### NC

#### The standard is maximizing expected well being – Prefer

#### [1] Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else regresses. Evolutionary knowledge is reliable – broad consensus and robust neuroscience prove.
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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.

#### [2] Actor specificity – state actors can only use util – outweighs since different actors have different obligations.

#### A – Aggregation – all policies benefit some and hurts others – only util can resolve these cuz it gives a clear weighing mechanism

#### B – Collectivism – States are composed of many actors who inevitably disagree about intent means they can only use consequentialism because they don’t have to agree

#### C – Bureaucrats aren’t philosophers – policymakers do not have experience with dense frameworks so they don’t understand how to apply them to specific instances but they do understand that pain is bad and pleasure is good because it’s intrinsic to existing.

#### [3] Extinction first –

#### a. Wager – if there is any chance of goodness existing, we ought to preserve our existence to maximize it.

#### b. Sequencing – if their framework is true, people dying is bad because it means those people can’t use their framework

#### c. Repugnance – if their framework cannot explain why people dying is bad – you should reject it because it cannot disavow of atrocities. You shouldn’t vote for a framework that can’t say the holocaust was a bad thing.

#### d. Performativity – us having a moral debate proves moral uncertainty because it means we are not certain about which framework is true - means we should preserve our ability to find the true framework

### CP

#### CP Text – Free Press should openly and deliberately articulate their advocacies on stories and on issues of relevancy to their writings.

#### CP promotes democracy while breaking the manipulate power of the so-called objective press

Brian Winston & is the Lincoln Professor at the University of Lincoln (UK). He is the author of A Right to Offend, The Rushdie Fatwa and After and also writes on documentary film and media technology. He was the founding director of the Glasgow University Media Group. 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-

Given that objectivity is, according to its ideological construction, in a state of binary opposition with subjectivity, it necessarily follows that if objectivity is abandoned, journalism would perform its functions by owning its subjectivity, its biases, and contextualising the information which it presented openly, according to its own clearly and explicitly defined perspectives, political and otherwise. The clarity and logical consistency of this context would condition the credibility of what is reported. And such a change of understanding is not unthinkable. As one of the authors of this book has discussed elsewhere,9 there was a (fairly long) period in the history of American journalism during which the news was openly biased, and, to oversimplify quite a bit, it still worked just fine. It can be argued, as we said at the beginning of this chapter, that this press earned a role for itself in the founding myth(s) of the American republic which conditions, to this day, the high claims made for its journalism. The arrow flies straight from Tom Paine’s time to John Carey now, hitting the bullseye and allowing Carey boldly to assert that ‘journalism is usefully understood as another name for democracy’.10 But for much of this arrow’s flight – how much is a matter of debate – objectivity was not just irrelevant, but unheard of. As another eminent US media scholar, Robert McChesney, observed: During the first two or three generations of the republic such notions for the press would have been nonsensical, even unthinkable. The point of journalism was to persuade as well as inform, and the press tended to be highly partisan.11 Gerald Baldasty, in discussing the ‘opinionated, politically biased, one-sided, argumentative and frequently strident’12 newspapers of the Jacksonian era, which were also publicly subsidised, privately patronised, and openly partisan, noted that in the early 1800s, it was in fact a failure to adopt and espouse clearly defined political positions that was taboo. This was not because of a lack of professionalism, or of a lack of respect for the importance of newspapers in the functioning of a democracy, but rather because journalism was viewed differently. Neutrality, thought Horace Greely, was a gag. In essence, as Baldasty notes, a newspaper’s failing to express a clear opinion would have been viewed as evidence, not of fairness, detachment, etc., but that either the editor did not have an opinion, or did not have the courage to express it. Neither was acceptable. Baldasty says, ‘Evenhandedness or objectivity was not so much bad as inappropriate.’13 While some might view the move from such an ideological position towards professionalism and objectivity as an example of progress, from the primitive to the sophisticated, and from worse to better, we, obviously, do not see it in this way. This admittedly now unfamiliar ideology seems to us far from incomprehensible or obviously inferior, given the nature and importance of lively public debate, informed not just by facts, but by popular understanding of the context(s) and meaning(s) of the news. Conscious that some may reply that much of the news is already openly politically-slanted, a note of clarification: though within the (admittedly fuzzy) borders of the mainstream press, there are of course news outlets of various kinds which might conventionally be considered as highly partisan (e.g. The Daily Mail, but also the likes of The Guardian), even their rhetoric is grounded, invariably, in presenting news/truth, with the only bias ever explicitly acknowledged being the national/common interest. The rhetoric of the spectacularly partisan Fox News network, which until relatively recently had the phrase ‘fair and balanced’ trademarked, exemplifies this point. Since admitting to your bias is no admission at all if you define it as a bias in favour of being right, this type of stance, still ultimately grounded in the ideology of objectivity, must not be confused with the honest, explicit partisanship from which we are suggesting the press should never have departed, and to which it should return. The word ‘objectivity’ comes into the language in 1803 but it is not immediately applied to the press. Nevertheless, according to Dan Schiller, selling what amounted to objectivity had, by the 1830s, become a shrewd commercial move for newspaper publishers.14 He grounds his case for its de facto adoption in the press of that era in terms of a response to the growing scepticism of the age of industrialisation and urbanisation – a new world of trains and electricity, of probabilistics and increasingly democratic modes of government. Objectivity at this point can in fact perhaps best be understood as a hustle, designed to obscure the exercise of power within the realm of news. Schiller describes how the con was pitched: With its universalistic intent, its concern for public rationality based on equal access to the facts, objectivity harbored a profoundly democratic promise. From the 1830s the informational system was not to be the exclusive preserve of a king, a baron, a president or a class but rather, as it seemed, of the political nation itself.15

#### Honest advocacy enhances knowledge whereas objective journalism masks and blocks critical challenging power structures

Greg McLaughlin Journalism, Objectivity and War Book Title: The War Correspondent Book Author(s): Published by: Pluto Press Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19qgf0x.7> The War Correspondent Greg McLaughlin Copyright Date: 2016

It was Kapuscinski, however, who revealed the deeper, broader picture, and like all great writers he forged his own unique style. He did not assume absolute truth or prescribe a moral course but, as James Aucoin (2001) puts it, he took you there, showed you an incomplete picture and then challenged you to find the missing pieces. He implicitly passed responsibility on to the reader. It was not conventional, objective journalism, and it was not the journalism of attachment, but perhaps it was better journalism for that. This is close to the idea of ‘honest journalism’ in conventional reporting, whereby the journalist admits not just to the difficulties of objectivity, but to the constructed nature of journalism as a form. In his study of the US press corps in El Salvador during some of the worst years of its civil war in the 1980s, Mark Pedelty highlights a key difference between American and Salvadoran journalists in how they saw their job. The Americans insisted that they ‘report’ news as fact; the Salvadorans talked in terms of ‘making’ news. The Americans adhered to notions of ‘objectivity’, while the Salvadorans thought the highest aspiration in journalism was ‘honesty’ (1995, p.  226–27). As Pedelty argues, the ethic of honest journalism comes somewhere between objective journalism and propaganda: Objective journalists deny their subjectivities, rather than acknowledge them and critically challenge them. They reduce complexities, rather than explain them. They evade contradiction, rather than letting the reader in on the inevitable doubts and difficulties encountered in any act of discovery. (ibid., p. 227)

### DA

#### Link Story

#### Best research proves that media has no harmful effect on others, rather it is explained by our assumption about others in what is called third person hypothesis

Clay Calvert, Mr. Calvert is Assistant Professor of Communications and law and Associate Director of the Pennsylvania Center for the First Amendment at the Pennsylvania State University. The First Amendment And The Third Person: Perceptual Biases Of Media Harms & Cries For Government Censorship, CommLaw Conspectus, Vol. 165 1998 – 1 Email [mavsdebate@gmail.com](mailto:mavsdebate@gmail.com) if you want a full copy of the article

As a society, we fear the harmful effects **of** these and other media-propagated images. But what if our beliefs and perceptions about alleged media harms are systematically wrong? What if we, in fact, typically overestimate the harm caused bymass media messages? What if we unnecessarily censor speech?  
There is a strong and growing body of empirical social science research from the field of communication that suggests that much of our First Amendment jurisprudence and efforts to censor speech may be radically off base. Specifically, the research supports what has been called the third-person effect hypothesis**.**

The hypothesis "predicts that people will tend to overestimate the influence that mass communications have on the attitudes and behavior of others." Parsed differently, the hypothesis, as originally articulated in 1983 by W. Phillips Davison, holds that "[i] n the view of those trying to evaluate the effects of a communication, its greatest impact will not be on 'me' or 'you,' but on 'them'-the third persons.""'

Now, 15 years and many empirical experiments and studieslater, evidencesupports this hypothesis. **That evidence has disturbing ramifications for extant and future First Amendment jurisprudence.** It suggests the government may be unnecessarily censoring **speech** based on a perceptual bias **about its effects on others.**

#### 75 years of research has produced no evidence the media influences people

Brian Winston & is the Lincoln Professor at the University of Lincoln (UK). He is the author of A Right to Offend, The Rushdie Fatwa and After and also writes on documentary film and media technology. He was the founding director of the Glasgow University Media Group. 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

Psychologists interested, for example, in the impact of media look to all ‘emerging research in fields such as neuroscience’ because of a belief that these give the researcher looking ‘for indications of how, why and when media messages trigger individual and social change’ -- insights beyond those to be gleaned, for example, from ‘marketing and box office metrics’.20 They do no such thing, of course. They are what they are:  statistics  – and their causation remains a black-box. Threequarters of a century of attaching electrodes have yielded little evidence, say, to convincingly condition social policy. We can plot brain activity and stimulations but, in reality, we do not know what is being thought. This does not, however, deter the search for empirical, quantitative data as a key to understanding the mentality underlying human behaviour. Reporting of such experimental data has, however, fuelled media panics (e.g. approaches to social media platform ‘use’ which, essentially, assume all ‘clicks’ are meaningful, condition received current understanding of new media impact). Journalists, anyway, do not use EEG, fMRI, or PET as newsgathering tools. For all that the press, too often entirely uncritically, reports the findings of those who do, some might think it is rather to journalism’s credit that this is obviously not like the work of journalists. It is no wonder that the protocols of ‘hard’ (or harder) science, even when dealing with humans, in general have little to do with the daily practices of the news media.

#### Impact Story

#### 2 implications –

#### 1] Guts any aff solvency – their scenarios are predicated on the idea that the media actually has influence on people’s ideas but science disproves that notion – prefer science

#### 2] Empirically, the third person hypothesis proves media’s impact are non-existent and encourages us to accept censorship to protect others from *nothing*

Clay Calvert, Mr. Calvert is Assistant Professor of Communications and law and Associate Director of the Pennsylvania Center for the First Amendment at the Pennsylvania State University. The First Amendment And The Third Person: Perceptual Biases Of Media Harms & Cries For Government Censorship, CommLaw Conspectus, Vol. 165 1998 - 2

An example**-censorship of sexually explicit speech-makes the danger clear.** Empirical re- search suggests that people systematically judge others to be more negatively influenced by pornography than themselves. In turn, people "favor restrictions on pornography in line with their perceptions of effects on others**." This is important because some experimental research also suggests that people systematically overestimate media effects on others.** The ramifications**,** communication researcher Albert C. Gunther of the University of Wisconsin-Madison notes, are profound - "if people are systematically overestimating the negative social-level effects of pornography, then the third-person effect may be inflating opinion in favor of censorship.”

#### And, Censorship is an impact filter – multiple impacts triggers

D’Souza**, PhD Phil @Oxford,** 1996(Frances, Prof. Anthropology Oxford, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/hearings/19960425/droi/freedom\_en.htm?textMode=on)

**In the absence of freedom of expression** **which includes a free and independent media**, **it is impossible to protect other rights, including** the right to **life**. **Once governments** are able to **draw a cloak of secrecy over their actions** and to remain unaccountable for their actions then **massive human rights violations can, and do, take place**. **For this reason alone** the right to **freedom of expression**, specifically protected in the major international human rights treaties, **must be considered** to be **a primary right**. It is significant that one of **the first indication**s **of a government's intent**ion **to depart from democratic principles is** the ever increasing **control of information** by means of gagging the media, and preventing the freeflow of information from abroad. At one end of the spectrum there are supposedly minor infringements of this fundamental right which occur daily in Western democracies and would include abuse of national security laws to prevent the publication of information which might be embarrassing to a given government: at the other end of the scale are the regimes of terror which employ the most brutal moves to suppress opposition, information and even the freedom to exercise religious beliefs. It has been argued, and will undoubtedly be discussed at this Hearing, that **in the absence of free speech** and an independent media, **it is** relatively **easy for governments to capture**, as it were, **the media** and to fashion them into instruments of propaganda, **for the promotion of ethnic conflict, war and genocide.** 2. Enshrining the right to freedom of expression The right to freedom of expression is formally protected in the major international treaties including the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. In addition, it is enshrined in many national constitutions throughout the world, although this does not always guarantee its protection. Furthermore, freedom of expression is, amongst other human rights, upheld, even for those countries which are not signatories to the above international treaties through the concept of customary law which essentially requires that all states respect the human rights set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by virtue of the widespread or customary respect which has been built up in the post World War II years. 3. Is free speech absolute? While it is generally accepted that freedom of expression is, and remains the cornerstone of democracy, there are permitted restrictions encoded within the international treaties which in turn allow for a degree of interpretation of how free free speech should be. Thus, **unlike the American First Amendment** Rights **which allow few, if any, checks on free speech** or on the independence of the media, the **international treaties are concerned that there should be a balance** between competing rights: for example, limiting free speech or media freedom where it impinges on the individual's right to privacy; where free speech causes insult or injury to the rights and reputation of another; where speech is construed as incitement to violence or hatred, or where free speech would create a public disturbance. Given that these permitted restrictions are necessarily broad, the limits of free speech are consistently tested in national law courts and, perhaps even more importantly, in the regional courts such as the European Commission and Court of Human Rights. In recent years several landmark cases have helped to define more closely what restrictions may be imposed by government and under what circumstances. In particular, it has been emphasised by the European Court that any restriction must comply with a three-part test which requires that any such restriction should first of all be prescribed by law, and thus not arbitrarily imposed: proportionate to the legitimate aims pursued, and demonstrably necessary in a democratic society in order to protect the individual and/or the state. 4. Who censors what? Despite the rather strict rules which apply to restrictions on free speech that governments may wish to impose, **many justifications are** nevertheless **sought by governments to suppress information** which is inimical to their policies or their interests. **These** justifications **include arguments in defence of** national and/or state **security**, **the public interst,** including the need to protect public morals and public order **and perfectly understandable attempts to prevent racism, violence, sexism**, religious intolerance and damage to the indi-vidual's reputation or privacy. The mechanisms employed by governments to restrict the freeflow of information are almost endless and range from subtle economic pressures and devious methods of undermining political opponents and the independent media to the enactment of restrictive press laws and an insist-ence on licensing journalists and eventually to the illegal detention, torture and disappearances of journalists and others associated with the expression of independent views. 5. Examples of censorship **To some** the right to **free speech may appear** to be one of the **fringe** human rights, especially **when compared to** such violations as **torture** and extra-judicial killings. It is also sometimes difficult **to dissuade the** general **public that censorship**, generally assumed to be something to do with banning obscene books or magazines, **is** no **bad** thing! It **requires a recognition of** some of the **fundamental principles of democracy** **to understand why censorship is** so **immensely dangerous**. **The conditon of democracy is** that **people are able to make choices** about a wide variety of issues which affect their lives, including what they wish to see, read, hear or discuss. While this may seem a somewhat luxurious distinction preoccupying, perhaps, wealthy Western democracies, **it is a comparatively short distance between government censorship** of an offensive book **to the silencing of political dissidents**. **And** the distance **between such silencing and the use of violence** to suppress a growing political philosophy which a government finds inconvenient **is even shorter**. **Censorship tends to have small beginnings and to grow rapidly**. **Allowing a government to** have the power to **deny people information**, **however trivial**, **not only sets in place laws** and procedures **which can and will be used by those in authority against those with less authority, but** **it** also **denies people the information which they must have in order to monitor their governments actions and to ensure accountability**. **There have been** dramatic and **terrible examples of** the role that **censorship** has played **in international politics** in the last few years: to name but a few, the extent to which the media in the republics of former **Yugoslavia** were manipulated by government for purposes of propaganda; the violent role played by the government associated radio in **Rwanda** which incited citizens to kill each other in the name of ethnic purity and the continuing threat of murder issued by the Islamic Republic of **Iran** against a citizen of another country for having written a book which displeased them. 6. The **link** between poverty, war and denial of free speech **There are undoubted connections between access to information**, or rather the lack of it, **and war**, **as indeed there are between poverty**, the right to freedom of expression and development. One can argue that **democracy aims to increase participation** in political and other decision-making at all levels. In this sense **democracy empowers** people. **The poor are denied access to information on decisions which deeply affect their lives**, are thus powerless and have no voice; the poor are not able to have influence over their own lives, let alone other aspect of society. **Because of this** essential **powerlessness, the poor are unable to influence the ruling elite** **in whose interests it may be to initiate conflict and wars in order to consolidate their own power and position.** Of the 126 developing countries listed in the 1993 Human Development Report, war was ongoing in 30 countries and severe civil conflict in a further 33 countries. **Of the total 63 countries in conflict, 55 are towards the bottom scale of the human development index** which is an indicator of poverty. There seems to be no doubt that **there is a clear association between poverty and war**. It is reasonably safe to assume that the vast majority of **people do not ever welcome war**. **They are** normally **coerced,** **more often than not by propaganda**, **into fear, extreme nationalist sentiments and war by their governments**. **If the majority** of people **had a democratic voice they would undoubtedly object** to war. But voices are silenced. Thus, **the freedom to express one's views** and to challenge government decisions and **to insist upon political rather than violent solutions, are necessary aspects of democracy which can, and do, avert war.** Government sponsored propaganda in Rwanda, as in former Yugoslavia, succeeded because there weren't the means to challenge it. **One** **has** therefore **to conclude that it is impossible for** a particular **government to wage war in the absence of a compliant media** willing to indulge in government propaganda. This is because **the government needs civilians to fight wars for them and also because the media is needed to re-inforce government policies and intentions at every turn.**