**Util NC**

**The standard is maximizing utility.**

**First, all other consequentialist moral theories devolve to life utilitarianism because at their root they all seek to maximize the best consequences, which cannot occur without life.**

**Second, life utilitarianism is the only moral theory that respects the equality of moral agents.**

**Cummiskey 90:**

(Dr. David Cummiskey, Bates College. “Kantian Consequentiaism.”Ethics, Vol. 100, No. 3 (Apr., 1990), pp. 586-615 Published by: The University of Chicago Press. Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2381810)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract “social entity.” It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive “overall social good.” Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Robert Nozick, for example, argues that “to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has.” But why is this not equally true of all those whom we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, we fail to sufficiently respect and take account of the **many other** separate **persons**, each with only one life, who will **bear the cost of our inaction**. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? A morally good agent recognizes that the basis of all particular duties is the principle that “rational nature exists as an end in itself”. Rational nature as such is the supreme objective end of all conduct. **If one truly believes that all rational beings have an equal value, then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives** and liberties **of as many rational beings as possible**. In order to avoid this conclusion, the non-consequentialist Kantian needs to justify agent-centered constraints. As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non- value-based rationale. But we have seen that Kant’s normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? If I sacrifice some for the sake of others, I do not use them arbitrarily, and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. Persons may have “dignity, that is, an unconditional and incomparable worth” that transcends any market value, but persons also have a fundamental **equality** that **dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.** The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others.

**Contention 1: Peace Journalism**

**Peace journalism is advocacy--- severs the neutrality principles of objectivity**

**Shaw 11**:

(Dr. Ibrahim Seaga Shaw is the Chairman and Information Commissioner for the Right to Access Information Commission in Sierra Leone. Debates in Peace Journalism, Journal of Peace Education, 8:3, 363-365, 2011. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17400201.2011.621380)

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

**Objectivity normalizes war-making and enables a militaristic status quo --- war journalism ensures ongoing violence is covered up and never questioned.**

**Lynch 8:**

(Jake Lynch is Director of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Sydney, Australia and Senior Research Fellow of the School of Communication at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa. *“Debates in Peace Journalism,”* Sydney University Press, 2008. https://books.google.com/books/about/Debates\_in\_Peace\_Journalism.html?id=n62YuU3sFxcC)

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

#### **Peace advocacy journalism promotes peace and decreases conflict--positively influences policymaking and public opinion**

**Brastic & Schirch 07:**

(Vladimir Brastic is a professor of communications at Hollins University. Lisa Schirch is Senior Research Fellow for the Toda Peace Institute where she directs the Institute's “Social Media, Technology and Peacebuilding. “Why and When to Use the Media for Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding.” *European Center for Conflict Prevention*, Dec. 2007, https://www.sfcg.org/articles/media\_for\_conflict\_prevention.pdf.)

It is important for conflict prevention and peacebuilding practitioners to understand these values and the dynamics of media decision-making on covering ‘peace’ news and entertainment. However, it does not preclude peace practitioners from utilizing the media to promote their own values. Indeed, the **media can play very positive roles in conflict prevention** and peacebuilding. The media play a wide range of roles in our lives. Some of these roles are constructive and some are destructive. Recognizing the diversity within media professionals is a first step in critically analyzing how best to use the media to support conflict prevention and peacebuilding. Media as Information Provider and Interpreter The media provide people with important information about their environment (e.g. political, cultural, social issues) and respond to more imminent problems (weather, traffic, natural catastrophes, etc.). At least in part, people make decisions about whether to dress for warm or cold, choose political leaders to vote for in elections, and judge other groups in society based on the media. The media interpret events beyond our physical realm and help us make sense of them. With the improvement of technologies and the advancement of new media such as the internet, media plays an increasingly more prominent role in our daily communication and entertainment. For example, the Otpor Movement, developed in 1998 by Serbian students, responded to new restrictions on academic and media freedom with a highly unconventional movement called Otpor (‘resistance’ in Serbian). Otpor developed their own grassroots media campaign to provide information and inspiration to all who resisted the Milosevic government.3 Media as Watchdog The media sometimes acts as a third party ‘watchdog’ who provide feedback to the public on local problems. Media can bring hidden stories out into the public. Investigative reports can surface public problems. For example, a US journalist uncovered and exposed a veteran’s hospital that was dilapidated, rat-infested, and uncaring.4 This highlighted a problem of how US soldiers are treated before and after their time in the US military. In Sierra Leone, a video depicting the serious impacts and extent of sexual violence has instigated discussion on the impact of the civil war in that country. The film, titled Operation Fine Girl: Rape Used as a Weapon of War in Sierra, was produced by human rights activists with the international non-governmental organization WITNESS.5 The film demonstrates how media productions can play an important complementary role alongside other post conflict reconciliation processes to promote awareness of critical social issues and bring them into the public arena so they can be addressed. Media as Gatekeeper The media can also act as a gatekeeper who sets agendas, filters issues and tries to maintain a balance of views. Media like to portray themselves as ‘balanced and fair,’ even when they privately seek to promote a particular ideological set of ideas and limit the public’s exposure to a wide array of information. In 2006, a cartoonist in Denmark created international conflict with his message about Islam. The global tensions prompted extensive analysis on how and when media professionals should act as a gatekeeper to prevent certain expressions that could be deemed humiliating or offensive to some groups. Media as Policymaker The **media has influence on policymakers**, particularly **as they think about how to prevent** and respond to violent **conflict.** The media **is** also **a tool of policymakers to get across** **their message**. Some theorists even claim that CNN has taken over policymaking - at least in humanitarian disaster situations. Images on CNN of genocide, famine, and violence force policymakers to intervene militarily to stop death, even if they do not think it is in the best interest of their country to adopt this policy. In Bosnia, for example, the media played a very important role in motivating the public to press their policymakers to intervene to stop the aggression.6 Media as Diplomat Sometimes the media is used to cover diplomatic initiatives and send messages back and forth between sides of a conflict. While policymakers usually prefer secret negotiations, sometimes there are no direct channels of communication. If one side wants to test reactions to a negotiation proposal, they may send signals and messages to other groups through the media. At times, the news media will invite leaders of opposing groups or nations onto a TV or radio program to talk with each other. **The media may help to create bridges** among enemies **and build confidence needed to open negotiations**.7 For example, an American television show Nightline regularly invites two or more people from different sides of a public policy issue to be on the show and dialogue with each other. The host, Ted Koppel, makes a point of trying to find common ground between the two sides. Media as Peace Promotor **Media events can** be used at the beginning of negotiations to build confidence, **facilitate negotiations or break diplomatic deadlocks** to create a climate conducive to negotiation. Media events such as **press releases**, rock concerts, or radio programs **can celebrate peace agreements and negotiations**. The media events may **help** to **promote and mobilize public support for agreements**. For example, in Burundi, Studio Ijambo is attempting to harness the power of radio for constructive purposes. Beginning in 1995, Search for Common Ground set up Studio Ijambo with a team of twenty Hutu and Tutsi journalists to promote dialogue, peace, and reconciliation. Studio Ijambo produces approximately one hundred radio programs per month to create a steady campaign to promote peace.

**Contention 2: Free Speech**

#### **Policies that promote objectivity become the pretext for government crackdowns on legitimate dissenting journalism and free press**

**West 17:**

(Darrell M. West is the Vice President and Director of the Center for Technology Innovation Douglas Dillon Chair in Governmental Studies. 12/18/2017, How to combat fake news and disinformation, Brookings, [https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/))

Government harassment of journalists is a serious problem in many parts of the world. United Nations Human Rights Council Special Rapporteur David Kaye notes that “all too many leaders see journalism as the enemy, reporters as rogue actors, tweeps as terrorists, and bloggers as blasphemers.”[23] In Freedom House’s most recent report on global press freedoms, researchers found that **media freedom** was **at its lowest point** in 13 yearsand there were “**unprecedented threats to journalists** and media outlets **in** major **democracies and** new **moves by authoritarian** states **to control the media**, including beyond their borders.”[[24]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-24) Journalists can often be accused of generating fake news and there have been numerous cases of legitimate journalists being arrested or their work being subject to official scrutiny. In Egypt, an Al-Jazeera producer was arrested on charges of “incitement against state institutions and broadcasting fake news with the aim of spreading chaos.”[[25]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-25) This was after the network broadcast a documentary criticizing Egyptian military conscription. Some **governments have** also moved to **create government regulations** to control information flows and **censor content** on social media platforms. Indonesia has established a government agency to “monitor news circulating online” and “tackle fake news.”[26] In the Philippines, Senator Joel Villanueva has introduced a bill that would impose up to a five-year prison term for those who publish or distribute “fake news,” which the legislation defined as activities that “cause panic, division, chaos, violence, and hate, or those which exhibit a propaganda to blacken or discredit one’s reputation.”[[27]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-27) Critics have condemned the bill’s **definition of** social networks, **misinformation**, hate speech, and illegal speech **as too broad**, and believe that it **risks criminalizing investigative journalism and limiting freedom of expression**. Newspaper columnist Jarius Bondoc noted “the bill is prone to abuse. A bigot administration can apply it to suppress the opposition. By **prosecuting critics as news fakers**, the government can **stifle** legitimate **dissent.** Whistleblowers, not the grafters, would be imprisoned and fined for daring to talk. Investigative journalists would cram the jails.”[[28]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-28) In a situation of false information, it is tempting for legal authorities to deal with offensive content and false news by forbidding or regulating it. For example, in **Germany, legislation** was passed in June 2017 that **forces** digital **platforms to delete** hate speech and **misinformation**. It requires large social media companies to “delete illegal, racist or slanderous comments and posts within 24 hours.” Companies can be fined up to $57 million for content that is not deleted from the platform, such as Nazi symbols, Holocaust denials, or language classified as hate speech.[[29]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-29) The German legislation’s critics have complained that its definition of “obviously” illegal speech **risks censorship and a loss of freedom of speech**. As an illustration, the law applies the rules to social media platforms in the country with more than 2 million users. Commentators have noted that is not a reasonable way to define relevant social networks. There could be much smaller networks that inflict greater social damage. In addition, it is not always clear how to identify objectionable content.[[30]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-30) While it is pretty clear how to define speech advocating violence or harm to other people, it is less apparent when talking about hate speech or “defamation of the state.” What is considered “hateful” to one individual may not be to someone else. There is some ambiguity regarding what constitutes hate speech in a digital context. Does it include mistakes in reporting, opinion piece commentary, political satire, leader misstatements, or outright fabrications? Watchdog organizations complained that “overly broad language could affect a range of platforms and services and put decisions about what is illegal content into the hands of private companies that may be inclined to over-censor in order to avoid potential fines.”[[31]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-31) Overly **restrictive regulation** of internet platforms in open societies **sets a dangerous precedent and** can **encourage authoritarian** regime**s to** continue and/or **expand censorship**. This will restrict global freedom of expression and **generate hostility to democratic governance. Democracies that place** undue **limits on speech** risk **legitimizin**g **authoritarian** leaders and their **efforts to crackdown** basic **human rights.** It is crucial that efforts to improve news quality not weaken journalistic content or the investigative landscape facing reporters.

**Uncensored freedom of the press is key to democracy**

**Soken-Huberty 21:**

(Emmaline Soken-Huberty is a freelance writer based in Portland, Oregon. She started to become interested in human rights while attending college, eventually getting a concentration in human rights and humanitarianism. *Why Is Freedom Of The Press Important in a Democracy?,* Human Rights Careers, March 21, 2021. https://www.humanrightscareers.com/issues/why-is-freedom-of-the-press-important-in-a-democracy/)

Freedom of the press states that expression and communication through published media – like in print and video – is a right. Freedom of the press is codified in multiple documents that set international standards. A government should not interfere with this freedom or censor media that’s critical of state power. For years, **freedom of** the **press** has been **an essential part of democracy.** In a democracy, people have the right to choose their government either directly or by electing representatives. Why is freedom of the press so important for democracy to thrive? What are the threats to this freedom? Truth, accountability, and informed voting: reasons why freedom of the press matters A healthy democracy has guiding principles like citizen rule, fair and free elections, the protection of individual rights, and cooperation. To ensure these principles become a reality, a free press is important. There are three main reasons why. A free press fights for the truth. Freedom of the press matters because a free press uncovers the truth. There are many issues – often very complicated ones – that journalists are trained to analyze and explain. Without newspapers, radio shows, blogs, etc, the average person would have little to no knowledge of what’s going on around them. Most people lack the time and resources to investigate issues and stories that affect them and their communities. That’s where journalists come in. Armed with skills like research and critical thinking, the best journalists know what questions to ask, what leads to pursue, and how to fact-check. Fact-checking is a vital element of a free press. If the press is not able to fact-check safely and effectively, the truth remains buried. A **free press holds power accountable**. Many entities can benefit from the truth staying hidden, including governments. One of the free press’ main missions is serving as a watchdog on power. The press is **the bridge between** the **people and powerful entities.** If the press is not free but instead beholden to power, it simply serves as an extension of that power. **Without freedom of** the **press, journalists** who try to tell the truth when it threatens the state **are not protected by the law.** This **makes censorship and suppression inevitable.** Even if a state made it a goal to be more truthful and transparent, there’s always an agenda they would need to serve. In the case of corruption and human rights violations, a **free press** is essential to **expos**ing **abuses of power**. A free press **informs voters and strengthens democracy.** Informed voting is the third reason why freedom of the press is so important. Democracies only thrive when voters are as informed as possible. Being informed ensures people understand the issues at hand and what policies and politicians best represent them. The press is the body that informs by analyzing information, encouraging discussion, and fact-checking. The freer the press, the better informed voters can be. **Without** this freedom, **voters would be at** the **mercy of politicians and special interest groups** that want to win elections and promote specific legislation. It would be very difficult and time-consuming for voters to do all their work on their own. A strong media makes the process less complicated and offers valuable insight.

#### **Government crackdowns on media are a form of soft authoritarianism that bring us farther away from democracy**

#### **Christensen 21:**

#### (Devin Christensen has a PhD in Political Science from UNC Chapel Hill. "Mainstream Media Recirculation of Trust-Reducing Social Media Messages." American Politics Research, July 6, 2021. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1532673X211023931>)

Trump’s consistent hostility and violent reactivity to criticism on Twitter mimicked the media outreach strategies of so-called “soft” authoritarian leaders seeking to undermine democratic norms and institutions in order to consolidate power in themselves. “Soft” authoritarianism differs from the more brutal “hard” authoritarianism associated with tyrannical regimes such as Nazi Germany and Stalin’s USSR. While infamous authoritarians, such as Stalin or Pol Pot, could compliment their cult of personality with the unfettered coercive power of the state, soft authoritarians are forced to grapple with adversarial democratic institutions that split and balance authority (Gandhi & Okar, 2009; Márquez, 2016, 2018; Schatz, 2009). In order to consolidate power, **soft authoritarians** must **play a long game** where they start by **undermin**ing these adversarial **institutions until** the institutions are **too weak to resist** the authoritarian’s **bid for power** (Cheibub et al., 2010; Gandhi & Okar, 2009; Márquez, 2016, 2018). **The media is one** adversarial institution that soft authoritarians must either degrade or coopt in order to consolidate power in themselves. As Schatz (2009) notes, through “discursive preemption,” the soft authoritarian seeks to “maintain the upper hand in guiding the media to project images that strengthen his position” in a way that “may flirt with outright propaganda” but which maintains a veneer of transparency and legitimacy (207). For example, in 2005, Kazahki President Nazarbaev preempted charges of electoral fraud in his reelection with what appeared to be leaked documents showing that the opposition planned to allege fraud against the regime regardless, which in turn blunted the impact of the scandal (Schatz, 2011). By diluting public discourse with misinformation and false labels of inaccuracy, citizens lose faith in journalistic credibility (Freeze et al., 2020) and “no one can criticize power, because there is no basis upon which to do so” (Snyder, 2017, p. 65, 71). **Authoritarians** then **capitalize on** growing **distrust** in institutions by **promulgating their** own salvation **narrative**, usually in defense of the “common man” (Schatz, 2009). Effective salvation narratives require the social amplification of a crisis, followed by blaming the “other” for the crisis and other problems that can stick (Waring, 2013; Waring & Glendon, 1998; Waring & Paxton, 2018). By controlling the media, **authoritarians** can **deny wrong doing, delegitimize** their **opponents and oppositional institutions**(including traditional media outlets themselves), and spin a narrative that the state is sick. The only cure for this sickness, the authoritarian claims, is to trust in the leader and grant them the authority to set things straight (Svilicic & Maldini, 2014).

#### **Authoritarianism causes a laundry list of catastrophic impacts**

**Kasparov & Halvorssen 17:**

(Garry Kasparov is Chairman of the New York-based Human Rights Foundation. Thor Halvorssen is the foundation’s president and chief executive. “Opinion: Why the rise of authoritarianism is a global catastrophe.” Washington Post. 2/13/17. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/democracy-post/wp/2017/02/13/why-the-rise-of-authoritarianism-is-a-global-catastrophe/>)

Last month the world’s elite listened politely as Chinese President Xi Jinping offered the keynote address at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. Of course, the leader of the Chinese **dictatorship** didn’t mention how he and his cronies jail and disappear human rights activists, **persecute ethnic minorities** and religious groups, and **operate** a vast **censorship and surveillance** system, among other evils. It is striking that a forum dedicated to “improving the state of the world” would offer such an important stage to the leader of a repressive regime. Xi began his remarks in part by asking “What has gone wrong with the world?” The fact is, he’s part of the problem. At present, the **authoritarianism** business **is booming.** According to the Human Rights Foundation’s research, the citizens of 94 countries suffer under non-democratic regimes, meaning that 3.97 billion people are currently controlled by tyrants, absolute monarchs, military juntas or competitive authoritarians. That’s 53 percent of the world’s population. Statistically, then, authoritarianism is one of the largest — if not the largest — challenges facing humanity. Consider the scale of some of the world’s other crises. About 836 million live under extreme poverty, and 783 million lack clean drinking water. War and conflict have displaced 65 million from their homes. Between 1994 and 2013 an annual average of 218 million people were affected by natural disasters. These are terrible, seemingly intractable problems — but at least there are United Nations bodies, aid organizations and State Department teams dedicated to each one of them. Dictators and elected authoritarians, by contrast, get a free pass. The World Bank bails out repressive regimes on a regular basis. There is no anti-tyrant U.N. task force, no Sustainable Development Goals against tyranny, no army of activists. We, the authors, have experienced the ills of authoritarianism personally. One of us has been beaten, blacklisted and forced into exile by operatives of the Kremlin. Russian President Vladimir Putin has relentlessly pushed to crush freedom of speech, brazenly annex Crimea and increase his global military activities in ways that hark back to the Cold War. The other author has seen his mother shot by Venezuelan security forces and his first cousin languish for nearly three years in a military jail as a prisoner of conscience. Today Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro runs a regime that regularly imprisons dissidents, abuses protesters and engages in such widespread graft and corruption that the country is now undergoing a catastrophic economic collapse. Putin and Maduro have co-conspirators in all parts of the world, fellow would-be tyrants who are dismantling the free press, jailing opponents, manipulating elections and committing a host of human rights violations. In Turkey, a once-promising democracy is gasping for air. Its president, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, has shut down 149 media outlets, shuttered more than 2,000 schools and universities, fired more than 120,000 civil servants and jailed more than 45,000 suspected dissenters. In North Korea, Kim Jong Un rules the most totalitarian government on Earth, brainwashing 25 million people and terrorizing them with public executions, forced famines and a vast network of concentration camps that reminded U.N. investigators of Pol Pot’s Cambodia and Nazi Germany. And there are so many lesser-known dictators in countries such as Bahrain, Kazakhstan and Equatorial Guinea, where tyrants pilfer their countries’ natural resources and pocket the profits in private off-shore accounts. To cover their atrocities, they hire lobbyists, public relations firms and even policy groups in the free world to whitewash their actions. If injustice and oppression aren’t bad enough, authoritarian governments bear an enormous social cost. Dictator-led countries have higher rates of mental illness, lower levels of health and life expectancy, and, as Amartya Sen famously argued, higher susceptibility to famine. Their citizens are less educated and file fewer patents. In 2016, more patents were filed in France than in the entire Arab world — not because Arabs are less entrepreneurial than the French, but because nearly all of them live under stifling authoritarianism. Clearly, the suppression of free expression and creativity has harmful effects on innovation and economic growth. Citizens of free and open societies such as Germany, South Korea and Chile witness advances in business, science and technology that Belarusans, Burmese and Cubans can only dream of. And consider that free nations do not go to war with each other. History has shown this to be the only ironclad law of political theory. Meanwhile, dictators are always at war, often with a foreign power and always with their own people. If you are worried about **public health, poverty or peace**, your mandate is clear: Oppose tyranny. Tragically, world institutions and organizations have failed to properly address authoritarianism. Western governments sometimes protest human rights violations in countries such as Russia, Iran, and North Korea — but routinely ignore them in places such as China and Saudi Arabia, in favor of upholding trade deals and security agreements. The United Nations, established to bring peace and justice to the world, includes Cuba, Egypt and Rwanda on its Human Rights Council. Here, a representative from a democracy carries the same legitimacy as a representative from a dictatorship. One acts on behalf of its citizens, while the other acts to silence them. Between June 2006 and August 2015 the Human Rights Council issued zero condemnations of repressive regimes in China, Cuba, Egypt, Russia, Saudi Arabia and Turkey. Despite the fact that **dictatorship is at the root of many global ills — poor health, failing education** systems **and global poverty** among them — authoritarianism is hardly ever addressed at major conferences worldwide. And no wonder: Many, including the World Economic Forum and the now-defunct Clinton Global Initiative, receive ample funding from authoritarians. Few human rights groups focus exclusively on authoritarianism, and most establishment ones spend significant chunks of their budgets on criticizing democratic governments and their policies. Dictators are rarely in the spotlight. The noble struggle against tyranny has fallen upon individual activists and dissidents living under authoritarian rule or working from exile. Citizen journalists Abdalaziz Alhamza and Meron Estefanos found that few people in peaceful, free countries were interested in reporting on Syria and Eritrea, so they took it upon themselves to do so, despite the enormous danger this put them in. Hyeonseo Lee defected from North Korea to find that victims of sex trafficking in China are often abandoned and ignored, so she started pressuring the Chinese government herself. When Rosa María Payá’s father, Cuban democracy leader Oswaldo Payá, died in mysterious circumstances in 2012, it fell to her to demand a formal investigation and fair treatment for dissidents in Cuba. Such individuals are in constant need of support, because in their home countries there is no legal way to protest, no ACLU, no Washington Post and no opposition party to stand up for their rights. If authoritarianism and dictatorship are to be properly challenged — and if so many resulting crises, including **military conflict, poverty and extremism**, are to be addressed at their root cause — such dissidents need funding, strategic advice, technical training, attention and solidarity. To turn the tide against repression, people across all industries need to join the movement. Artists, entrepreneurs, technologists, investors, diplomats, students — no matter who you are, you can reach out to a civil society organization at risk and ask how you can help by using your knowledge, resources or skills. Today, authoritarians rule an increasingly large part of the globe, but the leaders of the free world lack the motivation and gumption to create a new U.N.-style League of Democracies. In the meantime, as individuals living in a free society, we believe it is our moral obligation to take action to expose human rights violations and to use our freedom to help others achieve theirs.

**Contention 3: Public Health**

#### **Media advocacy is key to effective public health policy reform ---- substance control measures prove objective top-down approaches are ineffective.**

#### **Dorfman & Krasnow 14:**

#### (Lori Dorfman is Adjunct Professor of Health and Social Behavior whose research examines media portrayals of public health issues such as: alcohol, tobacco, food, children’s health, violence and health inequities. Ingrid Daffner Krasnow is a researcher at the Public Health Institute in Oakland, California. "Public Health and Media Advocacy," Annual Review of Public Health, 2014, <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-032013-182503e>)

**Media advocacy,** the strategic **use of** mass **media to support community organizing and advance healthy public polic**y(39), **evolved in** the **late 1980s as tobacco and alcohol control** advocates observed the policy success of public interest and consumer groups working on similar issues (38). Public interest **advocates employ**ed an array of **strategies** and tactics that were **more common in political campaigns than in public health efforts** (12). Public health efforts, however, had a strong basis in epidemiology. This article describes the result of that evolution: an approach that blends science, politics, and advocacy to advance public health goals. We begin by explaining how **media advocacy** can **bolster public health** practitioners’ **efforts to advance social justice and** work to **solve** some of our country’s most **complex social and political issues.** We discuss the foundations of media advocacy, how the theory translates to practical application, and the challenges of evaluating media advocacy campaigns. Public Health as Social Justice For more than a generation, public health practitioners have been guided by the work of Daniel Beauchamp, who argues that the ethic of public health is social justice, “a way of asserting the value and priority of all human life” (3, p. 8). Beauchamp called for newly constructed collective definitions of public health problems that clearly communicate “that the origins of [death and disability] lie beyond merely individual factors,” which have since been described as the socioecological model (3, p. 9). A formidable barrier to achieving social justice is the competing ethic of market justice. Beauchamp explains that market justice is rooted in the basic notion that the unfettered marketplace is the best way to serve people’s desires. Market justice ideals have long dominated political and cultural life in the United States. Much of the debate on public health policy issues concerns whether or how to restrain the marketplace with regulation, which, according to market justice ideals, should be tolerated only in limited circumstances. Tensions between social justice and market justice values are at the heart of nearly every major public health policy debate. Public Health Moves Wicked Problems Upstream According to the Institute of Medicine, the basic mission of public health is to ensure the conditions in which people can be healthy (8). When public health practitioners acknowledge that personal behavior is only part of what determines health status, they must contend with the physical, social, and political environments surrounding individuals. Public health’s defining metaphor— the upstream/downstream story—illustrates this perspective: If health workers are so busy rescuing drowning people downstream (i.e., people who are already sick or dying), then they do not have time to go upstream to see what is causing so many people to fall into the river (i.e., get sick) in the first place. Although medical treatment is essential—and often in short supply—the mission of public health in particular is to go upstream and identify the determinants of health status for populations, to intervene, and to develop policies that will foster conditions that stop the problems before they start. Upstream approaches recognize that social, political, and economic factors require basic social change to alter the conditions under which people easily fall into the river. Upstream problems are complex, “wicked problems” with layers of cause and effect that are difficult to disentangle from society’s other social problems, such as poverty, unemployment, education, or housing (34). In their seminal paper, Rittel &Webber (34) argue that social scientists searching for rational answers to society’s ills must wrestle with how political interests influence the definition of the problem itself: “[T]he formulation of a wicked problem is the problem!” (p. 161, emphasis in original). Wicked problems are not amenable to technical fixes; they require political solutions that very often involve government. However, trust in government has declined precipitously (30) in the United States in the early twenty-first century as politics have become more polarized and the role of government—and so the role of public health—has been challenged. It is in this political context that public health advocates used media advocacy to make the case for the policy solutions they seek. Public Health Focuses on Policy Policy is an important tool for reaching public health’s ambitious goal and improving the social determinants of health. Policies define the structures and set the rules by which we live. If public health practitioners and community organizers are going to improve social conditions and physical environments in lasting and meaningful ways, they must be involved in policy development and policy advocacy. Media advocacy is a tool for those working upstream on primary prevention policy that transforms environments. Changing the terms of debate so that upstream policy approaches are considered fairly means public health advocates must be able to explain that other forces, in addition to genetics and personal choice, affect health (11). Media advocacy applies social justice values to the practice of addressing the social determinants of health. MEDIA ADVOCACY: A TOOL FOR IMPROVING ENVIRONMENTS AND PROTECTING POPULATIONS As a tool for advancing and supporting community organizing and policy advocacy, **media advocacy draws on** theories from political science, cognitive linguistics, sociology, and other **fields concerned with** how **public opinion** is formed and political behavior is influenced. In particular, agenda-setting and media-framing theories underlie and inform media advocacy practice. Media Advocacy Differs from Other Health Communications **Most health communication**s **treat audiences as consumers, targeting them with information** so they can reduce their risk for illness or injury. Other communication strategies operate from exchange theories that assume the health problem derives from a lack of information (12). **In these approaches, the people with the problem are** the **audience for top-down messages** exhorting healthier behavior. **Media advocacy is** less about delivering a message and more **about raising voices in a democratic process using policy to change systems and conditions.** Rather than targeting the people with the health problem, **media advocates** target policy makers and those who can be mobilized to influence them (40), harnessing the power of the media to **apply pressure on decision makers for policy change**. Media advocacy’s narrow audience is the policy decision maker—sometimes a single person or a few committee members. The policy action will ultimately affect whole populations, but the target for the actual policy change is narrow. Media advocacy helps people understand the importance and reach of news coverage, the need to participate actively in shaping such coverage, and the methods for doing so effectively. Theoretical Underpinnings of Media Advocacy Media advocacy’s blend of science, politics, and advocacy means that it draws on several theoretical foundations and disciplines, including political science, communications, and cognitive linguistics. Agenda Setting and framing have been the core concepts informing media advocacy strategy. Agenda setting. Successful policy advocates pay attention to the news because the news media largely determine what issues we collectively think about, how we think about them, and what kinds of alternatives are considered viable; the news media set the agenda and terms of debate for policy makers and the public (9, 16, 25, 26). The public and policy makers do not consider issues seriously unless they are visible, and they are not visible unless the media have brought them to light. **Public health advocates cannot afford to have** their **issues go unnoticed** or to be caught unprepared when the events of the day catapult their issues into public discussion. **Media advocacy helps advocates be prepared** to create news and react to news on their issues.

**Objective fact-based communication strategies poorly address health crises--- only an institutional advocacy approach can address health disparities**

**B.M.S. 17:**

(Berkley Media Stuides is a non-profit media organization that works with community groups, journalists and public health professionals to use the power of the media to advance healthy public policy. *Communicating for Change: Making the Case for Health with Media Advocacy*, June 15, 2017. https://berkeley-public-health-archive.s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/sites/default/files/Communicating-for-Change-Making-the-Case-for-Health-with-Media-Advocacy.pdf)

**Many communications strategies** popular with health advocates emphasize the “information gap” or “motivation gap,” which **suggest**s **health problems are** primarily **caused when individuals lack** the **information** they need **to improve their health** or when they lack the desire to make healthy choices. Health educators then provide information to fill that gap. **When people “know the facts,” it is assumed they will adopt** a positive attitude toward the **health behavior,** act accordingly, and then the problem will be solved. The role of the **mass media**, in this case, **is to deliver the solution (knowledge)** to the millions of people who need it. **Media advocacy,** on the other hand, **focuses on the “power gap,” viewing health problems** as arising **from** people’s **lack of power to create change in** the **broader systems** and environments **that affect** their **health.** Media advocacy is the strategic use of mass media to advance a social or public policy initiative. **Media advocacy is** the **best mass communication choice to shift** the **public understanding of** the **health problem from** solely the **individual level to** the **institutional** or systems level. Media **advocacy directs attention to** the **policies that** can **reshape our environments** and institutions so that people can make healthier choices.