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### notes

financial aid and federal funding for students key and good now √

not restricting free speech makes the DOE angry under title ix which kills funding √

DOE also makes colleges pay lot of compensation if they don’t comply – another way to limit their money √

federal funding k2 maintain financial aid and colleges grow more dependent on it

### 1NC- Econ

#### Federal funding is on the rise- it’s critical for student financial assitance

**PEW 15** [PEW Charitable Trusts, research and analysis, , 6-11-2015, "Federal and State Funding of Higher Education: A Changing Landscape," No Publication, <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2015/06/federal-and-state-funding-of-higher-education>] NB

States and the federal government have long provided substantial funding for higher education, but changes in recent years have resulted in their contributions being more equal than at any time in at least the previous two decades. Historically, states have provided a far greater amount of assistance to postsecondary institutions and students; 65 percent more than the federal government on average from 1987 to 2012. But this difference narrowed dramatically in recent years, particularly since the Great Recession, as state spending declined and federal investments grew sharply, largely driven by increases in the Pell Grant program, a need-based financial aid program that is the biggest component of federal higher education spending. Although their funding streams for higher education are now comparable in size and have some overlapping policy goals, such as increasing access for students and supporting research, federal and state governments channel resources into the system in different ways. The federal government mainly provides financial assistance to individual students and specific research projects, while state funds primarily pay for the general operations of public institutions.

#### Title IX forces colleges to either mandate speech codes that can be seen as harassment and violate the constitution or risk lose federal funding

**Richardson 16** [Bradford Richardson (reporter) Washington Times Http, 5-1-2016, "Title IX ‘harassment’ order seen as free speech threat," Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/may/1/title-ix-harassment-order-seen-as-free-speech-thre/>] NB

Several free speech advocacy groups are concerned about a Justice Department order that they say forces colleges and universities to violate the First Amendment. Justice sent a letter to the University of New Mexico in late April concluding an investigation into the school’s sex discrimination policies and practices. In the letter, the agency said the university’s policies failed to account for “unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature,” including “verbal conduct,” in violation of Title IX. According to the letter, federal law defines sexual harassment as “unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature includ[ing] unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature, such as sexual assault or acts of sexual violence.” The Justice Department required universities to investigate any “unwanted sexual conduct” to determine “whether the harassment was sufficiently serious as to cause limitations or denial of educational benefits.” Foundation for Individual Rights in Education President and CEO Greg Lukianoff said the Justice Department letter has put colleges and universities in an “impossible position,” forcing them to choose between violating “the Constitution or risk losing federal funding.” “The federal government’s push for a national speech code is at odds with decades of legal precedent,” Mr. Lukianoff said in a FIRE report on the letter. “University presidents must find the courage to stand up to this federal overreach.”

#### Education department forces compensation which hurts school funds if they don’t regulate speech

Leef 15 [George Leef, 9-14-2015, "Free Speech Can't Be Trumped By Title IX," Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/georgeleef/2015/09/14/free-speech-cant-be-trumped-by-title-ix-but-college-officials-use-it-that-way/3/#7a995a734ceb>] NB

In short, in trying to avoid liability for “sexual harassment” under Title IX, many schools have gone way too far. They have allowed hyper-sensitive or vindictive students to use Title IX regulations as a weapon against anyone whose speech offends or annoys them. Even though the Education Department officially has advised colleges (in a 2003 guidance letter) that Title IX may not be used to regulate the content of speech, its current approach works the opposite way. The reason is that the Department’s Office for Civil Rights control over federal money flowing to schools gives it great power to “influence” school officials. Again, Bader explains: “Using this massive leverage, OCR is now forcing some colleges to pay large amounts of compensation to students who allege harassment or sexual assault, even though it lacks statutory authority to award such compensatory damages.”

#### Education is a key internal link promotes global competitiveness, power, and a more productive world

**Duncan 10** – Arne Duncan is an American education administrator who has been United States Secretary of Education since 2009, 2010 (“The Vision of Education Reform in the United States: Secretary Arne Duncan's Remarks to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO),” Paris, France, Department of Education, 11-4-2010, available online via http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/vision-education-reform-united-states-secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-united-nations-educational-scientific-and-cultural-organization-unesco-paris-france, accessed on 7-8-2015)

It is an absolute honor to address UNESCO. During the last 65 years, UNESCO has done so much to advance the cause of education and gender equity, alleviate poverty, and promote peace. When UNESCO was founded in 1945, much of Europe, Russia, and Japan lay in ruin. The promise of universal education was then a lonely beacon—a light to guide the way to peace and the rebuilding of nations across the globe. Today, the world is no longer recovering from a tragic global war. Yet the international community faces a crisis of a different sort, the global economic crisis. And education is still the beacon lighting the path forward—perhaps more so today than ever before. Education is still the key to eliminating gender inequities, to reducing poverty, to creating a sustainable planet, and to fostering peace. And in a knowledge economy, education is the new currency by which nations maintain economic competitiveness and global prosperity. I want to provide two overarching messages today about America's efforts to boost educational attainment and achievement. First, the Obama administration has an ambitious and unified theory of action that propels our agenda. The challenge of transforming education in America cannot be met by quick-fix solutions or isolated reforms. It can only be accomplished with a clear, coherent, and coordinated vision of reform. Second, while America must improve its stagnant educational and economic performance, President Obama and I reject the protectionist Cold War-era assumption that improving economic competitiveness is somehow a zero-sum game, with one nation's gain being another country's loss. I want to make the case to you today that enhancing educational attainment and economic viability, both at home and abroad, is really more of a win-win game; it is an opportunity to grow the economic pie, instead of carve it up. As President Obama said in his speech to the Muslim world in Cairo last year, "Any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail." There is so much that the United States has to learn from nations with high-performing education systems. And there is so much that America can share from its experience to the mutual benefit of nations confronting similar educational challenges. I am convinced that the U.S. education system now has an unprecedented opportunity to get dramatically better. Nothing—nothing—is more important in the long-run to American prosperity than boosting the skills and attainment of the nation's students. In the United States, we feel an economic and moral imperative to challenge the status quo. Closing the achievement gap and closing the opportunity gap is the civil rights issue of our generation. One quarter of U.S. high school students drop out or fail to graduate on time. Almost one million students leave our schools for the streets each year. That is economically unsustainable and morally unacceptable. One of the more unusual and sobering press conferences I participated in last year was the release of a report by a group of top retired generals and admirals. Here was the stunning conclusion of their report: 75 percent of young Americans, between the ages of 17 to 24, are unable to enlist in the military today because they have failed to graduate from high school, have a criminal record, or are physically unfit. Now, everyone here today knows that education is taking on more and more importance around the globe. In the last decade, international competition in higher education and the job market has grown dramatically. As the New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman famously pointed out, the world economy has indeed "flattened." Companies now digitize, automate, and outsource work to the most competitive individuals, companies, and countries. In the knowledge economy, opportunities to land a good job are vanishing fast for young workers who drop out of school or fail to get college experience. That is why President Obama often says that the nation that "out-educates us today is going to out-compete us tomorrow." Yet there is also a paradox at the heart of America's efforts to bolster international competitiveness. To succeed in the global economy, the United States, just like other nations, will have to become both more economically competitive and more collaborative. In the information age, more international competition has spawned more international collaboration. Today, education is a global public good unconstrained by national boundaries. In the United States, for example, concerns are sometimes raised about the large number of foreign-born students earning masters and doctorates in science and engineering fields. Immigrants now constitute nearly half of America's PhD scientists and engineers, even though they constitute only 12 percent of the workforce overall. These foreign-born students more often return to the country of origin than in the past. But their scientific skills and entrepreneurship strengthen not only their native economy but also stimulate innovation and new markets that can help boost the U.S. economy. The same borderless nature of innovation and ideas is evident when foreign-born students remain in America. Immigrants to the U.S. started a quarter of all engineering and technology companies from 1995 and 2005, including half of the start-ups in Silicon Valley, our high-tech capital. Sergey Brin, Google's co-founder, was born in Moscow but educated in the United States. Google is now used throughout the globe to gather information and advance knowledge. The brain drain, in short, has become the brain gain. It is no surprise that economic interdependence brings new global challenges and educational demands. The United States cannot, acting by itself, dramatically reduce poverty and disease or develop sustainable sources of energy. America alone cannot combat terrorism or curb climate change. To succeed, we must collaborate with other countries. Those new partnerships require American students to develop better critical thinking abilities, cross-cultural understanding, and facility in multiple languages. They also will require U.S. students to strengthen their skills in science, technology, engineering, and math—the STEM fields that anchor much of our innovation in the global economy. These new partnerships must also inspire students to take a bigger and deeper view of their civic obligations—not only to their countries of origin but to the betterment of the global community. A just and socially responsible society must also be anchored in civic engagement for the public good. In our view, the United States will be better off, in comparative terms, if we lead the world in educational attainment, rather than lagging behind. A generation ago, America did in fact lead the world in college attainment. But today among young adults, the U.S. is tied for ninth. That is why President Obama has set a goal that America will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by 2020, a decade from now. Yet even as the United States works to strengthen its educational system, it is important to remember that advancing educational attainment and achievement everywhere brings benefits not just to the U.S. but around the globe. In the knowledge economy, education is the new game-changer driving economic growth. Education, as Nelson Mandela says, "is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world."From Indonesia to Pakistan to Kenya, education has immeasurable power to promote growth and stability. It is absolutely imperative that the United States seize the opportunity to help Haiti build a stronger school system from the ruins of its old, broken one—just as America coalesced to build a fast-improving, vibrant school system in New Orleans after the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina. From devastation, beautiful flowers can grow—crisis can seed opportunities for transformational change. In 2001, Afghanistan had barely 900,000 boys in school. They now have almost seven million children in schools, almost 40 percent of whom are girls. Dramatic change can happen in a short period of time. It just requires the commitment to succeed. Educating girls and integrating them into the labor force is especially critical to breaking the cycle of poverty. It is hard to imagine a better world without a global commitment to providing better education for women and youth—including the 72 million children who do not attend primary school today. And don't forget that a better-educated world would be a safer world, too. Low educational attainment is one of the few statistically significant predictors of violence. My department has been pleased to partner with the U.S. Agency for International Development to help ensure that our best domestic practices are shared world-wide. The United States provides over a billion dollars annually to partner countries working on educational reform. Our goal for the coming year will be to work closely with global partners, including UNESCO, to promote qualitative improvements and system-strengthening. With such a shared commitment, we believe that we can greatly reduce the number of children out of school and ensure that the children who are in class are actually learning. Ultimately, education is the great equalizer. It is the one force that can consistently overcome differences in background, culture, and privilege. As the author Ben Wildavsky writes in his new book, The Great Brain Race, in the global economy "more and more people will have the chance... to advance based on what they know rather than who they are."

#### And, economic collapse causes competition for resources and instability that triggers hotspots around the globe – co-opts all other causes of war

**Harris and Burrows 9** Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf> Increased Potential for Global Conflict

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions**.** It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### 1NC- Leadership

#### Federal funding is on the rise- it’s critical for student financial assitance

**PEW 15** [PEW Charitable Trusts, research and analysis, , 6-11-2015, "Federal and State Funding of Higher Education: A Changing Landscape," No Publication, <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2015/06/federal-and-state-funding-of-higher-education>] NB

States and the federal government have long provided substantial funding for higher education, but changes in recent years have resulted in their contributions being more equal than at any time in at least the previous two decades. Historically, states have provided a far greater amount of assistance to postsecondary institutions and students; 65 percent more than the federal government on average from 1987 to 2012. But this difference narrowed dramatically in recent years, particularly since the Great Recession, as state spending declined and federal investments grew sharply, largely driven by increases in the Pell Grant program, a need-based financial aid program that is the biggest component of federal higher education spending. Although their funding streams for higher education are now comparable in size and have some overlapping policy goals, such as increasing access for students and supporting research, federal and state governments channel resources into the system in different ways. The federal government mainly provides financial assistance to individual students and specific research projects, while state funds primarily pay for the general operations of public institutions.

#### Title IX forces colleges to either mandate speech codes that can be seen as harassment and violate the constitution or risk lose federal funding

**Richardson 16** [Bradford Richardson (reporter) Washington Times Http, 5-1-2016, "Title IX ‘harassment’ order seen as free speech threat," Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/may/1/title-ix-harassment-order-seen-as-free-speech-thre/>] NB

Several free speech advocacy groups are concerned about a Justice Department order that they say forces colleges and universities to violate the First Amendment. Justice sent a letter to the University of New Mexico in late April concluding an investigation into the school’s sex discrimination policies and practices. In the letter, the agency said the university’s policies failed to account for “unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature,” including “verbal conduct,” in violation of Title IX. According to the letter, federal law defines sexual harassment as “unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature includ[ing] unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature, such as sexual assault or acts of sexual violence.” The Justice Department required universities to investigate any “unwanted sexual conduct” to determine “whether the harassment was sufficiently serious as to cause limitations or denial of educational benefits.” Foundation for Individual Rights in Education President and CEO Greg Lukianoff said the Justice Department letter has put colleges and universities in an “impossible position,” forcing them to choose between violating “the Constitution or risk losing federal funding.” “The federal government’s push for a national speech code is at odds with decades of legal precedent,” Mr. Lukianoff said in a FIRE report on the letter. “University presidents must find the courage to stand up to this federal overreach.”

#### Education department forces compensation which hurts school funds if they don’t regulate speech

Leef 15 [George Leef, 9-14-2015, "Free Speech Can't Be Trumped By Title IX," Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/georgeleef/2015/09/14/free-speech-cant-be-trumped-by-title-ix-but-college-officials-use-it-that-way/3/#7a995a734ceb>] NB

In short, in trying to avoid liability for “sexual harassment” under Title IX, many schools have gone way too far. They have allowed hyper-sensitive or vindictive students to use Title IX regulations as a weapon against anyone whose speech offends or annoys them. Even though the Education Department officially has advised colleges (in a 2003 guidance letter) that Title IX may not be used to regulate the content of speech, its current approach works the opposite way. The reason is that the Department’s Office for Civil Rights control over federal money flowing to schools gives it great power to “influence” school officials. Again, Bader explains: “Using this massive leverage, OCR is now forcing some colleges to pay large amounts of compensation to students who allege harassment or sexual assault, even though it lacks statutory authority to award such compensatory damages.”

#### Education is a key internal link promotes global competitiveness, power, and a more productive world

**Duncan 10** – Arne Duncan is an American education administrator who has been United States Secretary of Education since 2009, 2010 (“The Vision of Education Reform in the United States: Secretary Arne Duncan's Remarks to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO),” Paris, France, Department of Education, 11-4-2010, available online via http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/vision-education-reform-united-states-secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-united-nations-educational-scientific-and-cultural-organization-unesco-paris-france, accessed on 7-8-2015)

It is an absolute honor to address UNESCO. During the last 65 years, UNESCO has done so much to advance the cause of education and gender equity, alleviate poverty, and promote peace. When UNESCO was founded in 1945, much of Europe, Russia, and Japan lay in ruin. The promise of universal education was then a lonely beacon—a light to guide the way to peace and the rebuilding of nations across the globe. Today, the world is no longer recovering from a tragic global war. Yet the international community faces a crisis of a different sort, the global economic crisis. And education is still the beacon lighting the path forward—perhaps more so today than ever before. Education is still the key to eliminating gender inequities, to reducing poverty, to creating a sustainable planet, and to fostering peace. And in a knowledge economy, education is the new currency by which nations maintain economic competitiveness and global prosperity. I want to provide two overarching messages today about America's efforts to boost educational attainment and achievement. First, the Obama administration has an ambitious and unified theory of action that propels our agenda. The challenge of transforming education in America cannot be met by quick-fix solutions or isolated reforms. It can only be accomplished with a clear, coherent, and coordinated vision of reform. Second, while America must improve its stagnant educational and economic performance, President Obama and I reject the protectionist Cold War-era assumption that improving economic competitiveness is somehow a zero-sum game, with one nation's gain being another country's loss. I want to make the case to you today that enhancing educational attainment and economic viability, both at home and abroad, is really more of a win-win game; it is an opportunity to grow the economic pie, instead of carve it up. As President Obama said in his speech to the Muslim world in Cairo last year, "Any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail." There is so much that the United States has to learn from nations with high-performing education systems. And there is so much that America can share from its experience to the mutual benefit of nations confronting similar educational challenges. I am convinced that the U.S. education system now has an unprecedented opportunity to get dramatically better. Nothing—nothing—is more important in the long-run to American prosperity than boosting the skills and attainment of the nation's students. In the United States, we feel an economic and moral imperative to challenge the status quo. Closing the achievement gap and closing the opportunity gap is the civil rights issue of our generation. One quarter of U.S. high school students drop out or fail to graduate on time. Almost one million students leave our schools for the streets each year. That is economically unsustainable and morally unacceptable. One of the more unusual and sobering press conferences I participated in last year was the release of a report by a group of top retired generals and admirals. Here was the stunning conclusion of their report: 75 percent of young Americans, between the ages of 17 to 24, are unable to enlist in the military today because they have failed to graduate from high school, have a criminal record, or are physically unfit. Now, everyone here today knows that education is taking on more and more importance around the globe. In the last decade, international competition in higher education and the job market has grown dramatically. As the New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman famously pointed out, the world economy has indeed "flattened." Companies now digitize, automate, and outsource work to the most competitive individuals, companies, and countries. In the knowledge economy, opportunities to land a good job are vanishing fast for young workers who drop out of school or fail to get college experience. That is why President Obama often says that the nation that "out-educates us today is going to out-compete us tomorrow." Yet there is also a paradox at the heart of America's efforts to bolster international competitiveness. To succeed in the global economy, the United States, just like other nations, will have to become both more economically competitive and more collaborative. In the information age, more international competition has spawned more international collaboration. Today, education is a global public good unconstrained by national boundaries. In the United States, for example, concerns are sometimes raised about the large number of foreign-born students earning masters and doctorates in science and engineering fields. Immigrants now constitute nearly half of America's PhD scientists and engineers, even though they constitute only 12 percent of the workforce overall. These foreign-born students more often return to the country of origin than in the past. But their scientific skills and entrepreneurship strengthen not only their native economy but also stimulate innovation and new markets that can help boost the U.S. economy. The same borderless nature of innovation and ideas is evident when foreign-born students remain in America. Immigrants to the U.S. started a quarter of all engineering and technology companies from 1995 and 2005, including half of the start-ups in Silicon Valley, our high-tech capital. Sergey Brin, Google's co-founder, was born in Moscow but educated in the United States. Google is now used throughout the globe to gather information and advance knowledge. The brain drain, in short, has become the brain gain. It is no surprise that economic interdependence brings new global challenges and educational demands. The United States cannot, acting by itself, dramatically reduce poverty and disease or develop sustainable sources of energy. America alone cannot combat terrorism or curb climate change. To succeed, we must collaborate with other countries. Those new partnerships require American students to develop better critical thinking abilities, cross-cultural understanding, and facility in multiple languages. They also will require U.S. students to strengthen their skills in science, technology, engineering, and math—the STEM fields that anchor much of our innovation in the global economy. These new partnerships must also inspire students to take a bigger and deeper view of their civic obligations—not only to their countries of origin but to the betterment of the global community. A just and socially responsible society must also be anchored in civic engagement for the public good. In our view, the United States will be better off, in comparative terms, if we lead the world in educational attainment, rather than lagging behind. A generation ago, America did in fact lead the world in college attainment. But today among young adults, the U.S. is tied for ninth. That is why President Obama has set a goal that America will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by 2020, a decade from now. Yet even as the United States works to strengthen its educational system, it is important to remember that advancing educational attainment and achievement everywhere brings benefits not just to the U.S. but around the globe. In the knowledge economy, education is the new game-changer driving economic growth. Education, as Nelson Mandela says, "is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world."From Indonesia to Pakistan to Kenya, education has immeasurable power to promote growth and stability. It is absolutely imperative that the United States seize the opportunity to help Haiti build a stronger school system from the ruins of its old, broken one—just as America coalesced to build a fast-improving, vibrant school system in New Orleans after the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina. From devastation, beautiful flowers can grow—crisis can seed opportunities for transformational change. In 2001, Afghanistan had barely 900,000 boys in school. They now have almost seven million children in schools, almost 40 percent of whom are girls. Dramatic change can happen in a short period of time. It just requires the commitment to succeed. Educating girls and integrating them into the labor force is especially critical to breaking the cycle of poverty. It is hard to imagine a better world without a global commitment to providing better education for women and youth—including the 72 million children who do not attend primary school today. And don't forget that a better-educated world would be a safer world, too. Low educational attainment is one of the few statistically significant predictors of violence. My department has been pleased to partner with the U.S. Agency for International Development to help ensure that our best domestic practices are shared world-wide. The United States provides over a billion dollars annually to partner countries working on educational reform. Our goal for the coming year will be to work closely with global partners, including UNESCO, to promote qualitative improvements and system-strengthening. With such a shared commitment, we believe that we can greatly reduce the number of children out of school and ensure that the children who are in class are actually learning. Ultimately, education is the great equalizer. It is the one force that can consistently overcome differences in background, culture, and privilege. As the author Ben Wildavsky writes in his new book, The Great Brain Race, in the global economy "more and more people will have the chance... to advance based on what they know rather than who they are."

#### Innovation solves great power war

Taylor 4 – Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Mark, “The Politics of Technological Change: International Relations versus Domestic Institutions,” Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 4/1/2004, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46554792/Taylor>) //RGP

I. Introduction Technological innovation is of central importance to the study of international relations (IR), affecting almost every aspect of the sub-field. First and foremost, a nation’s technological capability has a significant effect on its economic growth, industrial might, and military prowess; therefore relative national technological capabilities necessarily influence the balance of power between states, and hence have a role in calculations of war and alliance formation. Second, technology and innovative capacity also determine a nation’s trade profile, affecting which products it will import and export, as well as where multinational corporations will base their production facilities. Third, insofar as innovation-driven economic growth both attracts investment and produces surplus capital, a nation’s technological ability will also affect international financial flows and who has power over them. Thus, in broad theoretical terms, technological change is important to the study of IR because of its overall implications for both the relative and absolute power of states. And if theory alone does not convince, then history also tells us that nations on the technological ascent generally experience a corresponding and dramatic change in their global stature and influence, such as Britain during the first industrial revolution, the United States and Germany during the second industrial revolution, and Japan during the twentieth century. Conversely, great powers which fail to maintain their place at the technological frontier generally drift and fade from influence on international scene. This is not to suggest that technological innovation alone determines international politics, but rather that shifts in both relative and absolute technological capability have a major impact on international relations, and therefore need to be better understood by IR scholars. Indeed, the importance of technological innovation to international relations is seldom disputed by IR theorists. Technology is rarely the sole or overriding causal variable in any given IR theory, but a broad overview of the major theoretical debates reveals the ubiquity of technological causality. For example, from Waltz to Posen, almost all Realists have a place for technology in their explanations of international politics. At the very least, they describe it as an essential part of the distribution of material capabilities across nations, or an indirect source of military doctrine. And for some, like Gilpin quoted above, technology is the very cornerstone of great power domination, and its transfer the main vehicle by which war and change occur in world politics. Jervis tells us that the balance of offensive and defensive military technology affects the incentives for war. Walt agrees, arguing that technological change can alter a state’s aggregate power, and thereby affect both alliance formation and the international balance of threats. Liberals are less directly concerned with technological change, but they must admit that by raising or lowering the costs of using force, technological progress affects the rational attractiveness of international cooperation and regimes. Technology also lowers information & transactions costs and thus increases the applicability of international institutions, a cornerstone of Liberal IR theory. And in fostering flows of trade, finance, and information, technological change can lead to Keohane’s interdependence or Thomas Friedman et al’s globalization. Meanwhile, over at the “third debate”, Constructivists cover the causal spectrum on the issue, from Katzenstein’s “cultural norms” which shape security concerns and thereby affect technological innovation; to Wendt’s “stripped down technological determinism” in which technology inevitably drives nations to form a world state. However most Constructivists seem to favor Wendt, arguing that new technology changes people’s identities within society, and sometimes even creates new cross-national constituencies, thereby affecting international politics. Of course, Marxists tend to see technology as determining all social relations and the entire course of history, though they describe mankind’s major fault lines as running between economic classes rather than nation-states. Finally, Buzan & Little remind us that without advances in the technologies of transportation, communication, production, and war, international systems would not exist in the first place.

#### US leadership prevents great power war and existential governance crises

overseas presence gives it leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action

alliance commitments also deter states i.e. linkages from trade and warming,

multipolar regions are worse because there are mroe arms races, prolif, and preventive temptations,

regional heg. could even do these because they don't do it as worse.

args of others

1. us security guarantees are not necesarry to prevent dangerous rivalries

2. prevention of rivalries in eurasia not being a us interest

first response- defensive realists thing that high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can assume that eurasian major states could manage regional multipolarity

retrenchement would be a bet on this scholarship- democratic governance are either absent or weak absent without a universal police force.

israel, egypt, saudi arabia might take actions upon us rentrenchment if not moderated,

Defensive realism is very optimistic about what would happen if US retrenched:

1. they assume that other actors have capabilitie to be defendexd against each other, or would want to be offensive,

2. even states that are secure may engage in competition with each otherempirically verified.

if eurasia was to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, there would be more military spending and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars.

Their prolif optimism is on wrong rationality, they think that most states are led by rational leaders, which our evidence says is not probable.

There are increasing concerns of nuclear leakage,

maintiang eurasian peace is a us interest,

on china rise: us likely to act in a similar way from soviet union, no conflict escalated. it will need to maintain key relationshios and alliances with others.

**Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth ’13** (Stephen, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, John Ikenberry is the Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, William C. Wohlforth is the Daniel Webster Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College “Don’t Come Home America: The Case Against Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Winter 2012/13), pp. 7–51)

A core premise of deep engagement is that it prevents the emergence of a far more dangerous global security environment. For one thing, as noted above, the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with influential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war. 72 How do retrenchment advocates, the bulk of whom are realists, discount this benefit? Their arguments are complicated, but two capture most of the variation: (1) U.S. security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflict in Eurasia; or (2) prevention of rivalry and conflict in Eurasia is not a U.S. interest. Each response is connected to a different theory or set of theories, which makes sense given that the whole debate hinges on a complex future counterfactual (what would happen to Eurasia’s security setting if the United States truly disengaged?). Although a certain answer is impossible, each of these responses is nonetheless a weaker argument for retrenchment than advocates acknowledge. The first response flows from defensive realism as well as other international relations theories that discount the conflict-generating potential of anarchy under contemporary conditions. 73 Defensive realists maintain that the high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used credibly to signal benign intent, mean that Eurasia’s major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully without the American pacifier. Retrenchment would be a bet on this scholarship, particularly in regions where the kinds of stabilizers that nonrealist theories point to—such as democratic governance or dense institutional linkages—are either absent or weakly present. There are three other major bodies of scholarship, however, that might give decisionmakers pause before making this bet. First is regional expertise. Needless to say, there is no consensus on the net security effects of U.S. withdrawal. Regarding each region, there are optimists and pessimists. Few experts expect a return of intense great power competition in a post-American Europe, but many doubt European governments will pay the political costs of increased EU defense cooperation and the budgetary costs of increasing military outlays. 74 The result might be a Europe that is incapable of securing itself from various threats that could be destabilizing within the region and beyond (e.g., a regional conflict akin to the 1990s Balkan wars), lacks capacity for global security missions in which U.S. leaders might want European participation, and is vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. What about the other parts of Eurasia where the United States has a substantial military presence? Regarding the Middle East, the balance begins to swing toward pessimists concerned that states currently backed by Washington— notably Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—might take actions upon U.S. retrenchment that would intensify security dilemmas. And concerning East Asia, pessimism regarding the region’s prospects without the American pacifier is pronounced. Arguably the principal concern expressed by area experts is that Japan and South Korea are likely to obtain a nuclear capacity and increase their military commitments, which could stoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It is notable that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan moved to obtain a nuclear weapons capacity and were only constrained from doing so by a still-engaged United States. 75 The second body of scholarship casting doubt on the bet on defensive realism’s sanguine portrayal is all of the research that undermines its conception of state preferences. Defensive realism’s optimism about what would happen if the United States retrenched is very much dependent on its particular—and highly restrictive—assumption about state preferences; once we relax this assumption, then much of its basis for optimism vanishes. Specifically, the prediction of post-American tranquility throughout Eurasia rests on the assumption that security is the only relevant state preference, with security defined narrowly in terms of protection from violent external attacks on the homeland. Under that assumption, the security problem is largely solved as soon as offense and defense are clearly distinguishable, and offense is extremely expensive relative to defense. Burgeoning research across the social and other sciences, however, undermines that core assumption: states have preferences not only for security but also for prestige, status, and other aims, and they engage in trade-offs among the various objectives. 76 In addition, they define security not just in terms of territorial protection but in view of many and varied milieu goals. It follows that even states that are relatively secure may nevertheless engage in highly competitive behavior. Empirical studies show that this is indeed sometimes the case. 77 In sum, a bet on a benign postretrenchment Eurasia is a bet that leaders of major countries will never allow these nonsecurity preferences to influence their strategic choices. To the degree that these bodies of scholarly knowledge have predictive leverage, U.S. retrenchment would result in a significant deterioration in the security environment in at least some of the world’s key regions. We have already mentioned the third, even more alarming body of scholarship. Offensive realism predicts that the withdrawal of the American pacifier will yield either a competitive regional multipolarity complete with associated insecurity, arms racing, crisis instability, nuclear proliferation, and the like, or bids for regional hegemony, which may be beyond the capacity of local great powers to contain (and which in any case would generate intensely competitive behavior, possibly including regional great power war). Hence it is unsurprising that retrenchment advocates are prone to focus on the second argument noted above: that avoiding wars and security dilemmas in the world’s core regions is not a U.S. national interest. Few doubt that the United States could survive the return of insecurity and conflict among Eurasian powers, but at what cost? Much of the work in this area has focused on the economic externalities of a renewed threat of insecurity and war, which we discuss below. Focusing on the pure security ramifications, there are two main reasons why decisionmakers may be rationally reluctant to run the retrenchment experiment. First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states—all of which would be concerning, in part because it would promote a faster diffusion of military power away from the United States. Greater regional insecurity could well feed proliferation cascades, as states such as Egypt, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia all might choose to create nuclear forces. 78 It is unlikely that proliferation decisions by any of these actors would be the end of the game: they would likely generate pressure locally for more proliferation. Following Kenneth Waltz, many retrenchment advocates are proliferation optimists, assuming that nuclear deterrence solves the security problem. 79 Usually carried out in dyadic terms, the debate over the stability of proliferationchanges as the numbers go up. Proliferation optimism rests on assumptions of rationality and narrow security preferences. In social science, however, such assumptions are inevitably probabilistic. Optimists assume that most states are led by rational leaders, most will overcome organizational problems and resist the temptation to preempt before feared neighbors nuclearize, and most pursue only security and are risk averse. Confidence in such probabilistic assumptions declines if the world were to move from nine to twenty, thirty, or forty nuclear states. In addition, many of the other dangers noted by analysts who are concerned about the destabilizing effects of nuclear proliferation—including the risk of accidents and the prospects that some new nuclear powers will not have truly survivable forces—seem prone to go up as the number of nuclear powers grows. 80 Moreover, the risk of “unforeseen crisis dynamics” that could spin out of control is also higher as the number of nuclear powers increases. Finally, add to these concerns the enhanced danger of nuclear leakage, and a world with overall higher levels of security competition becomes yet more worrisome. The argument that maintaining Eurasian peace is not a U.S. interest faces a second problem. On widely accepted realist assumptions, acknowledging that U.S. engagement preserves peace dramatically narrows the difference between retrenchment and deep engagement. For many supporters of retrenchment, the optimal strategy for a power such as the United States, which has attained regional hegemony and is separated from other great powers by oceans, is offshore balancing: stay over the horizon and “pass the buck” to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing any local rising power. The United States should commit to onshore balancing only when local balancing is likely to fail and a great power appears to be a credible contender for regional hegemony, as in the cases of Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union in the midtwentieth century. The problem is that China’s rise puts the possibility of its attaining regional hegemony on the table, at least in the medium to long term. As Mearsheimer notes, “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China, because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.” 81 Therefore, unless China’s rise stalls, “the United States is likely to act toward China similar to the way it behaved toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War.” 82 It follows that the United States should take no action that would compromise its capacity to move to onshore balancing in the future. It will need to maintain key alliance relationships in Asia as well as the formidably expensive military capacity to intervene there. The implication is to get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, reduce the presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia— just what the United States is doing. 83 In sum, the argument that U.S. security commitments are unnecessary **for peace** is countered by a lot of scholarship, including highly influential realist scholarship. In addition, the argument that Eurasian peace is unnecessary for U.S. security is weakened by the potential for a large number of nasty security consequences as well as the need to retain a latent onshore balancing capacity that dramatically reduces the savings retrenchment might bring. Moreover, switching between offshore and onshore balancing could well be difªcult. Bringing together the thrust of many of the arguments discussed so far underlines the degree to which the case for retrenchment misses the underlying logic of the deep engagement strategy. By supplying reassurance, deterrence, and active management, the United States lowers security competition in the world’s key regions, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse atmosphere for growing new military capabilities. Alliance ties dissuade partners from ramping up and also provide leverage to prevent military transfers to potential rivals. On top of all this, the United States’ formidable military machine may deter entry by potential rivals. Current great power military expenditures as a percentage of GDP are at historical lows, and thus far other major powers have shied away from seeking to match top-end U.S. military capabilities. In addition, they have so far been careful to avoid attracting the “focused enmity” of the United States. 84 All of the world’s most modern militaries are U.S. allies (America’s alliance system of more than sixty countries now accounts for some 80 percent of global military spending), and the gap between the U.S. military capability and that of potential rivals is by many measures growing rather than shrinking. 85

### 1NC- SV

#### Federal funding is on the rise- it’s critical for student financial assitance

**PEW 15** [PEW Charitable Trusts, research and analysis, , 6-11-2015, "Federal and State Funding of Higher Education: A Changing Landscape," No Publication, <http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2015/06/federal-and-state-funding-of-higher-education>] NB

States and the federal government have long provided substantial funding for higher education, but changes in recent years have resulted in their contributions being more equal than at any time in at least the previous two decades. Historically, states have provided a far greater amount of assistance to postsecondary institutions and students; 65 percent more than the federal government on average from 1987 to 2012. But this difference narrowed dramatically in recent years, particularly since the Great Recession, as state spending declined and federal investments grew sharply, largely driven by increases in the Pell Grant program, a need-based financial aid program that is the biggest component of federal higher education spending. Although their funding streams for higher education are now comparable in size and have some overlapping policy goals, such as increasing access for students and supporting research, federal and state governments channel resources into the system in different ways. The federal government mainly provides financial assistance to individual students and specific research projects, while state funds primarily pay for the general operations of public institutions.

#### Title IX forces colleges to either mandate speech codes that can be seen as harassment and violate the constitution or risk lose federal funding

**Richardson 16** [Bradford Richardson (reporter) Washington Times Http, 5-1-2016, "Title IX ‘harassment’ order seen as free speech threat," Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/may/1/title-ix-harassment-order-seen-as-free-speech-thre/>] NB

Several free speech advocacy groups are concerned about a Justice Department order that they say forces colleges and universities to violate the First Amendment. Justice sent a letter to the University of New Mexico in late April concluding an investigation into the school’s sex discrimination policies and practices. In the letter, the agency said the university’s policies failed to account for “unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature,” including “verbal conduct,” in violation of Title IX. According to the letter, federal law defines sexual harassment as “unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature includ[ing] unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature, such as sexual assault or acts of sexual violence.” The Justice Department required universities to investigate any “unwanted sexual conduct” to determine “whether the harassment was sufficiently serious as to cause limitations or denial of educational benefits.” Foundation for Individual Rights in Education President and CEO Greg Lukianoff said the Justice Department letter has put colleges and universities in an “impossible position,” forcing them to choose between violating “the Constitution or risk losing federal funding.” “The federal government’s push for a national speech code is at odds with decades of legal precedent,” Mr. Lukianoff said in a FIRE report on the letter. “University presidents must find the courage to stand up to this federal overreach.”

#### Education department forces compensation which hurts school funds if they don’t regulate speech

Leef 15 [George Leef, 9-14-2015, "Free Speech Can't Be Trumped By Title IX," Forbes, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/georgeleef/2015/09/14/free-speech-cant-be-trumped-by-title-ix-but-college-officials-use-it-that-way/3/#7a995a734ceb>] NB

In short, in trying to avoid liability for “sexual harassment” under Title IX, many schools have gone way too far. They have allowed hyper-sensitive or vindictive students to use Title IX regulations as a weapon against anyone whose speech offends or annoys them. Even though the Education Department officially has advised colleges (in a 2003 guidance letter) that Title IX may not be used to regulate the content of speech, its current approach works the opposite way. The reason is that the Department’s Office for Civil Rights control over federal money flowing to schools gives it great power to “influence” school officials. Again, Bader explains: “Using this massive leverage, OCR is now forcing some colleges to pay large amounts of compensation to students who allege harassment or sexual assault, even though it lacks statutory authority to award such compensatory damages.”

#### Financial assistance benefits disadvantage students the most- they increase funds

**AAU 9** [Association of American Universities, "MYTHS ABOUT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS," January 2009]

MYTH: Universities are not using enough of their endowments to make college accessible and affordable for low- and middle-income students. The cost of a college education is much higher for all students than the tuition prices charged by institutions. For college and universities with sizable endowments, the difference is subsidized by earnings from their endowments. The extensive aid colleges and universities extend to students from low- and middle-income families, which often covers tuition, books and living expenses, helps ensure that a top-quality education remains a path to the American dream. Many institutions with significant endowments are making this dream possible by converting loans to grants and by making college free for thousands of low- and moderate-income students (students from families with incomes below $40,000, and in some cases below $60,000 or $70,000 a year). Some of these institutions are: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Emory University; Vanderbilt University; the University of Washington; Stanford University; the University of Maryland at College Park; Princeton University; the University of Florida; Yale University; the University of Pennsylvania; Indiana University; Harvard University; Texas A&M University; Columbia University; and the University of Virginia. At these and many other institutions, financial aid is not just for low-income students. Middle income students are also offered significant financial support to help make college affordable, including grant aid to help reduce post-graduation debt. In addition to financial aid, universities conduct a variety of outreach programs to attract low-income applicants. These extensive outreach efforts include sending school representatives to low-income communities, paying for low-income high school students to visit the campus, and waiving application fees.

#### This turns and outweighs the case:

#### 1. Prerequisite- students need to have the capability to enter educational institutions if they want to have a chance in involvement in activism and others

#### 2. Timeframe of education- having access to an education provides better outcomes for the future compared to short term goals of activism

#### [3. Probability- the risk that the aff is successful compared to the confirmed amount of individuals who lose access proves that there are material harms for individuals]

## 2NC

### XT: Link Ev

#### Multiple empirics prove universities default to having codes- the aff reverses that and risks their funding

**Perrino 16** [April 25, 2016, Nico Perrino, Director of Communications, FIRE: 215-717-3473; [media@thefire.org](mailto:media@thefire.org). 4-25-2016, "Department of Justice: Title IX Requires Violating First Amendment," FIRE, <https://www.thefire.org/department-of-justice-title-ix-requires-violating-first-amendment/>] NB

The shockingly broad conception of sexual harassment mandated by DOJ all but guarantees that colleges and universities nationwide will subject students and faculty to months-long investigations—or worse—for protected speech. In recent years, unjust “sexual harassment” investigations into protected student and faculty speech have generated national headlines and widespread concern. Examples include: Northwestern University Professor Laura Kipnis was [investigated for months](https://www.thefire.org/laura-kipniss-title-ix-inquisition-reveals-absurdity-of-the-current-campus-climate/) for writing a newspaper article questioning “sexual paranoia” on campus and how Title IX investigations are conducted. Syracuse University law student Len Audaer was [investigated for harassment](https://www.thefire.org/cases/syracuse-university-disciplinary-investigations-of-satirical-law-school-blog/) for comedic articles he posted on a satirical law school blog patterned after The Onion. A female student at the University of Oregon was [investigated and charged](https://www.thefire.org/four-word-joke-results-five-conduct-charges-university-oregon-student/) with harassment and four other charges for jokingly yelling “I hit it first” out a window at a couple. The Sun Star, a student newspaper at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, was [investigated for nearly a year](https://www.thefire.org/cases/university-of-alaska-fairbanks-complaint-over-student-newspapers-articles-results-in-months-long-harassment-investigation/) for an April Fools’ Day issue of the newspaper and for reporting on hateful messages posted to an anonymous “UAF Confessions” Facebook page. And just two weeks ago, a police officer at the University of Delaware [ordered students to censor a “free speech ball”](https://www.thefire.org/university-of-delaware-police-to-students-self-censor-free-speech-ball/)—put up as part of a demonstration in favor of free speech—because it had the word “penis” and an accompanying drawing on it, claiming that it could violate the university’s sexual misconduct policy. DOJ’s rationale would not just legitimize all of the above investigations—it would require campuses to either conduct such investigations routinely or face potential federal sanctions. This latest findings letter doubles down on the unconstitutional and [controversial](https://www.thefire.org/year-later-impact-feds-blueprint-comes-focus/) [“blueprint” definition](https://www.thefire.org/cases/departments-of-education-and-justice-national-requirement-for-unconstitutional-speech-codes/) of sexual harassment jointly issued by DOJ and the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights in a [May 2013 findings letter](https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/legacy/2013/05/09/um-ltr-findings.pdf) to the University of Montana. [FIRE and other civil liberties advocates](https://www.thefire.org/fire-coalition-letter-to-departments-of-education-and-justice/) at the time warned that the controversial language threatens the free speech and academic freedom rights of students and faculty members.

### \*\*Link Level\*\*

### AT: Kruth 16- SC Ruled T9 ø Include FS

#### 1. Wrong Context- The supreme court ruling has already been established, but colleges still choose not to follow it. Their evidence still describes a tension between free speech and what is clarified as harassment, schools encompass harassment speech as violations of Title 9

#### 2. Low Strength of Link- For the government and colleges, it’s hard to draw the line for when speech sonstitutes a serious threat, they default to harassment speech including that threat which means that they default to having codes because harassment speech is likely to become offensive

#### 3. Empirics flow neg- colleges are more likely to limit free speech that’s on the brightline of hate speech, the speech that the aff passes may not be under “fighting words” but it could lead to that state and that’s how colleges have interpreted it

### AT: Trump Rolls Back T9 Funding

#### 1. Their evidence is predictive- but you can’t predict Trump if it hasn’t happened yet.

**Bernstein 1-23** [Jared Bernstein (Jared Bernstein, a former chief economist to Vice President Joe Biden, is a senior fellow at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and author of the new book "The Reconnection Agenda: Reuniting Growth and Prosperity.") , 1-23-2017, "You can't believe what President Trump says," chicagotribune, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/commentary/ct-donald-trump-lies-20170123-story.html>] NB

I'm not just saying that I don't believe that "carnage" describes the American condition (if it does, we need a new word for Syria), and I say that as someone who's been trying for decades to get policymakers to pay attention to the economic costs of globalization. I'm saying I don't believe that he believes it. From his speeches to his tweets, [Trump](http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/politics-government/donald-trump-PEBSL000163-topic.html) does not speak truth. Instead, he speaks in two modes. One, he says what his audience wants to hear, and two, he does his "Art of the Deal" shtick, trying to put perceived enemies and negotiating opponents back on their heels. Mode one is particularly easy to see; it's what he does in front of crowds. He tells coal workers he'll bring their jobs back. He tells those unhappy with their health insurance that his plan will provide more coverage for less money. He reassures the New York Times editorial board that he's a moderate on climate change ("I'm looking at it very closely"). He can't bring back coal jobs; he's got no plan for better health insurance, in no small part because it's impossible to provide more comprehensive coverage while spending less. Days after his meeting with the Times, he nominated Scott Pruitt, an avowed enemy of climate policy, to head the Environmental Protection Agency. His inaugural speech was full of populist rhetoric about helping those who've been on the wrong side of globalization and inequality. He boldly asserted that "every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families." How likely is that? It's early days, of course, and actions yet to come will speak louder than these words. But look at his Cabinet, look at his tax plan and the budgets of his Republican congressional majority. Observe that on the day he spoke those words, he signed an executive order to effectively gut Obamacare's individual mandate with no replacement in sight, raised the cost of mortgages to low and moderate-income home buyers, and expunged reports on climate change and gay rights from the government's website. Mode two is obvious in tweet-shaming China, threatening to punish companies that offshore jobs, 45 percent tariffs, the wall that he still claims Mexico will pay for, and most recently, falsely accusing the press of dishonestly reporting the size of the crowd at his inauguration. The idea here is that when actual negotiations on these matters commence, his opponents, which clearly include the media, will already be playing defense. That may or may not be an effective strategy - my guess is that it gets old pretty quickly - but that's what's going on. I don't believe a word he says, and neither should you. What does that mean from the perspective of both the media and the analytic community? Regarding the latter, I'm thinking about my own economic policy lens, but also that of the many foreign policy actors who are trying to figure out how to deal with our new president. (I've had numerous conversations with embassy officials here in Washington who've asked me some version of this question.) Starting with the media, I asked a reporter I much admire whether her paper really had to report Trump's tweets, given that whatever information they contain is wholly unreliable. Her reply was, "Of course! They're news." Her paper's solution is to provide context within which to place the tweet, which I took to mean some version of "the president may or may not mean what he says here." That means that all of us — voters, journalists, foreign officials, policy analysts — must either quickly learn this lesson, i.e., he doesn't mean what he says, or suffer severe mental whiplash on a daily basis while missing what's really going on. But how can we possibly figure out what he's really up to? For one, as alluded to above, you look at who he's surrounding himself with, which, contrary to his populist campaign, are Wall Street bankers, education privatizers (Betsy DeVos), anti-safety-net advocates (Ben Carson), and business-oriented globalizers (Rex Tillerson). It's unclear whether he'll listen to them — for the most part, their unifying theme is that they're really rich and were loyal to him during the campaign — but I have an easier time seeing this crew cutting taxes on the wealthy and regulations on business/finance than lifting the living standards of the working class. (And note that, thus far, their announced agenda is all the former and none of the latter.) Look at the budgets and tax plans that the Republican majority has had on the shelf for years now. The budgets cut deeply in low-income programs; the tax cuts enrich the wealthy while starving the Treasury of much-needed revenue. This is not speculation; these documents exist, and we've analyzed them. What is more speculative, though still based on stated preferences and some policy work of powerful Republicans, is the desire to pay for these tax cuts by cutting Social Security and Medicare. Trump says he won't go there, but what did I just tell you what Trump says? Throughout history, demagogues have used populism to "dangle the keys," to get people to "look over here" while "over there," they engage in activities that are diametrically opposed to the public good. This was clear in his inaugural speech, as Trump blamed government for everything that's gone wrong while ignoring the finance and corporate sectors that brought us the financial bubble and offshoring of jobs. Our job is thus not to be distracted by shiny objects, to keep our eye on the power, the budget, the social insurance, the facts, the numbers, the vulnerable, the safety net and the public good. I will not go gently into the fact-free night, and I expect you won't either.

#### 2. Devos hasn’t ruled on title 9 enforcement yet—still in consideration

**Akin 17** [Katie Akin, 1-16-2017, "What President Trump Means for Title IX at the University of Chicago," No Publication, <https://www.chicagomaroon.com/article/2017/1/16/president-trump-means-title-ix-university-chicago/>] NB

UPDATE: On January 17th, the confirmation hearing for Betsy DeVos began, and the nominee publicly discussed her views on Title IX for the first time. In the third hour of the hearing, Senator Murray (WA) asked DeVos if she could promise to not scale back the Office for Civil Rights and to continue to work towards the prevention of campus sexual assault. DeVos replied that, if confirmed, she would “be looking very closely at how this has been regulated and handled,” and would make decisions “with great sensitivity to those who are victims, and also considering perpetrators as well.”

#### 3. Nonverifiable- their evidence is predictive so it doesn’t define what would happen if the plan passed now, which means that we still get impacts to the DA

### AT: Kingkade- Funding Won’t Get Pulled

#### 1. Low strength of link- funding may not be pulled completely, but it can be pulled to affect certain programs which still decreases the total education they receive

#### 2. Our evidence is more specific- it isolates that certain schools have been presented with the choice between funding cuts or complete free speech protections