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# 1NC

## 1NC- Armenian Genocide Denial PIC

#### CP Text: Aff actors should remove restrictions on constitutionally protected journalist speech with the exception of newspapers that deny the Armenian genocide.

**Hunter Hart 1-5** [Monica Hunter-Hart, 1-5-2017, "Why Cenk Uygur Is Getting Confronted about the Name "The Young Turks," and Why It Matters," pastemagazine, <https://www.pastemagazine.com/articles/2017/01/why-cenk-uygur-is-getting-confronted-about-the-nam.html>]

Essentially everyone agrees that thousands of Armenians died from massacres and hazardous deportation marches. During these marches, Armenians faced starvation, disease, and often wholesale slaughter. Turkey, however, claims that these events were an unfortunate byproduct of war and do not constitute genocide. According to Turkey, the deportations were necessary to prevent the Armenians from uprising or joining en masse with the encroaching Russian front, and the mass murders weren’t authorized by the government but instead perpetrated by independent actors. Turks generally estimate the number of Armenian victims to be around half a million. Scholars outside of Turkey usually place the figure between 1 and 1.5 million, and almost all of them apply the genocide label (though the U.S. government, to avoid angering its ally Turkey, does not). In their typical explanation of the events, an already-incendiary climate between Muslims and Christian Armenians intensified as Ottoman fortunes in the war declined, paranoia spread, and the scapegoating of Armenians took a systematically violent turn. Some argue that the murders were explicitly ordered by the Ottoman government. Others argue that they were a result of local-level radicalization. In any of these versions of the events, the Young Turks should be considered complicit in the carnage: they ordered, at minimum, the forced deportation of civilians in a dangerous, volatile environment. For many, this culpability comes to mind when the phrase “young Turks” is used. At a Nov. 9 symposium TYT held at California State University, an audience member tried to bring up this issue. “The rise in anti-immigrant sentiment,” the young man began, “brings back memories in history of other leaders of other groups, people that rose to power and have done much worse, such as the Young Turks.” Before he could finish his question, the TYT hosts—led by John Iadarola—cut him off, silenced the subsequent audience agitation, and moved to a break. Many have rightly criticized TYT for this reaction, which is particularly hypocritical since the network markets itself as a bastion of transparency in the media. Should TYT’s response or choice of name affect our consumption of its politics coverage? Some go so far as to claim that calling an organization “The Young Turks” is like calling it “Hitler Youth.” For many, concerns about the name are exacerbated by the fact that Cenk Uygur—who was born in Turkey and moved to the U.S. at age 8—wrote an op-ed for his college newspaper in 1991 denying the Armenian genocide. He has since retracted those words, but not in favor of a new stance; he has instead opted to “refrain from commenting.”

## 1NC- Fake News PIC

#### CP Text: Public colleges and universities should remove restrictions on all constitutionally protected journalist speech

#### College students are disproportionately at risk for believing illegitimate news stories

**Borchers 16** [Callum Borchers (reporter, DC), 12-5-2016, "A harsh truth about fake news: Some people are super gullible," Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/11/22/a-harsh-truth-about-fake-news-some-people-are-super-gullible/?utm_term=.8eb1943f1aac>]

A Stanford University study published Tuesday concluded that many students, from middle school through college, struggle to discern what is legitimate reporting and what is not. The Wall Street Journal summarized some of the most alarming findings:¶ Some 82 percent of middle-schoolers couldn’t distinguish between an ad labeled “sponsored content” and a real news story on a website. . . . More than two out of three middle-schoolers couldn’t see any valid reason to mistrust a post written by a bank executive arguing that young adults need more financial-planning help.¶ And nearly four in 10 high-school students believed, based on the headline, that a photo of deformed daisies on a photo-sharing site provided strong evidence of toxic conditions near the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant in Japan, even though no source or location was given for the photo.¶ Lest you think this kind of naiveté is unique to millennials, consider some of the fake news stories that have caught on in the general population recently. In October, a Twitter joke about an Ohio postal worker who was supposedly tearing up pro-Trump absentee ballots fooled Rush Limbaugh, Matt Drudge and Jim Hoft. A week before the election, Sean Hannity got taken in by a made-up report that President Obama, Michelle Obama and Elizabeth Warren had unfollowed Hillary Clinton on Twitter. Some fabricated stories have been truly bizarre and wildly far-fetched yet have still duped people who read them — or at least, been embraced and used by some readers. On Tuesday, the New York Times unspooled the way “dozens of made-up articles about Mrs. Clinton kidnapping, molesting and trafficking children” in the back rooms of a D.C. pizzeria called Comet Ping Pong gained traction.¶ The misinformation campaign began when John Podesta’s email account was hacked and his emails were published by WikiLeaks during the presidential campaign. Days before the election, users on the online message board 4Chan noticed that one of Mr. Podesta’s leaked emails contained communications with Comet Ping Pong owner James Alefantis discussing a fund-raiser for Mrs. Clinton.¶ The 4Chan users immediately speculated about the links between Comet Ping Pong and the Democratic Party. Some posited the restaurant was part of a larger Democratic child trafficking ring, which was a theory long held by some conservative blogs. That idea jumped to other social media services such as Twitter and Reddit, where it gained momentum on the page “The\_Donald.” A new Reddit discussion thread called “Pizzagate” quickly attracted 20,000 subscribers. . . .¶ Soon, dozens of fake news articles on sites such as Facebook, Planet Free Will and Living Resistance emerged. Readers shared the stories in Saudi Arabia and on Turkish and other foreign language sites.¶ Some of the people who share fake news stories on social media surely know they are spreading fiction. They just like to imagine a world that conforms to their views. Or something.¶ Others are genuinely conned, either because they don't know how to tell the difference between real and fake news or because they don't care to try. Deception may drive the creation of fake news; gullibility helps create a market for it.

#### Legitimate news sites are subject to influence of fake news

**Uberti 16** [(David, a CJR staff writer and senior Delacorte fellow), “The real history of fake news,” Columbia Journalism Review, 12/15/1].

In an 1807 letter to John Norvell, a young go-getter who had asked how to best run a newspaper, Thomas Jefferson penned what today would make for a fiery Medium post condemning fake news.¶ “It is a melancholy truth, that a suppression of the press could not more compleatly sic deprive the nation of its benefits, than is done by its abandoned prostitution to falsehood,” the sitting president wrote. “Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle.”¶ That vehicle grew into a commercial powerhouse in the 19th century and a self-reverential political institution, “the media,” by the mid-20th. But the pollution has been described in increasingly dire terms in recent months. PolitiFact named fake news its 2016 “Lie of the Year,” while chagrined Democrats have warned about its threat to an honest public debate. The pope compared consumption of fake news to eating feces. And many of the wise men and women of journalism have chimed in almost uniformly: Come to us for the real stuff.¶ “Whatever its other cultural and social merits, our digital ecosystem seems to have evolved into a near-perfect environment for fake news to thrive,” New York Times CEO Mark Thompson said in a speech to the Detroit Economic Club on Monday. The broader issue driving the paranoia is the tardy realization among mainstream media that they no longer hold the sole power to shape and drive the news agenda.¶ ¶ A little bit of brake-tapping may be in order: It’s worth remembering, in the middle of the great fake news panic of 2016, America’s very long tradition of news-related hoaxes. A thumbnail history shows marked similarities to today’s fakery in editorial motive or public gullibility, not to mention the blurred lines between deliberate and accidental flimflam. It also suggests that the recent fixation on fake news has more to do with macro-level trends than any new brand of faux content.¶ Macedonian teenagers who earn extra scratch by concocting conspiracies are indeed new entrants to the American information diet. Social networks allow smut to hurtle through the public imagination—and into pizza parlors—at breakneck speed. People at or near the top of the incoming administration have shared fake news casually. And it’s appearing in news organizations’ own programmatic ads.

## 1NC- Police Blotter PIC

#### CP Text: Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict constitutionally protected journalist speech but ought to restrict reporting of student survivors and perpetrators of student criminal activity

#### In the squo police blotters, crime reports put in student newspapers, are constitutionally protected.

**Gersh 91** [Judge Rules in Favor of Students in Campus Crime Reports Case By Gersh, Debra | Editor and Publisher, November 30, 1991]

The Department of Education cannot prevent colleges and universities from releasing detailed information about campus crime reports by threatening to withdraw funding, according to a preliminary injunction issued by a federal judge in Washington, D.C. While acknowledging that there are constitutional limits to the scope of information available to the public, U.S. District Court Judge Stanley Harris ruled Nov. 21 that the Student Press Law Center and the three students who filed suit against the Department and Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander "have a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of their claim ..." The SPLC and the students filed suit in October, charging that the letters to universities and colleges from DoE led to a clampdown on the release of campus crime reports (E&P, Oct. 12). "The parties dispute the net burden that the FERPA [Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act] imposes on the student press," Judge Harris wrote. "Defendants stress that the information plaintiffs seek is available from local law-enforcement authorities. Plaintiffs maintain that the statute effectively prevents them from obtaining the information they seek by preventing them from learning the names of students involved in campus crime. Without the name of an arrestee, they maintain, searching the local law-enforcement records is cumbersome and ineffective. …

#### This creates an online record of minor crimes that are expunged by the legal system- that hurts future job opportunities and causes rights violations

**Reimold 13** [Dan Reimold, 10-22-2013, "Should college newspapers publish the names of student criminal suspects?," USA TODAY College, http://college.usatoday.com/2013/10/22/should-college-newspapers-publish-the-names-of-student-criminal-suspects/]

As she contends, “Miami University is a place where students come to start their lives. They are still young adults, and mistakes are common. Many of the incidents published in the Police Beat are first-time offenses in which the charges are dropped. Although the legal system forgives these mistakes, The Miami Student does not. Once your name goes online with publication, it’s out there forever. In the past this was not the case. Technology has made this discussion pertinent. Tradition must be re-evaluated as the world around us changes.” Tradition aside, from a legal perspective, a local Ohio attorney supports the shift because the past naming of students has resulted in trouble for them once they had their records sealed — a normal occurrence for the smaller infractions (usually tied to alcohol or marijuana) often included in the column. Another argument in favor of dropping the names centers on what some see as biased source material: the original police report. In Taylor’s words, “It relies on information presented by a single source, a police officer’s 10-minute encounter with an individual. By nature, they are one-sided. They provide no follow-up, no outside perspective or investigation. They lack the integrity of a balanced news story.” A local police officer’s counter to that charge is that the problem is among the public who reads the reports, not the police who write them up. As he put it, “A person’s name in the Police Beat is not placed there in a malicious fashion. It is a stating of facts of circumstance. It doesn’t state that a crime was committed.” Nevertheless, a letter writer applauding the change equates the entire name-game with “salacious journalism that serves no greater purpose other than inducing gawking and giggling at the misfortunes of others. These incidents are often the result of larger problems, including a culture that celebrates binge drinking and a system that doesn’t do enough to educate young people on the effects of alcohol. Furthermore, in a question of ethics, journalists must weigh the importance of sullying the names of students who have done something embarrassing, but not necessarily newsworthy. I point to the case of a young man who vomited while in police custody (Police Beat, 9/27/13). Whose interests are served when reporting this man’s name?”

#### Blotters are counterproductive- it diminishes safety because dorms become hostile- that also hurts proper education

**Nick 16** [Madison Nick, "Public knowledge or public humiliation?," Tab Pitt, http://thetab.com/us/pitt/2016/03/21/public-knowledge-public-humiliation-236]

Having your mistakes featured in a news article while you’re paying thousands in tuition to call your university “home” is not an ideal situation for any college student. While I understand this is a practice of “professional journalism” it is also morally and ethically wrong to post these types of news articles that are undoubtedly causing detriment to your own university’s students. Publishing police and crime news is a standard journalistic practice and is done to inform readers of where activity took place as a safety precaution, but The Police Blotter that is published every week in this same newspaper informs readers of this news already. Not to mention, in the police blotter student’s identities are kept anonymous. This is a much more efficient way of relaying information than targeting students and making them feel small at the University they choose as their home away from home. So why choose to ostracize students by publicizing these types of news stories that are making this information easily accessible for teachers, classmates, and potential employers to see? Not only does this make the student feel belittled, but it also could create an uncomfortable studying and living situation for them at their University feeling as if their reputation has been ruined. Though the argument can be made, and was made, that these arrest articles are public knowledge and anyone has the ability to see the arrest report, the amount of detail and the article itself would not have been as readily available had the newspaper not published it on paper and online. Now, anytime an employer searches that specific student’s name the online article is right there to view. The news articles of this type created a lot of uproar and backlash from students. My friend who was targeted by the school newspaper was so upset that a few students at the university went around and took all of the newspapers that had her article in it. They blacked out her name with sharpie and put most the newspapers back. One of the university’s professors was so angered by this that he photocopied the article, highlighted the student’s name, and sent it home to her parents anonymously. Later he was caught, but this proves that these types of articles are not only singling out students for their mistakes but also creating a hostile environment on campus among students AND GROWN ADULT PROFESSORS. This story brings a very important issue to the playing field that needs to be addressed by universities everywhere and their newspapers. Is the idea of “professional journalism” more important than bettering your student’s futures and staying loyal to the people that call your university home?

## 1NC- Hate Speech PIC

#### CP Text: Public colleges and universities in the United States should restrict constitutionally protected journalist speech when that speech is explicitly bigoted

**Lewy 08** [Anti Defamation League, Copyright 2008, Glen S. Lewy, National Chair, Abraham H. Foxman, National Director, Kenneth Jacobson, Deputy National Director, David Millstone, Chair, Education Committee, Ed S. Alster, Director, Education Division, Marvin Nathan, Chair, Civil Rights Committee, Deborah Lauter, National Civil Rights Director, Stacey Berkowitz, Director, Campus and Confronting Anti-Semitism Initiatives, Deborah Cohen, Assistant Director of Legal Affairs, “RESPONDING to BIGOTRY and INTERGROUP STRIFE on CAMPUS”, ADL, [http://www.adl.org/assets/pdf/education-outreach/Responding-to-Bigotry-and-Intergroup-Strife-on-Campus.pdf](http://www.adl.org/assets/pdf/education-outreach/Responding-to-Bigotry-and-Intergroup-Strife-on-Campus.pdf~-~-ghs//sk))]

To place an outright ban on certain speech would be unconstitutional and contrary to a fundamental tenet of American democracy. However, the Constitution does not oblige universities to host everyone who wants to speak or write there, nor does it require campus newspaper editors to publish every item submitted to them. Campus leaders and journalists must responsibly draw a line between valid, fact-based opinions and outright bigotry. The sections in this chapter outline common hate speech issues on campus. Each section contains background information, legal analysis, suggested action steps and examples of university responses. When dealing with specific speech issues on campus, there are certain fundamental guidelines that can be applied in most situations. • Be a public presence on campus by voicing your support or opposition in tensesituations. • Establish university response protocols to deal with hate incidents. These protocols must be communicated to the campus through student policy manuals, orientation materials, the institution’s Web site and clear step-by-step instructions placed in every campus building. • Continually review and train on the emergency protocols and be able to direct victims to where they can get assistance. • Appoint a central university ombuds officer as a point person to dealing with issues of hate, bigotry and intimidation. • Establish high-priority, long-term human relations and anti-bias programming within the curriculum, in the orientation process, through student services and in university publications. • Be equally concerned about and respond equally to instances of bias directed at any group on campus. Base your response on the incident itself, not the group identity of thetargets. • Hold fraternities, sororities and other student organizations responsible for acts of bigotry committed by their members participating in any fraternity, sorority or organizational activity. • Encourage alumni, parents and members of the larger community to speak out on issues of bigotry on campus. Their voices can have a significant positive impact on the atmosphere on campus. The campus media are a natural venue for the expression of ideas. Hate groups may take advantage of this and place paid advertisements, paid inserted supplements, opinion/editorial articles and letters to the editor in campus newspapers and other publications. This was a favorite, high-profile tactic of the Holocaust denial movement in the late 1990s, which succeeded in placing such materials in publications on more than 200 campuses. Editors should be aware that privately owned publications have editorial autonomy to decide what they will and will not publish. Courts generally view student newspapers (even those at public schools) as private when student editors, and not school administrators, make the decisions about content and advertising policies. University regulation and subsidization do not transform a newspaper from a private body into an arm of the state or university. Despite their claims, extremist groups have no legitimate First Amendment right to have their advertisements placed in campus publications. The First Amendment guarantees that they may stand in public areas speaking hateful messages, hold meetings and send racist fliers through the mail and the government cannot censor or punish them. However, the First Amendment does not secure anyone the right to be placed in a private newspaper. Private companies are not bound by the constraints of the First Amendment, and individuals have no First Amendment right to force a private, professional or college newspaper to run a story or advertisement. One federal appellate court observed: “The right to freedom of speech does not open every avenue to one who desires to use a particular outlet for expression.”12 Determining the paper’s editorial content and deciding what stories to print is solely the province of editors. Since campus newspaper staff change from year to year, educate campus newspaper editors on a continuing basis about their journalistic responsibilities. Proactive outreach is needed before any bigoted advertisements, articles or opinion pieces are received. • Advise student editors to devise and record an advertising policy, which they can reference when declining to run hateful ads. • Encourage students to use the campus media as a tool for civil and respectful dialogue instead of hate or bigotry. • Encourage the student leadership of the campus media to engage their staff in a dialogue regarding their rights and responsibilities as journalists. • Encourage faculty members and top administrators to take a public stand against the use of the campus newspaper to spread hateful propaganda. Administrators always have the right to criticize an article or the decisions made by newspaper staff.

#### Publications are a source of hate on campus – it’s been used to promote platforms for htings look holocaust denial. Foxman 10 (Abraham H. Foxman National Director Anti-Defamation League, Fighting Holocaust Denial in Campus Newspaper Advertisements A Manual for Action Revised: May 2010)

Holocaust denial is an anti-Semitic conspiracy theory which claims that the well-documented destruction of six million Jews during World War II is actually a myth created by Jews to serve their own self-interested purposes. On college campuses, Holocaust denial is most often encountered in the form of advertisements submitted to student newspapers by Bradley Smith and his Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH). These ads are an affront to truth and an insult to the memory of those who were murdered by the Nazis. They create a divisive atmosphere for Jews on campus and foster conflict among students, faculty, administrators and the local community. Hillel: The Foundation for Jewish Campus Life, and the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) have worked together for years to counteract these ads and to restore civility to the campus community when they have been published. Students, campus professionals and local community leaders necessarily play the major role in this effort. The Holocaust is a central tragedy in the sweep of Jewish and human history and a trauma that continues to inform Jewish life today. It is also a cautionary tale about human character that deserves retelling in every generation, to Jews and non-Jews alike. By fighting Holocaust denial on campuses we honor the memory of the victims, confront the forces of hatred, and help shape a responsible new generation of Americans. We urge you to join us in this effort.

#### Speech codes are good– they diminish right-wing movements and form coalitions of targeted groups.

**Parekh 12** [Parekh, Bhikhu (2012) ‘Is There a Case for Banning Hate Speech?’, in Herz, M. and Molnar, P. (eds.) The Content and Context of Hate Speech: Rethinking Regulation and Responses. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 37–56. ]

It is sometimes argued that banning hate speech drives extremist groups under- ground and leaves us no means of knowing who they are and how much support they enjoy. It also alienates them from the wider society, even makes them more detennined. and helps them recruit those attracted by the allure of forbidden fruit. This is an important argument and its force should not be underestimated. How- eyer, it has its limits. A ban on hate speech might drive extremist groups underground, but it also persuades their moderate and law-abiding members to dissociate them- selves from these groups. When extremist groups go underground, they are denied the oxygen of publicity and the aura of public respectability. This makes their operations more difficult and denies them the opportunity to link up with other similar groups and recruit their members. While the ban might alienate extremist groups, it has the compensating advantage of securing the enthusiastic commitment and support of their target groups. Besides, beyond a certain point, alienation need not be a source of worry. Some religious groups are alienated from the secular orientation of the liberal state, inst as the communists and polyamoronsly inclined persons bitterly resent its commitment (respectively) to market economy and rnonogamy. We accept such forms of alien- ation as inherent in collective life and do not seek to redress them by abandoning the liberal state. The ban might harden the determination of some, but it is also likely to weaken that of those who seek respectability and do not want to be associated with ideas and groups considered so disreputable as to be banned, or who are deterred by the cost involved in supporting them. There is the lure of the prohibited, but there is also the attraction of the respectable.

#### Turns the case and outweighs

#### 1. Magnitude- Hate speech normalizes psychological violence which renders educational spaces null and increases likelihood of physical violence

* Makes physical violence more likely—empirically proven
* Causes psychological harms
* Makes educational spaces null and void
* Normalizes oppressive practices
* Easy to reject from a position of privilege

**Heinze 14**: Eric Heinze, professor of law & humanities at Queen Mary university of London. March 31, 2014. Nineteen arguments for hate speech bans—and against them. Free Speech Debate. Free speech scholar Eric Heinze identifies the main arguments for laws restricting hate speech and says none are valid for mature Western democracies. <http://freespeechdebate.com/en/discuss/nineteen-arguments-for-hate-speech-bans-and-against-them/>. RW

On all sides of the debate, we can agree that speech is necessary for democracy. Governments ought not to abridge speech willy-nilly. They must show how the speech in question poses a genuine danger. In the case of hate speech, has any such menace been shown? In my book [Hate Speech and Democratic Citizenship](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/hate-speech-and-democratic-citizenship-9780198759027?cc=gb&lang=en&), I reject the classical liberal defences of free speech, let alone newer libertarian ones. I argue that the strongest case for free speech is grounded on specifically democratic principles, which must not be confused with Millian, liberal ones. I cannot reproduce that thesis here, but will briefly respond to some familiar claims raised by the bans’ advocates. 1. The ‘anti-absolutist’ argument: ‘No rights are absolute. Rights must be limited by respect for others, and by the needs of society as a whole. The British Lord Bhikhu Parekh writes, “Although free speech is an important value, it is not the only one. Human dignity, equality, freedom to live without harassment and intimidation, social harmony, mutual respect, and protection of one’s good name and honour are also central to the good life and deserve to be safeguarded. Because these values conflict, either inherently or in particular contexts, they need to be balanced.” There are, moreover, many regulations of speech to which no one objects, punishing, for example, commercial fraud, graffiti, or courtroom perjury. Hate speech bans are no different.’ The ‘not speech’ argument: ‘The crudest hate speech is not really speech at all. It is merely the kind of “inarticulate grunt” that can legitimately be banned because it forms, in the words of US Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy, “no essential part of any exposition of ideas.”’ The ‘Weimar’ (or ‘snowball’) argument: ‘Democracy under the Weimar Republic or the former Yugoslavia show that too much free speech leads to atrocities. Some offensive remarks may, on the surface, appear harmless. But seemingly innocuous offences snowball into more pernicious forms. Once speech reaches a Nazi-like extreme, it becomes too late to avert the dangerous consequences.’ The ‘direct harm’ argument: ‘Hate speech can cause psychological harm, just as hate-motivated violence causes physical harm. Children who are called “nigger”, “Paki”, or “queer” suffer just as much as when they are physically bullied. For adults, verbal abuse can render workplace, educational or other environments unbearable.’ The ‘indirect harm’ argument: ‘The harms of hate speech do not manifest in a conventionally empirical sense. From some phenomenological and socio-linguistic perspectives, hateful expression is “illocutionary”, i.e. not merely denoting hatred but enacting discrimination, and “perlocutionary”, disseminating adverse psychological effects regardless of any materially evident impact. Anthony Cortese describes a “cultural transmission theory”, whereby cultures “pass hate on to each succeeding generation, making intolerance “normal or conventional.” Hate speech germinates intolerance, not through discrete, causally traceable chains of events, but through cumulative effects.’ The ‘hate crime’ argument: ‘The bans are necessary because hate speech is commonly connected to hate-based acts of murder, battery, rape, assault, and property theft or damage.’ The ‘disproportionate impact’ argument: ‘It’s easy for those in privileged positions to oppose hate speech bans. They do not bear the brunt of hatred. But “individual freedom” looks different from the viewpoint of historically vilified groups.’

#### Turns counterspeech- psychological violence hurts ability to participate in the movement

#### 2. Inclusivity- It causes less discursive participation from minorities which harms ability to reach the truth

**Horne 16**: Solveigh Horne, Minister of children and equality in Norway. “hate speech—a threat to freedom of speech.” March 8, 2016. Huffington Post. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/solveig-horne/hate-speech--a-threat-to_b_9406596.html>. RW

Hate speech in the public sphere takes place online and offline, and affects young girls and boys, women and men. We also see hate speech attacking vulnerable groups like people with disabilities, LGBT-persons and other minority groups. Social media and the Internet have opened up for many new arenas for exchanging opinions. Freedom of speech is an absolute value in any democracy, both for the public and for the media. At the same time, opinions and debates challenge us as hate speech are spread widely and frequently on new platforms for publishing. Hate speech may cause fear and can be the reason why people withdraw from the public debate. The result being that important voices that should be heard in the public debate are silenced. We all benefit if we foster an environment where everybody is able to express their opinions without experiencing hate speech. In this matter we all have a responsibility. I am especially concerned about women and girls being silenced. Attempts to silence women in the public debate through hate speech, are an attack on women’s human rights. No one should be silenced or subjected to threats when expressing themselves in public. Women are under-represented in the media. In order to get a balanced public debate it is important that many voices are heard. We must encourage women and girls to be equal participants with men. Hate speech prevents women from making their voices heard. I also call upon the media to take responsibility in this matter. In some cases the media may provide a platform for hate speech. At the same time, I would like to stress that a liberal democracy like Norway strongly supports freedom of speech as a fundamental right.

## 1NC- T Any

#### Interpretation- On the Jan/Feb 2017 topic, the aff cannot specify a single type of constitutionally protected speech that their advocacy does remove a restriction for. To clarify, plan inclusive counterplans that remove restrictions in single type of speech are illegitimate.

#### “Any” is a negative polarity term which means that it is indefinite- especially considering that the res\* is a downward entailing operator

**Kadmon and Landman 93** [Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman. “Any” Linguistics and Philosophy Vol 16, No. 4 Aug 1993. Springer. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25001516. ] NB

As is well known, any can function in two different ways hand, it can be a negative polarity item - POLARITY SENSITIV on the other hand, it has what is called a 'free choice' inte FREE CHOICE (FC) any. In this paper, we will propose a unifie of the semantic and pragmatic effects of any, which applies to its uses. The use of any as a negative polarity it is illustrated in (1) and (2). (1) I don't have any potatoes. (2) \*I have any potatoes. According to Ladusaw 1979's well known analysis, negative polarity items (NPIs) are only licensed if they are in the scope of a downward entailing operator. A downward entailing (DE) operator is an operator that reverses the direction of entailment, roughly as specified in (3) (using > for entailment). (3) O is a DE operator iff if A => B then O(B) = O(A). On Ladusaw's account, example (1) is OK because any is in the scope of negation, which, as illustrated in (4), is a DE operator. (4) swim = move I don't move => I don't swim In example (2), any is not licensed, because there is no DE operator that any is in the scope of. Ladusaw's analysis elegantly accounts for a wide range of examples. Besides negative vs. affirmative pairs like (1) and (2), it deals, for example, with examples (5)-(8). (5) At most three girls saw anything. (6) \*At least three girls saw anything. (7) Every girl who saw anything was happy. (8) \*Some girl who saw anything was happy. Assuming, with Generalized Quantifier Theory, that determiners are two place relations between a nominal property and a verbal property, Ladu saw predicts that (5) and (7) are OK because the determiner at most three is DE on its second argument (as well as the first) and the determiner every is DE on its first argument. (6) and (8) are out because at least three and some are not DE on either argument. Ladusaw's analysis of polarity sensitivity is quite successful. It gives semantic content to Klima 1964's suggestion that NPIs are licensed by 'affective' expressions, and it improves upon the analysis of Baker (1970), which is based on licensing by overt negation, in that the notion of DE provides a uniform account of the licensing of NPIs in examples with and without negation. However, there remain some empirical and theoretical issues that Ladusaw's analysis leaves unresolved. We now turn to such issues. We note the four issues summarized in (9), on which we will comment in turn immediately below. (9) constitutes, in fact, a summary of our goals: what we set out to do in this paper is provide an analysis of any that can successfully deal with these four issues. (9)i. the connection between PS any and FC any (goal: a unified analysis); ii. any as an expression which indicates reduced tolerance of ex ceptions; iii. the distribution of the NPI as determined by its meaning and function; iv. empirical problems with the licensing of NPIs I. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN PS ANY AND FC ANY. (10)-(12) are ex amples of free choice any. (10) Any owl hunts mice. (11) Any lawyer could tell you that. (12) I would dance with anybody. Ladusaw (1979) offers a whole battery of arguments that show beyond doubt that PS any is an indefinite with an existential meaning. (Arguments for this are also given by Horn (1972) and others.) FC any, on the other hand, seems to have universal quantificational force. And this goes beyond mere appearance. Carlson (1981) gives several arguments that FC any is in fact a universal quantifier. A strong argument is the behavior of almost. Almost is an operator that can modify only universal determiners, as illustrated in (13)-(15). (13) Almost every lawyer could answer that question (14)Almostnolawyer (15)\*Almostsomelaw As (16) and (17) show, alm strongly suggests that FC (16)Almostanylawye (17)\*Idon'thavealmo (This goes back to Horn absolutely. Note that we alm ost is a sentential ad conclusion - towards w ambiguous:PSanyisan quantifier.

#### “Any” does not tolerate exceptions, because it’s either an existential quantifier or a universal quantifier

**Kadmon and Landman 93** [Nirit Kadmon and Fred Landman. “Any” Linguistics and Philosophy Vol 16, No. 4 Aug 1993. Springer. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25001516. ] NB

What is it that any adds to the meaning of the indefinite NP? We think it contributes what we have described above as reduced tolerance of exceptions. Compare the (a) and (b) sentences in the following examples. (26)a. I don’t have potatoes. b. I don’t have any potatoes. (=(l) above) (27)a. Every man who has matches is happy. b. Every man who has any matches is happy. (28)a. An owl hunts mice. (=(22) above) b. Any owl hunts mice. (=(10) above) In some sense, the (b) sentences rule out exceptions more strongly than the (a) sentences do. Let us clarify and illustrate this point. A context of utterance sets up a domain of quantification, from which all sorts of things are excluded. For example, in a given context, rotten potatoes or sick owls may be excluded as irrelevant. For that reason, you can accept (26a) as true even if you know that I do in fact have a few rotten potatoes in the back yard, and you can accept (283) as true even if you don’t think that sick owls hunt mice. The effect of any in the (b) sentences, especially when it carries main or emphatic stress, is to indicate that even things that could previously be disregarded as irrelevant (in a given context) are no exception to the claim being made. Thus, I don’t have ANY potatoes may imply: not even rotten ones; ANY owl hunts mice may imply: even a sick one - the use of any indicates that even rotten potatoes or sick owls (which might have otherwise been disregarded) are no exception. In what follows, we will discuss several concrete cases, where we supply contexts for our example sentences. The content of utterance may implicitly or explicitly suggest that only cooking potatoes (the regular potatoes you might find in the pantry) are relevant. For example, suppose you say (29) or (30). (29) Could we make some French fries? (30) I feel like French fries. Do you have cooking potatoes today? If I utter (26a) (1 don’t have potatoes) in the context of what you have just said, I mean that I don’t have cooking potatoes. In this context, it is irrelevant that I do have, say, some potted potatoes decorating my room (on the assumption that my potted potatoes are not cooking potatoes), since non-cooking potatoes are not taken into account. Because my potted potatoes are disregarded in the context, they constitute legitimate excep- tions to the claim I made by uttering (26a). Now, suppose you say (30) and I reply by saying (26b): 1 don’t have ANY potatoes! This time, I am not just talking about the potatoes that would normally be considered relevant in the context of (30) (i.e. regular cooking potatoes); this time I am saying that I don’t have other potatoes, either. My utterance may very well imply that I am no longer in possession of the potted potatoes that you eyed hungrily on previous occasions. Even though decorative potatoes would not normally be relevant in the context of (30), the use of any may indicate that they too are no exception to the claim that I don’t have potatoes.

#### Violation-

#### 1. Specification is incompatible with “any” as an indefinite. Indefinites do not refer to particular instantiations of the resolution.

**NOD** [New Oxford Dictionary “Indefinite” adjective.] NB

lasting for an unknown or unstated length of time: they may face indefinite detention. • not clearly expressed or defined; vague: their status remains indefinite. • Grammar (of a word, inflection, or phrase) not determining the person, thing, time, etc., referred to.

#### 2. Even if “any” permits few exceptions, the aff is only a single example of the resolution, so it can’t affirm the general rule of the resolution, let alone exclude any exception

#### Standards

#### 1. Semantics- our interpretation is best aligned with the definitions of individual words and the usage of “any” in different instances. Our interp is the most grammatical and is the most objective since it doesn’t rely on arbitrary determinants of what constitutes the best type of debate- and it determines the stasis point for what we know before the round.

#### 2. Limits- They allow way too many affs if they can allow infinite specifications of types of speech in certain scenarios. Even if there are some turns, the aff is massively overprepped for them since it limits their prep burden whereas im expected to prep against each of these affs. Generics don’t solve- agent CPs or state bad Ks aren’t persuasive vs a nuanced Aff that is also heavily prepped against these. Their counterinterp proves that there’s a t version of the aff- reading it as an advantage solves their education offense and allows for a broader comparison. They explode neg prep burden and predictability which kills fairness and engagement because there isn’t sufficient literature against their position. Caselist: [zones, journalism, offensive words, political speech, advertisements, war protests, painting, not saluting, burning flag, newspapers, specific campuses, dress codes, pornography, books, religious expression, cyberspeech, organizations inside the campus, specific people, specific times, specific places, specific manners on the campuses, commercial speech, speech against specific activities, rights of individual employees on campuses, etc.]

#### Voter

#### 1. Fairness, debates a competitive activity, 2. Education, only portable impact. Drop the debater because A. Norms- a loss deters future abuse, B. Timeskew- drop the arg means they can kick their offense for a positive time tradeoff. C. Gateway issue- unfair args skew the rest of the round. Evaluate Competing Interps, A. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention, B. deterrence- debaters can get away with defense on theory, C. reasonability collapses into competing itnersp because we have offense defense debates about brightlines, D. it’s a binary- either the aff is topical or it’s not 5. No RVI: A. Chills theory- RVIs deter me from reading theory because good theory debaters will bait abuse and go for the RVI which causes infinite abuse. B. Kills substance- they will just collapse to the shell which ruins the possibility of us ever returning to having education. C. Illogical- you shouldn’t win for being fair. Logic is an impact because it’s the basis of argumentation. D. No abuse- you could read your own shell or prove that I violate and you don’t which equals the theory layer

## Case

### Top Level

#### Status quo solves – you can organize an independent newspaper or make a website and it’s been done at several colleges already

**Kabay ’10** (M.E, December, Contributor at Network World, “Free speech issues: Controlling content in college newspapers.” Network World, http://www.networkworld.com/article/2195630/data-center/free-speech-issues~-~-controlling-content-in-college-newspapers.html~-~-ghs//sk)

If students feel strongly that a university administration is clamping down too strongly on their ability to speak freely, they can always organize an independent outlet for their thoughts. For example, at my doctoral alma mater, Dartmouth College, the college publishes several newsletters under the control of the institution. However, students dissatisfied with college control formed an independent newspaper, The Dartmouth Review, in which to express their opinions without interference from faculty and administrators. The publication lists several similar independent student publications at Stanford, Cornell, Princeton, and College of William and Mary. Creating a Web site is no longer an expensive proposition; for example, InMotion Hosting has provided excellent service for my personal Web site for about $7 a month, including registering my domain name. The only issue students might have to watch out for is that university names and logos are protected intellectual property, so no one can just stick them on unofficial Web pages or newspapers without permission. But returning to the content and style of publications, all organizations offering a venue for the expression of opinion should ensure that opinions are clearly demarcated from supposedly factual reporting. Both can be justified, but muddling the two categories can lead to unfortunate results. For example, interviewing three close buddies and then making wild generalizations about an entire student body is a classic example of what not to do with non-random sample data.

#### Self-censorship by editors and low trust in student newspapers are alt causes – college newspapers won't promote civic engagement or public dialogue even if they could

Brown 15 [Rachel Brown (MA candidate in communications at Ursinus College), "A New Role for Student Media: College Newspapers and the Crisis in Journalism," Media and Communication Studies Honors Papers @ Ursinus College, 2015] AZ

A similar study quantified self-censorship by gauging the tendency for college newspapers to resist controversy. The study surveyed college media advisers and editors across the country regarding their willingness to publish articles on a range of topics that could be perceived to be controversial, including sex, substance abuse, and criticism related to the educational institution. The results suggests that student editors are likely to self-censor with more severity than their advisers would recommend, refraining from printing some content because it could put the publication under scrutiny. The study proposes that perceptual bias theories “have long demonstrated that individuals exaggerate the way in which a nebulous group of others feels in regard to a controversial topic” (Filak 2012). The third-person effect, the phenomenon where individual consumers of mass media believe that they are less affected by media influence than other consumers, is cited as the primary reason why student journalists feel that their work will be scrutinized and as a result, self-censor. The study suggests that college students are more vulnerable to this bias, putting journalistic integrity at risk. This study contributes to the dialogue in the journalism industry surrounding the extent to which student newspaper staffs are limited by their dual roles as both students and editors, and whether this role limits their willingness to publish controversial yet potentially important content. If student newspapers are susceptible to self-censorship to a greater extent than commercial newspapers, then it is unlikely that college reporters will be able to match their professional counterparts in terms of depth and scope of news coverage. Self-censorship is a significant barrier to the success of college newspapers in filling the civic role of commercial publications. The potential for concentrated pressure to self-censor is intensified by both the context of student newspapers in an academic setting and the college newspaper staff’s inevitable lack of experience in dealing with such pressures. This selfcensorship, while it may be inadvertent on the part of the student reporter, interferes with journalistic integrity and the ability for school newspapers to fill the role of professional papers that do not face the same structural influences. Further, student newspapers’ credibility is impacted by their readership’s perceptions of organizational censorship. A 2009 study compared the perceived credibility of community newspapers to that of the student newspaper at the University of Florida. While the results of the study show that, overall, the students did not perceive their local papers to be more credible than their student papers, the study suggested that these differences are largely due to advertisements in commercial papers, not the credibility of the content itself (Bodle 1996). As a whole, the study showed that student newspapers are perceived to be credible by student readers, but the community readers that college newspapers would potentially be including in their readership do not share that perception (Bodle 1996).

#### Student newspapers misinform

Fang 16 Fang, Marina [Contributor, The Huffington Post] “Most College Students Want Free Speech on Campuses – But Not When It’s Hate Speech.” Huffington Post. April 2016. RP

The survey noted that race plays a particular role in college students’ perceptions of First Amendment freedoms. For example, only 39 percent of the black students in the survey reported feeling less confident in the right to peacefully assemble, compared to 70 percent of white students. **Students are highly distrustful of the press. Nearly 60 percent of the students surveyed “have little or no trust in the press to report the news accurately and fairly,” and many expressed mixed opinions about the media’s coverage of campus protests. While the vast majority of students surveyed said that the press should generally have unrestricted access to campus protests, close to half said that in some cases, there can be reasons to bar the press, like if protesters think that the reporter may be biased, or whether “the people at the protest say they have a right to be left alone.”**

#### Outweighs—

#### Lack of research – students aren't incentivized to rigorously analyze their opinions since their careers aren't on the line

#### Other sources of news solve – students don't rely on college newspapers anymore because CNN or NPR are so easily available

#### Skewed incentives – full-time students are pressured to meet deadlines for articles, exams, and homework – they push out articles instead of thinking critically about what they say

#### Gut check – when was the last time you read your college newspaper for news?

#### Plan kills civic engagement—journalism encourages people to read about the government rather than engage in first-hand policy experience

**Their author Small 6**

(Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition, “Moving Forward,” The Journal for Civic Commitment, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, the new century will present challenges that require collective action, unity, and enlightened self-interest. Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates, and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability will require cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all solidarity – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. Our very existence depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society. With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation. Unlike any other crisis before, the noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events. Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, we need to teach cooperation, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. It will require a radical transformation of our conception of education. We’ll need to trust a bit more, control a bit less, and put our faith in the potential of youth to make sense of their world. In addition to a declaration of the gauntlet set before educators in the twenty-first century, this paper is a proposal and a case study of sorts toward a new paradigm of social justice and civic engagement education. Unfortunately, the current pedagogical climate of public K-12 education does not lend itself well to an exploratory study and trial of holistic education. Consequently, this proposal and case study targets a higher education model. Specifically, we will look at some possibilities for a large community college in an urban setting with a diverse student body. Our guides through this process are specifically identified by the journal Equity and Excellence in Education. The dynamic interplay between ideas of social justice, civic engagement, and service learning in education will be the lantern in the dark cave of uncertainty. As such, a simple and straightforward explanation of the three terms is helpful to direct this inquiry. Before we look at a proposal and case study and the possible consequences contained therein, this paper will draw out a clear understanding of how we should characterize these ubiquitous terms and how their relationship to each other affects our study. Social Justice, Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Other Commie Crap Social justice is often ascribed long, complicated, and convoluted definitions. In fact, one could fill a good-sized library with treatises on this subject alone. Here we do not wish to belabor the issue or argue over fine points. For our purposes, it will suffice to have a general characterization of the term, focusing instead on the dynamics of its interaction with civic engagement and service learning. Social justice refers quite simply to a community vision and a community conscience that values inclusion, fairness, tolerance, and equality. The idea of social justice in America has been around since the Revolution and is intimately linked to the idea of a social contract. The Declaration of Independence is the best example of the prominence of social contract theory in the US. It states quite emphatically that the government has a contract with its citizens, from which we get the famous lines about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Social contract theory and specifically the Declaration of Independence are concrete expressions of the spirit of social justice. Similar clamor has been made over the appropriate definitions of civic engagement and service learning, respectively. Once again, let’s not get bogged down on subtleties. Civic engagement is a measure or degree of the interest and/or involvement an individual and a community demonstrate around community issues. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world. Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government and commerce, have the potential for positive change. Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context. Service learning is a methodology and a tool for teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and deepening practical understanding of a subject. Since it is a relatively new field, at least in the structured sense, service learning is only beginning to define itself. Through service learning students learn by experiencing things firsthand and by exposing themselves to new points of view. Instead of merely reading about government, for instance, a student might experience it by working in a legislative office. Rather than just studying global warming out of a textbook, a student might volunteer time at an environmental group. If service learning develops and evolves into a discipline with the honest goal of making better citizens, teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and most importantly, exposing students to different and alternative experiences, it could be a major feature of a modern education. Service learning is the natural counterbalance to our current overemphasis on standardized testing. Social justice, civic engagement, and service learning are caught in a symbiotic cycle. The more we have of one of them; the more we have of all of them. However, until we get momentum behind them, we are stalled. Service learning may be our best chance to jumpstart our democracy. In the rest of this paper, we will look at the beginning stages of a project that seeks to do just that.

### AT: Schuman/Goodman

#### Group Schuman and Goodman- uq framing cards

if there has been a ton of newspaper censorship already since 2005 and 12-8, why hasn’t that caused your impacts. That proves that either A. the impacts have already happened which means that uniqueness overwhelms the link, B. the impact will never happen because the link is too small to affect anything

### AT: Lukianoff 05

**Now, the Lukianoff 05- they say newspapers are a crucial internal link to campus censorship -**

#### 1. the aff isn’t strong enough to solve it’s own impact, the evidence cites alternate causes of campus censorship such as speech zones and overarching speech codes.

#### 2. no explanation for the internal link for why newspapers and the Hosty decision provided colleges with their unique chance to censor

#### Student activism, civic engagement and protests are at an all-time high even with speech codes

**HERI 16** [Higher Education Research Institute. “College students’ commitment to activism, political and civic engagement reach all-time highs”. UCLA Newsroom. February 10, 2016. <http://newsroom.ucla.edu/releases/college-students-commitment-to-activism-political-and-civic-engagement-reach-all-time-highs>. ]

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.”

### AT: Lukianoff/Small EXT

**Group Lukianoff 05 and Small 06- Campus free speech solves extinction**

1. be heavily weary of this impact- the card doesn't have anything near the semblance of a warrant and is simply hyperbolic

2. there are multiple alternate necessities in addition to speech that have to exist in order to provide inquiry

3. they have to prove that there are status quo restrictions on legitimate forms of speech which will be able to solve extinction in the long run, notjust things like hate speech which have no relevance.

#### 4. The aff’s enforcement of a fear and vulnerability re-entrenches insecurity logic – the impact is a circular apocalyptic impulse that makes violence inevitable.

**Chernus 1**

[Ira Chernus, Professor of Religious Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder “Fighting Terror in The National Insecurity State,” (2001)]

Just as the outcome of World War I sowed the seeds of World War II, and the outcome of World War II the seeds of the cold war, so the outcome of the cold war sowed the seeds of the war on terrorism. And this newest war is already, quite visibly, sowing the seeds of insecurity to come. It may be most useful to view the whole period from the early cold war years through the present war as a single historical era: the era of the national insecurity state. Throughout that era, U.S. policy decisions made in the name of national security consistently breed a greater sense of vulnerability, frustration, and insecurity. It is not hard to see why. Four decades of cold war enshrined two fundamental principles at the heart of our public life: there is a mortal threat to the very existence of our nation, and our own policies play no role in generating the threat. The belief structure of the national insecurity state flows logically from these premises. If our nation bears no responsibility, then we are powerless to eradicate the threat. If others threaten us through no fault of our own, what can we do? There is no hope for a truly better world, nor for ending the danger by mutual compromise with "the other side." The threat is effectively eternal. The best to hope for is to hold the threat forever at bay. Yet the sense of powerlessness is oddly satisfying, because it preserves the conviction of innocence: if our policies are so ineffectual, the troubles of the world can hardly be our fault. And the vision of an endless status quo is equally satisfying, because it promises to prevent historical change. If peril is permanent, the world is an endless reservoir of potential enemies. Any fundamental change in the status quo portends only catastrophe. The only path to security, it seems, is to prevent change by imposing control over others. When those others fight back, the national insecurity state protests its innocence: we act only in self-defense; we want only stability. The state sees no reason to re-evaluate its policies; that would risk the change it seeks, above all, to avoid. So it can only meet violence with more violence. Of course, the inevitable frustration is blamed on the enemy, reinforcing the sense of peril and the demand for absolute control through violence. The goal of total control is self-defeating; each step toward security becomes a source of, and is taken as proof of, continuing insecurity. This makes the logic of the insecurity state viciously circular. Why are we always fighting? Because we always have enemies. How do we know we always have enemies? Because we are always fighting. And knowing that we have enemies, how can we afford to stop fighting? In the insecurity state, there is no way to talk about security without voicing fears of insecurity, no way to express optimism without expressing despair. On every front, it is a self-fulfilling prophecy; a self-confirming and self-perpetuating spiral of violence; a trap that seems to offer no way out. It is not surprising, then, that the pattern of insecurity crystallized during the cold war survived that war. The "experts" insisted that now we were less secure. September 11 proved them indisputably right. Now they offer an official story that pretends to see an end to insecurity, but actually promises the endless insecurity of another cold war. And the policies based on that story virtually guarantee that the promise will be fulfilled. But that is just what most Americans expect, in any event. Caged inside the logic of the insecurity state, they can see no other possibility. So the official story hardly seems to be one option among many. Its premises and conclusions seem so necessary, so inevitable, that no other story can be imagined. For huge numbers of Americans, the peace movement’s alternative story is not mistaken. It is simply incomprehensible, like a foreign language, for it assumes that we can take steps to address the very sources of insecurity. That denies the most basic foundations of the prevailing public discourse. Quite naturally, then, the majority embraces the only story it can understand. The story is persuasive because the alternative seems to be having no story at all. The official story prevails by default, as the nation faces the prospect of further war around the world. Yet that is only half its power. The other half comes from the paradoxical consolation it provides as we look back to what happened here at home, on September 11, when four hijacked planes crashed headlong into the national insecurity state. The cold war is long over, the Reds are long gone, and now the twin towers are gone, too. But the national insecurity state still stands. Indeed, it stands stronger and taller precisely because the towers are gone. Our sense of insecurity has grown. But it is not fundamentally different in kind. The attacks did not create a pervasive sense of insecurity. Rather, the insecurity that was already pervasive shaped the dominant interpretation of and response to the attacks. The first response was the nearly universal cry: "Pearl Harbor." But "this was not Pearl Harbor," as National Security Advisor Condoleeza Rice recognized. There is no rivalry between great nation states. No foreign nation has attacked the U.S. No long-standing diplomatic and economic maneuvering preceded the attacks of September 11, 2001. Why, then, did they so quickly evoke the imagery of December 7, 1941? The common thread was not a hope for redemption, but only a conviction that the nation’s very existence was threatened. In 2001, that judgment is debatable, to say the least. Assuming that the attacks were indeed the work of a Muslim splinter group, such groups have been trying to attack U.S. interests for a quarter-century or more. One massive act of destruction, as horrendous as it was, hardly constitutes evidence of their overwhelming power. Nor is there any real evidence for Bush’s charge that these groups aim to impose their "radical beliefs on people everywhere¼ and end a way of life." Yet evidence is irrelevant in the national insecurity state. The fear comes first, before any evidence that it is warranted. How do we know that our existence is threatened? Because it is so obviously threatened! QED. This circular argument seems to be confirmed by the expressions of fear that have filled the mass media since September 11. They are certainly sincere. Yet it has become almost obligatory to say, "Life will never be the same because now, for the first time, we feel vulnerable." Most who say this can still remember, if they care to, the long cold war years of living on the brink of nuclear annihilation. Many are old enough to recall the Cuban missile crisis. Even more can remember the Reagan administration’s serious plans to fight a nuclear war. Are we really more vulnerable now, or only vulnerable in a different way? Are we really less secure than the days when one push of the button could trigger a thousand September 11’s? True, the September 11 attack was actual rather than merely potential. Yet the scale of the potential attack we feared for so long was so much greater than the actual attack. Why should so many say that the actual attack marked a quantum leap in national anxiety? The notoriously poor historical memory of Americans is only part of the answer. A larger part is the need to contain this new eruption of disorder within a familiar meaning structure. The study of human culture shows, over and over, that anxiety can be held in check, if not banished, by the way people talk about it. People can feel relatively secure amidst the most extraordinary disruption and anxiety, as long as they have familiar words that put the disruption into some larger, dependable, enduring order. The lifeline of security is a language that affirms the enduring truth of the prevailing discourse and worldview. Today, the discourse of the national insecurity state is the nation’s most familiar structure. How natural, then, to reaffirm the fundamental truth of that discourse, especially when its truth seems to be so empirically proven. Certainly, there is a very real danger of more attacks on U.S. soil. But the magnitude of the danger is measured by cultural needs rather than empirical considerations. In the insecurity state, universal cries of alarm, massive preparations for future attack, and protestations that life is fundamentally changed all show how little has really changed. They serve to confirm the basic premise that danger is eternal and unavoidable. The name of the danger changes from time to time; for now, its name is "terrorism." But the underlying reality remains the same. In the face of a massive shock to our cultural assumptions, that promise of continuity is immensely reassuring. This is the paradox that keeps so many millions trapped in the insecurity state. In order to feel culturally and psychologically secure, one must feel physically and politically insecure. Thus the problem¾ the fear of terrorist attack¾ becomes the solution. The film of the towers bursting into flame is shown over and over again. The sheriffs stockpiling gas masks and anthrax vaccine are interviewed over and over again. "Experts" explain "the psychology of the terrorist" over and over again. All of this has a ritualistic quality, for it serves much the same function as every ritual. It acts out the basic worldview of the insecurity state, confirming that it endures in the face of a massive challenge. The dominant response to the tragedy in the U.S. also confirms that our own policies play no role in evoking the danger. This message takes ritual form in prayer meetings, civic gatherings, charity drives, and the Bush administration’s humanitarian gestures for starving Afghans. All enact the essential goodness of Americans. Even the most benign and laudable responses to the tragedy¾ the national pride in heroic rescue efforts, the outpouring of generous contributions, the genuine concern for the welfare of Muslim- and Arab-Americans¾ are seized and twisted in the overpowering cultural grasp of the national insecurity state. As symbols of innocence, all reinforce the basic assumption that the U.S. is powerless to affect the sources of continuing insecurity. Bush has often stated the logical corollary of innocence. if our policies are not relevant to the problem, there is nothing to negotiate. In other words, the U.S. will not contemplate policy changes that might lead to any fundamental change in political or economic power relationships. Therefore the only remaining course is to heighten the nation’s guard and use force to control the behavior of would-be attackers. Much of the response to the tragedy reinforces these interlocked assumptions of powerlessness and innocence. The cries of alarm and defensive preparations create the impression that the nation is circling the wagons and hunkering down for a long siege, because there is nothing else to do. The ubiquitous American flag becomes a symbol, not of abolishing evil, but of banding together to withstand the assault of evil forever. Yet there is almost a palpable eagerness to feel vulnerable. The new sense of national unity comes less from a common commitment to victory than from a common conviction of victimization. Powerful vestiges of the crusading spirit do remain. There is still a longing for unconditional triumph over the foreign foe. The constant allusions to Pearl Harbor, FDR, and World War II express these longings. More importantly, they create the illusion that genuine security is still possible. It is disconcerting to live amidst insecurity and even more disconcerting to acknowledge it openly. So the story of the "good war" is evoked endlessly, because it would be so reassuring to be able to wage another "good war." But the gestures of apocalyptic hope have a peculiarly forced, artificial quality, as if the public is trying to draw the last vestiges of living marrow out of an increasingly dead husk. The symbols, rituals, and mantras of the redeemer nation serve a very different role when public culture no longer really believes in the redemption. The problem is defined in apocalyptic terms. But no apocalyptic solution is available, nor even suggested. Talk of hope for security still elicits powerful images of the peril we hope to be secure from. But talk of peril is simply talk of peril, not a prelude to hope. There are no safe homes we can return to, for we must assume that the enemy, in one form or another, will always be at our gates. Political leaders and pundits offer only an endless horizon of unflagging efforts to maintain relative stability. In an inherently unstable world, made less stable by a superpower pursuing control, this is indeed "a task that does not end." All that once symbolized hope for the Kingdom of God on earth (whether in religious or secular form) now locks us into a future of inconclusive struggle and mounting anxiety. And the more we are convinced that insecurity is perpetual, the more we will resist fundamental change. That, of course, is the ultimate point. The prospect of another long, twilight struggle returns our culture to the certitude of simplistic absolutes. It erases the uncertainties of the ‘90s. It reassures us that nothing has really changed and nothing need ever change. It offers the best reason to go on resisting change. All of the preparations for and acts of war, all the warnings of and protections against future attacks, all the patriotic singing and flag-waving, all the gestures of hope that things will be better in the future, indeed all the dominant cultural responses to the attacks¾ all are now representations of the overriding conviction that security is still an impossible dream, that the future will not be fundamentally different from the present. In a society so fearful of change, where constant change provokes widespread despair, the conviction of unchanging insecurity engenders a strange kind of confidence. Millions now look ahead with more hope precisely because they can now believe that there is nothing really new to hope for. They cling to the insecurity that justifies their resistance to change. They take comfort in knowing that the explosions of September 11, which we are told changed everything, could not shake the foundations of the national insecurity state. The official story of the war on terrorism gives them that perverse comfort. For years to come, we shall live in the shadow of the tragic deaths of September 11, 2001. As long as the official story prevails, death will be piled upon death, and suffering upon suffering. The national insecurity state affords no prospect beyond death and suffering. So this war pushes us further into the shadow of the most tragic death of all: the death of hope for a better, a more peaceful, a genuinely secure future.

#### Reps shape policy options

**Crawford 2** [Neta Crawford, PhD MA MIT, BA Brown, Prof. of poli sci at Boston University, “Argument and Change in World Politics”, p. 19-21]

Coherent arguments are unlikely to take place unless and until actors, at least on some level, agree on what they are arguing about. The at least temporary resolution of meta-arguments regarding the nature of the good (the content of prescriptive norms); what is out there, the way we know the world, how we decide between competing beliefs (ontology and epistemology); and the nature of the situation at hand (the proper frame or representation) must occur before specific arguments that could lead to decision and action may take place. Meta-arguments over epistemology and ontology, relatively rare, occur in instances where there is a fundamental clash between belief systems and not simply a debate within a belief system. Such arguments over the nature of the world and how we come to know it are particularly rare in politics though they are more frequent in religion and science. Meta-arguments over the “good” are contests over what it is good and right to do, and even how we know the good and the right. They are about the nature of the good, specifically, defining the qualities of “good” so that we know good when we see it and do it. Ethical arguments are about how to do good in a particular situation. More common are meta-arguments over representations or frames about how we out to understand a particular situation. Sometimes actors agree on how they see a situation. More often there are different possible interpretations. Thomas Homer-Dixon and Roger Karapin suggest, “Argument and debate occur when people try to gain acceptance for their interpretation of the world”. For example, “is the war defensive or aggressive?”. Defining and controlling representations and images, or the frame, affects whether one thinks there is an issue at stake and whether a particular argument applies to the case. An actor fighting a defensive war is within international law; an aggressor may legitimately be subject to sanctions. Framing and reframing involve mimesis or putting forward representations of what is going on. In mimetic meta-arguments, actors who are struggling to characterize or frame the situation accomplish their ends by drawing vivid pictures of the “reality” through exaggeration, analogy, or differentiation. Representations of a situation do not re-produce accurately so much as they creatively represent situations in a way that makes sense. “mimesis is a metaphoric or ‘iconic argumentation of the real.’ Imitating not the effectivity of events but their logical structure and meaning.” Certain features are emphasized and others de-emphasized or completely ignored as their situation is recharacterized or reframed. Representation thus becomes a “constraint on reasoning in that it limits understanding to a specific organization of conceptual knowledge.” The dominant representation delimits which arguments will be considered legitimate, framing how actors see possibilities. As Roxanne Doty argues, “the possibility of practices presupposes the ability of an agent to imagine certain courses of action. Certain background meanings, kinds of social actors and relationships, must already be in place.” If, as Donald Sylvan and Stuart Thorson argue, “politics involves the selective privileging of representations, “it may not matter whether one representation or another is true or not. Emphasizing whether frames articulate accurate or inaccurate perceptions misses the rhetorical import of representationhow frames affect what is seen or not seen, and subsequent choices. Meta-arguments over representation are thus crucial elements of political argument because an actor’s arguments about what to do will be more persuasive if their characterization or framing of the situation holds sway. But, as Rodger Payne suggests, “No frame is an omnipotent persuasive tool that can be decisively wielded by norm entrepreneurs without serious political wrangling.” Hence framing is a meta-argument.

### AT: Lomonte

**Lomonte 06- Censorship of college journalism guts civic engagement**

---- this evidence proves that there are multiple alternate solvency mechanisms to benefit college journalism. Your aff doesn't solve funding or retaliation protection issues- that guts solvency

# 2NC

## T Any

#### <Answers are completely scripted in the t-no restriction file>

#### Collapse to Limits—that's where they will lose the round

## PICs

### Police Blotter- Constitutional

#### In the squo police blotters, crime reports put in student newspapers, are constitutionally protected.

**Downey 11** [Sarah Downey (reporter), "Online, you are guilty even after being proven innocent," Abine Privacy Company, 5/20/2011] AZ

More and more people are having “Google problems.” They usually look like this: a) someone got arrested; b) the local newspaper wrote about it; c) prosecutors dropped the charges completely; d) the person’s record was expunged (in other words, the slate was wiped clean); but e) the original arrest article, however, is still online. Now whenever anyone searches that person’s name, the arrest is one of the top Google results even though they’re weren’t guilty. Google: Your new permanent record You can imagine the trouble this causes for the individual seeking the article’s takedown: difficulty getting a job, a promotion, or even a date. It seems unfair that even though the judicial system saw fit to remove all traces of the arrest from the person’s record, there’s no corresponding requirement that the local newspaper do the same. What’s the point of expunging a record when anyone with internet access can bring up an old, bogus arrest? Even if a court of law drops the matter, the court of public opinion has condemned that person for life. The free speech rights of publishers trump those of individuals In the battle of the newspapers versus the individual’s reputation, the law is on the newspapers’ side. They have a First Amendment right to report true information and are under no legal obligation to remove—“unpublish,” as it’s referred to lately—content, even when significant updates have occurred. In our experience, publishers are generally unwilling to remove articles that were factually accurate when written. Their reasoning ranges from lofty (saying they don’t want to “rewrite the historical record”) to lazy (they have a policy of never changing anything). Some publications will remove an article, but only if the stars align and several factors exist: the publication doesn’t have a strict policy against unpublishing, we reach an actual human being, we reach an actual human being who’s in a good mood that day, we’re able to provide documentation of the dropped charges or expunged record, and the person to whom we speak decides that the facts of the particular situation warrant removal. It takes hard work, persistence, and luck. Does it happen? Yes, but you can see why it’s pretty rare.

### AT: Rollback

#### 1. Grant us durable fiat—that means they don’t get to contest the passage of the counterplan

#### A. Ground – They make it such that I can’t leverage all of the literature for why my advocacy is good by contesting whether or not it can be passed in the first place. They undermine the benefits of the aff and makes it impossible for me to win because I can never solve anything. Ground is key to fairness because it determines access to the ballot in round.

#### B. Reciprocity – If fiat isn’t durable it creates a 2-1 skew for the neg because they can win either that the aff is a bad idea, or that my advocacy cannot exist. I have to win both layers in the time crunched 1AR, and they can go all in whatever layer I undercovered in the 2NR putting me in a double bind, making it impossible for me to win in the 2AR, killing fairness.

#### 2. No link- No guarantee that the counterplan is even constitutionally challenged in court in the first place

#### 3. No impact- this evidence doesn’t conclude that the constitution will end up rolling back the counterplan- just that it won’t have too much strength to it

#### 4. No link- if the code covers little speech with a big enough impact which is clarified by the PIC that we read- that means that it isn’t unconstitutionally vague as long as you provide sufficient reason for it- that means that it’s not as narrow