## 1AC

### Fwk

#### Adopting the perspective of the oppressed is the only way to account for dominant ideologies that skew our thought processes.

Mills 5 Charles W. Mills (John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy) ““Ideal Theory” as Ideology” Hypatia vol. 20, no. 3 (Summer 2005) JW

Now what distinguishes ideal theory is not merely the use of ideals, since obviously nonideal theory can and will use ideals also (certainly it will appeal to the moral ideals, if it may be more dubious about the value of invoking idealized human capacities). What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual. As O’Neill emphasizes, this is not a necessary corollary of the operation of abstraction itself, since one can have abstractions of the ideal-as-descriptive-model type that abstract without idealizing. But ideal theory either tacitly represents the actual as a simple deviation from the ideal, not worth theorizing in its own right, or claims that starting from the ideal is at least the best way of realizing it. Ideal theory as an approach will then utilize as its basic apparatus some or all of the following concepts and assumptions (there is necessarily a certain overlap in the list, since they all intersect with one another): An idealized social ontology. Moral theory deals with the normative, but it cannot avoid some characterization of the human beings who make up the society, and whose interactions with one another are its subject. So some overt or tacit social ontology has to be presupposed. An idealized social ontology of the modern type (as against, say, a Platonic or Aristotelian type) will typically assume the abstract and undifferentiated equal atomic individuals of classical liberalism. Thus it will abstract away from relations of structural domination, exploitation, coercion, and oppression, which in reality, of course, will profoundly shape the ontology of those same individuals, locating them in superior and inferior positions in social hierarchies of various kinds. • Idealized capacities. The human agents as visualized in the theory will also often have completely unrealistic capacities attributed to them—unrealistic even for the privileged minority, let alone those subordinated in different ways, who would not have had an equal opportunity for their natural capacities to develop, and who would in fact typically be disabled in crucial respects. • Silence on oppression. Almost by defi nition, it follows from the focus of ideal theory that little or nothing will be said on actual historic oppression and its legacy in the present, or current ongoing oppression, though these may be gestured at in a vague or promissory way (as something to be dealt with later). Correspondingly, the ways in which systematic oppression is likely to shape the basic social institutions (as well as the humans in those institutions) will not be part of the theory’s concern, and this will manifest itself in the absence of ideal-as-descriptive-model concepts that would provide the necessary macroand micro-mapping of that oppression, and that are requisite for understanding its reproductive dynamic. • Ideal social institutions. Fundamental social institutions such as the family, the economic structure, the legal system, will therefore be conceptualized in ideal-as-idealized-model terms, with little or no sense of how their actual workings may systematically disadvantage women, the poor, and racial minorities. • An idealized cognitive sphere. Separate from, and in addition to, the idealization of human capacities, what could be termed an idealized cognitive sphere will also be presupposed. In other words, as a corollary of the general ignoring of oppression, the consequences of oppression for f the social cognition of these agents, both the advantaged and the disadvantaged, will typically not be recognized, let alone theorized. A general social transparency will be presumed, with cognitive obstacles minimized as limited to biases of self-interest or the intrinsic difficulties of understanding the world, and little or no attention paid to the distinctive role of hegemonic ideologies and group-specifi c experience in distorting our perceptions and conceptions of the social order.

#### Thus, the standard is minimizing oppression.

#### Oppression is created by social systems so only a focus on material conditions can solve.

Johnson no date Allan Johnson (PhD in sociology, he joined the sociology department at Wesleyan University) <http://www.cabrillo.edu/~lroberts/AlanJohnsonWhatCanWeDO001.pdf> JW

Privilege is a feature of social systems, not individuals. People have or don't have privilege depending on the system they're in and the social categories other people put them in. To say, then, that I have race privilege says less about me personally than it does about the society we all live in and how it is organized to assign privilege on the basis of a socially defined set of racial categories that change historically and often overlap. The challenge facing me as an individual has more to do with how I participate in society as a recipient of race privilege and how those choices oppose or support the system itself. In dealing with the problem of privilege, we have to get used to being surrounded by paradox. Very often those who have privilege don't know it, for example, which is a key aspect of privilege. Also paradoxical is the fact that privilege doesn't necessarily lead to a "good life," which can prompt people in privileged groups to deny resentfully that they even have it. But privilege doesn't equate with being happy. It involves having what others don't have and the struggle to hang on to it at their expense, neither of which is a recipe for joy, personal fulfillment, or spiritual contentment.... To be an effective part of the solution, we have to realize that privilege and oppression are not a thing of the past. It's [is] happening right now. It isn't just a collection of wounds inflicted long ago that now need to be healed. The wounding goes on as I write these words and as you read them, and unless people work to change the system that promotes it, personal healing by itself cannot be the answer. Healing wounds is no more a solution to the oppression that causes the wounding than military hospitals are a solution to war. Healing is a necessary process, but it isn't enough.... Since privilege is rooted primarily in systems—such as families, schools, and workplaces—change isn't simply a matter of changing people. People, of course, will have to change in order for systems to change, but the most important point is that changing people isn't enough. The solution also has to include entire systems, such as capitalism, whose paths of least resistance shape how we feel, think, and behave as individuals, how we see ourselves and one another.

#### The role of the ballot is to evaluate the simulated consequences of the aff policy. Prefer this

#### 1. The state is inevitable- speaking the language of power through policymaking is the only way to create social change in debate.

Coverstone 5 Alan Coverstone (masters in communication from Wake Forest, longtime debate coach) “Acting on Activism: Realizing the Vision of Debate with Pro-social Impact” Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Conference November 17th 2005 JW 11/18/15

An important concern emerges when Mitchell describes reflexive fiat as a contest strategy capable of “eschewing the power to directly control external actors” (1998b, p. 20). Describing debates about what our government should do as attempts to control outside actors is debilitating and disempowering. Control of the US government is exactly what an active, participatory citizenry is supposed to be all about. After all, if democracy means anything, it means that citizens not only have the right, they also bear the obligation to discuss and debate what the government should be doing. Absent that discussion and debate, much of the motivation for personal political activism is also lost. Those who have co-opted Mitchell’s argument for individual advocacy often quickly respond that nothing we do in a debate round can actually change government policy, and unfortunately, an entire generation of debaters has now swallowed this assertion as an article of faith. The best most will muster is, “Of course not, but you don’t either!” The assertion that nothing we do in debate has any impact on government policy is one that carries the potential to undermine Mitchell’s entire project. If there is nothing we can do in a debate round to change government policy, then we are left with precious little in the way of pro-social options for addressing problems we face. At best, we can pursue some Pilot-like hand washing that can purify us as individuals through quixotic activism but offer little to society as a whole. It is very important to note that Mitchell (1998b) tries carefully to limit and bound his notion of reflexive fiat by maintaining that because it “views fiat as a concrete course of action, it is bounded by the limits of pragmatism” (p. 20). Pursued properly, the debates that Mitchell would like to see are those in which the relative efficacy of concrete political strategies for pro-social change is debated. In a few noteworthy examples, this approach has been employed successfully, and I must say that I have thoroughly enjoyed judging and coaching those debates. The students in my program have learned to stretch their understanding of their role in the political process because of the experience. Therefore, those who say I am opposed to Mitchell’s goals here should take care at such a blanket assertion. However, contest debate teaches students to combine personal experience with the language of political power. Powerful personal narratives unconnected to political power are regularly co-opted by those who do learn the language of power. One need look no further than the annual state of the Union Address where personal story after personal story is used to support the political agenda of those in power. The so-called role-playing that public policy contest debates encourage promotes active learning of the vocabulary and levers of power in America. Imagining the ability to use our own arguments to influence government action is one of the great virtues of academic debate. Gerald Graff (2003) analyzed the decline of argumentation in academic discourse and found a source of student antipathy to public argument in an interesting place. I’m up against…their aversion to the role of public spokesperson that formal writing presupposes. It’s as if such students can’t imagine any rewards for being a public actor or even imagining themselves in such a role. This lack of interest in the public sphere may in turn reflect a loss of confidence in the possibility that the arguments we make in public will have an effect on the world. Today’s students’ lack of faith in the power of persuasion reflects the waning of the ideal of civic participation that led educators for centuries to place rhetorical and argumentative training at the center of the school and college curriculum. (Graff, 2003, p. 57) The power to imagine public advocacy that actually makes a difference is one of the great virtues of the traditional notion of fiat that critics deride as mere simulation. Simulation of success in the public realm is far more empowering to students than completely abandoning all notions of personal power in the face of governmental hegemony by teaching students that “nothing they can do in a contest debate can ever make any difference in public policy.” Contest debating is well suited to rewarding public activism if it stops accepting as an article of faith that personal agency is somehow undermined by the so-called role playing in debate. Debate is role-playing whether we imagine government action or imagine individual action. Imagining myself starting a socialist revolution in America is no less of a fantasy than imagining myself making a difference on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, both fantasies influenced my personal and political development virtually ensuring a life of active, pro-social, political participation. Neither fantasy reduced the likelihood that I would spend my life trying to make the difference I imagined. One fantasy actually does make a greater difference: the one that speaks the language of political power. The other fantasy disables action by making one a laughingstock to those who wield the language of power. Fantasy motivates and role-playing trains through visualization. Until we can imagine it, we cannot really do it. Role-playing without question teaches students to be comfortable with the language of power, and that language paves the way for genuine and effective political activism. Debates over the relative efficacy of political strategies for pro-social change must confront governmental power at some point. There is a fallacy in arguing that movements represent a better political strategy than voting and person-to-person advocacy. Sure, a full-scale movement would be better than the limited voice I have as a participating citizen going from door to door in a campaign, but so would full-scale government action. Unfortunately, the gap between my individual decision to pursue movement politics and the emergence of a full-scale movement is at least as great as the gap between my vote and democratic change. They both represent utopian fiat. Invocation of Mitchell to support utopian movement fiat is simply not supported by his work, and too often, such invocation discourages the concrete actions he argues for in favor of the personal rejectionism that under girds the political cynicism that is a fundamental cause of voter and participatory abstention in America today.

#### 2. The 1AC acknowledges the state is bad in many ways. However, the aff uses state as heuristic which doesn’t affirm its legitimacy but allows enhanced governmental resistance.

Zanotti 14 Dr. Laura Zanotti (Associate Professor of Political Science at Virginia Tech) “Governmentality, Ontology, Methodology: Re-thinking Political Agency in the Global World” – Alternatives: Global, Local, Political – vol 38(4):p. 288-304,. A little unclear if this is late 2013 or early 2014 – The Stated “Version of Record” is Feb 20, 2014, but was originally published online on December 30th, 2013. Obtained via Sage Database

By questioning substantialist representations of power and subjects, inquiries on the possibilities of political agency are reframed in a way that focuses on power and subjects’ relational character and the contingent processes of their (trans)formation in the context of agonic relations. Options for resistance to governmental scripts are not limited to ‘‘rejection,’’ ‘‘revolution,’’ or ‘‘dispossession’’ to regain a pristine ‘‘freedom from all constraints’’ or an immanent ideal social order. It is found instead in multifarious and contingent struggles that are constituted within the scripts of governmental rationalities and at the same time exceed and transform them. This approach questions oversimplifications of the complexities of liberal political rationalities and of their interactions with non-liberal political players and nurtures a radical skepticism about identifying universally good or bad actors or abstract solutions to political problems. International power interacts in complex ways with diverse political spaces and within these spaces it is appropriated, hybridized, redescribed, hijacked, and tinkered with. Governmentality as a heuristic focuses on performing complex diagnostics of events. It invites historically situated explorations and careful differentiations rather than overarching demonizations of ‘‘power,’’ romanticizations of the ‘‘rebel’’ or the ‘‘the local.’’ More broadly, theoretical formulations that conceive the subject in non-substantialist terms and focus on processes of subjectification, on the ambiguity of power discourses, and on hybridization as the terrain for political transformation, open ways for reconsidering political agency beyond the dichotomy of oppression/rebellion. These alternative formulations also foster an ethics of political engagement, to be continuously taken up through plural and uncertain practices, that demand continuous attention to ‘‘what happens’’ instead of fixations on ‘‘what ought to be.’’83 Such ethics of engagement would not await the revolution to come or hope for a pristine ‘‘freedom’’ to be regained. Instead, it would constantly attempt to twist the working of power by playing with whatever cards are available and would require intense processes of reflexivity on the consequences of political choices. To conclude with a famous phrase by Michel Foucault ‘‘my point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. So my position leads not to apathy but to hyper- and pessimistic activism.’’84

### Inherency

#### Professors on public college campuses use trigger warnings constantly.

Kamenetz 16 Anya (Anya Kamenetz is NPR's lead education blogger. She joined NPR in 2014, working as part of a new initiative to coordinate on-air and online coverage of learning.) “Half Of Professors In NPR Ed Survey Have Used 'Trigger Warnings'” NPR September 7th 2016 <http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2016/09/07/492979242/half-of-professors-in-npr-ed-survey-have-used-trigger-warnings>

This school year, the University of Chicago has put the debate over "trigger warnings" on campus back in the news. The University [told incoming freshmen](http://www.npr.org/2016/08/26/491531869/university-of-chicago-tells-freshmen-it-does-not-support-trigger-warnings) that, because of its commitment to freedom of expression, it does not support warnings to students about potentially difficult material. But amid all the attention to trigger warnings, there have been very few facts about exactly how common they are and how they're used. NPR Ed sent out a survey last fall to faculty members at colleges and universities around the country. We focused specifically on the types of institutions most students attend — not the elite private universities most often linked to the "trigger warning" idea. We received more than 800 responses, and this month as the issue once again made headlines we followed up with some of those professors. Here are some of our key findings: About half of professors said they've used a trigger warning in advance of introducing potentially difficult material. Most said they did so of their own volition, not because of a student's request or an administrative policy. This was not a scientific sample, but it's one of the larger and more representative polls to be published on the topic to date. Our sample included 829 instructors of undergraduates. Just over half of our respondents, 53.9 percent, said they teach at public four-year institutions and 27 percent said they were at two-year institutions. These instructors were overwhelmingly familiar with trigger warnings: 86 percent knew the term and 56 percent said they had heard of colleagues who had used them. But only 1.8 percent said, as of last fall, that their institutions had any official policies about their use.

### Plan Text

#### Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not require that professors and faculty use trigger warnings.

#### The plan falls under the purview of the topic—the Court has interpreted colleges as deserving special amounts of protection because they are marketplaces of ideas.

Doll 16 Jordan (Honors, Oberlin College Politics Department) “Trauma and Free Speech in Higher Education: Do Trigger Warnings Threaten First Amendment Rights?” Spring 2016 JW

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”10 The relatively simple language of the US Constitution’s First Amendment belies the complexity of these rights. Differing interpretation abound. What is speech? What is the value of speech? When, if ever, can the government limit an individual’s right to speak? The rationale of the First Amendment—why we need this amendment in the first place—is significant to the discourse on the constitutionality of trigger warnings. Freedom of expression has never been absolute in America. The Court has long held that restraints on free expression may be “permitted for appropriate reasons.”11 Laws during colonial America punished seditious libel against elected officials. After the ratification of the Constitution, the Sedition Act of 1798 was used to prosecute publishers of “false, scandalous, and malicious writing or writings against the government of the United States”.12 (The act was rigorously enforced until 1801 when President Thomas Jefferson pardoned all convicted under the act.) The Sedition Act resulted partly from foreign policy tensions between the US and France. Foreign policy concerns continued to spawn infringements on speech into the 20th century. During WWI the Espionage Act outlawed speech intended “to incite, provoke or encourage resistance to the United States.”13 The Supreme Court ruled this Act did not violate the First Amendment in 1919.14 Today, laws that restrict speech during certain times and at certain places, laws that restrict speech that incites imminent lawless action, and other restrictions are constitutional. The Supreme Court often references the purpose of the First Amendment to justify constitutional abridgments. Because limits on free speech are sometimes constitutional, the purpose of the First Amendment is not singularly and unequivocally to protect all forms of expression. The most common rationals for the First Amendment include promoting self- government, self-fulfillment and autonomy, and pursuing and discovering truth. The last is most applicable to a legal analysis of trigger warnings. This paper works off the assumption that higher education is an institutionalized search for truth. Professors and students come together to learn, question, and discover. College admissions sites tout their institutions as spaces for thinking critically, discovering one’s passion, and learning about the world. Legal scholars construct higher education as essential for the pursuit of truth. Legal scholar David Rabban argues that "constitutional academic freedom . . . provide professors more protection for professional speech and less protection for unprofessional speech than the free speech clause would afford the same statements by nonacademics" (227).15 The Courts have argued universities inhabit “a peculiar place in the marketplace of ideas”,16 and have a unique level of protection to preserve an environment of exploration, speculation, and a spirit of free inquiry. The Court often cites the marketplace of ideas as a model for the pursuit of truth in the USA. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes first used the concept to defend First Amendment rights in 1919. The search-for-truth rational is partly based in the writing of John Stuart Mill, who articulated this concept in his essay On Liberty.17 John Stuart Mill, a 19th century philosopher and economist, envisioned a society where rational individuals could consider and choose from all ideas and forms of expression. As in a free market economy, the demand for the best ideas would drive up the supply of those ideas. Ideas that were not up to snuff would be left by the wayside. All ideas are welcome and necessary in the marketplace, but only the best ideas—the most sensible, the most moral, etc.—survive. The marketplace of ideas is often connected to liberal democracy because it prohibits a central control on discourse. No authority—such as a King or a totalitarian leader—may suppress ideas that contradict their own. Mill’s rationale, a favorite of the Supreme Court’s, frequently justifies the protection of speech. In his dissenting but highly influential opinion in Abrams v. United States,18 Justice Holmes argued that the unimpeded free trade of ideas serves the “ultimate good” of democracy. “The best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market.” To critics, trigger warnings restrict the free market place of ideas. Trigger warnings may act as censorship, and offensive or triggering ideas will never make it to the market place. For example, classroom materials described as triggering in my interviews were sometimes deemed unacceptable for the classroom all together. Some students who read a novel that depicted a graphic rape scene in an intro history course argued the book should not be included in future courses; the rape was too triggering. Critics of trigger warnings would argue, if this novel is eliminated from the syllabus for future classes, the work will not reach the classroom, which is an essential component to the market place of ideas at institutions of higher education. The pursuit of truth misses an opportunity to engage with a work because it is too triggering for some students.

#### Trigger warning suggestions and requirements are currently chilling freedom of expression on campus.

AAUP 14 American Association of University Professors “On Trigger Warnings” This report was drafted by a subcommittee of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure in August 2014 and has been approved by Committee A. <https://www.aaup.org/report/trigger-warnings> JW

A current threat to academic freedom in the classroom comes from a demand that teachers provide warnings in advance if assigned material contains anything that might trigger difficult emotional responses for students. This follows from earlier calls not to offend students’ sensibilities by introducing material that challenges their values and beliefs. The specific call for “trigger warnings” began in the blogosphere as a caution about graphic descriptions of rape on feminist sites, and has now migrated to university campuses in the form of requirements or proposals that students be alerted to all manner of topics that some believe may deeply offend and even set off a post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) response in some individuals. Oberlin College’s original policy (since tabled to allow for further debate in the face of faculty opposition) is an example of the range of possible trigger topics: “racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, cissexism, ableism, and other issues of privilege and oppression.” It went on to say that a novel like Chinua Achebe’s Things Fall Apart might “trigger readers who have experienced racism, colonialism, religious persecution, violence, suicide and more.” It further cautioned faculty to “[r]emove triggering material when it does not contribute directly to the course learning goals.” As one report noted, at Wellesley College students objected to "a sculpture of a man in his underwear because it might be a source of 'triggering thoughts regarding sexual assault.' While the [students’] petition acknowledged that the sculpture might not disturb everyone on campus, it insisted that we share a 'responsibility to pay attention to and attempt to answer the needs of all of our community members.' Even after the artist explained that the figure was supposed to be sleepwalking, students continued to insist it be moved indoors."\* The presumption that students need to be protected rather than challenged in a classroom is at once infantilizing and anti-intellectual. It makes comfort a higher priority than intellectual engagement and—as the Oberlin list demonstrates—it singles out politically controversial topics like sex, race, class, capitalism, and colonialism for attention. Indeed, if such topics are associated with triggers, correctly or not, they are likely to be marginalized if not avoided altogether by faculty who fear complaints for offending or discomforting some of their students. Although all faculty are affected by potential charges of this kind, non-tenured and contingent faculty are particularly at risk. In this way the demand for trigger warnings creates a repressive, “chilly climate” for critical thinking in the classroom. Our concern extends to academic libraries, the repositories of content spanning all cultures and types of expression. We think the statement of the American Library Association regarding “labeling and rating systems” applies to trigger warnings. “Prejudicial labels are designed to restrict access, based on a value judgment that the content, language, or theme of the material, or the background or views of the creator(s) of the material, render it inappropriate or offensive for all or certain groups of users….When labeling is an attempt to prejudice attitudes, it is a censor’s tool.” Institutional requirements or even suggestions that faculty use trigger warnings interfere with faculty academic freedom in the choice of course materials and teaching methods. Faculty might feel pressured into notifying students about course content for fear that some students might find it disturbing. Of course there may be instances in which a teacher judges it necessary to alert students to potentially difficult material and that is his or her right. Administrative requirements are different from individual faculty decisions. Administration regulation constitutes interference with academic freedom; faculty judgment is a legitimate exercise of autonomy.

### Adv 1 = Discussions

#### Instead of avoiding tricky conversations, we should open up spaces for meaningful discourse—this requires a concerted effort to reject trigger warnings, which are absent in the real world.

Haidt 15 Jonathan Haidt (social psychologist and professor of ethical leadership at the NYU-Stern School of Business) and Greg Lukianoff (president and CEO of the Foundatino of Individual Rights in Education) “The Coddling of the American Mind” The Atlantic September 2015 <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/>

Attempts to shield students from words, ideas, and people that might cause them emotional discomfort are bad for the students. They are bad for the workplace, which will be mired in unending litigation if student expectations of safety are carried forward. And they are bad for American democracy, which is already paralyzed by worsening partisanship. When the ideas, values, and speech of the other side are seen not just as wrong but as willfully aggressive toward innocent victims, it is hard to imagine the kind of mutual respect, negotiation, and compromise that are needed to make politics a positive-sum game. Rather than trying to protect students from words and ideas that they will inevitably encounter, colleges should do all they can to equip students to thrive in a world full of words and ideas that they cannot control. One of the great truths taught by Buddhism (and Stoicism, Hinduism, and many other traditions) is that you can never achieve happiness by making the world conform to your desires. But you can master your desires and habits of thought. This, of course, is the goal of cognitive behavioral therapy. With this in mind, here are some steps that might help reverse the tide of bad thinking on campus. The biggest single step in the right direction does not involve faculty or university administrators, but rather the federal government, which should release universities from their fear of unreasonable investigation and sanctions by the Department of Education. Congress should define peer-on-peer harassment according to the Supreme Court’s definition in the 1999 case *Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education*. The *Davis* standard holds that a single comment or thoughtless remark by a student does not equal harassment; harassment requires a pattern of objectively offensive behavior by one student that interferes with another student’s access to education. Establishing the *Davis* standard would help eliminate universities’ impulse to police their students’ speech so carefully. Universities themselves should try to raise consciousness about the need to balance freedom of speech with the need to make all students feel welcome. Talking openly about such conflicting but important values is just the sort of challenging exercise that any diverse but tolerant community must learn to do. Restrictive speech codes should be abandoned. Universities should also officially and strongly discourage trigger warnings. They should endorse the American Association of University Professors’ report on these warnings, which notes, “The presumption that students need to be protected rather than challenged in a classroom is at once infantilizing and anti-intellectual.” Professors should be free to use trigger warnings if they choose to do so, but by explicitly discouraging the practice, universities would help fortify the faculty against student requests for such warnings.

#### Generalized trigger warnings in classroom settings hinder discussion by diverting dialogue.

Filipovic 14 Jill (blogger at Feministe. She holds a JD and BA from New York University) “We’ve gone too far with ‘trigger warnings’” Guardian march 5th 2014 <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/mar/05/trigger-warnings-can-be-counterproductive>

It is true that everything on the above list might trigger a PTSD response in someone. The trouble with PTSD, though, is that its triggers are often unpredictable and individually specific – a certain smell, a particular song, being touched in that one way. It's impossible to account for all of them, because triggers are by their nature not particularly rational or universally foreseeable. Some are more common than others, though, which is why it seems reasonable enough for explicitly feminist spaces to include trigger warnings for things like assault and eating disorders. College, though, is different. It is not a feminist blog. It is not a social justice Tumblr. College isn't exactly the real world either, but it's a space for kinda-sorta adults to wade neck-deep into art, literature, philosophy, and the sciences, to explore new ideas, to expand their knowledge of the cultural canon, to interrogate power and to learn how to make an argument and to read a text. It is, hopefully, a space where the student is challenged and sometimes frustrated and sometimes deeply upset, a place where the student's world expands and pushes them to reach the outer edges – not a place that contracts to meet the student exactly where they are. Which doesn't mean that individual students should not be given mental health accommodations. It's perfectly reasonable for a survivor of violence to ask a professor for a heads up if the reading list includes a piece with graphic descriptions of rape or violence, for example. But generalized trigger warnings aren't so much about helping people with PTSD as they are about a certain kind of performative feminism: they're a low-stakes way to use the right language to identify yourself as conscious of social justice issues. Even better is demanding a trigger warning – that identifies you as even more aware, even more feminist, even more solicitous than the person who failed to adequately provide such a warning. There is real harm in utilizing general trigger warnings in the classroom. Oberlin College recommends that its faculty "remove triggering material when it does not contribute directly to the course learning goals". When material is simply too important to take out entirely, the college recommends trigger warnings. For example, Oberlin says, Chinua Achebe's Things Fall Apart is a great and important book, but: … it may trigger readers who have experienced racism, colonialism, religious persecution, violence, suicide, and more. Students should be duly warned by the professor writing, for example, "Trigger warning: This book contains a scene of suicide." On its face, that sounds fine (except for students who hate literary spoilers). But a trigger warning for what Oberlin identified as the book's common triggers – racism, colonialism, religious persecution, violence, suicide (and more!) – sets the tone for reading and understanding the book. It skews students' perceptions. It highlights particular issues as necessarily more upsetting than others, and directs students to focus on particular themes that have been singled out by the professor as traumatic. At Rutgers, a student urged professors to use trigger warnings as a sort of Solomonic baby-splitting between two apparently equally bad choices: banning certain texts or introducing works that may cause psychological distress. Works the student mentioned as particularly triggering include F Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby, Junot Diaz's This Is How You Lose Her and Virginia Woolf's Mrs Dalloway. The warnings would be passage-by-passage, and effectively reach "a compromise between protecting students and defending their civil liberties". But the space between comfort and freedom is not actually where universities should seek to situate college students. Students should be pushed to defend their ideas and to see the world from a variety of perspectives. Trigger warnings don't just warn students of potentially triggering material; they effectively shut down particular lines of discussion with "that's triggering". Students should – and do – have the right to walk out of any classroom. But students should also accept the challenge of exploring their own beliefs and responding to disagreement. Trigger warnings, of course, don't always shut down that kind of interrogation, but if feminist blogs are any example, they quickly become a way to short-circuit uncomfortable, unpopular or offensive arguments. That should concern those of us who love literature, but it should particularly trouble the feminist and anti-racist bookworms among us.

### Adv 2 = Coalitions

#### The overemphasis on creating a safe space pits those with unified causes against each other while ignoring the power structures that cause the traumatic events that they want to avoid talking about.

Halberstam 14 Jack Halberstam “You Are Triggering me! The Neo-Liberal Rhetoric of Harm, Danger and Trauma” July 5th 2014 http://bullybloggers.wordpress.com/2014/07/05/you-are-triggering-me-the-neo-liberal-rhetoric-of-harm-danger-and-trauma/

Claims about being triggered work off literalist notions of emotional pain and cast traumatic events as barely buried hurt that can easily resurface in relation to any kind of representation or association that resembles or even merely represents the theme of the original painful experience. And so, while in the past, we turned to Freud’s mystic writing pad to think of memory as a palimpsest, burying material under layers of inscription, now we see a memory as a live wire sitting in the psyche waiting for a spark. Where once we saw traumatic recall as a set of enigmatic symptoms moving through the body, now people reduce the resurfacing of a painful memory to the catch all term of “trigger,” imagining that emotional pain is somehow similar to a pulled muscle –as something that hurts whenever it is deployed, and as an injury that requires protection. Fifteen to twenty years ago, books like Wendy Brown’s States of Injury (1995) and Anna Cheng’s The Melancholy of Race: Psychoanalysis, Assimilation and Hidden Grief (2001) asked readers to think about how grievances become grief, how politics comes to demand injury and how a neoliberal rhetoric of individual pain obscures the violent sources of social inequity. But, newer generations of queers seem only to have heard part of this story and instead of recognizing that neoliberalism precisely goes to work by psychologizing political difference, individualizing structural exclusions and mystifying political change, some recent activists seem to have equated social activism with descriptive statements about individual harm and psychic pain. Let me be clear – saying that you feel harmed by another queer person’s use of a reclaimed word like tranny and organizing against the use of that word is NOT social activism. It is censorship. In a post-affirmative action society, where even recent histories of political violence like slavery and lynching are cast as a distant and irrelevant past, all claims to hardship have been cast as equal; and some students, accustomed to trotting out stories of painful events in their childhoods (dead pets/parrots, a bad injury in sports) in college applications and other such venues, have come to think of themselves as communities of naked, shivering, quaking little selves – too vulnerable to take a joke, too damaged to make one. In queer communities, some people are now committed to an “It Gets Better” version of consciousness-raising within which suicidal, depressed and bullied young gays and lesbians struggle like emperor penguins in a blighted arctic landscape to make it through the winter of childhood. With the help of friendly adults, therapy, queer youth groups and national campaigns, these same youth internalize narratives of damage that they themselves may or may not have actually experienced. Queer youth groups in particular install a narrative of trauma and encourage LGBT youth to see themselves as “endangered” and “precarious” whether or not they actually feel that way, whether or not coming out as LGB or T actually resulted in abuse! And then, once they “age out” of their youth groups, those same LGBT youth become hypersensitive to all signs and evidence of the abuse about which they have learned. What does it mean when younger people who are benefitting from several generations now of queer social activism by people in their 40s and 50s (who in their childhoods had no recourse to anti-bullying campaigns or social services or multiple representations of other queer people building lives) feel abused, traumatized, abandoned, misrecognized, beaten, bashed and damaged? These younger folks, with their gay-straight alliances, their supportive parents and their new right to marry regularly issue calls for “safe space.” However, as Christina978-0-8223-5470-3\_pr Hanhardt’s Lambda Literary award winning book, Safe Space: Neighborhood History and the Politics of Violence, shows, the safe space agenda has worked in tandem with urban initiatives to increase the policing of poor neighborhoods and the gentrification of others. Safe Space: Gay Neighborhood History and the Politics of Violence traces the development of LGBT politics in the US from 1965-2005 and explains how LGBT activism was transformed from a multi-racial coalitional grassroots movement with strong ties to anti-poverty groups and anti-racism organizations to a mainstream, anti-violence movement with aspirations for state recognition. And, as LGBT communities make “safety” into a top priority (and that during an era of militaristic investment in security regimes) and ground their quest for safety in competitive narratives about trauma, the fight against aggressive new forms of exploitation, global capitalism and corrupt political systems falls by the way side. Is this the way the world ends? When groups that share common cause, utopian dreams and a joined mission find fault with each other instead of tearing down the banks and the bankers, the politicians and the parliaments, the university presidents and the CEOs? Instead of realizing, as Moten and Hearny put it in The Undercommons, that “we owe each other everything,” we enact punishments on one another and stalk away from projects that should unite us, and huddle in small groups feeling erotically bonded through our self-righteousness. I want to call for a time of accountability and specificity: not all LGBT youth are suicidal, not all LGBT people are subject to violence and bullying, and indeed class and race remain much more vital factors in accounting for vulnerability to violence, police brutality, social baiting and reduced access to education and career opportunities. Let’s call an end to the finger snapping moralism, let’s question contemporary desires for immediately consumable messages of progress, development and access; let’s all take a hard long look at the privileges that often prop up public performances of grief and outrage; let’s acknowledge that being queer no longer automatically means being brutalized and let’s argue for much more situated claims to marginalization, trauma and violence. Let’s not fiddle while Rome (or Paris) burns, trigger while the water rises, weep while trash piles up; let’s recognize these internal wars for the distraction they have become. Once upon a time, the appellation “queer” named an opposition to identity politics, a commitment to coalition, a vision of alternative worlds. Now it has become a weak umbrella term for a confederation of identitarian concerns. It is time to move on, to confuse the enemy, to become illegible, invisible, anonymous (see Preciado’s Bully Bloggers post on anonymity in relation to the Zapatistas). In the words of José Muñoz, “we have never been queer.” In the words of a great knight from Monty Python and the Holy Grail, “we are now no longer the Knights who say Ni, we are now the Knights who say “Ekki-ekki-ekki-ekki-PTANG. Zoom-Boing, z’nourrwringmm.”

#### Trigger warnings create a hierarchy of trauma by identifying certain experiences as more or less traumatic. You don’t see trigger warnings for war films but you do for one’s about gendered violence even though both are traumatic.

Filipovic 14 Jill (blogger at Feministe. She holds a JD and BA from New York University) “We’ve gone too far with ‘trigger warnings’” Guardian march 5th 2014 <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/mar/05/trigger-warnings-can-be-counterproductive>

That should concern those of us who love literature, but it should particularly trouble the feminist and anti-racist bookworms among us. Trigger warnings are largely perceived as protecting young women and, to a lesser extent, other marginalized groups – people of color, LGBT people, people with mental illnesses. That the warnings hinge on topics that are more likely to affect the lives of marginalized groups contributes to the general perception of members of those groups as weak, vulnerable and "other". The kinds of suffering typically imaged and experienced in the white western male realm – war, intra-male violence – are standard. Traumas that impact women, people of color, LGBT people, the mentally ill and other groups whose collective lives far outnumber those most often canonized in the American or European classroom are set apart as different, as particularly traumatizing. Trigger warnings imply that our experiences are so unusual the pages detailing our lives can only be turned while wearing kid gloves. There's a hierarchy of trauma there, as well as a dangerous assumption of inherent difference. There's a reinforcement of the toxic messages young women have gotten our entire lives: that we're inherently vulnerable. And there's something lost when students are warned before they read Achebe or Diaz or Woolf, and when they read those writers first through the lens of trauma and fear. Then, simply, there is the fact that the universe does not treat its members as if they come hand-delivered in a box clearly marked "fragile". The world can be a desperately ugly place, especially for women. That feminist blogs try to carve out a little section of the world that is a teeny bit safer for their readers is a credit to many of those spaces. Colleges, though, are not intellectual or emotional safe zones. Nor should they be. Trauma survivors need tools to manage their triggers and cope with every day life. Universities absolutely should prioritize their needs – by making sure that mental health care is adequately funded, widely available and destigmatized. But they do students no favors by pretending that every piece of potentially upsetting, triggering or even emotionally devastating content comes with a warning sign.

#### A consensus of psychologists agree exposure is good and trigger warnings are bad. Trigger warnings cause more trauma than they’re meant to prevent.

Waters 14 Florence Waters “Trigger warnings: more harm than good?” The Telegraph October 4th 2014 http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/11106670/Trigger-warnings-more-harm-than-good.html

Prof Metin Basoglu, a psychologist internationally recognised for his trauma research, agreed to talk to me over the telephone about the issue. He told me it was now generally acknowledged that anxiety-inducing trauma reminders were frequent in trauma survivors. “We come across the phenomenon a lot,” he said. “Our patients come across these cues, these reminders of trauma, and they can provoke distress in varying intensities. They respond with anxiety and distress; all of the memories come up; occasionally they have flashback episodes, which can be quite dramatic and intense.” Basoglu is the founder of trauma studies at the Institute of Psychiatry, King’s College London, but he returned in September to Turkey, where he advises at the Istanbul Centre for Behaviour Therapy and Research (which he also founded). Over the years he has worked with patients with PTSD as well as survivors of mass trauma events, and has been publishing his findings since the early Nineties. Basoglu gave me an example of how wide-ranging and idiosyncratic such triggers could be: “I worked with a torture survivor who had been forced into signing a blank sheet of paper. The authorities used it to say she had signed a confession. She was conditioned to the colour white. She was not able to come close to white socks, for example.” According to Basoglu, “an infinite number of situations can act as triggers”, from characteristic smells, conversations, objects and social situations to watching television, reading a newspaper and listening to the news. In a world increasingly mediated by images and content that we have no control over, does he think it’s advisable for the media to issue trigger warnings? “There would be no point,” he said. “You cannot get a person to avoid triggers in their day-to-day lives. It would be impossible.” But, given a chance to think it over, Basoglu went much further than that. “The media should actually – quite the contrary… Instead of encouraging a culture of avoidance, they should be encouraging exposure. “Most trauma survivors avoid situations that remind them of the experience. Avoidance means helplessness and helplessness means depression. That’s not good. “Exposure to trauma reminders provides an opportunity to gain control over them. This is the essence of the treatment that we are using to help trauma survivors. It involves encouraging the patient not to avoid reminders of trauma, but in fact to make a point of exposing themselves to reminders of trauma so that they can develop a tolerance. “I liken it to a vaccination. You get a small dose of the virus so that the body can develop immunity towards it. Psychologically it’s the same phenomenon.” When asked why he thinks the subject is rousing such strong emotions, Basoglu laughed down the telephone from his office in Istanbul. “Any form of anxiety and distress is impermissible in Western culture,” he said. Then, very soberly, he added: “Anxiety is not an undesirable emotion. It’s a human emotion.” Based on his research, Basoglu believes trauma should not be treated with methods that seek to prevent anxiety, but rather the regaining and reconstruction of a sense of control. He referred to a study carried out after a 1999 earthquake in Turkey, for which thousands of survivors were interviewed, their recovery monitored over a period of time. It showed unexpected results at the time. “To our amazement, those that came across greater opportunities for exposure to trauma reminders recovered faster.” The study showed that the single most important factor that contributed to decline in PTSD and depression among survivors was the return to living at home or in concrete buildings (as opposed to camps where survivors were living in tents). The report stated that living in concrete housing after an earthquake “leads to self-instigated exposure to feared situations, such as staying alone in the house… Exposure helps survivors overcome their earthquake-related fears and to recover from PTSD and depression.” This stands for many victims of rape and abuse too. One of his patients, a woman from Congo who had been gang-raped, was unable to go to the hairdresser because the men who raped her had dragged her on the floor by her hair. “Of course she was in total avoidance of male hairdressers,” Basoglu told me. “Her treatment – her homework – was to go to a male hairdresser and have her hair done. She recovered. Completely.” Basoglu’s team uses various memory triggers for their rehabilitation model. They make a list of avoidance behaviours, based on activities that patients are not able to engage in. The treatment involves going through the list one by one and giving exercises that involve exposure. “Reminders are really the essence of the basic conditions for recovery from trauma,” he said. He claims to have seen a 90 per cent success rate in recovery after six weekly sessions. “We advocate a media campaign whereby the public are encouraged not to avoid trauma-related thoughts or reminders,” he said, talking specifically of mass trauma events. What happens, though, when you take a trauma survivor who is confronted with anxiety and flashbacks out of a mediated or safe environment? Is the outcome the same as it is when it is in therapy? “Many people discover the benefits of exposure for themselves. I’ve seen people who have said, ‘If I hadn’t started driving soon after the accident I’d have never driven again.’ ” There is still the problem of the not insignificant 10 per cent who don’t recover. Also, is it not unreasonable, in a country that is lucky enough to offer myriad paths to trauma recovery, that people might opt for a gentler way to come to terms with their own memories? Still, if there’s a lesson to be learnt from the fury expressed on both sides of the argument, it’s that a culture that panders to the delicate of this world will only feed the more bullying side of the less-than-delicate.

## AT: T-Any

### Counter Interps

#### Counter interp: the aff may *only* read a plan that removes trigger warning requirements. Solves the limits standard—there’s only one aff to prep against.

#### Second counter interp: the aff may read a plan removes trigger warning requirements if the plan text is disclosed on the NDCA LD wiki at least a month before the tournament. I meet. Net benefits:

#### 1. Policymaking – spec lets us focus the debate on a single implementable policy. Free speech without context is just an abstraction—the aff lets us focus on individual instances when it becomes important.

#### 2. Resolvability – the benefits and harms of different speech codes change depending on what the type of speech is—you can’t compare a trigger warnings advantage to a hate speech DA because they’re about different things.

#### 3. Stratskew – whole res means the neg can PIC out of any type of speech, kills fairness since you can scoop the entirety of the aff. Also, moots your standards – if people read PICs then you’ll have to do prep on specific countries in both worlds.

#### 4. Stable advocacy—without spec the aff can shift out of disads by saying specific harms don’t link to general principle—kills fairness since if arguments can be shifted the neg has no shot of winning. This turns predictability and outweighs because the aff can make unpredictable shifts in the 1AR. Also makes it impossible for the aff to engage—its unclear in whole res whether the neg defends the possibility of some speech restrictions, or every speech restriction in the status quo, or just one.

### Reasonability

#### Use reasonability on T with a brightline of the aff lifting free speech restrictions and cards in the literature. You still have link and impact turn ground and generics check which means you could have engaged, I’m in the direction of the topic. Key to substantive education because there’s less unnecessary theory which trades off with topical debate. It’s not arbitrary since I have a justified brightline.

### O/V

#### 1. Generics solve- you can read NCs, Ks, and impact turns. Any reason why speech codes are good also applies to the aff

#### 2. Lit solves- if it’s within the realm of the topic lit you should have cut cards which proves your standards link to laziness, not fairness.

#### 3. Disclosure solves—its on the wiki so you could have done prep. Trigger warnings are talked about extensively in the lit.

### AT: Textuality

#### Any can be specific.

AHD 16 American Heritage Dictionary, “any” Fifth Edition, 2016 <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/any> JW

One or some; no matter which: Take any book you want. Do you have any information on ancient Roman architecture?

#### Multiple grammatically correct interps of the topics means you have to weigh fairness and education first – nuke power could also mean states with nuclear weapons which is a very semantically plausible interp.

#### SCOTUS ruled that “any” implies limitations on the object they refer to.

Von Eintel 11 Kai Von Fintel, 7-6-2011, "Justice Breyer, Professor Austin, and the Meaning of 'Any'," Language Log, <http://languagelog.ldc.upenn.edu/nll/?p=3248> MG

In a recent interview, Supreme Court Justice Breyer lists the five books that have influenced his thinking the most. Among them: J.L. Austin's How to Do Things with Words. Breyer says: JL Austin was an ordinary language philosopher. When I studied in Oxford, I went to one of his classes and I read his books. How to Do Things with Words teaches us a lot about how ordinary language works. It is useful to me as a judge, because it helps me avoid the traps that linguistic imprecision can set. If I had to pick a single thing that I draw from Austin's work it would be that context matters. It enables us to understand, when someone makes a statement, what that statement refers to and what that person meant. When I see the word "any" in a statute, I immediately know it's unlikely to mean "anything" in the universe. "Any" will have a limitation on it, depending on the context. When my wife says, "there isn't any butter," I understand that she's talking about what is in our refrigerator, not worldwide. We look at context over and over, in life and in law. Austin suggests that there is good reason to look beyond text to context. Context is very important when you examine a statement or law. A statement made by Congress, under certain formal conditions, becomes a law. Context helps us interpret language, including the language of a statute. Purpose is often an important part of context. So Austin probably encourages me to put more weight on purpose. It is very interesting that Breyer should choose the word "any" as an example of why context matters. A few years back, there was in fact a Supreme Court decision (Small v. United States) that hinged on the meaning of "any" (pdf of the decision here]). And as it turns out, Justice Breyer wrote the decision for the majority (made up of Breyer, Stevens, O'Connor, Souter, and Ginsburg; ah the good old days). The background: Petitioner Small was convicted in a Japanese Court of trying to smuggle firearms and ammunition into that country. He served five years in prison and then returned to the United States, where he bought a gun. Federal authorities subsequently charged Small under 18 U. S. C. §922(g)(1), which forbids "any person … convicted in any court … of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year … to … possess … any firearm." Small subsequently argued that any court was not meant to encompass foreign courts, only domestic ones. The Supreme Court agreed. The arguments in the decision are a good case study of semantics/pragmatics in the real (well, legal) world. Here are some excerpts: The question before us is whether the statutory reference "convicted in any court" includes a conviction entered in a foreign court. The word "any" considered alone cannot answer this question. In ordinary life, a speaker who says, "I'll see any film," may or may not mean to include films shown in another city. In law, a legislature that uses the statutory phrase " 'any person' " may or may not mean to include " 'persons' " outside "the jurisdiction of the state." See, e.g., United States v. Palmer, 3 Wheat. 610, 631 (1818) (Marshall, C. J.) ("[G]eneral words," such as the word "'any,' " must "be limited" in their application "to those objects to which the legislature intended to apply them"); Nixon v. Missouri Municipal League, 541 U. S. 125, 132 (2004) (" 'any' " means "different things depending upon the setting"); United States v. Alvarez-Sanchez, 511 U. S. 350, 357 (1994) ("[R]espondent errs in placing dispositive weight on the broad statutory reference to 'any' law enforcement officer or agency without considering the rest of the statute"); Middlesex County Sewerage Authority v. National Sea Clammers Assn., 453 U. S. 1, 15-16 (1981) (it is doubtful that the phrase " 'any statute' " includes the very statute in which the words appear); Flora v. United States, 362 U. S. 145, 149 (1960) ("[A]ny sum," while a "catchall" phase, does not "define what it catches"). Thus, even though the word "any" demands a broad interpretation, see, e.g., United States v. Gonzales, 520 U. S. 1, 5 (1997), we must look beyond that word itself.

#### Adhering to the strict resolution text doesn’t produce good debates—topics are written by traditional old lay coaches so modification is key to nat circuit competition.

#### --The “topicality” rule is nonsense – you could also treat my standards like that. The “policymaking” and “stratskew” rules will also produce good debates.

### AT: Jurisdiction

#### 1. Empirically denied – judges vote on non-topical affs all the time and don’t get their contracts rescinded.

#### 2. The tournament rules don’t stipulate this is what we have to debate about, they just list it as a resolution with no external requirements.

### AT: Limits

#### 1. Lit solves –there are only a small number of viable affs with good lit ground. The caselist is just trigger warnings, newspapers, free speech zones, that’s about it.

#### 2. Non unique- if the aff defends whole res, you still have to prep out specific advantages or you’ll still use.

#### 3. T-you overlimit because there’s only one aff under your interp. Even if my interp is slightly too large, yours ensures negs win every round because they would get lots of PICs and reactive prep strategy.

#### 4. Limits standards are bad. They discourage creativity and critical thinking by making us stick to prep instead of thinking outside the box.

### AT: Ground

#### 1. Side bias impact turns—more aff ground’s good since it compensates for short 1AR and neg reactivity that make it harder to affirm.

#### 2. T-the fact that the plan isn’t happening now proves you have qualitative ground.

#### 3. Lots of great ground against this aff – tons of authors discuss trigger warnings good in the lit..

### AT: Breadth

#### 1. T-plans are key to breadth—they let us explore different areas of the topic instead of focusing on the same aff every round.

#### 2. Not everyone reads plans—other rounds solve.

#### 3. Depth is more important—spreading ourselves thin on many issues can be done with articles—only nuanced debates with specific evidence comparison about one policy are educational.

### RVI

#### Give the aff an RVI on counter interps to T:

#### A. Reciprocity—otherwise the neg gets T and theory but the aff only gets theory, kills fairness since you have more outs to the ballot, that’s a structural skew that outweighs substantive abuse which can be overcome by better debating.

#### B. Timeskew—the 2ARs too short to prove I’m T and adequately cover substance in 3 minutes; effective 2NRs will split their time and make affirming impossible.

### Reject the Arg

#### Reject the argument on T—if they win I’ll defend whole res. A. Substantive education—theory layer goes away and we get to debate the aff advantages which still apply—outweighs since education is the only reason people join the debate. B. Aff strat—dropping the debater makes affirming impossible because there’s always some interp that the aff violates.

### Reasonability

#### Use reasonability with a brightline of link and impact turn ground: you can still engage with the aff since most people have trigger warnings good cards. It’s on the wiki proves you could have cut cards. Theory distracts from substantive education which is better than theory because its more portable, we should have had a normal debate.

## AT: T-Trigger Warnings

### C/I

#### Counter interp: the aff can defend removing trigger warning requirements.

#### 1. Precision—their evidence doesn’t account for the way free speech has been defined on college campuses specifically in the past. That’s Doll 16 from the 1AC. Protecting free speech at colleges means preserving a marketplaces of ideas which trigger warnings prevent. Prefer contextual evidence—trigger warning requirements violate the 1st amendment—causes self-censorship.

Doll 16 Jordan (Honors, Oberlin College Politics Department) “Trauma and Free Speech in Higher Education: Do Trigger Warnings Threaten First Amendment Rights?” Spring 2016 JW

Trigger warnings add to an environment that is already inhospitable to nontenured professors in higher education today. Any policy on trigger warnings must seriously consider whether it will encourage professors to self-censor. Any policy that mandates the use of trigger warnings in any form violates the First Amendment. Administrative requirements support an environment in which academic material is handled with plastic gloves, and students are encouraged to complain if material they find discomforting is not marked with a trigger warning. There is a potential slippery slope—students may opt to exclude content that is too triggering; professors then may compromise what they teach to avoid a fight with their class and potentially their 53 of 68 school’s administration. When the cherished prize of tenure is increasingly distant for many, another potential pitfall could lead to self-censorship. If a policy were to encourage trigger warnings, it should not make a laundry list of specific triggers. Specific triggers for individuals are endless—from eggs and bacon, to the color white, to a plethora of other unexpected images, sounds, smells, tastes, and concepts. A specific list of triggering content may also create a hierarchy of trauma. Placing more emphasis on traumas such as rape and eating disorders than traumas such as war and natural disasters frames some life experiences as more important than others. It also suggests certain demographics are less equipped to handle trauma than others. Specifics may unintentionally feed into cultural and legal images of certain groups, such as women.

#### The 1st amendment includes the right not to speak and trigger warning requirements force professors to speak.

US Courts “What Does Free Speech Mean?” <http://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/educational-resources/about-educational-outreach/activity-resources/what-does> JW

The First Amendment states, in relevant part, that: “Congress shall make no law...abridging freedom of speech.” Freedom of speech includes the right: Not to speak (specifically, the right not to salute the flag). West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943). Of students to wear black armbands to school to protest a war (“Students do not shed their constitutional rights at the schoolhouse gate.”). Tinker v. Des Moines, 393 U.S. 503 (1969). To use certain offensive words and phrases to convey political messages. Cohen v. California, 403 U.S. 15 (1971). To contribute money (under certain circumstances) to political campaigns. Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S. 1 (1976). To advertise commercial products and professional services (with some restrictions). Virginia Board of Pharmacy v. Virginia Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748 (1976); Bates v. State Bar of Arizona, 433 U.S. 350 (1977). To engage in symbolic speech, (e.g., burning the flag in protest). Texas v. Johnson, 491 U.S. 397 (1989); United States v. Eichman, 496 U.S. 310 (1990). Freedom of speech does not include the right: To incite actions that would harm others (e.g., “[S]hout[ing] ‘fire’ in a crowded theater.”). Schenck v. United States, 249 U.S. 47 (1919). To make or distribute obscene materials. Roth v. United States, 354 U.S. 476 (1957). To burn draft cards as an anti-war protest. United States v. O’Brien, 391 U.S. 367 (1968). To permit students to print articles in a school newspaper over the objections of the school administration. Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier, 484 U.S. 260 (1988). Of students to make an obscene speech at a school-sponsored event. Bethel School District #43 v. Fraser, 478 U.S. 675 (1986). Of students to advocate illegal drug use at a school-sponsored event. Morse v. Frederick, \_\_ U.S. \_\_ (2007).

#### 2. Topic lit. Trigger warnings are hotly contested right now with lots of articles on both sides. It goes hand in hand with research on free speech since many authors discuss both as problems on campuses.

### AT: Restrict

#### Restrict means to confine

Merriam Webster “restrict <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/restrict> JW

Definition of restrict transitive verb 1 : to confine within bounds : restrain 2

#### Trigger warnings confine speech. That’s AAUP 14.

### Reasonability

#### Use reasonability with a brightline of link and impact turn ground: you can still engage with the aff since most people have trigger warnings good cards. It’s on the wiki proves you could have cut cards. Theory distracts from substantive education which is better than theory because its more portable, we should have had a normal debate.

## AT: Inherency

#### Multiple colleges have explicit trigger warning requirements—many others have implicit ones.

Harris 16 Samantha “Think Trigger Warnings Are Never Mandatory on Campus? Think Again.” The FIRE August 31st 2016 <https://www.thefire.org/think-trigger-warnings-are-never-mandatory-on-campus-think-again/> JW

While I was updating Drexel University’s entry in FIRE’s Spotlight Database, I noticed that the university’s Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment and Misconduct Policy states that “[i]t is expected that instructors will offer appropriate warning and accommodation regarding the introduction of explicit and triggering materials used.” And a quick Google search reveals that Drexel is not alone in instituting this requirement. Identical language can be found in sexual misconduct policies at Bay Path University, Colby-Sawyer College, North Iowa Area Community College, and St. Vincent’s College. And these are just the schools that phrase their requirement in the same terms; there may be others out there, as well.