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#### Perspectivism is true –

#### 1] Opacity – we can never access another person’s perspective because we can never fully understand who someone else is or what they think. Every truth I create cannot be universalized because I can’t guarantee that they will create the same truth because they do what they want.

#### 2] Resolvability – Centuries of moral debate proves we can’t come to an objectively correct answer so it has to be indexed to individual subjects. High school debaters can’t come to a correct conclusion on their own and moral dilemmas are too complicated to “solve” in 45 minutes, so you should prefer a perspectivist account.

#### 3] The theory of relativity proves that objective reality does not exist but only in the reference to the observer.

**Berghofer 20** [Philipp Berghofer (a graduate student at University of Graz, Institute of Philosophy). “Scientific perspectivism in the phenomenological tradition”. European Journal for Philosophy of Science volume. 16 June 2020. Accessed 4/17/21. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13194-020-00294-w> //Xu]

Concerning general relativity, Merleau-Ponty states: The physics of relativity confirms that absolute and final objectivity is a mere dream by showing how each particular observation is strictly linked to the location of the observer and cannot be abstracted from this particular situation; it also rejects the notion of an absolute observer. We can no longer flatter ourselves with the idea that, in science, the exercise of a pure and unsituated intellect can allow us to gain access to an object free of all human traces, just as God would see it. This does not make the need for scientific research any less pressing; in fact, the only thing under attack is the dogmatism of a science that thinks itself capable of absolute and complete knowledge. We are simply doing justice to each of the variety of elements in human experience and, in particular, to sensory perception. (Merleau-Ponty 2004, 44f.) It is to be noted that Merleau-Ponty’s remark is misleading since in the theory of relativity observation is not linked to the location of the observer but to the frame of reference of the observer.Footnote21 The principle of relativity implies that there is no privileged frame of reference; the laws of physics are the same in all inertial frames of reference. Special relativity is built upon the principle of relativity (first postulate) and the postulate that in a vacuum the speed of light is constant for all observers. Together, these two postulates have several implications that show that some of the facts that we usually consider to be “objective” are in fact observer-dependent. For instance, special relativity implies the relativity of simultaneity: It depends on the observer’s frame of reference whether two events separated in space occur at the same time. There is no objective or absolute sense in which we could tell that two spatially separate events take place simultaneously. When we turn to general relativity, we see that space and time are not absolute, not a fixed background, but that the geometry of spacetime itself is influenced by what is going on within spacetime, namely by the energy-momentum of matter. This means that there is a reciprocal relationship between spacetime and what it contains (including the embodied observer).Footnote22

**This commits us to practical deliberation as the method of moral inquiry   
Serra 09**Juan Pablo Serra. What Is and What Should Pragmatic Ethics Be? Some Remarks on Recent Scholarship*.* EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PRAGMATISM AND AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY. 2009. Francisco de Vitoria College, Humanities Department, Faculty member. https://journals.openedition.org/ejpap/905

This separation of theory and practice runs parallel to another split, namely, that of ethics and morals or, better put, of ethical theory and moral practice. Peirce denies that morality is subject to rationality and thinks that ethics is valuable as a science in a broad sense. But he also regards ethics as a science which bears on human conduct only indirectly, through the examination of past actions and the self-correction of the self in view of future action. In addition, ethics would be a normative knowledge only in so far as it analyzes the adjustment of actions to ends and in so far as it studies the general way in which a good life can be lived. In morals Peirce appeals to instinct and sentiment, and in ethics he recommends the use of logical thinking —just as scientists do. However, even within the framework of his system, it’s not obvious that scientists may so easily set aside their instincts —in fact, instinct (or ‘rational instinct’ as he called it in 1908) plays a significant role in the economy of re- search. Moreover, the statement that in moral issues there may be no possibility of carrying out an inquiry that is truth-oriented is not an uncontroversial one. After all, moral inquiry is performed in a deliberative way, weighing up argumentations, beliefs and principles, and comparing them either with their probable or conceivable consequences or with lived as well as possible experiences that can be forceful or impinge upon the deliberative subject in such a way as to acquire the compulsory resistance due to reality. As Misak puts it succint- ly, “the practice of moral deliberation is responsive to experience, reason, argument, and thought experiments... Such responsiveness is part of what it is to make a moral decision and part of what it is to try to live a moral life” (2000: 52)3. Likewise, this same deliberative activity implies an effort to acquire habits, beliefs and principles that contribute to a truly free deliberation which, in turn, can result in creative conclusions. For Peirce, as you get more habit-governed, you become more creative and free, and your selfhood acquires plas- ticity and receptiveness to experience4. Vincent Colapietro has referred to Peirce’s description of human reason in terms of a deliberative rationality (1999: 24). Also, in another place he has explained that deliberation for Peirce is a process of preparation for future action which has to do with the checking of previous acts, the rehearsal in imagination of different roads to be followed by possible conduct and the nurturing of ideals (Colapietro 1997: 270, 281). It is precisely this experi- ment carried out within imagination that generates habits, because, as Peirce says in “A Survey of Pragmaticism”, “it is not the muscular action but the accompanying inward ef- forts, the acts of imagination, that produce the habit” (CP 5.479, 1907). Habits are regular ways of thinking, perceiving and interpreting that generate actions. As such, habits have a huge influence on human behavior, manifest themselves in the con- crete things we do and, at the same time, are formed within those same activities. Even more, according to Peirce, the activity takes the form of experimentation in the inner world; and the conclusion (if it comes to a definite conclusion), is that under given conditions, the interpreter will have formed the habit of acting in a given way whenever he may desire a given kind of result. The real and living logical conclusion is that habit (CP 5.491, 1907). Much more evidence could be given to support the view that habits are virtually decided (CP 2.435, c.1893) and also that intelligence comprises inward or potential actions that in- fluence the formation of habits (CP 6.286, 1893). Suffice it to say that, according to Peirce, deliberation is a function of the imagination, and that imagination is in itself an experiment which may have unexpected consequences that impose themselves upon the deliberative subject.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with pragmatic deliberation.

#### Impact Calc – deliberation is procedural, which means that agents ought to act in a deliberative fashion by employing the pragmatic procedure of deliberation, not the substance or conditions where deliberation can arise. To clarify, consequences are a sequencing question.

#### 1] impacts cannot be isolated from their history and the only way to test the validity of truth is through application.

**Dewey 02** [John Dewey (head of the Philosophy Department at the University of Chicago). “The Evolutionary Method as Applied to Morality: II. Its Significance for Conduct.” The Philosophical Review, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Jul., 1902), pp. 353-371. Accessed 12/31/20. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2176470.pdf> //Recut Xu]

The problem of the best method of arriving at correct judg- ments on points of moral worth, necessarily traverses ground covered by the time-honored and time-worn theories of intuition- alism and empiricism. Even at the risk of threshing old straw, it will be advisable to compare the evolutionary method with these other points of view. In such a comparison, however, it is to be borne in mind that the sole point under review is that of the log- ical relationship of the theory examined to the meaning and sanc- tion of our moral judgments. The question is not whether or no there are intuitions; whether or no they can be utilized in special cases, or whether or no all supposed intuitions can be accounted for as products of associative memory. The problem is not one of fact but of value. It is a logical problem. If we suppose such necessary and universal beliefs as go by the name of ' intuition' to exist, does such existence settle anything regarding the valid- ity of what is believed, either in general or in part? It is a question of the relation of the intuition to fact -to the moral order in reality. Under what conditions alone, and in what measure or degree, are we justified in arguing from the existence of moral intuitions as mental states and acts to facts taken to correspond to them ? The reply already hinted at is that the mere existence of a belief, even admitting that as a belief it cannot in any way be got rid of, determines absolutely nothing regarding the objectivity of its own content. The worth of the intuition depends upon genetic considerations. In so far as we can state the intuition in terms of the conditions of its origin, development, and later career, in so far we have some criterion for passing judgment upon its pretentions to validity. If we can find that the intuition is a legitimate response to enduring and deep-seated conditions, we have some reason to attribute worth to it. If we find that historically the belief has played a part in maintaining the integrity of social life, and in bringing new values into it, our belief in its worth is additionally guaranteed. But if we cannot find such historic origin and functioning, the intuition remains a mere state of consciousness, a hallucination, an illusion, which is not made more worthy by simply multiplying the number of people who have participated in it. Put roughly we may say that intuitionalism, asordinarily conceived, makes the ethical belief a brute fact, because unrelated. Its very lack of genetic relationship to the situation in which it appears condemns it to isolation. This isolation logically makes it impossible to credit it with objective validity. The intuitionalist, in proclaiming the necessity of his content, proclaims thereby its objective reference; but in asserting its non-genetic character he denies any reference whatsoever. The genetic theory holds that the content embodied in any so-called intuition is a response to a given active situation: that it arises, develops, and operates somehow in reference to this situation. This functional reference establishes in advance some kind of relationship to objective conditions, and hence some presumption of validity. If the ' intuition' persists, it is within certain limits because the situation persists. If the particular moral belief is really inexpugnable, it is just because the conditions which require it are so enduring as to persistently call out an attitude which is relevant to them. The probability is that it continues in existence simply because it continues to be necessary in function.

#### 2] Pluralistic Materialism – other theories rely on minimalistic criteria; our framework understands knowledge as changing and uses experience to base social change and revise ideas. Glaude 7Eddie S. (Eddie S. Glaude Jr. is the African-American chair of the Center for African-American Studies and the William S. Tod Professor of Religion and African-American Studies at Princeton University.) In a Shade of Blue : Pragmatism and the Politics of Black America. University of Chicago Press, 2007. EBSCOhost. (5-7)

In a Shade of Blue is my contribution to the tradition I have just sketched. My aim is to think through some of the more pressing conceptual problems confronting African American political life, and I do so as a Deweyan prag-matist. I should say a bit about what I mean by this self-description. John Dewey thought of philosophy as a form of cultural and social criticism. He held the view that philosophy, properly understood as a mode of wis-dom, ought to aid us in our efforts to overcome problematic situations and worrisome circumstances. The principal charge of the philosopher, then, is to deal with the problems of human beings, not simply with the problems of philosophers. For Dewey, over the course of his long career, this involved bridging the divide between science, broadly understood, and morals—a divide he traced to a conception of experience that has led philosophers over the centuries to tilt after windmills. Dewey declared, “The problem of restoring integration and co-operation between man’s beliefs about the world in which he lives and his beliefs about values and purposes that should direct his conduct is the deepest problem of any philosophy that is not isolated from life.”9Dewey bases this conclusion on several features of his philosophy: (1) anti foundationalism, (2) experimentalism, (3) contextualism, and (4) soli-darity.10 Antifoundationalism, of course, is the rejection of foundations of knowledge that are beyond question. Dewey, by contrast, understands knowledge to be the fruit of our undertakings as we seek “the enrichment of our immediate experience through the control over action it exercises.”11He insists that we turn our attention from supposed givens to actual consequences, pursuing a future fundamentally grounded in values shaped by experience and realized in our actions. This view makes clear the experimental function of knowledge. Dewey emphasized that knowledge entails efforts to control and select future experience and that we are always con-fronted with the possibility of error when we act. We experiment or tinker, with the understanding that all facts are fallible and, as such, occasionally afford us the opportunity for revision.12Contextualism refers to an understanding of beliefs, choices, and actions as historically conditioned. Dewey held the view that inquiry, or the pursuit of knowledge, is value-laden, in the sense that we come to problems with interests and habits that orient us one way or another, and that such pursuits are also situational, in the sense that “knowledge is pursued and produced somewhere, some when, and by someone.”13Finally, solidarity captures the associational and cooperative dimensions of Dewey’s thinking. Dewey conceives of his pragmatism as “an instrument of social improvement” aimed principally at expanding democratic life and broadening the ground of individual self-development.14Democracy, for him, constitutes more than a body of formal procedures; it is a form of life that requires constant attention if we are to secure the ideals that purportedly animate it. Individuality is understood as developing one’s unique capacities within the context of one’s social relations and one’s community. The formation of the democratic character so important to our form of associated living involves, then, a caring disposition toward the plight of our fellows and a watchful concern for the well-being of our democratic life.

#### 3] Best studies prove pluralistic tendencies are inevitable

Polzler 19[Thomas Pölzler and Jennifer Cole Wright- “Empirical research on folk moral objectivism” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6686698/> NCBI. Published July 5th 2019]

Examining these studies' results more closely, however, makes it less clear whether this interpretation is appropriate (Pölzler, 2018b). Take again Goodwin and Darley's study. In this study, almost 30% of subjects' responses to the disagreement measure and almost 50% of their responses to the truth‐aptness measure fell on the option that the researchers took to be indicative of subjectivism (Goodwin & Darley, 2008, pp. 1347, 1351). Moreover, while some moral statements were dominantly classified as objective (e.g., the above statement about robbery), many others were dominantly classified as nonobjective (e.g., the stem cell research statement). This suggests that subjects in Goodwin and Darley's study may have actually favored what Wright, Grandjean, and McWhite (2013) called “metaethical pluralism,” i.e., they sometimes sided with objectivism and other times with nonobjectivism. More recent studies have by and large confirmed this hypothesis of folk metaethical pluralism. Wright et al. (2013) and Wright, McWhite, and Grandjean (2014), for example, replicated Goodwin and Darley's results, using the exact same measures, but letting subjects classify the presented statements as moral and nonmoral themselves. Objectivity ratings for statements that were dominantly self‐classified as moral varied between as little as 5% and as much as 85%. Research based on different measures yielded high proportions of intrapersonal variation as well (e.g., Beebe, 2014; Beebe, Qiaoan, Wysocki, & Endara, 2015; Beebe & Sackris, 2016; Fisher, Knobe, Strickland, & Keil, 2017; Goodwin & Darley, 2012; Heiphetz & Young, 2017; Wright, 2018; Zijlstra, forthcoming‐a).2

#### 4] Social relations are dynamic and constantly being decentered from normative systems of knowledge; only pragmatism’s understanding of interactive knowledge production can mitigate entrenched violence.

Kadlec 8, Alison. "Critical pragmatism and deliberative democracy." Theoria 55.117 (2008): 54-80. (doctorate in political science from the University of Minnesota and bachelor's degrees from Michigan State University in political theory, constitutional democracy and English literature.)//Elmer and UT AI and Dulles AS

Social Intelligence: The Critical Potential Lived Experience Though human nature is intersubjectively generated on an ongoing basis, we are not merely the products of Platonic conceptions of ourselves. Individuals are cultivated in and by society through experiential processes in which we are acted upon, and act back upon a dynamic environment. For Dewey, 'experience' connotes a very specific process that stands in stark contrast to the traditional conception of experience as a matter of private consciousness. Because Dewey's notion of experience is **social, active, and educative,** what he calls the 'experiential continuum' is the process by which we are best able to develop social intelligence. The 'experiential continuum' is characterised by our enduring and undergoing the consequences of our actions, and intelligence is to be understood as the self-conscious and ongoing process of adjusting our attitudes in light of these consequences.25 In The Public and Its Problems , Dewey gives this view of intelligence a decidedly deliberative spin when he says, 'we lie, as Emerson said, in the lap of an immense intelligence. But that intelligence is dormant and its communications are broken, inarticulate and faint until it possesses the local community as its medium'.26 In 'Ethical Principles Underlying Education', Dewey is more explicit in explaining his view of the relationship between social intelligence and the normative commitment to democracy in his declaration that 'ultimate moral motives and forces are nothing more nor less than social intelligence the power of observing and comprehending social situations and social power trained capacities of control at work in the service of social interest and aims'.27 Dewey's unflagging faith in the transformative potential of social intelligence intrinsic to democracy as a way of life **is not Utopian**, nor is it based on a belief that all problems are finally solvable. Rather, it expresses a moral commitment that suggests that a working faith in social intelligence is our best shot at crafting habits and institutions that will further encourage us to identify **new opportunities for the expansion of our capacities** moving forward. The upshot here is that democracy as a way of life means, above all, that we stop thinking of democracy as a thing and start thinking about it as a way. Democracy is belief in the ability of human experience to generate the aims and methods by which further experience will grow in ordered richness. . . . Democracy is the faith that the process of experience is more important than any special result attained, so that the special results achieved are of ultimate value only as they are used to enrich and order the ongoing process. Since the process of experience is capable of being **educative**, faith in democracy is all one with faith in experience and education. All ends and values that are cut off from the ongoing process become arrests and fixations. They strive to fixate what has been gained instead of using it to open the road and point the way to new and better experiences.28 On this account, social intelligence is not a possession, it is a de-centred and educative process of ordering our **experiences** through manifold **communication**. The guiding principles, then, of social intelligence are 1) the protection and expansion of our capacity for free and communicative inquiry and 2) the protection and expansion of our capacity to perceive the shared consequences of our habits and policies. We judge the goodness or badness of these consequences by evaluating the way they act back on and impact our individual capacities for free inquiry that inform the ongoing development of social intelligence In turn, the 'proper conditions' for social intelligence then are those that increase our ability to perceive the complex shared consequences of our choices and practices. Intelligence is social in pragmatism because it requires the development of both firstand second-order attitudes that can only take place in an ongoing process of communication. Free inquiry is not just a matter of having the opportunity to seek information that will allow for the generation of thoughtful attitudes about issues, it is also a matter of appreciating and harnessing the democratic potential of second-order attitudes (attitudes about our attitudes). We are not passive receivers of information, **but dynamic interactors**, and therefore intelligence is intrinsically communicative. Free inquiry is the engine of social intelligence, which is in turn based on our willingness to have our firstorder attitudes adjusted in light of our second-order attitudes.29 The ongoing mutual adjustment of our first-order and second-order attitudes through a back and forth process between the two emerges only to the extent that we have the opportunities to communicate freely with others, and this is none other than the 'method' of social intelligence. The goal of communicative inquiry then is to build an ever richer context for the ongoing development of our ability to perceive the relationship between our beliefs, practices, and institutions. By taking a principal focus on increasing our ability for evermore sophisticated perception of the consequences of our habits of thought and action, we will be better equipped to distinguish between those habits that improve and those that impede our capacities for free inquiry. This is the material of problem-solving, as it is just this capacity for free inquiry that makes it possible to identify common problems in a way that they may be productively addressed. Turning back to the challenges leveled by radical democratic theorists, we can begin to see the opportunities made possible by critical pragmatism. Tapping into the critical potential of lived experience under conditions of unalterable changefulness begins with the therapeutic recognition that there is no such thing as a unified field of power directed entirely by stable and fixed interests. The first implication here is that there are always new opportunities to exploit cracks and fissures in various structurally **entrenched forms of power**. Second, the essentially complexity and flux of our world is always **producing new opportunities for transformative resistance** and for the development of more creative approaches to meaningful deliberation. Critical pragmatism pivots on the notion that under such conditions what we most need are not fixed and static foundations, we need the flexible habits of inquiry and **communication** that make it possible to both identify pernicious obstacles to deliberation and to challenge, circumvent, or neutralise their impact. Vested interests, interests vested with power, are powerfully on the side of the status quo, and therefore they are especially powerful in hindering the growth and application of the method of natural intelligence.

#### 5] Performativity- when you enter debate, you presume that you can discuss the topic because of deliberation. This means denial of my framework is impossible and all objections should be ignored on face because responding to my framework requires my framework to do so.

#### 6] Normative Necessity- If you’re unsure what the good is, allow for deliberation because it allows people to pursue their conception of the good and discuss it. This means that epistemic modesty collapses because it means we need to include various viewpoints, which is prag

### Affirm

#### Objectivity in the press is consistent with the pragmatic theory of truth via rigorous inquiry and pluralist decision-making.

Ward 17 [Stephen J. A. Ward (Distinguished Lecturer in Ethics at the University of British Columbia, Courtesy Professor at the School of Journalism and Communication at the University of Oregon, and founding director of the Center for Journalism Ethics at the University of Wisconsin). “ENGAGEMENT AND PRAGMATIC OBJECTIVITY”. Center for Journalism Ethics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. March 27, 2017. Accessed 2/26/2022. <https://ethics.journalism.wisc.edu/2017/03/27/engagement-and-pragmatic-objectivity/> //Xu]

In the first article in this series, I argued for a radical rethink of ethics to respond properly to the challenge of journalism in a time of Trump. We need to practice democratically engaged journalism, which views journalists as social advocates. But they are advocates of a special kind: objective advocates for plural democracy. Here, I’ll examine the method of objective engagement, what I call pragmatic objectivity. Journalists of this ilk are neither partisans nor neutral reporters of “just the facts.” Objective engagement sounds strange to some ears; it runs against a strong strain of dualistic thinking in journalism ethics: I can be a disinterested journalist or an interest-driven advocate but not both. Facts versus opinion, facts versus values, neutrality versus engagement. These dualisms are the trouble-making heritage of a journalism ethic from a different media era a century ago. Pragmatic objectivity rejects the dualisms, but not objectivity. It redefines it. But how can journalists be engaged and objective? OBJECTIVITY AS TESTING What does it mean to be objective, and why be objective? Since philosophy in antiquity, objectivity has been an ideal of inquiry. Objectivity in this tradition is ontological, i.e., it is knowledge of the world as it exists independent of mind. Objective beliefs map the world. Subjective beliefs fail to map. To be concerned about objectivity is to ask: Which beliefs, reports, and theories are reliable representations of the world? Humans make mistakes. The sources of error are known: our desires, ideologies, prejudices, faulty logic, and interests. How decide which beliefs map the world? There is only one way. We examine how we formed a belief. We evaluate its reasons and its methods. Objectivity becomes epistemological. Objective belief is supported by evidence. Subjective belief lacks support. Objectivity comes down to testing beliefs by the methods and criteria of good inquiry. For example, we test beliefs to see if they follow valid statistical methods. The most familiar modes of testing are the methods of science. But criteria for objective inquiry populate philosophy, logic, critical thinking, social science, law, and journalism. Objectivity is an ideal. Even if never fully realized, it is a target at which to aim. Being objective is not easy. It requires mental discipline and a willingness to critique one’s views. So “Why be objective?” becomes, “Why value well-evidenced belief?” For two reasons. We need objective beliefs to guide actions. And, we need objective methods for adjudication: Teachers need to mark exams objectively; judges need to adjudicate disputes by law and fact. Too much time has been wasted of late on the flabby, unfocused question as to whether objectivity exists, or whether it is valuable. Of course objectivity exists, if we mean there are people capable of reasonably objective judgments. That happens every day. And, it is clear that objective judgment has value in many domains of life. So what is the debate over objectivity in journalism about, anyway? The real issue is what type of objective testing is appropriate for journalism? OLD AND NEW OBJECTIVITY Historically, journalism objectivity has been reductionist. Testing for objectivity is reduced to testing for facts and neutrality. The conception, adopted in the early 1900s for professional newsrooms, is that a report is objective if and only if it neutrally reports only observable facts. The sphere of objective belief is reduced to beliefs derived from the senses. Traditional objectivity is dualistic: it draws a firm line between observation and interpretation of fact, neutral reporting and advocacy. It is exclusive: Reporter’s opinions and interpretations are to be excluded from good reporting. This is the old objectivity. It makes objective engagement ‘sound strange.’ This way of thinking continues to haunt debates, even if people doubt objectivity. Reporters still balk at the suggestion they interpret events. They worry about losing neutrality when covering Trump. Too many commentators reject objectivity because they think of it as strict neutrality, as if there was not some other conception. Pragmatic objectivity is a new objectivity. It is plural and holistic. It evaluates beliefs with a variety of standards. It is inclusive, open to the evaluation of many kinds of writing. It denies dualisms, viewing journalism as both factual and interpretive, an engaged chronicling. For pragmatic objectivity, the sphere of objective belief is larger than the sphere of fact. What we know depends not only on observation but on our perspectives—webs of belief and values. Knowledge is an interpretation, in which fact and theory are entangled. Even what we consider a fact is determined by our webs of belief. Hence, expert analysis of political events and scientific theories of unobservable forces in nature can be objective, even if not reducible to observable fact. They are objective to the extent that they are reliable indicators of the world and guides to action. Journalism stories are web-dependent interpretations. They are not pure observations of fact. Even apparent facts-only reporting, e.g., reporting a news conference, require the journalist to select salient statements, decide on quotations, and make sense of the conference for a public. Salience, choosing content, and creating meaning are interpretive functions. If this view is true, then we need a notion of objectivity that disciplines and tests our interpretive tendencies, rather than tries to eliminate them. We need appropriate standards of evaluation. Pragmatic objectivity provides a list for journalism. They are: Standards of attitude: Journalists should adopt the objective stance, step back from their beliefs, display a passion for truth and give reasons that others could accept. Standards of empirical validity: What is the empirical evidence for the story? Are the facts carefully collected, verified, complete and placed in context? Are counter-facts treated seriously? Standards of clarity, logic, and coherence: Does the story cohere with existing knowledge in the field? Is the interpretation logically consistent? Are the concepts clear? Are fallacious arguments or manipulative techniques used? Standards of diverse and trusted sources: Are important sources taken into account and fairly assessed? Standards of self-consciousness: In constructing a story, are we conscious of the conceptual frame we use to understand the topic? Are there other frames? Standard of open, public scrutiny: Have we subjected our views to the views of others? Are we prepared to alter our views? The standards apply to many forms of journalism from ‘straight’ reporting to editorial commentary and advocacy journalism. It is a flexible, platform-neutral method.

#### A pragmatically objective press is a necessary component of a pluralist and deliberative democracy.

Ward 17 [Stephen J. A. Ward (Distinguished Lecturer in Ethics at the University of British Columbia, Courtesy Professor at the School of Journalism and Communication at the University of Oregon, and founding director of the Center for Journalism Ethics at the University of Wisconsin). “ENGAGEMENT AND PRAGMATIC OBJECTIVITY”. Center for Journalism Ethics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. March 27, 2017. Accessed 2/26/2022. <https://ethics.journalism.wisc.edu/2017/03/27/engagement-and-pragmatic-objectivity/> //Xu]

OBJECTIVITY WITHIN ENGAGEMENT How is pragmatic objectivity compatible with journalism as engaged? Objectivity and engagement are compatible because there is a difference between methods and goals. Goals are the aims of engagement in life and society. We are partial about our goals, favoring them over others. But our methods of achieving goals can be objective or subjective. The value of objectivity is that it helps us to be engaged, to achieve certain goals or perform certain functions. Scientists follow objective methods to create new technology to solve a problem. Judges follow the objective methods of law to pursue their goal of justice. Democratically engaged journalists have a dual commitment: they are committed to impartial methods as a means to their partial commitment to plural democracy. They commit themselves to rational and objective methods for deciding what to publish and how to persuade. Their desire for objective belief is part of a desire for reason-based democratic processes. In contrast, there are engaged citizens, such as extreme partisans, who use partial methods for partial goals. They do whatever it takes to advance their cause. Their manipulative strategies exploit the sources of subjective belief such as fears, biases, and stereotypes. Objective engagement does not require an all-encompassing neutrality which precludes expressing a view or coming to a conclusion. Both scientists and judges are impartial in method but they rightly come to conclusions and take sides in conflicts. Objectively engaged journalists are impartial or disinterested because they do not let their partialities or interests undermine objective judgment and inquiry. They do not prejudge the story before fairly weighing all relevant evidence. But after such inquiry, journalists are free to draw an informed conclusion. Such is the method of investigative journalism. Objectivity is not a value-free zone. TRUMP AND PRAGMATIC OBJECTIVITY How might pragmatic objectivity shape our response to journalism in a time of Trump? It would open up the space in which we think about journalism, refusing to reduce the options to a forced choice between neutral stenography and biased partisanship. Calling for a return to traditional objective journalism is like proposing that we go backward in time. Not only do many journalists not practice traditional facts-only reporting but the public sphere that once justified such an ethic has greatly disappeared. The situation is too serious for outdated solutions. Evidence, fact, and truth are ideas increasingly defined by politics, power, and manipulative persuasion. What is a fact is too often what someone claims is a fact, for self-interested reasons. Partisans and leaders, including Trump and his advisers, tweet unsubstantiated claims for political reasons: to galvanize their base of support, to maintain their ideology; and to distract the media. One strategy is to insert fake news into the infosphere knowing it will be there forever, influencing someone, diluting the influence of other interpretations. This insouciance toward objective reasons and disciplined thinking is disturbing. We face the end of the ideal of informed and reasonable democratic publics. In this corrupted media sphere, journalists should not be passive or neutral. Such a climate needs an active journalism with a method that resists subjective claims. Pragmatic objectivity encourages journalists to do the things that need to done: There is no better antidote to fake news than real news, objectively tested. Fake news and alternate facts are just other terms for biased, subjective belief. There is no better antidote to a passive, manipulatable press than a press objectively engaged as watchdogs for plural democracy, who fact-test political claims and investigate conflicts of interest among Trump’s family and advisers. There is no better antidote to illiberal and intolerant media than an objectively engaged journalism that performs the political explanatory journalism noted in the first article. Finally, news media that follow pragmatic objectivity, aimed at protecting plural democracy, can justifiably take legal and other action against a presidential decision, law, or policy that violates a constitutional principle, such as free expression, or the rights of minorities.

### Method

#### 1] 1AR theory is legit – anything else means infinite abuse

#### – drop the debater – 1AR is too short to make up for the time trade-off

#### – no RVIs – 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time

#### – competing interps – reasonability narrows the theory debate to one issue of brightline, making it easy for the Neg to collapse to the issue in the long 2NR

#### 2] Affirm if I win offense to a counterinterp

#### A] Timeskew – 6 Minute 2NR with collapse to whatever I undercover means that you can win theory and substance, but I need to go for both in half the time and split it between the 2 layers.

#### B] Reciprocity – you get T and theory so I should get theory and an RVI to make the burden reciprocal.

#### 3]Nothing in the 1AC has triggered it, but Presumption and permissibility affirm –

#### a) We always default to assuming something true until proven false ie if I told you my name is Ben you would believe me

#### b) If agents have to justify why every action is morally good we would have to justify actions that are morally neutral ie drinking water

**c) Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason.**

#### d) Negation Theory- Negating requires a complete absence of an existing obligation

Negate [is to]: to deny the existence of

That’s Dictionary.com- “Negate” https://www.dictionary.com/browse/negate.

#### e) empirics

**Shah 19,**[Shah, Sachin. “A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SIDE-BIAS ON THE 2019 JANUARY-FEBRUARY LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE TOPIC.” NSD Update, National Symposium of Debate, 16 Feb. 2019, <http://nsdupdate.com/2019/a-statistical-analysis-of-side-bias-on-the-2019-january-february-lincoln-douglas-debate-topic/> ]//LHPSS accessed 9/4/19

As a final note, it is also interesting to look at the trend over multiple topics. In the rounds **from** 93 TOC bid distributing tournaments (**2017 – 2019** YTD), **the neg**ative **won 52.99% of ballots** (**p-value < 0.0001)** and 54.63% of upset rounds (p-value < 0.0001). **This suggests the bias might be structural, and not topic specific, as this data spans six different topics.**

### Advantage

#### I affirm: In the Republic of India, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

#### Objectivity is about the method not the journalist. Bias is inevitable, the plan just requires transparent and consistent methods of testing information.

Panneerelvan 20 “The lost meaning of objectivity” OCTOBER 12, 2020 A.S. Panneerselvan <https://www.thehindu.com/opinion/Readers-Editor/the-lost-meaning-of-objectivity/article32828043.ece> SM

On October 8, members of the Organization of News Ombudsmen and Standards Editors held an internal shop talk on the question of ‘impartiality’. It was led by Tom Rosenstiel, Executive Director of the American Press Institute. Mr. Rosenstiel explained that in journalism we expect the method, and not the individual journalist, to remain objective. He said of the implications of this: “One is that the impartial voice employed by many news organisations, that familiar, supposedly neutral style of newswriting, is not a fundamental principle of journalism. Rather, it is an often helpful device news organisations use to highlight that they are trying to produce something obtained by objective methods.” He pointed out that objectivity as practised by journalists is to have a consistent method of testing information — a transparent approach to evidence. Expanding on this idea, Mr. Rosenstiel said: “The practice began as a way of injecting more scientific rigour into the practice of journalism, but instead it has turned into a devotion to false balance and other elements of what journalism professor Jay Rosen called ‘the view from nowhere’.”

#### Truth-based reporting in India is under fire now.

Ayyub 20 “Opinion: Journalism is under attack in India. So is the truth.” Rana Ayyub [Global Opinions contributing writer, total badass] February 21, 2020 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/02/21/journalism-is-under-attack-india-so-is-truth/> SM

Opinion: Journalism is under attack in India. So is the truth.

“Jihadi.” “Presstitute.”

Those are some of the insults the government of India routinely deploys against critical journalists. I’ve been at the receiving end of both. A few weeks ago, the Twitter account of the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party called me a “jihadi” for my criticism of its polarizing tweets against Muslims in India.

But I’m far from alone. Journalists are facing enormous pressures and intimidation in India.

President Trump, who is visiting the country next week, will surely feel right at home with a government that also dismisses critical news stories as fake and casts aspersions on journalistic integrity everyday.

Fabrication, hyper-nationalism and self-censorship are on the rise as the government of Prime Minister Narendra Modi tightens its grip on the country’s political and economic life. High-profile journalists have been pushed aside for not toeing the line. As a result, many of India’s finest journalist and editors can’t find supportive newsrooms.

One of the country’s most popular news anchors, Faye D’Souza, resigned under pressure after she aired an episode in August questioning the government’s decision to revoke the special status accorded to Kashmir, which led to a crackdown on local politicians, a total Internet blockade and a tight curfew. The channel pushed her out because it decided to stand with Modi’s Kashmir decision.

This climate of intimidation is not new. In June 2017, the Central Bureau of Investigation raided the residence of Prannoy Roy, the proprietor of one of India’s oldest and most credible news networks, NDTV. In his response, Roy said “they are trying to tell us that we can suppress you even if we haven’t done nothing wrong." Then he added: "It is a signal to the entire free press of India.”

But the tactics have become more brazen and are not even restricted to journalists based in India. After the New York-based writer Aatish Taseer wrote a cover story for Time critical of Modi, Taseer found his Overseas Citizen of India card revoked, which will now make it difficult for him to visit his home country.

The attacks and intimidation help clear the way for what award-winning journalist Ravish Kumar has termed the lapdog media, or “godi media.” It’s this partisan media that has been tasked with dehumanizing and demonizing students — who are protesting India’s discriminatory policies, including its controversial citizenship laws — minorities and activists, who are routinely labeled as anti-nationals on prime-time shows.

When you have a “lapdog media,” the prime minister doesn’t have to answer tough questions: Modi has yet to hold a news conference since he took office, but he has sat down for scripted interviews with selected news anchors.

These pliable anchors also generously amplify fake-news videos generated and circulated by the ruling party’s social media and then refuse to course-correct despite being called out by fact-checkers.

This week, many journalists, including Stephen Sackur, host of the BBC’s “Hard Talk,” took a dig at the presenters of a Hindi news channel for heckling a student on a show, calling him an anti-national. And earlier this month, when a fact-checking news site in India, Alt News, clarified that a student had not thrown a rock at a police officer, it was too late: The nationalist mainstream media had already ran with the story to say student protesters at Jamia Millia Islamia University in New Delhi were pelting cops with stones. In reality, police and thugs were the ones who entered the university’s library and mercilessly attacked students, injuring many and sparking international condemnation.

Even a popular stand-up comedian decided to do something to break this cycle. When Kunal Kamra found himself on a flight in January with Arnab Goswami, the anchor of a repugnant show on the channel Republic, he decided to question him and film the exchange. He asked Arnab if he was a coward or a nationalist since the anchor awarded these tags every night on his news show. But instead of being applauded, Kamra was banned from flying on almost all commercial airlines, including the national carrier Air India.

As India heads down the path of authoritarianism and hyper-nationalism, the price for speaking up is rising. Minorities are being stifled and intimidated. Protesters speaking against tyranny and discrimination are demonized. Never has journalism in India been in more urgent need of resolute moral clarity.

Our public institutions are being tested; the Indian journalists who are upholding the truth must remember that history will be kind for taking that position, especially when it was unpopular and the response brutal.

#### Advantage 1 is Sino-India:

#### Abandoning objective media escalates Sino-Indian conflict – uniquely likely now.

Zhiyong 21 “India’s social media spices up wild sensations, cooking border row madness” Hu Zhiyong [research fellow at the Institute of International Relations at the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences] Mar 03, 2021 <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202103/1217200.shtml> SM

Since May 2020, India had repeatedly provoked China in border areas, resulting in months of standoffs between the two countries. However, Indian media outlets have been distorting facts, thus misleading the Indian people. This has to a large extent stirred up waves of anti-China sentiments among Indian netizens who do not know the truth. China-India relations are deeply influenced by online public opinion, which also has an impact on India's policy options. These rhetoric has brought about extremely negative effects to the overall China-India relations.

At present, Chinese and Indian troops have carried out disengagement at the northern and southern banks of the Pangong Tso lake. This has clearly eased tensions in the border areas. However, some Indian and Western media deliberately misinterpreted the move, hinting that it was an act to save their reputations and to gain political support at home.

Some Indians even took the opportunity to characterize the Indian officers who unilaterally provoked the border skirmishes as heroes defending their country. They hyped their stories up on social media. This further incited hostility toward China among Indian people and undermined peace and stability on the China-India border.

Since the latest round of border conflicts, India has implemented a series of discriminatory measures against China, including blocking a number of Chinese apps and restricting Chinese investment. Bilateral relations with China have fallen to rock bottom. Anti-China sentiments in India continue to rise. Indian media outlets have played a role in fanning these flames.

As the world enters the era of social media, it is necessary for media outlets of any kind to report objectively, fairly and independently on the daily happenings around the world.

However, Indian media outlets are mostly privately owned. In order to attract readers, they often violate professional ethics, ignore facts, and publish information that is beneficial only to themselves. In addition, some Indian politicians often use media to show their extreme reactions to China. This has resulted in a severe lack of strategic mutual trust between the two countries.

Since taking office in 2014, Indian Prime Minister's Narendra Modi's administration proactively pumped Hindu nationalism into Indian people's daily lives. This, too, deeply influenced the mutual understanding between China and India.

Some Indian people's unfavorable view toward China makes them less willing to communicate with or to rediscover China. Anti-China discourse has become a new political correctness in India.

In the era of informationization and globalization, new media, newspapers and magazines have become the main channels for people to obtain information. Indian media's sensational propaganda of the so-called China threat has created a distorted image of China in the minds of the Indian people.

The image of China in Indian media is neither objective nor real. Instead, it is a mirage for India to vent its sadness, resentment, desire and fear. In addition, the war between the two countries in 1962 had left a psychological shadow on the Indian people. Since then, the Indian public generally has had a low preference for China, and it continues to decline.

Whenever disputes occur in the China-India border area, the Indian government, think tanks, and media outlets always collaborate: The media fabricates fake stories and news; certain politicians support the media reports; social media does not carefully verify the source of the information. This trend exacerbates the declining mutual trust between the two countries. Now, whenever the two countries encounter disputes, India's domestic public opinion tends to put pressure on the Indian government, leaving Indian leaders with no alternative but to take tough actions on issues with China.

Therefore, China and India need to deal with their differences calmly and steadily. In particular, media outlets should play an active role in it. They should create larger public opinion basis for enhancing mutually beneficial cooperation.

#### Sino-India war draws in allies and goes nuclear

Lockett 20 [(Jon Lockett) "World War 3 threat if India &amp; China escalate conflict &amp; allies dragged in," Sun, 6-18-2020, accessed 9-6-2020] IC https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/11893725/nuclear-world-war-3-india-and-china/

THERE are growing fears military clashes along the India-China border could spark a nuclear World War 3. A fire fight on Monday night [left multiple Indian troops dead](https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/11887262/india-warns-china-deaths-not-in-vain/) and has pushed tensions between the two mega-states to breaking point. And in a chilling warning, India's PM Narendra Modi vowed those killed in the Galvan Valley will not die in vain. In response China has said it will "crush" any military aggression from its neighbour. Now there are genuine concerns the regional dispute between the two rival nuclear powers could erupt into [a global conflict.](https://www.thesun.co.uk/topic/world-war-3/) And that could see America - which has just signed a £3bn arms deal with ally [India](https://www.thesun.co.uk/where/india/) - dragged into the bloodshed. New Delhi has grown closer to the US in recent years and Washington now calls India a "major defence partner". The warm welcome afforded to President Trump in India also reflects the extent to which he has found new friends in the region. Meanwhile, US-China relations have been are reaching an all-time low in the wake of a trade war and the coronavirus pandemic. [China](https://www.thesun.co.uk/where/china/), on the other hand, can count India's long-time enemy Pakistan as a very close friend and military partner. Beijing - which calls Pakistan its "iron brother" - has become its largest supplier of arms and its third-largest trading partner. The pair are curently involved in several military projects including the development of JF-17 Thunder fighter plane. Chinese and Pakistani troops also conduct joint regular [training sessions in the mountainous region.](https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/11882619/india-deploys-warships-fighters-china-war/) Tensions have been growing along the border since the spring when China deployed thousands of troops as well as artillery and vehicles. Analysts say the soldiers were sent there in an attempt to stop India increasing its own military presence in the area. Then China moved scores of nukes to Mongolia and leaked images of the weapons just to let the world know they were there. "Given China knows the location of India's bases, it could launch a pre-emptive first strike," warned Mark Almond, director of the Crisis Research Institute, Oxford, [in the Daily Mail.](https://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-8433623/MARK-ALMOND-fist-fight-Himalayas-spark-nuclear-war-engulfs-world.html) "Even if the bombers got airborne, they could be shot down by Chinese air defences in a war. "China has more than double the number of India's warheads - around 300 - and its strategy is based on the destruction of key urban centres which, it believes, would terrify an opponent into passive, appeasing mode." So it seems Beijing now has the ability to strike anywhere in India and India has no effective defence from attack. To make things worse, China has nuclear-armed Pakistan ready and waiting on India's doorstep. This also increases the risk India might feel pressured to strike first before its bases can be knocked out by either China and Pakistan. That would then almost definitely trigger a massive retaliatory strike from the nuclear-armed Chinese military. And it could void Beijing's "no first use" policy in which it pledges only to use nukes in retaliation to a similar attack on them. Not only would such an all-out conflict devastate billions of people in Asia it could force Russia - which has close ties to both - to choose sides. While the UK and Europe will almost certainly back India in any conflict it is unlikely its armies will join in any fighting. Other countries offering moral support to India are likely to include Israel and Sri Lanka. Beijing can expect similar support from its loyal friends including North Korea, Iran and Venzeuela. China and India have been arguing for decades over territory in the Himalayas. In 1962, the giant neighbours even went to war over the disputed Ladakh region. One month of bloodshed resulted in a Chinese military victory, with Beijing declaring a cease-fire after securing de facto control of the region. But the militaries that face off in the Himalayas today are far different from those that fought more than 50 years ago. Conventional wisdom says China holds a significant military advantage over India. However, the recent study by the Belfer Centre suggests India maintains an edge in high-altitude mountainous environments. And that could mean Beijing may rely on its nuclear supremacy if the "fist fights" escalate. China became a nuclear power in 1964 and India in 1974. Figures released this week by the [Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIRPI)](https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2020/nuclear-weapon-modernization-continues-outlook-arms-control-bleak-new-sipri-yearbook-out-now) estimate China has approximately 300 nuclear warheads. That is more than double India's count of 150. Both countries maintain a triad of delivery systems - missiles, bombers and submarines. Tensions between the rival nations has also been heightened recently over a long-running trade row. India has failed to get on board Beijing's plans for a “new Silk Road” to open land and sea corridors linking China with the rest of Asia. India’s snub to the project had been seen as the strongest move yet by Modi to stand up to mighty China. Until now , there have been six major nuclear rivalries: US-Soviet Union, US-Russia, US-China, Soviet Union-China, US-North Korea and India-Pakistan. It looks like India-China can now be added to that list.

#### Even a limited Indo-Pak nuclear war causes extinction.

Menon 19 Prakash Menon, The nuclear cloud hanging over the human race, Nov 15, 2019, [PhD from Madras University for his thesis “Limited War and Nuclear Deterrence in the Indo-Pak context”] [https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/the-nuclear-cloud-hanging-over-the-human-race/cid/1719608#](https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/the-nuclear-cloud-hanging-over-the-human-race/cid/1719608) SM

The nuclear cloud hanging over the human race Even a limited India-Pakistan nuclear conflict could pose an existential challenge to life on Earth The smoke injected into the stratosphere due to a nuclear attack would block the sunlight and result in a ‘Nuclear Winter' - freezing temperatures that pose an existential threat. One study estimates that in an India-Pakistan exchange, the immediate casualties could number 125 million lives The smoke injected into the stratosphere due to a nuclear attack would block the sunlight and result in a ‘Nuclear Winter' - freezing temperatures that pose an existential threat. One study estimates that in an India-Pakistan exchange, the immediate casualties could number 125 million lives iStock Prakash Menon | | Published 15.11.19, 08:04 PM With the recent administrative changes in Jammu and Kashmir, Indo-Pak hyphenation has come back to haunt India’s aspirations to break out of that narrow mould and be perceived as an independent player on the global stage. The clubbing of India with Pakistan is an echo of India’s political and strategic confinement to the sub-continent. Pakistan has always attempted to paint the Indo-Pak situation as a nuclear flashpoint essentially to invite international intervention in what India insists is a bilateral issue. A recent report in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists by Toon et al entitled 'How an India-Pakistan Nuclear War Could Start and have Global Consequences' provides grist to the mill of the nuclear flashpoint theory. But it also raises an issue that has yet not found its place in the public imagination nor has sufficient cognisance been taken by the political and military leadership of nuclear weapon powers – the climatic consequences of nuclear explosions. It is well known that nuclear powers have and continue to base their targeting requirements of nuclear weapons on calculations that are restricted mostly to the major but immediate effects of nuclear explosions – blast, heat and radiation. According to General Lee Butler, the former United States, Strategic Forces Commander, during the cold war, the Standard Integrated Operation Plan (SIOP) had targeted Moscow with 400 nuclear weapons and Kiev with 40. Several scientific studies of the impact of nuclear explosions since the 1980s up to the present which utilises advanced computer models, confirm the effect of smoke injected into the stratosphere that would block sunlight from reaching the earth’s surface and is described as ‘Nuclear Winter’. In essence global temperatures would plunge below freezing point thus posing threats to life support systems especially food production. In short, it threatened human existence itself. Later studies that focused on regional nuclear wars especially in the Indo-Pak context, have indicated that the impact of a nuclear exchange would have an immediate significant and catastrophic impact in terms of death and destruction. The latest Toon study, estimates that in a situation where around 350 warheads are used by India and Pakistan, the immediate casualties would vary between 50 to 125 million lives depending on the yields of the weapons used which could vary between 15-100 Kilotons. (a Kiloton being the explosive equivalent power of 1000 tons of TNT). Such scales and speeds of destruction for both parties would indeed be of an existential nature. Therefore, both India and Pakistan despite the rhetoric during times of tension have so far displayed caution and refrained from getting into situations where nuclear weapons are alerted. The speedy de-escalation after Balakot is indicative of a cautionary approach. Of course, this is no guarantee that the next round would not witness a different outcome. For as long as nuclear weapons exist in the arsenals of both countries, the possibility of use remains, however low the probability. It is now well known (but widely ignored by the strategic cognoscenti) that even a regional Indo-Pak nuclear war with hundreds of low yield nuclear explosions can also pose an existential threat at the global level. The latest study states “In the India-Pakistan scenario, we calculated a total of 16.1 TG (1 TG is equivalent of one million tons of smoke) of black carbon injected into the upper atmosphere (11 from India and 5.1 from Pakistan) for weapons with yields of 15 kilotons; 27.3 TG (19.8 from India and 7.5 from Pakistan) for 50 kiloton weapons; and 36.6 TG (27.5 from India and 9.1 from Pakistan) for 100 kiloton weapons. The smoke would be heated by sunlight and lofted high into the stratosphere, where it could remain for years, since it does not rain in the stratosphere”. The Climate Model indicates that global average temperatures and precipitation would be significantly lowered and comparisons are drawn to the ice age that prevailed thousands of years ago. Agriculture around the world would be impacted and billions of people could face starvation. In earlier studies, even 5 TG of smoke produced (which is one third of what is expected in a lower scale Indo-Pak conflict), food production would change in China and the US for specific crops causing widespread shortages at the global level. Moreover, the ozone layer would be degraded as the rising smoke absorbs the sunlight and heats up the stratosphere that would permit ultra-violet rays of greater magnitude to reach the earth causing negative effects. The political and strategic implications of the long-term impact on climate change challenges the foundations of the edifice on which nuclear weapon strategy has been constructed. It is obvious that any deliberate initiation of nuclear war has a high probability of posing an existential threat to humanity. Even with the achievement of the complete destruction of an adversary’s arsenal through a first strike, the initiator cannot itself escape the existential threat posed by long term climate change. This indicates that the First Use doctrine in the name of strengthening deterrence stands fully exposed for its incredibility and the utter stupidity of the use of nuclear weapons.