## 1

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who proves the truth or falsity of the resolution through textual or conceptual args.**

**Standards:**

**[a] – Inclusion. The Truth Testing role of the ballot allows for far more args then the assumed comparative worlds debate. This ROB includes all other args.**

**[b] – Reciprocity. Only way to weigh Ks and other args which test the truth of my position is the Truth Testing ROB.**

**[c] – Affirming or negating means assigning truth or falsity**

**Affirm means as per Dictionary.com – maintain as true**

**Negate means as per Dictionary.com - to deny the existence, evidence, or truth of**

**Presumption and permissibility flow neg: most statements aren’t true, so the resolution is most likely false. Debate is roleplay policymaking, and we don’t pass policies that would have no effect. Just because something is permissible doesn’t mean it is obligatory. It is morally permissible for me to wear a red shirt, but it doesn’t mean I need to wear a red shirt always.**

**A prioris and semantics first – A priori ideas must be discussed first because they control the links to the ethics and framing issues in the comp worlds debate. Semantics too because we must understand the logic of the words we speak right now. Understanding linguistics is essential to figure out the true impacts of any claim.**

**1] Zeno’s Paradox – to complete an action you must go halfway then halfway of that and so on, but this means you never complete it.**

**2] – Curry’s Paradox – implies modus ponens; I say if my name is Sid, you negate. Modus Ponens says that if the first statement is true then the second statement is true, and my name is Sid :)**

**3] – Paradox of Entailment – It is snowing, and it is also not snowing, thus you negate.**

#### 4] – Contestation – Args that would contest parts of my position presuppose the validity and truth of our claims which means they are true.

#### 5] - Perf cons are independent voters. Any proven contradiction of my opponent destroys debatability because they turn into a moving target, and I don’t know which of my opponent’s points they are actually going for and which to actually attack. This creates grounds issues where I don’t know what I am debating, and time skew issues where I must give up my already limited time to either figuring out which point they mean or winning both. This decks fairness and education.

**6] – Principle of Explosion – [a] All songs are made by Carti. [b] Not all songs are made by Carti. [c] All songs are made by Carti or you negate. Since it is clear that all songs are not made by Carti, you negate. Not the [a] point is considered true, and the [b] point is true, the first part of the [c] statement is false forcing, through the principle of explosion, the second part to be true, so you negate.**

**7] – Decision Making Paradox - To do something requires a system of decision making, but choosing one requires another system which seems to cause infinite regress.**

**8] – Carroll’s Paradox - The angular momentum of a stick should be zero, but it is not. Reality is not real which triggers neg presumption.**

**9] – Rule Following Paradox – Even if you think the aff did the better debating that doesn’t mean that you write aff on the ballot. Your general rule of voting for the better debater doesn’t factor me in. You aren’t going off of fact just interpretation, so when I am part of the debate, you’d vote for the neg. “no course of action could be determined by a rule, because any course of action can be made out to accord with the rule”.**

## 2

#### CP Text – In a Democracy, a Free Press ought to prioritize Objectivity over Advocacy, except for instances of Peace Journalism.

#### The CP competes – Peace Journalism is a form of advocacy journalism since it is a form of agenda-setting and framing.

Hakorimana 20, Gratien. Exploring peace journalism practices for conflict prevention in Rwanda: The case study of Pax Press initiative. Diss. University of Rwanda, 2020. (Master's degree, bachelor's and diploma, peace studies and conflict transformation, political science and mass media studies at the University of Rwanda)//Elmer

(viii) Framing theory: it examines how journalists choose what to report on and how they report what they chose. Now, both theories, agenda-setting and framing, are critical in peace journalism because “any meaningful debate about journalism must include some efforts to set out the basis on which some forms of representation should be preferred to others”. Agenda setting and framing theories are often combined together, because they share the focus on the influence of media to the audience. This is why they are recognized as important in the Peace journalism, and other advocacy forms of journalism according to some studies (Ogenga, 2019: 68).

#### Peace Journalism severs Neutrality principles of Objectivity.

Shaw 11 Dr Ibrahim Seaga Shaw (2011) Debates in Peace Journalism, Journal of Peace Education, 8:3, 363-365, DOI: 10.1080/17400201.2011.621380 (Chairman and Information Commissioner, Right to Access Information Commission in Sierra Leone)//Elmer

Chapter 1 sets the context by discussing the more traditional criticisms of peace journalism, based on the view that it undermines some of the important standards of professional journalism – especially ‘objectivity’, which emphasises neutrality and the simple separation of facts from opinion. One of the critics, journalist David Loyn (2007), says peace journalism turns reporters into ‘players’ rather than ‘observers’ and hence renders them ‘over-critical’, which is against the tenets of objective journalism. On the other hand, Thomas Hanitzsch (2007) says it is not possible to associate objective reality with its representation because the latter is inevitably biased; hence he sees peace journalism as not critical enough. Lynch, for his part, criticises ‘objectivity’ that favors ‘event’ (drama) over ‘process’ (structure), ‘official’ over ‘unofficial’ sources, and above all ‘dualism as a template for conflict’, a win–lose kind of situation where the winner takes all. He develops this notion in chapter 2, where he explores pedagogical arguments to help students appreciate the differentiated impact of peace journalism and war journalism as patterns of media response to conflict. Chapter 3 calls for a rethinking of journalism training in countries in conflict to reflect peace journalism as a critical pedagogy, which he describes as a solution-oriented dialogue. Paolo Freire (1970/2000) calls it libertarian education, which promotes reconciliation between the teacher and the student. The author develops this critical pedagogical approach of peace journalism in chapters 4 and 5 with case studies from Indonesia, and in chapters 6 and 7 with case studies from the Philippines. Moreover, these four chapters, as well as chapter 8 (a case study from Australia), use content analysis to demonstrate the extent to which peace journalism’s evaluative criteria are used in the news media discourse. In chapters 9 and 10 the author roundly blames war journalism for the prolonged Palestinian–Israeli crisis as well as terrorism in general, while the final chapter focuses on the reflections of journalists on the reporting and mis-reporting of the 2003 US-led invasion of Iraq.

#### Peace Journalism as advocacy specifically sets up conflict resolution – particularly the Middle East.

Abouaoun 20 Elie Abouanoun 3-13-2020 "Rethinking Media’s Role in Conflict and Peace in the Middle East" <https://www.usip.org/publications/2020/03/rethinking-medias-role-conflict-and-peace-middle-east> (Director, Middle East and North Africa Programs at US Institute of Peace)//Elmer

In 2014, the world watched in disbelief, as global news networks covered the stream of gruesome and horrific beheading videos released by the so-called Islamic State. For the first time, by bringing the terror of the Islamic State directly to the devices in the palm of our hands, it felt personal and close by, rather than across the world in a mysterious land. Without question, the role of the media in peace and conflict is becoming ever more important. While terror groups like IS have been proven effective in their use of media for their sinister agendas, has the rest of the world caught up? As media technologies advance, so too must our strategies to responsibly and effectively harness their power. Sadly, in some cases in the Middle East and North Africa, media have been employed, by both regimes and terrorists, as a tool to cause harm, incite violence and fuel dangerous narratives. With conflict and seemingly unending turmoil ravaging the region today, the role of media is as important as ever in documenting and exposing citizens around the world to the realities on the ground. However, strict requirements and seemingly impossible lists of legalities and compliances imposed by authoritarian regimes result in the suppression of ideas and stories that run counter to the official narrative. This is especially true in states where the government has cracked down on publications that are critical of their policies, which they describe as “fake news.” Too often journalists are targeted for illuminating injustice at the hands of harsh regimes in the region; regimes that are finding it more and more difficult to keep the world in the dark in the modern technological era. It is not surprising then that the region suffers from a lack of access to credible and reliable information; the result of amateurs taking up journalism as part of “democratization” combined with the unfortunate reality that serious journalists are co-opted by regimes to spread disinformation that aligns with official narratives. It is also challenging to decipher fact from fiction, as competing political agendas and international interests try to direct narratives and sway public opinion in their favor. The mix of digital technology, unscrupulous politics and commercial exploitation of the new communications landscape highlights the need for a revised framework of ethics, essential for rebuilding public trust in journalism and media; a framework that reasserts that the core values of accuracy, independence and responsible reporting that have evolved over the past 150 years remain as relevant as ever. The Media’s Power to Build Peace In a recently co-hosted conference in Tunis, Tunisia, the United States Institute of Peace and Al-Hurra Television partnered to address this complex issue and discuss recommendations for how the power of the media can be better employed to promote peacebuilding initiatives and resolve conflict in the region. By enhancing cooperation and coordination among local, independent media outlets in the region to create networks for knowledge sharing, their influence and strength would be consolidated and magnified. Additionally, by educating media practitioners in the region about the critical role they can play in building peace, promoting solidarity and understanding among communities in conflict with one another, they can challenge narratives of hatred and the use of violence as legitimate means to an end. Empowering media practitioners to embrace this role is essential, and there is a great opportunity for the international community to play a role here. With ever advancing media technologies, there are countless creative ways to elevate moderate voices and promote positive chronicles of peace and conflict resolution to change harmful narratives. Looking at the long-term, the region would benefit from developing and delivering media education to communities, beginning from an early age with a focus on using such skills for peacebuilding initiatives and innovatively combatting hate speech. With ever advancing media technologies, there are countless creative ways to elevate moderate voices and promote positive chronicles of peace and conflict resolution to change harmful narratives. Finally, and most essentially, governments of the region must provide the space for peace journalism to flourish to mitigate conflict and reduce tension, embracing the positive role that peace journalism can play in bridging divides. Getting violent and paranoid regimes to provide greater space for independent voices is a major challenge, as the trend line has tended to go in the opposite direction since the so-called “Arab Spring,” toward greater control and even intelligence service dominance over the media. Certainly, media alone cannot reverse decades of deep-seated conflict and turmoil in the region, but it can in fact catalyze modest strides toward understanding, empathy and humanizing the “other.” Restless masses throughout the Middle East are deeply unhappy with the status quo, as demonstrations from Algeria to Iran have made abundantly clear. Despite massive repression and regime media manipulation, many of the old lies don’t seem to work anymore. The region is indeed hungry for truthful representations of its own history with conflict and for accurate depictions of the consequences and human toll of the violence that has devastated the region. Without it, future generations are likely to repeat it.

#### Objectivity hides “War Journalism” that creates Serial Policy Failure and Militarism.

Lynch 8, Jake. Debates in peace journalism. Sydney University Press, 2008. (Jake Lynch is Director of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Sydney, Australia and Senior Research Fellow of the School of Communication, University of Johannesburg, South Africa.)//Elmer

The enduring power of propaganda There is little doubt that the world would be greatly benefited by the spread of peace journalism. Even to posit its existence contributes to our emancipation from the grip of those deadly forms of propaganda so influential in liberal democratic societies. This propaganda remains hegemonic partly because its facade so convincingly claims for itself neutrality and objectivity, which misleadingly implies that the journalist is detached on a principled, professional basis from special interests and ideological agendas. The non-critical pedagogy of war journalism should be viewed as a perfected form of mind control that entraps almost every practicing journalist Most of these war journalists honestly believe that their 'objectivity' makes them truth-tellers, and as such, the indispensable guardians of democracy. Lynch disabuses us of such a perception by showing us persuasively that the beliefs that make war journalism appear respectable are more correctly understood as the results of thorough brainwashing that enlists the fraternity of mainstream journalists into a virtual cult. Despite the many efforts at demystification, war journalism retains its paradigmatic status. This means that those who attempt to explain its harmful social effects are immediately excluded from mainstream channels of communication no matter how strong their credentials. Noam Chomsky, Johan Galtung, Jake Lynch, and many brave others, have done their creative best to open our eyes, and give us healthier ways to conceive of political turmoil, but sadly the long journey to a future where a culture of nonviolence and human security exists has barely begun. It remains a difficult journey that is blocked at every turn by the forces of wealth and privilege in the early 210 century. These forces avoid debate, carrying on their nihilistic struggle to retain pre-eminence by sustaining a near monopoly of sources of information that facilitates the marginalization of competing views. The employers of war journalists have long ago forfeited the benefits of moral and political imagination that might lead to such constructive adjustments in the canon of objectivity due to their addictive reliance on the fixes of violence and war. Despite this marginality there are reasons for peace journalists to work harder than ever. There is gathering evidence that the war system is producing a variety of failures for even the most powerful actors. First, the technology of mass destruction is spreading around the world, and if not eliminated, is almost certain to find its way into the field of battle in the decades ahead. Secondly, the politics of resistance are demonstrating over and over on various blood soaked battlefields again that military superiority does not produce political victory. The United States should have learned this lesson from its defeat in Vietnam, and it did seem intimidated for a while, but it has regressed, presently trying to (mis)represent a disastrous failure in Iraq as victory. Thirdly, the waste of resources devoted to militarism arc watering the roots of mass resentment in many countries, as well as making impossible a series of essential, yet expensive, adjustments to the challenges of climate change. Fourthly, the remarkable transformation of security politics in Europe since the end of World War II provides a laboratory for a framework of relations among sovereign states where war options have been effectively excluded and conflicts are addressed as if nonviolence is the only alternative. If in Europe, long the crucible of war, why not elsewhere, eventually everywhere? Yet so long as war journalism shapes the way we grasp policy options, it is unlikely that any of these realities will be properly appreciated. More likely in the short run is the reinforcement of militarist modes of behaviour; as the utility of military power continues to diminish, war journalists are enlisted to disguise failures by exhibiting enthusiasm for new tactics and the promise of better and more weapons, and to summon the public to display their unified support of official war aims as an expression of patriotic virtue.

#### Middle East Stability goes Nuclear.

Silverstein 21 “Iran-Israel tensions: The threat of nuclear disaster looms large,” Richard Silverstein [writes the Tikun Olam blog, devoted to exposing the excesses of the Israeli national security state], 23 April 2021 <https://www.middleeasteye.net/opinion/iran-israel-tensions-threat-nuclear-war-looms-large> SM

Israel had a near-miss of potentially catastrophic proportions on Thursday. As it has done hundreds of times in the past decade, the Israeli air force attacked Iranian bases inside Syria. In response, Syrian forces fired anti-aircraft missiles of a rather primitive Soviet model, one of which overflew its target and landed some 30 kilometres from Israel’s Dimona nuclear reactor. Israel said recently that it was bolstering its defences around Dimona for just such an eventuality. Although an Iranian general taunted Israel, implying that Iran had some responsibility for the attack, that doesn’t appear to be the case. But the missile landing inside Israel does show that if Iran wanted to attack Dimona, it has the capacity. And despite Israel’s best efforts, an Iranian missile could hit its target. With that, one of the worst nuclear disasters in the region’s history could unfold, including a Chernobyl-type radioactive leak that could endanger not only all of Israel, but also many of its neighbours.A US general has assured a Senate committee that the Syrians weren’t intending to attack Israel. Rather, a misguided missile meant to target an Israeli warplane overshot its target. He blamed it on “incompetence”, as if that was supposed to be somehow reassuring; rather, it only reinforces how easy it is even for a mistake to cause a nuclear disaster.Campaign of terror Certainly, if either Israel or Iran wanted to bomb each other’s nuclear facilities, they could do so successfully. An Israeli attack would probably cause less catastrophic damage, but only because Iran’s nuclear programme is not nearly as developed as Israel’s. An Iranian direct hit on Dimona would cause incalculable damage due to the plutonium reactor at the facility. Nor does this happen in a vacuum: Israel has maintained a decade-long campaign of terror attacks on Iranian military bases and nuclear scientists. Most recently, it bombed the Natanz nuclear facility, destroying the power generation source and damaging older-generation centrifuges. It also attacked an Iranian Revolutionary Guard spy ship off the Yemeni coast this month. Iran has responded in its own limited way, restrained by its need to maintain good relations with nuclear-deal signatories. For Israel, the attacks are a low-risk proposition. It defies US opposition (if there is any) with a wink and a nod, and the attacks look good on Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s résumé. To weather his corruption trial and retain public support, he needs external enemies (and internal enemies, but that’s a different story). Iran provides these in spades.Eliminating Israeli leverage The US could exert control over this scenario by eliminating Israeli leverage. If it agreed to lift sanctions in exchange for Iran’s return to low levels of uranium enrichment, as designated in the nuclear deal negotiated by the Obama administration, Israel’s rejectionist approach would become moot. The problem is that US President Joe Biden is running scared from Republican opposition to any nuclear deal with Iran. Besides, he has designated the Middle East a low priority for his administration. There is some faint hope in the US announcement that it is ready to lift a partial set of sanctions. However, the list on offer is quite limited, and will certainly not satisfy the Iranians. Such half-measures present an example of the limitations of the Biden approach. He should instead make a full-throated commitment to end this dithering once and for all. Israel is mounting a full-court press this coming week as it sends its Mossad and military intelligence chiefs, along with its army chief of staff, to Washington in an attempt to influence nuclear negotiations as they enter what may be a final stage. According to Haaretz, army chief of staff Aviv Kochavi “will also raise other issues, including Iran’s military expansion in Syria and the instability of Lebanon. Israel is concerned about the possibility that Hezbollah will try to … [foment] conflict with Israel.” The hypocrisy of Israel’s refusal to acknowledge its own massive military interventions in Lebanon, Syria, Gaza and even Iraq, while decrying Iran’s involvement in Syria, is almost breathtaking. There is next to no chance that any of this will enter into the considerations of negotiators in Vienna. Unlike Israel, they are interested in doing a nuclear deal, not engaging in wishful thinking. Combustible Middle East mix Returning to the Biden administration’s global goals, the Middle East doesn’t care about presidential priorities. It contains a combustible mix of corrupt elites and overbearing dictators who do not shirk from causing mayhem in their domains. And one of them, perhaps a desperate Israeli prime minister or an ageing ayatollah eager to preserve his honour and legacy, could inadvertently (or intentionally) set the entire region aflame. If Biden doesn’t act quickly and decisively, there is a sizeable risk that another missile from one country or the other will hit a target and cause devastation. That would mark a point of no return, like the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914, which led to World War One. The difference is that in 1914, armies fought with guns, bayonets and artillery. Today, they will fight with F-35s, ballistic missiles and possibly nuclear weapons.

#### Nuke war causes extinction AND outweighs other existential risks

PND 16. internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock’s 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans’ International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf> //Re-cut by Elmer

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest of the world) uninhabitable, potentially inducing global famine lasting up to decades. Toon and Robock note in ‘Self Assured Destruction’, in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, that: 13. “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, even after the arsenal reductions planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be suicidal, resulting in self assured destruction. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation to reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about **20 percent** for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.” 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/all humans (and severely impact/extinguish other species) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. Gareth Evans’ ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.

## 3

#### The standard is consistency with act hedonic utilitarianism

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### 3]  Death is the worst evil

**Paterson 03** – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island. (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, <http://sce.sagepub.com>)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning wille d human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### 4] Extinction is a distinct phenomenon that requires prior consideration

**Burke et al 16** Associate Professor of International and Political Studies @ UNSW, Australia, 2016 (Anthony, Stefanie Fishel is Assistant Professor, Department of Gender and Race Studies at the University of Alabama, Audra Mitchell is CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, Simon Dalby is CIGI Chair in the Political Economy of Climate Change at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, and, Daniel J. Levine is Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Alabama, “Planet Politics: Manifesto from the End of IR,” Millennium: Journal of International Studies 1–25)

8. Global ethics must respond to mass extinction. In late 2014, the Worldwide Fund for Nature reported a startling statistic: according to their global study, 52% of species had gone extinct between 1970 and 2010.60 This is not news: for three decades, conservation biologists have been warning of a ‘sixth mass extinction’, which, by definition, could eliminate more than three quarters of currently existing life forms in just a few centuries.61 In other words, it could threaten the practical possibility of the survival of earthly life. Mass extinction is not simply extinction (or death) writ large: **it is a qualitatively different phenomena that demands its own ethical categories.** It cannot be grasped by aggregating species extinctions, let alone the deaths of individual organisms. Not only does it erase diverse, irreplaceable life forms, their **unique histories** and **open-ended possibilities**, but it **threatens the ontological conditions of Earthly life**.

IR is one of few disciplines that is explicitly devoted to the pursuit of survival, yet it has almost nothing to say in the face of a possible mass extinction event.62 It utterly lacks the conceptual and ethical frameworks necessary to foster diverse, meaningful responses to this phenomenon. As mentioned above, Cold-War era concepts such as ‘nuclear winter’ and ‘omnicide’ gesture towards harms massive in their scale and moral horror. However, they are asymptotic: they imagine nightmares of a severely denuded planet, yet they do not contemplate the **comprehensive negation** that a mass extinction event entails. In contemporary IR discourses, where it appears at all, extinction is treated as a problem of scientific management and biopolitical control aimed at securing existing human lifestyles.63 Once again, this approach fails to recognise the reality of extinction, which is a **matter of being and nonbeing**, not one of life and death processes.

#### 2]. The neg needs to be proven true in any index, whatever sid says is the index.

#### 1] Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – all other frameworks collapse.

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] TDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that **pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable**. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels**, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the **pleasure is not good for anything further**; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

#### 1]. Life is a pre req to struc vi.

### UV

#### Reject 1AR Theory arguments – 1) double bind – either you can put minor ink next to answer of my responses and extend your arguments to auto-win or the judge has to intervene to see if the 2ar answers to the 2n are good enough. Intervention o/w since it takes the round out of debater’s hands 2) they have 2 speeches on theory while I have 1 which means they can structurally preempt my answers and respond to them and I can’t do either 3) infinite abuse in the context of aff abuse doesn’t make sense since you can read 1ac theory and uplayer with other 1ar offs like Ks 4) they have 1 more minute on the theory debate due to a 7-6 skew which o/w since theory is mainly about substance 5) they can blow up dropped arguments , we cant frame them out but they can which means only dropped arguments for them are game over.

#### 1AR theory is drop the argument – they can initiate theory in the aff and the 1ar which means they have 2 speeches to devastate the 1n with no risk auto-loss issues.

#### All theory paradigm issues the aff thinks are good must be in the 1ac since they have 1 more speech than me on theory so they should take a stance sooner so I don’t have to answer all of them in one speech while they can go for them in multiple – 2n issues are reciprocally answered by the 2ar, which means that you should just evaluate the debate after the 1NC, since the 7-6 skew always beats us back but 1-1 speech structure is good.