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#### 1] Interpretation – Objective Journalism is constituted of three things: factual information, impartial and unbiased viewpoints, and emotional detachment

Calcutt and Hammond 11 Andrew Calcutt and Philip Hammond, 11 [Andrew Calcutt, (Andrew Calcutt is Principal Lecturer in Journalism at the University of East London, where he leads Master courses in journalism and magazines. He is vice-chair of the London East Research Institute and editor of Proof: Reading Journalism and Society (www.proof-reading.org). Previous publications include White Noise: An A–Z of Contradictions in Cyberculture (1999) and Arrested Development: Pop Culture and the Erosion of Adulthood (1998)). Philip Hammond (Philip Hammond is Reader in Media and Communications at London South Bank University. He is the author of Media, War and Postmodernity (2007) and Framing Post-Cold War Conflicts (2007) and is co-editor, with Edward Herman, of Degraded Capability: The Media and the Kosovo Crisis (2000)).]. "Journalism Studies: A Critical Introduction." Routledge & CRC Press, 3-8-2011, Accessed 3 -4-2022. https://www.routledge.com/Journalism-Studies-A-Critical-Introduction/Calcutt-Hammond/p/book/9780415554312 // duongie

Objectivity in journalism is a complex idea, used to refer to at least three distinct, though interrelated, concepts. First, it primarily entails a commitment to truthfulness: reporting factually accurate information. Second, objectivity is often thought to imply neutrality in the sense of fairness and balance: seeking to be impartial and unbiased in the process of reporting and, where there are conflicting interpretations of an event, presenting different viewpoints even-handedly. Third, objectivity is also often understood to imply neutrality in the sense of emotional detachment: a dispassionate approach that separates fact from comment and allows news audiences to make up their minds about events rather than being offered a journalist’s own response. These are interrelated in that – at least in theory – journalists are dispassionate and neutral so as not to let their own emotional responses and political allegiances get in the way of reporting truthfully.

#### Prefer –

#### a] Context – The resolution isn’t about just Research, it’s about what a Free Press should do with regards to other reporting which only our Evidence assumes – outweighs – words aren’t intrinsically defined but defined with context.

Cambridge Dictionary No Date "Free Press" <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/free-press> //Elmer

If a country has a free press, its newspapers, magazines, and television and radio stations are able to express any opinions they want, even if these criticize the government and other organizations: How can there be democratic elections without a free press?

#### b] Intent to Define – 1NC Calcutt and Hammond are making a holistic description about what Objective Journalist Ethics entail, the [1AC card] is merely defining a subsection which can’t constitute a model of Debate since it arbitrarily defines the limits of the Topic beyond Framers Intent to always favor the Aff.

#### 2] Violation – the Aff only interprets Objectivity as factual reporting which isn’t sufficient to constitute Objectivity – [that’s the 1AC Definition and CX proves].

#### 3] Standards:

#### a] Neg Ground – Making the Debate Facts Good/Bad is physically impossible to Negate since both Advocacy and Objective Journalists agree Lying is Bad – removing perspective, solution, and point of view Journalism, all of which are factual but disagree w/ the detached and impartial aspects of Objective Journalism destroys all Core Generics.

#### b] Topic Ed – Topic Lit Controversy isn’t Objectivity Good/Bad BUT about distinctions of Impartial Reporting and Point of View – the Topic is about tensions between Advocacy and Objectivity which ISN’T Factual Research Good/Bad – that outweighs since we only debate the Topic for one tournament.

#### 4] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.
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#### Objectivity presumes the existence of real, perceptible truth.

Ryan 01 [Michael Ryan (Michael Ryan is a professor of communication at the University of Houston. He received a B.A. degree in government and an M.A. in journalism, both at the University of Texas at Austin, and a Ph.D. in journalism at Southern Illinois University). “Journalistic Ethics, Objectivity, Existential Journalism, Standpoint Epistemology, and Public Journalism”. Journal of Mass Media Ethics. Exploring Questions of Media Morality. Volume 16, 2001 - Issue 1. Accessed 3/1/2022. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/s15327728jmme1601_2> //Xu]

Objective journalists are accountable to their audiences, to the highest ethical and professional standards of objective journalism, and, finally, to their employers. They never assume that their employers, and not themselves, bear the ultimate responsibility for their behavior. This definition assumes, of course, the existence of a “real” world about which human beings can be right or wrong. Objective journalists believe a real world exists and that one can produce a reasonably accurate description of that world. They do not guarantee their descriptions are accurate in every respect, only that they have followed a process that allows them to produce a description that is more accurate than any other process allows, and that allows society to move closer to an understanding of the real world.

#### Thus the meta-standard is *consistency with philosophical skepticism.*

#### Journalistic ethics assume that objectivity is both possible and accessible. Disproving either of those assumptions means that aff has no offense.

#### Now Negate

#### 1] Objectivity impossible – human emotion.

Didier summarizes Salazar 20 [Emily Didier (Marquette University, BA International Relations (International Communication concentration); Public Relations minor). Ruben Salazar (civil rights activist and a reporter for the Los Angeles Times). “The Importance of Advocacy Journalism”. Medium. Feb 22, 2020. Accessed 3/2/2022. <https://medium.com/@emilyd7630/the-importance-of-advocacy-journalism-a1e682d14251> //Xu]

Ruben Salazar claims that objectivity in the press is unrealistic because as human beings we are emotional. We can attempt to be only rational; however, by our nature, our behavior is influenced by our emotions, and journalism is no exception. I agree with Salazar that humans are emotional and cannot be completely objective. Moreover, even if we recognize our emotions, biases, perspectives, etc. and attempt to leave them out of the story, it is nearly impossible to do so entirely. Our life experiences influence the way we think about things and thus the way a journalist would write about things, so complete objectivity is impossible in my opinion.

#### **2]** Nothing is verifiable under a standard of falsifiability – Hijacks Gordon

**Nickles**, Thomas. (Philosopher @ University of Nevada, Reno) "Falsifiability." New Dictionary of the History of Ideas. **2005**. , <https://elearning.shisu.edu.cn/pluginfile.php/35320/mod_resource/content/1/Falsifiability%20%28Introduction%29.pdf> ///AHS PB

**Falsifiable contrasts with verifiable. A claim is empirically verifiable if possible observation statements logically imply the truth of the claim. If actual observation statements do imply the claim, then it is verified. "This raven is black" verifies "There are black ravens."** During the 1930s the logical empiricists of the Vienna Circle proposed verifiability both as a criterion of demarcation of science from nonscience and a criterion of meaning. Their idea was that a statement is meaningful if and only if it is verifiable in principle, and its meaning is given by its method of verification. For the logical empiricists, only empirically verifiable claims make genuine assertions about the world and are, in this broad sense, scientific. All other claims (metaphysical, religious, ethical, etc.) are cognitively meaningless. In his Logik der Forschung (1934; Logic of Scientific Discovery), Popper replied by rejecting the logical empiricists' concern with language and meaning and by noting that **verifiability as a criterion** of demarcation **excludes** scientific **law** claims and thus the core of science **itself. For** since **a law claim** is universal in scope (in simplest form, "All A's everywhere and everywhen are B's"), it **cannot possibly be verified: there are always actual or potential instances beyond those so far observed. Yet a** universal claim **can be falsified by a single negative instance. The first observed black swan refuted the claim "All swans are white."** (Law claims of statistical probabilistic forms are more problematic.) Based on this logical asymmetry of verification and falsification, Popper proposed falsifiability as a criterion of demarcation of science from nonscience, although not as a criterion of meaning. According to Popper, nonscience includes pseudoscience (e.g., Freudian psychology and Marxism) and metaphysics, the one fraudulent, the other sometimes providing a valuable heuristic for science. Many deep scientific problems have their roots in metaphysics, but to be scientific, a claim must take an empirical risk. Moreover, **falsifiability**, as the ongoing risk of falsification in our world, **is a permanent status** for Popper. **No amount of successful testing can establish a hypothesis as absolutely true or even probable: it forever remains conjectural. That all** scientific theories remain falsifiable entails fallibilism, the view that our best epistemic efforts remain open to future revision**. There can be no certain foundations to knowledge.**

#### 3] Cartesian Skepticism. Brain in a vat means that even if they are right about how morality works, we can’t know if the circumstances observed in our brain equate to natural properties

Chapman summarizes descarte 14 [Andrew Chapman (lecturer in philosophy at the University of Colorado, Boulder). “External World Skepticism”. 1000-Word Philosophy: An Introductory Anthology. 6 FEBRUARY 2014. Accessed 12/11/21. <https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2014/02/06/external-world-skepticism/> //Xu]

You’re being deceived by a very powerful evil demon right now. This demon has the ability to manipulate your sensory impressions such that it will seem to you that things are some way when they are not that way at all. Accordingly, things are actually nothing like P. For example, suppose it seems to you as though you are in a room with a table and chair in it and that you are reading from a computer screen, etc. If (1) is true, then you actually are in a room with a table and chair in it and you are reading from a computer screen, etc. If (2) is true, then you are not in a room with a table and chair in it and you are not reading from a computer screen, etc. If (2) is true, things are very different from how they seem to you to be.1

\*Footnote 1\*

1 If the evil demon scenario is too far-fetched for you, imagine that you are dreaming or that you are hallucinating or even that you are in a laboratory and your visual cortex is being stimulated by electrodes.

\*Paragraph Following the First\*

Philosophers call (2) a skeptical scenario. In skeptical scenarios, you are radically misled, deceived, or bamboozled by your evidence in such a way that how things seem to you is different from how things actually are. Perhaps the most famous propounder of skeptical scenarios in the history of philosophy is René Descartes (1596-1650) in his Meditations on First Philosophy (1641). In the Meditations, Descartes considers that he might be dreaming or that he might be being deceived by the evil demon from our scenario (2) above. Hollywood has made much of skeptical scenarios in movies like Total Recall, The Matrix, and Inception. So back to our original question: Which of (1) or (2) is best supported or best justified by its seeming to you that P? If you’re being honest with yourself, you’ll conclude that how things seem equally well supports (1) and (2). From your internal, first-personal perspective, either of (1) or (2) could be true given how things seem to you. And if that weren’t bad enough, here comes the kicker: If both (1) and (2) are equally well supported by your evidence, how can you ever possibly know anything about the world outside your own skin? This is the problem of external world skepticism, perhaps the central problem of modern epistemology.

#### **4]** Paradox of scientific induction means that scientific truth is impossible

Black’s quotes Hume [Brackets Original. David Hume (Scottish Enlightenment philosopher, historian, economist, librarian and essayist). “The Paradox of Induction”. Black’s Academy. No Date. Accessed 12/18/21. <https://www.blacksacademy.net/pages/px-015-pxqekj-paradox-induction.php> //Xu]

#### The paradox of induction is the problem that in all scientific reasoning we form conclusions, called laws, that are of a general nature; however, the evidence we have for those laws is based upon particular experiences. For example, we form the conclusion that all rays of light will be bend as the pass from air into glass, but we have only ever observed a finite number of instances of this law. On further reflection we see that there is no necessary connection between something happening on one occasion and the same thing happening in like circumstances on another occasion. We are not directly acquainted with the “power” behind events that ensures the uniformity of nature throughout space and time. Another illustration of this might concern the uniformity of space. Imagine that a space mission is about to be sent to the nearest star, Alpha Centuri. People might be queuing up to volunteer to be the first people to witness life on a distant planet. On the other hand, there might be anxious reluctant passengers, desperate not to be dragged on the fool-hardy mission. Why? Because there is no guarantee that the laws of nature operate in the same way in outer space as they do in our solar system. It is entirely conceivable that once the space ship passes beyond the perimeter of our solar system, that entirely different laws of physics will apply, and the space ship could be destroyed by chaotic forces that cannot be anticipated. We have no way at present of being sure that universe is uniform. We have only sampled physical nature in our own limited portion of the universe. We might regard the fear of the passengers as outlandish, but it is not an irrational fear. Just because things have happened at one point of space and at a given time in a certain way is no guarantee that they always will happen that way. This, then, is the paradox. Every day we reason from particular instances to generalities, and such inference is essential to our way of life; but there is no guarantee that such an inference is valid, and, indeed, very often such inferences prove to be fallacious — as in the case of the chicken that reasoned that its master would always feed it just because its master always has! A schematic representation of the inductive inference is as follows.

#### **5] The pursuit of knowledge results in the dogmatic fallibilism and denies the subject’s inherent bias.**

Bardon 20 [Adrian Bardon(professor of philosophy at Wake Forest). “[Humans are hardwired to dismiss facts that don’t fit their worldview](https://www.fastcompany.com/90458795/humans-are-hardwired-to-dismiss-facts-that-dont-fit-their-worldview).” Fast Company. 2/1/20. Accessed 2/9/20. [https://www.fastcompany.com/90458795/humans-are-hardwired-to-dismiss-facts-that-dont-fit-their-worldview//](https://www.fastcompany.com/90458795/humans-are-hardwired-to-dismiss-facts-that-dont-fit-their-worldview/) Houston Memorial SC]

“Motivated reasoning” is what social scientists call the process of deciding what evidence to accept based on the conclusion one prefers. As I explain in my book, The Truth About Denial, this very human tendency applies to all kinds of facts about the physical world, economic history, and current events. DENIAL DOESN’T STEM FROM IGNORANCE The interdisciplinary study of this phenomenon has exploded over just the last six or seven years. One thing has become clear: The failure of various groups to acknowledge the truth about, say, climate change, is not explained by a lack of information about the scientific consensus on the subject. Instead, what strongly predicts denial of expertise on many controversial topics is simply one’s political persuasion. A 2015 metastudy showed that ideological polarization over the reality of climate change actually increases with respondents’ knowledge of politics, science, and/or energy policy. The chances that a conservative is a climate-change denier is significantly higher if he or she is college-educated. Conservatives scoring highest on tests for cognitive sophistication or quantitative reasoning skills are most susceptible to motivated reasoning about climate science. This is not just a problem for conservatives. As researcher Dan Kahan has demonstrated, liberals are less likely to accept expert consensus on the possibility of safe storage of nuclear waste, or on the effects of concealed-carry gun laws. DENIAL IS NATURAL Our ancestors evolved in small groups, where cooperation and persuasion had at least as much to do with reproductive success as holding accurate factual beliefs about the world. Assimilation into one’s tribe required assimilation into the group’s ideological belief system. An instinctive bias in favor of one’s in-group” and its worldview is deeply ingrained in human psychology. A human being’s very sense of self is intimately tied up with his or her identity group’s status and beliefs. Unsurprisingly, then, people respond automatically and defensively to information that threatens their ideological worldview. We respond with rationalization and selective assessment of evidence—that is, we engage in “confirmation bias,” giving credit to expert testimony we like and finding reasons to reject the rest. Political scientists Charles Taber and Milton Lodge experimentally confirmed the existence of this automatic response. They found that partisan subjects, when presented with photos of politicians, produce an affective “like/dislike” response that precedes any sort of conscious, factual assessment as to who is pictured. In ideologically charged situations, one’s prejudices end up affecting one’s factual beliefs. Insofar as you define yourself in terms of your cultural affiliations, information that threatens your belief system—say, information about the negative effects of industrial production on the environment—can threaten your sense of identity itself. If it’s part of your ideological community’s worldview that unnatural things are unhealthful, factual information about a scientific consensus on vaccine or GM food safety feels like a personal attack. Unwelcome information can also threaten in other ways. “System justification” theorists such as psychologist John Jost have shown how situations that represent a threat to established systems trigger inflexible thinking and a desire for closure. For example, as Jost and colleagues extensively review, populations experiencing economic distress or external threat have often turned to authoritarian, hierarchicalist leaders promising security and stability. DENIAL IS EVERYWHERE This kind of affect-laden, motivated thinking explains a wide range of examples of an extreme, evidence-resistant rejection of historical fact and scientific consensus. Have tax cuts been shown to pay for themselves in terms of economic growth? Do communities with high numbers of immigrants have higher rates of violent crime? Did Russia interfere in the 2016 U.S. presidential election? Predictably, expert opinion regarding such matters is treated by partisan media as though evidence is itself inherently partisan. Denialist phenomena are many and varied, but the story behind them is, ultimately, quite simple. Human cognition is inseparable from the unconscious emotional responses that go with it. Under the right conditions, universal human traits such as in-group favoritism, existential anxiety, and a desire for stability and control combine into a toxic, system-justifying identity politics. When group interests, creeds, or dogmas are threatened by unwelcome factual information, biased thinking becomes denial. And unfortunately these facts about human nature can be manipulated for political ends. This picture is a bit grim, because it suggests that facts alone have limited power to resolve politicized issues such as climate change or immigration policy. But properly understanding the phenomenon of denial is surely a crucial first step to addressing it.

#### **Presumption negates more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways**

#### Permissibility negates – the aff has to prove an obligation which entails an action is both possible and necessary. Winning permissibility disproves the necessity of action which
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#### **FWK - the 1AC is an object of research - They can weigh their impacts but we should be able to garner dissads and alt competition by testing their justifications because those are the reasons they staked out to vote aff.**

#### The supposed objectivity imbued in the freedom of press deters a cultural revolution that galvanizes support for a peoples dictatorship by entertaining the opinions of capitalist pigs.

Houn 59 Franklin w. Houn“Chinese Communist Control of the Press” The Public Opinion Quarterly , Winter, 1958-1959, Vol. 22, No. 4 (Winter, 1958-1959), pp. 435-448 Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the American Association for Public Opinion Research <http://www.jstor.com/stable/2746592> CHO -- ask me for pdf

THE PRESS in Communist China is essentially a political instrument with which the regime conducts socialist and Communist education among the masses. During the last few years the regime has developed the press into an elaborate, diversified, and highly specialized apparatus with each of its parts designed to reach a specific audience and to serve a definite function. Schools have included newspaper reading in their curricula, while governmental agencies, mass organizations, military units, commercial firms, industrial plants, and cooperative farms have organized "newspaper reading groups," which not only make it obligatory for literate persons to read newspapers regularly but also enable illiterate persons to get information and propaganda messages from newspapers by having literate persons read newspapers to them. With a regular readership comprising a majority of the vast population, the press is indeed the most important instrument used by the regime in the conduct of socialist and Communist education. The performance of the press, therefore, may well determine the pace and even the success or failure of the Communists' adventure in remolding the Chinese people's ideology. To ensure maximum effectiveness and absolute political reliability, the regime has found it necessary to put this giant press apparatus under rigid control and close supervision. Unlike the practice in some other totalitarian countries, press control in Communist China does not take the form of any conventional censorship. The absence of conventional censorship may be at- tributed to at least two causes. In the first place, a special censorial agency to screen the content of the press is necessary only in a country which has a press independent of the government. In such a case the government may find it impossible to curb a hostile or irresponsible press unless it has a censorship system. Since the press in Communist China is not an independent institution but an integral part of the government or of the Communist party, which is more or less synonymous with is one of internal supervision rather than external control. In the second place, a conventional censorship system would not be an adequate mechanism for controlling a press like the one in Communist China, which is expected to make certain positive contributions to the attainment of the regime's socio-political goals. Censorship is normally an instrument of prevention. While a government may use such an instrument to prevent the press from printing material that it finds detrimental or hostile to its interests, it cannot rely upon the same instrument to have the newspapers feature material most beneficial to the state. To ensure that the press will actively serve a regime's interests, there must be a type of control that is much broader in scope and more positive in nature than a conventional censorship system. How does the Chinese Communist regime actually control the press? Controls exercised by the Chinese Communist regime over the press fall into four major categories: organizational, personnel, editorial, and operational. ORGANIZATIONAL CONNTROL Through organizational control the regime determines the structural of the press. It is the regime that decides when, where, and how many papers should be founded. It is also the regime that decides who may found or own what kinds of newspaper. By making such decisions the regime is not only capable of suppressing "objectionable" or "superfluous" newspapers but also free to develop a press with a physical structure commensurate with the tasks that it is to perform. In point of fact, decisions of this nature made by the regime since 1949 have resulted in the confiscation of the former Kuomintang newspapers, the virtual elimination of privately owned news- papers, and, as said before, the development of a nationwide press apparatus for the regime itself. The theoretical justification for these decisions is that the press is a political weapon and that under a "people's dictatorship" such a weapon must be used by the people themselves or their representatives to the exclusion of their political enemies. Kuomintang newspapers. Since the Kuomintang was regarded as the arch enemy of the people, it was only natural for the Communists to ban all its newspapers on the mainland once they seized power there. Actually, most of the official newspapers of the Kuomintang, including the forty-four daily papers (one of them had editions in ten major cities) published by the cen- tral and provincial headquarters of the party, suspended publication on the eve of Communist occupation of their respective cities or towns, as they were fully aware of what their destiny would be after the Communists' arrival.' Thus the newly arrived Communist functionaries found little more to do than to confiscate the properties of the Kuomintang papers. This, of course, was done very quickly and thoroughly. As part of the campaign for the sup- pression of counter-revolutionaries, the Communist regime also liquidated or sent to forced-labor camps a good many former Kuomintang newsmen who failed to flee the mainland. Privately owned newspapers. The Communists' policy toward privately owned newspapers, however, has been far more subtle in form and circuitous in development. This is inevitable in view of the intricacy of the Chinese Communists' theory of the nature of the Chinese state at the "people's dictatorship" stage. According to this theory, all elements of society other than the bureaucratic capitalists, feudal landlords, and lackeys of foreign imperialism, most of whom, in the Communists' opinion, have strong representation in the Kuomintang, are legitimate components of the People's Republic of China and therefore entitled to enjoy all political rights including the right to have their own newspapers.2 Consequently, outright banning of all privately owned newspapers-a practice adopted by the Russian Communists after the October Revolution- has not been considered by the regime in Peking an advisable or expedient policy. On the other hand, the Communists do not see fit to give completely free rein to any privately owned newspaper. It is part of their theory that, during the stage of "people's dictatorship," the party or the government must effect an ideological transformation of the population as a whole and, in order to do this, it must assume the role of teacher, guide, and leader of the people. As people's teacher, guide, and leader, the party or government has both the right and responsibility to direct the flow of ideas and information through all sections of the mass communication media. This, of course, implies governmental regulation of privately owned newspapers. The first step taken by the Communist regime in this connection was to announce that while privately owned newspapers with "reactionary dispositions" would be outlawed at once, "progressive" ones and those without definite political inclinations might apply for new licenses for continuation of publication. Thus quite a number of privately owned newspapers were able to carry on business side by side with newspapers owned by the Communists, though they were subject to strict control and supervision by the regime. But late in 1951 the regime began to put into effect a policy aimed at reducing the number of privately owned newspapers and changing the nature of those to be retained. Many privately owned newspapers were closed, others were amalgamated, and still others were "reformed" and "reorganized."

**The alternative is to reject the aff in favor of a mass party building based on the scientific formulation of Maoist principles, in this: The People’s Press ought to prioritize Maoist advocacy over objectivity.**

Williams 18 [Carine, 7/30/18, “Why Black People Need Maoism in 2018”, *The Hampton Institute*, <http://www.hamptoninstitution.org/why-black-people-need-maoism.html#.XWwv7ZNKh0s> // KZaidi]

When they hear Maoism, many people think of China, Peru, and the Philippines. They picture peasants "surrounding the cities from the countryside." This is, of course, understandable, but a mistake. Maoism is not simply "everything that Mao did," or "everything that happened in China between 1949 and now." I have spent a great deal of my time writing working to dispel these sorts of myths, some peddled in an unprincipled fashion by anti-Maoists. Maoism is a living, breathing science. By science we mean something with universal principles that can be taken and applied by all who have a material interest in making revolution. In the United States, this is Black people, or the New Afrikan nation. It was not by accident that the original Black Panther Party (BPP) developed close relations with the revolutionary leadership of the People's Republic of China. Huey didn't go to China to play; he went to study and learn things that could be applied back home. Of course, he eventually degenerated in political line and practice, taking a right opportunist course along with Bobby Seale (always a centrist) and Elaine Brown (who guided the party, in his absence, into a mainstream political force that led into the arms of the Democratic Party). This opportunism in the highest expression of revolutionary sentiment, practice, and force in this country to date needs to be studied and ruthlessly criticized, yet we should be careful. We must place things in their historical context and ensure that we are able to divide one into two, meaning see the beneficial as well as the negative aspects of a thing but also realize that one aspect must be primary. The BPP was destroyed by a combination of factors: lack of a really scientific method of analysis and cohesive program of political education, failure to promote and apply the Marxist-Leninist principle of Democratic Centralism (debate inside the party, formation of a political line through this debate, and the upholding of this decision by all party members and organs), and a culture of liberalism that ended with comrades fighting comrades, thus opening the door for external factors (the FBI and other LE agencies) to play havoc and get cadre railroaded into prison and killed. We must study and learn all of these lessons, because when we develop another organization with the prestige, mass base, and power that the Panthers had, and we will, they will come for us all again. So, why do we need Maoism? Because we are against the most brutal, bloody, and vicious empire known to humankind. This country is looting and enslaving our class siblings all over the world. To overturn this order of things, to smash it and rebuild it in the interests of the revolutionary proletariat of the entire world, we must apply the synthesis of 200 years of systematic, organized class struggle, which is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: the continuity of the revolutionary project that was Marxism-Leninism, with a rupture from the dogmatism and revisionism. Maoists do not uphold "Actually Existing Socialism" because a scientific analysis rooted in the principles laid down by the revolutionary movements and projects that gave us Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao would demonstrate that stealing food from Filipino fisherfolk, like the People's Republic of China (PRC) has been doing, is 100% non-Marxist. This is in disagreement with many Marxist-Leninist organizations today, which uphold these things and other imperialist depredations carried out under the faded red banner of China. The Maoist argument is that Marxist-Leninist terrain has been spent, and the 21st century must learn from Maoism. "You haven't seized state power yet!" others cry. Indeed, and there has never been a truly Maoist party that has initiated armed struggle in the imperialist metro poles. This doesn't mean that Maoist principles cannot be applied to these countries, this means that we must be ever more creative in our application and ever more disciplined in our party-building efforts. Party building in the USA requires the careful and thorough cultivation of a mass base. Tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands, of people must depend on and follow this party and participate in mass organizations before it can even begin to call itself a vanguard. This is what many who came out of the New Communist Movement of the mid-late 1970s failed to realize. The days of endless squabbling sects that fight over "mass bases" of a handful of other activists must be put to an end, and we must have a truly mass perspective. There is optimism in the spread of For the People (FTP) organizations and the development of the Organizing Committee for a Maoist Communist Party (MCP-OC) which has a more mass orientation and places primacy on the development of a class analysis and political line in the USA that is based in painstaking investigation and rooted in the aspirations and struggles of the most oppressed, along with a record of seeking to develop international solidarity and prison work. This, I believe, is the best hope for New Afrikan Maoists in the United States and I wholeheartedly encourage Black comrades to develop FTP-type organizations in their own communities under OC guidance. Even if this isn't done, at the very least studies in Maoism, studies in Maoist revolutions, and studies in Maoist theory are beneficial. After and during these studies, think about how it can be applied on your block and in your community. Learn about and be like Fred Hampton. Time is up for spinning our wheels; we must get together, unite on a principled and unshakeable basis, and mount a formidable resistance against decades and centuries-old oppression based in capitalism and white supremacy. I also encourage support and donation to the Hampton Institute as an invaluable resource in promoting revolutionary ideology and practice in the finest Marxist tradition.

#### Resource competition and wealth extraction under Racial Capitalism produces fascism, endless war and environmental destruction which requires the cultivation of a mass base.

Robinson 14(William I., Prof. of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies, @ UC-Santa Barbara, “Global Capitalism: Crisis of Humanity and the Specter of 21st Century Fascism” The World Financial Review)

Cyclical, Structural, and Systemic Crises Most commentators on the contemporary crisis refer to the “Great Recession” of 2008 and its aftermath. Yet the causal origins of global crisis are to be found in over-accumulation and also in contradictions of state power, or in what Marxists call the internal contradictions of the capitalist system. Moreover, because the system is now global, crisis in any one place tends to represent crisis for the system as a whole. The system cannot expand because the marginalisation of a significant portion of humanity from direct productive participation, the downward pressure on wages and popular consumption worldwide, and the polarisation of income, has reduced the ability of the world market to absorb world output. At the same time, given the particular configuration of social and class forces and the correlation of these forces worldwide, national states are hard-pressed to regulate transnational circuits of accumulation and offset the explosive contradictions built into the system. Is this crisis cyclical, structural, or systemic? Cyclical crises are recurrent to capitalism about once every 10 years and involve recessions that act as self-correcting mechanisms without any major restructuring of the system. The recessions of the early 1980s, the early 1990s, and of 2001 were cyclical crises. In contrast, the 2008 crisis signaled the slide into a structural crisis*. Structural crises* reflect deeper contra- dictions that can only be resolved by a major restructuring of the system. The structural crisis of the 1970s was resolved through capitalist globalisation. Prior to that, the structural crisis of the 1930s was resolved through the creation of a new model of redistributive capitalism, and prior to that the struc- tural crisis of the 1870s resulted in the development of corpo- rate capitalism. A systemic crisis involves the replacement of a system by an entirely new system or by an outright collapse. A structural crisis opens up the possibility for a systemic crisis. But if it actually snowballs into a systemic crisis – in this case, if it gives way either to capitalism being superseded or to a breakdown of global civilisation – is not predetermined and depends entirely on the response of social and political forces to the crisis and on historical contingencies that are not easy to forecast. This is an historic moment of extreme uncertainty, in which collective responses from distinct social and class forces to the crisis are in great flux. Hence my concept of global crisis is broader than financial. There are multiple and mutually constitutive dimensions – economic, social, political, cultural, ideological and ecological, not to mention the existential crisis of our consciousness, values and very being. There is a crisis of social polarisation, that is, of *social reproduction.* The system cannot meet the needs or assure the survival of millions of people, perhaps a majority of humanity. There are crises of state legitimacy and political authority, or of *hegemony* and *domination.* National states face spiraling crises of legitimacy as they fail to meet the social grievances of local working and popular classes experiencing downward mobility, unemployment, heightened insecurity and greater hardships. The legitimacy of the system has increasingly been called into question by millions, perhaps even billions, of people around the world, and is facing expanded counter-hegemonic challenges. Global elites have been unable counter this erosion of the system’s authority in the face of worldwide pressures for a global moral economy. And a canopy that envelops all these dimensions is a crisis of sustainability rooted in an ecological holocaust that has already begun, expressed in climate change and the impending collapse of centralised agricultural systems in several regions of the world, among other indicators. By a crisis of humanityI mean a crisis that is approaching systemic proportions, threatening the ability of billions of people to survive, and raising the specter of a collapse of world civilisation and degeneration into a new “Dark Ages.”2 This crisis of humanity shares a number of aspects with earlier structural crises but there are also several features unique to the present: 1. The system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. Global capitalism now couples human and natural history in such a way as to threaten to bring about what would be the sixth mass extinction in the known history of life on earth.3 This mass extinction would be caused not by a natural catastrophe such as a meteor impact or by evolutionary changes such as the end of an ice age but by purposive human activity. According to leading environmental scientists there are nine “planetary boundaries” crucial to maintaining an earth system environment in which humans can exist, four of which are experiencing at this time the onset of irreversible environmental degradation and three of which (climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss) are at “tipping points,” meaning that these processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries. 2. The magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as is the concentration of the means of global communication and symbolic production and circulation in the hands of a very few powerful groups. Computerised wars, drones, bunker-buster bombs, star wars, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare. Warfare has become normalised and sanitised for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. At the same time we have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication, images and symbolic production. The world of Edward Snowden is the world of George Orwell; 1984 has arrived; 3. Capitalism is reaching apparent limits to its extensive expansion. There are no longer any new territories of significance that can be integrated into world capitalism, de-ruralisation is now well advanced, and the commodification of the countryside and of pre- and non-capitalist spaces has intensified, that is, converted in hot-house fashion into spaces of capital, so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. Capitalism must continually expand or collapse. How or where will it now expand? 4. There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums,”4 alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and **to** destruction - to a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. This includes prison-industrial and immigrant-detention complexes, omnipresent policing, militarised gentrification, and so on; 5. There is a disjuncture between a globalising economy and a nation-state based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to play the role of what social scientists refer to as a “hegemon,” or a leading nation-state that has enough power and authority to organise and stabilise the system. The spread of weapons of mass destruction and the unprecedented militarisation of social life and conflict across the globe makes it hard to imagine that the system can come under any stable political authority that assures its reproduction. Global Police State How have social and political forces worldwide responded to crisis? The crisis has resulted in a rapid political polarisation in global society. Both right and left-wing forces are ascendant. Three responses seem to be in dispute. One is what we could call “reformism from above.” This elite reformism is aimed at stabilising the system, at saving the system from itself and from more radical re- sponses from below. Nonetheless, in the years following the 2008 collapse of the global financial system it seems these reformers are unable (or unwilling) to prevail over the power of transnational financial capital. A second response is popular, grassroots and leftist resistance from below. As social and political conflict escalates around the world there appears to be a mounting global revolt. While such resistance appears insurgent in the wake of 2008 it is spread very unevenly across countries and regions and facing many problems and challenges. Yet another response is that I term *21st century fascism*.5 The ultra-right is an insurgent force in many countries. In broad strokes, this project seeks to fuse reactionary political power with transnational capital and to organise a mass base among historically privileged sectors of the global working class – such as white workers in the North and middle layers in the South – that are now experiencing heightened insecurity and the specter of downward mobility. It involves militarism,extrememasculinisation, homophobia, racism and racist mobilisations, including the search for scapegoats, such as immigrant workers and, in the West, Muslims. Twenty-first century fascism evokes mystifying ideologies, often involving race/culture supremacy and xenophobia, embracing an idealised and mythical past. Neo-fascist culture normalises and glamorises warfare and social violence, indeed, generates a fascination with domination that is portrayed even as heroic.

#### We fiat global Communist central planning and Maoist governance - using fiat to imagine future communist governance is a prior to developing the political grammar to get there

**Tonstad 16** (Professor Tonstad is a constructive theologian working at the intersection of systematic theology with feminist and queer theory. Her first book, God and Difference: The Trinity, Sexuality, and the Transformation of Finitude, was published by Routledge in 2016 and was named both as a best new book in ethics and a best new book in theology in Christian Century in the spring of 2017. “Debt Time is Straight Time” political theology, Vol. 17 No. 5, September 2016, 434–448, Edited for ableist language – “visible” changed to “recognizable” )

If debt time, as I have argued, is straight time, can other temporal modes of production and affiliation be imagined? If debt time depends on promises made in the past to subjugate the present and future, might other promising pasts (made available through the non-limitative, intergenerational relations that “homosexual production” sometimes promotes) redirect us toward other futures — futures located in queer time? Dreaming and day-dreaming allow for Kathi Weeks’s “utopian demand” that can teach us what a “different world” in which our dreams would come to life would look like.45 To reeducate our temporal desires, we need to “affirm what we are and will it, because it is also the constitutive basis from which we can struggle to become otherwise.”46 This affirmation is no mere acceptance of the past as it is enforced on us by the moral couplings effort-reward or debt-obligation. Rather, it is “an active intervention into our ways of inhabiting the past.” The utopic demand affirms a future in which the demand would no longer be utopic, while also estranging us from the ethos that there is no alternative.47Guy Hocquenghem writes, “Homosexual production takes place according to a mode of non-limitative horizontal relations, heterosexual reproduction according to one of hierarchical succession … another possible social relation … is not vertical but horizontal.”48 Horizontal temporal relations can join with new spatial orders to constitute a we. Franco Berardi notes that one of the reasons workers’ struggles have tended to disappear historically (as exceptions rather than lasting coalitions) is that “for struggles to form a cycle there must be a spatial proximity of laboring bodies and an existential temporal continuity. Without this proximity and this continuity, we lack the conditions for cellularized bodies to become a community.”49 Spatial proximity is not enough by itself — antiblackness in the United States is but one example proving the point — but it is essential to the formation of coalitions and new forms of solidarity. Without side-by-side relationships, spatial and symbolic, and without creating and becoming a we, we can neither understand “our” time aright to diagnose it, nor shift the future into a direction other than the one marked out by the insistence that there is no alternative. With such relationships, the door is open for possibilities for redirecting the trajectory of debt time that do not require “distance from dominant culture,” but instead can take their own “imbrication with contemporary socioeconomic forces”50 as a point of departure. The first step is to name the powers and in so naming call them up and make them visible [recognizeable]— materialization of the demons that ride and haunt us, seeking to destroy us. The next step is to reorder our temporal and spatial relations to each other to create a we that does not yet exist.The promise of queer prophetic performance Sleeping and waking cross each other: for we must wake from our dreams of dust and ashes in order to read the signs of the times, and we must sleep so that we can learn to dream new dreams. Between the space of sleep and waking, we encounter the memory of other times, a memory that may become grounds for a future that is no future. Naming the signs of the times (knowing the time in order to escape its grasp, refusing the future in order to redirect it) is a prophetic practice. Althaus-Reid says, “[I]f God is to be found in human relationships of economic and loving orders, it is obvious that the right not to be straight in a capitalist society and church has the goal of liberating God.”51 And who can set God free? We need a prophetic52 bodily reordering in which the untimely one will arrive and tell us, or better show us, the series of negations, intentional relations, and world-making activities that are our best hope for living love in a time of capital. These hopes weigh less than the Spirit of Gravity does on our shoulders (that always-already that the history of Christian capitalism imposes on us); with them we may hope for an easier yoke that would allow us to replenish our relations to ourselves and others. Prophets dream for us and against us; they sound the alarm and they fall into trances in which revelations are given to them. Prophets use speech, performance, visions, dreams, and bodies to shift the relations between structures of authority and embedded hierarchicalizations. Those manipulations, those reorderings of apparently fixed elements of the world, reproduce but can also reconfigure visions of orders of power.53 Most importantly, prophets contend with other prophets in inexplicable bodied acts,54 and prophets contend with the prophets of other gods.55 Prophetic contestation breaks open the “monopoly of actuality” that insists “there is no alternative.” “Blow the trumpet … sound the alarm!” “Your sons and daughters will prophesy, your old men will dream dreams, your young men will see visions. Even on my servants, both men and women, I will pour out my spirit in those days.”56 The passage from Joel points to the transgenerational and transgendered aspects of prophecy, and to the importance of dreams. Late capitalism denies us dreams, and late capitalism monetizes even our dreams. But prophets dream the dreams that the rest of us are denied. Prophecies “have been a means by which the “poor” have externalized their desires, given legitimacy to their plans, and have been spurred to action.” For this reason, prophecy had to be “replaced with the calculation of probabilities” — a calculation that depends on the postulate that “the future will be like the past.”57 We are seeking a future that is not like the past. Prophecy opens the possibility of the impossible beyond calculation and prediction. Prophecy can connect the partially open future with the overdetermined present to suggest strategies for redirection and recreation. Kirk Fuoss argues that performance always involves contestation; if he is right, the same would apply to prophetic performances.58 Prophetic performances may contribute to the development of what Valerie Rohy understands as queer non-causality: a temporality “whose beginnings are found in the future.”59 Rohy describes the way becoming gay may involve a circular causality that escapes linear historical determination. In the case of Oscar Wilde, for instance, “Wilde’s homosexuality both causes the gay male identity of the future and is caused by it.”60 Such alternative causalities may break the effort-reward, promise-fault couplings of determinate historical time — of debt time. If we become what is not yet possible, our becoming escapes the past’s determination without negating it. Queer performances that embody impossible futures may have the capacity to vivify and illuminate extant alternative imaginaries while challenging the “monopoly of actuality” exercised by debt time, especially if these queer prophetic performances distinguish themselves from capital not by their freedom from it61 but by practicing in relation to it. Performance can reeducate our imaginations (our dreams) in ways that do not pretend — as attenuated or homonormative gay culture sometimes does — that no other economic order is possible. We need to relearn the connections between sexuality and the economic order that lesbian feminists and black feminists recognized from the very beginning.62 We must enter desire’s school for reeducation so we may learn to name the present for the sake of a redirected future. In order to change our futures (to make them no future for the time of financialized capitalism and hetero-same reproduction), we need — as I have argued — spatial and symbolic side-by-side relations, we need to learn the nature of our time (and times), and we need to create the worlds that we need to learn to want through institution-building and the generation of publics.

#### Command economy key 2 Red innovation

Nieto & Mateo 20 [Maxi Nieto is a PhD is sociology from the University of Elche and writer for Ciber Comunismo and Juan Pablo Mateo is a visiting scholar in the department of Economics at The New School, New York and economics professor at the University of Valladolid (Spain). January 2020, “Dynamic Efficiency in a Planned Economy: Innovation and Entrepreneurship Without Markets”, Science & Society, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338327276\_Dynamic\_Efficiency\_in\_a\_Planned\_Economy\_Innovation\_and\_Entrepreneurship\_Without\_Markets //](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338327276_Dynamic_Efficiency_in_a_Planned_Economy_Innovation_and_Entrepreneurship_Without_Markets%20//)gbs jacobs & majeed]

4.1. Innovation and social property. Innovation occurs as a result of a long and complex accumulation process of knowledge and creativity, where very rarely is a single individual solely responsible. This is an essentially social process in which a plurality of actors and institutions contribute in very different spheres and circumstances. The Austrian School presents an idealized image of innovation in capitalist economies, attributing it exclusively to the figure of the enterprising entrepreneur — whether in a disruptive sense (Schumpeter), or in a strictly coordinating sense (Kirzner). In fact, the entrepreneurial function develops within specific institutional frameworks and organized structures, both at the micro and macro levels. In this sense, a socialist economy has significant advantages for developing technological and business innovation, as opposed to a capitalist economy: i) socialism allows for greater and more efficient allocation of resources to R&D&I activities, thanks to centralized control of the surplus and the absence of sumptuous consumption and a rentier population; ii) there are no obstacles (property rights) to the free dissemination of new products and techniques; iii) the equal distribution of resources (which guarantees that no basic needs go unmet) allows for discovery and fuller development of talent, which likewise occurs when work is undertaken through tasks that are more balanced for the majority and less routine; iv) in allocating investment, more information is available and the criteria are more varied than mere expectation of profit; v) social ownership is more inclusive and participatory than capitalist enterprise in terms of generating and mobilizing knowledge (tacit or not) and encouraging innovation; vi) socialism does not impose short-term innovation cycles looking to generate products that can be commercialized in, say, four to six months, as is typical in capitalist economies. Under these favorable general conditions, the development of innovation in a socialist economy would unfold in three fundamental areas: i) Strategic planning: this traces the main lines of scientific, technological, and innovation research. Here would enter programs for the development of new technologies and infrastructures, as well as visionary projects that explore eventualities and future scenarios. This sort of research is carried out in universities, scientific academies, technological institutes, and other specialized centers in coordination with the business world. The process would consist in testing different alternative productive projects or techniques in order to verify results, in connection with the companies and sectors being served. ii) Companies: research, design, and innovation departments. iii) Business entrepreneurship: individuals and teams put forward proposals in hopes of securing financing. For any of these three areas, material incentives would exist that reward the degree to which the freely programmed objectives are achieved, in addition to purely social or moral incentives such as social recognition or professional and personal fulfilment. In the next section, we focus on how socialist entrepreneurship — something that the Austrian School considers impossible — would ostensibly work. 4.2. Ecosystems for innovation and entrepreneurship. In today’s most dynamic capitalist economies, entrepreneurship and business innovation are developed mainly in the so-called innovation ecosystems, which are institutional environments dedicated to promoting symbiotic interaction among the different actors involved in the process of creating and transforming companies and industries. This sort of institutional framework represents the antithesis of the liberal mythology where the individual capitalist–entrepreneur operates in a purely commercial environment, since these ecosystems are based on public institutions and resources as well as procedures that are not strictly mercantile.9 An efficient and dynamic socialist economy needs institutional environments capable of fostering and channeling the initiative of individuals with special talents to translate innovative ideas into business projects. It must be clear that an ecosystem of socialist innovation does not substitute for, but instead complements, the innovations developed by particular state institutions and programs (such as the transition to a new source of energy, new materials, etc.) as well 9 In the case of Spain, think tanks and capitalist consultants openly admit that “there is not enough private capital to invest in new companies, either through individual investment or through venture capital funds” (Price Waterhouse Coopers, 2015, 32). as innovations taking place in the industrial design departments of businesses. The actors involved in such an ecosystem are essentially the same as those participating in the equivalent ecosystems of the current capitalist economies. Principal differences would lie in the form of interaction among them (in the absence of mercantile links), their decision-making capacity (since no private property rights adhere), and the types of rules in force (including the incentive system). Among the main actors would be the following
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### 1NC – AT: Util

#### Fear dbl bind– if we can’t act cuz we fear extinction then we can’t do the aff because we fear extinction

#### Slow violence o/ws on Magnitude - Slow violence stacks up to more bodies then a one-off extinction event which means our impacts come first no matter what

**Calc indicts don’t take out the NC because the aren’t util fails but journalist objectivity fails**

#### B] Not reciprocal because aff offense goes uncontested

#### If util calc works then negate because squo actors use util and decide the aff is a bad idea

### 1NC – Egoism Hijack

#### We’re hijacking internalism – we know internally that our own pleasure and pain are good but also don’t care about others. Empirically proven by eating meat or wanting people you hate to feel pain

#### 1% risk of solipsism being true under util means that we are ethically obligated to egoism. If you are the only person that exists then the pleasure you experience is the sum total of pleasure of universe which means it definitely outweighs

Milan **Griffes, 20** [Milan Griffes, (Milan Griffes posts about ethics, contemplative practice, social phenomena, and interesting tidbits from things I'm reading.)]. "Average utilitarianism implies solipsistic egoism" (Tarsney 2020)." 4-29-2020, Accessed 12-19-2021. https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/22TXQ5Ai6ix6k6XbT/link-average-utilitarianism-implies-solipsistic-egoism // Cho

Moreover, solipsistic swamping is just the limiting case of a more general phenomenon, viz., that when combined with standard expectational decision rules, average utilitarianism, variable value views, and rank-discounted utilitarianism all seem to over-weight small-population scenarios. For instance, consider an average utilitarian who assigns 1% credence to the hypothesis that the Universe will only ever contain 1020 welfare subjects, and 99% credence to the more optimistic hypothesis that advanced future civilizations will eventually support 1050 welfare subjects or more (Bostrom, 2013). The same absolute welfare improvement matters 1030 times more in the former scenario and therefore, discounting for her credence, matters 1028 times more in expectation. Thus, even though she is quite confident in the “optimistic” hypothesis, she should premise her choices almost entirely on the “pessimistic” hypothesis.11 More generally, she will end giving almost no practical weight to states that imply a very large population, even when those states are very probable. Apart from optimism about the future of humanity, such states might correspond to (i) hypotheses that attribute sentience to more beings, e.g., to insects, other invertebrates, or relatively simple artificial intelligences or (ii) cosmological hypotheses that imply that the Universe is very large and hence contains many nonEarth-originating welfare subjects (as well as exobiological hypotheses that imply a higher probability of welfare subjects emerging in a given star system). If we find this general phenomenon of “small-population swamping” counterintuitive, then ignoring small probabilities won’t help, since we cannot assume that small-population scenarios will always deserve de minimis probabilities. Maybe the conclusion to draw is that some population axiologies cannot be combined with standard decision theory, but must be equipped with their own, bespoke theories of decision-making under risk that avoid the tyranny of small population scenarios. It not immediately obvious what these decision theories should look like, and in departing from standard decision theory, they are likely to incur significant theoretical costs.12 But in any case, if we conclude that certain views. in population ethics cannot safely appeal to the best developed and most widely accepted theory of decision-making under risk, this on its own would be a notable conclusion. Absent some clever decision-theoretic escape, we are left with a conditional: If average utilitarianism, a variable value view, or rank-discounted utilitarianism is correct, then the best thing we can do, ex ante, to make the world a better place is to act selfishly (to greater or lesser extents, depending on the axiology). This leaves us, of course, with two further options: Reject all these axiologies, or embrace (de facto, impartially motivated) ethical egoism.
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