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### Framing

#### From drone strikes abroad to policing dissent at our premier universities- objectivity is a lie and ethical standpoints have been constructed by militarism. The role of the ballot is to serve as a site for knowledge production and critical dialogue which is essential to deconstructing flawed epistemic biases.

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

In a post-9/11 world, the U.S. university has become a particularly charged site for debates about nationalism, patriotism, citizenship, and democracy. The “crisis” of academic freedom emerges from events such as the ones we witnessed in Riverside and Davis but also in many other campuses where administrative policing flexes its muscles along with the batons, chemical weapons, and riot gear of police and SWAT teams and where containment and censorship of political critique is enacted through the collusion of the university, partisan off-campus groups and networks, and the state. After 9/11, we have witnessed a calamitously repressive series of well-coordinated attacks against scholars who have dared to challenge the national consen- sus on U.S. wars and overseas occupations. Yet there has been stunningly little scholarly attention paid to this policing of knowledge, especially against academics who have dared to challenge the national consensus on U.S. wars and overseas occupations and U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. Simultaneously, the growing privatization of the public university, as in California, has demonstrated the ways in which the gates of access to public higher education are increasingly closed and the more subtle ways in which dissident scholarly and pedagogical work (and their institutional locations) is delegitimized and—in particularly telling instances—censored at both public and private institutions. The 9/11 attacks and the crises of late capital- ism in the global North have intensified the crisis of repression in the United States and also the ongoing restructuring of the academy—as well as resis- tance to that process—here as well as in the global South.2 What does it mean, then, to challenge the collusion of the university with militarism and occupation, the privatization of higher education, and economies of knowledge from within the U.S. university? When scholars and students who openly connect U.S. state formation to imperialism, war, and racial violence are disciplined, then how are we to understand freedom, aca- demic and otherwise? How is post-9/11 policing and surveillance linked to racial, gendered, and class practices in the neoliberal academy? Has the War on Terror simply deepened a much longer historical pattern of wartime cen- sorship and monitoring of intellectual work or is this something new? This edited volume offers reports from the trenches of a war on scholarly dissent that has raged for two or three decades now and has intensified since 9/11, analyzed by some of the very scholars who have been targeted or have directly engaged in these battles. The stakes here are high. These dissenting scholars and the knowledges they produce are constructed by right-wing critics as a threat to U.S. power and global hegemony, as has been the case in earlier moments in U.S. history, particularly during the Cold War. Much discussion of incidents where academics have been denied tenure or publicly attacked for their critique of U.S. foreign or domestic policies, as in earlier moments, has centered on the important question of academic fAreedom. However, the chapters in this book break new ground by demonstrating that what is really at work in these attacks are the logics of racism, warfare, and nationalism that undergird U.S. imperialism and also the architecture of the U.S. academy. Our argument here is that these logics shape a systemic struc- ture of repression of academic knowledge that counters the imperial, nation- building project. The premise of this book is that the U.S. academy is an “imperial uni- versity.” As in all imperial and colonial nations, intellectuals and scholarship play an important role—directly or indirectly, willingly or unwittingly—in legitimizing American exceptionalism and rationalizing U.S. expansionism and repression, domestically and globally. The title of this book, then, is not a rhetorical flourish but offers a concept that is grounded in the particular imperial formation of the United States, one that is in many ways ambigu- ous and shape-shifting.3 It is important to note that U.S. imperialism is char- acterized by deterritorialized, flexible, and covert practices of subjugation and violence and as such does not resemble historical forms of European colonialism that depended on territorial colonialism.4 As a settler-colonial nation, it has over time developed various strategies of control that include proxy wars, secret interventions, and client regimes aimed at maintaining its political, economic, and military dominance around the globe, as well as cul- tural interventions and “soft power.” The chapters here help to illuminate and historicize the role of the U.S. university in legitimizing notions of Manifest Destiny and foundational mythologies of settler colonialism and exceptional democracy as well as the attempts by scholars and students to challenge and subvert them. This book demonstrates the ways in which the academy’s role in support- ing state policies is crucial, even—and especially—as a presumably liberal institution. Indeed, it is precisely the support of a liberal class that is always critical for the maintenance of “benevolent empire.”5 As U.S. military and overseas interventions are increasingly framed as humanitarian wars—to save oppressed others and rescue victimized women—it is liberal ideolo- gies of gender, sexuality, religion, pluralism, and democracy that are key to uphold.6 The university is a key battleground in these culture wars and in producing as well as contesting knowledges about the state of the nation. We argue that the state of permanent war that is core to U.S. imperialism and racial statecraft has three fronts: military, cultural, and academic. Our conceptualization of the imperial university links these fronts of war, for the academic battleground is part of the culture wars that emerge in a milita- rized nation, one that is always presumably under threat, externally or inter- nally. Debates about national identity and national culture shape the battles over academic freedom and the role of the university in defining the racial boundaries of the nation and its “proper” subjects and “proper” politics. Furthermore, pedagogies of nationhood, race, gender, sexuality, class, and culture within the imperial nation are fundamentally intertwined with the interests of neoliberal capital and the possibilities of economic dominance. The chapters here link the critique of the university to the contemporary as well as historical workings of race, warfare, and the nation-state. They demonstrate that an analysis of the foundational linkages between the U.S. academy and the imperial nation-state need to be critically scrutinized, especially in the post-9/11 moment, and that overseas imperial interventions are linked to domestic repression, policing, and containment that penetrate the university. In drawing attention to the core issue of U.S. imperialism, this volume goes beyond a liberal discourse of academic freedom, one that is generally bounded by the nation and individual rights. Shifting the focus from notions of freedom of expression, the chapters here link the battles over knowledge production and the policing of critical scholarship to the geopoli- tics of U.S. imperialism across historical time and space. The contributors to this book bring together seemingly disparate geographic areas and historical moments that are key sites of U.S. expansionism and U.S.-backed occupation (such as the Philippines, Palestine, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) as well as varied fields of scholarship (such as American studies, cultural studies, Middle East studies, feminist studies, queer studies, and ethnic studies) precisely to show how knowledge building is central to the imperial project.

#### Militarism causes both international and domestic violence through the logic of disposability

**Trautman 16** [Brian Trautman (PeaceVoice, military veteran, instructor of peace studies at Berkshire Community College) “Police Response in Ferguson Rooted in Systemic Violence and Militarism”, Common Dreams 2-20-2016] NB

To better understand, effectively reduce, and eventually prevent the underlying factors which led to thew police slaying of Mike Brown and other unarmed citizens, we must openly debate two major forms of violence prevalent in the United States: systemic violence (aka structural violence) and militarism. Systemic violence is the type of violence that is deeply-embedded in a nation’s social, economic, educational, political, legal and environmental frameworks, and tends to be rooted in government policy. It is organized violence with an historical context, and often manifests in subtle but very specific and destructive ways. Examples include entrenched racism, classism and discrimination and economic inequality and relative poverty. Systemic violence paves the way for authoritarian and undemocratic values such as exploitation, marginalization and repression, especially of underrepresented, underprivileged populations. Militarism is the ideology that a nation must maintain a strong military capability and must use, or threaten to use, force to protect and advance national interests. America’s militaristic approach to overseas conflicts can be found in many aspects of its domestic policies. Systemic violence and militarism are interconnected and mutually dependent. They go hand in hand, building on and reinforcing each other. Both define and direct American policing, which regularly treats citizens like enemies of the state. We need not look further for an example than the military-style police assault in Ferguson. Systemic violence and militarism are responsible for the flow of military grade equipment such as mine resistance vehicles and semi-automatic weapons to police departments across the country. In an op-ed I wrote last month entitled “Escalating Domestic Warfare,” I discussed a report from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) on the emergence of a militarist ethos in American policing. The ACLU’s research showed that the militarization of police has become excessive and lethal. For example, SWAT teams are being deployed primarily to serve search warrants in low-level drug cases, and these teams are using methods and equipment traditionally reserved for war to do so. The ACLU also found that police militarization increased substantially after each of three major national events: the initiation of the “War on Drugs,” the attacks of 9-11, and a series of Supreme Court decisions which have eroded the rights guaranteed in the Fourth Amendment. Over the past two decades, the violent crime rate in the United States has decreased sharply. The militarization of policing, then, is counter-intuitive. Historically, nations that have militarized their police have done so not because of violent crime but rather to rapidly quell potential mass civil uprisings against tyranny, oppression and injustice. A statement released by Veterans for Peace (VFP), a global organization of military veterans and allies working to build a culture of peace, calls for justice for Mike Brown and his family through, in part, “a complete, swift and transparent investigation” into his death. VFP strongly condemns the use of violence – in any form – to secure justice. Instead, they implore protestors “to continue to channel their anger towards building power, solidarity and creating change nonviolently…” The organization expresses deep outrage for the state violence in Ferguson: “police over reaction to community expressions of grief and anger is the outcome of a national mindset that violence will solve any problem.” According to VFP, the military-industrial complex and a permanent war mentality are two major sources of this violence: “Thirteen years of war has militarized our whole society. We see equipment designed for the battlefield used in our nation’s streets against our citizens. We see police in uniforms and using weapons indistinguishable from the military.” This militaristic approach to domestic policing, says VFP, has resulted in tragedy on our streets: “Week after week we see reports of police abuse and killings of innocent and unarmed civilians.” Justice for the victims is often denied: “time and time again we see police given impunity for their crimes and citizens left in disbelief wondering where to turn next.” VFP reminds us of the repeated targeting of communities of color by police. The Ferguson protests are a natural reaction to this legacy of mistreatment and injustice. Police brutality against young black males, in particular, VFP argues, was a powder keg waiting to explode: “the unrest in Ferguson and similar incidents of citizen rebellions are the outcome of state abuse and neglect, not of hoodlums and opportunists. Eventually, any people who are held down will attempt to standup.” VFP’s statement also warns that militarism at home cannot be solved until we end our nation’s militarism abroad: “We cannot call for peace in the streets at home and at the same time conduct war for thirteen years in the streets of other nations.” America's violent system of policing and its antagonistic foreign policy are interrelated. Therefore, they must be addressed together before reforms can be effective and help to end our culture of violence. Solutions-based approaches begin with local, state and federal legislators acknowledging that many current laws and policies create and fuel systemic violence and militarism. They must then find the wisdom and muster the courage to act to change or abandon those laws and policies. One strategy that our towns and cities can adopt to contribute to this process is nonviolent community policing. Retired police captain Charles L. Alphin, who served for over twenty-six years in the St. Louis City Police Department, offers suggestions for such a policing model in an article titled “Kingian Non-violence: A Practical Application in Policing.” Alphin believes Kingian nonviolence holds great potential for American policing. He gives examples of how this model of policing can work using Dr. King’s philosophy of nonviolence. Alphin contends, as Dr. King did, that how we approach policing cannot stand alone from teaching nonviolence in the school, home, streets and in every phase of life. Alphin also explains that he applied Kingian philosophy effectively in interrogation of criminal suspects and in the organization of communities to get at the root causes of violence and drugs, effectively empowering communities to identify and work on these problems at the grassroots level (note: this community-based solution to violence is a feature of the theory and practice of transformative justice). There is an urgent need for models of paramilitary policing to be replaced with models of nonviolent community policing. Freedom and democracy are at stake. So are the lives of our innocent citizens. The killing of Mike Brown can be a pivotal moment for how we treat the systemic violence and militarism that produced the policing system of today. Ferguson has awakened many Americans to the realities of police militarism on their streets and to the urgent need to demilitarize the police. We cannot afford public apathy on this issue any longer. The people must insist on alternative models of policing that respect and protect civil and human rights. To reverse the trend of police violence in this country, we must work to eliminate the systemic and militaristic roots of this violence, remembering that military-style policing is inextricably linked to America’s belligerence abroad. No matter how you slice it, the weapons of war and other violent tactics used against Ferguson protestors will go down as a tragic chapter in American history. Still, robust and meaningful people-powered action for progressive social change can help make this chapter a turning point toward the positive transformation of policing in the United States. This action, change, and transformation are inevitable because justice demands it.

### Framing- Phil

#### From drone strikes abroad to policing dissent at our premier universities- objectivity is a lie and ethical standpoints have been constructed by militarism. The role of the ballot is to serve as a site for knowledge production and critical dialogue which is essential to deconstructing flawed epistemic biases.

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

In a post-9/11 world, the U.S. university has become a particularly charged site for debates about nationalism, patriotism, citizenship, and democracy. The “crisis” of academic freedom emerges from events such as the ones we witnessed in Riverside and Davis but also in many other campuses where administrative policing flexes its muscles along with the batons, chemical weapons, and riot gear of police and SWAT teams and where containment and censorship of political critique is enacted through the collusion of the university, partisan off-campus groups and networks, and the state. After 9/11, we have witnessed a calamitously repressive series of well-coordinated attacks against scholars who have dared to challenge the national consen- sus on U.S. wars and overseas occupations. Yet there has been stunningly little scholarly attention paid to this policing of knowledge, especially against academics who have dared to challenge the national consensus on U.S. wars and overseas occupations and U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. Simultaneously, the growing privatization of the public university, as in California, has demonstrated the ways in which the gates of access to public higher education are increasingly closed and the more subtle ways in which dissident scholarly and pedagogical work (and their institutional locations) is delegitimized and—in particularly telling instances—censored at both public and private institutions. The 9/11 attacks and the crises of late capital- ism in the global North have intensified the crisis of repression in the United States and also the ongoing restructuring of the academy—as well as resis- tance to that process—here as well as in the global South.2 What does it mean, then, to challenge the collusion of the university with militarism and occupation, the privatization of higher education, and economies of knowledge from within the U.S. university? When scholars and students who openly connect U.S. state formation to imperialism, war, and racial violence are disciplined, then how are we to understand freedom, aca- demic and otherwise? How is post-9/11 policing and surveillance linked to racial, gendered, and class practices in the neoliberal academy? Has the War on Terror simply deepened a much longer historical pattern of wartime cen- sorship and monitoring of intellectual work or is this something new? This edited volume offers reports from the trenches of a war on scholarly dissent that has raged for two or three decades now and has intensified since 9/11, analyzed by some of the very scholars who have been targeted or have directly engaged in these battles. The stakes here are high. These dissenting scholars and the knowledges they produce are constructed by right-wing critics as a threat to U.S. power and global hegemony, as has been the case in earlier moments in U.S. history, particularly during the Cold War. Much discussion of incidents where academics have been denied tenure or publicly attacked for their critique of U.S. foreign or domestic policies, as in earlier moments, has centered on the important question of academic fAreedom. However, the chapters in this book break new ground by demonstrating that what is really at work in these attacks are the logics of racism, warfare, and nationalism that undergird U.S. imperialism and also the architecture of the U.S. academy. Our argument here is that these logics shape a systemic struc- ture of repression of academic knowledge that counters the imperial, nation- building project. The premise of this book is that the U.S. academy is an “imperial uni- versity.” As in all imperial and colonial nations, intellectuals and scholarship play an important role—directly or indirectly, willingly or unwittingly—in legitimizing American exceptionalism and rationalizing U.S. expansionism and repression, domestically and globally. The title of this book, then, is not a rhetorical flourish but offers a concept that is grounded in the particular imperial formation of the United States, one that is in many ways ambigu- ous and shape-shifting.3 It is important to note that U.S. imperialism is char- acterized by deterritorialized, flexible, and covert practices of subjugation and violence and as such does not resemble historical forms of European colonialism that depended on territorial colonialism.4 As a settler-colonial nation, it has over time developed various strategies of control that include proxy wars, secret interventions, and client regimes aimed at maintaining its political, economic, and military dominance around the globe, as well as cul- tural interventions and “soft power.” The chapters here help to illuminate and historicize the role of the U.S. university in legitimizing notions of Manifest Destiny and foundational mythologies of settler colonialism and exceptional democracy as well as the attempts by scholars and students to challenge and subvert them. This book demonstrates the ways in which the academy’s role in support- ing state policies is crucial, even—and especially—as a presumably liberal institution. Indeed, it is precisely the support of a liberal class that is always critical for the maintenance of “benevolent empire.”5 As U.S. military and overseas interventions are increasingly framed as humanitarian wars—to save oppressed others and rescue victimized women—it is liberal ideolo- gies of gender, sexuality, religion, pluralism, and democracy that are key to uphold.6 The university is a key battleground in these culture wars and in producing as well as contesting knowledges about the state of the nation. We argue that the state of permanent war that is core to U.S. imperialism and racial statecraft has three fronts: military, cultural, and academic. Our conceptualization of the imperial university links these fronts of war, for the academic battleground is part of the culture wars that emerge in a milita- rized nation, one that is always presumably under threat, externally or inter- nally. Debates about national identity and national culture shape the battles over academic freedom and the role of the university in defining the racial boundaries of the nation and its “proper” subjects and “proper” politics. Furthermore, pedagogies of nationhood, race, gender, sexuality, class, and culture within the imperial nation are fundamentally intertwined with the interests of neoliberal capital and the possibilities of economic dominance. The chapters here link the critique of the university to the contemporary as well as historical workings of race, warfare, and the nation-state. They demonstrate that an analysis of the foundational linkages between the U.S. academy and the imperial nation-state need to be critically scrutinized, especially in the post-9/11 moment, and that overseas imperial interventions are linked to domestic repression, policing, and containment that penetrate the university. In drawing attention to the core issue of U.S. imperialism, this volume goes beyond a liberal discourse of academic freedom, one that is generally bounded by the nation and individual rights. Shifting the focus from notions of freedom of expression, the chapters here link the battles over knowledge production and the policing of critical scholarship to the geopoli- tics of U.S. imperialism across historical time and space. The contributors to this book bring together seemingly disparate geographic areas and historical moments that are key sites of U.S. expansionism and U.S.-backed occupation (such as the Philippines, Palestine, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) as well as varied fields of scholarship (such as American studies, cultural studies, Middle East studies, feminist studies, queer studies, and ethnic studies) precisely to show how knowledge building is central to the imperial project.

#### Also warrants nonideal theory:

#### A. they are actively used by dominant structures to promote ideals of militarism which avoids clearer ethical ideas

#### B. Objectivity is impossible in a world of real ethics because the academy has been construed

#### C. Prerequisite to other ethical theories- we need to be a part of ethical deliberation and ethics in order for it to matter

### Harms

#### The collusion between the military and the academy such as investment funds and resarch is connected to a broader imperial project

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

The bursts of dissent (both within scholarly production and in student protests and the Occupy movement) suggest that “business as usual” is being disrupted in the U.S. university. However, this dissent—and the modes of repression it provokes—begs the question of what sustains “business as usual.” Our introductory vignette, juxtaposing the bucolic green of a “peace- ful” campus with the performance of militarized power, offers our unease with the normalized terms of “peace” in our elysian surroundings, not to mention with the complicity of the U.S. state with military occupations elsewhere and the lockdown on open critique of particular foreign states. The police in riot gear do not signal something exceptional; rather, their presence unmasks the codes of “the normal” in academic discourse and practice. It is a normalization that we see routinely in the grants that we are encouraged to apply for and in Department of Defense funding that many scientists, social scientists, and technologists receive for their research, as discussed in Roberto González’s chapter. The capital provided by these grants has built the foundations of some of the most powerful and preeminent universities in the world: MIT, Stanford, UC Berkeley, California Institute of Technology (Caltech), and many others. The alliance between military research and sci- ence, which is well known, builds the deepest strata of connection and com- plicity between imperial statecraft and the knowledge complex of the U.S. academy. This, also, is nothing new, as González and Oparah demonstrate in analyzing the historical, global economies within which U.S. intelligence and prison systems enact violent logics of incapacitation and counterinsurgency. The contributors to this book seek to illuminate the historical continu- ities of crisis and the boundaries of regulation and containment, especially in the current moment, because they reveal the threshold of academic repres- sion. This involves connecting analyses of localized domestic dissent (e.g., in student protests) to the censorship of scholarship and pedagogies of cri- tique of U.S. state projects (especially related to support for Israel and the domestic and global frontlines of the War on Terror). Many of the chapters highlight that the regulation and repression of various forms of dissent share core ideologies—about corporate and militarized capitalism as the means and ends of state power as well as the deeper codes of cultural, racial, and national supremacy that they enable. When the University of California debates the purchase of an army tank, as it did in Berkeley in 2012, it crudely reveals the profound strategic confluence of military science and militarized praxis in fortifying the citadels of higher learning.

#### Academic containment of both scholars and students fuel the imperial project which sacrifices the rights of faculty and students in the name of security

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

State warfare and militarism have shored up deeply powerful notions of patriotism, intertwined with a politics of race, class, gender, sexuality, and religion, through the culture wars that have embroiled the U.S. academy. The fronts of “hot” and “cold” wars—military, cultural, and academic—have rested on an ideological framework that has defined the “enemy” as a threat to U.S. freedom and democracy. This enemy produced and propped up in the shifting culture wars—earlier the Communist, now the (Muslim) terrorist— has always been both external and internal. The overt policing of knowledge production, exemplified by right-wing groups such as ACTA, reveals an ideo- logical battle cry in the “culture wars” that have burgeoned in the wake of the civil rights movement—and the containment and policing demanded within the academy. Defending the civilizational integrity of the nation requires producing a national subject and citizen by regulating the boundaries of what is permissible and desirable to express in national culture—and in the university. As Readings observed, “In modernity, the University becomes the model of the social bond that ties individuals in a common relation to the idea of the nation-state.”46 Belonging is figured through the metaphor of patriotic citizenship, in the nation and in the academy, through displays of what Henry Giroux has also called “patriotic correctness”: “an ideology that privileges conformity over critical learning and that represents dissent as something akin to a terrorist act.”47 This is where the recent culture wars have shaped the politics of what we call academic containment. For right-wing activists, the nation must be fortified by an educational foundation that upholds, at its core, the singular superiority of Western civilization. A nation-state construed as being under attack is in a state of cultural crisis where any sign of disloyalty to the nation is an act of treachery, including acts perceived as intellectual betrayal. The culture wars have worked to uphold a powerful mythology about American democracy and the American Dream and a potent fiction about freedom of expression that in actuality contains academic dissent. This exceptionalist mythology has historically represented the U.S. nation as a beacon of indi- vidual liberty and a bulwark against the Evil Empire or Communist bloc; Third Worldist and left insurgent movements, including uprisings within the United States in the 1960s and 1970s and in Central America in the 1980s; Islamist militancy and anti-imperial movements since the 1980s; and the threat posed by all of these to the American “way of life.” The battle against Communism, anti-imperial Third Worldism, and so-called Islamofascism entailed regulating and containing movements sympathetic to these forces at home, including intellectuals with left-leaning tendencies and radical schol- ars or students—all those likely to contaminate young minds and indoctri- nate students in “subversive” or “anti-American” ideologies. What does it mean, then, to contain scholars who “cross the line” in their academic work or public engagement? Academic containment can take on many modalities: stigmatizing an academic as too “political,” devaluing and marginalizing scholarship, unleashing an FBI investigation, blacklist- ing, or not granting scholars the final passport into elite citizenship in the academic nation—that is, tenure. These various modalities of containment, which are discussed by Thomas Abowd, Laura Pulido, and Steven Salaita, among others, narrow the universe of discourse around what is really per- missible, acceptable, and tolerable for scholars in the imperial university. All these modes are at work in the three important moments of ideological policing that we touch on here: World War I and the McCarthy era of the 1940s–1950s, the COINTELPRO era from the late 1950s to early 1970s, and the post-9/11 era or “new Cold War,” which is the major focus of this book. Moments of social stress and open dissent about class politics in the United States during World War I and the first decades of the twentieth cen- tury make clear that containment worked in tandem with emerging defi- nitions of “academic freedom.” As the U.S. professoriate began to build its ranks at the end of the nineteenth century and a few scholars48 challenged the status quo, “academic freedom” emerged as a way to deal with these dis- senters as well as the “relative insecurity” felt by many in this new profes- sion.49 Indeed, the tumult of the turn of the century led to a pattern within the academy that has persisted—the exclusion of ideas as well as behavior that the majority did not like and an increasingly internalized notion that “advocacy for social change” was a professional risk for academics. The AAUP’s Seligman Report of 1915 reveals that the notion of academic freedom was, in fact, “deeply enmeshed” with the “overall status, security, and prestige of the academic profession.”50 Setting up procedural safeguards was important, but its language regarding “appropriate scholarly behavior” and cautiousness about responding to controversial matters in the academy (by ensuring that all sides of the case were presented) suggested the limits of dissent. Academic freedom, then, is a notion that is deeply bound up with academic containment—a paradox suggested in our earlier discussion of protest and inclusion/incorporation in the academy and one that has become increasingly institutionalized since the formation of the AAUP. The academic repression of the McCarthy era received its impetus from President Truman’s March 22, 1947, executive order that “established a new loyalty secrecy program for federal employees.” However, the roots of insti- tutional capitulation—by both administrators and faculty—when the state targeted academics who were communists or viewed as “sympathizers” are much deeper. It is also significant that the notion of “appropriate behavior” for faculty rested on a majoritarian academic “consensus” about “civil” and “collegial” comportment. For example, Ellen Schechter notes cases prior to the Cold War where scholars were fired not necessarily for their political affiliations per se but due to “their outspoken-ness.”51 This repression from within—not just beyond—the academy reveals the cultures of academic con- tainment where, as Pulido, Gumbs, and Rojas remind us, certain kinds of “unruliness” must be managed or excised.

#### They Continue:

The post-9/11 panic about Muslim terrorists and enemy aliens increas- ingly focused on the threat of “homegrown terrorism” as the War on Ter- ror shifted its focus to “radicalized” communities within the United States, especially Muslim American youth. At the same time, as Godrej observes, the criminalization of those considered threats to national security has included the violent repression of Occupy activists and student protesters and indefinite detention authorized by the PATRIOT (Provide Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism) Act and the National Defense Authorization Act. Protests focused on higher education thus blur into dissent against U.S. warfare and the homeland security state in a cli- mate of heightened campus securitization and university collaboration with the FBI in the interest of “public safety.” Anarchists are considered domestic terror threats to be contained, and Muslim or Arab American students (or faculty) who are also anarchists are subjected to multiple levels of contain- ment and scrutiny, as suggested in the chapter by Falcón et al. Academic containment is clearly part of a larger politics of repression and policing in the national security state that affects faculty and students as well as the cam- pus climate in general.

### Solvency

#### Thus, the advocacy: Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict constitutionally protected speech. The plan is critical to student activism.

**Kurtz 15** [Stanley Kurtz (Senior Fellow at Ethics and Public Policy Center), 12-7-2015, "A Plan to Restore Free Speech on Campus," National Review, <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/428122/plan-restore-free-speech-campus-stanley-kurtz>] NB

Many of the proposals listed below can be mandated for public universities by state legislatures. These proposals can also galvanize student activism on campuses across the country, as well as activism by faculty, parents, alumni, administrators, trustees, and citizens. Alumni can press their alma maters to adopt these proposals, on pain of losing donations. Citizens can press their state legislators to adopt these proposals, on pain of losing votes. Here is the program: First: Colleges and universities ought to adopt a policy on freedom of expression modeled on Yale’s Woodward Report of 1974, which identifies ensuring intellectual freedom in the pursuit of knowledge as the primary obligation of a university. While the Woodward Report forthrightly acknowledges the importance of solidarity, harmony, civility, and mutual respect to campus life, it unmistakably marks these values as subordinate in priority to freedom of expression. In accordance with this, the Woodward Report rejects the proposition that members of an academic community are entitled to suppress speech they regard as offensive. Of course, within a university, the need for intellectual freedom is in the service of the pursuit of knowledge. Freedom of expression is a critical consideration, yet does not in itself fully resolve issues like the structure of the college curriculum. That said, the Woodward Report can and should serve as a model for statements on free expression at our colleges and universities. Once adopted, new statements on freedom of expression would supersede and replace any pre-existing speech codes. Second: Colleges and universities need to systematically educate members of their community in the principles of free expression. The central theme of freshman orientation, for example, ought to turn around the primacy of free speech. Many colleges and universities now assign incoming freshman a “common reading” to complete over the summer before entering school. During freshman year, colleges organize seminars and guest-lectures around that reading. The National Association of Scholars has reported on the thin and tendentious nature of many common reading selections, and I have commented on their politicization. As an antidote to such problems, colleges should consider assigning John Stuart Mill’s On Liberty as a common reading for entering freshmen. Responding to threats to intellectual freedom at Princeton, a student group, the Princeton Open Campus Coalition, recently called for bringing more representatives of seldom-heard viewpoints to campus. Inviting outside speakers to address John Stuart Mill’s argument for liberty of thought and discussion during freshman orientation would be an easy way to draw unconventional voices to campus. At every level of the university, efforts should be made to invite both outsiders and insiders to study, discuss, and debate the scope and meaning of free speech. Political philosopher Peter Berkowitz recently floated the idea of establishing university centers for the study and practice of free speech. These centers would “foster an understanding of free speech and its indissoluble connection with liberal education.” The founding of such centers on our campuses should become a priority. Third: “A university administration’s responsibility for assuring free expression imposes further obligations: it must act firmly when a speech is disrupted or when disruption is attempted; it must undertake to identify disruptors, and it must make known its intentions to do so beforehand.” The above passage is from Yale’s Woodward Report. Although the Woodward Report is official university policy at Yale, some of its central recommendations are apparently not being taken seriously. Consider the recent controversy over freedom of speech at Yale, where a student had to be dragged out of a lecture hall by a police officer after disrupting the William F. Buckley, Jr. Program’s conference on free speech (video here). The conduct of this student would appear to be a violation of Yale’s Undergraduate Regulations on “peaceful dissent, protests, and demonstrations” (derived from the Woodward Report), which bar any member of the University community from preventing “the orderly conduct of a University function or activity, such as a lecture, meeting…or other public event,” on pain of potential suspension or expulsion. If Yale’s regulations were being properly enforced, this student would have faced a disciplinary hearing. Ultimately, if the facts turned out to be as they appear from the video and published reports, some sort of discipline would result — at minimum, a warning that any further such actions would bring certain suspension or expulsion. To all appearances, no such discipline has taken place. And appearances are important, because a core recommendation of the Woodward Report is that in order to serve as effective deterrents to further violations, sanctions for disruption of speech must be publicized. (I have submitted a series of questions to Yale’s administration on disciplinary proceedings related to the disruption at the Buckley Program conference on free speech, and will report when I receive a reply.) We take it for granted nowadays that conduct like this student’s disruption of the Yale free-speech conference — and conduct far worse — entails no consequences for students. If we are to restore free speech to our campuses, that needs to change. In the absence of a deeper understanding of the principles of free expression, discipline alone will not be effective. Yet in combination with broader education in the principles of intellectual freedom, discipline for interference with campus speech can be very effective indeed. We will not see freedom of speech on our campuses until disruptors face discipline for silencing, or attempting to silence, others. Fourth: College and university trustees must monitor administrators to ensure that they promote and defend freedom of expression. Thomas D. Klingenstein, chairman of the board of the Claremont Institute, recently suggested that college and university trustees establish a board-level standing committee on free expression (COFE), and provide that committee with staff and considerable independence. A university COFE could act as a check on the reluctance of college administrators to court student displeasure by enforcing rules against disruption of speech. For public universities, state legislatures could receive and act on reports from a system-wide COFE. The public should also take an interest in COFE reports.

#### First, Free speech creates separate spaces which affirm critical thinking capacities which spills over into public life.

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

Scholars working in zones of occupation, militarism, settler colonialism, and imperialism, here and there, call on us to recraft our notion of “aca- demic freedom” by focusing unflinchingly on the larger structural forces and deeper alliances between the MPIC and the academy. If we heed this call seriously, we are moved to think about the question of freedom—academic and otherwise—in a much deeper way. Ultimately, our project is to decolo- nize the imperial university, and the chapters here help us understand how imperial cartographies produce manifest knowledges and logics of academic containment that structure the U.S. academy and its repression. Academic heresies and insurgencies are constitutive of this critique of the holy grail of academic freedom and of the spaces that we can create in our pedago- gies and academic work through forms of intellectual guerilla warfare and theaters of dissent, as suggested by Rojas and Dominguez, among others. This involves not shying away from forms of speech and scholarship that compel unease, as De Genova courageously suggests—challenging genocide, “death,” and the many forms of violence under white supremacy and in the settler colonial state. We can build on Gramsci’s critical work on hegemony in thinking of insurgent spaces within the academy that must be fostered in alliance and direct engagement with those “organic intellectuals” or move- ments beyond the university, even as those alliances are surveilled or cen- sured. If this book is a project of solidarity—one we hope will continue to evolve through our web archive—it aims to help support and build dissent focused on dismantling empire, and thinking freedom otherwise.

#### Free protest on campus has empirically been critical to civil rights, military reform, and economic justice

**Gay 15** [Roxane Gay, 11-11-2015, "Student Activism Is Serious Business," New Republic, <https://newrepublic.com/article/123431/student-activism-serious-business>] NB

Education, Martha Nussbaum suggests that a liberal education, one designed to “produce free citizens,” should help students connect with their humanity and understand their place in the world. “It would be catastrophic,” she writes, “to become a nation of technically competent people who have lost the ability to think critically, to examine themselves, and to respect the humanity and diversity of others.” Activism is one way students can learn to become the free citizens Nussbaum describes. Students have protested hikes in tuition, university policies on undocumented students, graduate student stipends and health insurance, predatory professors, sexual violence on campus, and many other issues. Sometimes, students protest provocative speakers, inept athletic directors, and toxic social media sites. They have directed their activism toward both national and global concerns including war and other military interventions, exclusionary legislation, reproductive freedom, racial inequality, and economic inequality. During the height of Occupy Wall Street, smaller [Occupy](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/22/education/edlife/the-new-student-activism.html?_r=0" \t "_blank) sites began appearing at colleges and universities across the country. Student activism is widespread, because some students are making the most of their college experience. They understand that this may very well be the last moment in their lives when they can confront real issues in an environment where they are forced to encounter people who don’t look like them, who don’t think like them, environments where change is still possible. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and protestors at campuses across the country including Yale and Mizzou are part of a robust, vital tradition that we should not overlook. Today’s student activists are doing the necessary work to ensure that the next generation that participates in the tradition of student activism will be fighting different battles. Or, perhaps, they are doing the necessary work to ensure that students, of all identities, might have a fighting chance to experience college and life beyond more equally than those who came before them.

#### Second, student protests have been capable of questioning the military industrial complex within the departments that fuel the war effort

**Tilly 99** et. al. Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, Charles Tilly. (1999). How Social Movements Matter. University of Minnesota Press. AS

The Anti-Vietnam War Movement and Science Although the United States had been involved in fighting nationalist Vietnamese forces on behalf of France as early as 1954, American involvement took a decidedly large step in 1965, when President Johnson took action on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, dramatically increasing the bombing of North Vietnam. Unlike the earlier "ban the bomb" movement, which had been led mainly by professionals, some scientists, and a handful of pacifists, protest against American involvement in Vietnam was led by students (DeBenedetti 1990). Science was not an early target of campus-based protesters organized against the war, but it became so as a coincidence of student protests that not only took place on college campuses but were increasingly directed against universities themselves, which were seen as full partners in facilitating the war in Vietnam. It is a truism that people tend to protest against the nearest objects, and the military-science alliance on college campuses was quite visible. For many students it was no great leap to begin to ask questions about the relationship between universities and the "military-industrial complex" that Dwight Eisenhower had identified in 1958. There were also more ideological and intellectual reasons for attacking universities and their faculty: members of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), who on many campuses acted as leaders of antiwar protest, took seriously the work of Frankfurt school philosopher Herbert Marcuse, who argued that repression in capitalist societies was located not only in the overt actions of the police and courts but in the very institutions, languages, and cultures of a given society (Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich 1969: 34—35). Increasingly, students targeted military recruitment programs and research laboratories that received funding for research that was ultimately used by American troops in Vietnam. Between 1965 and 1970 on at least eleven major college campuses,6 military-supported research buildings and laboratories were sites of antiwar protest and were associated with some of the most dramatic events of the period: the 1970 bombing of the Army Math Research Center at the University of Wisconsin, which killed a researcher; the 1970 Kent State University killings; and the 1968 sit-in at Columbia University. In each of these cases, protesters directed their actions against the physical representations of the alliances between universities and the military, usually Department-of-Defense-sponsored laboratories and programs. At Kent State as early as 1968, student protest was directed against the Liquid Crystals Institute, which developed motion detectors used in Vietnam (Heineman 1993: 37) and at Stanford, against the Stanford Research Institute, which was created explicitly to attract defense contracts and upon which Stanford was economically dependent, though the institute was nominally separate from Stanford University. At Columbia University, the 1968 campus occupation was sparked mainly by Columbia's association with the Institute for Defense Analysis, which poured millions of defense dollars into scientific research on campus. Similarly, the bombing of Sterling Hall at the University of Wisconsin in 1970 was motivated by anger toward the university's alliance with the military (Bates 1992; DeBenedetti 1990; Heineman 1993). More generally, protesters considered the war foolish, cruel, and stupid, perpetuated by authorities—including scientists—who were out of touch with citizens. The main charge against scientists was that they had failed to take responsibility for using scientific knowledge and goods for socially useful, rather than deadly and destructive, ends. The attack on science and technology was so widespread that at a White House ceremony for the National Medal of Science Award, President Johnson was compelled to defend scientists: "An aggrieved public does not draw the fine line between 'good' science and 'bad' technology. . . . You and I know that Frankenstein was the doctor, not the monster. But it would be well to remember that the people of the village, angered by the monster, marched against the doctor" (qtd. in Kevles 1978: 400). This larger questioning of authority placed scientists directly in the line of fire, since they had earlier laid claim to status based on political authority and on their role in keeping America safe (DeBenedetti 1990; Kevles 1978; Lapp 1965; Leslie 1993). In conjunction with the direct and public attacks on the alliance between science, universities, and the war in Vietnam, antiauthoritarian challenges made scientists' claims to serve humanity increasingly implausible. It is possible that universities, professional science associations, scientists, and others might simply have ignored these protests. Yet that is not how the story unfolded.

#### Third, student activism is crucial to divestment and restricting protests which have actual impacts abroad

**Oparah 14** [Oparah, Julia C. “Challenging Complicity- The Neoliberal University and the Prison-Industrial Complex” Chapter 3 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

How does an abolitionist lens assist us in assessing responses to the academic-MPIC? First, it draws our attention to the economic basis of the academic-MPIC and pushes us to attack the materiality of the militari- zation and prisonization of academia rather than limiting our interventions to the realm of ideas. This means that we must challenge the corporatization of our universities and colleges and question what influences and account- abilities are being introduced by our increasing collaboration with neoliberal global capital. It also means that we must dismantle those complicities and liberate the academy from its role as handmaiden to neoliberal globaliza- tion, militarism, and empire. In practice, this means interrogating our uni- versities’ and colleges’ investment decisions, demanding they divest from the military, security, and prison industries; distance themselves from military occupations in Southwest Asia and the Middle East; and invest instead in community-led sustainable economic development. It means facing allega- tions of disloyalty to our employers or alma maters as we blow the whistle on unethical investments and the creeping encroachment of corporate fund- ing, practices, and priorities. It means standing up for a vision of the liberal arts that neither slavishly serves the interests of the new global order nor returns to its elitist origins but instead is deeply embedded in progressive movements and richly informed by collaborations with insurgent and activ- ist spaces. And it means facing the challenges that arise when our divest- ment from empire has real impact on the bottom line of our university and college budgets. Andrea Smith, in her discussion of native studies, has argued that politi- cally progressive educators often adopt normative, colonial practices in the classroom, using pedagogical strategies and grading practices that rein- scribe the racialized and gendered regulation, policing, and disciplining that PIC abolitionists seek to end.53 In this sense, there could be no “postcarceral” academy. Certainly, sanctions for undergraduate and graduate students and faculty who challenge the university’s regular practices—from failing grades and expulsions to tenure denials and deportation—are systemically distrib- uted, along with rewards for those who can be usefully incorporated. Yet uni- versities and colleges also hold the seeds of a very different possible future, evoked, for example, by the universal admissions movement or by student strikes in Britain and Canada that demand higher education as a right, not a privilege of the wealthy. Rather than seeking to eradicate or replace higher educational institutions altogether, I suggest that we demand the popular and antiracist democratization of higher education. The first step toward this radical transformation is the liberation of aca- demia from the machinery of empire: prisons, militarism, and corporations. Speaking of abolishing the white race, Noel Ignatiev argues that it is neces- sary for white people to make whiteness impossible by refusing the invisible benefits of membership in the “white club.”54 Progressive academics are also members of a privileged “club,” one that confers benefits in the form of a pay- check, health care, and other fringe benefits; social status; and the freedom to pursue intellectual work that we are passionate about. But we can also put our privilege to work by unmasking and then unsettling the invisible, symbi- otic, and toxic relationships that constitute the academic-MPIC. Decoupling academia from its velvet-gloved master would begin the pro- cess of fundamental transformation. Without unfettered streams of income from corporations, wealthy philanthropists, and the military, universities and colleges would be forced to develop alternative fund-raising strategies, relationships, and accountabilities. Can we imagine a college administration aligned with local Occupy organizers to protest the state’s massive spend- ing on prisons and policing and demand more tax money for housing, edu- cation, and health care? Can we imagine a massive investment of time and resources by university personnel to solve the problem of how to decarcerate the nation’s prisons or end the detention of undocumented immigrants in order to fund universal access to higher education? Can we imagine a uni- versity run by and for its constituents, including students, kitchen and gar- den staff, and tenure-track and adjunct faculty? These are the possibilities opened up by academic-MPIC abolition

#### Divestment protests on college campuses work- empirics prove that they stigmatize institutions and reduce their capital

**Beeler 15** [Carolyn Beeler, 4-11-2015, "Students Push College Fossil Fuel Divestment To Stigmatize Industry," NPR.org, <http://www.npr.org/2015/04/11/398757780/students-push-college-fossil-fuel-divestment-to-stigmatize-industry>] NB

In the past few years, students at hundreds of colleges and universities have started pushing their schools to divest from fossil fuel companies as a way to slow climate change. The campaign has had some notable wins in the past year. But at tiny Swarthmore College, outside of Philadelphia, where the movement was born, students have been staging a sit-in for nearly a month to try to make their voices heard. On the first day of an extended sit-in at the elite liberal arts college, dozens of students are crowded into a hallway outside the finance offices, learning a new protest song. "We're asking for our school to sell its holdings in the top 200 coal, oil and gas companies," senior Sara Blazevic says. "Divestment is a way for our school, as a institution with a lot of social standing and a lot of clout, to stigmatize the fossil fuel industry." That stigma is key. Climate change activist Bill McKibben, who visited Swarthmore on day eight of the sit-in, explained that divestment isn't meant to stop the flow of cash to well-capitalized energy companies. "No one's under the illusion that if Swarthmore or any other college sells its shares in Exxon, that will immediately bankrupt Exxon," he says. "What it will do is begin the process, further the process, of politically bankrupting them." By that, he means creating a world where campaign contributions from fossil fuel companies will carry the same stigma as cash from Big Tobacco. "Making it much harder for them to dominate our political life the way they have," McKibben adds. "Because this is the richest industry on earth, it has way more political influence than it deserves." Swarthmore's divestment movement began back 2011, says Sara Blazevic. "When our campaign started, it was sort of scrappy," she says. "It didn't have a ton of support, we didn't have a network the way that the divestment movement has a network now, and then it grew really quickly." Hundreds of schools now have divestment campaigns. They have been successful at about two dozen U.S. colleges and universities, most recently at Syracuse, the largest endowment to date to commit to fully divesting.

## 1AC- Military Spec

### Framing [1:00]

#### From drone strikes abroad to policing dissent at our premier universities- objectivity is a lie and ethical standpoints have been constructed by militarism. The role of the ballot is to serve as a site for knowledge production and critical dialogue which is essential to deconstructing flawed epistemic biases. The weighing mechanism is decreasing militaristic violence.

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

In a post-9/11 world, the U.S. university has become a particularly charged site for debates about nationalism, patriotism, citizenship, and democracy. The “crisis” of academic freedom emerges from events such as the ones we witnessed in Riverside and Davis but also in many other campuses where administrative policing flexes its muscles along with the batons, chemical weapons, and riot gear of police and SWAT teams and where containment and censorship of political critique is enacted through the collusion of the university, partisan off-campus groups and networks, and the state. After 9/11, we have witnessed a calamitously repressive series of well-coordinated attacks against scholars who have dared to challenge the national consen- sus on U.S. wars and overseas occupations. Yet there has been stunningly little scholarly attention paid to this policing of knowledge, especially against academics who have dared to challenge the national consensus on U.S. wars and overseas occupations and U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. Simultaneously, the growing privatization of the public university, as in California, has demonstrated the ways in which the gates of access to public higher education are increasingly closed and the more subtle ways in which dissident scholarly and pedagogical work (and their institutional locations) is delegitimized and—in particularly telling instances—censored at both public and private institutions. The 9/11 attacks and the crises of late capital- ism in the global North have intensified the crisis of repression in the United States and also the ongoing restructuring of the academy—as well as resis- tance to that process—here as well as in the global South.2 What does it mean, then, to challenge the collusion of the university with militarism and occupation, the privatization of higher education, and economies of knowledge from within the U.S. university? When scholars and students who openly connect U.S. state formation to imperialism, war, and racial violence are disciplined, then how are we to understand freedom, aca- demic and otherwise? How is post-9/11 policing and surveillance linked to racial, gendered, and class practices in the neoliberal academy? Has the War on Terror simply deepened a much longer historical pattern of wartime cen- sorship and monitoring of intellectual work or is this something new? This edited volume offers reports from the trenches of a war on scholarly dissent that has raged for two or three decades now and has intensified since 9/11, analyzed by some of the very scholars who have been targeted or have directly engaged in these battles. The stakes here are high. These dissenting scholars and the knowledges they produce are constructed by right-wing critics as a threat to U.S. power and global hegemony, as has been the case in earlier moments in U.S. history, particularly during the Cold War. Much discussion of incidents where academics have been denied tenure or publicly attacked for their critique of U.S. foreign or domestic policies, as in earlier moments, has centered on the important question of academic fAreedom. However, the chapters in this book break new ground by demonstrating that what is really at work in these attacks are the logics of racism, warfare, and nationalism that undergird U.S. imperialism and also the architecture of the U.S. academy. Our argument here is that these logics shape a systemic struc- ture of repression of academic knowledge that counters the imperial, nation- building project. The premise of this book is that the U.S. academy is an “imperial uni- versity.” As in all imperial and colonial nations, intellectuals and scholarship play an important role—directly or indirectly, willingly or unwittingly—in legitimizing American exceptionalism and rationalizing U.S. expansionism and repression, domestically and globally. The title of this book, then, is not a rhetorical flourish but offers a concept that is grounded in the particular imperial formation of the United States, one that is in many ways ambigu- ous and shape-shifting.3 It is important to note that U.S. imperialism is char- acterized by deterritorialized, flexible, and covert practices of subjugation and violence and as such does not resemble historical forms of European colonialism that depended on territorial colonialism.4 As a settler-colonial nation, it has over time developed various strategies of control that include proxy wars, secret interventions, and client regimes aimed at maintaining its political, economic, and military dominance around the globe, as well as cul- tural interventions and “soft power.” The chapters here help to illuminate and historicize the role of the U.S. university in legitimizing notions of Manifest Destiny and foundational mythologies of settler colonialism and exceptional democracy as well as the attempts by scholars and students to challenge and subvert them. This book demonstrates the ways in which the academy’s role in support- ing state policies is crucial, even—and especially—as a presumably liberal institution. Indeed, it is precisely the support of a liberal class that is always critical for the maintenance of “benevolent empire.”5 As U.S. military and overseas interventions are increasingly framed as humanitarian wars—to save oppressed others and rescue victimized women—it is liberal ideolo- gies of gender, sexuality, religion, pluralism, and democracy that are key to uphold.6 The university is a key battleground in these culture wars and in producing as well as contesting knowledges about the state of the nation. We argue that the state of permanent war that is core to U.S. imperialism and racial statecraft has three fronts: military, cultural, and academic. Our conceptualization of the imperial university links these fronts of war, for the academic battleground is part of the culture wars that emerge in a milita- rized nation, one that is always presumably under threat, externally or inter- nally. Debates about national identity and national culture shape the battles over academic freedom and the role of the university in defining the racial boundaries of the nation and its “proper” subjects and “proper” politics. Furthermore, pedagogies of nationhood, race, gender, sexuality, class, and culture within the imperial nation are fundamentally intertwined with the interests of neoliberal capital and the possibilities of economic dominance. The chapters here link the critique of the university to the contemporary as well as historical workings of race, warfare, and the nation-state. They demonstrate that an analysis of the foundational linkages between the U.S. academy and the imperial nation-state need to be critically scrutinized, especially in the post-9/11 moment, and that overseas imperial interventions are linked to domestic repression, policing, and containment that penetrate the university. In drawing attention to the core issue of U.S. imperialism, this volume goes beyond a liberal discourse of academic freedom, one that is generally bounded by the nation and individual rights. Shifting the focus from notions of freedom of expression, the chapters here link the battles over knowledge production and the policing of critical scholarship to the geopoli- tics of U.S. imperialism across historical time and space. The contributors to this book bring together seemingly disparate geographic areas and historical moments that are key sites of U.S. expansionism and U.S.-backed occupation (such as the Philippines, Palestine, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) as well as varied fields of scholarship (such as American studies, cultural studies, Middle East studies, feminist studies, queer studies, and ethnic studies) precisely to show how knowledge building is central to the imperial project.

#### Also warrants nonideal theory:

#### A. they are actively used by dominant structures to promote ideals of militarism which avoids clearer ethical ideas

#### B. Objectivity is impossible in a world of real ethics because the academy has been construed

#### C. Prerequisite to other ethical theories- we need to be a part of ethical deliberation and ethics in order for it to matter

#### Militarism causes both international and domestic violence through the logic of disposability

**Trautman 16** [Brian Trautman (PeaceVoice, military veteran, instructor of peace studies at Berkshire Community College) “Police Response in Ferguson Rooted in Systemic Violence and Militarism”, Common Dreams 2-20-2016] NB

To better understand, effectively reduce, and eventually prevent the underlying factors which led to thew police slaying of Mike Brown and other unarmed citizens, we must openly debate two major forms of violence prevalent in the United States: systemic violence (aka structural violence) and militarism. Systemic violence is the type of violence that is deeply-embedded in a nation’s social, economic, educational, political, legal and environmental frameworks, and tends to be rooted in government policy. It is organized violence with an historical context, and often manifests in subtle but very specific and destructive ways. Examples include entrenched racism, classism and discrimination and economic inequality and relative poverty. Systemic violence paves the way for authoritarian and undemocratic values such as exploitation, marginalization and repression, especially of underrepresented, underprivileged populations. Militarism is the ideology that a nation must maintain a strong military capability and must use, or threaten to use, force to protect and advance national interests. America’s militaristic approach to overseas conflicts can be found in many aspects of its domestic policies. Systemic violence and militarism are interconnected and mutually dependent. They go hand in hand, building on and reinforcing each other. Both define and direct American policing, which regularly treats citizens like enemies of the state. We need not look further for an example than the military-style police assault in Ferguson. Systemic violence and militarism are responsible for the flow of military grade equipment such as mine resistance vehicles and semi-automatic weapons to police departments across the country. In an op-ed I wrote last month entitled “Escalating Domestic Warfare,” I discussed a report from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) on the emergence of a militarist ethos in American policing. The ACLU’s research showed that the militarization of police has become excessive and lethal. For example, SWAT teams are being deployed primarily to serve search warrants in low-level drug cases, and these teams are using methods and equipment traditionally reserved for war to do so. The ACLU also found that police militarization increased substantially after each of three major national events: the initiation of the “War on Drugs,” the attacks of 9-11, and a series of Supreme Court decisions which have eroded the rights guaranteed in the Fourth Amendment. Over the past two decades, the violent crime rate in the United States has decreased sharply. The militarization of policing, then, is counter-intuitive. Historically, nations that have militarized their police have done so not because of violent crime but rather to rapidly quell potential mass civil uprisings against tyranny, oppression and injustice. A statement released by Veterans for Peace (VFP), a global organization of military veterans and allies working to build a culture of peace, calls for justice for Mike Brown and his family through, in part, “a complete, swift and transparent investigation” into his death. VFP strongly condemns the use of violence – in any form – to secure justice. Instead, they implore protestors “to continue to channel their anger towards building power, solidarity and creating change nonviolently…” The organization expresses deep outrage for the state violence in Ferguson: “police over reaction to community expressions of grief and anger is the outcome of a national mindset that violence will solve any problem.” According to VFP, the military-industrial complex and a permanent war mentality are two major sources of this violence: “Thirteen years of war has militarized our whole society. We see equipment designed for the battlefield used in our nation’s streets against our citizens. We see police in uniforms and using weapons indistinguishable from the military.” This militaristic approach to domestic policing, says VFP, has resulted in tragedy on our streets: “Week after week we see reports of police abuse and killings of innocent and unarmed civilians.” Justice for the victims is often denied: “time and time again we see police given impunity for their crimes and citizens left in disbelief wondering where to turn next.” VFP reminds us of the repeated targeting of communities of color by police. The Ferguson protests are a natural reaction to this legacy of mistreatment and injustice. Police brutality against young black males, in particular, VFP argues, was a powder keg waiting to explode: “the unrest in Ferguson and similar incidents of citizen rebellions are the outcome of state abuse and neglect, not of hoodlums and opportunists. Eventually, any people who are held down will attempt to standup.” VFP’s statement also warns that militarism at home cannot be solved until we end our nation’s militarism abroad: “We cannot call for peace in the streets at home and at the same time conduct war for thirteen years in the streets of other nations.” America's violent system of policing and its antagonistic foreign policy are interrelated. Therefore, they must be addressed together before reforms can be effective and help to end our culture of violence. Solutions-based approaches begin with local, state and federal legislators acknowledging that many current laws and policies create and fuel systemic violence and militarism. They must then find the wisdom and muster the courage to act to change or abandon those laws and policies. One strategy that our towns and cities can adopt to contribute to this process is nonviolent community policing. Retired police captain Charles L. Alphin, who served for over twenty-six years in the St. Louis City Police Department, offers suggestions for such a policing model in an article titled “Kingian Non-violence: A Practical Application in Policing.” Alphin believes Kingian nonviolence holds great potential for American policing. He gives examples of how this model of policing can work using Dr. King’s philosophy of nonviolence. Alphin contends, as Dr. King did, that how we approach policing cannot stand alone from teaching nonviolence in the school, home, streets and in every phase of life. Alphin also explains that he applied Kingian philosophy effectively in interrogation of criminal suspects and in the organization of communities to get at the root causes of violence and drugs, effectively empowering communities to identify and work on these problems at the grassroots level (note: this community-based solution to violence is a feature of the theory and practice of transformative justice). There is an urgent need for models of paramilitary policing to be replaced with models of nonviolent community policing. Freedom and democracy are at stake. So are the lives of our innocent citizens. The killing of Mike Brown can be a pivotal moment for how we treat the systemic violence and militarism that produced the policing system of today. Ferguson has awakened many Americans to the realities of police militarism on their streets and to the urgent need to demilitarize the police. We cannot afford public apathy on this issue any longer. The people must insist on alternative models of policing that respect and protect civil and human rights. To reverse the trend of police violence in this country, we must work to eliminate the systemic and militaristic roots of this violence, remembering that military-style policing is inextricably linked to America’s belligerence abroad. No matter how you slice it, the weapons of war and other violent tactics used against Ferguson protestors will go down as a tragic chapter in American history. Still, robust and meaningful people-powered action for progressive social change can help make this chapter a turning point toward the positive transformation of policing in the United States. This action, change, and transformation are inevitable because justice demands it.

### Harms [:45]

#### The collusion between the military and the academy such as investment funds and resarch is connected to a broader imperial project

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

The bursts of dissent (both within scholarly production and in student protests and the Occupy movement) suggest that “business as usual” is being disrupted in the U.S. university. However, this dissent—and the modes of repression it provokes—begs the question of what sustains “business as usual.” Our introductory vignette, juxtaposing the bucolic green of a “peace- ful” campus with the performance of militarized power, offers our unease with the normalized terms of “peace” in our elysian surroundings, not to mention with the complicity of the U.S. state with military occupations elsewhere and the lockdown on open critique of particular foreign states. The police in riot gear do not signal something exceptional; rather, their presence unmasks the codes of “the normal” in academic discourse and practice. It is a normalization that we see routinely in the grants that we are encouraged to apply for and in Department of Defense funding that many scientists, social scientists, and technologists receive for their research, as discussed in Roberto González’s chapter. The capital provided by these grants has built the foundations of some of the most powerful and preeminent universities in the world: MIT, Stanford, UC Berkeley, California Institute of Technology (Caltech), and many others. The alliance between military research and sci- ence, which is well known, builds the deepest strata of connection and com- plicity between imperial statecraft and the knowledge complex of the U.S. academy. This, also, is nothing new, as González and Oparah demonstrate in analyzing the historical, global economies within which U.S. intelligence and prison systems enact violent logics of incapacitation and counterinsurgency. The contributors to this book seek to illuminate the historical continu- ities of crisis and the boundaries of regulation and containment, especially in the current moment, because they reveal the threshold of academic repres- sion. This involves connecting analyses of localized domestic dissent (e.g., in student protests) to the censorship of scholarship and pedagogies of cri- tique of U.S. state projects (especially related to support for Israel and the domestic and global frontlines of the War on Terror). Many of the chapters highlight that the regulation and repression of various forms of dissent share core ideologies—about corporate and militarized capitalism as the means and ends of state power as well as the deeper codes of cultural, racial, and national supremacy that they enable. When the University of California debates the purchase of an army tank, as it did in Berkeley in 2012, it crudely reveals the profound strategic confluence of military science and militarized praxis in fortifying the citadels of higher learning.

#### Academic containment of both scholars and students fuel the imperial project which sacrifices the rights of faculty and students in the name of security

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

State warfare and militarism have shored up deeply powerful notions of patriotism, intertwined with a politics of race, class, gender, sexuality, and religion, through the culture wars that have embroiled the U.S. academy. The fronts of “hot” and “cold” wars—military, cultural, and academic—have rested on an ideological framework that has defined the “enemy” as a threat to U.S. freedom and democracy. This enemy produced and propped up in the shifting culture wars—earlier the Communist, now the (Muslim) terrorist— has always been both external and internal. The overt policing of knowledge production, exemplified by right-wing groups such as ACTA, reveals an ideo- logical battle cry in the “culture wars” that have burgeoned in the wake of the civil rights movement—and the containment and policing demanded within the academy. Defending the civilizational integrity of the nation requires producing a national subject and citizen by regulating the boundaries of what is permissible and desirable to express in national culture—and in the university. As Readings observed, “In modernity, the University becomes the model of the social bond that ties individuals in a common relation to the idea of the nation-state.”46 Belonging is figured through the metaphor of patriotic citizenship, in the nation and in the academy, through displays of what Henry Giroux has also called “patriotic correctness”: “an ideology that privileges conformity over critical learning and that represents dissent as something akin to a terrorist act.”47 This is where the recent culture wars have shaped the politics of what we call academic containment. For right-wing activists, the nation must be fortified by an educational foundation that upholds, at its core, the singular superiority of Western civilization. A nation-state construed as being under attack is in a state of cultural crisis where any sign of disloyalty to the nation is an act of treachery, including acts perceived as intellectual betrayal. The culture wars have worked to uphold a powerful mythology about American democracy and the American Dream and a potent fiction about freedom of expression that in actuality contains academic dissent. This exceptionalist mythology has historically represented the U.S. nation as a beacon of indi- vidual liberty and a bulwark against the Evil Empire or Communist bloc; Third Worldist and left insurgent movements, including uprisings within the United States in the 1960s and 1970s and in Central America in the 1980s; Islamist militancy and anti-imperial movements since the 1980s; and the threat posed by all of these to the American “way of life.” The battle against Communism, anti-imperial Third Worldism, and so-called Islamofascism entailed regulating and containing movements sympathetic to these forces at home, including intellectuals with left-leaning tendencies and radical schol- ars or students—all those likely to contaminate young minds and indoctri- nate students in “subversive” or “anti-American” ideologies. What does it mean, then, to contain scholars who “cross the line” in their academic work or public engagement? Academic containment can take on many modalities: stigmatizing an academic as too “political,” devaluing and marginalizing scholarship, unleashing an FBI investigation, blacklist- ing, or not granting scholars the final passport into elite citizenship in the academic nation—that is, tenure. These various modalities of containment, which are discussed by Thomas Abowd, Laura Pulido, and Steven Salaita, among others, narrow the universe of discourse around what is really per- missible, acceptable, and tolerable for scholars in the imperial university. All these modes are at work in the three important moments of ideological policing that we touch on here: World War I and the McCarthy era of the 1940s–1950s, the COINTELPRO era from the late 1950s to early 1970s, and the post-9/11 era or “new Cold War,” which is the major focus of this book. Moments of social stress and open dissent about class politics in the United States during World War I and the first decades of the twentieth cen- tury make clear that containment worked in tandem with emerging defi- nitions of “academic freedom.” As the U.S. professoriate began to build its ranks at the end of the nineteenth century and a few scholars48 challenged the status quo, “academic freedom” emerged as a way to deal with these dis- senters as well as the “relative insecurity” felt by many in this new profes- sion.49 Indeed, the tumult of the turn of the century led to a pattern within the academy that has persisted—the exclusion of ideas as well as behavior that the majority did not like and an increasingly internalized notion that “advocacy for social change” was a professional risk for academics. The AAUP’s Seligman Report of 1915 reveals that the notion of academic freedom was, in fact, “deeply enmeshed” with the “overall status, security, and prestige of the academic profession.”50 Setting up procedural safeguards was important, but its language regarding “appropriate scholarly behavior” and cautiousness about responding to controversial matters in the academy (by ensuring that all sides of the case were presented) suggested the limits of dissent. Academic freedom, then, is a notion that is deeply bound up with academic containment—a paradox suggested in our earlier discussion of protest and inclusion/incorporation in the academy and one that has become increasingly institutionalized since the formation of the AAUP. The academic repression of the McCarthy era received its impetus from President Truman’s March 22, 1947, executive order that “established a new loyalty secrecy program for federal employees.” However, the roots of insti- tutional capitulation—by both administrators and faculty—when the state targeted academics who were communists or viewed as “sympathizers” are much deeper. It is also significant that the notion of “appropriate behavior” for faculty rested on a majoritarian academic “consensus” about “civil” and “collegial” comportment. For example, Ellen Schechter notes cases prior to the Cold War where scholars were fired not necessarily for their political affiliations per se but due to “their outspoken-ness.”51 This repression from within—not just beyond—the academy reveals the cultures of academic con- tainment where, as Pulido, Gumbs, and Rojas remind us, certain kinds of “unruliness” must be managed or excised.

#### They Continue:

The post-9/11 panic about Muslim terrorists and enemy aliens increas- ingly focused on the threat of “homegrown terrorism” as the War on Ter- ror shifted its focus to “radicalized” communities within the United States, especially Muslim American youth. At the same time, as Godrej observes, the criminalization of those considered threats to national security has included the violent repression of Occupy activists and student protesters and indefinite detention authorized by the PATRIOT (Provide Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism) Act and the National Defense Authorization Act. Protests focused on higher education thus blur into dissent against U.S. warfare and the homeland security state in a cli- mate of heightened campus securitization and university collaboration with the FBI in the interest of “public safety.” Anarchists are considered domestic terror threats to be contained, and Muslim or Arab American students (or faculty) who are also anarchists are subjected to multiple levels of contain- ment and scrutiny, as suggested in the chapter by Falcón et al. Academic containment is clearly part of a larger politics of repression and policing in the national security state that affects faculty and students as well as the cam- pus climate in general.

### Solvency [1:30]

#### Thus, the plan;

#### Resolved: Public colleges and Universities in the United States of America ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech that criticizes military policy

**Wilson 07** [John K., 6-25-2007, "The Defense Department vs. Free Speech on Campus," No Publication, <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/06/25/defense-department-vs-free-speech-campus>] NB

FAIR v. Rumsfeld allows the institution to engage in criticism of the military policy. The colleges that lost this case over military recruiters should continue their resistance in the face of the far more serious threats to academic freedom from this proposed rule. But they should go further in protecting the right of protest and counterspeech. Colleges should pass policies protecting the right of students to peaceably protest recruiters of any kind, and to allow anyone to provide potential recruiters with counterspeech. Colleges should also adopt a "Truth in Recruiting Policy" that requires any recruiters who engage in discrimination to fully disclose this fact in all recruiting materials.

#### First, Free speech creates separate spaces which affirm critical thinking capacities which spills over into public life.

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

Scholars working in zones of occupation, militarism, settler colonialism, and imperialism, here and there, call on us to recraft our notion of “aca- demic freedom” by focusing unflinchingly on the larger structural forces and deeper alliances between the MPIC and the academy. If we heed this call seriously, we are moved to think about the question of freedom—academic and otherwise—in a much deeper way. Ultimately, our project is to decolo- nize the imperial university, and the chapters here help us understand how imperial cartographies produce manifest knowledges and logics of academic containment that structure the U.S. academy and its repression. Academic heresies and insurgencies are constitutive of this critique of the holy grail of academic freedom and of the spaces that we can create in our pedago- gies and academic work through forms of intellectual guerilla warfare and theaters of dissent, as suggested by Rojas and Dominguez, among others. This involves not shying away from forms of speech and scholarship that compel unease, as De Genova courageously suggests—challenging genocide, “death,” and the many forms of violence under white supremacy and in the settler colonial state. We can build on Gramsci’s critical work on hegemony in thinking of insurgent spaces within the academy that must be fostered in alliance and direct engagement with those “organic intellectuals” or move- ments beyond the university, even as those alliances are surveilled or cen- sured. If this book is a project of solidarity—one we hope will continue to evolve through our web archive—it aims to help support and build dissent focused on dismantling empire, and thinking freedom otherwise.

#### Free protest on campus has empirically been critical to civil rights, military reform, and economic justice

**Gay 15** [Roxane Gay, 11-11-2015, "Student Activism Is Serious Business," New Republic, <https://newrepublic.com/article/123431/student-activism-serious-business>] NB

Education, Martha Nussbaum suggests that a liberal education, one designed to “produce free citizens,” should help students connect with their humanity and understand their place in the world. “It would be catastrophic,” she writes, “to become a nation of technically competent people who have lost the ability to think critically, to examine themselves, and to respect the humanity and diversity of others.” Activism is one way students can learn to become the free citizens Nussbaum describes. Students have protested hikes in tuition, university policies on undocumented students, graduate student stipends and health insurance, predatory professors, sexual violence on campus, and many other issues. Sometimes, students protest provocative speakers, inept athletic directors, and toxic social media sites. They have directed their activism toward both national and global concerns including war and other military interventions, exclusionary legislation, reproductive freedom, racial inequality, and economic inequality. During the height of Occupy Wall Street, smaller [Occupy](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/22/education/edlife/the-new-student-activism.html?_r=0" \t "_blank) sites began appearing at colleges and universities across the country. Student activism is widespread, because some students are making the most of their college experience. They understand that this may very well be the last moment in their lives when they can confront real issues in an environment where they are forced to encounter people who don’t look like them, who don’t think like them, environments where change is still possible. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and protestors at campuses across the country including Yale and Mizzou are part of a robust, vital tradition that we should not overlook. Today’s student activists are doing the necessary work to ensure that the next generation that participates in the tradition of student activism will be fighting different battles. Or, perhaps, they are doing the necessary work to ensure that students, of all identities, might have a fighting chance to experience college and life beyond more equally than those who came before them.

#### Second, student protests have been capable of questioning the military industrial complex within the departments that fuel the war effort

**Tilly 99** et. al. Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, Charles Tilly. (1999). How Social Movements Matter. University of Minnesota Press. AS

The Anti-Vietnam War Movement and Science Although the United States had been involved in fighting nationalist Vietnamese forces on behalf of France as early as 1954, American involvement took a decidedly large step in 1965, when President Johnson took action on the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, dramatically increasing the bombing of North Vietnam. Unlike the earlier "ban the bomb" movement, which had been led mainly by professionals, some scientists, and a handful of pacifists, protest against American involvement in Vietnam was led by students (DeBenedetti 1990). Science was not an early target of campus-based protesters organized against the war, but it became so as a coincidence of student protests that not only took place on college campuses but were increasingly directed against universities themselves, which were seen as full partners in facilitating the war in Vietnam. It is a truism that people tend to protest against the nearest objects, and the military-science alliance on college campuses was quite visible. For many students it was no great leap to begin to ask questions about the relationship between universities and the "military-industrial complex" that Dwight Eisenhower had identified in 1958. There were also more ideological and intellectual reasons for attacking universities and their faculty: members of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), who on many campuses acted as leaders of antiwar protest, took seriously the work of Frankfurt school philosopher Herbert Marcuse, who argued that repression in capitalist societies was located not only in the overt actions of the police and courts but in the very institutions, languages, and cultures of a given society (Ehrenreich and Ehrenreich 1969: 34—35). Increasingly, students targeted military recruitment programs and research laboratories that received funding for research that was ultimately used by American troops in Vietnam. Between 1965 and 1970 on at least eleven major college campuses,6 military-supported research buildings and laboratories were sites of antiwar protest and were associated with some of the most dramatic events of the period: the 1970 bombing of the Army Math Research Center at the University of Wisconsin, which killed a researcher; the 1970 Kent State University killings; and the 1968 sit-in at Columbia University. In each of these cases, protesters directed their actions against the physical representations of the alliances between universities and the military, usually Department-of-Defense-sponsored laboratories and programs. At Kent State as early as 1968, student protest was directed against the Liquid Crystals Institute, which developed motion detectors used in Vietnam (Heineman 1993: 37) and at Stanford, against the Stanford Research Institute, which was created explicitly to attract defense contracts and upon which Stanford was economically dependent, though the institute was nominally separate from Stanford University. At Columbia University, the 1968 campus occupation was sparked mainly by Columbia's association with the Institute for Defense Analysis, which poured millions of defense dollars into scientific research on campus. Similarly, the bombing of Sterling Hall at the University of Wisconsin in 1970 was motivated by anger toward the university's alliance with the military (Bates 1992; DeBenedetti 1990; Heineman 1993). More generally, protesters considered the war foolish, cruel, and stupid, perpetuated by authorities—including scientists—who were out of touch with citizens. The main charge against scientists was that they had failed to take responsibility for using scientific knowledge and goods for socially useful, rather than deadly and destructive, ends. The attack on science and technology was so widespread that at a White House ceremony for the National Medal of Science Award, President Johnson was compelled to defend scientists: "An aggrieved public does not draw the fine line between 'good' science and 'bad' technology. . . . You and I know that Frankenstein was the doctor, not the monster. But it would be well to remember that the people of the village, angered by the monster, marched against the doctor" (qtd. in Kevles 1978: 400). This larger questioning of authority placed scientists directly in the line of fire, since they had earlier laid claim to status based on political authority and on their role in keeping America safe (DeBenedetti 1990; Kevles 1978; Lapp 1965; Leslie 1993). In conjunction with the direct and public attacks on the alliance between science, universities, and the war in Vietnam, antiauthoritarian challenges made scientists' claims to serve humanity increasingly implausible. It is possible that universities, professional science associations, scientists, and others might simply have ignored these protests. Yet that is not how the story unfolded.

#### Third, student activism is crucial to divestment and restricting protests which have actual impacts abroad

**Oparah 14** [Oparah, Julia C. “Challenging Complicity- The Neoliberal University and the Prison-Industrial Complex” Chapter 3 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

How does an abolitionist lens assist us in assessing responses to the academic-MPIC? First, it draws our attention to the economic basis of the academic-MPIC and pushes us to attack the materiality of the militari- zation and prisonization of academia rather than limiting our interventions to the realm of ideas. This means that we must challenge the corporatization of our universities and colleges and question what influences and account- abilities are being introduced by our increasing collaboration with neoliberal global capital. It also means that we must dismantle those complicities and liberate the academy from its role as handmaiden to neoliberal globaliza- tion, militarism, and empire. In practice, this means interrogating our uni- versities’ and colleges’ investment decisions, demanding they divest from the military, security, and prison industries; distance themselves from military occupations in Southwest Asia and the Middle East; and invest instead in community-led sustainable economic development. It means facing allega- tions of disloyalty to our employers or alma maters as we blow the whistle on unethical investments and the creeping encroachment of corporate fund- ing, practices, and priorities. It means standing up for a vision of the liberal arts that neither slavishly serves the interests of the new global order nor returns to its elitist origins but instead is deeply embedded in progressive movements and richly informed by collaborations with insurgent and activ- ist spaces. And it means facing the challenges that arise when our divest- ment from empire has real impact on the bottom line of our university and college budgets. Andrea Smith, in her discussion of native studies, has argued that politi- cally progressive educators often adopt normative, colonial practices in the classroom, using pedagogical strategies and grading practices that rein- scribe the racialized and gendered regulation, policing, and disciplining that PIC abolitionists seek to end.53 In this sense, there could be no “postcarceral” academy. Certainly, sanctions for undergraduate and graduate students and faculty who challenge the university’s regular practices—from failing grades and expulsions to tenure denials and deportation—are systemically distrib- uted, along with rewards for those who can be usefully incorporated. Yet uni- versities and colleges also hold the seeds of a very different possible future, evoked, for example, by the universal admissions movement or by student strikes in Britain and Canada that demand higher education as a right, not a privilege of the wealthy. Rather than seeking to eradicate or replace higher educational institutions altogether, I suggest that we demand the popular and antiracist democratization of higher education. The first step toward this radical transformation is the liberation of aca- demia from the machinery of empire: prisons, militarism, and corporations. Speaking of abolishing the white race, Noel Ignatiev argues that it is neces- sary for white people to make whiteness impossible by refusing the invisible benefits of membership in the “white club.”54 Progressive academics are also members of a privileged “club,” one that confers benefits in the form of a pay- check, health care, and other fringe benefits; social status; and the freedom to pursue intellectual work that we are passionate about. But we can also put our privilege to work by unmasking and then unsettling the invisible, symbi- otic, and toxic relationships that constitute the academic-MPIC. Decoupling academia from its velvet-gloved master would begin the pro- cess of fundamental transformation. Without unfettered streams of income from corporations, wealthy philanthropists, and the military, universities and colleges would be forced to develop alternative fund-raising strategies, relationships, and accountabilities. Can we imagine a college administration aligned with local Occupy organizers to protest the state’s massive spend- ing on prisons and policing and demand more tax money for housing, edu- cation, and health care? Can we imagine a massive investment of time and resources by university personnel to solve the problem of how to decarcerate the nation’s prisons or end the detention of undocumented immigrants in order to fund universal access to higher education? Can we imagine a uni- versity run by and for its constituents, including students, kitchen and gar- den staff, and tenure-track and adjunct faculty? These are the possibilities opened up by academic-MPIC abolition

#### Divestment protests on college campuses work- empirics prove that they stigmatize institutions and reduce their capital

**Beeler 15** [Carolyn Beeler, 4-11-2015, "Students Push College Fossil Fuel Divestment To Stigmatize Industry," NPR.org, <http://www.npr.org/2015/04/11/398757780/students-push-college-fossil-fuel-divestment-to-stigmatize-industry>] NB

In the past few years, students at hundreds of colleges and universities have started pushing their schools to divest from fossil fuel companies as a way to slow climate change. The campaign has had some notable wins in the past year. But at tiny Swarthmore College, outside of Philadelphia, where the movement was born, students have been staging a sit-in for nearly a month to try to make their voices heard. On the first day of an extended sit-in at the elite liberal arts college, dozens of students are crowded into a hallway outside the finance offices, learning a new protest song. "We're asking for our school to sell its holdings in the top 200 coal, oil and gas companies," senior Sara Blazevic says. "Divestment is a way for our school, as a institution with a lot of social standing and a lot of clout, to stigmatize the fossil fuel industry." That stigma is key. Climate change activist Bill McKibben, who visited Swarthmore on day eight of the sit-in, explained that divestment isn't meant to stop the flow of cash to well-capitalized energy companies. "No one's under the illusion that if Swarthmore or any other college sells its shares in Exxon, that will immediately bankrupt Exxon," he says. "What it will do is begin the process, further the process, of politically bankrupting them." By that, he means creating a world where campaign contributions from fossil fuel companies will carry the same stigma as cash from Big Tobacco. "Making it much harder for them to dominate our political life the way they have," McKibben adds. "Because this is the richest industry on earth, it has way more political influence than it deserves." Swarthmore's divestment movement began back 2011, says Sara Blazevic. "When our campaign started, it was sort of scrappy," she says. "It didn't have a ton of support, we didn't have a network the way that the divestment movement has a network now, and then it grew really quickly." Hundreds of schools now have divestment campaigns. They have been successful at about two dozen U.S. colleges and universities, most recently at Syracuse, the largest endowment to date to commit to fully divesting.

## 1AC- More Adv. Materals

### Adv- Military Specific Plan

#### Plan Text: Public colleges and Universities ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech that criticizes military policy

**Wilson 07** [John K., 6-25-2007, "The Defense Department vs. Free Speech on Campus," No Publication, <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/06/25/defense-department-vs-free-speech-campus>] NB

FAIR v. Rumsfeld allows the institution to engage in criticism of the military policy. The colleges that lost this case over military recruiters should continue their resistance in the face of the far more serious threats to academic freedom from this proposed rule. But they should go further in protecting the right of protest and counterspeech. Colleges should pass policies protecting the right of students to peaceably protest recruiters of any kind, and to allow anyone to provide potential recruiters with counterspeech. Colleges should also adopt a "Truth in Recruiting Policy" that requires any recruiters who engage in discrimination to fully disclose this fact in all recruiting materials.

### Adv- Oppression

#### The election of Trump only amplified hate speech on campuses- current speech codes are insufficient

**Long 1-27** [Katherine Long, 1-27-2017, "UW on edge over perception of rise in hate speech," Seattle Times, <http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/education/uw-on-edge-over-perception-of-rise-in-hate-speech/>] NB

Why does one of the country’s most liberal campuses appear to be suddenly experiencing a rash of prejudice? The switch in people’s willingness to openly express bias and prejudice is real nationwide, and it’s wrapped up in the concept of social norms, which changed after Donald Trump was elected to the highest office, an expert on prejudice says. “Literally overnight” after Trump won the election Nov. 8 it became acceptable to disparage Muslims, Mexican immigrants, women and other minority groups, said Chris Crandall, a University of Kansas psychology professor who grew up in Seattle and received his undergraduate degree at the University of Washington. Crandall said [his research shows](http://undark.org/article/trump-social-psychology-prejudice-unleashed/" \t "_blank) that President Trump’s election didn’t create new biases. But his win has unleased the expression of those prejudices. People who felt biases against others suddenly decided it was all right to say them out loud, Crandall said. That feeling extended to people on all sides of the political spectrum, including Democrats, who earlier felt it was wrong to express bias, but now believe it’s acceptable, his research shows. In his Jan. 20 speech at the UW, Breitbart editor Milo Yiannopoulos — who’s been banned on Twitter — mocked liberals, Democrats, feminists, gays and lesbians, to his audience’s delight. He concluded by saying that Americans are raising a generation of children who can’t handle words used against them, that cyberbullying is not the same as real bullying, and that people should ignore things they find offensive. “If someone is speaking on campus you don’t like, don’t attend the lecture,” he said. Students who had opposed Yiannopoulos’s appearance on campus [argued that the talk should be canceled out of concern for student safety](http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/education/uw-wsu-brace-for-speech-by-breitbart-editor-banned-from-twitter/). On the night of the speech, protesters who tried to shut down the event clashed with people standing in line to hear Yiannopoulos, and one man was shot in the stomach. UW President Ana Mari Cauce [defended Yiannopoulos’ right to speak](http://www.washington.edu/president/2016/12/19/test-of-free-speech/" \t "_blank), saying to do so meant upholding the public university’s commitment to the free exchange of ideas and expression. But she also condemned the violence. Late this week, a Facebook group calling itself “UW Wall Building Association” advertised a pro-Trump campus demonstration that is to take place Monday on Red Square. The UW College Republicans, who hosted Yiannopoulos, say the event is fake, placed online to bait students and the media. But the Latinx Student Law Association, which believes UW students are behind the post, [called on the university to intervene](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSe3htNRCcnvzYhrWbCH1et-Xy5WTFBu9DfRpB9FdrRHI-lO3w/viewform?c=0&w=1" \t "_blank) because the event constitutes harassment, which would violate the UW’s Student Code of Conduct. “We want the administration to really address this seriously now, especially because of heightened sense of fear and anxiety” among all students, especially undocumented students, said Michelle Saucedo, a member of the Latinx Law Student Association, who helped draft a letter calling on the university to take action. “We’re not trying to limit anyone’s free speech,” Saucedo said. “We’re calling on the university to stand by the Student Code of Conduct, and investigate” to find out who is behind the post. The UW Wall group is violating the code, she said, by targeting a specific group based on race, national origin and citizenship. The post also calls for students to bring bricks, which could be used as weapons. The group has created a “hostile and offensive environment in which undocumented and Latinx UW students feel unsafe and unwelcome,” the letter reads. Saucedo said about 1,500 students, faculty, staff and community members have signed it. UW officials say they don’t know if the event is real or fake, but they plan to have security in place on Monday. In response to the rally, Denzil Suite, the UW’s vice president for student life, [released a statement Friday saying that anyone who commits criminal acts will be arrested](http://www.washington.edu/news/2017/01/27/uw-statement-regarding-purported-red-square-event-monday/" \t "_blank).

### Adv- Prisons- NEW FOR TOC

#### <DO NOT BREAK WITHOUT TEAM PERMISSION>

#### Speech through protest is contained now in the name of security

**Chaterjee and Maira 14** [Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

State warfare and militarism have shored up deeply powerful notions of patriotism, intertwined with a politics of race, class, gender, sexuality, and religion, through the culture wars that have embroiled the U.S. academy. The fronts of “hot” and “cold” wars—military, cultural, and academic—have rested on an ideological framework that has defined the “enemy” as a threat to U.S. freedom and democracy. This enemy produced and propped up in the shifting culture wars—earlier the Communist, now the (Muslim) terrorist— has always been both external and internal. The overt policing of knowledge production, exemplified by right-wing groups such as ACTA, reveals an ideo- logical battle cry in the “culture wars” that have burgeoned in the wake of the civil rights movement—and the containment and policing demanded within the academy. Defending the civilizational integrity of the nation requires producing a national subject and citizen by regulating the boundaries of what is permissible and desirable to express in national culture—and in the university. As Readings observed, “In modernity, the University becomes the model of the social bond that ties individuals in a common relation to the idea of the nation-state.”46 Belonging is figured through the metaphor of patriotic citizenship, in the nation and in the academy, through displays of what Henry Giroux has also called “patriotic correctness”: “an ideology that privileges conformity over critical learning and that represents dissent as something akin to a terrorist act.”47 This is where the recent culture wars have shaped the politics of what we call academic containment. For right-wing activists, the nation must be fortified by an educational foundation that upholds, at its core, the singular superiority of Western civilization. A nation-state construed as being under attack is in a state of cultural crisis where any sign of disloyalty to the nation is an act of treachery, including acts perceived as intellectual betrayal. The culture wars have worked to uphold a powerful mythology about American democracy and the American Dream and a potent fiction about freedom of expression that in actuality contains academic dissent. This exceptionalist mythology has historically represented the U.S. nation as a beacon of indi- vidual liberty and a bulwark against the Evil Empire or Communist bloc; Third Worldist and left insurgent movements, including uprisings within the United States in the 1960s and 1970s and in Central America in the 1980s; Islamist militancy and anti-imperial movements since the 1980s; and the threat posed by all of these to the American “way of life.” The battle against Communism, anti-imperial Third Worldism, and so-called Islamofascism entailed regulating and containing movements sympathetic to these forces at home, including intellectuals with left-leaning tendencies and radical schol- ars or students—all those likely to contaminate young minds and indoctri- nate students in “subversive” or “anti-American” ideologies. What does it mean, then, to contain scholars who “cross the line” in their academic work or public engagement? Academic containment can take on many modalities: stigmatizing an academic as too “political,” devaluing and marginalizing scholarship, unleashing an FBI investigation, blacklist- ing, or not granting scholars the final passport into elite citizenship in the academic nation—that is, tenure. These various modalities of containment, which are discussed by Thomas Abowd, Laura Pulido, and Steven Salaita, among others, narrow the universe of discourse around what is really per- missible, acceptable, and tolerable for scholars in the imperial university. All these modes are at work in the three important moments of ideological policing that we touch on here: World War I and the McCarthy era of the 1940s–1950s, the COINTELPRO era from the late 1950s to early 1970s, and the post-9/11 era or “new Cold War,” which is the major focus of this book. Moments of social stress and open dissent about class politics in the United States during World War I and the first decades of the twentieth cen- tury make clear that containment worked in tandem with emerging defi- nitions of “academic freedom.” As the U.S. professoriate began to build its ranks at the end of the nineteenth century and a few scholars48 challenged the status quo, “academic freedom” emerged as a way to deal with these dis- senters as well as the “relative insecurity” felt by many in this new profes- sion.49 Indeed, the tumult of the turn of the century led to a pattern within the academy that has persisted—the exclusion of ideas as well as behavior that the majority did not like and an increasingly internalized notion that “advocacy for social change” was a professional risk for academics. The AAUP’s Seligman Report of 1915 reveals that the notion of academic freedom was, in fact, “deeply enmeshed” with the “overall status, security, and prestige of the academic profession.”50 Setting up procedural safeguards was important, but its language regarding “appropriate scholarly behavior” and cautiousness about responding to controversial matters in the academy (by ensuring that all sides of the case were presented) suggested the limits of dissent. Academic freedom, then, is a notion that is deeply bound up with academic containment—a paradox suggested in our earlier discussion of protest and inclusion/incorporation in the academy and one that has become increasingly institutionalized since the formation of the AAUP. The academic repression of the McCarthy era received its impetus from President Truman’s March 22, 1947, executive order that “established a new loyalty secrecy program for federal employees.” However, the roots of insti- tutional capitulation—by both administrators and faculty—when the state targeted academics who were communists or viewed as “sympathizers” are much deeper. It is also significant that the notion of “appropriate behavior” for faculty rested on a majoritarian academic “consensus” about “civil” and “collegial” comportment. For example, Ellen Schechter notes cases prior to the Cold War where scholars were fired not necessarily for their political affiliations per se but due to “their outspoken-ness.”51 This repression from within—not just beyond—the academy reveals the cultures of academic con- tainment where, as Pulido, Gumbs, and Rojas remind us, certain kinds of “unruliness” must be managed or excised.

#### They Continue:

The post-9/11 panic about Muslim terrorists and enemy aliens increas- ingly focused on the threat of “homegrown terrorism” as the War on Ter- ror shifted its focus to “radicalized” communities within the United States, especially Muslim American youth. At the same time, as Godrej observes, the criminalization of those considered threats to national security has included the violent repression of Occupy activists and student protesters and indefinite detention authorized by the PATRIOT (Provide Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism) Act and the National Defense Authorization Act. Protests focused on higher education thus blur into dissent against U.S. warfare and the homeland security state in a cli- mate of heightened campus securitization and university collaboration with the FBI in the interest of “public safety.” Anarchists are considered domestic terror threats to be contained, and Muslim or Arab American students (or faculty) who are also anarchists are subjected to multiple levels of contain- ment and scrutiny, as suggested in the chapter by Falcón et al. Academic containment is clearly part of a larger politics of repression and policing in the national security state that affects faculty and students as well as the cam- pus climate in general.

#### DOJ overturned the recent ruling on private prisons- they are legal now and increasing

**Wilber 2-23** [Del Quentin Wilber, 2-23-2017, "Justice Department rescinds order phasing out use of private prisons," latimes, <http://www.latimes.com/politics/washington/la-na-essential-washington-updates-justice-department-rescinds-order-1487893081-htmlstory.html>] NB

Atty. Gen. Jeff Sessions has jettisoned an Obama administration order to phase out the use of private prisons to hold federal inmates. The new order reverses [one issued by former Deputy Atty. Gen. Sally Yates](http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-privateprisons-20160818-snap-story.html) in August that sought to eliminate the department's use of private for-profit prisons, which hold just over 10% of the current prison population. The Obama administration order "changed long-standing policy and practice, and impaired the bureau’s ability to meet the future needs of the federal correctional system," Sessions wrote Thursday to announce the reversal. Civil rights and prisoner rights groups decried the Sessions' decision, saying private prisons are not as cost-effective or as safe as government-run facilities, citing numerous abuses in the past. The Bureau of Prisons houses about 21,000 of its 190,000 inmates in a dozen private prisons, including one near Bakersfield. "Atty. Gen. Sessions has shown that he is not taking the mass incarceration crisis seriously," said Wade Henderson, who heads the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights. "Continuing to rely on private prisons for federal inmates is neither humane nor budget conscious," Henderson added. "We need a justice system that can work better for all people." Yates' order did not affect facilities used to detain people in the country illegally. The use of private prisons is expected to surge under President Trump's promised crackdown on illegal immigration. Trump has signed [an executive order](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/01/25/executive-order-border-security-and-immigration-enforcement-improvements" \t "_blank) calling for expansion of immigrant detention facilities and authorized the use of private contractors “to construct, operate, or control facilities." Stocks in private prison companies have jumped on Wall Street since Trump won the presidential election, and they continued [their rise on news](http://www.marketwatch.com/story/private-prison-stocks-jump-after-trump-official-says-feds-will-continue-using-facilities-2017-02-23) of Sessions' order.

#### Universities consistently invest in private prisons corporations

**Gold 14** [Hannah K. Gold, 6-18-2014, "5 Weird Links Between Colleges and the Prison Industry," Rolling Stone, <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/5-links-between-higher-education-and-the-prison-industry-20140618>] NB

American universities do a fine job of selling themselves as pathways to opportunity and knowledge. But follow the traffic of money and policies through these academic institutions and you'll often wind up at the barbed wire gates of Corrections Corporation of America (CCA) and GEO Group, the two largest private prison operators in the United States. In the last two decades the private prison industry has exploded, growing 784 percent at the federal level, and helping the United States to achieve the highest incarceration rate in the world. CCA operates 69 facilities throughout the United States, GEO operates 55; both typically mandate that 90 percent of their beds be filled at all times. In the last two years alone CCA has defended itself against charges of fraudulent understaffing of its facilities, medical neglect and abuse of inmates. A series of policies, appointments and investments knit America's universities into the widening net of the criminal justice system and the prison industrial complex. Institutions of higher education have now become a part of what sociologist Victor Rios has called the "youth control complex"—a tightly bundled network of institutions that work insidiously and in harmony to criminalize young people of color. Here are five ways that universities buy into private prison companies. 1. Investing In Private Prisons The clearest link between havens of higher education and private prisons, are direct investments of a university's endowment in CCA and GEO Group. The most public display of such nefarious investments has been at Columbia University, where in June 2013 a group of students discovered that their university owns 230,432 shares of CCA stock worth $8 million. In February 2014 the newly formed student groups Columbia Prison Divest delivered a letter to President Lee Bollinger demanding, among other things, that Columbia divest all its CCA shares and fully disclose its investments in the future (students can only view 10 percent of the university's investments currently). These connections are glaring, the less obvious ones go by the names of Goldman Sachs, JP Morgan Chase, Wells Fargo, and other members of the "million shares club"—companies that own more than one million shares of CCA and GEO Group, and which collectively own more than two-thirds of these private prison companies. They all have directors and CEOs who sit on the boards of wealthy universities like Stanford and Columbia, and these top universities hand over healthy wads of endowment cash to them too. The full list of mega-powerful conglomerates that take stock in incarceration can be viewed [here](http://prisondivestment.wordpress.com/2014/06/12/million-shares-club-36-major-private-prison-investors/). In the spring of 2013, several student groups at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara passed a Student Senate resolution calling for the UC system to dump its "million shares club" investments. California, a state that [spends more money on incarceration than higher education](http://thinkprogress.org/justice/2012/09/08/815951/california-spends-more-on-jails-than-higher-education/),accounted for [12 percent of CCA's total revenue](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-09/corrections-corp-wins-as-jerry-brown-buys-california-prison-fix.html) in 2012.

#### Student activism is crucial to divestment protests

- stigmatization is the strongest internal link a. forces institutions to question their ideals and commit their practices to broader issues, b. generates public backlash- that leads to further protests against specific organization and puts pressure on political system, c. empirics- in the 1970s and 80s, magnifying glass to focus attention on usfg apathy towards apartheid and nelson mandela imprisonment, congress passed sanctions on south Africa, and apartheid ended. On tobacco, divestment helped highlight bad practices of tobacco industries and presence of schools like Harvard, umich, Stanford were all key,

**Oparah 14** [Oparah, Julia C. “Challenging Complicity- The Neoliberal University and the Prison-Industrial Complex” Chapter 3 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

How does an abolitionist lens assist us in assessing responses to the academic-MPIC? First, it draws our attention to the economic basis of the academic-MPIC and pushes us to attack the materiality of the militari- zation and prisonization of academia rather than limiting our interventions to the realm of ideas. This means that we must challenge the corporatization of our universities and colleges and question what influences and account- abilities are being introduced by our increasing collaboration with neoliberal global capital. It also means that we must dismantle those complicities and liberate the academy from its role as handmaiden to neoliberal globaliza- tion, militarism, and empire. In practice, this means interrogating our uni- versities’ and colleges’ investment decisions, demanding they divest from the military, security, and prison industries; distance themselves from military occupations in Southwest Asia and the Middle East; and invest instead in community-led sustainable economic development. It means facing allega- tions of disloyalty to our employers or alma maters as we blow the whistle on unethical investments and the creeping encroachment of corporate fund- ing, practices, and priorities. It means standing up for a vision of the liberal arts that neither slavishly serves the interests of the new global order nor returns to its elitist origins but instead is deeply embedded in progressive movements and richly informed by collaborations with insurgent and activ- ist spaces. And it means facing the challenges that arise when our divest- ment from empire has real impact on the bottom line of our university and college budgets. Andrea Smith, in her discussion of native studies, has argued that politi- cally progressive educators often adopt normative, colonial practices in the classroom, using pedagogical strategies and grading practices that rein- scribe the racialized and gendered regulation, policing, and disciplining that PIC abolitionists seek to end.53 In this sense, there could be no “postcarceral” academy. Certainly, sanctions for undergraduate and graduate students and faculty who challenge the university’s regular practices—from failing grades and expulsions to tenure denials and deportation—are systemically distrib- uted, along with rewards for those who can be usefully incorporated. Yet uni- versities and colleges also hold the seeds of a very different possible future, evoked, for example, by the universal admissions movement or by student strikes in Britain and Canada that demand higher education as a right, not a privilege of the wealthy. Rather than seeking to eradicate or replace higher educational institutions altogether, I suggest that we demand the popular and antiracist democratization of higher education. The first step toward this radical transformation is the liberation of aca- demia from the machinery of empire: prisons, militarism, and corporations. Speaking of abolishing the white race, Noel Ignatiev argues that it is neces- sary for white people to make whiteness impossible by refusing the invisible benefits of membership in the “white club.”54 Progressive academics are also members of a privileged “club,” one that confers benefits in the form of a pay- check, health care, and other fringe benefits; social status; and the freedom to pursue intellectual work that we are passionate about. But we can also put our privilege to work by unmasking and then unsettling the invisible, symbi- otic, and toxic relationships that constitute the academic-MPIC. Decoupling academia from its velvet-gloved master would begin the pro- cess of fundamental transformation. Without unfettered streams of income from corporations, wealthy philanthropists, and the military, universities and colleges would be forced to develop alternative fund-raising strategies, relationships, and accountabilities. Can we imagine a college administration aligned with local Occupy organizers to protest the state’s massive spend- ing on prisons and policing and demand more tax money for housing, edu- cation, and health care? Can we imagine a massive investment of time and resources by university personnel to solve the problem of how to decarcerate the nation’s prisons or end the detention of undocumented immigrants in order to fund universal access to higher education? Can we imagine a uni- versity run by and for its constituents, including students, kitchen and gar- den staff, and tenure-track and adjunct faculty? These are the possibilities opened up by academic-MPIC abolition

#### Divestment movements work- Columbia proves

**Joseph 15** [George Joseph, 6-2015 "The New Divestment Movement," JACOBIAN. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/06/mass-incarceration-college-corrections-corporation/>] NB  
On Monday, student organizers announced that Columbia University’s board of trustees had voted to divest from the private prison industry, a victory for the nearly two-year campaign led by the student group [Columbia Prison Divest](http://columbiaprisondivest.tumblr.com/). The vote mandates that the university [sell](http://www.cnn.com/2015/06/23/us/columbia-university-prison-divest/) its 220,000 shares in G4s, a British prison and security services company that operates prisons across the world and [provides equipment](http://www.whoprofits.org/company/g4s-israel-hashmira) for Israeli-run checkpoints in occupied Palestine. Furthermore, Columbia has [pledged](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/06/22/columbia-divest-prison_n_7640888.html) never to invest its $8 billion–plus endowment in other private prison corporations like Corrections Corporation of America in which, according to student estimates, the school [had $8 million](https://www.themarshallproject.org/2015/03/20/school-ties) worth of shares as of June 2013. These investments, it should be said, are a drop in the bucket for an industry that brings in [roughly $3 billion](http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/21694-shocking-facts-about-americas-for-profit-prison-industry) in revenue annually by operating prisons, jails, and holding facilities for undocumented immigrants. Students argue their campaign was not intended to make a huge dent in the profit margins of these corporations, but instead to increase awareness of the industry, and mass incarceration more broadly. “These are billion-dollar corporations,” Columbia Prison Divest organizer Gabriela Pelsinger told me. “If we hope to see an end to this, we have to look to and expose the economic engine driving this exploitation and incarceration, which is in large part due to the lobbying and the political presence of the private prison industry.”

#### Tackling the prison-industrial complex is critical to weaken the culture of militarism- multiple synergies confirm the normalization of violence

**Oparah 14** [Oparah, Julia C. “Challenging Complicity- The Neoliberal University and the Prison-Industrial Complex” Chapter 3 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

Efforts to bring insurgent knowledges about the prison-industrial complex into conversation with a critical analysis of U.S. militarism have proven use- ful in countering this approach. Prior to the September 11, 2001, attacks, antiprison organizers paid infrequent attention to U.S. military bases and interventions abroad and tended to focus on the financial and human cost of mass incarceration in isolation from the multibillion-dollar military- industrial complex.16 Indeed, the prison-industrial complex has often been theorized as the successor of the arms race, with the racialized fear of crime replacing the fear of “reds under the beds,” domestic wars on drugs and crime replacing wars abroad, and prisons replacing the army as the primary market for technological developments and sales.17 In the wake of the attacks of 9/11, as saber rattling reached its height and the United States prepared for war with Afghanistan, there was a marked shift as antiprison organizers witnessed a sharp (but temporary) reduction in support for abolitionist work in favor of antiwar mobilization. It was evident that the prison-industrial complex was simply not on the agenda of the mainstream antiwar move- ment. Contributing to this lacuna, scholars and other intellectuals who identify as being aligned with an antiwar politics had failed to produce critical analysis that unpacked the synergies between the military- and prison-industrial complexes and demonstrated the importance of challeng- ing both simultaneousl By 2003, as the United States bombarded Baghdad in order to “shock and awe” the Iraqi population, antiprison organizations had begun to respond to this gap. At the time, I was organizing with the Arizona Prison Moratorium Coalition (APMC) in Tucson against the construction of a new women’s prison and several new federal detention centers in the Southwest. As Tuc- son became the site of increasingly hostile and aggressively policed confron- tations between antiwar demonstrators and war supporters from families dependent on the military and local munitions industries, APMC issued a statement that sought to inform progressive activists about the intersections between the state’s dependency on the military and a powerful proprison lobby.18 Pointing to the ideological, technological, financial, and politi- cal synergies between militarism and prisons, APMC argued that “we are witnessing the consolidation of a powerful military-security-prison indus- trial complex that is driving an agenda of policing and aggression at home and abroad.” It concluded, “If we are to undo the U.S. culture of militarism, we must also attack our politicians’ profitable relationship with prisons.” APMC’s multifaceted critique rejects the separation of movements against state violence. In so doing, it recognizes and makes visible the multiple faces of imperial force—from prisons and immigration detention centers to army bases and military bombardments. APMC’s analysis was prescient of how the war and subsequent occupa- tion would unfold in Iraq. The ideological, political, and economic synergies between prisons and the military have played a critical role in the invasion and reconstruction of Iraq. Long before the war was declared, the U.S. popu- lace was prepared for a punitive and violent response to 9/11 through the saturation of news and popular media with images of crime and retribu- tive “justice.” The death penalty, in particular, plays a key role in legitimat- ing state-sanctioned killing as a rational and ethical response to threats to (national) security. George W. Bush presided over 152 deaths during his eight years as governor of Texas, a number not achieved by any governor before or since, despite the emergence of DNA counterevidence and exposes of egre- gious miscarriages of justice.19 The dehumanization of those deemed to have offended by the state, the normalization of state-sanctioned death, and the callous disregard for evidence of guilt or innocence were also essential com- ponents of the hunting down of al-Qaeda, the assassination of Bin Laden and his family, the indefinite detention without trial and torture of alleged enemy combatants, and the misinformation supplied to the public about weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

### Adv- Intelligence – NEW FOR TOC

#### <DO NOT BREAK WITHOUT TEAM PERMISSION>

#### The state has funneled extra money into universities largely populated by minorities to facilitate recruitment tactics for intelligence services

**Gonzalez 14** [Gonzalez, Roberto J. “Militarizing Education- The Intelligence Community’s Spy Camps” Chapter 2 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

In July 2005, a select group of fifteen- to nineteen-year-old high school stu- dents participated in a week-long summer program called “Spy Camp” in the Washington, DC, area. The program included a field trip to the CIA’s headquarters in Langley, Virginia, an “intelligence simulation” exercise, and a visit to the $35 million International Spy Museum. According to the Spy Museum’s website, visiting groups have the option of choosing from three different “scavenger hunts,” in which teams are pitted against one another in activities ranging “from code-breaking to deceptive maneuvers. . . . Each team will be armed with a top secret bag of tricks to help solve challenging questions” that can be found in the museum.1 On the surface, the program sounds like fun and games, and after reading about the program one might guess that it was organized by an imagina- tive social studies teacher. But for some, “Spy Camp” was more than just fun and games—it was very serious business. The high school program was car- ried out by Trinity University of Washington, DC—a predominantly African American university with an overwhelmingly female student population—as part of a pilot grant from the U.S. Office of the Director of National Intel- ligence (DNI) to create an “Intelligence Community Center of Academic Excellence” (or IC Center). According to the Office of the DNI, the goal of the IC Center program is to increase the pool of future applicants for careers in the CIA, the FBI, the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), and the dozen or so other organizations that make up the U.S. “intelligence community”—in less euphemistic terms, America’s spy agencies. The idea for IC Centers came about in the wake of the September 11, 2001, attacks, when both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives held hearings about how the country’s spy agencies missed clues that might have foiled the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks. As part of the response, Congress passed a sweeping law called the Intelligence Reform and Terror- ism Prevention Act (S 2845). In the House Intelligence Committee hearings prior to the bill’s passage, California representative Jane Harman (Demo- crat from California and chair of the House Intelligence Committee) put it bluntly: “We can no longer expect an Intelligence Community that is mostly male and mostly white to be able to monitor and infiltrate suspicious organi- zations or terrorist groups. We need spies that look like their targets, CIA offi- cers who speak the dialects that terrorists use, and FBI agents who can speak to Muslim women that might be intimidated by men” (emphasis added).2 For this reason, the IC Center program wasn’t aimed at students attend- ing Harvard, Yale, Princeton, or other Ivy League schools or internation- ally renowned universities like Stanford or Berkeley or the University of Chicago. The program’s architects consciously directed it at schools where minority students are the majority—predominantly African American and Latino universities, which are chronically underfunded. Perhaps this reflects the shape of “multiculturalism” in a militarized society: the government’s spy agencies and armed forces recruit minority students from low-income regions in order to “monitor and infiltrate” people (“targets”) that look and speak like them. Since 2005, Trinity’s IC Center has had its funding renewed, and “Spy Camp” has continued every summer since. In fact, beginning in 2006, the director of National Intelligence dramatically expanded the IC Center pro- gram (of which the “Spy Camp” is only one part), and today there are a total of twenty-one such centers throughout the country. These are located at Cali- fornia State University, San Bernardino; Carnegie-Mellon University; Clem- son University; Clark Atlanta University; Florida A&M University; Florida International University; Howard University; Miles College (Alabama); Nor- folk State University (Virginia); North Carolina A&T University; Pennsylva- nia State University; Tennessee State University; Trinity University; University of Maryland, College Park; University of Nebraska; University of New Mex- ico; University of North Carolina, Wilmington; University of Texas, El Paso; University of Texas, Pan American; University of Washington; Virginia Tech; and Wayne State University (Michigan). Significantly, most of these univer- sities have large numbers of minority students, which corresponds with the original objectives of the IC Center program’s architects. Tens of millions of dollars have been appropriated for the programs, with some centers receiving individual grants of up to $750,000. According to the Washington Post, the DNI planned to expand the program to twenty universities by the year 2015. Apparently, it has met this goal far ahead of schedule.3 (Since 2008, the DNI has included universities with significantly higher percentages of “white” stu- dents. It appears that the DNI quickly exhausted its supply of predominantly Hispanic and African American universities.) This is by no means the first time that U.S. military and intelligence agen- cies have funneled large sums of money into universities to advance their interests. The 1958 National Defense Education Act led to the creation of doz- ens of language and area studies programs focused on Russia, Latin America, and Southeast Asia, but those centers generally did not limit scholars’ ability to pursue a wide range of research, including critical social science research building upon anti-imperial and leftist scholarship.4 By contrast, there are clear indications that the IC Centers and other new recruitment programs have much more focused and narrow objectives that threaten core educa- tional values that have underpinned American universities for many years. Judging from some students’ responses, it seems that the DNI programs are making an impact. News reports from college newspapers begin to tell the story. Najam Hassan, a nineteen-year-old student at Trinity University, said, “It’s a good opportunity. I have interest in the FBI.” Reagan Thompson, who is seventeen, told a reporter, “I want to be a spy when I grow up. You learn different perspectives and it opens your mind.” Meriam Fadli, also sev- enteen, said, “I was like ‘Oh my God, I am so joining the FBI’. . . . She [the speaker] made it seem so interesting. It’s not like a dull office job.” Leah Mar- tin, a twenty-one-year-old, decided that she wanted an intelligence career after getting involved in the program: “You get to travel, to do something different every day, you’re challenged in your work and you get to serve your country. How cool is that?”5 The picture that emerges from these and other comments is that students are drawn to the IC Centers because they offer exciting, challenging experiences that will serve the country—not unlike the reasons that many young people decide to enlist in the armed forces. Televi- sion series that glorify law enforcement agents (CSI: Crime Scene Investiga- tion), intelligence operatives (24), and military personnel (JAG) have greatly romanticized these careers.

#### IC centers pervade universities through their curriculum, guest lectures, and separate programs

**Gonzalez 14** [Gonzalez, Roberto J. “Militarizing Education- The Intelligence Community’s Spy Camps” Chapter 2 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

What makes the new IC Centers across the country different from other insti- tutes or research centers? Though there are numerous differences from one school to the next, several universities appear to be involved in three kinds of activities apart from high school outreach programs like “Spy Camp.” Curriculum development—especially the creation of new classes—is a common process for IC Center schools. Many participating universities are creating new majors and minors in “intelligence studies” and developing new courses to meet the demands of spy agencies. For example, Trinity Uni- versity developed a new course titled “East vs. West: Just War, Jihad and Cru- sade, 1050–1450.” While the title itself is benign (though it conjures up images of the “clash of civilizations” popularized by historian Samuel Huntington), the syllabus reportedly states that the course “seeks to develop the critical/ analytical and writing skills that are particularly important to the intelligence community.”10 (We are left to wonder what the costs of favoring some kinds of writing—perhaps intelligence briefs and PowerPoint presentations—over others might be.) In some cases new masters’ programs are also being devel- oped, which might result in new faculty hiring. New classes in languages deemed important to U.S. security are being established as well (particularly in Arabic and Mandarin), and many campuses are purchasing books and films to support these new courses. Another group of activities includes organized events such as academic colloquia and guest lectures. Like all university special events, these can be intellectually stimulating, particularly when a thought-provoking or contro- versial speaker is invited to speak. But what should occur when a guest lec- ture or other campus event becomes a recruiting pitch for spy agencies? Finally, nearly all the IC Centers include scholarship and travel abroad programs. The same law that brought the IC Centers into existence also created the new “Intelligence Community Scholarship Program” (ICSP). Scholarship fellows take required intelligence-related courses and are typi- cally eligible for study abroad experiences and internships with spy agencies. According to the law, ICSP students who do not take jobs with U.S. intelli- gence agencies after graduating are required “to repay the costs of their edu- cation plus penalties assessed at three times the legally allowed interest rate.”11 Like PRISP (the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholarship Program, a $25,000, one-year scholarship for undergraduate and graduate students that requires them to work for the CIA after graduation), the identities of students are not publicly announced. Congress established PRISP in 2004 as a kind of academic version of the ROTC (Reserve Officer Training Corps) program: it was designed to combine intelligence training skills with academic areas of expertise, such as anthropology or political science. Since its creation PRISP has placed hundreds of students in an unknown number of university class- rooms. Although critics have referred to such programs as “debt bondage to constrain student career choices,” President Barack Obama’s director of National Intelligence, Dennis Blair, announced in 2009 plans to make PRISP permanent.12 In and of themselves, these activities sound benign, even desirable. After all, who could argue against funding for new courses, films, guest speakers, conferences, and scholarships, particularly during this period of chronic underfunding of higher education? But there is a subtle danger posed by the deluge of funds reaching universities through IC Centers—a danger similar to that posed by military funding. Anthropologist Hugh Gusterson has writ- ten eloquently about the ways in which this can twist the education process over time. A wide range of problems comes into focus: When research that could be funded by neutral civilian agencies is instead funded by the military, knowledge is subtly militarized and bent in the way a tree is bent by a prevailing wind. The public comes to accept that basic academic research on religion and violence “belongs” to the military; scholars who never saw themselves as doing military research now do; maybe they wonder if their access to future funding is best secured by not criticizing US foreign policy; a discipline whose independence from military and corporate fund- ing fueled the kind of critical thinking a democracy needs is now compromised; and the priorities of the military further define the basic terms of public and academic debate.13 In short, the IC Centers could further threaten the notion of the classroom as a free “marketplace of ideas”—a process that is well under way due to the powerful influence exerted on college campuses by multinational corpora- tions and other commercial interests. The fact that the “intelligence com- munity” includes heavy representation from Pentagon agencies (such as DIA and Marine Corps Intelligence, to name but two) and is closely linked to military contract firms further underscores the significance of Gusterson’s words.

#### Campus dissenters against intelligence agency cooption of their campuses were afraid of actual dissent because of punishment for dissent

**Gonzalez 14** [Gonzalez, Roberto J. “Militarizing Education- The Intelligence Community’s Spy Camps” Chapter 2 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

Not everyone at UTPA approved of the IC Center. A group made up of students from the university’s chapter of MEChA (a nationwide Chicano student organization) and faculty members voiced opposition to UTPA’s participation in the DNI grant before it had been awarded, and I contacted several of them. These critics brought up a wide range of concerns. Some expressed con- cern that the center might lead to bias in the classroom or a biased orienta- tion of books and other materials purchased in the library. In the words of a professor opposed to the IC Center, “I don’t think they’re going to be buy- ing history books that examine the CIA’s crimes in Central America or the abuses of graduates of the School of the Americas.” (I heard later that some university staff designated one section of the main library the “spy room” because it houses a large number of intelligence-related journals and books acquired for the IC Center.) The professor noted that IC Center personnel appeared to suffer from a lack of awareness of the dark history of the CIA, the FBI, and other agencies making up the “intelligence community.” UTPA political science professor Samuel Freeman argued that “just as intelligence agencies are penetrating our universities today with phony ‘Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence’—like the center recently established at UTPA unfortunately—the CIA, in the 1950s and 1960s conspired with unethical university professors and administrators.”16 Free- man’s concerns linked intelligence agencies’ current recruiting efforts on col- lege campuses to a broader history of co-optation on university campuses. Some critics were concerned about the way in which the intelligence agencies might be manipulating “diversity” to meet their own interests rather than the interests of students. A graduate student I spoke with was particu- larly galled by the cloak of “multiculturalism” used by the DNI and the IC Center to promote the program. Another student, Nadezhda Garza, report- edly said of the UTPA program, “At this point, you have to decide if opportu- nity is really opportunity. . . . The [intelligence community] isn’t pushing you academically, it’s pushing you to recruitment. The [intelligence community] has its own agenda.”17 A report in the San Antonio Express-News appeared to confirm Garza’s words, noting that “CIA recruiters were on [the UTPA] campus visiting mainly with students in the program who are earning an intelligence studies certificate.”18 Still another concern expressed by critics of the program had to do with the safety of UTPA students participating on study abroad programs. “What kind of risk are students in China going to face if that country’s government knows that they are connected to the Office of the Director of National Intel- ligence?” asked a professor. He argued that Chinese officials might view them as spies. Finally, both students and professors were alarmed at the possibil- ity that academic freedom at UTPA might be threatened by the IC Center. What would happen to students or faculty who refused to go along with the current produced by waves of IC Center funding? How would university administrators (or campus police) deal with students or faculty who actively protested guest speakers from the CIA or FBI? According to the minutes of an April 2006 UTPA faculty senate meeting, a group of MEChA students expressed concerns over the proposed IC Center ranging from “possible restrictions to academic freedom” to “exploitation of UTPA students by intelligence communities.”19 When local media ran a handful of stories on the UTPA IC Center in 2007, reporters generally ignored the many criti- cisms that had been raised by concerned faculty and students. The CIA, FBI, and other spy agencies appeared to be scoring a “silent coup” at UTPA, a pat- tern that would be repeated at other universities as the IC Center program diffused throughout the country.20

#### Intelligence communities whitewash their past and deflect criticism against human rights violations

**Gonzalez 14** [Gonzalez, Roberto J. “Militarizing Education- The Intelligence Community’s Spy Camps” Chapter 2 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

Once I began combing through dozens of documents, articles, government reports, websites, and interview transcripts, it became clear that many uni- versity administrators, congressional representatives, and educators were ignoring the elephant in the room: outrageous and illegal actions that U.S. spy agencies have been involved with over the last sixty years. I began to ask, what happened to teaching “critical thinking skills” at the IC Centers? As Stephen Kinzer has noted in his book Overthrow, the CIA has been deeply involved in orchestrating coups, assassinations, and civil wars in such diverse places as Iran, Guatemala, Chile, Indonesia, and El Salvador, among many others over the past century.21 We now know that the CIA supported social science research throughout the 1950s and 1960s to perfect psycho- logical torture techniques that were outsourced to Vietnam, Argentina, and other countries.22 Phillip Agee was so shocked by the CIA’s covert operations in support of Latin American dictatorships that in 1968 he quit the agency and spent the rest of his life criticizing it.23 Over the past decade many people have exposed illegal acts carried out with impunity by the “intelligence community.” For example, in December 2002, the Washington Post ran a front-page story describing how CIA opera- tives sent suspected members of al-Qaeda to third countries for brutal inter- rogations.24 In November 2005, journalist Dana Priest revealed the presence of a secret CIA network of overseas prisons in Eastern Europe, Southeast Asia, and other regions. The “black sites” were located in countries whose police and intelligence agencies are infamous for their egregious human rights violations, which have been extensively documented by human rights organizations.25 In April 2006, Former AT&T technician Mark Klein issued a public statement in which he described AT&T’s cooperation in a secret National Security Agency (NSA) operation that would allow it to conduct “vacuum-cleaner surveillance of all the data crossing the internet,” a form of wiretapping prohibited by the U.S. Constitution. In December 2005, the New York Times described the NSA and Defense Intelligence Agency’s use of illegal wiretapping at the request of the Bush administration.26 In February 2007, an Italian court indicted twenty-six U.S. intelligence agents, most of them from the CIA, for the 2003 kidnapping of an Egyptian cleric, Usama Nasr. Nasr was taken to Egypt where he was held for four years and report- edly tortured before being freed by an Egyptian court that ruled his deten- tion to be “unfounded.”27 In January 2007, a German court issued arrest warrants for thirteen U.S. intelligence agents (mostly CIA) involved in the 2003 kidnapping of a German citizen, Khaled el Masri. Masri was taken to Afghanistan, jailed for five months, and physically and psychologically tor- tured before being released without charges.28 Although these events (and many other similar violations) were making headlines at the time the IC Centers were established, few of the news arti- cles about the centers mentioned any dilemmas that might be posed by uni- versity collaboration with the agencies in question. Nor did they ask whether it was appropriate for institutions of higher education to be accepting money linked to such sources. It was as if the 1975–1976 Church Committee reports of the U.S. Senate—which famously and publicly exposed the legal and polit- ical abuses carried out by U.S. intelligence agencies—had never existed. Some scholars did make these connections and raised questions that were inconvenient for proponents of the program. For example, independent scholar and writer Kamala Platt noted that in south Texas, “decades of being among the poorest and most underserved regions of the country have laid the groundwork” for the program. In many ways, student participation in IC Centers resembles participation in JROTC programs. As anthropologist Gina Pérez argues, JROTC is “deeply rooted in notions of citizenship [and service to country] . . . [and] informed by the realities of a local political economy with extremely limited employment opportunities for working-class youth.” Consequently, IC Centers and JROTC might be seen as programs in which “notions of exceptional citizenship [are] anchored in a distinctive and par- ticularly valorized military culture.”29 But a militarized culture can lead to intellectual, moral, and ethical dilemmas. According to Kamala Platt, a range of contradictions inherently accompany such initiatives: Underlying ICC’s interest in these [academic] fields is the identi- fication, fear, and domination of “enemies” and the blowing up of bridges of communication. . . . The intelligence community’s interest in these disciplines defiles them, and I could never in good con- science (i.e. with intellectual or moral integrity) participate in these junctures of university and IC-CAE. I could never teach a Chicana novel in a classroom where I knew some of the students were being trained to read the literature for knowledge that might endanger sister barrios.30 It seems likely that once critics started to raise such points, some IC Centers began to drop the words “Intelligence Community” from their names. Now many are known simply as “Centers for Academic Excellence.” Similarly, the “Spy Camp” at Trinity became simply “Summer Intelligence Seminar,” while UTPA’s version became the “Got Intelligence?” camp. It may be that the DNI’s primary goal in creating the IC Centers is to increase the pool of minority youth seeking employment in spy agencies. But an important secondary goal appears to be a public relations goal: to give an extreme makeover to the CIA, the FBI, the NSA, and other agencies for a generation too young to know about their past abuses and too overworked and distracted to be aware of their current ones. Only by whitewashing the past can the director of National Intelligence hope to normalize spy work.

#### Only free speech in the form of protests can reveal the truth behind such programs

**Gonzalez 14** [Gonzalez, Roberto J. “Militarizing Education- The Intelligence Community’s Spy Camps” Chapter 2 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

UTPA professor Samuel Freeman observes, “The [IC] Spy Center is part of nothing less than an attempt to legitimize the illegitimate, to manipu- late us into condoning the unpardonable, and to accept the crimes of US intelligence agencies as actions that are legitimate, acceptable, and even respectable. . . . Hopefully, protests raised by students and faculty will send a message to other UTPA organizations that consorting with IC-CAE/IGkNU is not worth the cost.”33 Will students and faculty eventually mobilize themselves against the “intelligence community” on America’s college campuses? It is still too early to tell. The IC Centers have largely succeeded because they have countered local resistance efforts that have tended to be isolated from each other. David Price has noted that those opposed to IC-CAE are more likely to succeed if they forge alliances nationwide for a common cause: “Something like an ‘IC- CAE Watch’ or ‘CIA Campus Watch’ website could be started by a faculty member or grad student on an IC-CAE campus, providing forums to collect documents, stories, and resistance tactics from across the country.”34 In addi- tion, Price recommends that concerned students, faculty, and staff make use of state public records laws and the national Freedom of Information Act to request records related to IC-CAE and that tenured professors at IC-CAE funded universities take a leading role in asking tough questions about the program.

#### Intelligence programs on campuses erode academic freedom and prioritize an interest in conflict, it’s time to change that

**Gonzalez 14** [Gonzalez, Roberto J. “Militarizing Education- The Intelligence Community’s Spy Camps” Chapter 2 of “The Imperial University- Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent” Piya Chaterjee, Sunaina Maira, (UC Professors) – editors of the book. University of Minnesota Press.2014] NB

IC Centers, PRISP, the Minerva Consortium, and their like will likely erode academic freedom and distort the education of university students. Classes that support the needs of the “intelligence community” and the Pen- tagon will likely have ample funding; those that expose the historical crimes of the CIA, FBI, and other spy agencies will not. Professors who accept the goals and perspectives of the DNI will likely be supported in their efforts to secure tenure, internal grants, and facilities; those who don’t accept them will not. Similar situations in the past—in which universities have succumbed to the pressures of commercialization—have tended to produce these results, and as a new wave of intelligence-based commercialization hits, we need to be wary of the dangers that it poses to academic freedom and the core principles of higher education.35 The university itself runs the risk of selling its soul for a quick financial fix that, in the end, does a disservice to the stu- dents and the entire society. That the structures of the IC Center programs, PRISP, and other initiatives threaten to constrain free and open intellectual inquiry on our campuses should concern us all. As noted earlier, this is not the only time that military and intelligence agencies have aggressively infiltrated college and university campuses. In many ways, the stage was set as early as the 1980s, when public universi- ties began shifting to a profit-driven corporate model. As state governments began cutting back public funding for higher education, universities came to rely more and more on external funding, especially from corporations and other private sources. The private, profit-driven model has all but replaced our country’s public university system. In the process it has inflicted wide- spread damage to a part of American society that is still greatly admired around the world.36 Universities in the United States have strayed far from their core values: academic freedom, open scientific inquiry not subject to secrecy, and com- mitment to high-quality education for the benefit of students, not for some ulterior motive.37 But there is still time to turn things around. In this con- text it is worth remembering the words of Senator William Fulbright (for whom the Fulbright Fellowship program was named). Just over forty years ago, in the midst of the Vietnam War, he said the following on the floor of the Senate: More and more our economy, our government, and our universities are adapting themselves to the requirements of continuing war. . . . The universities might have formed an effective counterweight to the military-industrial complex by strengthening their emphasis on the traditional values of our democracy, but many of our lead- ing institutions have instead joined the monolith, adding greatly to its power and influence. . . . Among the most baneful effects of the government-university contract system, the most damaging and corrupting are the neglect of its students, and the taking into the government camp of scholars, especially those in the social sciences, who ought to be acting as responsible and independent critics of their government’s policies. . . . When the university turns away from its central purpose and makes itself an appendage to the govern- ment, concerning itself with techniques rather than purposes, with expedients rather than ideals . . . it is not only failing to meet its responsibilities to its students; it is betraying a public trust.38 Fulbright’s words are as relevant today as when he first spoke them in 1967. It is left now to students, faculty, and citizens of conscience to ensure that wisdom and good judgment will prevail over a marriage of convenience between universities and spy agencies.

# 1AR- Case

## XT

### XT: Framing

#### Your decision calculus should be centered around which debater best decreases militarism because it eschews our rational perspectives by forcing us to calculate a certain way, shuts down our critical thinking skills because it silences dissent, and causes violence abroad and in the US-- that's Chaterjee and Maira and Trautman.

#### Your role as a judge and human is to promote critical thinking as higher level obligation that transcends your procderual as a debate judge so aff outweighs theory and is a gateway issue

### Case Proper

#### The academy has been taken by militarism- 3 key warrants:

#### 1. The DOD uses multiple universities for military research and curriculum through investments

#### 2. They contain academics and students who question the security complex

<specifically uc davis and uc riverside>

#### Free speech is critical to promote student activism- that's Kurtz.

#### Student activism is necessary to derail militarism - 3 separate links

#### 1. Free speech teaches students critical thinking skills and consider other perspectives which makes them advocates for liberalism with real policy reform – empirics prove, that's Chaterjee then Gay

#### 2. Student protests have been capable of questioning the military before such as in Vietnam which lead to drawdown through decreased resolve and recruitment-- that's Tilly 99

#### 3. Divestment protests stop universities from investing in military research and occupations abroad- that's Oparah, it's empirically worked

### ! Weighing

## Hate Speech

### Straight Turn

#### Counterspeech is especially effective

**Calleros 95** [Calleros, Charles R. “Paternalism, Counterspeech, and Campus Hate-Speech Codes: A Reply to Delgado and Yun” (Professor of Law, Arizona State University). HeinOnline. Arizona State Law Journal. 1995] NB

Delgado and Yun summarize the support for the counterspeech argument by paraphrasing Nat Hentoff: "[A]ntiracism rules teach black people to depend on whites for protection, while talking back clears the air, emphasizes self-reliance, and strengthens one's self-image as an active agent inchargeofone'sowndestiny."50 DelgadoandYunalsocitetothosewho believe that counterspeech may help educate the racist speaker by addressing 51 the ignorance and fear that lies behind hostile racial stereotyping. But they reject this speech-protective argument, stating that "it is offered blandly, virtually as an article of faith" by those "in a position of power" who "rarely offer empirical proof of their claims. ,,52 The authors argue that talking back in a close confrontation could be physically dangerous, is unlikely to persuade the racist speaker to reform his views, and is impossible "when racist remarks are delivered in a cowardly fashion, by means of graffiti scrawled on a campus wall late at night or on a poster placed outside of a black student's dormitory door." 53 They also complain that "[e]ven when successful, talking back is a burden" that minority undergraduates 54 should not be forced to assume. In rejecting the counterspeech argument, however, Delgado and Yun cast the argument in its weakest possible form, creating an easy target for relatively summary dismissal. When the strategies and experiential basis for successful counterspeech are fairly stated, its value is more easily recognized. First, no responsible free speech advocate argues that a target of hate speech should directly talk back to a racist speaker in circumstances that quickly could lead to a physical altercation. If one or more hateful speakers closely confronts a member of a minority group with racial epithets or other hostile remarks in circumstances that lead the target of the speech to reasonably fear for her safety, in most circumstances she should seek assistance from campus police or other administrators before "talking back." Even staunch proponents of free speech agree that such threatening speech and conduct is subject to regulation and justifies more than a purely educative response. The same would be true of Delgado's and Yun's other examples of speech conveyed in a manner that defaces another's property or 56 When offensive or hateful speech is not threatening, damaging, or impermissibly invasive and therefore may constitute protected speech, 57 education and counterspeech often will be an appropriate response. However, proponents of free speech do not contemplate that counterspeech always, or even normally, will be in the form of an immediate exchange of views between the hateful speaker and his target. Nor do they contemplate that the target should bear the full burden of the response. Instead, effective counterspeech often takes the form of letters, discussions, or demonstrations joined in by many persons and aimed at the entire campus population or a community within it. Typically, it is designed to expose the moral bankruptcy of the hateful ideas, to demonstrate the strength of opinion and numbers of those who deplore the hateful speech, and to spur members of the campus community to take voluntary, constructive action to combat hate and to remedy its ill effects. 58 Above all, it can serve to define and underscore the community of support enjoyed by the targets of the hateful speech, faith in which may have been shaken by the hateful speech. Moreover, having triggered such a reaction with their own voices, the targets of the hateful speech may well feel a sense of empowerment to compensate for the undeniable pain of the speech. 59 One may be tempted to join Delgado and Yun in characterizing such a scenario as one "offered blandly, virtually as an article of faith" and without experiential support. 6° However, campus communities that have creatively used this approach can attest to the surprising power of counterspeech. Examples of counterspeech to hateful racist and homophobic speech at Arizona State and Stanford Universities are especially illustrative.61 In an incident that attracted national attention, the campus community at Arizona State University ("A.S.U.") constructively and constitutionally responded to a racist poster displayed on the outside of the speaker's dormitory door in February 1991. Entitled "WORK APPLICATION," it contained a number of ostensibly employment-related questions that advanced hostile and demeaning racial stereotypes of African-Americans and Mexican-Americans. Carla Washington, one of a group of African- American women who found the poster, used her own speech to persuade a resident of the offending room voluntarily to take the poster down and allow her to photocopy it. After sending a copy of the poster to the campus newspaper along with an opinion letter deploring its racist stereotypes, she demanded action from the director of her residence hall. The director organized an immediate meeting of the dormitory residents to discuss the issues. In this meeting, I explained why the poster was protected by the First Amendment, and the women who found the poster eloquently described their pain and fears. One of the women, Nichet Smith, voiced her fear that all nonminorities on campus shared the hostile stereotypes expressed in the poster. Dozens of residents expressed their support and gave assurances that they did not share the hostile stereotypes, but they conceded that even the most tolerant among them knew little about the cultures of others and would 62 benefit greatly from multicultural education.  The need for multicultural education to combat intercultural ignorance and stereotyping became the theme of a press conference and public rally organized by the student African-American Coalition leader, Rossie Turman, who opted for highly visible counterspeech despite demands from some students and staff to discipline the owner of the offending poster. The result was a series of opinion letters in the campus newspaper discussing the problem of racism, numerous workshops on race relations and free speech, and overwhelming approval in the Faculty Senate of a measure to add a course on American cultural diversity to the undergraduate breadth 63 requirement.  The four women who initially confronted the racist poster were empowered by the meeting at the dormitory residence and later received awards from the local chapter of the NAACP for their activism.64 Rossie Turman was rewarded for his leadership skills two years later by becoming the first African-American elected President of Associated Students of A.S.U.,65 a student body that numbered approximately 40,000 students, only 66 2.3 percent of them African-American. Although Delgado and Yun are quite right that the African-American students should never have been burdened with the need to respond to such hateful speech, Hentoff is correct that the responses just described helped them develop a sense of self-reliance and constructive activism. Moreover, the students' counterspeech inspired a community response that lightened the students' burden and provided them with a sense of community support and empowerment. Indeed, the students received assistance from faculty and administrators, who helped organize meetings, wrote opinion letters, spoke before the Faculty Senate, or joined the students in issuing public statements at the press conference and public rally.67 Perhaps most important, campus administrators wisely refrained from disciplining the owners of the poster, thus directing public attention to the issue of racism and ensuring broad community support in denouncing the racist poster. Many members of the campus and surrounding communities might have leapt to the racist speaker's defense had the state attempted to discipline the speaker and thus had created a First Amendment issue. Instead, they remained united with the offended students because the glare of the public spotlight remained sharply focused on the racist incident without the distraction of cries of state censorship. Although the counterspeech was not aimed primarily at influencing the hearts and minds of the residents of the offending dormitory room, its vigor in fact caught the residents by surprise. 68 It prompted at least three of them to apologize publicly and to display curiosity about a civil rights movement that they were too young to have witnessed first hand. 69 This effective use of education and counterspeech is not an isolated instance at A.S.U., but has been repeated on several occasions, albeit on smaller scales.7° One year after the counterspeech at A.S.U., Stanford University responded similarly to homophobic speech. In that case, a first-year law student sought to attract disciplinary proceedings and thus gain First Amendment martyrdom by shouting hateful homophobic statements about a dormitory staff member. The dean of students stated that the speaker was not subject to discipline under Stanford's code of conduct but called on the university community to speak out on the issue, triggering an avalanche of counterspeech. Students, staff, faculty, and administrators expressed their opinions in letters to the campus newspaper, in comments on a poster board at the law school, in a published petition signed by 400 members of the law school community disassociating the law school from the speaker's epithets, and in a letter written by several law students reporting the incident to a prospective employer of the offending student.71 The purveyor of hate speech indeed had made a point about the power of speech, just not the one he had intended. He had welcomed disciplinary sanctions as a form of empowerment, but the Stanford community was alert enough to catch his verbal hardball and throw it back with ten times the force. Thus, the argument that counterspeech is preferable to state suppression of offensive speech is stronger and more fully supported by experience than is conceded by Delgado and Yun. In both of the cases described above, the targets of hateful speech were supported by a community united against bigotry. The community avoided splitting into factions because the universities eliminated the issue of censorship by quickly announcing that the hateful speakers were protected from disciplinary retaliation. Indeed, the counterspeech against the bigotry was so powerful in each case that it underscored the need for top administrators to develop standards for, and some limitations on, their participation in such partisan speech. 72 Of course, the community action in these cases was effective and empowering precisely because a community against bigotry existed. At A.S.U. and Stanford, as at most universities, the overwhelming majority of students, faculty, and staff are persons of tolerance and good will who deplore at least the clearest forms of bigotry and are ready to speak out Of course, the community action in these cases was effective and empowering precisely because a community against bigotry existed. At A.S.U. and Stanford, as at most universities, the overwhelming majority of students, faculty, and staff are persons of tolerance and good will who deplore at least the clearest forms of bigotry and are ready to speak out against intolerance when it is isolated as an issue rather than diluted in muddied waters along with concerns of censorship. Just as the nonviolent demonstrations of Martin Luther King, Jr., depended partly for their success on the consciences of the national and international audiences monitoring the fire hoses and attack dogs on their television sets and in the print media,73 the empowerment of the targets of hateful speech rests partly in the hands of members of the campus community who sympathize with them. One can hope that the counterspeech and educational measures used with success at A.S.U. and Stanford stand a good chance of preserving an atmosphere of civility in intellectual inquiry at any campus community in which compassionate, open minds predominate. On the other hand, counterspeech by the targets of hate speech could be less empowering on a campus in which the majority of students, faculty, and staff approve of hostile epithets directed toward members of minority groups. One hopes that such campuses are exceedingly rare; although hostile racial stereotyping among college students in the United States increased during the last decade, those students who harbored significant hostilities (as contrasted with more pervasive but less openly hostile, subconscious racism) still represented a modest fraction of all students.74 Moreover, even in a pervasively hostile atmosphere, counterspeech might still be more effective than broad restrictions on speech. First, aside from the constitutional constraints of the First Amendment, such a heartless campus community would be exceedingly unlikely to adopt strong policies prohibiting hateful speech. Instead, the campus likely would maintain minimum policies necessary to avoid legal action enforcing guarantees of equal educational opportunities under the Fourteenth Amendment 75 or federal antidiscrimination statutes such as Title V176 or Title IX. 77 Second, counterspeech even from a minority of members of the campus community might be effective to gradually build support by winning converts from those straddling the fence or from broader regional or national audiences. Such counterspeech might be particularly effective if coupled with threats from diverse faculty, staff, and students to leave the university for more hospitable environments; even a campus with high levels of hostility likely would feel 78 pressures to maintain its status as a minimally integrated institution. The A.S.U. and Stanford examples illustrating the efficacy of counterspeech also lend support to the argument that "[firee speech has been minorities' best friend ...[as] a principal instrument of social reform."79 In both cases, demonstrations, opinion letters, and other forms of counterspeech dramatically defined the predominant atmosphere on each campus as one that demanded respect and freedom from bigotry for all members of the community; it is doubtful that passage of a speech-restrictive policy could have sent a similar message of consensus any more strongly. Moreover, in the A.S.U. case, the reasoned counterspeech, coupled with the decision to refrain from disciplining the hateful speaker, persuaded the Faculty Senate to pass a multicultural education proposal whose chances for passage were seriously in doubt in the previous weeks and months.8 The racist poster at A.S.U. may have been a blessing in disguise, albeit an initially painful one, because it sparked counterspeech and community action that strengthened the campus support for diversity.

#### Speech codes are more likely to work against minorities- Great Britain and Michigan prove

Strossen 90 [(Nadine, June 1990, president of the American Civil Liberties Union from February 1991 to October 2008, John Marshall Harlan II Professor of Law at New York Law School., “Regulating Racist Speech on Campus: A Modest Proposal?”, Duke Law Journal, Vol. 1990, No. 3, Frontiers of Legal Thought II. The New First Amendment (Jun., 1990), pp. 484-573, Duke University School of Law, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1372555]

First, there is no persuasive psychological evidence that punishment for name- calling changes deeply held attitudes. To the contrary, psycho-logical studies show that censored speech becomes more appealing and persuasive to many listeners merely by virtue of the censorship. Nor is there any empirical evidence, from the countries that do out-law racist speech, that censorship is an effective means to counter racism. For example, Great Britain began to prohibit racist defamation in 1965. 359 A quarter century later, this law has had no discernible adverse impact on the National Front and other neo- Nazi groups active in Brit- ain.360 As discussed above, 361 it is impossible to draw narrow regulations that precisely specify the particular words and contexts that should lead to sanctions. Fact- bound determinations are required. For this reason, authorities have great discretion in determining precisely which speakers and which words to punish. Consequently, even vicious racist epithets have gone unpunished under the British law.362 Moreover, even if actual or threatened enforcement of the law has deterred some overt racist in-sults, that enforcement has had no effect on more subtly, but nevertheless clear, signals of racism.363 Some observers believe that racism is even more pervasive in Britain that in the United States.364¶ C. Banning Racist Speech Could Aggravate Racism. For several reasons banning the symptom of racist speech may compound the underlying problem of racism. Professor Lawrence sets up a false dichotomy when he urges us to balance equality goals against free speech goals. Just as he observes that free speech concerns should be weighed on the pro- regulation, as well as the anti- regulation, side of the balance,365 he should recognize that equality concerns weigh on the anti-regulation, as well as the pro-regulation, side.366¶ The first reason that laws censoring racist speech may undermine the goal of combating racism flows from the discretion such laws inevitably vest in prosecutors, judges, and other individuals who implement them. One ironic, even tragic, result of this discretion is that members of minority groups themselves- the very people whom the law is intended to protect- are likely targets of punishment. For example, among the first individuals prosecuted under the British Race Relations Act of 1965 367 were black power leaders.368 Their overtly racist messages un-doubtedly expressed legitimate anger at real discrimination, yet the stat-ute drew no such fine lines, nor could any similar statute possibly do so. Rather than curbing speech offensive to minorities, this British law in-stead has been regularly used to curb the speech of blacks, trade union-ists, and anti- nuclear activists.369 In perhaps the ultimate irony, this statute, which was intended to restrain the neo-Nazi National Front, instead has barred expression by the Anti- Nazi League.370 ¶ The British experience is not unique. History teaches us that anti- hate speech laws regularly have been used to oppress racial and other minorities. For example, none of the anti- Semites who were responsible for arousing France against Captain Alfred Dreyfus were ever prose-cuted for group libel. But Emile Zola was prosecuted for libeling the French clergy and military in his “J’Accuse,” and he had to flee to Eng-land to escape punishment.371 Additionally, closer to home, the very doctrines that professor Lawrence invokes to justify regulating campus hate speech- for example, the fighting words doctrine, upon which he chiefly relies- are particularly threatening to the speech of racial and political minorities. ¶ The general lesson that rules banning hate speech will be used to punish minority group members has proven true in the specific context of campus hate speech regulations. In 1974, in a move aimed at the Na-tional Front, the British National Union of Students (NUS) adopted a resolution that representatives of “openly racist and fascist organiza-tions” were to be prevented from speaking on college campuses “by whatever means necessary (including disruption of the meeting).”373 A substantial motivation for the rule had been to stem an increase in cam-pus anti-Semitism. Ironically, however, following the United Nations’ cue,374 some British students deemed Zionism a form of racism beyond the bounds of permitted discussion. Accordingly, in 1975 British stu-dents invoked the NUS resolution to disrupt speeches by Israelis and Zionists, including the Israeli ambassador to England. The intended tar-get of the NUS resolution, the National Front, applauded this result. However, the NUS itself became disenchanted by this and other unin-tended consequences of its resolution and repealed it in 1977.375 ¶ The British experience under its campus anti- hate speech rule paral-lels the experience in the United States under the one such rule that has led to a judicial decision. During the approximately one year that the University of Michigan rule was in effect, there were more than twenty cases of whites charging blacks with racist speech. 376 More importantly, the only two instances in which the rule was invoked to sanction racist speech (as opposed to sexist and other forms of hate speech) involved the punishment of speech by or on behalf of black students.377 Additionally, the only student who was subjected to a full- fledged disciplinary hearing under the Michigan rule was a black student accused of homophobic and sexist expression.378 In seeking clemency from the sanctions imposed fol-lowing this hearing, the student asserted he had been singled out because of his race and his political views.379 Others who were punished for hate speech under the Michigan rule included several Jewish students accused of engaging in anti- Semitic expression380 and an Asian- American student accused of making an anti- black comment.381 Likewise, the student who recently brought a lawsuit challenging the University of Connecticut’s hate speech policy, under which she had been penalized for an allegedly homophobic remark, was Asian- American.382 She claimed that, among the other students who had engaged in similar expression, she had been singled out for punishment because of her ethnic background.383 ¶ Professor Lawrence himself recognizes that rules regulating racist speech might backfire and be invoked disproportionately against blacks and other traditionally oppressed groups. Indeed, he charges that other university rules already are used to silence anti- racist, but not racist, speakers.384 Professor Lawrence proposes to avoid this danger by ex-cluding from the rule’s protection “persons who were vilified on the basis of their membership in dominant majority groups.”385 Even putting aside the fatal first amendment flaws in such a radical departure from content- and viewpoint- neutrality principles, 386 the proposed exception would create far more problems of equality and enforceability than it would solve.387 ¶

#### Speech codes chill speech other than hate speech since people don’t want to risk violating the policy- that kills real movements

**Lukianoff 08**

<https://www.nas.org/articles/Campus_Speech_Codes_Absurd_Tenacious_and_Everywhere> Campus Speech Codes: Absurd, Tenacious, and Everywhere May 23, 2008 | Greg Lukianoff

Third, even if the university has not enforced the code, it is still part of its regulations and may, at any time, be pulled out when a student or faculty member might wish to silence, intimidate, or punish a member of the community whose opinions he or she disagrees with. It would most likely be at the very instances when free speech protections are most badly needed that the dormant code would be dusted off and put to work.37 Finally, and most importantly, the speech code itself, whether enforced or not, is the harm.  First Amendment jurisprudence recognizes this concept in the doctrine of “facial” unconstitutionality.  A speech regulation may be declared “facially” unconstitutional if it, by its very terms, sweeps in a large amount of clearly protected speech or if it is so vague that people of reasonable intelligence would have to guess at its meaning.  Either way, speech is “chilled” because the overwhelming majority of people typically would rather keep their mouths shut than risk the consequences of violating such a policy.  Furthermore, if the speech code is promulgated through the student handbook at a public university and the administration tells students that the university reserves the right to punish any speech that it deems “offensive,” it has both chilled speech and gravely misinformed students about their rights as students and citizens, whether the administration intends to enforce the speech code or not.

#### Link Turn- Prohibitions on hate speech fail- enforcement will be blocked, create backlash, used against minorities, and doesn’t work against subtle speech

**Baker 8** C. Edwin Baker. “Hate Speech.” Penn Law, Public Law and Legal Theory Research Paper Series. March 10th, 2008.

Even more problematic, to be an effective place to intervene, adopted prohibitions must be efficacious in reducing the likelihood of serious racist evils. Most obviously, this result probably requires sufficient enforcement of the prohibitions against the relevant targets. Maybe, however, their mere adoption could help create a cultural climate where racist speech, and even more importantly, virulent racist practices, are unacceptable. The question of whether to expect effective enforcement is made more difficult because it is not clear at what stage enforcement would be meaningful in preventing the polity from devolving in an unacceptably racist direction or whether enforcement could be effective at reversing cultural directions. Active enforcement (against appropriate targets) is likely only if racist groups have not become too established. By the time Nazis were gaining power, or during the year immediately preceding the genocide in Rwanda, effective enforcement was unlikely. At the relevant time, enforcement would likely either be blocked, create a backlash against the enforcers and sympathy for the ‘suppressed’ racists, or as will be discussed below, enforced primarily against ‘unpatriotic’ or ‘racist’ speech of those most needing protection – Jews or Tutsis, for example, or against African-Americans in the United States or Algerians in France. Thus, the hope of those favoring hate speech prohibitions must be that enforcement will be meaningful and effective at a quite early stage. Pessimism about this speculative hope seems justified. First are generic doubts about the likelihood of effective legal enforcement. More important, however, is the likelihood that at this most relevant stage the speech that meaningfully contributes to developing or sustaining racism will be subtle, quotidian and, to many people, seemingly inoffensive or at least not ‘seriously’ offensive speech. This speech is likely to fly under the legal radar screen and, in any event, meaningful enforcement of prohibitions against this speech is even less likely. Thus, even given a belief that racist speech contributes significantly to virulent racism and genocidal practice, my hypothesis is that at earlier stages legal prohibitions will not cover or be effectively enforced against the most relevant speech and at later stages enforcement will not occur, will be counter-productive in creating martyrs for a racist cause, or will focus on the wrong targets.

#### Link Turn- Speech codes are arbitrary- they can be used against proper forms of speech and still chill students other speech

**Golding 2K** [Martin P. Golding, [Professor, Duke University School of Law], Free Speech on Campus, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc, 2000, 17. Print.]

Besides fears that certain ideas, true and false, may be expunged from the marketplace, speech codes will also indirectly eliminate acceptable ideas from the marketplace. “The movement to control speech.., has a sinister side .... The chilling effect on those who are concerned about potential pun- ishment... will surely stifle the free and robust exchange of ideas that is so critical to the campus climate.”’ 05 Even if administrators can devise a code that prohibited only the “right amount of speech” and allows all speech nec- essary for academic debate, the mere threat of penalty will have a chilling effect.’0 6 This deterrence effect will be especially strong under codes which use the contextual method or balancing test to determine whether certain speech is sanctionable, because these codes offer only vague definitions of what is permitted and what is prohibited. Thus, under these codes students and faculty will not offer certain ideas that are unpopular or inflammatory but nonetheless permitted and encouraged, because the students and faculty members will be unsure whether they will be free of sanction for presenting those ideas.7

## Heg Bad Indicts

### BIW 13

#### 1. They presume Eurasia is incapable of defending itself- but withdrwal increases their military budgets because governments are reactive and they all possess nuclear capability

#### 2. Prolif is more likely in unipolarity because smaller states are more likely to balance against hegemon

#### 3. They agree states have a status preference- that proves that heg triggers state interventionism consistently

### Barnett

#### 1. Alt causes such as cap explain decreasing structural violence

#### 2. Your stats aren’t true heg- heg only existed clearly after the Cold war

### Grygiell

#### 1. Uniqueness overwhelms the link- if other states are consistently probing the US right now then the impact should have happened but it hasn’t

#### 2. Turn- increasing heg is more likely to anger states that probe the US which increases chance of war

# 1AR- NC

## AT: Kant NC

### Framework OV

#### 1. double bind—either our offense about student rights turn the nc and it’s not exclusionary, or they exclude it with their framework and we lose offense

#### 2. We can’t access the NC—this denies a priori reasoning is possible

#### A. We are all empirical beings, and can’t abstract to assume that we are the soverign

#### B. Objective ethical theories don’t exist- they are subjective and our mental states influence them

#### C. If nobody is harmed by the violation of the i/f distinction in terms of actual ability to pursue ends then there’s no moral relevance to your claim

#### 3. All the reasons for the no intent- foresight means the aff turns the NC because foreseen consequences are still true even if you win the framework broadly

### Turn OV

#### 1. Restrictions on free speech prevent people from acting on their agency no matter how miniscule the restriction is

**Lambert 16** (Saber, writer @ being libertarian, “The Degradation of Free Speech and Personal Liberty,” April 9, 2016, https://beinglibertarian.com/the-degradation-of-free-speech-and-personal-liberty///[LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence))

Many individuals in society claim that they live in a free nation full of individual liberties. North American constitutions such as the ones implemented in the United States and Canada allow for freedom of speech. However, it is evident that the government has implemented and enforced policies to the contrary. There are a plethora of entertainment programs that have strict censorship policies that go against freedom of speech as it disallows, for example, television producers and musicians to use words or phrases that may be offensive directly or indirectly to a person or group. Regardless, if it is possibly offensive to one or many, the U.S. and Canadian constitutions allow for individuals to say very controversial things. However, restricting one’s freedom of speech in the form of censorship greatly impacts the exchange of ideas that are said to contribute to the (possibly) improvement of society. It is not up to the government to decide what individuals choose to say, read, or hear, and it should not be up to the government to decide what is acceptable within society. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in the United States controls all forms of television broadcasting and claims “it is a violation of federal law to air obscene programming at any time. It is also a violation of federal law to air indecent programming or profane language during certain hours.” It is quite clear that censorship by institutional power is a way to control a society in the sense that it determines what individuals in society can legally say, hear, or read. It is against the majoritarian virtues and values that are constitutionally instilled within a society, and is often paralleled to a form of dictatorship – no matter how miniscule

#### 2. Restricting free speech puts the sovereign in contradiction with itself because the omnilateral will is subject to coercion by itself, creating a contradiction in conception

**Suprenant 15** [Chris W. “Kant on the Virtues of a Free Society” April 7th 2015 <https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/kant-virtues-free-society>]

The second point is a bit less straightforward. His claim is that a sovereign that outlaws free speech creates a condition where his actions “put him in contradiction with himself.” This language is remarkably similar to what he uses in his moral theory to describe principles that violate the categorical imperative, Kant’s supreme principle of morality. In the Groundwork, Kant claims that when a principle of action fails when tested against the categorical imperative, it fails because something about that principle is contradictory. It may be the case that it is not possible to conceive of the action that comes about as a result of universalizing the underlying principle connected to the action (i.e., a contradiction in conception), or the result of universalizing the principle is self-defeating in some way (i.e., a contradiction in the will). In the case of the sovereign restricting freedom of the press, the contradiction appears to be more practical. Elsewhere Kant argues what justifies sovereign authority is that his actions are supposed to represent the united will of the people (MM 6:313). But a sovereign that denies free speech and otherwise undermines the conditions necessary to maintain a free society has made it impossible to gather the information needed to represent the will of the people appropriately. In this way, Kant sees any attempt by the sovereign to limit or otherwise suppress the free exchange of ideas, and, in particular, the exchange of ideas among the educated members of society (e.g., academics), as undermining his own authority.

#### This outweighs:

#### A. even if certain types of speech are bad, giving the omnilateral will power to coerce free speech allows them to apply the law in false ways

#### B. Censorship is a contradiction in the will because if everyone was censored- there would be no information to end up censoring so it’s self defeating

#### 3. Free speech is a prerequisite to argumentation- without the right, we can’t be free to debate and determine the truth or falsity of the resolution

#### Arguments aren’t intrinsically harmful- dialogue is always possible

**Anderson 6** [Amanda Anderson, Caroline Donovan Professor of English Literature and Department Chair at Johns Hopkins University, Senior Fellow at the School of Criticism and Theory at Cornell University, holds a Ph.D. in English from Cornell University, 2006 (“Reply to My Critic(s),” Criticism, Volume 48, Number 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Project MUSE, p. 289)]

Probyn's piece is a mixture of affective fallacy, argument by authority, and bald ad hominem. There's a pattern here: precisely the tendency to personalize argument and to foreground what Wendy Brown has called "states of injury." Probyn says, for example, that she "felt ostracized by the book's content and style." Ostracized? Argument here is seen as directly harming persons, and this is precisely the state of affairs to which I object. Argument is not injurious to persons. Policies are injurious to persons and institutionalized practices can alienate and exclude. But argument itself is not directly harmful; once one says it is, one is very close to a logic of censorship. The most productive thing to do in an open academic culture (and in societies that aspire to freedom and democracy) when you encounter a book or an argument that you disagree with is to produce a response or a book that states your disagreement. But to assert that the book itself directly harms you is tantamount to saying that you do not believe in argument or in the free exchange of ideas, that your claim to injury somehow damns your opponent's ideas.

### AT: Hate Speech Intrinsic

#### 1.. The framework only relegates intentions- the principle of free speech never intended hate speech which means there’s no link

#### 2. Hindering denotes an action not an omission- the case is an omission because we remove colleges rights to place restrictions which is a negative action- that doesn’t intrinsically harm colleges

### AT: Seditious Speech

#### 1. The case outweighs- it happens in such few instances of actual rebellion that it’s sufficient for the aff’s freedom to others to be better

#### 2. Suprenant 15 turns this- in order for the government to have any legitimacy it cannot censor the voice of it’s own people who want it to be aware of it’s doing wrong because the omnilateral will is composed of the unilateral will

## AT: Hobbes

### Framework OV

#### Overview: double bind—either our offense about student rights turn the nc and it’s not exclusionary, or they exclude it with their framework and we lose offense

#### 1. We can’t access the NC

#### A. We are all empirical beings, and can’t abstract to assume that we are the soverign

#### B. Objective ethical theories don’t exist- they are subjective and our mental states influence them

#### That means the aff is on a higher layer

#### 2. Violates liberty and their metaethic- the sovereign has infinite capability to control laws and coerce individuals- which prevents them from setting their own ends

#### 3. It isn’t legitimate coercion- they haven’t justified why the sovereign as a separate will is any more legitimate than any other agent or unilateral will. This means the sovereign should be subject to moral law

#### 4. Indeterminate- they don’t provide a clear metric in terms of when the sovereign is required to impose laws

### Turn OV

#### 1. Suprenant 15 turns this- free speech puts the soveriegn in contradiction with itself becaues the way that the sovereign derives power is by assessing how the unilateral will interacts but restrictions make it impossible for the principle of a sovereign to exist.

**Suprenant 15** [Chris W. “Kant on the Virtues of a Free Society” April 7th 2015 <https://www.libertarianism.org/columns/kant-virtues-free-society>]

The second point is a bit less straightforward. His claim is that a sovereign that outlaws free speech creates a condition where his actions “put him in contradiction with himself.” This language is remarkably similar to what he uses in his moral theory to describe principles that violate the categorical imperative, Kant’s supreme principle of morality. In the Groundwork, Kant claims that when a principle of action fails when tested against the categorical imperative, it fails because something about that principle is contradictory. It may be the case that it is not possible to conceive of the action that comes about as a result of universalizing the underlying principle connected to the action (i.e., a contradiction in conception), or the result of universalizing the principle is self-defeating in some way (i.e., a contradiction in the will). In the case of the sovereign restricting freedom of the press, the contradiction appears to be more practical. Elsewhere Kant argues what justifies sovereign authority is that his actions are supposed to represent the united will of the people (MM 6:313). But a sovereign that denies free speech and otherwise undermines the conditions necessary to maintain a free society has made it impossible to gather the information needed to represent the will of the people appropriately. In this way, Kant sees any attempt by the sovereign to limit or otherwise suppress the free exchange of ideas, and, in particular, the exchange of ideas among the educated members of society (e.g., academics), as undermining his own authority.

#### 2. Fiat solves- the aff changes what the sovereign allows and makes it a law, so Hobbes affirms.

#### 3. Hobbes reasoning is because free speech could cause civil strife- they haven't won that initial claim: A. Censorship from the NC is more likely to cause strife- that's proven by current movements, B. the principle of free speech allows dialogue which resolves issues of civil strife,

#### 4. Their contention is also based on the empirical understanding of the world- not the principle of how humans and others act, which means that it's inconsistent and doesn't link to their framework—that violates their own understanding