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### 1AC – Plan (0:40)

#### Plan – Democracies ought to apply the Fairness Doctrine to members of the free press as per our solvency advocate.

#### The plan forces broadcasters to abide or recognize content as entertainment which would increase marketplace diversity and combat disinformation.

Murphy, William. “We Hold These Distruths To Be Self-Evident: How Legal History Could Save America From Itself.” St. John's Scholar. 2021. <https://scholar.stjohns.edu/jga/vol2/iss2/3/>.

Given this reality, any modern invocation of the Fairness Doctrine in America requires a more nuanced approach than a mere straightforward reinstatement. Well versed in selectively covering “public issues” appealing to specific consumer demographics and not others after decades of practice, a fair coverage requirement may prompt further informational deviation of the public by cable news outlets not only in terms of viewpoint but also in terms of general awareness and knowledge. An outlet appealing to a specific political ideology, for example, may avoid reporting important public information entirely where doing so would involve presenting opposing evidence clearly demonstrating that the viewers' beliefs, logic, or understanding is completely erroneous with respect to that particular and pressing matter. Situations where proponents of an alternative but incorrect view fervently demand coverage opportunities in attempts to obfuscate underlying facts and truths also represent conceivable concerns, albeit less so as the Fairness Doctrine empowered broadcasters with the ability to choose precisely how contrary interpretations were imparted. Perhaps then the most pragmatic solution is to provide cable news organizations with the choice of either adhering to the Fairness Doctrine or instead openly recognizing their respective content for what it actually is, a consumer entertainment commodity, and having it regulated as such. Shifting oversight from the FCC to the Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) under that scenario, cable news outlets would be forced to conspicuously label their content as directed by the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. To the extent, cable news is a for-profit enterprise, and the factual information it claims to share is actually false, misleading, materially editorialized, or simply comprised mostly of plain opinion, the FTC could require prominent labeling of said content throughout a broadcast as “Not Factually Accurate,” “For Entertainment Purposes Only,” etc. In other words, faced with the choice of either presenting an opposing viewpoint or displaying a blatant disclaimer notifying viewers that the “news” they are consuming is not news at all and, transparently, more fiction than fact, the Fairness Doctrine likely presents a more inviting option. While cable news organizations controlling the time with and the manner in which opposing views are presented as well selecting stories to avoid damaging revelations remain viable threats, at the very least, viewers will be exposed to a different take on important issues which they likely would not have realized even existed otherwise and maybe begin approaching the content with some skepticism rather than unchallenged absolutism. This exposure, even minimally, may lead viewers to examine other sources to explore, to some degree, all sides of an issue and help protect against the further spread of damaging disinformation throughout society.

#### The plan empirically solves public mistrust in media and reduces bias.

Klein, Ian. “Enemy Of The People: The Ghost Of The F.C.C. Fairness Doctrine In The Age Of Alternative Facts.” Hastings Communications and Entertainment Law Journal. 2020. <https://repository.uchastings.edu/hastings\_comm\_ent\_law\_journal/vol42/iss1/4/>.

As statistics plainly show, Americans’ trust in broadcast media was at its highest during the life of the Fairness Doctrine and has been on the decline since the Fairness Doctrine’s demise.130 That decline coincides with a quantifiable bias in media,131 which fuels the public’s distrust of mainstream media.132 If Fairness Doctrine 2.0 required outlets like Fox and MSNBC to objectively present opposing points of view on important issues, it would be relatively easy to overcome both the perceived and objective components of bias. MSNBC having to present objective information on the Republican point of view on a given issue, for example, would have the twofold benefit of (1) increasing objectivity and reducing bias, and (2) increasing the outlet’s credibility among the public. In other words, this would not only be beneficial for viewers, who would suddenly be receiving both sides of a story rather than an extremely slanted view, but it would help outlets, as their credibility (and, theoretically, views) would increase. Furthermore, if the Personal Attack Rule were to make a resurgence as part of Fairness Doctrine 2.0, outlets like Sinclair would be unable to air derogatory content without giving the subjects of that content the chance to respond.133 This would by no means prevent outlets from presenting this information, but would afford the subjects of these attacks opportunity to respond, which could either validate or refute whatever the outlet said.

¶

### 1AC – Advantage (3:20)

#### The advantage is democracy –

#### Democracy is backsliding now

Freedom House 21 [Freedom House. Freedom House works to defend human rights and promote democratic change, with a focus on political rights and civil liberties. We act as a catalyst for freedom through a combination of analysis, advocacy, and action. Our analysis, focused on 13 central issues, is underpinned by our international program work. “New Report: The global decline in democracy has accelerated”. 3-3-2021. . https://freedomhouse.org/article/new-report-global-decline-democracy-has-accelerated.]

Washington  -  March 3, 2021 — Authoritarian actors grew bolder during 2020 as major democracies turned inward, contributing to the 15th consecutive year of decline in global freedom, according to [Freedom in the World 2021](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2021/democracy-under-siege), the annual country-by-country assessment of political rights and civil liberties released today by Freedom House.

The report found that the share of countries designated Not Free has reached its highest level since the deterioration of democracy began in 2006, and that countries with declines in political rights and civil liberties outnumbered those with gains by the largest margin recorded during the 15-year period. The report downgraded the freedom scores of 73 countries, representing 75 percent of the global population. Those affected include not just authoritarian states like China, Belarus, and Venezuela, but also troubled democracies like the United States and India.

In one of the year’s most significant developments, India’s status changed from Free to Partly Free, meaning less than 20 percent of the world’s people now live in a Free country—the smallest proportion since 1995. Indians’ political rights and civil liberties have been eroding since Narendra Modi became prime minister in 2014. His Hindu nationalist government has presided over increased pressure on human rights organizations, rising intimidation of academics and journalists, and a spate of bigoted attacks—including lynchings—aimed at Muslims. The decline deepened following Modi’s reelection in 2019, and the government’s response to the coronavirus pandemic in 2020 featured further abuses of fundamental rights.

The changes in India formed part of a broader shift in the international balance between democracy and authoritarianism, with authoritarians generally enjoying impunity for their abuses and seizing new opportunities to consolidate power or crush dissent. In many cases, promising democratic movements faced major setbacks as a result.

In Belarus and Hong Kong, for example, massive prodemocracy protests met with brutal crackdowns by governments that largely disregarded international criticism. The Azerbaijani regime’s military offensive in Nagorno-Karabakh indirectly threatened recent democratic gains in Armenia, while the armed conflict in Ethiopia’s Tigray Region dashed hopes for the tentative political opening in that country since 2018. All four of these cases notably featured some degree of intervention by an autocratic neighbor: Moscow provided a backstop for the regime in Belarus, Beijing propelled the repression in Hong Kong, Turkey’s government aided its Azerbaijani counterpart, and Ethiopia’s leader called in support from Eritrea.

The malign influence of the regime in China, the world’s most populous dictatorship, ranged far beyond Hong Kong in 2020. Beijing ramped up its global disinformation and censorship campaign to counter the fallout from its cover-up of the initial coronavirus outbreak, which severely hampered a rapid global response in the pandemic’s early days. Its efforts also featured increased meddling in the domestic political discourse of foreign democracies, as well as transnational extensions of rights abuses common in mainland China. The Chinese regime has gained clout in multilateral institutions such as the UN Human Rights Council, which the United States abandoned in 2018, as Beijing pushed a vision of so-called noninterference that allows abuses of democratic principles and human rights standards to go unpunished while the formation of autocratic alliances is promoted.

“This year’s findings make it abundantly clear that we have not yet stemmed the authoritarian tide,” said Sarah Repucci, vice president of research and analysis at Freedom House. “Democratic governments will have to work in solidarity with one another, and with democracy advocates and human rights defenders in more repressive settings, if we are to reverse 15 years of accumulated declines and build a more free and peaceful world.”

A need for reform in the United States

While still considered Free, the United States experienced further democratic decline during the final year of the Trump presidency. The US score in [Freedom in the World](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2021/democracy-under-siege) has dropped by 11 points over the past decade, and fell by three points in 2020 alone. The changes have moved the country out of a cohort that included other leading democracies, such as France and Germany, and brought it into the company of states with weaker democratic institutions, such as Romania and Panama.

Several developments in 2020 contributed to the United States’ current score. The Trump administration undermined government transparency by dismissing inspectors general, punishing or firing whistleblowers, and attempting to control or manipulate information on COVID-19. The year also featured mass protests that, while mostly peaceful, were accompanied by high-profile cases of violence, police brutality, and deadly confrontations with counterprotesters or armed vigilantes. There was a significant increase in the number of journalists arrested and physically assaulted, most often as they covered demonstrations. Finally, the outgoing president’s shocking attempts to overturn his election loss—culminating in his incitement of rioters who stormed the Capitol as Congress met to confirm the results in January 2021—put electoral institutions under severe pressure. In addition, the crisis further damaged the United States’ credibility abroad and underscored the menace of political polarization and extremism in the country.

”January 6 should be a wake-up call for many Americans about the fragility of American democracy,” said Michael J. Abramowitz, president of Freedom House. “Authoritarian powers, especially China, are advancing their interests around the world, while democracies have been divided and consumed by internal problems. For freedom to prevail on a global scale, the United States and its partners must band together and work harder to strengthen democracy at home and abroad. President Biden has pledged to restore America’s international role as a leading supporter of democracy and human rights, but to rebuild its leadership credentials, the country must simultaneously address the weaknesses within its own political system.”

“Americans should feel gratified that the courts and other important institutions held firm during the postelection crisis, and that the country escaped the worst possible outcomes,” said Abramowitz. “But the Biden administration, the new Congress, and American civil society must fortify US democracy by strengthening and expanding political rights and civil liberties for all. People everywhere benefit when the United States serves as a positive model, and the country itself reaps ample returns from a more democratic world.”

#### Media echo chambers threaten democracy – only the plan ensures fact-based and common-ground discussions

Friedland 21 [Julian Friedland, Assistant Professor of Corporate Social Responsibility in the School of Business at Metropolitan State University of Denver, 03-15-2021, “A Fairness Doctrine for the Twenty-First Century,” AREO, https://philarchive.org/archive/FRIAFD]/

Michael Goldhaber, who popularized the term the attention economy, said of the US Capitol insurrection: “It felt like an expression of a world in which everyone is desperately seeking their own audience and fracturing reality in the process. I only see that accelerating.” If we don’t do something about this, American democracy may not survive. For when there is no longer any common ground of evidence and reason, history shows that misinformation will eventually overwhelm public discourse and authoritarianism can take over. That is **precisely what** dictators **across the world gleefully anticipate** will happen in the US. Historically, such an outcome was prevented by the existence of public spaces in which people with differing viewpoints could confront each other. Radio became a national conversation platform, as the public and the Federal Communications Commission recognized the need to protect the airwaves from unrelenting political bias. Given that there were only so many spots on the radio dial, regulators reasoned that the space should be treated as a limited public resource, free from dishonest and misleading content. They therefore required stations to fairly represent opposing views: any station broadcasting one-sided opinions had to allow reply time for other perspectives. The fairness doctrine—which later also encompassed television—was in place from the 1940s up until 1987, when the FCC repealed it on the grounds that modern media technology provides for a potentially unlimited number of voices, so “the electronic press should have the same First Amendment guarantees enjoyed by print media.” As it stands, however, no court has ever deemed the fairness doctrine unconstitutional in letter or in spirit. That’s probably because the doctrine worked so well for so long and because judges feared the effects of new media technologies on public discourse. They were right to do so. Our present technology tailors news to each individual, according to increasingly sophisticated algorithms designed to predict engagement. The preselected material is often maximally provocative or sensational, which compels us to like, comment or share it among our affinity groups. Each of us manoeuvres for attention and recognition by a specific audience with shared identities, inclinations and allegiances. Naturally, what tends to emerge is self-arming groupthink. The upshot is that we now live in a cacophonic reality, which undermines the possibility of coherent national conversations based on common sets of recognized facts. The Biden administration could combat this by establishing a digital fairness doctrine for the twenty-first century. This would not mean setting up a government agency as the arbiter of truth. The purpose of such a doctrine is simply to preserve the possibility of a functioning national discourse on critical issues of public interest. It would not run afoul of First Amendment free speech guarantees, given that it would do nothing to block speech itself. In fact, it would expand and enrich national conversations, by preventing echo chambers prone to systematic bias. Any digital media platform employing targeting algorithms and with an audience of 1 million or more could be required to provide opposing viewpoints on a consistent basis: at least for the 10% most viewed news or opinion stories. Tax incentives could be provided for those who go above and beyond this. Top ranked stories would have to include prominent tabs marked opposing view or disputed claims. Disputed claims tabs would lead to a reputable third-party factchecking service and opposing view tabs would lead to an honest counterview, if available.

#### That causes nationalism and exclusionary populism

Fuchs 18 “Democracies Everywhere Are Backsliding. To Survive We Must Unite | Michael H Fuchs.” *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 9 Nov. 2018, www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/nov/09/us-democracy-countries-global-authoritarian.

The United States is fighting for the soul of its democracy. While the hateful agenda of [Donald Trump](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/donaldtrump) was dealt a rebuke in the midterm elections, in a deeply polarized country, the struggle for democracy will only intensify as Trump and his allies attempt to pull America down a dangerous path.

The president spouts racist conspiracy theories – which have been used as [justification](https://www.vox.com/2018/10/29/18037580/pittsburgh-shooter-anti-semitism-racist-jewish-caravan) for the mass slaughter of Jews in a synagogue and which appear to have [inspired](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/oct/25/trump-insults-bombs-targets-democrats) the attempted assassination of Democratic party leaders – with impunity. The president said the US military should shoot at asylum-seeking refugees at the southern border. He attacks the media as the “enemy of the people”. And all this was just in the past month.

But the United States isn’t alone – democracies across the world are struggling for their survival. Hungarian president Viktor Orban has launched systematic attacks on his country’s democratic institutions. President Rodrigo Duterte of the Philippines has led a campaign of extrajudicial killings of drug users and sellers. Brazil elected as president Jair Bolsonaro, who has [defended](https://www.npr.org/2018/07/30/631952886/dictatorship-was-a-very-good-period-says-brazil-s-aspiring-president) Brazil’s former dictatorship and espouses hate against women, the LGBTQ community, and others. Whether driven by nationalism, racism, fear of immigration, or other forces, populist movements can be contagious.

This should not be surprising, as political transitions can happen in waves. The “third wave” of democratization swept across Latin America, Europe, Africa and Asia in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, and in 2011 a rapid succession of popular rebellions erupted across the Middle East.

Democracies and autocracies learn from one another. In the wake of the murders at a Pittsburgh synagogue, China’s state-run media [suggested](https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2018/10/28/asia-pacific/chinese-state-media-claims-pittsburgh-mass-shooting-highlights-need-anti-extremism-education-similar-xinjiang-camps/#.W93lXdhKjBI) that the United States employ “anti-extremism education” like that China is using in Xinjiang, where it imprisons roughly a million Uighurs just because of their religion. When Nigeria’s military recently killed protesters who had been accused of throwing rocks, the Nigerian military [cited](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/02/world/africa/nigeria-trump-rocks.html) Trump’s comments that the US military could shoot refugees at the southern US border if they threw rocks.

#### That sets the stage for escalation – multiple warrants –

#### Nationalism affects political incentives to escalate and intensifies reaction to perceived threats – Indian doctrine proves.

Ahmed 14 (Ali, PhD is a freelance analyst. “China and India: Nationalism and Nuclear Risk”, http://thediplomat.com/2014/12/china-and-india-nationalism-and-nuclear-risk/)

Following Gaurav Kampani’s recent essay in International Security, another paper by the author was published by the Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies. This new paper is quite compelling and deserves a close look, especially where he notes two tendencies increasing deterrence instability between India and China. However, there may be a blind spot in Kampani’s analysis. But let’s start with the first tendency noted by Kampani: As both militaries have entered nuclear strategic decision making – with the Indian military lagging behind by about a decade – there is a push to move from minimal to limited deterrence. This involves, in part, seeking to enhance deterrence by building in options for limited nuclear use. The second tendency is in the negative implications this carries for no-first use (NFU), which is currently the professed policy of both states. This was particularly evident in the now-defunct Indian debate on the expected revision of its nuclear doctrine. Taken together, the two beget a situation of instability described by Kampani as: “… limited options render deterrence more credible and are more likely to achieve intra-war deterrence … The net strategic effect of these operational changes will be the lowering of the bar for nuclear weapons use in the future.” Kampani rightly notes that there are mitigating structural and institutional features, namely large and strong militaries and balancing institutional pulls from political and scientific establishments, that make for stability. Kampani’s case is that while “there is reason for concern, the case for nuclear pessimism in the China–India nuclear dyad is overstated,” so can’t we, on account of that stability, leave well enough alone? To be sure, the two states have considerable depth in both territory and forces, thus precluding the ready or early resort to nuclear weapons. However, nationalism is growing stronger in the politics of both states. Chinese nationalism is being fanned by the nationalist turns in Japan, and this year India elected a nationalist government. The impact of nationalism on strategic rationality is to force everything towards the hard option. During crises or conflicts, there are also media-induced nationalist pulls and pressures magnifying this force. Of course, this force is further strengthened by both states being on the cusp of rising to the next echelon in power, with China poised to become a superpower and India a great power. The adverse effect of downward movement by either will be taken as impacting its standing. In India’s case this would include its regional salience in relation to Pakistan. Finally, while nationalism in both states can prove fatal, it is bad enough in just one as that would suffice to ensure a mirroring in the other. The net effect of this is the escalation of the several border incidents in the recent past between the two states, such as the most recent, which coincided with the Chinese premier’s visit to Delhi. Clearly, there is nothing positive to be found here. A nudge is more liable to end up as a push, and a push more liable to transform into a shove. Nationalism and the cultural need to save face at this stage will likely kick in with greater gusto. The side that perceives itself to be on the losing end can be expected to escalate to escape disadvantage. To be sure, escalation can very well occur. Indeed, directions in the military preparedness of both states betray as much. Even though there is only a border dispute between them, an incipient rivalry in the Indian Ocean is being played out. This horizontal escalation is building in scope. Coupled with the nationalist impulse in strategic thinking, vertical escalation is becoming a certainty where otherwise it would have remained a mere possibility. What will vertical escalation look like? Nationalism-inspired strategies will place a premium on territory. With forces available and mobile thanks to increased investment in infrastructure and aerial transport fleets, the rapid concentration of forces can be foreseen. This might potentially set the stage for de-escalation, since neither would be able to claim an easy victory. In fact, precedence does favor this in that China withdrew after its earlier forays into India and Vietnam, and India has restricted its actions against Pakistan in Kargil to that theater itself. However, nationalism, with its effects on strategy, is the wildcard, making it difficult to rule out escalation. Traditional nuclear strategists would claim that India currently lacks strategic deterrence, since its Agni series is not yet complete and the K series has not yet been tested from the nuclear submarine. Even so, India will likely have enough deterrence elements to please such strategists by the end of the decade. In the interim, it is exercising minimal deterrence, the effect of which cannot be discounted, as China values its economic trajectory. However, this can, at best, only ensure deterrence stability at the upper reaches of city busting levels. As Kampani notes in his warning of military pushes in both states towards the operational – instead of political – utility of nuclear weapons, there will also likely be military pushes in both states for operational level leverage with nuclear weapons. Kampani admits to both militaries being capable of nuclear use from demonstration shots to shots across the bow. A nationalist strategy, coupled with a military need to recuperate from a bad bargain, may foreshadow the operational use of nuclear weapons. Use of nuclear weapons will not necessarily bring about a doomsday scenario in that the choice of nuclear first use and its response will be in areas marginal to the territorial and socio-political heartland of both states. Nuclear first use of this kind would likely invoke the strategic benefit in the deterrence logic of the “threat that leaves something to chance.” The scenario here relies on a factor usually discounted in traditional strategic analyses, which presume strategic rationality and have internal political factors as a [unknown] blind spot. Consequently, though Kampani is right that the “competition is unlikely to assume the unbridled nature of the former superpower rivalry,” that is not quite the real fear.

#### It causes protectionism causing strategic disengagement and trade wars destabilizing relationships and causing war

**Morelli and Mattozzi 20** [MORELLI, Massimo, , MATTOZZI, Andrea, , NAKAGUMA, Marcos Y., *Populism and war*, CEPR Discussion Paper, 2020/14501 Retrieved from Cadmus, European University Institute Research Repository, at: <https://hdl.handle.net/1814/68417>]

1 Introduction **In recent years, the world has witnessed a rise of populist political leaders in many western democracies, including the United States** − the world’s dominant superpower. We broadly refer to a populist leader as one who **champions short-term protectionist policies, disregarding their long-term consequences and pandering to voters’ fears and beliefs.**1 Another distinctive feature of populist governments is their **disdain for traditional politics and both national and international institutions. A populist government concentrates resources domestically, choosing to strategically disengage from conflicts abroad. Trade wars, the unilateral imposition of tariffs, closing of borders and abrupt disengagement from international issues are among the measures that have been taken by populist leaders recently**, in line with globalization blaming also emphasized by Rodrick [10]. In the United States, **Trump administration’s foreign policy has been notorious for aggressively resorting to “economic statecraft”, i.e. the strategy of using economic means, particularly protectionism and economic coercion, to pursue foreign policy goals** (Drezner [3]). **The “trade war” initiated in 2018 is perhaps the biggest example of the use of such strategy.**2 Between January 2018 and November 2019, the trade war lead to a tripling of the average U.S. tariff on imports (Amiti et al. [1]), **which in turn caused U.S. trading partners, particularly China, to retaliate by increasing tariffs on U.S. exports. The trade war resulted in a significant reduction in trade flows, disruption of global value chains and an overall increase in policy uncertainty**, consequently leading to a reduction in global growth rates (Ikonen et al. [5]). Alongside with economic statecraft, an additional feature of Trump’s foreign policy has been the “pulling back” or strategic **disengagement from conflicts around the world (Posen [8]), especially “unwinnable” foreign wars in the Middle East and Afghanistan, creating security vacuums and threatening regional stabilities and balances of power.**3 This paper studies the implications of populism for international relations, focusing on the incidence of interstate and civil conflict across the world. We start our analysis from the premise that populism in a superpower dramatically increases the risk of protectionism and trade wars and leads to strategic disengagement (“America first”). The combination of these features could have terrible consequences. We show that the tendency to protectionism can increase the risk of war world-wide and increase inequality within and between countries. Neither the fear that disengagement of the U.S. could lead to war nor the fear that protectionism could lead to war are new. The novel contribution of this paper is to provide a simple unified gametheoretic framework to connect the consequences of these two different features of populism. Our analysis provide an answer to the following questions: (1) Should we expect the consequences of populism to increase or decrease inequality and the risk of civil war in ethnically divided countries? (2) Should we expect populism to lead to a greater or lower risk of interstate wars? In order to examine these issues, we propose a flexible theoretical framework that can be adapted to study both civil and interstate wars. In our model, a war may occur due to the realization of uncertainty over the cost of conflict. Basically, conflict is unavoidable if the cost of war is small enough for at least one of the parties involved in the conflict. Our framework allows us to show that protectionism and the associated reduction in the gains from international trade unambiguously increases the risk of civil conflict. In particular, a reduction in the gains from trade due to the choices of populist leaders in superpowers leads governments in ethnically divided societies to renegotiate the “social contract”. This renegotiation amounts to a reduction of the share of resources offered to the ethnic group(s) not in power, yielding either a peaceful acceptance of greater inequality or a more likely war, or both. Our analysis leads to the novel insight that populism causes inequality to spread across the world. Furthermore**, a reduction in trade** reduces the opportunity cost of interstate wars, especially in country dyads which were sufficiently asymmetric in terms of openness to international trade and of military power. Populism leads superpowers to strategic**ally disengage from international conflicts.** Which types of conflicts will a populist leader choose to disengage from? He will choose to disengage from conflicts where the likelihood of success is small and where it was previously backing the weaker side. Intuitively, these are the types of conflicts that are most costly and lead to little domestic benefits for the populist leader. Therefore, we expect disengagement from superpowers to cause the relationships between countries and between **groups within a country to become more unbalanced, leading, as a consequence, to more internal inequality and to an increase in the risk of both interstate and civil conflict across the world**. This paper contributes to the literature on the formal theory of conflict, in that it characterizes the conditions under which the risk of war or bargaining break-down due to asymmetric information increases with protectionism and disengagement by a populist superpower leader.4 Thus, our paper also relates to the literature on third party involvement in bilateral crises.5 Our analysis is consistent with other papers in the literature that have shown that the probability of civil war increases during economic downturns (Chassang and Padro-i-Miquel [2]). However, while previous studies have focused primarily on the direct impact of economic shocks on the opportunity cost of war, our analysis emphasizes the crucial role of endogenous inequality and bargaining between rebels and government as mechanisms linking adverse economic shocks and civil conflict.

#### Backsliding causes prolif and undermines DPT – goes nuclear

**Yulis 17** (Max Yulis, Penn Political Review. In Defense of Liberal Internationalism. April 8, 2017. pennpoliticalreview.org/2017/04/in-defense-of-liberal-internationalism/)

Over the past decade, international headlines have been bombarded with stories about the unraveling of the post-Cold War world order, the creation of revolutionary smart devices and military technologies, the rise of militant jihadist organizations, and nuclear proliferation. Indeed, times are paradoxically promising and alarming. In relation to treating the world’s ills, fortunately, there is a capable hegemon– one that has the ability to revive the world order and traditionally hallmarked human rights, peace, and democracy. The United States, with all of its shortcomings, had crafted an international agenda that significantly impacted the post-WWII landscape. Countries invested their ambitions into security communities, international institutions, and international law in an effort to mitigate the chances of a nuclear catastrophe or another World War. The horrors and atrocities of the two Great Wars had traumatized the global community, which spurred calls for peace and the creation of a universalist agenda. Today, the world’s fickle and declining hegemon still has the ability, but not the will, to uphold the world order that it had so carefully and eagerly helped construct. Now, the stakes are too high, and there must be a mighty and willing global leader to lead the effort of diffusing democratic ideals and reinforcing stability through both military and diplomatic means. To do this, the United States must abandon its insurgent wave of isolationism and protectionism, and come to grips with the newly transnational nature of problems ranging from climate change to international terrorism. First, the increase in intra-state conflict should warrant concern as many countries, namely in Africa and the Middle East, are seeing the total collapse of civil society and government. These power vacuums are being filled with increasingly ideological and dangerous tribal and non-state actors, such as Boko Haram, ISIS, and Al-Shabaab. Other bloody civil wars in Rwanda, Sudan, and the Congo have contributed to the deaths of millions in the past two decades. As the West has seen, however, military intervention has not been all that successful in building and empowering democratic institutions in the Far East. A civil crusade, along with the strengthening of international institutions, may in fact be the answer to undoing tribal, religious, and sectarian divisions, thereby mitigating the prospects of civil conflict. During the Wilsonian era, missionaries did their part to internationalize the concept of higher education, which has contributed to the growth of universities in formerly underdeveloped countries such as China and South Korea.[1] In addition, the teachings of missionaries emphasized the universality of humanity and the oneness of man, which was antithetical to the justifications for imperialism and the rampant sectarianism that plagued much of the Middle East and Africa.[2] Seeing that an increase in the magnitude of human casualty is becoming more of a reality due to advancements in military technology and the increasing outbreaks of civil war, international cooperation and the diffusion of norms that highlight the importance of stable governance, democracy, and human rights is the only recourse to address the rise in sectarian divides and civil conflicts. So long as the trend of the West’s desire to look inward continues, it is likely that nation states mired in conflict will devolve into ethnic or tribal enclaves bent on relying on war to maintain their legitimacy and power. Aside from growing sectarianism and the increasing prevalence of failed states, an even more daunting threat come from weapons that transcend the costs of conventional warfare. The problem of nuclear proliferation has been around for decades, and on the eve of President Trump’s inauguration, it appeared that Obama’s lofty goal of advocating for nonproliferation would no longer be a priority of American foreign policy.[3] In addition, now that the American president is threatening to undo much of the United States’ extensive network of alliances, formerly non-nuclear states may be forced to rearm themselves. Disarmament is central to liberal internationalism, as was apparent by the Washington Naval Treaty advocated by Wilson, and by the modern CTBT treaty. The reverse is, however, being seen in the modern era, with cries coming from Japan and South Korea to remobilize and begin their own nuclear weapon programs.[4] A world with more nuclear actors is a formula for chaos, especially if nuclear weapons become mass-produced. Non-state actors will increasingly eye these nuclear sites as was the case near a Belgian nuclear power plant just over a year ago.[5] If any government commits a serious misstep, access to nuclear weapons on the behalf of terrorist and insurgent groups will become a reality, especially if a civil war occurs. States with nuclear weapons require domestic stability and strong security, which is why states such as Israel, North Korea, and Pakistan could be in serious trouble in the event of a domestic uprising or military coup. The disarmament of all states is essential for human survival, and if it is not achieved, then a world full of nuclear weapons and an international system guided by realpolitik could give rise to nuclear warfare. In today’s world, nuclear weapons leave all states virtually defenseless. But, for nuclear deproliferation to become a cornerstone of the global agenda, a pacifying and democratic power must rise to the limelight to advocate the virtues of peace, stability, and human rights. Those who equivocate democratic interventionism as an idealistic crusade cannot be further from the truth. Some, however, see it as an effective foreign policy that has a grand scheme for peace in mind.[6] The latter contention, despite being widely disputed, holds the premise for the democratic peace theory. Throughout the history of all democracies, not one modern-day democracy has fought against another democracy.[7] Whether that’s because of ideational symmetry, similar objectives and morals**,** or generally pacific foreign policies, such a phenomenon must be given attention by policymakers. According to liberal internationalists, democracies make better partners, tend to move towards increased political and moral agreement, oppose illiberal regimes, and support disarmament policies. This supposition is heavily supported by the smooth post-WWII transitions that the German, Japanese, and Italian governments underwent. All of the governments were formerly fascistic and authoritarian, but with intensive military and economic support from the West, they became some of the most shining exemplars of democratic societies. Even today, Germany is the backbone of the European Union and repeatedly champions democratic norms, such as human rights, economic freedom, and individual liberty.[8] Equipping other countries with the necessary foundations for democracy is no easy feat, but the fight for peace far outweighs the costs of inhabiting a world rife with nuclear-armed authoritarian and belligerent states. In conclusion, liberal internationalism can have a lasting legacy on the prospects for peace if it is executed properly. Putting democracy, humanism, and liberty on a pedestal is what states ought to do if they seek to save humanity from itself. Although the rise of transnational issues pertaining to climate change, nuclear weapons, and civil wars should make international cooperation an increasingly desired aim, states seem to be thinking just the opposite. Only time will tell whether this is a short-lived trend, or a more ominous warning for the world at large.

#### One instance of nuclear weapon use destroys the firebreak, causing cascading nuclear wars

Betts 2k <Richard Betts, Professor and the Director of the Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia, “Universal Deterrence or Conceptual Collapse? Liberal Pessimism and Utopian Realism,” The Coming Crisis: Nuclear Proliferation, U.S. Interests, and World Order, ed. Utgoff, 2000, p. 82>

Quite opposite reactions are imaginable. The shock might jar sluggish statesmen into taking the danger seriously, cutting through diplomatic and military red tape, and undertaking dramatic actions to push the genie back in the bottle. Or the shock might prompt panic and a rush to stock up on WMD, as the possibility of use underlines the need for deterrent capability, or the effectiveness of such weapons as instruments of policy One seldom-noticed danger is that breakage of the taboo could de­mystify the weapons and make them look more conventional than our post-Hiroshima images of them. It helps to recall that in the 1930s, popular images of conventional strategic bombing were that it would be apocalyptic, bringing belligerent countries to their knees quickly. The apocalyptic image was fed by the German bombing of Guernica, a com­paratively small city in Spain. When World War II came in Europe, both British and Germans initially refrained from bombing attacks on cities. Once city bombing began and gathered steam, however, it proved to be far less decisive than many had expected. British and German popula­tions managed to adjust and absorb it. Over time, however, the ferocity of Allied bombing of Germany and Japan did approach the apocalyptic levels originally envisioned. In short, dire assumptions about the awesomeness of strategic bombing deterred its initiation, but once initi­ated did not prevent gradual escalation to the devastating level originally envisioned. Nuclear weapon inventories of countries like India and Pakistan are likely to remain small in number and yield for some time. According to press reports, by some U.S. estimates the yields of the 1998 tests were only a few kilotons. If the first weapon detonated in combat is a low-yield device in a large city with uneven terrain and lots of reinforced concrete, it might only destroy a small part of the city A bomb that killed 10,000 to 20,000 people would be seen as a stunning catastrophe, but there are now many parts of the world where that number would be less than 1 percent of a city’s population. The disaster could seem surprisingly limited, since in the popular imagination (underwritten by the results in the small and flimsy cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki), nuclear weapons mean ‘one bomb, one city” Awful destruction that yet seems surprisingly limited could prompt revisionist reactions among lay elites in some coun­tries about the meaning of nuclear ordnance.

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

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

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

### 1AC – Framing (0:40)

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing –

#### Neuroscience – Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else regresses.

Blum et al. 18

Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even **produce the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### Actor spec – policies inevitably cause tradeoffs between people which means side-constraints freeze action – calc indicts are empirically disproven because governments use util.

#### Util is a pre-req – A non-ideal framework is needed to have intuitive foundation to make decisions under duress.

#### 4) Weighability - Only util explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital.

### Underview

#### [1] Objectivity is a process not an endpoint and thus claims of why objectivity are bad are misapplied as they are not criticizing the process, rather the misapplications of objectivity

Matthew Winston is the author of Gonzo Text: Disentangling Meaning in Hunter S. Thompson’s Journalism. He teaches in the School of Media, Communication and Sociology at the University of Leicester, THE ROOTS OF FAKE NEWS: Obecting to Objective Journalism, September 2020- Book – pdf available upon request – mavsdebate@gmail.com

Specifically, scientific objectivity comes from proceeding ~~‘blind’~~ – seeing ‘without interference, interpretation, or intelligence’, as we have indicated above (see p. 111). Philosophers have also been concerned with objectivity outside of science and within the humanities, primarily in history. There it presents a problem because the ‘knower’, the historian, denied repeatability and incapable of completeness, is – as it were – ‘contaminated’ (as is the journalist), by subjectivity. Journalism may be ‘the first rough draft of history’,22 but, leaving historiography and its problems behind, it is more comfortable with – although still severely challenged by – legal approaches to the question of knowability than it is with the techniques of the historian. But for journalism reaching for objectivity is a process, in essence is a way of avoiding the conundrum posed by truth, a state of being related to fact. The objective journalist might not know exactly where they are going (truth) but they know, by denying self, how they are getting there (objectivity).

#### 2 Implications –

#### [A] any argument which presumes that objectivity is a static concept that always stays the same is based on a *wrong premise*.

#### [B] objective press would print retractions when error or bias is discovered where advocacy press would like bias to continue unabated. This means advocacy is always worse because it incentivizes not correcting issues.

#### [2] Populism destroys effective governance which multiplies existential risk – filters any of their impacts

Gans and Leigh 21 <Gans, Joshua, and Andrew Leigh. “What's the Worst That Could Happen?” *The MIT Press*, The MIT Press, mitpress.mit.edu/books/whats-worst-could-happen.>

Did you know that you're more likely to die from a catastrophe than in a car crash? The odds that a typical US resident will die from a catastrophic event—for example, nuclear war, bioterrorism, or out-of-control artificial intelligence—have been estimated at 1 in 6. That's fifteen times more likely than a fatal car crash and *thirty-on*e times more likely than being murdered. In *What's the Worst That Could Happen?*, Andrew Leigh looks at catastrophic risks and how to mitigate them, arguing provocatively that the rise of populist politics makes catastrophe more likely.

Leigh explains that pervasive short-term thinking leaves us unprepared for long-term risks. Politicians sweat the small stuff—granular policy details of legislation and regulation—but rarely devote much attention to reducing long-term risks. Populist movements thrive on short-termism because they focus on their followers' immediate grievances. Leigh argues that we should be long-termers: broaden our thinking and give big threats the attention and resources they need.

Leigh outlines the biggest existential risks facing humanity and suggests remedies for them. He discusses pandemics, considering the possibility that the next virus will be more deadly than COVID-19; warns that unchecked climate change could render large swaths of the earth uninhabitable; describes the metamorphosis of the arms race from a fight into a chaotic brawl; and examines the dangers of runaway superintelligence. Moreover, Leigh points out, populism (and its crony, totalitarianism) not only exacerbates other dangers but is also a risk factor in itself, undermining the institutions of democracy as we watch.

#### [3] Objectivity is better than advocacy for social movements – advocacy is undeniably worse

Winthrop 20 Zadie Winthrop, part of The Daily's Summer Journalism Workshop, 8-20-2020, "Should journalists rethink objectivity? Stanford professors weigh in," Stanford Daily, <https://stanforddaily.com/2020/08/20/should-journalists-rethink-objectivity-stanford-professors-weigh-in/> // ella [brackets in original article]

According to Neiman, moral clarity arises after a writer assesses the facts and context of a particular situation, makes a moral judgment about it and includes that judgment in his or her article. With moral clarity, a journalist could make statements that, say, the criminal justice system is unfair to Black people or that racism is bad because the journalist holds that these claims are, at their root, fact-based claims — despite politicalpolarization that could lead one to see the statements as biased.Wesley Lowery, who has served as a national correspondent for the Washington Post, has been a prominent voice in the moral clarity versus objectivity debate. Lowery wrote in a tweet, “American view-from-nowhere, “objectivity”-obsessed, both-sides journalism is a failed experiment…The old way must go. We need to rebuild our industry as one that operates from a place of moral clarity.” Even so, Janine Zacharia, a communications lecturer at Stanford, is not persuaded by arguments for moral clarity. She told The Daily that she believes abandoning objective reporting would not be good for journalism. She gave an example where a journalist wants to write a story about white nationalists. If the prospective subjects of the article were to Google the journalist and see their past work or social media paint negative opinions about white nationalism, those subjects may not be willing to be interviewed for the story, fearing that the story would not be fairly written. Under such premises, Zacharia said, the stories and issues that journalists could bring attention to would dwindle. Similarly, Communications Professor Fred Turner said in an interview with The Daily that objective reporting can be an impactful way to achieve social change. Turner argues that journalists in the 1960s, ostensibly working under the guidelines of objectivity, exposed the world to protests against the Vietnam War. In doing so, Turner said, journalists helped the anti-war movement grow. Turner believes the same thing is happening today with the Black Lives Matter movement. “Each time people see one of these killings or see the protests,” Turner said, “it stops being a purely local matter and becomes a matter of public concern, and then it becomes something that we can all take action on.” Journalists, he said, are partially to thank for spreading these stories. Because journalists report what they see, whether positive or negative, journalism is “by definition an activist occupation,” Turner said. Turner does not believe objectivity restricts journalists’ abilities to engage in social change. On the contrary, he said, “you must be objective — and that’s the key to your ability to be an activist for democracy: calling things as you see them, and staying objective, and staying out of the fray.” Glasser disagreed. For him, objectivity and social justice are in conflict, and he urged that journalism “free itself from this notion of objectivity to develop a sense of social justice.” Jefferson said that objectivity is not often practiced equitably. In the real world, he said, only “people of color, queer people, women, and so on have their commitment to objectivity questioned.” This discrimination happens, he said, because society perceives objectivity as neutral, and people don’t associate straight, white men with identities that interfere with neutrality. “There’s this assumption that if you really want objective journalism, just give me a staid, white person,” Jefferson said. But that, Jefferson said, is obviously wrong: Like everyone else, a white man “comes to his work as a journalist with attitudes, beliefs, preferences and identities … that structure his own thinking about the world.”

#### [4] Participatory and citizen journalism is valuable but will lose its value and not be considered press if it spreads unverified information

Maria D. Molina, professor of journalism at Penn State University, et al, October 14, 2019

“'Fake News' Is Not Simply False Information: A Concept Explication and Taxonomy of Online Content,” American Behavioral Scientist, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0002764219878224 (accessed 2/9/22)

In the digital world, reporting has become a collaborative and participatory practice. As Downie and Schudson (2009) explain, news gathering is not only conducted by the traditional newsroom, but also by freelancers and citizens at large. Although these nontraditional sources can provide important information about breaking news and be eye-witnesses to events otherwise not covered, some of their reports can be unverified and inaccurate (Conroy et al., 2015), or simply personal commentary for sharing opinions, photos, observations, and activities (Downie & Schudson, 2009). There are two different categories of citizen journalism. The first includes blogs and websites from citizens, civil societies, and organizations with content originally created by such users (Howard et al., 2017). Features to distinguish this content from other online information include message aspects such as not adhering to journalistic style of reporting and verification. Additionally, its contents are more emotionally driven and subjectively reported. Last, there are essential structural components. For instance, the URL and “about us” section are giveaways of the site being a blog, personal site, or a site specifically meant for citizen reporting.