths of the oppressed was the means by which white life could be civilized, and made morally aware. He was of the view that anti-Black violence and death made Blacks interiorize pacifism and fearful of direct political confrontation with the white state. As he says, “The greatest tragedy of all is the fact that this long process of violent conditioning of the Afroamerican has created a race where true Black masculinity is a rare commodity.”65 This situation was easily apparent to Williams: From the time the first Negroes were made slave captives in Africa, the white masters have left no stone unturned to dehumanize the Black race. Throughout the history of the Afroamerican in the racist USA, racist whites have perpetually striven to create an inferiority slave complex in this wretched soul. All of the social forces of the white man’s society, including Christianity have been directed toward the objective of creating an entire race of subhumans. The 400 years of brutal oppression of the Afroamerican in the New World have rendered him a broken, twisted mass of fears, and fathomless phobias. The noble sounding words of liberty, justice, democracy and Free World have been no more than vague fantasies of tantalizing mockery. He has been treated worse than a step child by a deranged and sadistical step mother. He has been like a frustrated child lullabied to sleep by songs of hate and tenor. He has been awakened in the morning by the terrifying sounds of thunder and violence. No, there has been no melodious robin singing outside his cabin window at sunrise. The bird that greets him is Jim Crow and its melody is misery and death.66 Robert F. Williams’s understanding of the imperial conquest which created slavery and the effects of racism on Blacks is clear. Racist domination is part of a program designed to break the oppressed; a regimen of dehumanizing violence and repression making the oppressed afraid to challenge the white oppressor class. This system is apparent, but where Williams differs from his Black bourgeois counterparts is that he insists: “We know that racism is part and parcel of the social system, but we are not out to promote theory, we want to provoke action.67

### Alt = Scholarship

#### All we have to do is win that Williams scholarship is worth the exploration - - The Alt is about challenging the white hold over scholarship

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

Despite the long history of, and varied justifications for, armed resistance offered over the last two centuries by oppressed Blacks throughout the Diaspora, the envisioning of armed resistance by Blacks in the academy and throughout the public remains quite narrow. People routinely fantasize about the power of Harriet Tubman’s shotgun while traveling the Underground Railroad, or reference the symbolism of Black Panthers standing in front of the Alameda County Courthouse with rifles, or may even mention in passing Frantz Fanon’s call for revolutionary violence, but rarely if ever are these representations connected to a theoretical analysis of the various arguments presented by Black activists and organizations justifying armed resistance. Revolutionary violence and the arguments used to justify its practice are quite different from the arguments used to justify the use of self-defense by many proponents of armed resistance; despite this distinction rarely being upheld in academic discussions concerning the political use of violence. This failure of attending to the philosophical basis and theoretical nuance of Black theorists advocating armed resistance has led to a dogmatic engagement with the militant civil rights tradition, where any and all calls for violence by Blacks becomes irrational, rage filled revenge, fueled by hate, patriarchal, and barbaric. In other words, despite the centuries of white philosophical traditions enduring alongside and even justifying armed revolt, riot, and just/unjust war, philosophy is thought to end with discussions where Blacks theorize or advocate the extinguishing and challenging of white life. As Black political theorists, we cannot continue to ignore this collapsing of inquiry when confronted with the long history of Black thinking outside of the liberal tradition, or the anxiety created by engaging the sexualized mythos of the armed Black male militant. We must challenge this persistent retreat into racist caricature. This tradition is too historically important for theorists to allow it to be dismissed by liberal thought, and framed erroneously by Black feminist historiography.47

### Self Defense = Right

#### If we win that civil society is anti-black – independently vote neg. Blacks cannot be forced to put their lives in the hands of white law – self-defense is a right.

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

Contrary to the popular imagination, “When Robert F. Williams seriously questioned the concept of non-violence over a decade ago he was a lone voice with very little support. He posted this question during the early part of the Martin Luther King era that had started with the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955; the historic decision of the Supreme Court on school segregation announced that previous year had set in motion the possibility that Black Americans were now on the road to full citizenship. All of them did not indulge in this illusion, knowing that it would take more than court decisions to change their condition.”55 Black citizenship was illusory. As Williams said “To us there was no Constitution . . . the only thing left was the bullet.”56 Throughout Negroes with Guns, Williams describes the normalized violence and the death of Black people during the Civil Rights movement which inspired him to create a philosophy of armed resistance. Contrary to the popular ideas of our day, desegregation had failed. Throughout the 1950s and the early 1960s, Black Americans were being killed, brutally raped, and lynched. The moral plea of King did not singularly arrest the death of Black people. This demanded a response other than appealing to the murderers of Blacks and their courts and laws for justice. Williams recognized that white supremacy and the rule of law were inextricably woven together such that the supposed rights guaranteed to Blacks by the Constitution, and the then recent Brown v. Board of Education decision would always be denied. Negroes with Guns was written as a response to this violation and is rooted in the recognition that “In civilized society the law serves as a deterrent against lawless forces that would destroy the democratic process. But where there is a breakdown of the law, the individual citizen has a right to protect his person, his family, his home and his property. To me this is so simple and proper that it is self-evident.”57

### A2: Black on Black Crime

#### Black self-defense is the primary value. Black Americans must not be left to depend on the protection of the state.

Cottrol and Diamond ’92: (Robert J. Cottrol and Raymond T. Diamond—1992 ("Toward an Afro-Americanist Reconsideration of the Second Amendment," Georgetown Law Journal 80 ~~~[1992~~~]: 309-361).

Twice in this nation's history—once following the Revolution, and again after the Civil War—America has held out to blacks the promise of a nation (pg.361) that would live up to its ideology of equality and of freedom. Twice the nation has reneged on that promise. The ending of separate but equal under Brown v. Board in 1954,287—the civil rights movement of the 1960s, culminating in the Civil Rights Act of 1964,288 the Voting Rights Act of 1965,289 and the judicial triumphs of the 1960s and early 70s—all these have held out to blacks in this century that same promise. Yet, given this history, it is not unreasonable to fear that law, politics, and societal mores will swing the pendulum of social progress in a different direction, to the potential detriment of blacks and their rights, property, and safety. The history of blacks, firearms regulations, and the right to bear arms should cause us to ask new questions regarding the Second Amendment. These questions will pose problems both for advocates of stricter gun controls and for those who argue against them. Much of the contemporary crime that concerns Americans is in poor black neighborhoods 290 and a case can be made that greater firearms restrictions might alleviate this tragedy. But another, perhaps stronger case can be made that a society with a dismal record of protecting a people has a dubious claim on the right to disarm them. Perhaps a re-examination of this history can lead us to a modern realization of what the framers of the Second Amendment understood: that it is unwise to place the means of protection totally in the hands of the state, and that self-defense is also a civil right.

### Rob – Narratives

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

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

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

### ROB Long

#### Voting negative *also* supports injecting indigenous epistemology into the academy. That is not the nexus question. This is the best model of competition:

#### A. Key to productive disagreement­—debate should train us to find points of agreement, not just points of *dis-*agreement. Forcing the neg to disagree with the entire aff entrenches an unproductive political model that mirrors the worst forms of Beltway partisanship. Nuanced discussions of policy controversies and the representational practices that are used to frame them are more valuable than Cable News Network-style battles between partisan political operatives. Debate should simulate productive disagreement, not *disagreement-at-all-costs*.

#### B. Key to critical engagement—advocacy-centric models of competition rig the game and devalue criticism. If the stasis point is plan-desirability, criticism is always a secondary consideration. Debates about method are a prerequisite to constructive policy discussion—only the curriculum we establish can ensure meaningful political debate.

Kurki 8 — Milja Kurki, Lecturer in the Department of International Politics at Aberystwyth University, 2008 (“Introduction: causation and the divided discipline,” *Causation in International Relations: Reclaiming Causal Analysis*, Published by Cambridge University Press, ISBN 9780521882972, p. 8-9)

It should be noted that the approach adopted here is unashamedly theoretical and philosophical in nature. While philosophical, or meta- theoretical, discussions have often been subjected to criticism from the more empirically minded IR scholars, in my view philosophical reflection on the key concepts we use frequently, such as causation, is fundamental in the social sciences, IR among them. This is because, as Colin Wight puts it, ‘conceptual inquiry is a necessary prerequisite to empirical research’.21 Without an adequate understanding of the ways in which we apply concepts, appreciation of the reasons for our conceptual choices, and recognition of the strengths and the weaknesses [end page 8] that our use of key concepts entail, we run the risk of conducting empirical studies that we cannot justify or that amount to nothing more than aimless fact-finding. Also, we risk not being able to understand how and why our accounts might differ from those of others and, hence, are not able to engage in constructive debate with other perspectives. This book is motivated by the belief that IR has not become too theoretical or philosophical at the expense of empirical inquiry:22 rather it still remains inadequately reflective towards many fundamental concepts used in empirical analyses. While meta-theoretical, or philosophical, debate is clearly in and of itself not the sole or the central aim of Inter- national Relations scholarship, it should not be forgotten that the ways in which we ‘see’ and analyse the ‘facts’ of the world political environment around us are closely linked to the kinds of underlying assumptions we make about meta-theoretical issues, such as the nature of science and causation. Indeed, the analysis here is motivated by the belief that whenever we make factual, explanatory or normative judgements about world political environments, important meta-theoretical filters are at work in directing the ways in which we talk about the world around us, and these filters are theoretically, linguistically, methodologically, and also potentially politically consequential.23 It follows that philosophical investigation of key concepts such as causation should not be sidelined as ‘hair-splitting’ or ‘meta-babble’,24 but embraced—or at least engaged with—as one important aspect of the study of international relations.

### Root Cause of B/B Violence

#### Black-on-Black violence is rooted in a thrust for survival in a world that guarantees their death. Resolving the psychodynamics of white civil society resolves the root cause.

WILSON Assistant Prof of Psychology City U of New York 2k11 Amos; “Black on Black Violence: The Psychodynamics of Black self-Annihilation in service of white domination” original publication 1990

Black-on-Black criminality and violence represents quests for power and outraged protests against a sense of powerlessness and insignificance. They are protective fetishes used to defend against feelings of helplessness and vulnerability. Black-on-Black violence is reflective of vain attempts to achieve basic, positive human ends in a negative environment, by negative means. It represents an often misguided, furious struggle for self-affirmation by many African Americans while entangles in a White American-spun spider’s web specifically designed and constructed to accomplish their disaffirmation. Black-on-Black violence and criminality are [is] rooted in “positive” White American values –irrational quests for power, prestige, possession, affection, and acceptance among peers so as to secure illusory reassurances against anxiety, self-contempt, and feelings of inferiority. They are rooted as well in attempts to protect against exploitation by others also caught up in the same rapacious social environment generated and sustained by egregious White American values.

### A2: “Black on Black Crime”

#### 1] Alt has other ways of solving it – should not use that as an excuse to disarm blacks

#### 2] Integrationist outweighs

#### 3] Black Nationalism

#### 4] Impacts of the

# 1NC – Prison K

## 1NC – Shorten pls

### Rob – Intergrationist bad

#### Ought questions presume an integrationist approach to ethics which deny the reality of Black Death that surrounds us --- Hope is a delusion used to relegate blackness outside of our frame of reference --- reframe the role of the ballot from liberation to survival.

[Dr. Tommy J. Curry 13, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Texas AandM, "In the Fiat of Dreams: The Delusional Allure of Hope, the Reality of Anti-Black Violence and the Demands of the Anti-Ethical", 2013] FT

For many philosophers and social political theorists, the eventuation of an egalitarian humanist society is the teleological impetus, the inevitable consequence, of embracing liberalism and integrationist theories of democracy. While these proclamations have been by Black thinkers for centuries as the promulgations of America’s democratic potential, the Black victims of America’s fetish for racism, those who are forced to endure the failure of white theory to arrest the racist tyranny, have their deaths, their murders, their deprivation interpreted as caricatures, the brutality of which is taken to be academic capital driving philosophical engagements with and theorizations about race within the confines America’s geography. In this illusory world, Black citizens are aspirations—thought experiments rooted in the desire to motivate political theories through the excoriation of Blackness. The Black thinker becomes a voyeur gazing upon this thought—raced, but not unhumaned by Blackness—the citizen, historically white, empirically violent, but recognized as human instead of animal. Hope is then made the concrete political delusion; the idea that is taken to explain all Black social and political existence since slavery as progress, despite contradiction or regress. In thinking about Blackness, the Black scholar removes Black existence from the horrors of America preferring to think Blackness as unrealized. This is a conceptual failing of Black scholarship, a failing that Frank Wilderson describes as “people consciously or unconsciously peel away from the strength and the terror of their evidence in order to propose some kind of coherent, hopeful solution to things.” . It is in this act—the cessation of inquiry whereby the epistemic is collapsed into the political/ontological—that the dereliction of Black thought, its predilection towards becoming a racial normative, is apparent. Much like the dilemmas found in dealing with Black death and confronting the genocidal tendencies haunting the lives of Black men articulated by Wynter’s “No Humans Involved” in chapter one, there is a need to sanitize, make tolerable, academify Black existence so that it does not become nihilistic and fatalist, but a thought experiment that offers the white listener, reader, or colleague entrance into the possibility of being an anti-racist compassionate white reformist. This vacating of Black existence is not symbolic; rather it is the psychical consequence of the physical effect of Black death. This is not to suggest that Black people dying is an abstraction. The death of Black men and boys by state violence, white vigilantism and economic deprivation removes this group from being seen in society, and erases them from our conceptualization theoretically. Black male death, the death of Black men seen as a problem, of Black boys thought to inevitably grow into criminals beyond their adolescent deviance is the background from which Black male death is described generically and as the background of how one situates the extremities of racism. Michelle Alexander’s The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness which argues that the victims of the War on Drugs, young Black men “are part of a growing undercaste, permanently locked up and locked out of mainstream society,” (2010) confirms Huey P. Newton’s War Against the Panthers: A Study of Repression in America (1980), which argues that: Direct and unconcealed brute force and violence—although clearly persisting in many quarters of society—are today less acceptable to an increasingly sophisticated public, a public significantly remote from the methods of social and economic control common to early America. This is not a statement, however, that there is such increased civility that Americans can no longer tolerate social control of the country's under classes by force of violence; rather, it is an observation that Americans today appear to be more inclined to issue endorsement to agents and agencies of control which carry out the task, while permitting the benefactors of such control to retain a semi-dignified, clean-hands image of themselves. This attitude is very largely responsible for the rise of the phenomenon to which systematic attention is given in the study undertaken here: the rise in the 1960s of control tactics heavily reliant upon infiltration, deliberate misinformation, selective harassment, and the use of the legal system to quell broad based dissent and its leadership.

### 1nc

#### Need to set up links.

#### The call for a gun ban gives more power to police, exacerbating the current situation and feeding the prison industrial complex. They use black deaths as justification for police militarization – this is color blindness

Gourevitch ’15: (Alex Gourevitch, assistant professor of political science at Brown University. "Gun Control’s Racist Reality: The Liberal Argument against Giving Police More Power." 24 June 2015. FT)

Soon after the shootings at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, the first black president of the United States offered some thoughts on Dylan Roof’s racist attack. First and foremost, President Obama said, recent events were about how “innocent people were killed in part because someone who wanted to inflict harm had no trouble getting their hand on a gun.” The killings were also about a “dark chapter in our history,” namely racial slavery and Jim Crow. Obama only suggested practical action regarding the first issue, namely gun control. He did not consider that such measures will make the persistence of the second problem even worse. It is perhaps counterintuitive to say so but gun control responses to mass killings – whether racially motivated or otherwise – are a deep mistake. The standard form of gun control means writing more criminal laws, creating new crimes, and therefore creating more criminals or more reasons for police to suspect people of crimes. More than that, it means creating yet more pretexts for a militarized police, full of racial and class prejudice, to overpolice. As multiple police killings of unarmed black men have reminded us, the police already operate with barely constrained force in poor, minority neighborhoods. From SWAT to stop-and-frisk to mass incarceration to parole monitoring, the police manage a panoply of programs that subject these populations to multiple layers of coercion and control. As a consequence, more than 7 million Americans are subject to some form of correctional control, an extremely disproportionate number of whom are poor and minority. While it is commonly assumed that the drug war is to blame for all this, work by scholars like Benjamin Levin and Jeff Fagan demonstrates that already existing gun control efforts also play an important role. One of the most notorious areas of policing, the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program, was justified as a gun control rather than a drug war measure. In the name of preventing violence, hundreds of thousands of poor minorities are subject to searches without probable cause each year. Further, a range of Supreme Court-authorized exceptions to standard Fourth Amendment protections against illegal search and seizure derive from a concern with gun violence.

! – their view of crime fails to see it as a construct of the state.

#### And their utopian optimism is indicative of their color-blind starting point. They put faith that the law is enforced as the law is written.

Gourevitch ’15: (Alex Gourevitch, assistant professor of political science at Brown University. "Gun Control’s Racist Reality: The Liberal Argument against Giving Police More Power." 24 June 2015. FT)

This invasiveness is a necessary feature of criminalized gun possession. After all, policing guns is just like policing drugs. Like drugs, there are a vast number of guns. Possession is far more widespread than can possibly be policed so decisions have to be made about where to devote resources. Furthermore, since possession itself is the crime, the only way to police that crime is to shift from actual harm to identifying and preventing risks. As legal scholar Benjamin Levin argues in a forthcoming piece “Searching for guns – like searching for drugs – can easily become pretextual, a proxy for some general prediction of risk, danger, or lawlessness.” In other words, there must be selective enforcement, where enforcement includes invasive searches based on existing prejudices about who is and isn’t dangerous. For example, as research by Jeff Fagan and Garth Davies shows, in the late 1990s, the NYPD used suspected weapons violations to justify numerous stops, even though these stops resulted in fewer arrests than stops for other crimes. And when it comes to individualized assessments of who is dangerous and worthy of punishment, every study shows steep, and unfounded, bias. Michelle Alexander, quotes a former U.S. attorney in her recent sensation, “The New Jim Crow,” saying the following: “I had an [assistant U.S. attorney who] wanted to drop the gun charge against the defendant [in a case which] there were no extenuating circumstances. I asked, ‘Why do you want to drop the gun offense?’ And he said, ‘He’s a rural guy and grew up on a farm. The gun he had with him was a rifle. He’s a good ol’ boy, and all good ol’ boys have rifles, and it’s not like he was a gun-toting drug dealer.’ But he was a gun-toting drug dealer, exactly.” This isn’t just a point about conscious and unconscious biases towards poor minorities – biases that some imagine can be removed with proper training. No matter how neutral the laws are, their enforcement must remain unequal and unfair. That is because the policing involved would never be tolerated if they affected politically influential groups to the same degree. These policing practices persist because they are disproportionately directed against marginal populations.

! – justifies police mentality about preventing risk

! – Proves your color blind starting point – see law as enforced as it is written and don’t perceive the antiblackness that pervades

! – Turns solvency – don’t stop other crimes b/c redirect to guns to enforce racial biases.

#### The prison system industrial complex functions as a pre-condition for structural racism – their impacts are inevitable without abolition.

Davis: Angela Davis, an American political activist, scholar, and author, emerged as a prominent counterculture activist and radical in the 1960s as a leader of the Communist Party USA, “Masked Racism: Reflections on the Prison Industrial Complex”, <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/davisprison.html>

Imprisonment has become the response of first resort to far too many of the social problems that burden people who are ensconced in poverty. These problems often are veiled by being conveniently grouped together under the category "crime" and by the automatic attribution of criminal behavior to people of color. Homelessness, unemployment, drug addiction, mental illness, and illiteracy are only a few of the problems that disappear from public view when the human beings contending with them are relegated to cages. Prisons thus perform a feat of magic. Or rather the people who continually vote in new prison bonds and tacitly assent to a proliferating network of prisons and jails have been tricked into believing in the magic of imprisonment. But prisons do not disappear problems, they disappear human beings. And the practice of disappearing vast numbers of people from poor, immigrant, and racially marginalized communities has literally become big business. The seeming effortlessness of magic always conceals an enormous amount of behind-the-scenes work. When prisons disappear human beings in order to convey the illusion of solving social problems, penal infrastructures must be created to accommodate a rapidly swelling population of caged people. Goods and services must be provided to keep imprisoned populations alive. Sometimes these populations must be kept busy and at other times -- particularly in repressive super-maximum prisons and in INS detention centers -- they must be deprived of virtually all meaningful activity. Vast numbers of handcuffed and shackled people are moved across state borders as they are transferred from one state or federal prison to another. All this work, which used to be the primary province of government, is now also performed by private corporations, whose links to government in the field of what is euphemistically called "corrections" resonate dangerously with the military industrial complex. The dividends that accrue from investment in the punishment industry, like those that accrue from investment in weapons production, only amount to social destruction. Taking into account the structural similarities and profitability of business-government linkages in the realms of military production and public punishment, the expanding penal system can now be characterized as a "prison industrial complex." The Color of Imprisonment Almost two million people are currently locked up in the immense network of U.S. prisons and jails. More than 70 percent of the imprisoned population are people of color. It is rarely acknowledged that the fastest growing group of prisoners are black women and that Native American prisoners are the largest group per capita. Approximately five million people -- including those on probation and parole -- are directly under the surveillance of the criminal justice system. Three decades ago, the imprisoned population was approximately one-eighth its current size. While women still constitute a relatively small percentage of people behind bars, today the number of incarcerated women in California alone is almost twice what the nationwide women's prison population was in 1970. According to Elliott Currie, "[t]he prison has become a looming presence in our society to an extent unparalleled in our history -- or that of any other industrial democracy. Short of major wars, mass incarceration has been the most thoroughly implemented government social program of our time." To deliver up bodies destined for profitable punishment, the political economy of prisons relies on racialized assumptions of criminality -- such as images of black welfare mothers reproducing criminal children -- and on racist practices in arrest, conviction, and sentencing patterns. Colored bodies constitute the main human raw material in this vast experiment to disappear the major social problems of our time. Once the aura of magic is stripped away from the imprisonment solution, what is revealed is racism, class bias, and the parasitic seduction of capitalist profit. The prison industrial system materially and morally impoverishes its inhabitants and devours the social wealth needed to address the very problems that have led to spiraling numbers of prisoners. As prisons take up more and more space on the social landscape, other government programs that have previously sought to respond to social needs -- such as Temporary Assistance to Needy Families -- are being squeezed out of existence. The deterioration of public education, including prioritizing discipline and security over learning in public schools located in poor communities, is directly related to the prison "solution." Profiting from Prisoners As prisons proliferate in U.S. society, private capital has become enmeshed in the punishment industry. And precisely because of their profit potential, prisons are becoming increasingly important to the U.S. economy. If the notion of punishment as a source of potentially stupendous profits is disturbing by itself, then the strategic dependence on racist structures and ideologies to render mass punishment palatable and profitable is even more troubling. Prison privatization is the most obvious instance of capital's current movement toward the prison industry. While government-run prisons are often in gross violation of international human rights standards, private prisons are even less accountable. In March of this year, the Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), the largest U.S. private prison company, claimed 54,944 beds in 68 facilities under contract or development in the U.S., Puerto Rico, the United Kingdom, and Australia. Following the global trend of subjecting more women to public punishment, CCA recently opened a women's prison outside Melbourne. The company recently identified California as its "new frontier." Wackenhut Corrections Corporation (WCC), the second largest U.S. prison company, claimed contracts and awards to manage 46 facilities in North America, U.K., and Australia. It boasts a total of 30,424 beds as well as contracts for prisoner health care services, transportation, and security. Currently, the stocks of both CCA and WCC are doing extremely well. Between 1996 and 1997, CCA's revenues increased by 58 percent, from $293 million to $462 million. Its net profit grew from $30.9 million to $53.9 million. WCC raised its revenues from $138 million in 1996 to $210 million in 1997. Unlike public correctional facilities, the vast profits of these private facilities rely on the employment of non-union labor.

#### The alternative is to refuse the notion that historically racist institutions, like the prison industrial complex, is the solution to black liberation—we need to destroy and demystify the concept of the white man and white virtue— this is an anti-ethical approach

[Dr. Tommy J. Curry 13, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Texas AandM, "In the Fiat of Dreams: The Delusional Allure of Hope, the Reality of Anti-Black Violence and the Demands of the Anti-Ethical", 2013] RG

Anti-ethics; the call to demystify the present concept of man as illusion, as delusion, and as stratagem, is the axiomatic rupture of white existence and the multiple global oppressions like capitalism, militarism, genocide, and globalization, that formed the evaluative nexus which allows whites to claim they are the civilized guardians of the world’s darker races. It is the rejection of white virtue, the white’s axiomatic claim to humanity that allows the Black, the darker world to sow the seeds of consciousness towards liberation from oppression. When white (in)humanity is no longer an obstacle weighed against the means for liberation from racism, the oppressed are free to overthrow the principles that suggest their paths to liberation are immoral and hence not possible. To accept the oppressor as is, the white made manifest in empire, is to transform white western (hu)man from semi-deitous sovereign citizen to contingent, mortal, and un-otherable. Exposing the inhumanity of white humanity is the destruction/refusal of the disciplinary imperative for liberal reformism and dialogue as well as a rejection of the social conventions that dictate speaking as if this white person, the white person and her white people before you are in fact not racist white people, but tolerable—not like the racist white people abstracted from reality, but really spoken of in conversations about racism. The revelatory call, the coercively silenced but intuitive yearning to describe the actual reality set before Black people in an anti-Black society, is to simply say there is no negotiating the boundaries of anti-Blackness or the horizons of white supremacy. Racism, the debasement of melaninated bodies and nigger-souls, is totalizing.

#### No permutation: the alt is mutually exclusive – the aff is the epitome of colorblind faith in the carceral state --- we are literally the opposite.

Gourevitch ’15: (Alex Gourevitch, assistant professor of political science at Brown University. "Gun Control’s Racist Reality: The Liberal Argument against Giving Police More Power." 24 June 2015. FT) \*\*Only read blue if with ample time \*\*.

There is an unrecognized gap between the justification for gun control and its most likely effect. There is no reason to expect fair enforcement of gun control laws, or even that they will mainly be used to someone prevent these massacres. That is because how our society polices depends not on the laws themselves but on how the police – and prosecutors and courts – decide to enforce the law. Especially given how many guns there are in the U.S., gun law enforcement will be selective. That is to say, they will be unfairly enforced, only deepening the injustices daily committed against poor minorities in the name of law and order. It is hard to imagine any feasible gun control laws doing much to decrease mass shootings. But it is easy to see how they will become part of the system of social control of mostly black, mostly poor people. There are already too many crimes, there is too much criminal law, and there is far too much incarceration — especially of black people. To the degree that all that is part of the “dark chapter in our history,” given the deep injustice of our society, and especially its policing practices, the actual practice of gun control will continue that dark chapter, not resolve it. Of course, a reasonable gun control regime is logically possible. We can imagine one in our heads. But it is not politically possible in the United States right now. And it is a great error to think that gun control is the path to racial justice. More likely, it is the other way around. Racial justice is a precondition for any reasonable gun control regime. That, perhaps, is why the demands that have emerged from the #blacklivesmatter movement focus not on gun control but instead on demilitarizing the police and investing in “jobs, housing, and schools” for those “black communities most devastated by poverty.” What happened in Charleston is a horrific tragedy. The criminal law will not solve it. I wish I had a better solution ready at hand. I don’t, though I think it would start by freeing our political imagination from instinctively reaching for the criminal law.

## 2NR

#### All we have to do is win that their trust in the prison industrial complex is flawed –

#### Not effective.

McCray ’15: (Rebecca McCray, “Why Gun Control Isn’t at the Heart of the Black Lives Matter Movement,” Takepart, Sep 23 2015//FT)

Without that, Haviland-Eduah and Sinyangwe fear, black communities will unfairly bear the brunt of stricter gun laws. The idea wasn’t created in a vacuum: Going back well over a century, vagrancy and anti-loitering laws were selectively enforced against blacks, and more recently, police practices such as stop-and-frisk, in which an officer stops and pats down a pedestrian suspected of possessing contraband such as a firearm, have been shown to be highly racialized. Though ostensibly aimed at getting guns off the streets, guns were found in only 0.1 percent of 532,000 stop-and-frisk stops made in New York City in 2012, according to the New York Civil Liberties Union. Ninety percent of those stopped were black or Latino, even though whites were more likely to be found packing heat, according to research by Jeffrey Fagan at Columbia University Law School.

#### Gun possession charges would be tacked on as another way to overcharge minorities, causes plea bargains and fuels the prison industrial complex

Gourevitch ’15: (Alex Gourevitch, writer for Salon. "Gun Control’s Racist Reality: The Liberal Argument against Giving Police More Power." 24 June 2015. FT)

Once individuals find themselves arrested gun control reappears as a reason for increasing punishment. Gun possession can be used to enhance sentences for other crimes and even functions as a kind of double punishment when that possession becomes the reason for also tacking on an extra criminal charge. Gun charges are also a part of the excessive and racially unequal over-charging practices that not only contribute to rising incarceration rates but also ends force numerous individuals away from trial and into plea bargains. Poor Blacks and Latinos are easily intimidated by charge-happy prosecutors into accepting plea deals, meaning they never see their day in court. Some even end up admitting to crimes they did not commit just to avoid the possibility of more severe punishments. More criminal gun laws would only feed this deeply unjust system.

#### Turns and outweighs the case.

Blanks ’15: (Jonathan Blanks. “Gun Control Will Not Save America from Racism.” Vice. June 22, 2015. FT)

But as politicians call for new gun laws in the wake of this racist attack, lawmakers ought to take a look at the origins and effectiveness of similar gun control measures that have passed, and their consequences—especially for black people. And in an era where blacks and other minorities continue to suffer from over-policing and disproportionately suffer the abuses of law enforcement, any new criminal laws should be carefully considered. Like many criminal laws, gun control legislation has disproportionately affected black people and contributed to sky-high rates of incarceration for minorities in the US. As Radley Balko wrote in the Washington Post last year: Although white people occasionally do become the victims of overly broad gun laws...the typical person arrested for gun crimes is more likely to have [black] complexion.... Last year, 47.3 percent of those convicted for federal gun crimes were black — a racial disparity larger than any other class of federal crimes, including drug crimes. In a 2011 report on mandatory minimum sentencing for gun crimes, the U.S. Sentencing Commission found that blacks were far more likely to be charged and convicted of federal gun crimes that carry mandatory minimum sentences. They were also more likely to be hit with "enhancement" penalties that added to their sentences. In fact, the racial discrepancy for mandatory minimums was even higher than the aforementioned disparity for federal gun crimes in general. Balko's piece goes on to detail the case of Shaneen Allen, a black woman and single mother who legally owned a firearm in Pennsylvania. She was arrested in New Jersey for having that weapon during a routine traffic stop in October 2013. She faced a three-year mandatory minimum sentence despite a clean record and having committed no other crime. Allen fortunately received a pardon from Governor Chris Christie as her case gained national attention. Another story that made headlines was that of Marissa Alexander, a black woman who was convicted and sentenced to a mandatory minimum 20 years in prison in Florida after firing what she claims was a warning shot in self-defense against her estranged husband. After public agitation and much legal wrangling, Alexander was offered a plea bargain and was released from prison in January after serving three years. This evidence is anecdotal, to be sure, but strict gun laws with harsh penalties aimed at punishing violent criminals can also ensnare law-abiding people who make mistakes. That these laws often affect people of color is not at all new.

#### Anti ethics

Blanks ’15: (Jonathan Blanks. “Gun Control Will Not Save America from Racism.” Vice. June 22, 2015. FT)

In recent years, some of these policies have been deemed unconstitutional. In the landmark 2008 Supreme Court case that ended the de facto gun ban for home possession in Washington, DC, personal safety was the motivation for one of the original lead plaintiffs, ShellyParker—but instead of white mobs, Parker was afraid of the neighborhood drug dealers and hoodlums that thrived on the drug trade. It was also the driving factor for the late Otis McDonald, whose Supreme Court case against the city of Chicago in 2010 effectively ended indiscriminate gun-in-the-home bans across the country.

#### C) The Bureau of Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives deliberately targets minorities in sting operations. Balko 2

The Washington Post; Shaneen Allen, race and gun control; [Radley Balko](http://www.washingtonpost.com/people/radley-balko) July 22, 2014; <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-watch/wp/2014/07/22/shaneen-allen-race-and-gun-control/>; CE

The nation’s top gun-enforcement agency overwhelmingly targeted racial and ethnic minorities as it expanded its use of controversial drug sting operations, a USA TODAY investigation shows.¶ The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives has more than quadrupled its use of those stings during the past decade, quietly making them a central part of its attempts to combat gun crime. The operations are designed to produce long prison sentences for suspects enticed by the promise of pocketing as much as $100,000 for robbing a drug stash house that does not actually exist.¶ At least 91% of the people agents have locked up using those stings were racial or ethnic minorities, USA TODAY found after reviewing court files and prison records from across the United States. Nearly all were either black or Hispanic. That rate is far higher than among people arrested for big-city violent crimes, or for other federal robbery, drug and gun offenses.¶ The ATF operations raise particular concerns because they seek to enlist suspected criminals in new crimes rather than merely solving old ones, giving agents and their underworld informants unusually wide latitude to select who will be targeted. In some cases, informants said they identified targets for the stings after simply meeting them on the street.¶

# Guns Help Black People – Materiality

### Hijacks convo

#### By making this debate a discussion of guns instead of a discussion of racism, they hijack the conversation – it allows the aff to avoid recognizing their complicity in violence and parallels white fear-mongering to cement control.

**Carlson 15:** [Jennifer Carlson, “Charleston isn’t really about gun control. It’s about racial violence”, Washington Post, June 19, 2015]

It’s been just a day since a gunman burst into the Emmanuel AME Church in Charleston, S.C., killing nine. But already, the media is abuzz with its usual response to mass shootings. On the one hand, pro-gun proponents bemoaned “[pistol-free zones](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.huffingtonpost.com_2015_06_18_bryan-2Dfischer-2Dcharleston-5Fn-5F7612662.html&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=nj34Lg3aocak2pHCYkTkmQaW4ieS_3PRd8Jtye3wpuM&s=uyg4DLePbPHsT4KT9RdV5LbjoevOvHs0_8exmeB1yYA&e=)” like churches, where guns aren’t allowed. If the victims had been armed, they argue, [this violence could have been prevented](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.huffingtonpost.com_2015_06_18_bryan-2Dfischer-2Dcharleston-5Fn-5F7612662.html&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=nj34Lg3aocak2pHCYkTkmQaW4ieS_3PRd8Jtye3wpuM&s=uyg4DLePbPHsT4KT9RdV5LbjoevOvHs0_8exmeB1yYA&e=). Gun control advocates, on the other hand, lamented that [easy access to guns emboldened criminals to carry out “unthinkable” crimes](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__everytown.org_press_everytown-2Dsouth-2Dcarolina-2Dmoms-2Drespond-2Dto-2Dmass-2Dshooting-2Din-2Dcharleston-2Dthat-2Dkilled-2Dnine_&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=8C0zS1SVhz6UijeuH1sQkEKo63i9T-dy26B9-vHq7pU&s=CIDrXm0PKzXw9DbqGZmBDpLyBW4FkYJnkitJPX62tiQ&e=). Even President Obama linked the shooting to gun violence, [saying](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2015/06/18/president-obama-waves-the-white-flag-on-gun-control/?tid=pm_pop_b) “at some point, we as a country will have to reckon with the fact that this type of mass violence does not happen in other advanced countries.” Now Wayne LaPierre has explicitly blamed the massacre on there being too few guns in the church that night.” But turning this shooting into a referendum on the gun debate misses the point. It obscures a deeper, more uncomfortable conversation about race that can’t be resolved by passing gun laws or loosening gun restrictions. Too often, the gun debate serves as a powerful device for avoiding explicit challenges to racial violence, whether by adhering to a colorblind narrative of “[good guys” and “bad guys”](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.npr.org_2012_12_21_167824766_nra-2Donly-2Dthing-2Dthat-2Dstops-2Da-2Dbad-2Dguy-2Dwith-2Da-2Dgun-2Dis-2Da-2Dgood-2Dguy-2Dwith-2Da-2Dgun&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=nj34Lg3aocak2pHCYkTkmQaW4ieS_3PRd8Jtye3wpuM&s=K6r8I7gQxV5NTHeOrrVjnfzB1JSsuPUdsYAeun5Gfnw&e=) (at best) or playing into [racial imagery](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.aspentimes.com_news_14957190-2D113_michael-2Dbloomberg-2Dcalls-2Dcolorados-2Ddecision-2Don-2Dlegal-2Dpot-2Dstupid&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=nj34Lg3aocak2pHCYkTkmQaW4ieS_3PRd8Jtye3wpuM&s=JFrj1LQWimXZF79vkhpAGxyEqyTy8lika9ai2fys2sQ&e=) (at worst). Instead of rehashing a hackneyed gun debate that has never taken us very far in national conversations on race and racism, we should be explicitly addressing the core issue at stake: racial violence. To say it differently, this isn’t a story about guns. It’s a story about racial terrorism. What we know so far is that suspect Dylann Roof targeted the Emanuel AME Church both a place of worship and a historical site of black empowerment. He sat quietly for an hour, then broke out into gunfire, reloading his gun five times. As his victims pleaded with him to stop, he refused. “I have to do it,” he reportedly said. “You rape our women and you’re taking over our country. And you have to go.” He apparently wanted to spare at least one woman, so she could recount to others what happened in the church. If you substitute a noose for a gun, Roof’s actions are a shockingly unsurprising repetition of a long-standing history of Southern horrors; his desire to punish African Americans for the alleged rape of white women (“our women”), the fears of African Americans “taking over” government institutions, the insistence on using the public spectacle of white-on-black violence not just to victimize individuals but to warn and intimidate entire groups of Americans — all of these are textbook elements of the rampant racial terrorism marking the South (and, in some cases, the North) in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Extralegal violence — whether in the form of rope, clubs, guns, fists, knives or other weapons — sustained this racial terrorism in Jim Crow America. According to the [Equal Justice Initiative](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.eji.org_lynchinginamerica_&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=8C0zS1SVhz6UijeuH1sQkEKo63i9T-dy26B9-vHq7pU&s=Q--9OlRUA9kXqCdvtn6JWoPHgZhymanuZ_SfkzeNU3U&e=), 4,000 lynchings occurred from 1877 to 1950 in just 12 states. Race riots — such as the “Burning of Black Wall Street” in 1921 — decimated black wealth and destroyed black communities. Meanwhile, “racial cleanings,” as Elliot Jaspin explains in “[Buried in Bitter Waters: The Hidden History of Racial Cleaning in America](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.amazon.com_Buried-2DBitter-2DWaters-2DHistory-2DCleansing_dp_0465036376&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=8C0zS1SVhz6UijeuH1sQkEKo63i9T-dy26B9-vHq7pU&s=WF2c88mfXQWl2s_8xhGaGKAE10lAOzAe9CZY9GjU9Jw&e=),“ compelled the forced expulsion of African Americans from towns across the South and the North. Each of these served to reinforce segregation and racial subordination. Against this historical backdrop, the Charleston shooting is far from inexplicable, as [South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley said](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.theguardian.com_us-2Dnews_live_2015_jun_18_charleston-2Dchurch-2Dshooting-2Dreports-2Dfatalities-2Dsuspect-2Dlarge-2Dlatest-2Dupdates&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=nj34Lg3aocak2pHCYkTkmQaW4ieS_3PRd8Jtye3wpuM&s=PXK5DviB44T-t9RhdfsX-gJmfbrUuULeDSDveYQ7E9s&e=). The FBI keeps a tally on “hate crimes:” Not only do racially motivated crimes constitute [roughly half](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.fbi.gov_news_pressrel_press-2Dreleases_fbi-2Dreleases-2D2013-2Dhate-2Dcrime-2Dstatistics&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=8C0zS1SVhz6UijeuH1sQkEKo63i9T-dy26B9-vHq7pU&s=aQqqM6TBkDLcCreKnVpp8rKbgtVSPGfnBj0cvk-btgA&e=) of hate crimes reported to police, but African Americans are by far the largest group of victims — [65 percent in 2012](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.fbi.gov_about-2Dus_cjis_ucr_hate-2Dcrime_2012_tables-2Dand-2Ddata-2Ddeclarations_1tabledatadecpdf_table-5F1-5Fincidents-5Foffenses-5Fvictims-5Fand-5Fknown-5Foffenders-5Fby-5Fbias-5Fmotivation-5F2012.xls&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=8C0zS1SVhz6UijeuH1sQkEKo63i9T-dy26B9-vHq7pU&s=8jAR0DG5za4Av1WH5GR5rsAq0ffSgJzBkxNmmpqgoyc&e=) among race-motivated hate crimes. While a majority of hate crimes go [unreported](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.bjs.gov_content_pub_pdf_hcv0412st.pdf&d=BQMFaQ&c=RAhzPLrCAq19eJdrcQiUVEwFYoMRqGDAXQ_puw5tYjg&r=ci9dNSBHCsj_tBZnUFxUpnvmECiSBFNm6IYUdkMIY7I&m=8C0zS1SVhz6UijeuH1sQkEKo63i9T-dy26B9-vHq7pU&s=tBVAjiPEa-csvh0ZmE5050c0BY-Dhu4BwIwKqZghSiY&e=), the Bureau of Justice Statistics estimates around 200,000 to 300,000 happen every year, the vast majority of which are robberies, sexual assaults, aggravated assaults, simple assaults and murders. But even as America continues to be haunted by a violent past, there is a key difference: In the past, the state was at best complicit and at worst actively involved. Today, the police chief of Charleston called the massacre as he saw it: a “hate crime” that “no community should have to experience.” Naming these acts as hate crimes is a first step in coming to terms with a violent past that continues to haunt us. Like racial disparities in violence more generally, racial terrorism is not inevitable, but it can only begin to be addressed if we are willing to first forefront a conversation about the valuation of human life in the United States and how race continues to shape it. We need to have these conversations and use them to direct initiatives that can reduce violence across racial lines. While stories about guns generate clicks and sound-bytes, not every every shooting is a referendum on gun policy. Rather, the gun debate too often hijacks conversations, serving as a stand-in for the discussions we desperately need to be having — and actions we should be taking — about race, violence and inequality. That’s not to say we shouldn’t talk about guns, but when it is the only debate we are capable of having, that is a problem. Calling this incident out as racial terrorism, embedded in a deep, unsavory but persistently relevant history, is a first step.

Owens ’15: (Bob Owens, “A Word To President Obama About ‘Gun Violence’” July 5 2015//FT)

I can easily forgive President Barack Obama for not understanding American culture, especially gun culture. Growing up in the exclusive Menteng district of Jakarta, Indonesia, before moving to Honolulu, Hawaii to attend a private school, Obama knew nothing of the continental United States until he moved to California as a young adult to attend Occidental College in Los Angeles. From Los Angeles, Obama moved to New York City to attend Columbia. He then moved to Chicago and his first job as a community organizer, before going to Harvard. After Harvard, he returned to Chicago, and lived there until he moved to Washington, DC, as President. His exposure to firearms has been seeing them in the arms of Indonesian soldiers, on the hips of Hawaiian, Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago police officers, and of course, in the crime news of the urban areas in which he has always lived in Asia and in “blue state” metropolises. Obama views firearms as tools that he can used to enforce the laws that he passes and the executive orders he proclaims. He views them as something useful to provide to allies and drug cartels and foreign terrorists to shape domestic and international politics. He views them as a threat to his one true faith, an all-powerful federal government. And of course, he views them as a vessel for crime and murder among criminals. Put bluntly, he views firearms as nothing more or less something to be exploited… for good or ill. The idea of a firearm as a tool ensuring personal liberty is as foreign to him as a life in an Indonesian private school is to patriotic Americans. The concept of being responsible for your own personal safety, and that of your family, is as alien to him as the concept of personal responsibility itself. Barack Hussein Obama is an American President without an appreciation for the essential nature of firearms as part of the American heritage and the American spirit. But while we can forgive the President’s shortcomings, we cannot allow him to continue spreading the fiction that the United States has a “gun violence” problem, that the existence of firearms in the United States forces people to become violent. That is, quiet simply, a lie. Worse still, this liberal “gun violence” lie is based in the racist belief that people of minority cultures are inherently violent, echoing a disgusting piece called “The Black Dilemma” which seems to have originated on a site called American Renaissance. It should hardly be surprising. Billionaire gun control supporter Michael Bloomberg, who fuels the “gun violence” studies at Harvard, and who is the money behind Mayors Against Illegal Guns, Moms Demand Action, Everytown for Gun Safety, and a new anti-gun propaganda site called The Trace, was very blunt in his beliefs that minority males are inherently violent. Once you listen to audio of his statements, you’ll understand why. “It’s controversial, but first thing is all of your — 95 percent of your murders, and murderers, and murder victims fit one [unintelligible]. You can just take the description, Xerox it, and pass it out to all of the cops. They are male, minorities, 15 to 25. That’s true in New York, it’s true in virtually every city in America,” said Bloomberg. “You’ve got to get the guns out of the hands of the people getting killed,” he continued. “First thing you can do to help that group is to keep them alive.” It is quite stunning that the media and activists have not challenged the former Mayor’s comments asserting that young minority males should be disarmed. The racists at American Renaissance and the racists on the progressive left want to scapegoat firearms because it is politically advantageous, but what they really believe is that minority males are inherently violent. They use the phrase “gun violence” as a code word and as an excuse for many things. When Obama wants to attack the rights of 100 million law-abiding citizens because of the vile actions of someone who is mentally ill or racist or terrorist, he blames “gun violence,” attributing the actions of a single homicidal madman to the tool he used, smearing 1/3 of the nation. When anti-liberty Democrats want to create a scapegoat for the unending crime problems in Democrat-controlled cities, they blame “gun violence,” instead of the cycle of poverty and despair that resulted from 50+ years of failure in action that are the results of their social engineering experiments. When white, wealthy progressives lament “gun violence,” they do so with the specter of carjackings and home invasions in there minds, fearing that the minority “other” will intrude upon their suburban golf course homes, their penthouse views, and their trendy urban lofts. The politicians blame “gun violence” as an excuse to attempt to seize more liberty from law-abiding citizens. Progressives use this same “gun violence” argument as code to disguise their deep-seated fear that black people are inherently violent. They feel if they take away the tool that the violence will stop (which shows again how little progressives know about the root causes of violence, but that’s another discussion entirely). But as we’ve noted previously, firearms are not the problem. “Gun violence” is a myth, an excuse, a multi-purpose strawman. Nor are minorities a problem. Billionaire totalitarian Michael Bloomberg almost understood the problem, but he seems to view violence as a genetic trait. It’s a bitter irony, considering how many of his own people have been sent to gulags and gas chambers for the same sort of bigotry. Writing this morning at the Denver Post, Kirk Mitchell and Noelle Phillips almost get it as well. They lament the “no snitching” culture, the infantile nature of the slights that lead to murders and tit-for-tat retaliation killings, and the police response of disruption tactics to try to temporarily stem the attacks, but they simply refuse to address the problem of a specific minority culture. We don’t have a “gun violence” problem as liberty-hating opportunistic politicians pretend. We don’t have a “black male, 15-25” problem, as the wealthy, paranoid, and prejudiced proclaim. What we have is an amoral, gang-celebrating, “thug life” culture that embraces criminality as not just acceptable behavior, but as a preferred way of life. If we could magically strip away every firearm from this same violent subculture, they’d simply find other ways to carry out the violence and intimidation tactics that are at the core of this system. Perhaps they’d “only” revert to knives and bats and clubs. Or perhaps they’d advance to bombs and arson, and importing fully-automatic weapons from the same overseas markets that supply the narcotic poison that sustains them, and we’d end up with “little Mexicos” in gang neighborhoods, where even the most heavily armed and armored police units would fear to tread. Anyone attempting to sell you on “gun violence” is attempting to sell you on a lie. Period. We have a violent “thug culture” problem, a problem that can be addressed by changing cultural norms and vilifying certain cultural mores, instead of celebrating and perpetuating them. You should question why they are lying to you, and why they refuse to address an addressable problem within a specific subculture that can be changed just as easily as views on smoking or drunk driving. Subcultures come and go, and destructive subcultures can be marginalized and minimized until they simply cease to have any appeal, and are abandoned. It would be nice to have a President who still retains so much popularity among certain groups attempt to use that influence to reduce crime. Unfortunately, he’s clearly more interested in stoking the fears and prejudices of this same thuggish subculture, inspiring hatred, supporting lawlessness, and offering subtle supports for thug-culture based rioting. Hopefully, the next President won’t be so interested in exploiting those he should instead be helping, to undermine the liberty of all.

### K

#### Use of guns is historically key to black civil rights movements and protection of black people in the U.S.

Winkler 11 The Atlantic; The Secret History of Guns; Adam Winkler; September 2011; http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2011/09/the-secret-history-of-guns/308608/

Opposition to gun control was what drove the black militants to visit the California capitol with loaded weapons in hand. The Black Panther Party had been formed six months earlier, in Oakland, by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale. Like many young African Americans, Newton and Seale were frustrated with the failed promise of the civil-rights movement. Brown v. Board of Education, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were legal landmarks, but they had yet to deliver equal opportunity. Ione zn Newton and Seale’s view, the only tangible outcome of the civil-rights movement had been more violence and oppression, much of it committed by the very entity meant to protect and serve the public: the police.¶ Inspired by the teachings of Malcolm X, Newton and Seale decided to fight back. Before he was assassinated in 1965, Malcolm X had preached against Martin Luther King Jr.’s brand of nonviolent resistance. Because the government was “either unable or unwilling to protect the lives and property” of blacks, he said, they had to defend themselves “by whatever means necessary.” Malcolm X illustrated the idea for Ebony magazine by posing for photographs in suit and tie, peering out a window with an M-1 carbine semiautomatic in hand. Malcolm X and the Panthers described their right to use guns in self-defense in constitutional terms. “Article number two of the constitutional amendments,” Malcolm X argued, “provides you and me the right to own a rifle or a shotgun.”¶ Guns became central to the Panthers’ identity, as they taught their early recruits that “the gun is the only thing that will free us—gain us our liberation.” They bought some of their first guns with earnings from selling copies of Mao Zedong’s Little Red Book to students at the University of California at Berkeley. In time, the Panther arsenal included machine guns; an assortment of rifles, handguns, explosives, and grenade launchers; and “boxes and boxes of ammunition,” recalled Elaine Brown, one of the party’s first female members, in her 1992 memoir. Some of this matériel came from the federal government: one member claimed he had connections at Camp Pendleton, in Southern California, who would sell the Panthers anything for the right price. One Panther bragged that, if they wanted, they could have bought an M48 tank and driven it right up the freeway.¶ Along with providing classes on black nationalism and socialism, Newton made sure recruits learned how to clean, handle, and shoot guns. Their instructors were sympathetic black veterans, recently home from Vietnam. For their “righteous revolutionary struggle,” the Panthers were trained, as well as armed, however indirectly, by the U.S. government.¶ Civil-rights activists, even those committed to nonviolent resistance, had long appreciated the value of guns for self-protection. Martin Luther King Jr. applied for a permit to carry a concealed firearm in 1956, after his house was bombed. His application was denied, but from then on, armed supporters guarded his home. One adviser, Glenn Smiley, described the King home as “an arsenal.” William Worthy, a black reporter who covered the civil-rights movement, almost sat on a loaded gun in a living-room armchair during a visit to King’s

#### Crime is soaring, stats show more black people want protection.

Will Bunch *Should more black people carry guns?* Senior writer at Philadelphia Daily News Thursday, April 2, 2015

After crime soared in the 1970s, '80s and '90s, many leaders in the black community shared a common political goal -- getting guns off the street. Philadelphia's current [Mayor Nutter could be a poster child for that movement](http://www.phillymag.com/news/2014/04/17/mayor-nutter-joins-anti-gun-coalition/" \t "_blank) -- throughout his two terms, Nutter has traded barbs with the NRA, called for a renewed ban on assault rifles, and led anti-gun coalitions. His views were shared by rank-and-file city voters. But after decades of failed efforts to enact saner gun laws, the mood is changing. There's mounting evidence that African-Americans are embracing gun ownership. [A national poll published in December by the Pew Research Center](http://www.people-press.org/2014/12/10/growing-public-support-for-gun-rights/" \t "_blank)chronicled this stunning change in attitudes. It reported: "Currently, **54% of blacks say gun ownership does more to protect people than endanger personal safety,** nearly double the percentage saying this in December 2012 (29%)." Indeed, the massive and swift flip in black opinion was a key reason why for the first time over Americans overall support gun rights over so-called gun control. I first heard of the Pew findings today in [a broader NPR story about black gun ownership](http://www.npr.org/2015/04/02/396869889/more-african-americans-support-carrying-legal-guns-for-self-defense" \t "_blank). Their piece quoted Detroit's African-American police chief, James Craig, as an example of changing opinions; he said **gun ownership by law-abiding black citizens could be a strategy for dealing with slow police response times in poorly served, high-crime neighborhoods.** It's the argument, basically, that the NRA has been putting out there for years -- just now reaching a new populations.

Taylor **Gordon***Black Leaders in Arkansas Urge Black People to Arm Themselves With Guns and Cameras* Taylor Gordon is a writer for Atlanta Black Star. April 16th,20**15**

In the midst of what seems to be a never-ending wave of unarmed Black citizens being killed by police, **Black leaders are now pushing for the community to take action by arming themselves with guns** and video cameras. **The [Black community’s attitude towards gun control](http://atlantablackstar.com/2015/04/04/black-citizens-lose-faith-law-enforcement-major-shift-happens-support-carrying-concealed-weapons/" \t "_blank) has seen a major shift in recent years as the cruelty of police brutality has garnered national attention.** While many still remain unsure about whether or not it is best to bring more guns into their communities, **local leaders in Arkansas are very clear about their stance on the matter. “We’re asking that Black people around the country arm themselves and join in established gun clubs,”** Hubert Bass, CEO of the Crittenden County Justice Commission, told Memphis station WREG. Shabaka Afrika, the president of the Crittenden County NAACP, mirrored those sentiments. **Both of these local leaders insisted it isn’t a call for more violence but rather a precautionary action to make sure the Black community has its own line of defense when the police fail to serve and protect them.** These two certainly aren’t the first to make this push in the very community that once strongly advocated for more gun control. Just a few weeks ago, Samuel Mosteller, longtime president of the Georgia chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, also urged the Black community to “exercise their Second Amendment rights.” Mosteller expressed a clear frustration with the fact that so many Black citizens were being fatally attacked by police regardless of their actions leading up to the tragic encounter. **“You stand there, [police] shoot,”** Mosteller told reporters back in March. **“You run, they shoot. We’re going to have to take a different track.”** Data released by the Pew Research Center found that many members of the Black community are also having a change of heart about concealed carry laws. **Researchers found that more than 50 percent of Black people were now in favor of using firearms to “protect people from being victims of crimes.”**

## Impact

#### I control the internal link—destruction of the western conception of man precedes stopping oppression. Any attempt to disrupt power hierarchies call for ceasing of the overrepresentation of the western conception of man. Wynter 3

Sylvia Wynter 3—2003 (“Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation--An Argument,” CR: The New Centennial Review, Volume 3, Number 3,257-337)RG

The argument proposes that the struggle of our new millennium will be one between the ongoing imperative of securing the well-being of our present ethnoclass (i.e., Western bourgeois) conception of the human, Man, which overrepresents itself as if it were the human itself, and that of securing the well-being, and therefore the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species itself/ourselves. Because of this overrepresentation, which is defined in the first part of the title as the Coloniality of Being/ Power/Truth/Freedom, any attempt to unsettle the coloniality of power will call for the unsettling of this overrepresentation as the second and now purely secular form of what Aníbal Quijano identifies as the “Racism/ Ethnicism complex,” on whose basis the world of modernity was brought into existence from the fifteenth/sixteenth centuries onwards (Quijano 1999, 2000),2 and of what Walter Mignolo identifies as the foundational “colonial difference” on which the world of modernity was to institute itself (Mignolo 1999, 2000).3The correlated hypothesis here is that all our present struggles with respect to race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, struggles over the environment, global warming, severe climate change, the sharply unequal distribution of the earth resources (20 percent of the world’s peoples own 80 percent of its resources, consume two-thirds of its food, and are responsible for 75 percent of its ongoing pollution, with this leading to two billion ofearth’s peoples living relatively affluent lives while four billion still live on the edge of hunger and immiseration, to the dynamic of overconsumption on the part of the rich techno-industrial North paralleled by that of overpopulation on the part of the dispossessed poor, still partly agrarian worlds of the South4)—these are all differing facets of the central ethnoclass Man vs. Human struggle. Central to this struggle also is the usually excluded and invisibilized situation of the category identified by Zygmunt Bauman as the “New Poor” (Bauman 1987). That is, as a category defined at the global level by refugee/economic migrants stranded outside the gates of the rich countries, as the postcolonial variant of Fanon’s category of les damnés (Fanon 1963)—with this category in the United States coming to comprise the criminalized majority Black and dark-skinned Latino inner-city males now made to man the rapidly expanding prison-industrial complex, together with their female peers—the kicked-about Welfare Moms—with both being part of the ever-expanding global, transracial category of the homeless/the jobless, the semi-jobless, the criminalized drug-offending prison population. So that if we see this category of the damnés that is internal to (and interned within) the prison system of the United States as the analog form of a global archipelago, constituted by the Third- and Fourth-World peoples of the so-called “underdeveloped” areas of the world—most totally of all by the peoples of the continent of Africa (now stricken with AIDS, drought, and ongoing civil wars, and whose bottommost place as the most impoverished of all the earth’s continents is directly paralleled by the situation of its Black Diaspora peoples, with Haiti being produced and reproduced as the most impoverished nation of the Americas)—a systemic pattern emerges. This pattern is linked to the fact that while in the post-sixties United States, as Herbert Gans noted recently, the Black population group, of all the multiple groups comprising the post-sixties social hierarchy, has once again come to be placed at the bottommost place of that hierarchy (Gans, 1999), with all incoming new nonwhite/non-Black groups, as Gans’s fellow sociologist Andrew Hacker (1992) earlier pointed out, coming to claim “normal” North American identity by the putting of visible distance between themselves and the Black population group (in effect, claiming “normal” human status by distancing themselves from the group that is still made to occupy the nadir, Sylvia Wynter ● 261“nigger” rung of being human within the terms of our present ethnoclass Man’s overrepresentation of its “descriptive statement” [Bateson 1969] as if it were that of the human itself), then the struggle of our times, one that has hitherto had no name, is the struggle against this overrepresentation. As a struggle whose first phase, the Argument proposes, was first put in place (if only for a brief hiatus before being coopted, reterritorialized [Godzich 1986]) by the multiple anticolonial social-protest movements and intellectual challenges of the period to which we give the name, “The Sixties.” The further proposal here is that, although the brief hiatus during which the sixties’ large-scale challenge based on multiple issues, multiple local terrains of struggles (local struggles against, to use Mignolo’s felicitous phrase, a “global design” [Mignolo 2000]) erupted was soon to be erased, several of the issues raised then would continue to be articulated, some in sanitized forms (those pertaining to the category defined by Bauman as “the seduced”), others in more harshly intensified forms (those pertaining to Bauman’s category of the “repressed” [Bauman 1987]). Both forms of “sanitization” would, however, function in the same manner as the lawlike effects of the post-sixties’ vigorous discursive and institutional re-elaboration of the central overrepresentation, which enables the interests, reality, and well-being of the empirical human world to continue to be imperatively subordinated to those of the now globally hegemonic ethnoclass world of “Man.” This, in the same way as in an earlier epoch and before what Howard Winant identifies as the “immense historical rupture” of the “Big Bang” processes that were to lead to a contemporary modernity defined by the “rise of the West” and the “subjugation of the rest of us” (Winant 1994)—before, therefore, the secularizing intellectual revolution of Renaissance humanism, followed by the decentralizing religious heresy of the Protestant Reformation and the rise of the modern state—the then world of laymen and laywomen, including the institution of the political state, as well as those of commerce and of economic production, had remained subordinated to that of the post-Gregorian Reform Church of Latin-Christian Europe (Le Goff 1983), and therefore to the “rules of the social order” and the theories “which gave them sanction” (See Konrad and Szelenyi guide-quote), as these rules were articulated by its theologians and implemented by its celibate clergy (See Le Goff guide-quote)