

We don't care about consequences, I could have the intent to kill 1000 people but I do it wrong and save 1 life. My intent was still bad

If loss of autonomy, mal.

Nothing matters

Freedom important

A2 Hitler arg- we don't justify actions bc we aren't caring about consequences

If rights like free speech get compromised, democracy fails. This will eventually increase war

## Neg Case

### I negate

The **value** is maximizing individual autonomy.

Free speech is vital to a democracy, so a democracy must take steps to ensure free speech is available to all.

The **criterion** is Kant's Categorical Imperative. Kant's theory lies on freedom. Prefer for two reasons

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26625467#:~:text=Kant%20formulated%20the%20positive%20conception,necessary%20condition%20of%20moral%20agency.>

### DEMENCHONOK 19

1. Kant formulated the positive conception of freedom as the free capacity for choice. It asserts the unconditional value of the freedom to set one's own ends. Autonomy of the will is the supreme principle of morality and a necessary condition of moral agency. Attention is paid to the discussions about outer and inner freedom, and the differences between those who argue for the relations of right to morality and those who deny this. In Kant's philosophy, morality and right are intrinsically related. He criticized moral utilitarianism as related to servility and political paternalism, which lead to unfreedom. In today's world, imperial designs and neototalitarian tendencies are two sides of the same coin. The article holds that the real alternative to the hegemon-centric order will be not for the dominating power to change hands, but for a world free from any hegemonic domination. It shows the relevance of Kant's project of perpetual peace and cosmopolitan world order.

2. the Categorical imperative is the best ethical framework- it is the only universalizable ethic Johnson & Cureton 16

Johnson, R., & Cureton, A. (2016). Robert Johnson is Professor of Philosophy and Chair of the Philosophy Department at the University of Missouri, Columbia. Johnson's PhD dissertation was written under the supervision Thomas E. Hill, Jr. at UNC Chapel Hill in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Adam Cureton is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Tennessee. His main research interests are in ethics, Kant, and issues of disability. He is currently co-editing a volume with Thomas E. Hill titled Disability in Practice: Attitudes, Policies and Relationships. Kant's Moral Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Retrieved January 8, 2020, from Stanford.edu website: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/#AutFor>

Although most of Kant's readers understand the property of autonomy as being a property of rational wills, some, such as Thomas E. Hill, have held that Kant's central idea is that of autonomy is a property, not primarily of wills, but of principles.

**The core idea is that Kant believed that all moral theories prior to his own went astray because they portrayed fundamental moral principles as appealing to the existing interests of those bound by them.** By contrast, in

Kant's view moral principles must not appeal to such interests, for no interest is necessarily universal. Thus, in assuming at the outset that moral principles must embody some interest (or "heteronomous" principles), such theories rule out the very possibility that morality is universally binding. By contrast, the Categorical Imperative, because it does not enshrine existing interests, presumes that rational agents can conform to a principle that does not appeal to their interests (or an "autonomous" principle), and so can fully ground our conception, according to Kant, of what morality requires of us.

## Contention 1: liberal democracy is good

Wallace, Jon, et al. "The importance of democracy." *Chatham House*, 14 april 2021, [www.chathamhouse.org/2021/04/importance-democracy](http://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/04/importance-democracy).

### Wallace 21

Democracy is the theory that the common people know what they want, and deserve to get it good and hard. H.L. In Europe and the English-speaking world it is often assumed democracy naturally takes the form of liberal democracy – popular sovereignty but limited by a constitution which guarantees individual freedoms (such as speech) and rights (such as to a fair trial). Crucially these essential freedoms are not subject to a democratic vote. In fact, democracy does not necessarily have to be liberal. Certain nations today have illiberal democracies where voting continues but liberal characteristics, such as an independent judiciary and free press, have been compromised. (this is what would happen in aff wrld.) Defenders of liberal democracy say this actually makes these societies inherently undemocratic, as stripping away liberal guarantees leads to intimidation and coercion by the state, undermining elections. The guarantees of liberal democracy are intended to ensure no ethnic, geographic, class, or business interest dominates or exploits others to an unreasonable degree, and that there is fair and universal consent gained for government policies. Watch the event recording. Henry Kissinger on the future of liberal democracies. the importance of liberal democracy is two-fold: no other system of government guarantees the right to free expression of political preference; and no other system promotes progress through peaceful competition between different interests and ideas. Why do we need democracy? This question is being asked a lot more as democracy is threatened by various forces around the world. Some question the value of the popular vote when it leads to seismic shifts such as Brexit, and the election of demagogues who threaten liberal values. Even the American system, for a long time the exemplar of democratic freedoms, seems so polarized that it is in danger of becoming impotent, its ability to endure technological, demographic, and cultural change in doubt. Meanwhile, over the last 30-50 years, a more technocratic, uniform form of politics has taken hold in the European Union (EU), where democracy is arguably less responsive to citizens and large elements of the population feel excluded from the process of government. More recently, non-democratic, authoritarian governments such as China have been praised for enduring the COVID-19 pandemic better than democracies, because they are better able to compel specific behavior from citizens without

concern for individual liberties, or dissent from a free press. All this may question the need for democracy. But most authoritarian systems are hampered by structural weaknesses: large, disenfranchised minority groups foster a sense of injustice; reliance on 'strongmen' figures makes the transfer of power potentially violent; and vested interests are protected from popular demands for change. Why democracy is the best form of government

**Liberal democracy**, in theory at least, **provides a mechanism for some form of rule by proportionate representation, with citizens empowered to bring about change through participation and persuade the powerful to act for the greater good.** The cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy. John Dewey, But democracy is a process, not a state. Countries such as the UK and the US were not true democracies until relatively recently. Britain's franchise was gradually extended from 1830 and it was only in 1918 that women were given the right to vote. In the US it was not until 1965 that African-Americans in its southern states gained a guaranteed right to vote. **Democracy has played a vital role in the story of civilization, helping transform the world from power structures of monarchy, empire, and conquest into popular rule, self-determination, and peaceful co-existence.** A direct form of democracy was initially practiced in ancient Greece, but there were many slaves in that society, and hardly anyone was a citizen and able to participate. Democracy then vanished until its re-emergence as 'representative democracy' in the late 18th century. Since then it has The Founding Fathers of the United States of America were acutely aware of this perceived threat and designed the constitution and electoral college to constrain popularly elected leaders with the liberal rights guaranteed by the constitution. Read the research paper

The Future of Democracy in Europe: Technology and the Evolution of Representation Recent events have led some commentators to conclude that the system is broken. But **when we question its merits and seek out its flaws, we should be acutely aware that we live in societies that permit us to criticize, and that this is in itself a crucial right.** We should also question what our alternatives would be. We might imagine the landscape in an authoritarian or dictatorship state: would we expect to receive a fairer trial? To find more balanced information on the internet? To see minority rights more protected? Would a settlement of World War Two imposed by fascist victors, rather than democracies, have created a more just and free peace?

## Democracy solves nuclear war—makes conflict escalation unlikely

**Halperin 11**— Senior Advisor Open Society Institute, Senior Vice President of the Center for American Progress. Morton, Unconventional Wisdom - Democracy is Still Worth Fighting For, Foreign Policy, January / February, [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional\\_wisdom?page=0,11](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional_wisdom?page=0,11)

As the United States struggles to wind down two wars and recover from a humbling financial crisis, realism is enjoying a renaissance. Afghanistan and Iraq bear scant resemblance to the democracies we were promised. The Treasury is broke. And America has a president, Barack Obama, who once compared his foreign-policy philosophy to the realism of theologian Reinhold Niebuhr: "There's serious evil in the world, and hardship and pain," Obama said during his 2008 campaign. "And we should be humble and modest in our belief we can eliminate those things." But one can take such words of wisdom to the extreme—as realists like former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and writer Robert Kaplan sometimes do, arguing that the United States can't afford the risks inherent in supporting democracy and human rights around the world. Others, such as cultural historian Jacques Barzun, go even further, saying that America can't export democracy at all, "because it is not an ideology but a wayward historical development." Taken too far, such realist absolutism can be just as dangerous, and wrong, as neoconservative hubris. For there is one thing the neocons get right: As I argue in *The Democracy Advantage*, **democratic governments are more likely than autocratic regimes to** engage in conduct that advances U.S. interests and **avoids situations that pose a threat to peace** and security. **Democratic states** are more likely to develop and to **avoid famines and economic collapse. They are** also **less likely to become failed states or suffer a civil war. Democratic states** are also more likely to **cooperate in dealing with** security issues, such as **terrorism and proliferation** of weapons of mass destruction. As the

bloody aftermath of the Iraq invasion painfully shows, democracy cannot be imposed from the outside by force or coercion. It must come from the people of a nation working to get on the path of democracy and then adopting the policies necessary to remain on that path. But we should be careful about overlearning the lessons of Iraq. In fact, the outside world can make an enormous difference in whether such efforts succeed. There are numerous examples—starting with Spain and Portugal and spreading to Eastern Europe, Latin America, and Asia—in which the struggle to establish democracy and advance human rights received critical support from multilateral bodies, including the United Nations, as well as from regional organizations, democratic governments, and private groups.

## Contention 2: freedom if speech is cornerstone to democracy

"Chapter 6: The Right to Freedom of Speech." *Annenberg Classroom*, [www.annenbergclassroom.org/resource/our-rights/rights-chapter-6-right-freedom-speech/](http://www.annenbergclassroom.org/resource/our-rights/rights-chapter-6-right-freedom-speech/)  
#~:~:~text=The%20right%20to%20speak%20freely%2C%20without%20restraint%2C%20is%20essential%20to%20challenge%2C%20rebuttal%2C%20and%20debate.  
Accessed 10 Mar. 2022.

Annenberg classroom no date

Free speech is our most fundamental—and our most contested—right. It is an essential freedom because it is how we protect all of our other rights and liberties. If we could not speak openly about the policies and actions of the government, then we would have no effective way to participate in the democratic process or protest when we believed governmental behavior threatened our security or our freedom. Although Americans agree that free speech is central to democratic government, we disagree sharply about what we mean by speech and about where the right begins and ends. Speech clearly includes words, but does it also include conduct or symbols? Certainly, we have the right to criticize the government, but can we also advocate its overthrow? Does the right to free speech allow us to incite hate or use foul language in public?

The framers of the Bill of Rights understood the importance of free expression and protected it under the First Amendment.

Both English history and their own colonial past had taught them to value this right, but their definition of free speech was much more limited than ours. Less than a decade after the amendment's ratification, Congress passed the Sedition Act of 1798, making it a crime to criticize the government. Many citizens believed government could forbid speech that threatened public order, as witnessed by numerous early nineteenth-century laws restricting speech against slavery. During the Civil War, thousands of antiwar protestors were arrested on the theory that the First Amendment did not protect disloyal speech. Labor unrest in the 1800s and 1890s brought similar restraints on the right of politically unpopular groups, such as socialists, to criticize government's failure to protect working people from the ills of industrialization and economic depression.

For the next five decades, the Court wrestled with the right balance between speech and order. Much of what defined freedom of speech emerged from challenges to the government's ability to regulate or punish political protest. Each case brought a new set of circumstances that allowed the justices an opportunity to modify or extend the clear and present danger test. Many decisions recognized the abstract right of individuals to speak freely, but each one hedged this right in important ways. Always in the background were conditions that pointed to disorder, dissension, and danger—the Great Depression, World War II, and the Cold War, among them—so the justices were cautious in expanding a right that would expose America to greater threats. These cases, however, gradually introduced a new perspective on the value of free speech in a democracy, namely, the belief that truth is best reached by the free trade in ideas.

The belief that no matter how radical, ultimately prevailed. In 1927, the Court had endorsed what came to be called the bad tendency test: if officials believed speech was likely to lead to a bad result, such as urging people to commit a violent act, it

was not protected under the First Amendment even if no violence occurred. By 1969, however, similar facts produced a different outcome. Ku Klux Klan members in Ohio invited a television station to film their rally. Waving firearms, they shouted racist and anti-Semitic slurs and threatened to march on Congress before their leader was arrested and later convicted under a state law banning speech that had a tendency to incite violence. The Supreme Court overturned his conviction in *Brandenburg v. Ohio* and established the rule still in effect today: the First Amendment protects the right to advocate the use of force or violence, but it does not safeguard speech likely to incite or produce an immediate unlawful act. The *Brandenburg* test has allowed Nazis to march, Klan members to hold rallies, and other extremist groups to promote views far outside the mainstream of public opinion. With few exceptions—fighting words and obscenity, for example—government today cannot regulate the content of speech. conception of constitutionally protected speech to include the symbols we use to express our convictions. **Restriction of free thought and free speech is the most dangerous of all subversions. It is the one un-American act that could most easily defeat us.**

Justice William O. Douglas, "The One Un-American Act" (1953)

More than most other recent decisions, cases involving symbolic speech have revealed how contentious the right of free speech remains in our society. In 1989, the Supreme Court ruled that the First Amendment protected individuals who burned the American flag in protest. This decision was highly controversial, and it has resulted in numerous attempts to amend the Constitution to protect the flag and, in effect, limit speech in this circumstance. The outcome of this effort is uncertain, but the debate raises important questions: What role does this right play in our democracy? How does it contribute to our liberty as Americans. **The right to speak freely, without restraint, is essential to**

**democratic government because it helps us develop better laws and policies through challenge and debate. When we all have the ability to speak in the public forum, offensive opinions can be combated with an opposing argument, a more inclusive approach, a more effective idea.** We tolerate offensive speech and protect the right to speak even for

people who would deny it to us because we believe that exposing their thoughts and opinions to open debate will result in the discovery of truth. This principle is an old one in Western thought. U.S. Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes's [says] dissent in *Abrams v. United States*, a 1919 case suppressing free speech, is a classic statement of this view: "the best test of truth is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which [the public's] wishes safely can be carried out". **Governmental actions to deny differing**

**points of view, rob us of the range of ideas that might serve the interests of society more effectively.** In a case decided almost a decade before *Tinker v. Des Moines*, the Supreme Court

found this rationale especially applicable to the classroom. "The Nation's future," the justices wrote, "depends upon leaders trained through wide exposure to that robust exchange of ideas which discovers truth out of a multitude of tongues." As a nation, we are willing to live with the often bitter conflict over ideas because we believe it will lead to truth and to improved lives for all citizens. We recognize that freedom of speech is the first freedom of democracy, as the English poet John Milton argued during his own seventeenth-century struggle to gain this right: "Give me the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties."

**The ability to speak freely allows us to pursue truth, to challenge falsehoods, to correct mistakes—all are necessary for a healthy society.**

**Free speech also reflects a commitment to individual freedom and autonomy, the right to decide for ourselves and to pursue our own destiny.** We see it reflected daily in everything from advertising slogans—"Have It Your Way"—to fashion statements, but fail to recognize how closely



freedom is tied to the right to speak freely. Free speech guarantees us an individual voice, no matter how far removed our opinions and beliefs are from mainstream society. With this voice we are free to contribute as individuals to the marketplace of ideas or a marketplace of goods, as well as to decide how and under what circumstances we will join with others to decide social and governmental policies.

Impact: a free press has freedom of speech. The press can say whatever it wants, so long as it's constitutional. In a democracy, this must be prioritized. Anything that restricts free speech we must not vote for.

### **Contention 3: prioritizing objectivity limits free speech, only advocacy solves**

#### **Objective news sources deprive journalists from free speech**

"THE JOURNALIST AS CITIZEN ACTIVIST: THE ETHICAL LIMITS OF FREE SPEECH." [Database Name], Hein online, 1999. Accessed 15 Feb. 2022.

##### **Hein online 99**

Media consolidation also hastened the advent of a less partisan press. While newspaper circulation increased between 1910 and 1930, the number of newspapers declined. By 1930 eight cities of more than 100,000 population were each served either by only one paper or by a morning and afternoon paper under the same ownership.<sup>26</sup> This institutional consolidation required a local press that, while not necessarily neutral in its editorial stance, was impartial in its news coverage in order to appeal to the larger community rather than audiences identified along political or socio-economic lines. The partisanship of the press also declined as newspapers became increasingly dependent upon advertising and preoccupied with enlarging their circulations to a diverse audience.<sup>27</sup> The marketing ambitions of publishers thus laid the foundation for an ethic of objectivity that required reporters to suppress personal opinions on the issues they covered and to aspire to a standard of impartiality and balance. Although these structural changes had a profound impact on the independence of the American press, it was the influence of modern science that provided the philosophical foundation for an ethic of objectivity. For professional journalists objectivity came to signify the separation of facts and values. The code of objectivity, as originally envisioned, did not require a journalist-in fact it prohibited a journalist from investigating the truth behind the facts. The code further required that overt persuasion be confined to the editorial pages and that news columns be free of opinion.<sup>30</sup> Implicit in this code of newsgathering was the assumption that journalists themselves should shun partisanship and avoid entangling alliances that might jeopardize their independent vantage point. By the mid-1930s the term objectivity was a familiar feature of the journalistic lexicon and had become an "articulate professional

#### **Advocacy allows journalists their first amendment freedoms that are essential to democracy**

Impact: when we prioritize objectivity and facts, we limit the free speech of journalists. When journalists have to be unbiased, they are unable to put their

individual opinions in their work. This is a threat to free speech, and furthermore a threat to democracy. A threat to democracy increases the chances of civil war, famine, and nuclear war, and poses a severe threat to peace.. We are talking about a democracy, and a democracy must take care to protect the democracy itself, as it is good. Threats to this will be disastrous.