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#### Atomistic declaration of gun rights has made death into a “regrettable normalcy” --- gun culture tears apart urban America and solidifies the politics of disposability.

Kairys ’08: (David Kairys, “Ch 15: Why Are Handguns So Accessible on Urban Streets?” AGAINST THE WALL: POOR, YOUNG, BLACK, AND MALE, Elijah Anderson, ed., Penn Press, 2008//FT)

Why are handguns so accessible on urban streets? Why is it easier for young black men to obtain a handgun[s] than an up-to-date school textbook[s] or a regular job? This question has two components: How does the gun market work to make a product designed to kill so easily available? And why do we allow it to function this way? The answers differ significantly from conventional wisdom. The common image of an underground, illegal market is largely fictional. Most of what goes on is the predictable result of simple distribution and marketing choices, and is surprisingly legal. The statistics on handguns are familiar. There are about 60 handgun deaths each day in the United States, with a yearly total of about 24,000. About three times that many people are injured but not killed each day. This level of non-war-related handgun deaths is among the highest in the world, and many times greater than in other countries of comparable development and wealth. Handguns have been the biggest and most consistent threat to urban safety and public health in the United States for the last several decades. Research has shown that bringing a gun into your home increases the probability that someone in the home will be the victim of a gun homicide by three times and increases the probability of a suicide in your home by five times. If there is a teenager in the household, the suicide risk is multiplied by ten. The toll of these grim statistics falls hardest on poor and black communities, particularly black young men. Black males aged twenty to twenty-four have the highest homicide rate of all groups, and homicide— about 90 percent of which is by guns—is the leading cause of death for black youth. The introduction of easily available handguns into communities that are deprived and struggling has created a daily disaster, fed false stereotypes (only a small proportion of black young men shoot people), provided a rationalization for the failure to deal with poverty or discrimination, and sapped efforts to reform and regain hope.1 Yet most Americans seem oddly immune to concern about the gun problem, unable to take it seriously. The dominant public attitude toward handgun homicide is “regrettably normal.” Every day on television, news anchors, reporters, pundits, and politicians express sadness about the latest deaths, but there is a pervasive acceptance, a strange sense that this extraordinary level of death and killing is a normal or inevitable aspect of life in urban America.

#### We have let both the NRA and the politicians they own fracture society with fear --- Modern gun culture normalizes daily violence in American cities and allow a politics of disposability to infect all aspect of American politics.

Giroux ’15: Henry A. Giroux, "Murder, Incorporated: Guns and the Growing Culture of Violence in the US,"vTruthout, 7 Oct 2015, VM.

Nine people were killed and seven wounded recently in a mass shooting at a community college in Roseburg, Oregon. Such shootings are more than another tragic expression of unchecked violence in the United States; they are symptomatic of a society engulfed in fear, militarism, a survival-of-the-fittest ethos and a growing disdain for human life. Sadly, this shooting is not an isolated incident. Over 270 mass shootings have taken place in the United States this year alone, proving once again that the economic, political and social conditions that underlie such violence are not being addressed. To read more articles by Henry A. Giroux and other authors in the Public Intellectual Project, click here. In the United States, calls for liberal, Band-Aid reforms do not work in the face of the carnage taking place. "The United States sees an average of 92 gun deaths per day - and more preschoolers are shot dead each year than police officers are killed in the line of duty." (1) Mass violence in the United States has to be understood within a larger construction of the totality of the forces that produce it. Focusing merely on the more dramatic shootings misses the extent of the needless violence and murders that are taking place daily. US politicians now attempt to govern the effects of systemic violence while ignoring its underlying causes. State repression, unbridled self-interest, an empty consumerist ethos and war-like values have become the organizing principles of US society, producing an indifference to the common good, compassion, a concern for others and equality. As the public collapses into the individualized values of a banal consumer culture and the lure of private obsessions, US society flirts with forms of irrationality that are at the heart of everyday aggression and the withering of public life. US society is driven by unrestrained market values in which economic actions and financial exchanges are divorced from social costs, further undermining any sense of social responsibility. In addition, a wasteful, giant military-industrial-surveillance complex fueled by the war on terror, along with the United States' endless consumption of violence as entertainment and its celebration of a pervasive gun culture, normalizes the everyday violence waged against Black youth, immigrants, children fed into the school-to-prison pipeline and others considered disposable. US politicians now attempt to govern the effects of systemic violence while ignoring its underlying causes. Under such circumstances, a society saturated in violence gains credence when its political leaders have given up on the notion of the common good, social justice and equality, all of which appear to have become relics of history in the United States. In the face of mass shootings, the public relations disimagination machine goes into overdrive claiming that guns are not the problem, and that the causes of such violence can be largely attributed to people living with mentally illness. When in actuality, as two Vanderbilt University researchers, Dr. Jonathan Metzl and Kenneth T. MacLeish, publishing in the American Journal of Public Health, observed that: Fewer than 6 percent of the 120,000 gun-related killings in the United States between 2001 and 2010 were perpetrated by people diagnosed with mental illness. Our research finds that across the board, the mentally ill are 60 to 120 percent more likely than the average person to be the victims of violent crime rather than the perpetrators.... There are 32,000 gun deaths in the United States on average every year, and people are far more likely to be shot by relatives, friends or acquaintances than they are by lone violent psychopaths. (2) It may not be an exaggeration to claim that the US government has blood on its hands because of the refusal of Congress to rein in a gun lobby that produces a growing militarism that sanctions a love affair with the unbridled corporate institutions, financial interests and mass-produced cultures of violence. The Oregon community college shooting is the 41st school shooting this year while there have been 142 incidents of violence on school properties since 2012. Yet, the violence continues unchecked, all the while legitimated by the cowardly acts of politicians who refuse to enact legislation to curb the proliferation of guns or support measures as elementary as background checks - which 88 percent of the American people support - or for that matter, ban large-capacity ammunition magazines and assault rifles. In part, this cowardly refusal on the part of politicians is due to the fact that gun lobbyists pour huge amounts of money into the campaigns of politicians who support their interests. For example, in 2015, the gun lobby spent $5,697,429 while those supporting gun control paid out $867,601. In a New York Times op-ed, Gabrielle Giffords pointed out that the National Rifle Association (NRA) in the 2012 election cycle "spent around $25 million on contributions, lobbying and outside spending." (3) Outside money does more than corrupt politics; it is also responsible for people being shot and killed. The culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Many Americans are obsessed with violence. They not only own nearly 300 million firearms, but also have a love affair with powerful weaponry such as 9mm Glock semiautomatic pistols and AR-15 assault rifles. Collective anger, frustration, fear and resentment increasingly characterize a society in which people are out of work, young people cannot imagine a decent future, everyday behaviors are criminalized, inequality in wealth and income are soaring and the police are viewed as occupying armies. This is not only a recipe for both random violence and mass shootings; it makes such acts appear routine and commonplace. Fear has become a public relations strategy used not only by the national security state but also by the gun industry. When you live in a country in which you are constantly bombarded by the assumption that the government is the enemy of democracy and you are told that nobody can be trusted, and the discourse of hate, particularly against Black youth, immigrants and gun control advocates, spews out daily from thousands of conservative radio stations and major TV networks, a climate of fear engulfs the country reinforcing the belief that gun ownership is the only notion of safety in which people can believe in order to live as free human beings. Under such circumstances, genuine fears and concerns for safety are undermined. These include the fear of poverty, lack of meaningful employment, the absence of decent health care, poor schools, police violence and the militarization of society, all of which further legitimate and fuel the machinery of insecurity, violence and death. Fear degenerates into willful ignorance while any semblance of rationality is erased, especially around the logic of gun control. As Adam Gopnik observes: Gun control ends gun violence as surely an antibiotics end bacterial infections, as surely as vaccines end childhood measles - not perfectly and in every case, but overwhelmingly and everywhere that it's been taken seriously and tried at length. These lives can be saved. Kids continue to die en masse because one political party won't allow that to change, and the party won't allow it to change because of the irrational and often paranoid fixations that make the massacre of students and children an acceptable cost of fetishizing guns. (4) President Obama is right in stating that the violence we see in the United States is "a political choice we make that allows this to happen." While taking aim at the gun lobby, especially the NRA, what Obama fails to address is that extreme violence is systemic in US society, has become the foundation of politics and must be understood within a broader historical, economic, cultural and political context. To be precise, politics has become an extension of violence driven by a culture of fear, cruelty and hatred legitimated by the politicians bought and sold by the gun lobby and other related militaristic interests. Moreover, violence is now treated as a sport, a pleasure-producing form of commerce, a source of major profits for the defense industries and a corrosive influence upon US democracy. And as such it is an expression of a deeper political and ethical corruption in US society. As Rich Broderick insists, US society "embraces a soulless free-market idolatry in which the value of everything, including human beings, is determined by the bottom line" and in doing so this market fundamentalism and its theater of cruelty and greed perpetuate a spectacle of violence fed by an echo chamber "of paranoia, racism, and apocalyptic fantasies rampant in the gun culture." (5) The lesson here is that the culture of violence cannot be abstracted from the business of violence. Murdering children in schools, the streets, in jails, detention centers and other places increasingly deemed unsafe has become something of a national pastime. One wonders how many innocent children have to die in the United States before it becomes clear that the revenue made by the $13.5 billion gun industry, with a $1.5 billion profit, are fueling a national bloodbath by using lobbyists to pay off politicians, wage a mammoth propaganda campaign and induct young children into the culture of violence. (6) What is clear is that as more guns are on the streets and in the hands of people a savage killing machine is unleashed on those who are largely poor, Black and vulnerable. The widespread availability of guns is the reason for the shooting and killing of children and adults in Chicago, Boston, Ferguson, New York City and in other major cities. The Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence reports that "in 2010, guns took the lives of 31,076 Americans in homicides, suicides and unintentional shootings. This is the equivalent of more than 85 deaths each day and more than three deaths each hour. [In addition], 73,505 Americans were treated in hospital emergency departments for non-fatal gunshot wounds in 2010." (7) And the toll of gun violence on young people is truly heartbreaking with almost 30,000 young people killed in a 10-year period, which amounts "to nearly 3,000 kids shot to death in a typical year." (8) According to a Carnegie-Knight News21 program investigation, For every US soldier killed in Afghanistan during 11 years of war, at least 13 children were shot and killed in the United States. More than 450 kids didn't make it to kindergarten. Another 2,700 or more were killed by a firearm before they could sit behind the wheel of a car. Every day, on average, seven children were shot dead. A News21 investigation of child and youth deaths in the United States between 2002 and 2012 found that at least 28,000 children and teens 19-years-old and younger were killed with guns. Teenagers between the ages of 15 and 19 made up over two-thirds of all youth gun deaths in the United States. (9) Even worse, the firearms industry is pouring millions into recruiting and educational campaigns designed to both expose children to guns at an early age and to recruit them as lifelong gun enthusiasts. Reporting on such efforts for The New York Times, Mike McIntire writes: The industry's strategies include giving firearms, ammunition and cash to youth groups; weakening state restrictions on hunting by young children; marketing an affordable military-style rifle for "junior shooters" and sponsoring semiautomatic-handgun competitions for youths; and developing a target-shooting video game that promotes brand-name weapons, with links to the Web sites of their makers.... Newer initiatives by other organizations go further, seeking to introduce children to high-powered rifles and handguns while invoking the same rationale of those older, more traditional programs: that firearms can teach "life skills" like responsibility, ethics and citizenship. (10) As the United States moves from a welfare state to a warfare state, state violence becomes normalized. The United States' moral compass and its highest democratic ideals have begun to wither, and the institutions that were once designed to help people now serve to largely suppress them. Gun laws, social responsibility and a government responsive to its people matter. We must end the dominance of gun lobbyists, the reign of money-controlled politics, the proliferation of high levels of violence in popular culture and the ongoing militarization of US society. At the same time, it is crucial, as many in the movement for Black lives have stated, that we refuse to endorse the kind of gun control that criminalizes young people of color. Gun violence in the United States is inextricably tied to economic violence as when hedge fund managers invest heavily in companies that make high-powered automatic rifles, 44-40 Colt revolvers, laser scopes for semiautomatic handguns and expanded magazine clips. (11) The same mentality that trades in profits at the expense of human life gives the United States the shameful title of being the world's largest arms exporter. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, "Washington sold 31% of all global imports during the 2010-2014 period." (12) This epidemic of violence connects the spreading of violence abroad with the violence waged at home. It also points to the violence reproduced by politicians who would rather support the military-industrial-gun complex and arms industries than address the most basic needs and social problems faced by Americans. Rather than arming people with more guns, criminalizing every aspect of social behavior, militarizing the police and allowing the gun lobby to sanction putting semiautomatic weapons in the hands of children and adults, the most immediate action that can be taken is to institute effective gun control laws. As Bernardine Dohrn has argued: We want gun control that sanctions manufacturers, distributors and adults who place, and profit from, deadly weapons in the possession of youth. We want military-style weaponry banned. We want smaller schools with nurses and social workers, librarians and parent volunteers - all of which are shown to contribute to less disruption and less violence. Let's promote gun-control provisions and regulations that enhance teaching and learning as well as justice and safety for children, not those that will further incarcerate, punish and demonize young people of color. We've been there before. (13)

#### Thus the plan: Apple Incorporated ought to ban private ownership of the handgun emoji in iPhones in the United States.

#### **The handgun emoji is loaded with symbolism—it affirms a world in which guns are as ubiquitous as iPhones—the plan represents a meaningful corporate stance against gun culture**

Valinsky ’15 (Jordan, Digiday, “#DisarmTheiPhone: Anti-gun group tells Apple to delete the gun emoji,” 8/3, <http://digiday.com/brands/disarmtheiphone-anti-gun-group-tells-apple-delete-gun-emoji/>) OS

The gun emoji might not be loaded with bullets, but it’s filled with symbolism. New Yorkers Against Gun Violence (NYAGV) is calling on Apple to delete the gun emoji from users’ keyboards in an attempt to raise awareness about gun violence with the hashtag #DisarmTheiPhone. The nonprofit group, whose mission is spelled out in its name, is chastising Apple for including progressive emoji (i.e. the same-sex couple) while staying silent on a hot topic issue like this. NYAGV states in a press release that the gun emoji has “taken root in our culture and our digital conversations,” with guns becoming just as ubiquitous as the iPhone. While it’s unlikely that Apple would delete the gun from its keyboards, NYAGV executive director Leah Barnett told Digiday that “at very least, the campaign raises the issue of gun violence” in the U.S. The group targeted Apple because it positions itself as a progressive company that “should be concerned with the toll that gun violence” inflicts across America, she said.

#### **Corporate stances on political issues are key and spillover to alter broader culture better than governmental ones—Walmart proves**

Weatherby and Day ’15 (Danielle and Terri, Danielle Weatherby is an assistant professor at the University of Arkansas School of Law. Terri Day is a professor of law at Barry University in Florida. “How Walmart could get Congress to reform America's gun control laws,” Fortune, 6/25, <http://fortune.com/2015/06/25/how-walmart-could-get-congress-to-reform-americas-gun-control-laws/>) OS

Walmart took a stand on a controversial social issue this this week when it declared its intent to stop selling Confederate flag merchandise following the shooting deaths of nine African-Americans at a Charleston church. In the aftermath of the brutal deaths, a public debate erupted over the display of the flag, which has unfortunately persisted as a symbol of Southern and – let’s be honest, white – pride. When an image of the Charleston perpetrator donning a gun and Confederate flag exploded on social media, the flag became an immediate flashpoint for opening unhealed wounds about racism in America. While the U.S. Supreme Court affirms Texas’s decision to ban specialty license plates displaying the Confederate flag and South Carolina wrestles with removing the flag from its state Capitol, corporate America is acting – without hesitation – based on its conscience. Once again, Walmart WMT -0.23% entered the fray of public controversy, taking a moral and political stand, without regard for its bottom line. In many ways, Walmart is the corporate face of America. With this position as the world’s biggest retailer comes the power to influence other corporate actors, setting business trends and consumer standards, and possibly shaping cultural norms. Recently, the corporate giant has already set a precedent of taking a stance on divisive civil rights issues. It boycotted overly-zealous religious freedom laws in Indiana and its home state of Arkansas, which threatened to legalize private discrimination against the LGBT community. Earlier this year, the company announced it would raise wages for half a million employees. And, now, in response to the violent racist act in Charleston, it has made the courageous decision to discontinue the sale of Confederate flag merchandise in its big-box and online stores. Following Walmart’s lead, eBay, Sears SHLD 0.77% and Amazon AMZN 0.54% all banned the sale of Confederate flags in their stores and online sites. Will Walmart be the catalyst for gun control reform? Despite the fact that Walmart is headquartered in Arkansas, one of the nation’s most conservative and gun-toting Southern states, the corporate empire’s act in banning Confederate flag merchandise is symbolic of its sensitivity to a larger, more systemic problem with gun violence. Now, Walmart has the opportunity to go one step further and speak out on the broader issue. In protest of the perpetuation of gun violence in America and the country’s obsession with the right to pack heat, Walmart could discontinue the sale of firearms in its stores. This singular act would send the powerful message to consumers that America’s favorite retailer considers gun accessibility to be a grave matter of public safety. We know that the politics of gun control reignites after every gun-related tragedy. But it is doubtful that the loss of innocent lives in schools, movie theaters, malls and now a church will galvanize Congress to revisit gun reform, particularly in an election year. Walmart’s corporate acts could be the impetus toward solving the country’s problem with gun violence. Second Amendment advocates will condemn the removal of guns from retail shelves. Proponents of the First Amendment will claim that banning the Confederate flag is anti-American. Nonetheless, as a private, non-partisan actor, Walmart is not constrained by the First and Second Amendments or political gridlock. Walmart has the right to exercise its corporate conscience by taking a stance on the most politicized social problems of the day. When Walmart takes a stance on a divisive issue, the debate moves from the halls of Congress and federal courtrooms to the grocery-lined aisles where middle America shops. The typical demographic of a Walmart shopper is a middle-aged, Caucasian female with an annual household income of roughly $53,000. This average-Jane customer may not relate to the talking heads and commentators on network news; but when Walmart acts to further its own social agenda, Jane will listen.

#### At its core the plan represents more than one facet of gun violence—it affirms a world-view of solidarity contrary to the individualistic vision of neoliberalism.

Esposito and Finley 14: (Luigi, Prof Sociology @Barry, Laura, Asst. Prof Sociology and Criminology @Barry, Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States, Theory in Action, Vol. 7, No. 2, April ) Esposito and Finley, PhDs, 14//FT)

In a 2003 article, Yale legal scholar and psychologist Dan M. Kahan argues that the ongoing debate about gun control in the U.S. has been dominated by what he calls the “tyranny of econometrics” (i.e., debates revolve around whether or not “more guns” produce more or less crime and violence). Kahan suggests this focus on quantitative outcomes either ignores or trivializes how both sides of this debate are predicated on fundamentally different worldviews that shape and give coherence to their respective interpretations of “what America is and ought to be” (Kahan, 2003, p. 6). Specifically, a focus on econometrics downplays how the majority of those who support gun control base their position on an egalitarian and solidaristic view of the world, while a majority of those who oppose gun control base their arguments on a more hierarchical and individualistic vision. Without taking these opposing visions into account, the debate ignores the crucial relevance of culture in shaping people’s attitudes about gun control. Consistent with Kahan’s analysis, one might also argue that both sides of the gun control debate have very different understandings about the role of government in a free and democratic society. Among those who support gun control, a majority tends to embrace a progressive understanding of government. Stated simply, they believe that people— through activism and direct participation—can harness the power of government to advance human freedom, challenge societal injustices, and protect the common good (Esposito and Finley 2012). Government, in this sense, can be a potentially benevolent mechanism that works to create a better society for all. This position stands in sharp contrast to the vision espoused by a majority who oppose gun control. Among many of those in this latter camp, government is invariably the enemy and can therefore never be trusted to promote the well-being of the populace. Self-reliant individuals competing in a free market, as opposed to a central authority, is what promotes an optimal society. According to this viewpoint, hierarchy is simply a natural product of freedom and it is really up to individuals to look after their own interests—including their personal safety. Having unrestricted (or minimally restricted) access to firearms as a way to protect oneself and one’s family should thus be a fundamental right. For over three decades, this latter position—which has dominated social, political, and cultural discourse in the United States—has been bolstered and reinforced by the market ideology often referred to as neoliberalism. At its most basic, neoliberalism is typically associated with pro-market policies such as de-regulation, privatization, and liberalization. Neoliberalism, however, is far more than simply a body of policy prescriptions. Developed in opposition to Keynesianism and similar theories calling for a regulated economy and a strong welfare state, the architects of neoliberalism, which include economists such as Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, understand the free market as a quasi-infallible mechanism for organizing social life (e.g., Harvey 2005; Klein 2007; Giroux 2008; Esposito 2011). Centralized state planning, according to neoliberals, is burdened by a series of bureaucratic restraints that compromise efficiency, particularly within the social and economic realms (Harvey 2005) . Therefore, rather than relying on the state, most social or economic objectives are best achieved by individuals operating within the private realm (e.g., Friedman and Friedman 1980; Friedman 1982). It is within the private realm that persons have the freedom to act in their self-interest as they “see fit.” Neoliberalism, in this respect, draws from classical liberal principles and emphasizes that, under conditions of freedom, individuals are rational actors who constantly makes calculations of what will serve them best. Minimizing government and handing over as much of the economy and society in general to the private sector is thus a central objective in the neoliberal agenda. This shift presumably promotes an efficient order of autonomous individuals who, by freely pursuing their preferences, are able to meet their own needs and control their own destinies.

#### This debate should be a question of competing world-views—empirics are tainted

Kahan 3 Kahan, Dan M. Professor of Law, Yale Law School. "Gun Control Dabate: A Culture-Theory Manifesto, The." Wash. and Lee L. Rev. 60 (2003): 3. SW 12/15/15

Gun control fits the same expressive pattern. As one southern Democratic senator recently put it in urging his party to back off the issue, the gun debate is "about values ... about who you are and who you aren't." 3 Those who share an egalitarian and solidaristic world view, on the one hand, and those who adhere to a more hierarchical and individualistic one, on the other, both see the extent of gun regulation as a measure of their (and their social groups') relative status in American society. 4 What makes the gun control debate so intense is not a disagreement about the facts-does private ownership of guns promote or deter violent crime?-but a disagreement about "alternative views of what America is and ought to be."' 5 Of course, to all of this the econometricians might simply demur. Sure, they might say, the gun controversy reflects a conflict in cultural world views. But they cannot hope to make the two sides agree about the nature of a good society. They do both profess, however, to agree about the value of protecting innocent persons from harm. So let us continue to focus our attention on the empirical issue-whether more guns produce more crime or less-as our best hope to negotiate a peace between the cultural combatants. The problem with this reasoning, I want to suggest, is that it misconceives the relationship between cultural orientations and beliefs about empirical facts, such as whether gun control reduces or in fact increases crime. Beliefs about the causes and effective responses to societal risks, I want to argue, derive from cultural world views. As a result, we cannot reach agreement about the consequences of gun control unless we have first come to some common ground about what values gun laws ought to express.

#### We should not let realpolitik considerations stifle change and lock us into the status quo. We have to stop letting them win sometime, and that time is now. Vote aff as a war against the paradigm of disposability.

Dixon 99: (Nicholas Dixon 99---1999 (“Handguns, Violent Crime, and Self-Defense,” International Journal of Applied Philosophy, 13.2 (1999):239-260)

To allow considerations of realpolitik to influence our judgments about the morality of a practice or policy would effectively lock us into the status quo, and sabotage the role of applied ethics as a vehicle for proposing social change. Absurd consequences are easy to find. For instance, when the abolitionist movement first began, little doubt exists that it had no realistic chance at that time of persuading Congress to abolish slavery. Does this mean that its members were wrong to morally condemn slavery and call for its abolition? Similar comments apply to the suffragette movement in its early days. Worse still, if applied ethicists are to confine themselves to defending positions that have a realistic chance of currently being legally enacted, prolife philosophers will have to stop writing papers in which they condemn abortion, since, given the current composition of the Supreme Court, legislation banning¶ "regular" abortion is virtually impossible to enact and defend against constitutional challenges. ¶ Granted, the abolitionist movement did indeed take heed of political realities and worked incrementally to restrict slavery to certain states before finally pushing for its complete abolition. This is because it, like the suffragette movement, was a political movement, whose goal was to bring about concrete social change. Nonetheless, underlying both movements were moral arguments that made no compromise for political realities in their condemnation of slavery and the oppression of women. And this is precisely the role that applied ethicists should play in discussing handgun control: providing a moral vision of the handgun policy that would best reduce violence and respect rights. How to realize that moral vision is an important question, but a secondary one, and one that is best left to political organizations that are more knowledgeable about political realities. It may well tum out that Handgun Control, Inc.'s strategy of proposing moderate restrictions on handgun ownership is a shrewd first step that is a necessary prelude to the more radical proposal advanced here. But moral arguments for handgun prohibition are needed to guide and motivate even incremental change to achieve that goal. Nor is guiding and motivating those who already share a movement's goal the only role for applied ethicists. Even more important is the ability of cogent moral arguments to convince opponents and the uncommitted of the desirability of social change. The abolitionist, suffragette, and civil rights movements all illustrate this phenomenon. So another error made by those who reject as unrealistic my proposal to ban handguns is to regard one of the realities that do indeed make it difficult to achieve at present-i.e., the widespread belief that handguns make law-abiding citizens safer against crime as engraved in stone. They overlook the power of striking empirical evidence and clearly presented arguments to persuade the American public that the widespread ownership of handguns is a major cause of violent crime. We need to continue to present this evidence and these arguments until we convince enough people that handgun prohibition is desirable that it will eventually become eminently attainable (256-257).

#### Disposability has infected this space. We must challenge the militarization of academic spaces to create viable alternatives for progress. This entails a politics of engagement – not cynicism. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the advocacy that best resists our culture of violence that renders lives disposable.

Giroux ‘13: (Henry Giroux has a professorship at McMaster University and is a distinguished visiting professor at Ryerson University, "Beyond Savage Politics and Dystopian Nightmares“Beyond Savage Politics and Dystopian Nightmares” http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19025-beyond-savage-politics-and-dystopian-nightmares Wednesday, 25 September 2013 <!--JAG-->//FT)

Right-wing market fundamentalists want to root out those considered defective consumers and citizens, along with allegedly unpatriotic dissidents. They also want to punish the poor and remove their children from the possibility of a quality public education. Hence, they develop schools that are dead zones of the imagination for most children and highly creative classroom environments free of the frenzy of empiricism and test-taking for the children of the rich. It gets worse. In Pennsylvania, right-wing Gov. Tom Corbett and Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter are intent on destroying the public school system. Instead of funding public schools, Corbett and Nutter are intent on crushing the teachers union and supporting vouchers and charter schools. They also are fond of claiming that money can’t help struggling public schools as a pretext for closing more than 23 schools “while building a $400 million state prison.”[xv] As Aaron Kase reports, “Things have gotten so bad that at least one school has asked parents to chip in $613 per student just so they can open with adequate services, which, if it becomes the norm, effectively defeats the purpose of equitable public education, and is entirely unreasonable to expect from the city’s poorer neighborhoods.”[xvi] Vouchers and under-regulated charter schools have become the unapologetic face of a vicious form of casino capitalism waging war on the imagination while imposing a range of harsh and punitive disciplinary methods on teachers and students, particularly low-income and poor white minorities.[xvii] The vast stores of knowledge and human creativity needed by young people to face a range of social, economic and political problems in the future are not simply being deferred, they are being systematically destroyed. When the emancipatory potential of education does emerge, it is often couched in the deadening discourse of establishing comfort zones in classrooms as a way of eliminating any pedagogy that provokes, unsettles or educates students to think critically. Critical knowledge and pedagogy are now judged as viable only to the degree that they do not make a student uncomfortable. There is more at stake here than the death of the imagination; there is also the elimination of those modes of agency that make a democracy possible. In the face of such cruel injustices, neoliberalism remains mute, disdaining democratic politics by claiming there are no alternatives to casino capitalism. Power in the United States has been uprooted from any respect for public value, the common good and democratic politics. This is not only visible in the fact that 1 percent of the population now owns 40 percent of the nation’s wealth or took home “more than half of the nation’s income,” it is also evident in a culture that normalizes, legitimates and thrives in a politics of humiliation, cruelty, racism and class discrimination.[xviii] Political, moral and economic foundations float free of constraints. Moral and social responsibilities are unmoored, free from any sense of responsibility or accountability in a permanent war state. Repression is now the dominant mantra for all of society. As Zygmunt Bauman and David Lyons point out, the American public has been turned into “security addicts,” ingesting mistrust, suspicion and fear as the new common sense for a security state that seems intent on causing the death of everything that matters in a democracy.[xix] The surveillance state works hard to not only monitor our phone conversations or track our Internet communication but to turn us into consumers, ratchet up the desire to be watched, and enforce new registers of social exclusion between those inside and outside the official temples of consumerism, social rights and captainship itself. Confining, excluding and vigilantism is one register of the new face of authoritarianism in the US. As America enters a historical era dominated by an authoritarian repressive state, the refugee camp as a symbol of exclusion and suffering is everywhere, visible in the material encampments for the homeless, urban ghettoes, jails, detention centers for young people, and in the tents propping up alongside highways that hold the new refugees from the suburbs who have lost their jobs, homes and dignity. The refugee camp also has become a metaphor for those who question authority, because they are increasingly rendered stateless, useless and undesirable. Critical thought is now considered dangerous, discomforting and subject to government prosecution, as is evident in the war being waged against whistleblowers in the name of national (in)security.[xx] The technologies of smart missiles hunt down those considered enemies of the United States, removing the ethical imagination from the horror of the violence it inflicts while solidifying the “victory of technology over ethics.”[xxi] Sorting out populations based on wealth, race, the ability to consume and immigration status is the new face of America. The pathologies of inequality have come home to roost in America.[xxii] Moreover, as suffering increases among vast swaths of the population, the corporate elite and rich use the proliferating crises to extract more wealth, profits and resources.[xxiii] Crises become the new rationale for destroying the ideologies, values and institutions that give power to the social contract. [xxiv] The ethos of rabid individualism, hyper-masculinity and a survival-of-the-fittest ethic has created a society of throwaways of both goods and people. The savage ethic of economic Darwinism also drives the stories we now tell about ourselves. The state of collective unconsciousness that haunts America has its deepest roots not only in the writings of Friedrich Hyek, Ayn Rand, Milton Friedman and other neoliberal philosophers but also in the increasing merging power of private-sector corporations that, as John Ralston Saul has argued, has its roots in the “anti-democratic underpinnings of Fascist Italy in particular, but also of Nazi Germany.”[xxv] Today this “corporatism [is] so strong it that it has taken the guts out of much of daily democratic life.”[xxvi] Combined with the power of the national surveillance state, it is fair to say, again quoting Saul, that “corporatism, with all of the problems attached to it, is digging itself ever deeper into our society, undermining our society.”[xxvii] Clearly, those words echoed a few years ago were not only prescient but vastly underestimated the growing authoritarianism in the United States, in particular. We now live in a society in which leadership has been usurped by models of corporate management, self-interest has triumphed over the ethical imagination, and a respect for others is discarded for the crude instrumental goal of accumulating capital, regardless of the social costs. Intellectuals in too many public spheres have become either dysfunctional or they have sold out. Higher education is no longer the city on the hill. Instead it has become a corporate boardroom/factory in which Bill Gates wannabes govern the university as if it were an outpost of Wall Street. Outside of the boardrooms, intellectual violence prevails aimed largely at faculty and students, who are reduced to either grant writers or consumers. To make matters worse academic knowledge is drowning in firewalls of obtuseness, creating a world of dysfunctional intellectuals, at least those who have tenure. Those who don’t have such security are tied to the harsh rhythm and rituals of contingent subaltern labor and barely make enough money to be able to pay their rent or mounting debts - never mind engage in teaching critically and creatively while writing as a sustained act of dissent. At the same time, the wider culture is sinking under a flood of consumer and celebrity idiocy. There are some who suggest that such critiques of the growing authoritarianism and repression in American society are useless and in the long run do nothing more than reinforce a crippling dystopianism. I think this line of argument is not only wrong but complicitous with the very problems it refuses to acknowledge. From a left suffocating in cynicism, there is the argument that people are already aware of these problems, as if neoliberal hegemony does not exist and that its success in building a consensus around its ideology as a mode of common sense is passé. At the same time, liberals detest such criticism because it calls into question the totality of American politics rather than focus on one issue and gestures toward a radical restructuring of American society rather than piecemeal and useless reforms. The call for such a restructuring rather than piecemeal reforms sends liberals into fits of hysteria. Of course, the right in all of its varieties views criticism as a virus that destroys everything they admire about America - a society in which democracy has been eviscerated and largely benefits the top ten percent of the population. Most importantly, the banality of evil lies less in the humdrum cruelty of everyday relations but in its normalization, the depolicitizaton of culture, and, at the present moment, in the reproduction of a neoliberal society that eradicates any vestige of public values, the ethical imagination, social responsibility, civic education and democratic social relations. The enemy is not a market economy but a market society and the breakdown of all forms of social solidarity that inform democratic politics and the cultural, political and economic institutions that make it possible. The authoritarianism that now shapes American society is not a matter of fate but one rooted in organized struggle and a vision built on the recognition that there are always alternatives to the existing order that speak to the promise of a democracy to come. The contradictions of neoliberalism are unraveling, but the consensus that informs it is alive and well. And it is at that level of educational intervention that the war against market authoritarianism in all of its diverse forms has to be fought first. Commonsense has become the enemy of critical thought. Hope is no longer part of the discourse of the left, only a dreary sense of despair with no vision of how to imagine a radical democracy. Manufactured ignorance has become a virtue instead of a liability in a society ruled by the financial elite. And as such we have no serious crisis of ideas. Instead, we have a crisis of power relations and structures that needs a new political language if it is to be contested at the level of both a pedagogical and political struggle. The current neoliberal drive to ruthlessly extend the never-ending task of accumulating capital is matched only by its ruthless determination to produce[s] a notion of common sense that reinforces the idea that there is no way to think beyond the present system. The American public needs to break the authoritarian dysimagination machine that affirms everyone as a consumer and reduces freedom to unchecked self-interest while reproducing subjects who are willingly complicit with the plundering of the environment, resources and public goods by the financial elite. Class and racial warfare are alive and well in the United States. In fact, racism and the class warfare waged by right-wing politicians, bankers, hedge fund managers and the corporate rich are intensifying. Americans need to reject a politics in which public goods are demonized and eradicated, African-American youths become the fodder for wars abroad and the military-prison-industrial complex, the underclass disappears, public servants are disparaged, youths vanish into debt and despair, and the middle class passes into oblivion. While politics must be connected to its material moorings, it is not enough to imagine a different future than the one that now hangs over us like a suffocating sandstorm. Those intellectuals, workers, young people, artists and others committed to a radical democracy need to develop a new vocabulary about how to think about the meaning of politics, human agency and the building of a formative culture through which organized collective struggles can develop in the effort to imagine a new and more democratic future.

#### The aff is a method of educated hope --- we are a process that begins to develops the political language to win back the public sphere.

Giroux ’15: (Henry A. Giroux, "Beyond Dystopian Visions in the Age of Neoliberal Authoritarianism", Truthout, 4 Nov 2015//FT)

Fifth, another serious challenge facing advocates of a new truly democratic social order is the task of developing a discourse of both critique and possibility or what I have called [is] a discourse of educated hope. Critique is important and is crucial to break the hold of common-sense assumptions that legitimate a wide range of injustices. The language of critique is also crucial for making visible the workings of unequal power and the necessity of holding authority accountable. But critique is not enough and without a discourse of hope, it can lead to a paralyzing despair or, even worse, a ~~crippling~~ cynicism. Hope speaks to imagining a life beyond capitalism, and combines a realistic sense of limits with a lofty vision of demanding the impossible. As Ernst Bloch once insisted, reason, justice and change cannot blossom without hope, because educated hope taps into our deepest experiences and longing for a life of dignity with others, a life in which it becomes possible to imagine a future that does not mimic the present. I am not referring to a romanticized and empty notion of hope, but to a notion of informed hope that faces the concrete obstacles and realities of domination but continues the ongoing task of "holding the present open and thus unfinished." (51) The discourse of possibility not only looks for productive solutions. It also is crucial in defending those public spheres in which civic values, public scholarship and social engagement allow for a more imaginative grasp of a future that takes seriously the demands of justice, equity and civic courage. Democracy should encourage, even require, a way of thinking critically about education, one that connects equity to excellence, learning to ethics, and agency to the imperatives of social responsibility and the public good. Casino capitalism is a toxin that has created a predatory class of unethical zombies who are producing dead zones of the imagination that even Orwell could not have envisioned, while waging a fierce fight against the possibilities of a democratic future. The time has come to develop a political language in which civic values, social responsibility and the institutions that support them become central to invigorating and fortifying a new era of civic imagination, a renewed sense of social agency and an impassioned international social movement with a vision, organization and set of strategies to challenge the neoliberal nightmare engulfing the planet. Educators, artists, youth, intellectuals and others must refuse to succumb to the authoritarian forces that are circling US society, waiting for the resistance to stop and for the lights to go out. History is open, and as James Baldwin once insisted, "Not everything that is faced can be changed; but nothing can be changed until it is faced."

#### Pessimism cedes the political and roles back every material reform of the last century – decentering politics from institutions during a period of rampant xenophobia cedes the political to imperialistic, neoliberal fearmongering – While we might miss the mark a bit, we should just go back to the drawing board and make necessary alterations not sacrifice the aff’s entire politics of engagement -- contradictions underlie healthy democracy – institutional focus in public dialogue is necessary to reform democratic spaces. Now is key.

Obama 16 President Obama’s 2016 State of the Union Address 01/12/16 08:54 PM EST, Politico <http://www.politico.com/story/2016/01/state-of-the-union-2016-transcript-217671#ixzz3x5rzrA7a> IM

It will only happen if we fix our politics. A better politics doesn’t mean we have to agree on everything. This is a big country, with different regions and attitudes and interests. That’s one of our strengths, too. Our Founders distributed power between states and branches of government, and expected us to argue, just as they did, over the size and shape of government, over commerce and foreign relations, over the meaning of liberty and the imperatives of security. But democracy does require basic bonds of trust between its citizens. It doesn’t work if we think the people who disagree with us are all motivated by malice, or that our political opponents are unpatriotic. Democracy grinds to a halt without a willingness to compromise; or when even basic facts are contested, and we listen only to those who agree with us. Our public life withers when only the most extreme voices get attention. Most of all, democracy breaks down when the average person feels their voice doesn’t matter; that the system is rigged in favor of the rich or the powerful or some narrow interest. Too many Americans feel that way right now. It’s one of the few regrets of my presidency — that the rancor and suspicion between the parties has gotten worse instead of better. There’s no doubt a president with the gifts of Lincoln or Roosevelt might have better bridged the divide, and I guarantee I’ll keep trying to be better so long as I hold this office. But, my fellow Americans, this cannot be my task — or any President’s — **alone**. There are a whole lot of folks in this chamber who would like to see more cooperation, a more elevated debate in Washington, but feel trapped by the demands of getting elected. I know; you’ve told me. And if we want a better politics, it’s not enough to just change a Congressman or a Senator or even a President; we have to change the system to reflect our better selves. We have to end the practice of drawing our congressional districts so that politicians can pick their voters, and not the other way around. We have to reduce the influence of money in our politics, so that a handful of families and hidden interests can’t bankroll our elections — and if our existing approach to campaign finance can’t pass muster in the courts, we need to work together to find a real solution. We’ve got to make voting easier, not harder, and modernize it for the way we live now. And over the course of this year, I intend to travel the country to push for reforms that do. But I can’t do these things on my own. Changes in our political process — in not just who gets elected but how they get elected — that will only happen when the American people demand it. It will depend on you. That’s what’s meant by a government of, by, and for the people. What I’m asking for is hard. It’s easier to be cynical; to accept that change isn’t possible, and politics is hopeless, and to believe that our voices and actions don’t matter. But if we give up now, then we forsake a better future. Those with money and power will gain greater control over the decisions that could send a young soldier to war, or allow another economic disaster, or roll back the equal rights and voting rights that generations of Americans have fought, even died, to secure. As frustration grows, there will be voices urging us to fall back into tribes, to scapegoat fellow citizens who don’t look like us, or pray like us, or vote like we do, or share the same background. We can’t afford to go down that path. It won’t deliver the economy we want, or the security we want, but most of all, it contradicts everything that makes us the envy of the world. So, my fellow Americans, whatever you may believe, whether you prefer one party or no party, our collective future depends on your willingness to uphold your obligations as a citizen. To vote. To speak out. To stand up for others, especially the weak, especially the vulnerable, knowing that each of us is only here because somebody, somewhere, stood up for us. To stay active in our public life so it reflects the goodness and decency and optimism that I see in the American people every single day. It won’t be easy. Our brand of democracy is hard. But I can promise that a year from now, when I no longer hold this office, I’ll be right there with you as a citizen — inspired by those voices of fairness and vision, of grit and good humor and kindness that have helped America travel so far. Voices that help us see ourselves not first and foremost as black or white or Asian or Latino, not as gay or straight, immigrant or native born; not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans first, bound by a common creed. Voices Dr. King believed would have the final word — voices of unarmed truth and unconditional love. They’re out there, those voices. They don’t get a lot of attention, nor do they seek it, but they are busy doing the work this country needs doing. I see them everywhere I travel in this incredible country of ours. I see you. I know you’re there. You’re the reason why I have such incredible confidence in our future. Because I see your quiet, sturdy citizenship all the time.

#### Evaluating abstract philosophies before issues of oppression is nonsensical—it’s just a way to avoid confronting oppression

Matsuda ‘89 (Mari, Associate Professor of Law @ the University of Hawaii, “When the First Quail Calls: Multiple Consciousness as Jurisprudential Method”, 11 Women's Rts. L. Rep. 7 1989) PO

The multiple consciousness I urge lawyers to attain is not a random ability to see all points of view, but a deliberate choice to see the world from the standpoint of the oppressed. That world is accessible to all of us. We should know it in its concrete particulars. We should know of our sister carrying buckets of water up five flights of stairs in a welfare hotel, our sister trembling at 3 a.m. in a shelter for battered women, our sisters holding bloodied children in their arms in Cape Town, on the West Bank, and in Nicaragua. The jurisprudence of outsiders teaches that these details and the emotions they evoke are relevant and important as we set out on the road to justice. These details are accessible to all of us, of all genders and colors. We can choose to know the lives of others by reading, studying, listening, and venturing into different places. For lawyers, our pro bono work may be the most effective means of acquiring a broader consciousness of oppression. Abstraction and detachment are ways out of the discomfort of direct confrontation with the ugliness of oppression. Abstraction, criticized by both feminists and scholars of color, is the, method that allows theorists to discuss liberty, property, and rights in the aspirational mode of liberalism with no connection to what those concepts mean in real people's lives. Much in our mainstream intellectual training values abstraction and denigrates nitty-gritty detail. Holding on to a multiple consciousness will allow us to operate both within the abstractions of standard jurisprudential discourse, and within the details of our own special knowledge. Whisperings at Yale and elsewhere about how deconstructionist heroes were closet fascists remind me of how important it is to stay close to oppressed communities. High talk about language, meaning, sign, process, and law can mask racist and sexist ugliness if we never stop to ask: "Exactly what are you talking about and what is the implication of what you are saying for my sis- ter who is carrying buckets of water up five flights of stairs in a welfare hotel? What do you propose to do for her today, not in some abstract future you are creating in your mind?" If you have been made to feel, as I have, that such inquiry is theoretically unsophisticated, and quaintly naive, resist! Read what Professor Williams, Professor Scales-Trent, and other feminists and people of color are writing.' The reality and detail of oppression are a starting point for these writers as they enter into mainstream debates about law and theory.

#### Attempts to challenge disposability politics must propose concrete solutions --- only can produce material change and be accessible to the oppressed --- the aff is one step in the demand for the political world we want.

Giroux 14: Henry A. Giroux 14 ~American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy~, "Neoliberalism’s War on Democracy", Truthout, 26 Apr 2014, BE

In this instance, understanding must be linked to the practice of social responsibility and the willingness to fashion a politics that addresses real problems and enacts concrete solutions. As Heather Gautney points out, We need to start thinking seriously about what kind of political system we really want. And we need to start pressing for things that our politicians did NOT discuss at the conventions. Real solutions—like universal education, debt forgiveness, wealth redistribution, and participatory political structures—that would empower us to decide together what's best. Not who's best.75 Critical thinking divorced from action is often as sterile as action divorced from critical theory. Given the urgency of the historical moment, we need a politics and a public pedagogy that make knowledge meaningful in order to make it critical and transformative. Or, as Stuart Hall argues, we need to produce modes of analysis and knowledge in which "people can invest something of themselves . . . something that they recognize is of them or speaks to their condition."76 A notion of higher education as a democratic public sphere is crucial to this project, especially at a time in which the apostles of neoliberalism and other forms of political and religious fundamentalism are ushering in a new age of conformity, cruelty, and disposability. But as public intellectuals, academics can do more.