# 1NC Cap K Core [1:40]

#### Gun control ensures capitalism’s survival – the aff props up racism and police brutality and distracts from working class issues, Marxists 1:[[1]](#footnote-1)

For months the ruling class has subjected the American people to an unrelenting propaganda barrage about the dangers of crime and especially guns in U.S. cities. Right-wing politicians and tabloid media have been in the forefront—not surprisingly, since a major purpose of the campaign is to scapegoat Blacks for the ills of the system and justify increasing repression. But liberal leaders, starting from Bill Clinton with his vindictive crime legislation, have gone along, as have Black spokesmen from Jackson to Farrakhan. Stop Gun Control! Crime in the cities is indeed mounting, bred by the miseries of decaying capitalism. The ruling class, society’s biggest criminals, foster misery and the plagues of drugs and violent crime in poor communities. The favorite panaceas of liberals of all hues is gun control: take[s] weapons away from everyone but the cops and the military, plus a handful of “respectable” (i.e., upper middle-class) types. At the time of its revolutionary origins, the U.S. had to grant its citizens the right to bear arms. Now in its epoch of imperialist decay, it tries to remove that right. By using the crime campaign to hide its own, far greater violence, it denies the right of the oppressed masses to defend themselves. In the absence of proletarian leadership that provides a real answer, the initiative has been handed to reactionaries. The National Rifle Association, a right-wing outfit, takes the lead in defending the Second Amendment, while left, union, and Black leaders go along with the gun-control mania. Working-class revolutionaries recognize the need for measures of self-defense—not only against crime in the streets but also against the violence of the ruling class. It will take revolution to achieve a socialist world, the only answer to capitalism’s horrors. Yet the working class needs to survive today to fight in the mass struggles on the horizon. For starters, we say to working people: defend your constitutional right to bear arms! The NRA says that individual gun ownership is the answer. But what’s needed is organized, mass, self-defense. Another article in this issue, “Black Struggle Arms Itself,” sketches the history of Black self-defense efforts and details the reasons why a class-based strategy is crucial. At the moment the U.S. ruling class is trying to build support for a major attack against the working class at home. But unable to take on the whole class frontally yet, it uses the old divide-and-conquer tool of racism. It first heats up its crusade against Blacks and Latinos who have fought capitalist immiseration through rebellions against capitalist police and property from Los Angeles to Washington Heights. Anti-Gun Campaign It is no surprise that the anti-gun campaign in New York originated against the rebellious Dominican neighborhood of Washington Heights and then moved to the seething Black community in Brooklyn. The media hero of the day is a Dominican businessman, Fernando Mateo, who started the “Toys for Guns” program. Owners of illegal guns were encouraged to bring them in to the local police station in exchange for a $100 gift certificate at their local “Toys ’R’ Us” store. That program has become a permanent “Goods for Guns” program across the country. A few facts show that the program is pure deception. The $100 incentive will obviously not persuade big-time criminals to throw down their guns and adopt pacifism. Nor will it attract the drug gangs who shoot bystanders in the streets. Sure, some will turn in a spare peashooter or two, but they know the value of real weapons. According to the New York press, many gun traders admitted to owning other guns; some even planned to use the cash reward toward the purchase of better weapons! Even Mateo, the founder of Goods for Guns, said that he had no intention of giving up his gun. People with legal [and illegal] connections can get guns; people with illegal connections can, too. But not if you are a working woman or man [and] liable to be mugged on the street, robbed at home or subject to unprovoked attacks by the cops (see our article on the James Frazier case). The media won’t admit that many people who are not criminals need to keep guns for self-protection. At the other end of the scale, Clinton, accurately described by the Boston Globe as the “Earth’s top pusher of arms,” has no intention of surrendering his guns. Those he needs for future mass slaughters, as in Panama and Iraq. Nor do the capitalists’ cops and National Guard ever disarm themselves. The gun-control program is not about protecting the honest working person. Clinton and his cops and phony programs like “Toys for Guns” do nothing to deter the petty criminals who plague us. That is not their intention. The aim is to reinforce the lie that working and oppressed people must rely not on themselves but on the cops **to protect them.** That way we will be deluded into supporting a further buildup of the state’s armed forces. The cops say they will protect us. But as the ruling class has itself documented, cops more often than not protect (and join) the drug dealers and do nothing to protect ordinary people, especially Blacks and Latinos, from petty criminals. (See “Race, Class and Cop Brutality,” PR 45.)

#### Cap has infected institutions and status quo modes of domination – resisting it is necessary to overcome intersections of oppression, Ollman[[2]](#footnote-2)

So why should people involved in the social movements be interested in Marxism? Well—because most of them/us are also workers (white collar as well as blue collar), and Marxism is invaluable in helping to develop a strategy that serv[ing] es their/our interests as workers. Because the other forms of domination from which they/we suffer all have a capitalist component, and Marxism best explains it. Because even those parts of these oppressions that are older than capitalism have acquired a capitalist form and function, so that a Marxist analysis of capitalism is required to distinguish what is historically specific in their operation from what is not. And, lastly, because overturning capitalism is the necessary (though not sufficient) condition for doing away with all forms of domination**, including** domination over nature, and only a class conscious working class has the numbers (still), the power (potentially), and the interests (always) to bring about a change of this magnitude. Hence, the priority Marxists give to class analysis and class based politics (which does not rule out organizing around other oppressions at specific times for specific purposes). The priority given to class here (not to "the workers" but to "us as workers") has nothing to do with who is hurting more or which form of oppression is more immoral or which dominated group happens to be in motion, and everything to do with what is the adequate framework and vantage point for grasping the specific manner in which all these oppressions are interacting ow and how best to get rid of them all. (And this is what Albert caricatures as a "master discourse"). I do not expect that simply making these claims has convinced anyone that they are right, but I hope they help clarify where the real disagreements between Marxist and social movement theorists lie, and, hence, what is worth discussing if we are ever to construct the united movement that is needed to achieve our—yes!—common goals.

#### The alternative is the fervent acquisition and possession of all guns to stage an armed revolution, solving capitalism, Marxists 2[[3]](#footnote-3)

Armed Self-Defense: A Working-Class Policy The capitalist classes of all countries defend their power through their states, institutions holding a legal monopoly of armed force. The liberal’s remedy for crime is to rely on the state to prevent it. Most working people know that doesn’t work--especially Blacks and Latinos, who more often than not see the state’s agents, the cops, fighting against them. The far right-wingers have a different answer. They see Blacks, Latinos and other militant workers as the real (or at best potential) criminals and don’t trust even the bosses’ state to keep them down. They will look to armies of fascists when the time is ripe. Even with gun-control laws, these thugs will get weapons (plus quite a few members) from the cops. This has always been the case when fascism rises. For all sections of the bourgeois class, the notion of working people, especially Blacks and Latinos, arming themselves is a great threat. Capitalism wouldn’t last a moment if working people were armed and organized. That is why the right to armed self-defense today is a working-class demand. Certainly the working class is concerned to get rid of the criminal elements in our communities once and for all. We will stop these elements most effectively through a mass struggle to build a revolutionary movement and leadership to do away with the criminal system altogether.

#### The judge has an obligation to reject capitalism, because status quo schools turn students to mindless consumers, McLaren[[4]](#footnote-4)

The epistemological presuppositions that undergird neoliberal capitalism can be unraveled like an unspooled film; each application of neoliberal prescriptions to knowledge formation can be scrutinized in the context of the larger mise-en-scène. Cultural theorists have done an excellent job of understanding the impact of neoliberal ideology on the production of space, place, scale, historical time, and race, gender and class identity and human agency. I agree that this is important work and we need to look at such production in relation to the commodification of everyday life. Among other things, neoliberal logic is a logic of the lowest common denominator, a technocratic rationality in which value is accorded to how much surplus value can be extracted and accumulated..¶ While well-meaning progressive educators might be willing to criticize the manner in which humans are turned into dead objects that Marxists refer to as fetishized commodities, they are often loathe to consider the fact that within capitalist society, all value originates in the sphere of production and that one of the primary roles of schools is to serve as agents or functionaries of capital. Furthermore, they fail to understand that education is [can be] more reproductive of an exploitative social order than a constitutive challenge to it precisely because it rests on the foundations of capitalist exchange value. Reading Marx and Freire may not alchemize us into revolutionaries capable of transcending capitalism but ignoring what they had to say about transforming education in the context of class struggle would be a huge loss to our efforts.

## K turns case – root cause to gun violence

**The culture of fear perpetuated by the capitalist media has cause the isolation of individuals and social tension which culminates into gun violence. Analysis of our social condition is key to ending gun violence, Phil 12[[5]](#footnote-5)**

Yesterday's [shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Conneticut](http://edition.cnn.com/2012/12/14/us/connecticut-school-shooting/index.html) once again re-ignited the gun control debate. **For** US **liberals, stricter gun regulations** are the key to preventing future tragedies. **For conservatives, responsible gun ownership** and armed citizenry is the best defence. But **neither position really gets to the roots of the issue.** As an anarchist, it should go without saying that I don't subscribe to the position that if only the state bans more things the problem will go away. Whether it's a social right like abortion, recreational products like drugs and alcohol or something as problematic as guns, it's generally true that prohibition doesn't work. Taking the specific issue of guns, we might look at the UK as an example of this. Following the [Dunblane Massacre](http://www.h2g2.com/approved_entry/A11103580), private ownership of handguns was[almost entirely banned](http://www.statutelaw.gov.uk/content.aspx?activeTextDocId=2863335). However, [parliamentary statistics](http://www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/sn01940.pdf) (PDF) still record handguns as being used in 44% of non-air weapon firearms offences in England and Wales, followed by imitation weapons in 23%. (23% and 22% respectively in Scotland.) In other words, the majority of gun crime is committed with illegal weapons. There is a rough correlation between gun ownership levels and gun deaths, as seen in the graph below. However, one of the main reasons behind this is quite simply that in gun owning countries more of those who commit suicide do so using guns. The USA also remains something of a statistical anomaly: On the other side of the coin, the right-wing argument boils down roughly to legalised gun ownership being "[the only way for ordinary people to protect themselves against gun massacres](http://libertarianalliance.wordpress.com/2010/06/02/cumberland-shootings-la-statement/)." One example being that the [Appalachian School of Law shooting in 2002](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Appalachian_School_of_Law_shooting) was brought to a premature end by armed civilians. But this would only be a guarantee against such massacres if such armed citizenry was *compulsory* rather than just a right. After all, surely the US of all places should be able to offer more than one example? The conservative argument also fails to address the deeper roots of the problem. All it says is that we should all carry guns, leaving the prospect of somebody turning up and shooting holes in everyone as a regrettable fact of life we must prepare against. But is it - or is **the way to address massacres** such as yesterday's **[is] not** down to **gun control but** to **social conditions**? We don't yet know enough about the shooter at Sandy Hook Elementary School to start assessing motives. However, we can look at other shootings to get a snapshot of the kind of people who would commit these kind of crimes. The most famous such massacre, popularised by the Michael Moore film[*Bowling for Columbine*](http://www.bowlingforcolumbine.com/)*,* is the Columbine High School massacre. Although there was much nonsense surrounding the shootings - not least [the religious right blaming Marilyn Manson](http://www.jesus-is-savior.com/Evils%20in%20America/Rock-n-Roll/marilyn_manson.htm) - there was also some insight into the social makeup of American high schools and its effects on such events. Columbine killers Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold were both [thought to have been victims of bullying](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/national/daily/june99/columbine12.htm), whilst a Secret Service analysis the year after of 37 pre-meditated school shootings found that two-thirds of perpetrators were victims of bullying they described "[in terms that approached torment](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/05/15/AR2006051501103.html)." Of course, this doesn't mean that such tragedies can be boiled down to bullying, with suggestions that [Harris was a clinical psycophath](http://www.slate.com/id/2099203/) pointing to far more complex issues at work. Nonetheless, the role that alienation plays cannot be discounted. Last January, Adam Ford looked at two US shooters who on the surface couldn't be more different - [Jared Loughner and Clay Duke](http://infantile-disorder.blogspot.co.uk/2011/01/jared-loughner-and-clay-duke-tale-of.html). Loughner, who infamously shot US representative Gabrielle Giffords, framed his motives in terms of the reactionary right, whilst Duke, who committed suicide after a hostage situation, spoke of the class divide in America. Yet Ford sees both cases as "social tensions ... erupt[ing] in acts of individual desperation" for the lack of "mass collective expression." Moore's Columbine film hints at this when it looks at other tragic shooting cases. Most notably, the case of a single mother whose six-year-old son found a gun in his uncle's apartment, took it to school and [killed a classmate](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shooting_of_Kayla_Rolland). The boy had to stay in his uncle's apartment because his mother was facing eviction, even whilst being bussed out of state in the early hours and returning late at night under a welfare-to-work program. Over here, we might not have seen workfare participants' kids finding guns and killing friends, but we have had [the self-immolation of an unemployed worker outside a job centre](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/jobs/9365087/Unemployed-man-sets-himself-alight-outside-Birmingham-Jobcentre.html), just one of many recent [welfare suicides](http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/politics/2012/07/welfare-reform-suicides-must-not-be-overlooked). The shooting of Kayla Rolland documented in Bowling for Columbine is an indirect consequence of capitalist social relations, those suicides a direct one, but both are a consequence of those same social relations. This brings us back to the graph we saw before. **The U**nited **S**tates **stands out as a statistical anomaly - less guns per head than Switzerland but more gun homicides.** Why? In Bowling for Columbine, Moore asks if it's something unique toUS culture, and comes back to **the culture of fear on the news and in the media.** This may be part of it, but in all honesty I doubt that there's an argument for American exceptionalism when it comes to a capitalist media that **perpetuates** fear and **division.** I don't know enough about class politics in the US to offer as thorough an analysis as is needed here. However, I can sketch some thoughts and theories which hopefully American comrades may be able to either expand upon or correct. Firstly, the popular perception across the pond is that **the ruling class has succeeded in atomising American society and isolating individuals** to a far greater extent perhaps than anywhere else. (Hence part of the reason why the[2011 Wisconsin protests](http://libcom.org/tags/wisconsin-protests) or [the Wal Mart strikes](http://libcom.org/blog/black-friday-wal-mart-strikes-analysis-22112012) were so important.) In part, that's **the mythology the country was built on - rugged individualism** and the liberty of those with property - but it's also the result of an official union movement that is thoroughly institutionalised and a "left" tied to a party that doesn't even offer the hollow pretences that the UK Labour Party does. Secondly, as already discussed above, we know where alienation and desperation lead. Many in the UK have found it hard to come to terms with the class content of [last year's riots](http://libcom.org/tags/uk-riots). It may be harder for Americans to associate mass murder, especially of children, with the effects of class and capitalism. But in the absence of a positive collective response,the eruption of social tensions is pretty much bound to be so uncontrolled and ugly. Throw the right to bear arms, extremely high gun ownership and any other social factors from the dynamics of high school to the rhetoric of the hard right in the mix, and you've got a recipe for far more gun homicides than anywhere else in the world and lots of high profile massacres. But whilst America has far more instances of this type of crime than anywhere else, it holds no monopoly on them or on other forms of desperate, tragic violence.Atomisation, alienation, **poverty and the** complete **absence of hope are the inevitable results of capitalism. The backlash against that** (conscious or subconscious) **may be massacres, riots or suicides, but it will be there. The real debate isn't whether we ban guns** or whether we arm everyone to defend against the madmen lurking around every corner. **It's how we build a real movement against the present conditions so that people's only option isn't to kill ourselves or each other.**

## Discourse alternative

**The alternative is a reframing of the gun debate- it’s not a question of ban guns or have guns to protect yourself, it’s a question of shifting present conditions that make the conditions of death by gun necessary, Phil ‘12:**

Dec 15 2012 17:18 “A class struggle perspective on the gun control debate” <https://libcom.org/blog/class-struggle-perspective-gun-control-debate-15122012> KKJY
**Firstly, the popular perception across the pond is that the ruling class has succeeded in atomising American society and isolating individuals to a far greater extent perhaps than anywhere else. (Hence part of the reason why the 2011 Wisconsin protests or the Wal Mart strikes were so important.) In part, that's the mythology the country was built on - rugged individualism and the liberty of those with property - but it's also the result of an official union movement that is thoroughly institutionalised and a "left" tied to a party that doesn't even offer the hollow pretences that the UK Labour Party does. Secondly, as already discussed above, we know where alienation and desperation lead. Many in the UK have found it hard to come to terms with the class content of last year's riots. It may be harder for Americans to associate mass murder, especially of children, with the effects of class and capitalism. But in the absence of a positive collective response, the eruption of social tensions is pretty much bound to be so uncontrolled and ugly. Throw the right to bear arms, extremely high gun ownership and any other social factors from the dynamics of high school to the rhetoric of the hard right in the mix, and you've got a recipe for far more gun homicides than anywhere else in the world and lots of high profile massacres. But whilst America has far more instances of this type of crime than anywhere else, it holds no monopoly on them or on other forms of desperate, tragic violence. Atomisation, alienation, poverty and the complete absence of hope are the inevitable results of capitalism. The backlash against that (conscious or subconscious) may be massacres, riots or suicides, but it will be there. The real debate isn't whether we ban guns or whether we arm everyone to defend against the madmen lurking around every corner. It's how we build a real movement against the present conditions so that people's only option isn't to kill ourselves or each other.**

## Alternate Link card

**The aff’s call to remove private ownership of handguns buys into the myths perpetuated by capitalist state and will inevitably fail. Gun violence is a symptom of the socioeconomic realities created by capitalism and allows the state a justification to disarm the working class to maintain power.** **Socialist Appeal 13[[6]](#footnote-6)**

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

## Optional – state links

**The state is controlled by the capitalist elite; the aff isn’t really a solution to suffering, just a means for them to control the masses, Nadesan ’11:**

(Majia, professor of communication in the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences in the New College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences) “THE BIOPOLITICS OF TRANSACTIONAL CAPITALISM” MediaTropes eJournal Vol III, No 1 (2011): 23–57
Efforts to reign in and regulate the excesses of transactional capitalism will fail in the absence of widespread popular resistance. **Established governance institutions reflect the interests of elites** who profit from speculative capitalism. **For instance, in** June **2010 the** United Nations **(U.N.) cautioned “against** onerous **restrictions on speculative investors** in commodities markets”(Hotter and Raff, 2010, p. C2) **despite conclusive evidence that speculation in food commodities** in 2007 and 2008 **massively increased global hunger** (Kaufman, 2010).10 Thus, the U.N. followed the rhetorical lead of the “chorus of authorities challenging the popular belief that financial investors were the primary culprits in the run-up in commodities prices that culminated in the middle of 2008” (Hotter and Raff, 2010, p. C2; my italics). **Those that benefit from** speculative **capitalism will use political appointments and pressure to bend policy and popular rhetoric to justify the decisions of agencies enthralled by regulatory capture, or “control fraud**” (Black, 2010).”

**The state exists to perpetuate capitalist exploitation; the aff’s use of legal measures will always be skewed in favor of the rich, Organise:**

Consider the following facts: 1. Capitalist society is class society. Despite the claims made by the most powerful people in our society—who, we might add, have vested interests in doing so—**the unity of the** nation-**state is** an **illusory** one, **because capitalist society is divided into** economic **classes**. On the one hand we have those who own and control social resources, and who enjoy the economic and social privileges that accompanies such ownership and control, and on the other those who lack such ownership and control and are obliged by the circumstances of their birth to sell their labour for a wage, which is generally most of us. 2. **Exploitation is inherent to class society.** The foundation of meaningful freedom is economic independence, and economic independence on a social level derives from the ability of each of us to control the fruits of our labour. This is a basic human right. In capitalist society the propertied classes own and control the tools of production, the places where we work and the things we work with, which means that those of us who don't own and control the tools of production are forced to work for those who do. Needless to say, this situation deprives us of our economic independence and forces us into a position of submission and subservience. But it gets worse. The capitalist class generates profits from the wage system by paying workers less in wages than the value of the product of our labour, which they take for themselves. This is exploitation, period, and any sort of exploitation is inconceivable in a free society, because as long as one person can be exploited none of us are free. The only difference between chat**tel slaves and wage workers is that the former were owned, whereas the latter are rented. Seen in the cold hard light of day, wage labour is really wage-slavery. Suffice it to say that the economic and social privileges that the propertied classes enjoy in our society depends for their existence on the denial of elementary human rights to the vast majority of society. 3. The exploitation inherent to capitalist society is protected by the state. The denial of the basic human** right of economic independence to the working class is protected by the institutionalied violence of the state, by the police, military and judiciary**. The primary function of the state is to protect** and defend **the** social and economic **privileges of the propertied classes**. It is an institution of class domination which lords over the whole of society and imposes economic dependence and servitude on the great mass of humanity in the service of an opulent minority. (Some will argue in the defense of the state that it 1) maintains order and 2) protects us from violent crime. To this we pose the counter-arguments as follows: 1) what sort of order and in whose interests, and 2) that being 'protected' against 'crime' by the state is like being 'protected' against 'crime' by the mafia, and that as the state bequeaths its 'protection' to the working classes, facilitating the theft of the wealth it produces, so too does it perpetuate crime in the name of stopping it. Since the system of deterrence has failed to stop violent crime, we suggest alternative strategies such as addressing the causes). 4. The primary function of the state as a defender of privilege and injustice is reflected in capitalist law. The character of the state as an institution of class domination and the nature of its basic function (to protect the privileges of the propertied classes from the rest of us) forms the basis of capitalist law. The golden rule is that those with the gold make the rules. **The basic fraud behind** the doctrine of **equality before the law, the foundation for capitalist democracy, derives** then **from the fact that the laws are made by and for the rich**. The fact then that, in applying the same law to all, capitalist law has overcome the arbitrariness of kingly despotism is ultimately irrelevant for those of us in a state of economic servitude, since **the law itself is unjust**; being **grounded as it is in** the **protection of elite privilege** and the perpetuation of the master-slave relationship at the core of the wage system, it perpetuates the arbitrary rule—the despotism—of a

## Extra Impacts

### Oppression

**A multitude of oppressions are inevitable under capitalism – swamps their specific solvency, and also means I control the link to the root cause, Smith ’95:**(Sharon, columnist for Socialist Worker and author of Women’s Liberation and Socialism, Mistaken Identity: or
Can Identity Politics Liberate the Oppressed, [http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj62/smith.htm)](http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj62/smith.htm%29)
“Nevertheless, even in the richest societiesin the world, including the United States, **the working class** still **experiences oppression**. Oppression takes **[in] many forms: regressive taxation policies; inferior schools; substandard or inaccessible medical care**; the prevailing ideologies, which teach workers that they are less intelligent or less capable than the better-educated middle and upper classes; even **the siting of toxic waste dumps, never installed anywhere but in working class areas-[etc.]** -the list goes on and on. **Oppression is** necessary to (and **a product of**) a system based upon the rule of a tiny minority at the expense of the vast majority. In other words, oppression i[it’]s endemic to **capitalism.** The special forms of oppression experienced by women, gays, blacks, and other racial minorities in society are also endemic to the system. **Women's oppression rose** hand in handwith the family, along **with the development of class society. Racism and anti-gay ideology grew up** more recently **with capitalism. Today** these various forms of oppression serve to uphold the capitalist system in particular ways. But they also serve a more general function for capital: pitting worker against worker by creating divisions within the working class. **[t]he ruling class deliberately fosters antagonisms between** different sections of **workers by** promoting inequality and **discriminating against** certain parts of the population.Using whatever means are at its disposal, including the legal system, the media, the educational system, and again the prevailing ideologies, the ruling class creates **scapegoats** to blame for society's ills, or **to be relegated to second class citizenship.** Harmful stereotypes are made to seem like 'common sense'.”

### Epistemology

**Capitalism epistemically skews our perspectives in a variety of ways by reducing thought to economic calculus, precluding all other ethical concerns.** **Brown ’03:**

Brown, Wendy. "Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy." Theory & Event 7.1 (2003). Pg. 43-44

**The extension of economic rationality** to formerly non-economic domains and institutions extends to individual conduct, or more precisely, **prescribes citizen-subject conduct in a neo-liberal order.** Whereas classical liberalism articulated a distinction, and at times even a tension, among the criteria for individual moral, associational, and economic actions (hence the striking differences in tone, subject matter and even prescription between Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations and his Theory of Moral Sentiments), **neo-liberalism normatively constructs** and interpellates **individuals as** entrepreneurial actors in every sphere of life. It ﬁgures individuals as **rational, calculating creatures whose** moral **autonomy is measured by** their capacity for "self-care" -- **the ability to provide for** their own needs and service **their own ambitions.** In making the individual fully responsible for her/himself, neo-liberalism **[it] equates moral responsibility with** rational action; it relieves the discrepancy between economic and moral behavior by conﬁguring morality entirely as a matter of rational **deliberation about costs, beneﬁts, and consequences.** In so doing, it also carries responsibility for the self to new heights: the rationally calculating individual bears full responsibility for the consequences of his or her action no matter how severe the constraints on this action, e. g., lack of skills, education, and childcare in a period of high unemployment and limited welfare beneﬁts. Correspondingly, a "mismanaged life" becomes a new mode of depoliticizing social and economic powers and at the same time reduces political citizenship to an unprecedented degree of passivity and political complacency. **The** model **neo-liberal citizen** is one who **strategizes for her/ himself among various social, political and economic options, not** one who **strive**s with others **to alter or organize these options.** A fully realized neo—liberal citizenry would be the opposite of public-minded, indeed it would barer exist as a public. The body politic ceases to be a body but is, rather, a group of individual entrepreneurs and consumers . . . which is, of course, exactly the way voters are addressed in most American campaign discourse.— Other evidence for progress in the development of such a citizenry is not far from hand: consider the market rationality permeating universities today, from admissions and recruiting to the relentless consumer mentality of students in relationship to university brand names, courses, and services, from faculty raiding and pay scales to promotion criteriag Or **consider the way in which** consequential **moral lapses (of a sexual or criminal nature) by politicians**, business executives, or church and university administrators **are so often apologized for as "mistakes in judgement," implying that it was the calculation that was wrong, not the act**, actor, or rationale.

### Extinction

**Research proves industrial civilization is unsustainable absent major structural changes – capitalism is driving us on a course to collapse Ahmed ’14:**

Nafeez Ahmed (executive director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development). “Nasa-funded study: industrial civilisation headed for 'irreversible collapse'?” The Guardian. Published 3/14, Updated 3/16/14
“A new study partly-sponsored by Nasa's Goddard Space Flight Center has highlighted the prospect that **global industrial civilisation could collapse** in coming decades **due to unsustainable resource exploitation and increasingly unequal wealth distribution.** Noting that warnings of 'collapse' are often seen to be fringe or controversial, the study attempts to make sense of compelling historical data showing that "the process of rise-and-collapse is actually a recurrent cycle found throughout history." Cases of severe civilisational disruption due to "precipitous collapse - often lasting centuries - have been quite common." **The** independent **research project is based on a new cross-disciplinary 'Human And Nature DYnamical'** (HANDY) **model**, led by applied mathematician Safa Motesharrei of the US National Science Foundation-supported National Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center, in association with a team of natural and social scientists. The HANDY model was created using a minor Nasa grant, but the study based on it was conducted independently. The study based on the HANDY model has been accepted for publication in the peer-reviewed Elsevier journal, Ecological Economics. It finds that **according to** the **historical record even advanced**, complex **civilisations are susceptible to collapse**, raising questions about the sustainability of modern civilisation: "The fall of the Roman Empire, and the equally (if not more) advanced Han, Mauryan, and Gupta Empires, as well as so many advanced Mesopotamian Empires, are all testimony to the fact that advanced, sophisticated, complex, and creative civilizations can be both fragile and impermanent." By investigating the human-nature dynamics of these past cases of collapse, the project identifies the most salient interrelated factors which explain civilisational decline, and which may help determine the risk of collapse today: namely, population, **Climate, Water, Agriculture, and Energy**. These factors **can lead to collapse when they** converge to **generate** two crucial social features: **[first]** "the stretching of resources due to the **strain** placed **on** the **ecological carrying capacity"; and [second]** "the **economic stratification of society into Elites** rich **and** Masses (or "**Commoners**") poor" **These social phenomena have played "a central role in** the character or in the process of the **collapse," in all such cases over "the last five thousand years."** Currently, **high levels of economic stratification are linked directly to overconsumption** of resources, with "Elites" based largely in industrialised countries responsible for both: "... accumulated surplus is not evenly distributed throughout society, but rather has been controlled by an elite. The mass of the population, while producing the wealth, is only allocated a small portion of it by elites, usually at or just above subsistence levels." The study challenges those who argue that technology will resolve these challenges by increasing efficiency: "Technological change can raise the efficiency of resource use, but it also tends to raise both per capita resource consumption and the scale of resource extraction, so that, absent policy effects, the increases in consumption often compensate for the increased efficiency of resource use." Productivity increases in agriculture and industry over the last two centuries has come from "increased (rather than decreased) resource throughput," despite dramatic efficiency gains over the same period. Modelling a range of different scenarios, Motesharrei and his colleagues conclude that under conditions "**closely reflecting the reality of the world today... we find that collapse is difficult to avoid."**

The Role of the Ballot is to refuse dominant ideologies of criminality- those are the ideas perpetuated by the government by who our enemies are.
Raymond G. Kessler 88 ‘IDEOLOGY AND GUN CONTROL” <https://www.saf.org/journal/other/kessler-id.htm> Reprinted by Permission of: ¦ ¦Quarterly Journal of Ideology ¦ ¦Vol. 12 #2(1988) pp. 1-13. ¦ KKJY
In general, those who control the economic or material forces in a society, control that society's intellectual forces thus, the ideology of the dominant classes becomes the dominant ideology (Marx and Engles, 1970:64-67). This control of consciousness is the most important nonviolent mechanism by which elites maintain their positions and justify social and economic inequality. Ideological hegemony is sustained in part by the constant diffusion and elaboration of the dominant ideology and exclusion of competing ideologies (see Wolfe, 1974:50; Milbrand, 1977:Ch.3). "Ideologies foster the suppression and repression of some interests, even as they give expression to others." (Gouldner, 1976:28). Further, the interests of the dominant class appear to be common interests of all members of society. These interests are expressed in ideal form and appear to be the only rational, universally valid one (Marx and Engels, 1970:65-66; Gouldner, 1976:28). However, this does not necessarily mean that theirs is conscious deception or manipulation by those involved in the creation and dissemination of ideas and information, including the mass media. They sincerely believe in the accuracy of their version of reality, and because of their power, their ideology becomes that of most individuals (Reiman, 1984:130-131). Contemporary American theorizing about government, economics and crime is dominated by those who support capitalism in one form or another. The consensus is, however, not perfect and there is conflict over specific policies among various powerful pro-capitalist factions (Domhoff 1978:117-l19). In the "political arena one sees not only classes, but fractions of classes and alliances of classes and class fractions" (Greenberg, 1981:193). To the extent there is any meaningful debate about issues, it centers around the differences between liberals and conservatives over their differing versions of the ideal capitalist society (Gordon, 1977:Ch.1).
This is a prior question to the 1AC- reforms to solve violent crime under the dominant paradigm of capitalism is impossible. Means absent resolving the link, the 1AC has no solvency.
SA 13 Socialist Appeal “USA: Gun Control and Class Struggle” Tuesday, 04 June 2013
<http://www.marxist.com/gun-control-and-class-struggle.htm> KKJY
There are no quick fixes to the problem of gun violence, and no solutions within the limits of capitalism, a system based on the organized exploitation and violence of one class against another. Only the organized and united working class can offer a solution to the violence of class society, whether it be perpetrated by the capitalist state when breaking a strike, or by unstable and alienated individuals on a killing rampage. The labor movement, by organizing a political party of its own, could begin to deal with the ills of our society—but only if that party is armed with a socialist program. Corporations like Colt and Smith and Wesson make huge profits from the sale of weapons. A workers’ government would nationalize the arms industry and place it under democratic workers’ control. Under a workers’ government, the working class would democratically organize itself to protect society. As socialism spreads worldwide, and relations between nations are increasingly based on solidarity, not expoitation, the need for national defense and the military will fade away, along with national borders themselves. Here at home, the need for a special police force standing above society, with special powers and privileges, would likewise disappear. With the immense wealth and resources of our society geared towards providing jobs and raising everyone’s standard of living, we could eliminate the instability, alienation, and inhuman conditions of capitalism that give rise to the senseless violence that plagues our society.
There are no solutions within the limits of capitalism because capitalism is the overriding force that turns these forms of violence into profit- NRA Gains money from the school shootings and gun culture at large.

Link
Aff makes resistance to cap impossible in their assumption that the state will properly represent minorities.
SA 13 Socialist Appeal “USA: Gun Control and Class Struggle” Tuesday, 04 June 2013
<http://www.marxist.com/gun-control-and-class-struggle.htm> KKJY
When capitalist politicians call for “gun control,” they are really saying that the working class majority should give more power to the bourgeois state in determining who should have access to arms. The capitalist class would breathe a sigh of relief at the complete disarmament of the working class. The capitalist state would then have a complete monopoly of arms, on top of its monopoly of the courts, prisons, police, spy agencies, military, etc. Therefore, from the point of view of the capitalist class, the real essence of “gun control” is not the disarming of criminal elements or unstable individuals—who would still have access to guns through illegal channels—it is the disarming of the working class on the whole. We have seen how this has been used in the past. When the Black Panthers had arms for self-defense, the bourgeois state violently attacked them. Far-right groups, on the other hand, are armed to the teeth and the state typically looks the other way.
Impact
The impact is throwing problems of class under the bus- focus of the 1AC on homicides etc conceal the cause of them and death by those who don’t matter because they aren’t productive. An attempt to reform the current capitalist system is an attempt to throw it’s offspring- eg the impoverished – under the bus and out of solutions
Raymond G. Kessler 88 ‘IDEOLOGY AND GUN CONTROL” <https://www.saf.org/journal/other/kessler-id.htm> Reprinted by Permission of: ¦ ¦Quarterly Journal of Ideology ¦ ¦Vol. 12 #2(1988) pp. 1-13. ¦ KKJY
One component of the dominant ideology is an "ideology of crime" Quinney, 1979:194) which includes conceptions of both the causation and amelioration of crime. The dominant ideology of crime in America has two major branches, and a number of aspects of these “liberal” and “conservative” approaches to crime (i.e., "ideologies of crime" have been discussed elsewhere (Gordon, 1977:Ch.6; Miller, 1978; Walker, 1986:Pt. 2,4). Suffice it to say that while each approach includes criticisms of different allegedly criminogenic details of American life, neither seriously addresses the role of the political economy of a capitalist society in the generation of violence. While much liberal rhetoric focuses on the need for major social reform to deal with crime, liberal policies rarely go beyond "social tinkering" (Walker, 1986:212,220). For instance, "neither liberal democrats nor conservative republicans have offered a realistic program for massive job creation" (Walker, 1986:220) or any program that seriously dealt with basic structural problems (Walker, 1986;212) or class dominance. Most of the public, social scientists, and politicians subscribe to the dominant (i.e., contemporary American capitalist) ideology of crime. This ideology includes the assumption that it is possible to create an effective but still humanitarian system of crime control under the present economic and political framework. Proposals for reform are invariably formulated within a structure of corporate capitalism and designed to shape new adjustments to existing political and economic conditions. Radical solutions to the crime problem are rejected and labeled "utopian" (see Platt, 1974:357-359; Greenberg, 1981:9; Reiman, 1984:118-135). The Assumptions of Gun Control In order to examine the ideological dimensions of gun control policies, it is necessary to discuss some of the assumptions underlying these policies. Although different gun control advocates utilize different approaches, their basic assumptions are generally of two types--the "causal model" and the "relative lethality" model." The causal model assumes that firearms somehow cause, stimulate or, at the very least, facilitate or encourage violent crime. A prominent police organization (quoted is Alviani and Drake, 1975;52) concludes that “there is a causal connection between the easy availability of firearms and juvenile and youth criminal behavior. . . .” A former Attorney General (Clark, 1970:104) contends that "easy access to guns causes thousands of preventable murders. . . ." A psychologist contends (Berkowitz, 1986:22) that firearms "not only permit violence, they can stimulate it as well. The finger pulls the trigger, but the trigger may also be pulling the finger." The relative lethality model rests on the thesis that most homicides and assaults are not premeditated but result from relatively spontaneous outbursts of violence generated by disputes between spouses, friends, neighbors, etc. It is not contended that firearms cause the dispute. The assumption is that if there is a gun available, the enraged disputant is likely to use it. If a gun is not available, other weapons (e.g., knives, clubs, etc.) will be used. Proponents of this model argue that guns are markedly more lethal than other weapons and that by eliminating guns less harm will be inflicted by the attacker (see Newton and Zimring, 1970:Ch. 7). Ideological Functions Conceptions of crime and crime control are perpetuated because they serve a variety of group and individual psychological interests, not just the system-maintenance interests of elites. Analysis must extend beyond elite interests, and public support for the dominant ideology can be explained at least in part by the fact that this ideology also serves other interests including the short term interests of the public (see Bohm, 1986:l99,200; Grundy and Weinstein, 1974:307). The Elite The dominant ideology of crime (see Reiman 1984:Ch. 2) has at least two facets clearly relevant here. First is a focus on one-on-one harm. This focus keeps attention diverted away from the more serious forms of social harms caused or tolerated by elites such as death and injury from occupational diseases and hazards, pollution, and infant mortality among the poor (Reiman 1984:Ch. 2). Second, when holding individuals and groups legally responsible and/or morally responsible for crime, it is implicitly assumed that fundamental social or economic conditions are not responsible (Reimar 1984: 119). Blaming gun owners, the "gun lobby," and/or gun manufacturers, or guns in general, diverts attention away from other more basic factors. The relative lethality model takes disputes, their intensity, and the willingness to use violence in general to settle disputes, as givens rather than conditions to be explained and ameliorated by reference to basic social or economic features. Both models ignore the possibility that the causes of violent crime may be in the political, racial and economic inequality, unemployment alienation and value distortion generated by capitalism (see Bonger 1916:Pt. 2). A specific example of these ideological functions is the frequently drawn regional comparisons of homicide rates. Both are higher in the South and the conclusion drawn is that there is some type of causal connection between the two rates (e.g. Alviani and Drake, 1975:102). What such speculation ignores is the persuasive evidence that the high late of criminal violence in the South is due mainly to the lower prevailing socioeconomic conditions of the region" (Wright, Rossi and Daly, 1983:13). Because elimination of these alleged causes might require radical changes in the political and economic structure (Quinney 1974:186-192), it is in the interest of those who benefit disproportionately from the status quo, including those whose reforms are limited to "social tinkering," to keep attention focused on convenient scapegoats such as firearms.2
Proves we outweigh under the RoB- politicians like the aff want to scapegoat issues of institutional classism and pin it on the gun or the criminal and totally ignore the millions who die to state sponsored crime- the idea that those who are poor are disposable and unproductive, while championing the bourgeoisie who can trust the federal government in protecting their pockets.
Alternative
The alternative is a reframing of the gun debate- it’s not a question of ban guns or have guns to protect yourself, it’s a shift in present conditions that make the conditions of death by gun necessary.
Phil 12 Dec 15 2012 17:18 “A class struggle perspective on the gun control debate” <https://libcom.org/blog/class-struggle-perspective-gun-control-debate-15122012> KKJY
Firstly, the popular perception across the pond is that the ruling class has succeeded in atomising American society and isolating individuals to a far greater extent perhaps than anywhere else. (Hence part of the reason why the 2011 Wisconsin protests or the Wal Mart strikes were so important.) In part, that's the mythology the country was built on - rugged individualism and the liberty of those with property - but it's also the result of an official union movement that is thoroughly institutionalised and a "left" tied to a party that doesn't even offer the hollow pretences that the UK Labour Party does. Secondly, as already discussed above, we know where alienation and desperation lead. Many in the UK have found it hard to come to terms with the class content of last year's riots. It may be harder for Americans to associate mass murder, especially of children, with the effects of class and capitalism. But in the absence of a positive collective response, the eruption of social tensions is pretty much bound to be so uncontrolled and ugly. Throw the right to bear arms, extremely high gun ownership and any other social factors from the dynamics of high school to the rhetoric of the hard right in the mix, and you've got a recipe for far more gun homicides than anywhere else in the world and lots of high profile massacres. But whilst America has far more instances of this type of crime than anywhere else, it holds no monopoly on them or on other forms of desperate, tragic violence. Atomisation, alienation, poverty and the complete absence of hope are the inevitable results of capitalism. The backlash against that (conscious or subconscious) may be massacres, riots or suicides, but it will be there. The real debate isn't whether we ban guns or whether we arm everyone to defend against the madmen lurking around every corner. It's how we build a real movement against the present conditions so that people's only option isn't to kill ourselves or each other.
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