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#### A] Interpretation: The Aff must defend allowing all constitutionally protected speech on campus – they may not specify a subset of speech to not protect.

-Counterplans that restrict only certain forms of speech are theoretically illegitimate.

#### The negative “any” is an indefinite that refers to all

**Cambridge Dictionary:** Cambridge Dictionary, Any, <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/grammar/british-grammar/quantifiers/any>.

**We use any before nouns to refer to indefinite or unknown quantities or an unlimited entity**: Did you bring any bread? **Mr Jacobson refused to answer any questions**. If I were able to travel back to any place and time in history, I would go to ancient China. **Any as a determiner has two forms: a strong form and a weak form. The forms have different meanings. Weak form any: indefinite quantities We use any for indefinite quantities in questions and negative sentences**. We use some in affirmative sentences: Have you got any eggs? I haven’t got any eggs. I’ve got some eggs. Not: I’ve got any eggs. We use weak form any only with uncountable nouns or with plural nouns: [talking about fuel for the car] Do I need to get any petrol? (+ uncountable noun) There aren’t any clean knives. They’re all in the dishwasher. (+ plural noun) Warning: We don’t use any with this meaning with singular countable nouns: Have you got any Italian cookery books? (or … an Italian cookery book?) Not: Have you got any Italian cookery book? Strong form any meaning ‘it does not matter which’ We use any to mean ‘it does not matter which or what’, to describe something which is not limited. We use this meaning of any with all types of nouns and usually in affirmative sentences. In speaking we often stress any:. (+ uncountable noun) When you make a late booking, you don’t know where you’re going to go, do you? It could be any destination. (+ singular countable noun) [talking about a contract for new employees] Do we have any form of agreement with new staff when they start? (+ singular countable noun) [a parent talking to a child about a picture he has painted] A: I don’t think I’ve ever seen you paint such a beautiful picture before. Gosh! Did you choose the colours? B: We could choose any colours we wanted. (+ plural countable noun) See also: Determiners and types of noun Some and any Any as a pronoun Any can be used as a pronoun (without a noun following) when the noun is understood. A: Have you got some £1 coins on you? B: Sorry, I don’t think I have any. (understood: I don’t think I have any £1 coins.) [parents talking about their children’s school homework] A: Do you find that Elizabeth gets lots of homework? Marie gets a lot. B: No not really. She gets hardly any. (understood: She gets hardly any homework.) A: What did you think of the cake? It was delicious, wasn’t it? B: I don’t know. I didn’t get any. (understood: I didn’t get any of the cake.) See also: Determiners used as pronouns Any of We use any with of before articles (a/an, the), demonstratives (this, these), pronouns (you, us) or possessives (his, their): Shall I keep any of these spices? I think they’re all out of date. Not: … any these spices? We use any of to refer to a part of a whole: Are any of you going to the meeting? I couldn’t answer any of these questions. I listen to Abba but I’ve never bought any of their music. **Any** doesn’t have a negative meaning on its own. It **must be used with a negative word to mean the same as no. Compare Not** **Any**: **there aren’t any biscuits left**. They’ve eaten them all. **No**: There are no biscuits left. They’ve eaten them all.

#### B] Violation

#### C] Net Benefits

#### 1] Legal context – SCOTUS has established that any means all.

**SCOTUS:** Supreme Court of the United States. United States v. Gonzales 520 U.S. 1 [Delivered by Justice O’Connor]. <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/520/1/case.html>1997. RP

**The question we face is whether the phrase "any other term of imprisonment" "means what it says, or whether it should be limited to some subset"** of prison sentences, Maine v. Thiboutot, 448 U. S. 1, 4 (1980)-namely, only federal sentences. **Read naturally, the word "any" has an expansive meaning, that is, "one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind.**" Webster's Third New International Dictionary 97 (1976). **Congress did not add any language limiting the breadth of that word, and so we must read § 924(c) as referring to all "terms of imprisonment**," including those imposed by state courts. Cf. United States v. AlvarezSanchez, 511 U. S. 350, 358 (1994) (noting that statute referring to "any law enforcement officer" includes "federal, state, or local" officers); Collector v. Hubbard, 12 Wall. 1, 15 (1871) (**stating "it is quite clear" that a statute prohibiting the filing of suit "in any court" "includes the State courts as well as the Federal courts," because "there is not a word in the statute tending to show that the words 'in any court' are not used in their ordinary sense")**. There is no basis in the text for limiting § 924(c) to federal sentences.

#### 2] Limits -- they allow SO MANY affs – they can defend any type of speech—here’s things they could say we shouldn’t restrict: saying racism is bad, writing papers, having casual conversations, the list goes on and on—their interp literally allows them to write infinite affs

#### 3] Ground – if they can spec speech, they can defend literally any ridiculous Aff. Plans could say “don’t restrict the right to say racism is bad” – combined with a specific framework, negating is impossible. Affs could read a Kant framework and a plan “don’t restrict the right to say Deont is true”.

#### D] Voting issue

#### Topical version of the Aff solves their offense – they can just read it including all speech with an advantage area that’s specific to types of speech.

# Hate Speech DA

## 1NC

#### The Aff’s stance towards anti-war activism makes students unsafe on campuses – those who don’t agree are stigmatized and marginalized – this causes hate speech.

**Levy:** Levy, Janet [Contibutor, Accuracy in Media] “Iraq’s only Similarity to Vietnam: Its Dangerous Anti-War Movement.” February 2007. RP

**Equally reminiscent of the ’60s and ’70s, university and high school campuses are hotbeds for anti-American and anti-war sentiments**. Prior to the inception of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the “Books Not Bombs” strike was coordinated on campuses nationwide by the National Youth and Student Peace Coalition, whose members include the Young Communist League, USA, and the Muslim Students’ Association of the U.S. and Canada. **This anti-war protest was endorsed by professors in a wide variety of disciplines, from economics to biology, who cancelled classes or assured anti-war students they would not be penalized for absences. Some professors even focused the day’s class material on the potential war. Thus, a majority of institutions of higher education appeared to expect conformity of anti-war opinion and, in some cases, actually imposed the strike on the student population**. This behavior continues today as literature and anthropology professors use classroom time to express their opinions against the war and pressure students to toe their ideological line. **Often, students who agree with the Bush administration’s policy in Iraq jeopardize their grades by coming forward. They are treated with disdain and even disrespect in the classroom. Returning Iraq war veterans have been insulted, harassed and called “baby killers” in university classrooms. She adds:** Finally, as was the case during the U.S. fight against communism in Southeast Asia, the mission of the military has been undermined by blatant hostility and blanket condemnations. **Venomous slurs have been directed toward the dedicated servicemen and women who toppled a brutal dictator, struggled against radical Islamists, and fought for a better life for the Iraqi people. Politicians have been extremely negative. For example, Illinois senator Barrack Obama referred to the “wasted” lives of our soldiers. Massachusetts Senator John Kerry insulted the intelligence of our armed forces by proclaiming that people end up in the military if they’re not smart or studious.** Anti-military groups have tried to stop military recruitment drives and job fair participation in high schools and on college campuses. Even though all recruits today are committed volunteers who believe in the U.S. mission, anti-war activists portray them as victims, mercenaries or butchers. Isolated military improprieties committed by a few soldiers, like the Haditha incident and the Abu Ghraib scandal, receive outsized attention and are portrayed as representative of all military conduct. The slightest hint of misconduct is used to characterize all recruits and to malign the entire military mission. Anti-militarism has even been expressed by sweeping, local government measures. The city of San Francisco has engaged in various actions to rid itself of any relationship whatsoever to the military. Residents recently passed a symbolic measure demanding the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and prohibiting recruitment at high schools and colleges. City residents tried to stop Navy sponsorship of a summer concert, successfully blocked the docking of the USS Iowa at the Port of San Francisco and are trying to eliminate Fleet Week and the Blue Angels air shows.

#### This harassment is racialized and classist – minorities and poor people are most often in the military, so the plan directs harassment their way.

**Wyant:** Wyant, Carissa [Contributor, Mint Press News] “Who’s Joining the US Military? Poor, Women And Minorities Targeted.” *Mint Press News.* December 2012. RP

(MintPress) – Be all that you can be. That’s the slogan of the U.S. Army, and when its uttered, the picture that likely springs to mind is one of a young, white male in fatigues. G.I. Joe — “the real American hero”. But that popular cliche perhaps does not ring true to the reality — past or present — of who has and is joining and serving in the U.S. military. Back in November, an Army widow in Tennessee, 23-year-old Ashley Edens, made headlines after she decided to honor her husband’s memory by joining the military. Edens joined the Army to honor Spc. Jason Edens of Franklin, Tenn. who died in April after suffering a gunshot wound to the head in Afghanistan. She told [WJHL-TV](http://www.newschannel5.com/story/20126381/soldiers-widow-joins-army) that she was “lost” after her husband was killed but in the months afterward she began to find a new focus, and she joined the military. While Eden’s case may have made headlines because it sounds so unusual, Edens is part of a growing trend of women entering the armed services. **Moreover, other recent research into the question of who is joining the military revealed that women and lower-income minorities are joining the ranks, and the government is actively recruiting individuals from these demographics. A 2008** [**study from Syracuse University**](http://surface.syr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=soc)**examines the extent to which the poor and minorities are disproportionately selected into the military.** While Amy Lutz, the author of the study, writes that relatively little research has examined this question empirically, although the Department of Defense keeps annual records on the race and gender of military personnel. **Lutz relays that a study done in 1980 found that from 1940 to 1973 blacks were less likely to join the military than whites, while in more recent years, a 2006 study concluded that blacks are overrepresented in the military.** The same 2006 study found that people who serve in the military come from more well-off neighborhoods than those who have not joined the military — although the economic elite are underrepresented in armed service. **Lutz’s study also looks at the history of participation of the three largest racial and ethnic groups in the military — whites, blacks and Latinos — and examined ethnicity, immigrant generation and socioeconomic status in relation to military service. It concluded that significant disparities exist only by socioeconomic status, finding “the all-volunteer force continues to see overrepresentation of the working and middle classes, with fewer incentives for upper class participation.” Immigrants to America have a long history of joining the military, as Lutz says German, Irish and Italian immigrants as well as Latinos have a lengthy history of participation in the United States military from the Revolutionary War to World War II. The same is true for African-Americans, who have fought in every American war, including the Revolutionary War, in which George Washington initially banned black participation against the British.** Washington changed his mind when the British offered to free slaves who fought on their side. However, despite their many contributions, it wasn’t until much later in American history that the discrimination facing African-Americans in the military was addressed. African-Americans did face discrimination, as Lutz explains, “In the early years of the United States, policies toward African-Americans in the military were somewhat ambivalent. Often, the policies stated that participation in the military was for whites only, but in practice blacks were allowed to join whenever the military needed manpower.” In 1948, President Harry Truman issued Executive Order 9981, which outlawed racial discrimination in the military. The order stated, “It is hereby declared to be the policy of the President that there shall be equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the Armed Forces without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin. This policy shall be put into effect as rapidly as possible, having due regard to the time required to effectuate any necessary changes without impairing efficiency or morale.” Truman’s executive order also established a committee appointed by the president to examine racial inequality in the military as well as to create and alter military policies related to civil rights. While previous policies had sought to put an end to racial discrimination in the military, they did not define segregation as a form of discrimination, thus allowing it to continue. **In 2011, a** [**study by the Pew Research Center**](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2011/12/22/women-in-the-u-s-military-growing-share-distinctive-profile/)**found that black women are enlisting in the military at far higher rates than are white or Hispanic women, and they now represent nearly a third of all the women in the armed forces. And women are joining the military in record numbers at the same time that the military is seeing less people enlist overall**. From 1973 to 2010 the number of active duty enlisted women in the military grew from about 42,000 to 167,000. Over that same period, the enlisted force as a whole saw a decrease of about 738,000 service members. The study, which utilized demographic data collected by the Defense Department, found that of the 167,000 enlisted women in the military, 31 percent are black, which is twice their percentage in the civilian female population. Black men represent about 16 percent of the male enlisted population, which is proportionally equal in the civilian population. In contrast, white women represent 53 percent of women in the military, while accounting for 78 percent of the civilian female population. A New York Times [article](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/23/us/black-women-enlist-at-higher-rates-in-us-military.html?_r=0), which reported on the study, stated that “black women are a crucial source of new recruits for the armed forces, especially for the Army and the Air Force.” However, the question of why black women enlist at higher rates than white women or black men remains unanswered and has not been studied, Beth J. Asch, a senior economist and defense manpower specialist at the Rand Corporation, told the newspaper. The study also found that women were far more likely than men to serve in the Air Force, but far less likely to join the Marine Corps. “That probably reflects the central role of the infantry in the Marines, since women are barred from ground combat units,” the article speculates. Asch alluded to the fact that “the military tries to attract high school graduates who are looking for job training, good benefits and help with college tuition — and that a high percentage of black women fit that bill, as a possible explanation of the discovery. “That is the group the military targets,” Asch said. Women in the military are less likely than military men to be married, as only 46 percent of women in the military are married as opposed to 58 percent of men. Almost half of the married women in the military have spouses who are also in the military, but only 7 percent of married military men have wives in the forces. The military also seems to be drawing recruits who have less education, as a recent report documented the percentage of new recruits entering the Army with a high school diploma dropped to a new low. The study, which was conducted by the [National Priorities Project](http://nationalpriorities.org/) (NPP), found slightly more than 70 percent of new recruits joining the active duty Army had a high school diploma, nearly 20 percentage points lower than the Army’s goal of at least 90 percent. Army officials confirmed lowering their standards to meet high recruiting goals in the middle of ongoing conflicts that the U.S. was involved in around the world. Massachusetts-based research NPP concluded that the number of high school graduates among new recruits fell to 70.7 percent in 2008. “The trend is clear,” Anita Dancs, the project’s research director who based the report on Defense Department data released via the Freedom of Information Act, told the Washington [Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/01/22/AR2008012203326.html). “They’re missing their benchmarks, and I think it’s strongly linked to the impact [of] the Iraq War.” The study also found that the number of recruits with both a high school diploma and a score in the upper half on the military’s qualification test fell by 15 percent from 2004 to 2007. An analysis of recruiting data revealed that low- and middle-income families are supplying far more Army recruits than families with incomes of more than $60,000 a year. “Once again, we’re staring at the painful story of young people with fewer options bearing the greatest burden,” Greg Speeter, the project’s executive director, told the newspaper.

#### Hate speech outweighs – it promotes systemic racism which is the root cause of militaristic violence based on fear.

**Delgado and Stefancic:** Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic [Delgado is Charles Inglis Thomson Professor of Law, University of Colorado. J.D., U. Cali- fornia-Berkeley, 1974. Stefancic is theTechnical Services Librarian, University of San Francisco School of Law. M.L.S., Simmons College, 1963; M.A., University of San Francisco, 1989. “FOUR OBSERVATIONS ABOUT HATE SPEECH.” *Wake Forest Law Review.* Volume 44. 2009. RP

**With general hate speech, such as anonymously circulated flyers or speeches to a crowd, the harms, while diffuse, may be just as serious. Recent scholarship shows how practically every instance of genocide came on the heels of a wave of hate speech depicting the victims in belittling terms.75 For example, before launching their wave of deadly attacks on the Tutsis in Rwanda, Hutus in government and the media disseminated a drumbeat of messages casting their ethnic rivals as despicable.76 The Third Reich did much the same with the Jews during the period leading up to the Holocaust. When the United States enslaved African Americans and killed or removed the Indians, it rationalized that these were simple folk who needed discipline and tutelage, or else bloodthirsty savages who resisted the blessings of civilization.** When, a little later, the nation marched westward in pursuit of manifest destiny, it justified taking over the rich lands of California and the Southwest on the ground that the indolent Mexicans living on them did not deserve their good fortune. Before interning the Japanese during World War II, propagandists depicted the group as sneaky, suspicious, and despotic. **It is possible that the connection between general hate speech and instances of mass oppression may not be merely statistical and contingent, but conceptual and necessary. Concerted action requires an intelligible intention or rationale capable of being understood by others. One cannot mistreat another group without first articulating a reason why one is doing it**—otherwise, no one but a sadist would join in. Without a softening-up period, early steps toward genocide, such as removing Jews to a ghetto, would strike others as gratuitous and command little support. Discriminatory action of any kind presupposes a group that labors under a stigma of some kind. The prime mechanism for the creation of such stigma is hate speech**. Without it, genocide, imperialism, Indian removal, and Jim Crow could gain little purchase.**

# Heg Gud DA

## 1NC

#### Decline of US heg has been overstated – heg is high and on the rise.

**Hunt March 13:** Hunt, Edward [Contributor, Jacobin Magazine] “The American Empire Isn’t in Decline.” *Jacobin.* March 13, 2017. RP

The warning signs seem to be everywhere. A resurgent Russia is exerting its power in Eastern Europe and the Middle East. A rising China is extending its reach across its periphery. ISIS has taken control of large parts of Iraq and Syria. Establishment Democrats and Republicans couldn’t even stop Donald Trump from becoming the president of the United States. **For the foreign policy establishment in Washington, it all raises a very troubling question: is the United States an empire in decline? Some insist that the answer is yes — that the period of US global dominance that has reigned since the end of the Cold War is coming to an end**. As things now stand, “the post–Cold War, unipolar moment has passed,” the National Intelligence Council [reported](https://www.dni.gov/files/images/globalTrends/documents/GT-Full-Report.pdf) earlier this year. Former CIA officials John E. McLaughlin and Gen. David H. Petraeus [made](https://armedservices.house.gov/legislation/hearings/full-committee-hearing-state-world-national-security-threats-and-challenges) a similar assessment before the House Armed Services Committee this past February. In the years ahead, McLaughlin argued, “the world will be without a hegemonic power — that is, without a country so powerful as to exert dominant influence and advance policy with little reference to others.” Petraeus agreed, saying that the post–Cold War era of “US domination of the world” is ending. **Still, there are some reasons to think otherwise. As former US diplomat R. Nicholas Burns recently** [**observed**](http://www.armed-services.senate.gov/hearings/16-07-07-north-atlantic-treaty_organization-russia-and-european-security)**, the United States maintains “alliances in Europe and Asia, and the Russians and Chinese do not.” In addition, the American military has begun to** [**wipe out**](https://lobelog.com/the-new-exterminatory-warfare/) **ISIS, killing more than** [**sixty thousand**](http://www.military.com/daily-news/2017/02/14/specops-commander-60000-isis-fighters-killed-by-us-troops.html) **fighters over the past two and a half years**. So do a resurgent Russia, an ascendant China, and the emergence of the Islamic State suggest that US power is ebbing, or are these challenges exaggerated? What do US officials really think about these matters? **If we take stock of their public statements as a whole, the foreign policy establishment certainly appears concerned about the latest challenges to US empire, especially the uncertainty that Trump’s election has introduced. But they also remain quite confident in their power to shape the world and steer the United States into a new age of global hegemony**. **Over the past few years, a number of high-level officials have expressed great confidence in the durability of US hegemony. Not only have they insisted that the declinist thesis is wrong, but they have argued that the United States will remain the world’s dominant power well into the future.** In May 2016, two former high-level officials [laid out](https://www.foreign.senate.gov/hearings/examining-americas-role-in-the-world-051216) the more confident view for the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. In a statement to the panel, former Secretary of State James Baker said that the United States would continue to lead the international system. Certainly, “much of the rest of the world — countries like China, Brazil and India — are catching up with us,” Baker conceded. “Still, we should remain the world’s preeminent leader for the foreseeable future.” Former National Security Advisor Thomas Donilon agreed. **As long as the United States takes the proper precautions, he said, it “will continue to be the world’s leading and most powerful nation for a long time to come**.” Donilon also rejected the declinist thesis, calling it a “myth” that should not be taken seriously: “The idea that America is in decline does not stand up to a rigorous analysis of our national balance sheet of strategic assets and liabilities,” Donilon asserted. “The truth is that no nation can match our comprehensive set of enduring strengths.”Other Obama administration officials offered similar views. Last October, for example, Secretary of State John Kerry noted that the United States maintains tremendous economic advantages. “We’re the richest country on the face of the planet,” Kerry [said](https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2016/10/263891.htm). **In fact, the Obama administration made great strides in expanding US economic power across the globe. President Obama, who** [**acknowledged**](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/11/20/press-conference-president-obama-lima-peru) **during his final months in office that he had “made it a priority to open up new markets overseas,” boasted that his administration had “increased US exports to the world by more than 40 percent — to record levels.” At the same time, administration officials also pointed to their other great advantage in world affairs**: American military power. As Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter [noted](http://archive.defense.gov/Transcripts/Transcript.aspx?TranscriptID=5610) in April 2015, “it will take decades — and let me repeat that: decades — for anyone to build the kind of military capability the United States possesses today.” Obama expressed similar sentiments during his farewell tour. The United States possesses “the greatest military in the history of the world,” Obama [declared](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2017/01/04/remarks-president-armed-forces-full-honor-review-farewell-ceremony). “Make no mistake,” he continued, “even with the challenges of recent years — and there have been challenges — our allies and adversaries alike understand America’s military remains, by far, the most capable fighting force on the face of the Earth.” In short, contrary to those who warn of waning US hegemony, high-ranking officials insist that the United States remains the most powerful country in the world. “We are, without a doubt, the world’s superpower,” CIA Director John Brennan [said](https://csis-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/160914_Brennan_Keynote.pdf) this past September

#### Anti-war protests on campus undermine heg – they force withdrawal – Iraq proves.

**Levy:** Levy, Janet [Contibutor, Accuracy in Media] “Iraq’s only Similarity to Vietnam: Its Dangerous Anti-War Movement.” February 2007. RP

**Equally reminiscent of the ’60s and ’70s, university and high school campuses are hotbeds for anti-American and anti-war sentiments**. Prior to the inception of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the “Books Not Bombs” strike was coordinated on campuses nationwide by the National Youth and Student Peace Coalition, whose members include the Young Communist League, USA, and the Muslim Students’ Association of the U.S. and Canada. This anti-war protest was endorsed by professors in a wide variety of disciplines, from economics to biology, who cancelled classes or assured anti-war students they would not be penalized for absences. Some professors even focused the day’s class material on the potential war. Thus, a majority of institutions of higher education appeared to expect conformity of anti-war opinion and, in some cases, actually imposed the strike on the student population This behavior continues today as literature and anthropology professors use classroom time to express their opinions against the war and pressure students to toe their ideological line. Often, students who agree with the Bush administration’s policy in Iraq jeopardize their grades by coming forward. They are treated with disdain and even disrespect in the classroom. Returning Iraq war veterans have been insulted, harassed and called “baby killers” in university classrooms. Finally, as was the case during the U.S. fight against communism in Southeast Asia, the mission of the military has been undermined by blatant hostility and blanket condemnations. Venomous slurs have been directed toward the dedicated servicemen and women who toppled a brutal dictator, struggled against radical Islamists, and fought for a better life for the Iraqi people. Politicians have been extremely negative. For example, Illinois senator Barrack Obama referred to the “wasted” lives of our soldiers. Massachusetts Senator John Kerry insulted the intelligence of our armed forces by proclaiming that people end up in the military if they’re not smart or studious. Anti-military groups have tried to stop military recruitment drives and job fair participation in high schools and on college campuses. Even though all recruits today are committed volunteers who believe in the U.S. mission, anti-war activists portray them as victims, mercenaries or butchers. Isolated military improprieties committed by a few soldiers, like the Haditha incident and the Abu Ghraib scandal, receive outsized attention and are portrayed as representative of all military conduct. The slightest hint of misconduct is used to characterize all recruits and to malign the entire military mission. Anti-militarism has even been expressed by sweeping, local government measures. The city of San Francisco has engaged in various actions to rid itself of any relationship whatsoever to the military. Residents recently passed a symbolic measure demanding the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and prohibiting recruitment at high schools and colleges. City residents tried to stop Navy sponsorship of a summer concert, successfully blocked the docking of the USS Iowa at the Port of San Francisco and are trying to eliminate Fleet Week and the Blue Angels air shows. In Congress, many Democrats and several Republicans are invoking the Vietnam “quagmire” descriptive to support demands to curtail the Iraq war and withdraw U.S. troops. The Democrat electorate has chosen to interpret recent election results as a sign that the public is opposed to the war, rather than opposed to the way the war is being fought. According to a recent national survey by Public Opinion Strategies, a majority of Americans (57%) wants to win the war in Iraq and makes the connection between Iraq and the global jihad. Fifty-three percent feel the Democrats are acting precipitously in pushing for immediate withdrawal and a majority (56%) also believes that Americans should stand behind the president in times of war. Most telling, 74% of those surveyed disagreed with the statement, “I don’t care what happens in Iraq after the U.S. leaves. I just want the troops brought home.” Last week, on the same day that Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki told Bush that the new security plan and heightened troop presence in Baghdad were “a dazzling success,” the House passed a non-binding resolution rejecting Bush’s 21,500-troop surge in Iraq. In the Senate, the resolution was just four votes short of the sixty required for cloture, which would have limited debate on the resolution and ensured passage. As a consequence of this narrow defeat, Democrats have pledged to repeal a 2002 measure authorizing and defining the mission of U.S. troops in Iraq. With no consideration of how this plays with the enemy, the morale of U.S. troops and the U.S. ground troops’ ability to build alliances with Iraqis, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid issued a statement that the invasion of Iraq was “the worst foreign policy mistake” in U.S. history. In further attempts to block the deployment of more troops, House Democrats hope to restrict parts of a $100 billion emergency military funding request by the President. Rep. John Murtha (D-PA) and other Democrats have joined forces with anti-war groups to limit the President’s powers as Commander-In-Chief. Murtha and company plan to attach stipulations to any military appropriations; embark on a multi-million dollar, anti-war advertising campaign; and target vulnerable Republicans. Murtha is also seeking legislation as part of what he calls his “slow bleed strategy.” It would prevent military units from being deployed unless they meet certain standards and receive a break of at least one year between deployments. **This damaging action by politicians and their failure to support the U.S. government “destroys morale, stymies success and emboldens the enemy,” says Rep. Sam Johnson (R-TX), a former Vietnam prisoner of war. “Words cannot fully describe the horrendous damage of the anti-American efforts against the war back home to the guys on the ground,” Johnson said. “We must stick by ‘the troops.’ We must support them all the way? To our troops we must remain?always faithful.” This inattention to the message being sent to our soldiers is part of the broader failure by Iraq war opponents to recognize the dire consequences of U.S. withdrawal. It completely escapes opponents of the war on all fronts ? anti-war activists, Hollywood, colleges and universities and politicians ? that the conflict is not regional and one from which we can walk away without harm. It is positively stunning that they fail to recognize that Iraq could fall to Islamic terrorists. If this happened, Iraq would be a fertile base for Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups and a haven from which emboldened terrorists could attack U.S. allies and interests and threaten the very existence of our nation.**

**Hegemony decline causes extinction.**

**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, theUnited 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 U**nited **S**tates **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 **America**n 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 prolif**eration**changes 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 U**nited **S**tates **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
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### A2 China

#### Wrong!!!!!!!!

**Hunt March 13:** Hunt, Edward [Contributor, Jacobin Magazine] “The American Empire Isn’t in Decline.” *Jacobin.* March 13, 2017. RP

**hroughout Washington, many officials are worried that China will replace the United States as the dominant power in the Pacific.**

**Last June, Brennan delivered this** [**warning**](http://www.cfr.org/intelligence/john-brennan-transnational-threats-global-security/p38082)**: “China is a growing power of great economic, political, and increasingly military influence and presence.” China, he noted, has continued expanding its presence in the South China Sea, an area American officials have identified as a strategically important transit route. “There is a reason for the United States to pay attention to what China is doing on a number of fronts, which we are,” Brennan said.**

**A few months later, two high-level officials put the matter more directly. Appearing before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Secretary of Defense Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Joseph Dunford** [**claimed**](http://www.armed-services.senate.gov/hearings/16-09-22-us-national-security-challenges-and-ongoing-military-operations) **that the United States and China are now arrayed against each other.**

**Alabama senator Tom Cotton asked, “Gen. Dunford, are we in great-power competition with China?” “We are, senator,” Dunford replied. Carter agreed, saying, “absolutely right.”**

**In early January, Secretary of State John Kerry even suggested that China would eventually surpass the United States as the world’s leading economic power. “We’re the most powerful country on the planet, yes, and we’re the biggest economy in the world, yes,” Kerry** [**stated**](https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2017/01/266793.htm)**. “But China will be eventually just by virtue of its size.”**

**Nevertheless, US officials have also expressed certitude about their ability to deal with China. While they may identify China as a great-power competitor that is destined to grow more powerful, they have also argued the US maintains the upper hand in bilateral relations.**

**In July 2016, Vice President Joe Biden** [**provided**](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/07/14/remarks-vice-president-us-japan-south-korea-trilateral-meeting) **one example. He recounted that after the Chinese government had tried to create an** [**air defense identification zone**](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/24/world/asia/china-warns-of-action-against-aircraft-over-disputed-seas.html) **over disputed territory in the East China Sea, the United States had asserted its dominance. According to Biden, President Xi had asked him, “What do you expect me to do?” In response, Biden had said, “I don’t expect you to do much, but just so you know, we’re flying B-52s through it. We’re coming.” In other words, Biden told the Chinese president that regardless of any newly declared air rights, the United States would continue to use that area.**

**Since then, officials have only grown more confident in their capacity to manage China. Kerry himself bragged last September that China has not been able to alter the strategic calculus in the South China Sea. “In the South China Sea, we have been able to make it clear, freedom of navigation,” Kerry** [**commented**](https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2016/09/262581.htm)**. “We’ve been able to deal with China.”**

**In fact, the United States has maintained the** [**dominant**](http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/08/24/maintaining-u-s-dominance-in-the-pacific/) **position throughout the entire Asia Pacific area. The United States “is the strongest military and the power of the region and will remain so for a long time,” Carter** [**said**](https://www.defense.gov/News/Transcripts/Transcript-View/Article/1020495/media-availability-with-secretary-carter-enroute-to-tokyo-japan) **last December.**

**Officials in the Trump administration have indicated they may use that military power to confront China. In January, Rex Tillerson said during his confirmation hearing for secretary of state that the US will no longer tolerate China’s attempts to gain control of the South China Sea. “We’re going to have to send China a clear signal that first, the island-building stops, and second, your access to those islands is also not going to be allowed,” Tillerson** [**said**](https://www.foreign.senate.gov/hearings/nominations-hearing-011117)**.**

**In short, US officials are relatively unperturbed by China’s power. Although they still fear that China may one day emerge to challenge American hegemony, they have largely ensured that China will remain a secondary power in the region for the immediate future.**

### A2 Russia

#### Doesn’t kill heg
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**eanwhile, state officials face another significant challenge to their plans: Russia.**

**Last June, Brennan captured their trepidation in a statement to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence: “Russia is threatening its neighbors and aggressively reasserting itself on the global stage,” he** [**stated**](https://www.cia.gov/news-information/speeches-testimony/2016-speeches-testimony/statement-by-director-brennan-as-prepared-for-delivery-before-ssci.html)**.**

**The following month, diplomat Alexander Vershbow provided a more direct assessment, explaining that the United States and Russia are once again competing for influence in Europe. “We now sadly recognize that we’re in a long — what I’d call a long-term strategic competition with Russia,” Vershbow** [**said**](https://nato.usmission.gov/atlantic-council-nato-future-leader-summit-security-beyond-defense/)**.**

**Earlier this year, Mattis issued the strongest warning, saying that Russia represented the main hazard to the world order. “I would consider the principal threats to start with Russia,” Mattis** [**said**](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/kind-threat-russia-pose-u-s/)**.**

**At the same time, US officials assert that the rivalry with Russia remains largely one-sided. While they see Russia as a competitor, they simultaneously insist that the country has much less power than the United States.**

**In April 2016, US ambassador to NATO Douglas Lute argued that Russia — not the United States — has entered a period of declension. “There’s a sense that, yes, there’s a new, more assertive, maybe even more aggressive Russia,” he** [**explained**](http://aspensecurityforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/NATO-Russia-Cold-War-Redux.pdf)**, “but fundamentally Russia is a state in decline.”**

**A few months later, Defense Department official Elissa Slotkin made a similar argument. The Russians are “acting from a position of weakness,” she** [**stated**](http://aspensecurityforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/The-Russian-Bear-on-the-Prowl.pdf)**, before going on to note that the Kremlin faces many constraints. “I think the combination of the economic sanctions after Crimea and Eastern Ukraine plus the low price of oil has really hurt them,” she said. The United States should not “overestimate the competitor,” she continued, suggesting that her predecessors had done just that with the Soviet Union. The Russians “are not unbeatable,” she insisted. “They are not operating from a position of strength.”**

**The highest ranking officials in the Obama administration shared her view. This past October, Secretary of State John Kerry said that very little about Russia scared him. “I don’t sit around quaking about Russia,” Kerry** [**commented**](https://2009-2017.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2016/10/263661.htm)**.**

**Obama also waved away the notion that Russia posed a serious challenge, even after allegations of election interference surfaced. “The Russians can’t change us or significantly weaken us,” he** [**stated**](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/12/16/press-conference-president)**. “They are a smaller country. They are a weaker country.”**

**Essentially, foreign policy elites seem content in the knowledge that while Russia has emerged as a competitor on a variety of issues, it is acting from a position of weakness. As former US ambassador to Russia William Burns** [**noted**](http://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/07/opinion/sunday/how-we-fool-ourselves-on-russia.html) **earlier this year, “I’ve learned that we have a much better hand to play with Mr. Putin than he does with us.”**

### A2 Trump

#### Doesn’t kill heg
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**he only thing that seems to really worry the US foreign policy establishment at the moment is Donald Trump. Since the election, officials have been scrambling to work with a president who is largely unfamiliar with — and perhaps hostile to — establishment thinking on American foreign policy.**

**In the days after the election, establishment fears about Trump were rampant. A series of *New York Times* headlines captured the growing concern: “**[**Donald Trump’s Victory Promises to Upend the International Order**](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/09/world/donald-trumps-victory-promises-to-upend-the-international-order.html)**.” “**[**Uncertainty Over Donald Trump’s Foreign Policy Risks Global Instability**](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/10/world/americas/donald-trump-foreign-policy.html)**.” “**[**The End of the Empire**](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/cp/opinion/election-night-2016/end-of-the-empire)**.” The establishment’s central concern was that Trump’s election signaled the start of an internal decline. “Empires rot from the inside even as emperors blame the barbarians,” writer Viet Thanh Nguyen** [**asserted**](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/projects/cp/opinion/election-night-2016/end-of-the-empire)**.**

**The fears became so intense that Obama felt a special responsibility to make sure Trump understood what Washington insiders expected of him. “I think the main reflection I have and the main advice that I give to the incoming president is the United States really is an indispensable nation in our world order,” Obama** [**explained**](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/11/20/press-conference-president-obama-lima-peru)**.**

**Pushing the same point, Antony J. Blinken, the deputy secretary of state, penned an** [**op-ed**](http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2016/11/22/u-s-global-engagement-war-trade-nato-terror-antony-j-blinken/94240926/) **for *USA Today* titled “America must engage with the world.” If the US pulled back from the international stage, Blinken warned, tumult would ensue and citizens “would be worse off.”**

**Indeed, US officials grew quite skittish about what a Trump presidency meant for their plans for the world. On top of everything that Trump had said and done during the campaign, they feared that the new president did not understand how to run the most powerful country in the world — and how to ensure the continuation of US empire. Ultimately, Trump’s approach “could lead to global chaos,” career diplomat Ryan Crocker** [**said**](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/01/us/politics/rex-tillerson-secretary-of-state-confirmed.html)**.**
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#### Campus movements against war cause failures overseas that doom US efforts – Vietnam proves.

**Levy:** Levy, Janet [Contibutor, Accuracy in Media] “Iraq’s only Similarity to Vietnam: Its Dangerous Anti-War Movement.” February 2007. RP

Contrary to media reports and the perception of a majority of Americans, the United States was winning the war in Vietnam following the successful watershed battle known as the Tet Offensive. **Sadly, the Vietnam War was not lost on the battlefield. The carnage and repressive regimes that followed the U.S. exit may have been avoided had the truth been known by the American public. The United States was defeated by a carefully conceived, multi-pronged propaganda campaign that set the stage for America’s eventual failure in the region. The ingredients for the U.S. defeat consisted of the funding and encouragement of the anti- war movement by Hanoi and Communist splinter groups, enlistment of “useful idiots” in Hollywood to publicize and popularize the movement, media complicity with negative portrayals of the war, anti-American proselytizing by professors and students on American university campuses, denigration and demonizing of the military and, ultimately, withdrawal of support and appropriations by the U.S. Congress.** **All these factors led to the perceptual reframing of the Vietnam War as an ignoble imperialistic atrocity, a far cry from its launch as a fight to extinguish communism in Southeast Asia. Today, many of these same elements have reappeared as the United States struggles to defeat Islamic terrorists in Iraq and Afghanistan and to apprehend a fifth column of jihadists at home. Inherited from the Vietnam experience, they are now evident within the new conflict. This time, the risks to our country’s future are even greater should they succeed.**
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#### Text: The United States federal government ought to strengthen legal protection for military whistleblowers through Congressional guarantees against prosecution.

**HRW:** Human Rights Watch [Nonprofit, nongovernmental human rights organization made up of roughly 400 staff members around the globe. Its staff consists of human rights professionals including country experts, lawyers, journalists, and academics of diverse backgrounds and nationalities. Established in 1978, Human Rights Watch is known for its accurate fact-finding, impartial reporting, effective use of media, and targeted advocacy, often in partnership with local human rights groups. Each year, Human Rights Watch publishes more than 100 reports and briefings on human rights conditions in some 90 countries, generating extensive coverage in local and international media. With the leverage this brings, Human Rights Watch meets with governments, the United Nations, regional groups like the African Union and the European Union, financial institutions, and corporations to press for changes in policy and practice that promote human rights and justice around the world] “US: Statement on Protection of Whistleblowers in Security Sector,”. June 2013. RP

**We believe US authorities should exercise discretion when considering prosecuting such leaks under US laws governing classified information**. They should not bring charges against whistleblowers who expose government wrongdoing unless they can make a compelling case that the harm to national security caused by the disclosure is so significant that it overrides the public’s right to know and are prepared to make that case publicly, providing as much detail as possible on the actual harm. Any law that respects rights should place the burden of this argument on the government, not the whistleblower, and the simple fact that information is classified should never be sufficient on its own to defeat protection for disclosures that are in the public interest. **In particular, the Espionage Act, which was framed to punish the passing of sensitive information to a foreign enemy, should never be distorted beyond its intended purpose and used to punish whistleblowers. Congress should live up to its responsibility to provide effective protection and meaningful recourse to whistleblowers. To start, it should enact meaningful laws on which they can rely, both to challenge official retaliation and to defend themselves from criminal and civil liability**. It should insist on greater disclosure from security agencies and share information concerning the dimensions and modalities of security surveillance with the public. And it should work with the administration to cut back on the overwhelming growth of classified information and protect the public’s right to know. **Both Congress and the Obama administration should rethink surveillance programs and reform them to ensure that they intrude no more than necessary on the private communications of all people, not just US citizens**. The United States has been a strong proponent of Internet freedom, but it risks its reputation when it fails to respect the rights of Internet and phone users.

#### Current policies suppress whistleblowers in the military but protections would *expose military abuses across society* – solves the case.

**Goodman:** Goodman, Melvin A. [Ex CIA Analyst] “The Need for National Security Leaks.” *Consortium News.* June 2013. RP

**A major problem in the United States is not that there are too many whistleblowers but that there are too few. Where were the whistleblowers when the Central Intelligence Agency was operating secret prisons; conducting torture and abuse; and kidnapping individuals off the streets in Europe and the Middle East and turning them over to foreign intelligence agencies that conducted torture and abuse? Where were the whistleblowers when the National Security Agency violated the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution against “unreasonable searches and seizures” and conducted widespread warrantless eavesdropping? Where were the whistleblowers when the State Department permitted the use of a consulate to serve as a cover for an inadequately protected intelligence platform in Benghazi? Where were the whistleblowers when the Pentagon was building secret facilities in North Africa and the Arabian Peninsula in order to conduct military strikes in countries where the United States was not at war? President Barack Obama, a Harvard-trained lawyer and former professor of constitutional law, has made it particularly difficult for whistleblowers and has displayed a stunning disregard for the balance of power and the need for oversight of foreign policy decision-making**. He has pursued more leak investigations than all previous presidents combined since the passage of the Espionage Act in 1919. Several press disclosures have been referred to the Justice Department for investigation, and in May 2013 the department subpoenaed two months of records for 20 telephone lines used by Associated Post reporters and editors. This was the most aggressive federal seizure of media records since the Nixon administration. Attorney General Eric Holder even departed from First Amendment norms by approving an affidavit for a search warrant that named a Fox News reporter as a possible co-conspirator in violations of the Espionage Act, because the reporter might have received classified information while doing his job. President Obama has also inexplicably contributed to the need for whistleblowers by weakening the traditional institutions for oversight in the national security process, the Office of the Inspector General. Inspectors General are not popular institutions within the federal government, but they are essential for keeping the government honest by unearthing fraud, abuse and other illegal activities. The Obama administration from the outset focused on weakening the OIG at the CIA by taking more than a year and a half to replace an outstanding IG, John Helgerson, whose staff had exposed the improprieties linked to extraordinary renditions as well as torture and abuse. The most outrageous pursuit of a whistleblower was conducted against Thomas Drake, who determined that NSA eavesdroppers were squandering hundreds of millions of dollars on failed programs while ignoring privacy issues. Drake took his issues to the IG at NSA, the IG at the Pentagon, and to the congressional intelligence committees. (I am aware of individuals who have contacted congressional staffers with issues that required congressional scrutiny, but were warned that they would not receive a friendly reception from key members of the committee.) After failing in these efforts, Drake turned to a reporter from the *Baltimore Sun.* As a result, Drake faced ten felony charges involving mishandling of classified information and obstruction of justice, which a judge wisely dismissed. The case of Bradley Manning also demonstrates the mindset of the Obama administration and the mainstream media. Although Manning has entered a plea of guilty to charges that would give him a 20-year prison sentence, the government is pursuing a charge of aiding the enemy, which would mean a life sentence. The government has also ignored the Sixth Amendment’s guarantee of a “speedy and public trial,” with Manning’s trial beginning on June 3, nearly three years after his arrest. The military handling of Manning, particularly its imposition of unconscionable solitary confinement, has amounted to abuse and is in violation of the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition of “cruel and unusual punishment.” The scant coverage of the trial in the press is another example of the marginalization of a whistleblower. The absence of checks and balances in the national security system over the past ten years has virtually assured the abuse of power that has taken place. In general, Congress has acquiesced in the questionable actions of both the Bush and Obama administrations since 2001, permitting foreign policy to be the sole preserve of the Executive Branch and not the shared responsibility of the President and the Congress. Congressional intelligence committees have become advocates for the intelligence community, particularly the CIA, instead of rigorous watchdogs. Similarly, the Armed Services committees have been advocates for the Pentagon and have not monitored the abuses of weapon’s acquisitions programs. Since the Vietnam War, we have observed a system of judicial tolerance, with the Supreme Court only intervening on foreign policy matters to endorse the policies and powers of the President. This deferential attitude toward the White House has resulted in an absence of judicial scrutiny of illegalities, including warrantless eavesdropping and the destruction of the torture tapes at the CIA that documented torture going beyond methods authorized by the Justice Department. Ironically, the destroyer of the 92 videotapes of interrogations, Jose Rodriquez, who ignored a White House order not to destroy the tapes and should have faced at least obstruction of justice charges, has published a book sanctioned by the CIA that maligns the OIG for a “holier-than-thou attitude and the prosecutorial ways they routinely treated fellow CIA employees.” In addition to the failure of Congress and the courts to provide necessary regulation and oversight of the national security process, the mainstream media has been complacent about its watchdog role regarding secret agencies in a democratic arena. The media require the efforts of contrarians and whistleblowers in order to penetrate the secrecy of the policy and intelligence communities, but typically ignore the reprisals taken against whistleblowers. Often, they disdain the information provided by whistleblowers that is critical of senior officials and government agencies preferring to protect their access to these officials. David Ignatius of the *Washington Post* falsely claimed that journalists “instinctively side with leakers,” but he was quick to ridicule Edward Snowden who has exposed NSA’s spying on millions of Americans‘ phone records and the Internet activity of hundreds of millions of foreigners. Ignatius, moreover, has been an apologist for the CIA and has relied on clandestine operatives to present a one-sided picture of the CIA’s National Clandestine Service. His novel (*Agents of Innocence*) provided a laudatory account of CIA tradecraft, relying on sensitive leaks from a senior operations officer. My own experience with the mainstream media as a whistleblower is revelatory. During my congressional testimony in 1991 against the nomination of Robert M. Gates as director of CIA, I provided background information to Elaine Sciolino of the *New York Times* in order to counter malicious rumors emanating from the White House that was designed to compromise my credibility. Sciolino initially reported this information accurately, but then tilted to support Gates’s confirmation. In a conversation several weeks after the confirmation hearings, Sciolino explained that it was becoming obvious that Gates would be confirmed and would be an important source to her as a CIA director. She added that, as I would return to the National War College as a professor of international relations, I would be of little further use. Sciolino noted that whistleblowers make good sources only in the short run, while journalists must rely on policymakers for long-term access and should not gratuitously offend them. This explains the conventional analysis offered by the press corps and its reluctance to challenge official sources. As a result of the imbalance in the process of foreign policy decision-making, we have come full circle from President Woodrow Wilson, who wanted to make the “world safe for democracy,” to Presidents George W. Bush and Obama, who find the world too dangerous to honoring constitutional democracy. **The excesses of the Vietnam War; Watergate; Iran-Contra; and the Global War on Terror have contributed to the creation of a dangerous national security state and a culture of secrecy. Whistleblowers can help all of us decide whether the ends justify the means regarding these excesses. Meanwhile, secrecy itself has fostered dangerous ignorance in the United States. The overuse of secrecy limits necessary debate and dialogue on foreign policy and deprives citizens of information on which to make policy and political judgments. Only a counter-culture of openness and a respect for the balance of power in the conduct of foreign policy can reverse the damage of the past decade. As long as Congress defers to the President in the conduct of foreign policy; the courts intervene to prevent any challenge to the power of the President in the making of foreign policy; and the media defer to authorized sources, we will need courageous whistleblowers.**

# Case Arguments

## Top Level

### Evidence Ethics

#### The solvency advocate is miscut – it’s only about not banning *speakers,* not about all speech on campus.

**Wilson 10**, John K., Ph.D candidate with dissertation on the history of academic freedom in America and author of three books, early excerpt from Patriotic Correctness: Academic Freedom and Its Enemies which was later published in 2010

**In the wake of 9/11, academic freedom suffered under a wave of patriotic correctness in America.** An institution of higher learning should not fear controversy or prefer bland clichés to intellectual content. All colleges should prohibit banning speakers**, even if they dissent from a particular orthodoxy.** The response to the terrible acts of terrorism on September 11, 2001, did not require an exception to the rules of academic freedom. To the contrary, the period after 9/11 was a moment when intellectual scrutiny of American foreign policy wasmore important than ever. Higher education did no worse, and perhaps better, than other American institutions , s u ch as Con g ress and the media, that accepted the Bush Administration plans, often without debate or inquiry. Sadly, though, the enemies of academic freedom too often succeeded in their aim of silencing dissent. Both the ideal and the practice of academic freedom have been under attack since 9/11, as America became a place where, in the words of Bush press secretary Ari Fleisher, you had to “watch what you say.”31

#### Evidence ethics is an independent voting issue – if they cut something out of context, the rest of their scholarship can’t be examined. Just as a teacher would fail a student for plagiarizing a paper even if the paper was great, you can’t evaluate their solvency claims.

### Not CPS

#### The right to criticize the military isn’t constitutionally protected speech – the plan does nothing.

**The CRF:** The Constitutional Rights Foundation “A ‘Clear and Present Danger’.” 2017. RP

Another major attempt to regulate freedom of speech occurred during World War I. **In 1917, Congress passed the Federal Espionage Act. This law prohibited all false statements intending to interfere with the military forces of the country or to promote the success of its enemies. In addition, penalties of up to $10,000 and/or 20 years in prison were established for anyone attempting to obstruct the recruitment of men into the military. In 1918, another law was passed by Congress forbidding any statements expressing disrespect for the U.S. government, the Constitution, the flag, or army and navy uniforms**. Almost immediately, Charles Schenck, general secretary of the American Socialist Party, violated these laws. He was arrested and convicted for sending 15,000 anti-draft circulars through the mail to men scheduled to enter the military service. The circular called the draft law a violation of the 13th Amendment's prohibition of slavery. It went on to urge draftees not to "submit to intimidation," but to "petition for repeal" of the draft law. **The government accused Schenck of illegally interfering with military recruitment under the espionage act. Schenck admitted that he had sent the circulars, but argued that he had a right to do so under the First Amendment and was merely exercising his freedom of speech. The issue found its way to the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Schenck v. United States, 249 U.S. 47 (1919). It was the court's first important decision in the area of free speech. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote the opinion of the unanimous Court, which sided with the government. Justice Holmes held that Mr. Schenck was not covered by the First Amendment since freedom of speech was not an absolute right**. There were times, Holmes wrote, when the government could legally restrict speech. According to Justice Holmes, that test is "whether the words...are used in such circumstances as to create a clear and present danger." Holmes said that in Charles Schenck's case the government was justified in arresting him because, "When a nation is at war, many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight and that no Court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right." In the Schenck case, the highest court in the nation ruled that freedom of speech could be limited by the government. But Justice Holmes was careful to say that the government could only do this when there was a "clear and present danger" such as during wartime. While settling one legal issue, however, the Supreme Court created others. For example, what does a "clear and present danger" specifically mean, and when should it justify stopping people from speaking?

## Solvency

### Overview

#### The plan probably solves nothing – most Americans support US intervention abroad

**Levy:** Levy, Janet [Contibutor, Accuracy in Media] “Iraq’s only Similarity to Vietnam: Its Dangerous Anti-War Movement.” February 2007. RP

In Congress, many Democrats and several Republicans are invoking the Vietnam “quagmire” descriptive to support demands to curtail the Iraq war and withdraw U.S. troops. The Democrat electorate has chosen to interpret recent election results as a sign that the public is opposed to the war, rather than opposed to the way the war is being fought. **According to a recent national survey by Public Opinion Strategies, a majority of Americans (57%) wants to win the war in Iraq and makes the connection between Iraq and the global jihad. Fifty-three percent feel the Democrats are acting precipitously in pushing for immediate withdrawal and a majority (56%) also** believes that Americans should stand behind the president in times of war**. Most telling, 74% of those surveyed disagreed with the statement, “I don’t care what happens in Iraq after the U.S. leaves. I just want the troops brought home.”**

#### Plan isn’t inherent – they can’t name a single school that shuts down criticism of the military – even if some random professors don’t allow it, there are no policies on the books that disallow it

#### Alt cause to their Aff – people can just protest digitally or off of campuses – there’s no reason why campus protests are specifically key.

#### Uniqueness goes my way – civic engagement and protests are increasing in the status quo

**Higher Education Research Institute:** Higher Education Resarch Institute “College Students’ Commitment to Activism, Political and Civic Engagement Reach All-Time Highs.” *UCLA Newsroom.* February 2016. RP

**Colleges and universities across the U.S. experienced an increase in student activism over the past year**, as students protested rising college costs and hostile racial climates on their campuses. Now, findings from UCLA’s annual CIRP Freshman Survey (PDF) suggest that participation in demonstrations may intensify in the months ahead. **The survey of 141,189 full-time, first-year students from around the U.S. found that interest in political and civic engagement has reached the highest levels since the study began 50 years ago**. Nearly 1 in 10 incoming first-year students expects to participate in student protests while in college. The survey, part of the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, is administered nationally by the Higher Education Research Institute at the UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. The 8.5 percent who said they have a “very good chance” of participating in student protests while in college represents the highest mark in the survey’s history and is an increase of 2.9 percentage points over the 2014 survey. **Black students were the most likely to expect to protest, with 16 percent reporting that they had a very good chance of demonstrating for a cause while in college — 5.5 percentage points higher than in 2014. The rising interest in activism coincides with some recent successful protests by college students**. After months of protesting a perceived lack of responsiveness by university administrators to racial bias and discrimination, University of Missouri students forced the resignation of the system’s president in November 2015. “**Student activism seems to be experiencing a revival, and last fall’s incoming freshman class appears more likely than any before it to take advantage of opportunities to participate in this part of the political process**,” said Kevin Eagan, director of CIRP. “We observed substantial gains in students’ interest in political and community engagement across nearly every item on the survey related to these issues.”

#### There’s an oversaturation of protests in the status quo – there’s no uniqueness for any of your impacts – protests are just ineffective

Dvorak 17 [(Petula, reporter @ the Washington Post) “Washington’s new normal: A Trump protest spectacle a day” January 26, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/washingtons-new-normal-a-trump-protest-a-day/2017/01/26/7d2e5978-e3bb-11e6-a453-19ec4b3d09ba\_story.html?utm\_term=.7637eb2a5dcd]

**We began Wednesday morning with the sight of Greenpeace activists scaling a 270-foot construction crane in downtown Washington** and unfurling a gigantic orange and black banner that bore the message: “RESIST.” **We ended the day with several hundred protesters marching to the White House to condemn** President **Trump’s** executive order on immigration. Welcome to Trump’s capital. It’s a spectacle a day here. Self-proclaimed anarchists swarmed through downtown D.C. on Trump’s Inauguration Day, torching a limousine, smashing bus-stop glass and vandalizing businesses**. Then hundreds of thousands of people massed on the Mall the following day for the Women’s March on Washington,** waving clever and sometimes scathing signs aimed at the new commander in chief: “There Is So Much Wrong It Cannot Fit on This Sign” and “We Want a Leader, Not a Creepy Tweeter.” [At the Women’s March, the men mattered, too] **Coming Friday: The annual March for Life, which will bring tens of thousands of newly energized antiabortion demonstrators** to the nation’s front yard. **Even the country’s scientists are planning a march on Washington.** Meetings? Deadlines? Schedules? All plans are soft in the District, a city where people chanting in the streets or rappelling off construction cranes bring traffic to a halt. The working world is feeling it. #Thisisnotnormal. I have to confess that I’ve always been a street protest skeptic. This comes from decades of covering protests. I’ve double-time marched backward for miles, interviewing people about apartheid, gay rights, abortion, Rodney King, racism, Palestine, globalization, layoffs, public dancing, the World Bank, female genital mutilation, women’s rights, the death penalty, homelessness and war after war. I’ve slept in the bushes to hang with the protesters, I’ve been in the control rooms as police chiefs strategize riot control. Yet **I’ll never forget talking with the banker in his crisp suit and air-conditioned office, looking out the window at the protesters below and just laughing, laughing, laughing. Because he knew they’d eventually be gone and nothing would change. That reality dulled the power of protest for me**. Even one of the founders of the Occupy Wall Street movement, which spread to 82 countries and had millions of people in the streets, agreed with my assessment. “**The end of protest is the proliferation of ineffective protests that are more like a ritualized performance of children than a mature, revolutionary challenge to the status quo,”** said Micah White, who wrote “The End of Protest — A New Playbook for Revolution” after the Occupy movement had the world’s attention, then sputtered and stalled in a pile of ragged tents and trashed city parks.

#### Their protests are a display of collective powerlessness that panders to the converted but refuses to make specific demands of the power elite.

Doss 15 [(J. Pharoah Doss, black activist blogger and writer—graduate of Geneva College. His writing has appeared in The New Pittsburgh Courier, The Commonline Joural, Gutter Eloquence Magazine, The Shepherd, and Commonline/The E Journal.) “Protest conveys nothing without a demand” [January 28, 2015](http://newpittsburghcourieronline.com/2015/01/28/) http://newpittsburghcourieronline.com/2015/01/28/protest-conveys-nothing-without-a-demand

Frederick Douglass said, “Power concedes nothing without a demand.” **Douglass’ demand was specific, the abolishment of slavery.** The movement to end slavery even named themselves after their demand. They were called abolitionist. **What are the specific demands of modern protesters?** I remember during the Bush administration I asked an anti-war demonstrator, “Why are you protesting the war?” He said, “Because the president lied.” During the occupy Wall Street movement I met a participant. I asked the young lady, “What exactly are you protesting?” She said, “Corporate greed.” After a white police officer was not indicted by a grand jury for killing an unarmed black man in Ferguson, Missouri there was a rally in my home town of Pittsburgh. **The protesters carried signs that read: Black Lives Matter and People of Color Deserve Equality. The one sign that actually stated a demand said: Stop Racist Police Terror. What are these modern protesters asking power to abolish? More importantly does the power being protested have the power to abolish or change the circumstances?** Lying and greed are subjective matters of morality. Congressional staffers and elected officials assembled on the capital steps with their hands up. Their reason was to show solidarity with those protesting death caused by the police. But the only thing hands up can symbolize from elected officials and their staff is that they’re powerless to legislate morality. The signs held by those protesting the grand jury decision made basic statements no civilized person would oppose. **Of course black lives matter, of course people of color deserve equality, and who would not oppose the concept of racist police terror? But stopping racist … fill in the blank is not a demand that can be rectified by those in power. Power has limits**. Racism is a belief in superiority. It can be held by any race. Holding this belief is a problem for the holder alone. It becomes a social problem when the holder puts this belief into practice and discriminates against specific groups. But **the government has already legislated against discrimination. So what is the purpose of modern protest?** According to the editorial board of The Gazette, Western’s Daily Student Newspaper, the purpose of protest … in all of its various forms, has the same goal -- To create awareness of an issue. Really? I don’t think Douglass and the abolitionist sought to create awareness of the institution of slavery. Protest is defined by Dictionary.com as: An expression or declaration of objection, disapproval, or dissent, often in opposition to something a person is powerless to prevent or avoid. **When Trayvon Martin**, a black teen, **was shot and killed** by a Hispanic neighborhood watch volunteer in Florida the police did not arrest the volunteer. **People protested** across the country. **But they weren't raising awarness of neighborhood watch violence or racial profiling. They demanded the arrest of the shooter**. As demonstration grew, the demand grew, and power conceded. The shooter was arrested and tried for second degree murder. **Too often modern protests generalize grievances government can not legislate and corporate policy can not regulate.** They mistake activity for activism. They painfully demonstrate a collective powerlessness that the powerful are fully aware of without a public display. And if Frederick Douglass could address modern protesters he might say, “**Protest conveys nothing to power without a specific demand.”**

### Advantage

#### Framing the university as militarized and imperial makes academic change impossible

**Kennedy:** Kennedy, Randall L. [Law Professor, Harvard University] “Racial Critiques of Legal Academia.” *Harvard Law Review.* June 1989. RP

**Second, Professor Delgado's writings express and popularize a militarization of academic discourse**. n297 **The very imagery of his rhetoric -- such as the reference to "imperial" scholars -- calls to mind a notion of "us" and "them," a conception of academia as battleground. Adopting that conception of the situation might very well entail, for many of "us," adopting a mode of conduct that would include a disposition to assume the worst about everything said and done by "them**." If warlike conditions really do exist, defensive thinking of this sort makes perfect sense. **If, on the other hand, one mistakenly perceives a condition as warlike, the defensive thinking generated by that misperception may be wasteful, cutting one off, for instance, from fruitful collegial exchange. Worse, it may actually help to create or exacerbate hostilities via a self-fulfilling prophecy**. n298 **Because descriptions can help to create the very thing they purport to describe, one ought to be cautious in the way one defines socially vexing situations**. Professor Delgado fails to use appropriate caution. Instead of alleging racial bias at the end of a process in which other plausible explanations have been fully considered and found wanting, he seems eager to make such allegations as a first choice. **The militarization of discourse also increases pressure on intellectuals to "choose sides" and to display loyalty to the side chosen.** In such a setting, disagreement becomes attack and dissent becomes betrayal -- hardly an atmosphere conducive to free intellectual discussion or self-critical reflection**. Moreover, as in so many other contexts in our society, the overall burden of a bad situation falls especially hard upon minorities. The sense of isolation that many minority academics feel creates a particularly powerful demand for loyal conformity to whatever becomes the group's dominant political program.** This is the socio-psychological dynamic that lays behind the charge [\*1816] that an article like this one, written by a minority scholar, displays a special lack of political responsibility.

#### Campus protests are used blame student activists and *prevent structural action* against racism

**Cornett:** Cornett, Sarah [Sarah Cornett is a senior at Whitman College, and the editor of the student-run weekly newspaper, The Pioneer] “Racism on Campus - Not Free Speech - Is the Real Story: Mainstream Media Are Missing the Mark.” *Truthout.* December 2015. RP

**Of all the images that accompanied articles on the recent protests against systemic racism at the University of Missouri, a screenshot of a professor shouting at a student photojournalist somehow became one of the most prevalent**. "I need some muscle over here," said Melissa Click, an assistant professor of communications at Missouri, attempting to grab his camera "Help me get this reporter out of here." Anyone following events at the university has likely read this quote many times over. As the clip gained traction on social media, national news organizations began to pay attention. The New York Times ran an article describing the incident on its website's home page. The Atlantic, now infamous for its articles lambasting college students for being "hypersensitive," followed up with a piece by Conor Friedersdorf calling Click's outburst an example of the problem with the idea of "safe space." Part of the media obsession with Click clearly had to do with the nature of the subject itself: threats to journalists tend to draw the attention of journalists. But looking at student accounts from that week show that the story was about much more than a confrontation between protesters and a photographer. **The incident became a media distraction from the real issues - direct threats to students, and the complicity of faculty and school officials in them. As part of the free speech backlash, some journalists took it upon themselves to educate student protesters on how to be proper activists**. "To truly demonstrate self-determination, activists would do well to also learn how to use the media to amplify their story," wrote Deborah Douglas and Afi-Odelia Scruggs in the Columbia Journalism Review. **Journalists effectively turned the spotlight on themselves and used protest movements led by Black students against systemic racism and violence as a platform for their own voices**. The sophisticated organizing and concrete successes of these movements - the University of Missouri system president resigned within days, after all - were ignored. Instead, student activists were told they need a lesson in working with media. "Here was an activist group that needed us to get their message out and they were trying to shut us down," Brian Kratzer, a journalist reporting on the events for the Columbia Missourian, told NPR "Maybe they didn't understand how public spaces work." **The focus on free speech offered an easy critique of student activists.** An important but abstract principle was elevated to become the crux of the story. This strategy is one that New Yorker writer Jelani Cobb called that week "victim-blaming with a software update." **The First Amendment narrative has allowed the media to disregard daily threats students of color are calling attention to at Missouri, Yale and dozens of other campuses. "To understand the real complexities of these students' situation," Cobb wrote, "free- speech purists would have to grapple with what it means to live in a building named for a man who dedicated himself to the principle of white supremacy and to the ownership of your ancestors**." Cobb was referring to Yale, where students have been fighting to change the name of Calhoun College, named after the Confederate general**. In stories on the Yale protests, reporters honed in on a video of a student confronting a residential college master over an email as further evidence of a supposed threat to free speech. But the reasons for students' mobilization - racialized harassment and administrative complicity in it - were repeatedly ignored.** Junior Briana Burroughs called attention to the deeply unsafe campus culture students continue to fight against when she described ways she'd been verbally and physically harassed at fraternity parties. "Fear paralyzed me as their discussions of my Black body and hair turned into taunts and fondling. Every incident included jeering and pointing, and some included spanking and screaming," wrote Burroughs in the Yale Daily News. "Most, however, went unnoticed." As Yale senior Aaron Lewis pointed out on Medium, media discussion of campus activism created a split dynamic: **A free-speech focus obscures the pressing problem of racism on campus. "People have lost sight of the larger issue: systemic racism on campus**," Lewis wrote. **The loss of focus on systemic racism that Lewis mentioned has become especially evident as free speech has been intellectualized as the problem of the "new student activism,"** and liberal college campuses. This came into focus at Yale when Erika Christakis, a live-in administrator at one of the residential colleges, questioned administrative cautioning against culturally appropriative Halloween costumes. "American universities were once a safe space not only for maturation but also for a certain regressive, or even transgressive, experience," she wrote in an email to students "Increasingly, it seems they have become places of censure and prohibition." Christakis pointed to the tired argument that US college students are creating environments of liberal intolerance through the tyranny of "safe spaces" and trigger warnings. In doing so, she negated the real threats cultural appropriation can cause to students of color. Should students really be required to educate their peers on the inappropriateness of wearing a feather headdress or blackface? **Colleges are expected to address overt threats to the mental and physical health of their students.** At the New Republic, Roxane Gay questioned whether those who make statements like Christakis' would believe that racism fell into this category. "Christakis suggests we take our arguments out of their real-world context - eliding real people in the process - and instead move them into the realm of the theoretical, where no one can feel hurt," she wrote. The tendency to intellectualize these situations distracts from the severity of racism and harassment and the threats to students' safety that are all too real. Students like Lewis, the Yale senior, make clear they don't see free speech principles as incompatible with fighting administrative complicity in racial injustice. But in working toward a clearer understanding of the climates these students are resisting, the polarization fostered by many media accounts made this work harder. "There's absolutely no reason we can't acknowledge both the value of free speech and the reality of the prejudice that students of color face everyday," wrote Lewis. "It saddens me that this has gotten to the point where people feel like they have to take sides." Since the week of November 9, media focus has shifted. International attacks by ISIS and the mass shootings in California and Colorado have rightfully commanded headlines in the past two weeks. However, looking back to that week - when media attention was very much focused on college protests against racism and this question of free speech - tells us much about how most news organizations think about student activists. As protests continue on campuses nationwide, Mrinal Kumar, a Yale Daily News columnist, called attention to the real power that students, undeterred by critical media attention, have in creating real change. "The last two weeks have proven that we have the power to incite change not only at Yale but also on campuses across the nation," Kumar said. "But we can't afford to stop there."

#### Institution-protected free speech is a trap states use to entrench their own power.

**Crimethinc:** Crimethinc. [News Source] “This is Not a Dialogue.” *Crimethinc*, January 2017. RP

There appears to be a broad consensus in the US political spectrum in favor of the right to free speech. While opponents may quibble over the limits, such as what constitutes obscenity, pundits from left to right agree that free speech is essential to American democracy. Appeals to this tradition of unrestricted expression confer legitimacy on groups with views outside the mainstream, and both fascists and radicals capitalize on this. Lawyers often defend anarchist activity by referencing the First Amendmentʼs provision preventing legislation restricting the press or peaceable assembly. We can find allies who will support us in free speech cases who would never support us out of a shared vision of taking direct action to create a world free of hierarchy. The rhetoric of **free speech** and First Amendment rights give us a common language with which to broaden our range of support and make our resistance more comprehensible to potential allies, with whom we may build deeper connections over time. But at what cost? This discourse of rights **seems to imply that the state is necessary to protect us against itself, as if it is a sort of Jekyll and Hyde split personality that simultaneously attacks us with laws and police and prosecutors while defending us with laws and attorneys and judges. If we accept this metaphor, it should not be surprising to find that the more we attempt to strengthen the arm that defends us, the stronger the arm that attacks us will become. Once freedom is defined as an assortment of rights granted by the state, it is easy to lose sight of the** actual **freedom those rights are meant to protect and focus instead on the rights themselves—implicitly accepting the legitimacy of the state. Thus, when we build visibility and support by using the rhetoric of rights, we undercut the possibility that we will be able to stand up to the state itself. We also open the door for the state to impose othersʼ “rights” upon us.**

#### The state uses free speech rights to crack down on its critics.

**Crimethinc:** Crimethinc. [News Source] “This is Not a Dialogue.” *Crimethinc*, January 2017. RP

**In the US, many take it for granted that it is easier for the state to silence and isolate radicals in countries in which free speech is not legally protected. If this is true, who wouldnʼt want to strengthen legal protections on free speech? In fact, in nations in which free speech is not legally protected, radicals are not always more isolated—on the contrary, the average person is sometimes more sympathetic to those in conflict with the state, as it is more difficult for the state to legitimize itself as the defender of liberty. Laws do not tie the hands of the state nearly so much as public opposition can; given the choice between legal rights and popular support, we are much better off with the latter.** One dictionary defines civil liberty as “the state of being subject only to laws established for the good of the community.” This sounds ideal to those who believe that laws enforced by hierarchical power can serve the “good of the community”—but who defines “the community” and what is good for it, if not those in power? **In practice, the discourse of civil liberties enables the state to marginalize its foes: if there is a legitimate channel for every kind of expression, then those who refuse to play by the rules are clearly illegitimate.** Thus we may read this definition the other way around: under “civil liberty,” all laws are for the good of the community, and any who challenge them must be against it. **Focusing on the right to free speech, we see only two protagonists, the individual and the state.** Rather than letting ourselves be drawn into the debate about what the state should allow, anarchists should focus on a third protagonist—the general public. We win or lose our struggle according to how much sovereignty the populace at large is willing to take back from the state, how much intrusion it is willing to put up with. If we must speak of rights at all, rather than argue that we have the right to free speech let us simply assert that the state has no right to suppress us. **Better yet, letʼs develop another language entirely.**

#### Activists are motivated not by concern but by hatred of America that manifests itself in violence within the country.

**Levy:** Levy, Janet [Contibutor, Accuracy in Media] “Iraq’s only Similarity to Vietnam: Its Dangerous Anti-War Movement.” February 2007. RP

**As was true during the Vietnam War, today’s anti-war groups hide their anti-Americanism behind the politics of peace. Recruiting others on a platform of “peace,” they ally themselves with radical Islamists, glorify the enemy’s goals and identify themselves as “freedom fighters,” battling an imperialistic world power. In the lead up to the war against Iraq, anti-war activists effectively mobilized some of the largest protests and demonstrations since the Vietnam War. They attacked the war effort abroad and security measures at home, sympathized with Saddam Hussein as a victim of American war-mongering and even served as strategically-placed human shields**. Although Operation Iraqi Freedom was welcomed by the vast majority of Iraqis and succeeded in liberating 25 million people from the ravages of a murderous despot, anti-war protestors decried the U.S. “occupation” of Iraq and the alleged subjugation of the Iraqi people. Their steadfast position was that any use of American military power was an attempt to establish American hegemony in the region and exploit Iraq’s oil resources. The discovery of Saddam’s mass graves and torture chambers were ignored by the anti-war movement in the service of demonizing the actions of the evil, American empire.

#### Violent agitators coopt protests – turns free speech

Nguyen 17 [(Tina, writer @ Vanity Fair) “TRUMP THREATENS TO DEFUND U.C. BERKELEY AFTER STUDENTS PROTEST BREITBART WRITER” February 2, 2017, http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/02/uc-berkeley-protests-milo-yiannopolous]

Yiannopoulos, who gained notoriety during the Trump campaign as a popular figure within the “alt-right” movement, blamed **“violent left-wing protesters**” for **shut**ting **down the event**, writing on his Facebook page that, “The Left is absolutely terrified of free speech and will do literally anything to shut it down.” **More than 1,500 demonstrators gathered outside the venue to protest Yiannopoulos’s appearance, The Washington Post reported, a protest that grew violent when a large group of agitators showed up, hurling rocks and Molotov cocktails.** It was unclear whether the masked protesters were Berkeley students. Campus officials instituted a “shelter in place” order, and police eventually fired pand pepper balls into to the crowd to disperse it, according to the local police chief. The optics could not have been worse for Berkeley, the birthplace of the Free Speech Movement in the 1960s and a longtime center of nonviolent protest movements. Breitbart writer Tom Ciccotta seized the opportunity to argue that by rioting, the students had “betrayed” their university and proved Yiannopoulos correct in his denunciations of liberal culture. In a statement, the college expressed profound disappointment that “**the threats and unlawful actions of a few have interfered with the exercise of First Amendment rights** on a campus that is proud of its history and legacy as the home of the Free Speech Movement.”

#### The Aff requires police protection of protests – the colleges and state need to provide INCREASED POLICE.

**Matsuda:** Matsuda, Mari [Associate Professor of Law, University of Hawaii, the William S. Richardson School of Law. B.A. 1975, Arizona State University; J.D. 1980, University of Hawaii; LL.M. 19 Harvard University] “Public Response to Racist Speech: Considering the Victim’s Speech.” *Michigan Law Review,* Volume 87. August 1989. RP

**A corollary to the American position of protection of racist expres- sion is that the government must take certain affirmative steps to pre- serve that right**.167 **The state must make public facilities available on a nondiscriminatory basis to individuals and groups wishing to express their race hatred.**168 It must provide police protection to preserve or- der and protect speakers who are threatened by counter-demonstra- tors.169 **Since groups like the Klan typically draw angry opposition when they parade in public streets, this has meant that the Klan is entitled to publicly financed police escorts. Without this,** the right free speech is meaningless**. Angry and intolerant majorities could pre- vent unpopular minorities from using public facilities, rendering the right of free speech illusory.**

#### Protests fail and this directly answers their internal link of just having “more” people in public colleges engaging in dialogue

Rosman 17 [(Artur, writer) “Why Are Protest Movements (Like the Women’s March) Ineffective?” January 24, 2017, http://www.patheos.com/blogs/cosmostheinlost/2017/01/24/what-makes-all-protest-movements-so-ineffective

**Protest movements frequently use the slogan of “Solidarity.” Solidarity is measured the** quantity of people **attending the marches**, rather than by the quality of their interactions. This choice of words cannot but remind me of the Polish context of the word. I once even translated a piece explaining why Solidarity collapsed so quickly for Thinking in Values (“Solidarity as Church” by Dariusz Karlowicz). **I suspect that the Women’s March will have the same short-term effect as the Occupy Movement, the Arab Spring, Femen, the Greenpeace protests, Global Warming resistances, the Pro-Life Movement, and any number of such movements that have had their moment in the limelight only to fall into irrelevancy in ever-shorter cycles**. Almost by design, **success spells the end of these** single-issue movements**; the same goes for lack thereof**. I include the Polish Solidarity movement in this group, along with many other Eastern European opposition movements, which have totally disappeared without too many Western commentators ever really noticing it. I still get people who come up to me and say “Solidarity” and expect me to jump for joy, or those who say Walesa is a hypocrite as if that’s some sort of news. If **protests are so ineffective, then why is it that protest movements are so popular?** Here’s what Alasdair MacIntyre says in his widely-discussed After Virtue: **It is easy also to understand why protest becomes a distinctive moral feature of the modern age** and why indignation is a predominant modern emotion. ‘To protest’ and its Latin predecessors and French cognates are originally as often or more often positive as negative; to protest was once to bear witness to something and only as consequence of that allegiance to bear witness against something else. He continues in the same book (part of my TOP11 critiques of modernity booklist) to go on and explain why these movements are so ineffective: But **protest is now almost entirely that negative phenomenon which characteristically occurs as a reaction to the alleged invasion of someone’s rights in the name of someone else’s utility**. The self-assertive shrillness of protest arises because **the facts of incommensurability ensure that protestors can never win an argument; the indignant self-righteousness of protest arises because the facts of incommensurability ensure equally that the protestors can never lose an argument either. Hence the utterance of protest is characteristically addressed to those who already share the protestors’ premise. The effects of incommensurability ensure that protestors rarely have anyone else to talk to but themselves.** This is not to say that protest cannot be effective; it is to say that it cannot be rationally effective and that its dominant modes of expression give evidence of a certain perhaps unconscious awareness of this. I should add that they tend to be minimally effective because they are not rationally effective. **Since the protesters tend to talk to themselves about either nebulous notions unrelated to any concrete political agenda, or, about a single cause divorced from a program that rationally embraces dialogue across a series of interconnected issues.**

#### Protests are empirically ineffective and result in appeasement.

**Naim:** Naim, Moises “Why Street Protests Don’t Work.” *The Atlantic.* 2014. RP

**Street protests are in. From Bangkok to Caracas, and Madrid to Moscow, these days not a week goes by without news that a massive crowd has amassed in the streets of another of the world’s big cities.** The reasons for the protests vary (bad and too-costly public transport or education, the plan to raze a park, police abuse, etc.). **Often, the grievance quickly expands to include a repudiation of the government, or its head, or more general denunciations of corruption and economic inequality**. Aerial photos of the anti-government marches routinely show an intimidating sea of people furiously demanding change. **And yet, it is surprising how little these crowds achieve. The fervent political energy on the ground is hugely disproportionate to the practical results of these demonstrations.** Notable exceptions of course exist: In Egypt, Tunisia, and Ukraine, street protests actually contributed to the overthrow of the government. But most massive rallies fail to create significant changes in politics or public policies. Occupy Wall Street is a great example. Born in the summer of 2011 (not in Wall Street but in Kuala Lumpur’s Dataran Merdeka), the Occupy movement spread quickly and was soon roaring in the central squares of nearly 2,600 cities around the world. The hodgepodge groups that participated had no formal affiliation with one another, no clear hierarchy, and no obvious leaders. But social networks helped to virally replicate the movement so that the basic patterns of camping, protesting, fundraising, communicating with the media, and interacting with the authorities were similar from place to place. The same message echoed everywhere: It is unacceptable that global wealth is concentrated in the hands of an elite 1 percent while the remaining 99 percent can barely scrape by. **Such a global, massive, and seemingly well-organized initiative should have had a greater impact. But it didn’t. Though the topic of economic inequality has gained momentum in the years since, in practice it is hard to find meaningful changes in public policy based on Occupy’s proposals. By and large the Occupy movement has now vanished from the headlines. In fact, government responses usually amount to little more than rhetorical appeasement, and certainly no major political reforms. Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff, for example, publicly validated the frustrations of those who took to the streets of her country, and promised that changes would be made, but those ‘changes’ have yet to materialize**