## 1N Solvency Press

1. Most public colleges already don’t have speech codes so aff impacts are non unique because we already know who the racist are even if they aren’t allowed to shout the n – word. FIRE 17 Foundalation for Individual Rights in Education, “SPOTLIGHT ON SPEECH CODES 2017,” 2017

Despite the critical importance of free speech on campus, too many universities—in policy and in practice—censor and punish students’ and faculty members’ expressive activity. One way that universities do so is through the use of speech codes: policies prohibiting speech that, outside the bounds of campus, would be protected by the First Amendment. **FIRE surveyed 449 schools** for this report **and found** that **39.6 percent maintain severely restrictive**, “red light” **speech codes that** clearly and substantially **prohibit constitutionally protected speech. This is the ninth year in a row that the percentage** of schools **maintaining such policies has declined**, and this year’s drop was nearly ten percentage points. (Last year, 49.3 percent of schools earned a red light rating.)

1. Turn: aff solvency assumes that if we talk to racist people they will be less racist, but this is false - if people are unwilling to process new information and will co-opt new ifno like the aff to suit their own needs, then the radical change of the aff is counterproductive. Psychological Studies prove exposure to the opposite side re-entrenches beliefs which means best case for the aff is they get solvency but neg impact turns it.

**Nyhan 05** Brendan Nyhan RWJ Scholar in Health Policy Research School of Public Health University of Michigan Jason Reifler Assistant Professor Department of Political Science Georgia State University "When Corrections Fail: The persistence of political misperceptions" 2005 [www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/nyhan-reifler.pdf](http://www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/nyhan-reifler.pdf)

**The experiments** reported in this paper **help us understand why factual misperceptions about politics are so persistent**. We find that **responses to corrections in mock news articles differ significantly according to subjects’ ideological views**. As a result, **the corrections fail to reduce misperceptions for the most committed participants**. Even worse, **they actually strengthen misperceptions among ideological subgroups** in several cases. **Additional results suggest that these conclusions are not specific to the Iraq war; not related to** the salience of **death; and not a reaction to the source of the correction**. Our results thus contribute to the literature on correcting misperceptions in three important respects. First, we provide a direct test of corrections on factual beliefs about politics and show that **responses to corrections about controversial political issues vary systematically by ideology**. Second, **we show that corrective information in news reports may fail to reduce misperceptions and can sometimes increase them for the ideological group most likely to hold those misperceptions**. Finally, we establish these findings in the context of contemporary political issues that are salient to ordinary voters. **The backfire effects that we found seem to provide further support for the growing literature showing that citizens engage in “motivated reasoning.”** While our experiments focused on assessing the effectiveness of corrections, **the results show that direct factual contradictions can actually strengthen ideologically grounded factual beliefs** – an empirical finding with important theoretical implications. Previous research on motivated reasoning has largely focused on the evaluation and usage of factual evidence in constructing opinions and evaluating arguments (e.g. Taber and Lodge 2006). By contrast, our research – the first to directly measure the effectiveness of corrections in a realistic context– suggests that it would be valuable to directly study the cognitive and affective processes that take place when subjects are confronted with discordant factual information. Two recent articles take important steps in this direction. **Gaines et al. (2007) highlight the construction of interpretations of relevant facts, including those that may be otherwise discomforting, as a coping strategy, while Redlawsk, Civettini, and Emmerson (forthcoming) argue that motivated reasoners who receive sufficiently incongruent information may become anxious and shift into more rational updating behavior**. It would also be helpful to test additional corrections of liberal misperceptions. Currently, **all of our backfire results come from conservatives** – a finding that may provide support for the hypothesis that conservatives are especially dogmatic (Greenberg and Jonas 2003; Jost et al. 2003a, 2003b). However, there is a great deal of evidence that liberals (e.g. the stem cell experiment above) and Democrats (e.g., Bartels 2002: 133-137, Bullock 2007, Gerber and Huber 2010) also interpret factual information in ways that are consistent with their political predispositions. Without conducting more studies, it is impossible to determine if liberals and conservatives react to corrections differently.33 In addition, it would be valuable to replicate these findings with non-college students or a representative sample of the general population. Testing the effectiveness of corrections using a within-subjects design would also be worthwhile, though achieving meaningful results may be difficult for reasons described above. In either case, researchers must be wary of changing political conditions. Unlike other research topics, contemporary misperceptions about politics are a moving target that can change quickly (as the difference between the Iraq WMD experiments in Study 1 and Study 2 suggests). Future work should seek to use experiments to determine the conditions under which corrections reduce misperceptions from those under which they fail or backfire. **Many citizens seem or unwilling to revise their beliefs in the face of corrective information, and attempts to correct those mistaken beliefs may only make matters worse**. Determining the best way to provide corrective information will advance understanding of how citizens process information and help to strengthen democratic debate and public understanding of the political process.

1. Turn – driving speech underground is good – underground movements are less effective and destructive, and there are still plenty of people who would be deterred and they allow for coalitions of targeted groups to fight back.

**Parekh 12** Parekh, Bhikhu (2012) ‘Is There a Case for Banning Hate Speech?’ The Content and Context of Hate Speech: Rethinking Regulation and Responses. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

**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 oper- ations 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 advan- tage 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**.

#### TURN- empirics show white nationalists just use free speech to get more powerful

Burley 16

"How the Alt Right is trying to create a ‘safe space’ for racism on college campuses," Waging Nonviolence, 10-6-2016, <http://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/alt-right-safe-space-racism-college-campuses/> Shane Burley,

A murmur began in May around Berkeley and the surrounding Bay Area as posters appeared overnight on the sides of buildings and wrapped on poles. Adorned with images of statues of antiquity, these classical images of European men depicted as gods were intended to light a spark of memory in the mostly white faces that passed by them. With lines like “Let’s become great again” printed on them, the posters were blatant in their calls for European “pride,” clearly connecting romanticized European empires of the past to the populism of Donald Trump today. The posters were put up by Identity Europa, one of the lesser-known organizations amid that esoteric constellation of reactionary groups and figures known as the “Alt Right.” **They were part of a campaign around the country enticing college-age white people to join a new kind of white nationalist movement.** While similar posters emerged elsewhere on the West Coast and Midwest, in central California they pointed toward a public event — one directed specifically toward the tradition of free speech at the University of California at Berkeley. Shortly after the posters went up, a brief announcement came from Alt Right leader Richard Spencer and his think-tank, the National Policy Institute. **They, along with Identity Europa and other white nationalist organizations, were planning to hold** an “Alt Right Safe Space” in Berkeley’s Sproul Plaza on May 6. The “safe space” is a play on words for the Alt Right, using the phrase that many leftist-oriented facilities use for a code of conduct that bans oppressive or bigoted behavior. Instead, they intended to make a “safe space” for white racism, the **public declaration of which has become unwelcome in most any space. The plan was to show up and publicly proselytize on the problems of multiculturalism and the need for “white identity.”** Identity Europa founder Nathan Damigo joined Spencer, along with Johnny Monoxide, a podcaster and blogger from the white nationalist blog The Right Stuff, which has become popular in Internet racialist circles (racialist being a term they use, since racist carries a negative connotation) for its internal lingo and open use of racial slurs. Alt Right media outlet Red Ice Creations teamed up with Monoxide to livestream the event, bringing the white nationalist crowd together with their international audience of conspiracy theorists, anti-vaccine activists and alternative religion proponents. While live streaming to their crowd, they came ready to argue. “This guy’s anti-dialogical! He’s anti-white,” yelled Damigo when challenged on the racialist content of his talking points. Race and identity For decades, both the institutional and radical left in the United States has relied on campus activism as a key part of its organizing base. From the antiwar movement of the 1960s to the development of feminist and queer politics to the growing youth labor and Black Lives Matter movement, colleges have been a center for political encounters and mobilizations. The radicalization of students has often leaned to the left because the left’s challenges to systems of power seem like a perfect fit for people expanding their understanding of the world. Amid major shifts in U.S. politics, a space has opened for revolutionary right-wing politics that have not traditionally been accessible to those outside of the most extreme ranks of the white nationalist movement. Today, the Alt Right is repackaging many of the ideas normally associated with neo-Nazis and KKK members into a new, more middle-class culture by using the strategies and language traditionally associated with the left. This means a heavy focus on argumentation and academic legitimacy, as well as targeting campus locations (and millennials) for recruitment. Until Hillary Clinton’s August 21 speech, most people had never heard of the Alt Right. However, it is a movement that has been growing for almost a decade in backroom conferences and racially-charged blogs. It is a kind of cultural fascism, one birthed out of the post-war fascist movements of Europe and given character by a culture of Twitter trolls and populist American anger. Yet, when it appears on campus, the Alt Right’s recruiting is hardly different from the Klan’s attempts to openly recruit members by leaving bags of leaflets and candy at people’s doorsteps. While the Alt Right Safe Space was put together as a joint effort with several nationalist organizations, Identity Europa emphasizes focusing on the youth most of all. The name and branding of Identity Europa are new, but the organization was started years ago as the National Youth Front. Nathan Damigo was an Iraq war veteran going to school at the University of California at Stanislaus when he took over the organization, shifting its ideological orientation from “civic nationalism” to “race realism,” the notion that whites have higher average IQ’s and a smaller propensity for crime than blacks. While Damigo notes that they have a “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy when it comes to gay members, he said that bi-racial and transgendered people would be turned away. For Damigo and others who trade in white nationalist talking points like “race realism,” the differences between races are significant. “Ethnic and racial or religious diversity can actually wreak havoc on a social system, and cause tons of problems,” Damigo said. “I do believe that there are differences between human populations … [T]he distribution of genes that affect behavior and intelligence are already known to not be equally distributed between all populations.” Identity Europa then represents a sort of “fraternal organization” where “European-descended” people can meet and network, working their way towards a kind of campus activism that challenges discourse and educational plans embedded with multiculturalism and egalitarianism. Such organizations have a long history on the right, stretching back to the 19th century fencing clubs and fraternities that popularized the pan-German ideas of Georg Schönerer — an immediate influence on Nazism. **As organizers, however, Identity Europa do not follow the standard playbook for campus activism, which usually involves breaking broad political ideas into organized demands with reachable goals. Instead,** they simply want to cultivate a subculture whose constituents will intervene in public discourse, thereby seeding their well-rehearsed talking points about racial inequality, white sovereignty and the return to heteronormative social roles. While Damigo brags about the growth of Identity Europa, it likely does not have membership beyond a few dozen people on campuses around the country at this point. However, there are reports of Identity Europa posters appearing at different places around the country almost weekly. Outreach to millennials Through its brand of social interruption, Identity Europa intends to foment a revolutionary right-wing culture — precisely the goal shared by Richard Spencer and his National Policy Institute. Spencer has been in right-wing politics for years, first joining as an assistant editor at the American Conservative after an article he published on the Duke Lacrosse sexual assault scandal made him a minor star. He later went to the controversial Taki’s Magazine, known for giving a voice to the shrinking paleoconservative movement and staffing dissident voices from the right who are regularly accused of racism. As he further cemented himself in this “dissident right” world, he developed the term “Alternative Right” to indicate the different strands that he saw uniting against multiculturalism, equality and American democracy. It was in this climate that Spencer founded the website Alternative Right, giving voice to a growing white nationalist movement that built on fascist intellectual traditions in Western Europe and challenged the right-wing connection to the American conservative movement. He eventually went on to take over the white nationalist think-tank, the National Policy Institute, or NPI, originally founded by William Regnery, using money inherited from the conservative publishing house, Regnery Publishing. The organization was meant to center on Samuel Francis, a former columnist with the Washington Times who was let go as he shifted further into white nationalism and associated with racialist organizations like American Renaissance and the Council of Conservative Citizens. Spencer took over the organization after Francis’s death, molding it into the intellectual core of the growing Alt Right movement. Spencer’s goal has always been the creation of a “meta-political” movement rather than one founded on contemporary political wedge issues. He hopes to draw together ideas like “white identitarianism” — a term used to brand the movement as being about European heritage — and the eugenics-invoking “human biodiversity.” Both are terms fostered by the so-called “European New Right” and its leading ideologues. What immediately distinguished Spencer’s role in the white nationalist movement from the older generation was his explicit focus on millennial outreach. For instance, his expensive NPI conferences are dramatically discounted for those under 30, and his new Radix Journal is marketed directly to an Internet culture of disaffected and angry white youths. He was an early proponent of podcasts as a main voice of the movement, a move that has given the Alt Right its conversational tone and made its ideas more accessible. With Damigo, Spencer developed the Alt Right Safe Space idea to exploit the projection of free speech on college campuses, despite the movement’s general rejection of human rights. “I think it’s symbolic as a way of saying, ‘we’re here,’” Spencer explained. “It is very hard to find a student who will rent an auditorium or a classroom,” Spencer pointed out. “You might get shut down by the administration, but there are ways of doing it so that you can get away with it. The only problem with it is that the students will have to take responsibility for it, and students are not willing to do that at this point. And I totally understand.” Spencer has been shut down on campuses before — for example, when invited to speak by far-right campus groups like Youth for Western Civilization, or YWC, on issues like “anti-white discrimination” through affirmative action. YWC was known for riding on issues like immigration and gender rights, bringing radical right speakers like Bay Buchanan to campuses and naming extremist Colorado Congressmen Tom Tancredo as its honorary chairman. The group’s founder, Kevin DeAnna, went on to be a staff person with the evangelical Leadership Institute, which is ironic given that he had converted to a racialized form of Nordic paganism. As the Alt Right grows and gains public recognition in this election cycle, it is becoming less and less likely that it will simply go under the radar as just another radical student group. Instead, Spencer and Damigo hope to express their radicalism publicly, and argue for their own space in public discourse.

#### TURN- alt right groups just stop others from wanting to speak and leads to more joining their movement

Burley and Ross 16

Shane Burley and Alexander Reid Ross. October 6, 2016 How the Alt Right is trying to create a ‘safe space’ for racism on college campuses

The Alt Right, itself, prizes anonymity. Commentators on popular blogs, podcasts and message boards often use ironic avatars to hide themselves from retribution at home or at work. **By embracing elements of the Alt Right along** with xenophobia, economic populism, and rapprochement with Putin, however, Donald Trump normalizes their neo-fascist ideology, **enabling them to step out of the shadows and into the popular political discourse by identifying as “Donald Trump Republicans.”¶ In the years before Donald Trump, there were few groups that walked the line between beltway conservative politics and the far right. One such group is** Students for Liberty, a libertarian student group that has slid toward the Alt Right since Trump’s candidacy and is currently organizing a national conference to discuss the subject of anarchism and its potential for facilitating a left-right convergence. Since Trump’s campaign grew to prominence, however, similar groups have emerged in numbers. Chaired by Campbell University sophomore Ryan Fournier, the national student group Students for Trump came on the scene in an attempt to link up right-wing students with a viable presidential candidate. With 29,000 followers on Twitter and 59,000 on Instagram, Students for Trump takes on the roll of a larger, more legitimate YWC, stealing much of the “hip” appearance that libertarian campus groups had only a couple of years ago.¶ While much of the group toes the mainstream GOP line, sharing social media posts by Sean Hannity and Fox News, there is a significant amount of crossover into the Alt Right. In particular, **Alt Right figure Milo Yiannopoulos,** who calls Trump “daddy,” **seems popular, getting shares from student leaders in the youth Trump campaign.** Portland State University’s Students for Trump chapter has become possibly the most notorious.¶ In May, while Spencer and Damigo plotted out their Safe Space advance, Students for Trump went to battle with multicultural campus groups like the Portland State University’s Student Union. The PSU Student Union challenged the racialist rhetoric of PSU Students for Trump by bringing almost 10 times the number of Trump supporters to an event, overwhelming the discussion with examples of Trump’s racist policies and the problematic behavior of PSU Students for Trump members. With the conversation dominated by counter-protesters, Trump students were put on the defensive, and after words were exchanged the Trump students eventually gave up and left. In response, Students for Trump opened up left-wing organizers to a slew of hateful online trolling from the Alt Right, and disrupted a Student Union demonstration **against the arming of campus police while waving a banner reading, “Thug Lives Don’t Matter.” With a show of support from conspiracy theory magnate Alex Jones and his website Infowars, they confronted many anti-racist counter protesters in April in a heated clash of voices. The confrontational style found generous online support, as Students for Trump continued to resort directly to Alt Right memes on their social media accounts, regularly posting skewed race and crime statistics, as well as quotes from prominent neo-Nazis.¶ Recently, Identity Europa posters showed up on the PSU campus, indicating that the Alt Right students are attempting to make their presence a permanent one.¶ Similarly, University of Michigan students formed Students Against Trump right as Alt Right posters began showing up on campus declaring that “Euro-Americans” were scared of their heritage. Using the Alt Right logo that Richard Spencer recently unveiled at an Alt Right press conference, they hope to plaster Alt Right branding over the traditional racist arguments used by neo-Nazis and KKK organizations.¶ As Nazi-affiliated groups like the Traditionalist Workers Party feel that they have the cultural cache to hold public rallies, a militant antifascist movement also grows in ranks.¶ “These groups basically come to campus to pick a fight with the student body,” said Daryle Lamont Jenkins, founder of the anti-fascist organization One People’s Project. Jenkins has been traveling around the country for over a decade, challenging Alt Right and white nationalist events and leaders and often shutting down their conferences before they even begin. According to Jenkins, successful tactics used against the Alt Right include pressuring school administration, exposing sympathetic students and mounting** a large direct confrontation.

#### Turn: Echo chambers are empirically disproven -- they portray liberal echo chambers as stereotypes which gives trump more support but that’s empirically not the case.

Hanlon 16

(Aaron, Dec 22nd, Assistant Professor of English at Colby College and advisor for Georgetown University’s MLA/Mellon Foundation “Connected Academics” project., “The Myth of the Liberal “Echo Chamber” on Campus”, New Republic, https://newrepublic.com/article/139474/myth-liberal-echo-chamber-campus)

**Even at elite liberal arts colleges,** there’s a lot more dialogue between liberals and conservatives than critics suggest. “After Donald Trump’s election, some universities echoed with primal howls,” Kristof wrote, in a pitch-perfect impersonation of National Review. “Faculty members canceled classes for weeping, terrified students who asked: How could this possibly be happening?” Kristof’s point was that liberals on campus had sheltered themselves from the real world, but this was not the case at Colby College, where I teach. I know a lot of our students and faculty were upset, but I didn’t witness students weeping in despair about the impending Trump presidency, or looking to censor views they don’t share. Yes, some professors canceled classes. But most didn’t. I taught my classes as usual and left my office door open for students looking to talk politics—of any persuasion. Like my colleagues, I wasn’t concerned only for students fearful of Trump, but also those who supported him and might now feel embattled. Indeed, in the weeks following the election, what little I had to say about it in class came with an explicit affirmation of my respect for all of our students, and my openness to political discussion of any kind. When students asked for my thoughts, I was honest, but I also made clear that, like them, I’m a political being with my own positions and values, and I don’t expect everyone to agree with me.¶ **Beyond the classroom, a** campus-wide conversation was also taking place. **A week after the election, faculty members and students from the College Republicans and College Democrats held a panel to consider the implications of the Trump presidency.** Then progressive students began organizing a walkout and march in solidarity with those marginalized by Trump. Students had discussed their plans with the administration, faculty, and other students, and a bipartisan debate ensued about whether a walkout was the best way to protest, and what the protest would mean to different college groups and constituencies. When the march finally took place, students with pro-Trump apparel mingled with the protesters—and did so maturely, without incident, which can’t always be said for political protests in the “real world.”¶ This is just one professor’s observations from one elite liberal campus, but there’s also plenty of evidence to disprove Kristof’s broader claims about a liberal “echo chamber” on campus. He repeatedly laments that only “about 10 percent of professors in the social sciences or the humanities are Republicans,” but a largely liberal faculty doesn’t guarantee a systematic liberal one-sidedness **or indoctrination in the classroom. As my colleague Neil Gross, a leading sociologist of intellectual life who researches campus political bias, notes of humanities and social science faculty:¶ The vast majority of professors focus on teaching students the subject matter of their fields as well as basic skills such as analytical reading, writing and critical thinking. If current events do come up in classroom discussions, the usual pattern is for** professors to promote what they see as open conversation. ¶ **Gross’s research findings appear to hold on the student end as well. A Harvard Institute of Politics** study finds that 21 percent of Republican students nationwide report feeling uncomfortable sharing their political opinions on campus, compared with 8 percent of Democrats. As Gross observes, “if suppression of conservative voices were rampant we’d see a far larger share **of collegiate Republicans concerned about their freedom of speech.”¶** Since there’s little evidence that a left-leaning faculty means only left-leaning ideas are acceptable on campus, what about the effects of left-leaning students? According to the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute survey of incoming first-years, students are entering college with increasingly liberal views (as opposed to colleges “indoctrinating” students with liberal propaganda). One might assume that so many liberal faculty and liberal students would turn our nation’s youth into the worst caricature of the Oberlin protester. **In fact, according to Pew Research Center data, those with a college degree are less likely than those without a college degree to support censoring offensive speech, and they’re more likely to support the idea that “people should be able to say offensive things publicly.”** In other words, contra Kristof, **college students are more likely to be tolerant of offensive speech or opposing viewpoints than those who haven’t had the benefit of a college education.¶** **There is no “ivory tower,” no meaningful separation between the campus and the “real world.” The percentage of college students who also work full-time jobs was almost 20 percent as of 2011, double what it was in 2005.** Among community college students, 29 percent have household incomes under $20,000 per year, and more than 60 percent work more than 20 hours per week. Even at elite institutions that enroll more affluent students, the geographical, racial, and ethnic diversity of students and faculty is not separate from, but a contributing factor to, the ideological diversity Kristof wants to see. I’m a progressive English professor, but my family lives in rural Pennsylvania and I’m among the few of my kin who didn’t vote for Trump. I live in Maine, on the border of very liberal and very conservative congressional districts. The day after the election, a white man pulled up to my partner, a Vietnamese refugee, and yelled “go home!” in her face. My politics offered no protection. In both my job and my personal life, I couldn’t escape into an “echo chamber” even if I wanted to. Thus, when people like Kristof depict students and faculty with cartoonish simplicity, they ignore the fact that we all contain multitudes.¶ **Kristof’s portrayal of campus liberals is just another form of elitist stereotyping, the mirror image of assumptions that every Trump supporter is a narrow-minded racist. By burlesquing progressives in academia, Kristof is making a faux-populist gesture of the very sort that drives the Trump-era right in its contempt for teaching and learning.** Trump and his supporters have no regard for knowledge or debate, and thrive on petty caricaturing of political opponents. The right has turned the learning process that is student activism, with all of its inevitable triumphs and miscues, into national news fodder that’s meant to mock and discredit academia, not to bolster freedom of speech or ideological diversity. In this era of virulent anti-intellectualism, we don’t need more caricatures of academic life, especially from the left. **We need more public intellectuals, especially progressive ones like Kristof, to stand up for the value of higher education—because without it, our political echo chambers**

## A2 Legal Precedent

1. No link – legal precedent isn’t set by universities – its set by SCOTUS which means ending restrictions on speech on college campuses does literally nothing to set legal precedent for civil rights
2. Non-unique: the judicial system have already established relevant precedents via civil rights – this policy isn’t necessary to set crucial precedent
3. Uniqueness overwhelms the link – precedence’s have already been set – most universities don’t ban free speech which means the legal precedent has already been set
4. Material violence outweighs on magnitude – most people don’t use legal precedent in their daily lives but hate speec causes psychological violence that lasts for years

## A2 Protests

1. Policing DA – when students of color protest, universities increase policing which harms minorities and turns case —the ability to drop everything and risk facing police violence is a privileged perspective, meaning only white people are at liberty to show up to your university resistance

Davis 10 Ryan Sinclaire Davis. *An Absence of Solidarity: Anti-Blackness and Deference to White Privilege.* April, 2010. Reclamations. <http://www.reclamationsjournal.org/issue02_ryan_davis.html>. Ryan Sinclaire Davis is a fourth-year student in African-American Studies and Political Science, University of California, Irvine.

**The popular slogan being passed around in the current surge of student activity, “occupy everything and demand nothing” is indicative of a privileged struggle being touted as the “student movement.” For students who have historically found the gates of the university open to them with any and all resources at their disposal, “occupy everything and demand nothing” may be a justifiable tactic. Students of color, particularly the Black subject, cannot afford this; our actions must speak to the particular conditions we face.** **Communities of color have fought** long and hard **for a space within the higher education system and continue to fight for preserving resources** and representation in the curriculum. **Throwing our bodies on the line and not addressing the particulars which shape our university experience is activist suicide.** **Student action is being met with police overreaction.** The Campbell Hall ‘occupation’ was protected by students of color being brutalized 200 yards away outside the Regents Meeting. These were peaceful students protesting the 32 percent fee increase and fighting to make their voices heard. Meanwhile, **the colonization of Campbell Hall lacked police aggression, a fact that most certainly would have been different if it were actually students of color speaking to their conditions—and liberating their hall.**

1. No uniqueness – protests already at an all time high.

**Higher Education Research Institute 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 we**re 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.”**

# 2N

## 2N Nyhan Extension

The 1AC relies on an assumption that when people are exposed to new information or are engaged in a productive dialogue, people will change their minds – ie a Klan member will change his mind after people tell him how terrible racism is or a Wall Street CEO will see student protests and be like “oh yea maybe cap really is bad, I’ll go quit my job and protest” , but this is false – psychological evidence shows that when people, especially conservatives, are exposed to information that contradicts their opinions, even when they *should* change their minds, their beliefs become even more entrenched. People should logically change their mind but psychologically do not. This undercuts the fundamental assumption behind the 1ar solvency press which is that confronting racists will work and they will become less racist which our evidence denies -This is a link turn to the aff – trying to convince a KKK member to not be racist only makes them more racist.

rendan Nyhan RWJ Scholar in Health Policy Research School of Public Health University of Michigan Jason Reifler Assistant Professor Department of Political Science Georgia State University "When Corrections Fail: The persistence of political misperceptions" 2005 [www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/nyhan-reifler.pdf](http://www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/nyhan-reifler.pdf)

Prefer this evidence - It’s a series of 5 studies on college students where college students were given correct information that contradicted their believes on current events in politics and culture and analyzed whether they changed their minds

# Nyhan Methodology

**Nyhan 05** Brendan Nyhan RWJ Scholar in Health Policy Research School of Public Health University of Michigan Jason Reifler Assistant Professor Department of Political Science Georgia State University "When Corrections Fail: The persistence of political misperceptions" 2005 [www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/nyhan-reifler.pdf](http://www.dartmouth.edu/~nyhan/nyhan-reifler.pdf)

To evaluate the effects of corrective information, **we conducted four experiments in which subjects read mock newspaper articles containing a statement from a political figure that reinforces a widespread misperception**. **Participants were randomly assigned to read articles that either included or did not include corrective information immediately after a false or misleading statement** (see appendix for the full text of all four articles). **They were then asked to answer a series of factual and opinion questions**. Because so little is known about the effectiveness of corrective information in contemporary politics, we designed the experiments to be realistic as possible in capturing how citizens actually receive information about politics. First, we focus on controversial political issues from contemporary American politics (the war in Iraq, tax cuts, and stem cell research) rather than the hypothetical stories commonly found in psychology research (e.g. Johnson and Seifert 1994). As a result, **our experiments seek to correct pre-existing misperceptions rather than constructing them within the experiment**. While this choice is likely to make misperceptions more difficult to change, it increases our ability to address the motivating concern of this research – correcting misperceptions in the real world. In addition, we test the effectiveness of corrective information in the context of news reports, one of the primary mechanisms by which citizens acquire information. In order to maximize realism, we constructed the mock news articles using text from actual articles whenever possible. Given our focus on pre-existing misperceptions, it is crucial to use experiments, which allow us to disentangle the correlations between factual beliefs and opinion that frustrate efforts to understand the sources of real-world misperceptions using survey research (e.g. Kull, Ramsay, and Lewis 2003). For instance, rather than simply noting that misperceptions about Iraqi WMD are high among conservatives (a finding which could have many explanations), we can randomize subjects across conditions (avoiding estimation problems due to pre-existing individual differences in knowledge, ideology, etc.) and test the effectiveness of corrections for that group and for subjects as a whole. A final research design choice was to use a between-subjects design in which we compared misperceptions across otherwise identical subjects who were randomly assigned to different experimental conditions. This decision was made to maximize the effect of the corrections. A within-subjects design in which we compared beliefs in misperceptions before and after a correction would anchor subjects’ responses on their initial response, weakening the potential for an effective correction or a backfire effect. **The experiments we present in this paper were all conducted in an online survey environment with undergraduates at a Catholic university in the Midwest**.11 **Study 1, conducted in fall 2005, tests the effect of a correction on the misperception that Iraq had WMD immediately before the war in Iraq. Study 2, which was conducted in spring 2006, includes a second version of the Iraq WMD experiment as well as experiments attempting to correct misperceptions about the effect of tax cuts on revenue and federal policy toward stem cell research**. As noted above, we define misperceptions to include both false and unsubstantiated beliefs about the world. We therefore consider two issues (the existence of Iraqi WMD and the effect of the Bush tax cuts on revenue) in which misperceptions are contradicted by the best available evidence, plus a third case (the belief that President Bush “banned” stem cell research) in which the misperception is demonstrably incorrect. **STUDY 1: FALL 2005** **The first experiment** we conducted, which took place in fall 2005, **tested the effect of a correction embedded in a news report on beliefs that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction immediately before the U.S. invasion**. **One of the primary rationales for war offered by the Bush administration was Iraq’s alleged possession of biological and chemical weapons**. Perhaps as a result, many Americans failed to accept or did not find out that WMD were never found inside the country. **This misperception**, which persisted long after the evidence against it had become overwhelming, **was closely linked to support for President Bush** (Kull, Ramsay, and Lewis 2003).12 One possible explanation for the prevalence of the WMD misperception is that journalists failed to adequately factcheck Bush administration statements suggesting the U.S. had found WMD in Iraq (e.g. Allen 2003). As such, we test a correction condition embedded in a mock news story (described further below) in which a statement that could be interpreted as suggesting that Iraq did have WMD is followed by a clarification that WMD had not been found. **A**nother **plausible explanation for why Americans were failing to update their beliefs about Iraqi WMD is fear of death in the wake of September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks**. To test this possibility, we drew on terror management theory (TMT), which researchers have suggested may help explain responses to 9/11 (Pyszczynski, Solomon, and Greenberg 2003). TMT research shows that **reminders of death create existential anxiety that subjects manage by becoming more defensive of their cultural worldview and hostile toward outsiders**. Previous studies have found that increasing the salience of subjects’ mortality increased support for President Bush and for U.S. military interventions abroad among conservatives (Cohen et al. 2005, Landau et al. 2004, Pyszczynski et al. 2006) and created increased aggressiveness toward people with differing political views (McGregor et al. 1998), but the effect of mortality salience on both support for misperceptions about Iraq and the correction of them has not been tested. We therefore employed a mortality salience manipulation to see if it increased WMD misperceptions or reduced the effectiveness of the correction treatment. Method 130 participants13 were randomly assigned to one of four treatments in a 2 (correction condition) x 2 (mortality salience) design.14 The appendix provides the full text of the article that was used in the experiment. Subjects in the mortality salience condition are asked to “Please briefly describe the emotions that the thought of your own death arouses in you” and to “Jot down, as specifically as you can, what you think will happen to you as you physically die and once you are physically dead.” (Controls were asked versions of the same questions in which watching television is substituted for death.) **After a distracter task, subjects were then asked to read a mock news article attributed to the Associated Press that reports on a Bush campaign stop in Wilkes-Barre, PA during October 2004**. **The article describes Bush’s remarks as “a rousing, no-retreat defense of the Iraq war” and quotes a line from the speech he actually gave in WilkesBarre on the day the Duelfer Report was released** (Priest and Pincus 2004): “There was a risk, a real risk, that Saddam Hussein would pass weapons or materials or information to terrorist networks, and in the world after September the 11th, that was a risk we could not afford to take.” **Such wording may falsely suggest to listeners that Saddam Hussein did have WMD that he could have passed to terrorists after September 11, 2001**. **In the correction condition, the story then discusses the release of the Duelfer Report, which documents the lack of Iraqi WMD stockpiles or an active production program immediately prior to the US invasion**. 15 **After reading the article, subjects were asked to state whether they agreed with this statement: “Immediately before the U.S. invasion, Iraq had an active weapons of mass destruction program, the ability to produce these weapons, and large stockpiles of WMD, but Saddam Hussein was able to hide or destroy these weapons right before U.S. forces arrived.” 16 Responses were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5)**.17