### Framework

**We acknowledge that we are standing on Native American land and are grateful to live and learn on this land. This tournament is being held on Karankawa land.**

#### The meta-ethic is contractarianism – Prefer

#### [1] Motivation Internalism is true –

#### A] Value Creation: All external forces only matter because we as individuals confer value to it for example a chair is only useful if we want to use it as a seat or laws are only binding if we as citizens assume their legitimacy.

#### B] Motivation Theory: Externalism cannot resolve the question of philosophical curiosity e.g. why we have a general desire to see which moral theory is correct

#### C] Epistemic Reliability: The external world is unreliable since a demon could control us, we could be living in a simulation, etc. We are unsure about the external world but we are 100% certain we have internal motivations because we feel and understand them.

#### D] Collapses- The External world is not an agent that can confer independent value onto things but rather is just the compilation of individual agents that aggregate their values to create a larger communal good. This means that any claims to larger public external values regress back to the individual that make up that community in the first place

#### [2] Ethical theories must have a theory of motivation to function:

#### A] Bindingness- Otherwise individuals could just opt out and ask why we must follow X theory which devolves to skepticism

#### B] Application- If your framework cannot motivate individuals to follow it then it cannot guide action

#### [3] Motivational Internalism justifies Contractarianism because we create the contracts

Gauthier ’87

Gauthier, David P. Morals by Agreement. Clarendon Press, 1987. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1fMcj4jRIahQn7pL4Xfbr8BqspCxgicF9/view?usp=sharing // rc Phoenix

Morals by agreement offer a contractarian rationale for distinguishing what one may and may not do. Moral principles are introduced as the objects of fully voluntary ex ante agreement among rational persons. Such agreement is hypothetical, in supposing a pre- moral context for the adoption of moral rules and practices. But the parties to agreement are real, determinate individuals, distinguished by their capacities, situations, and concerns. In so far as they would agree to constraints on their choices, restraining their pursuit of their own interests, they acknowledge a distinction between what they may and may not do. As rational persons understanding the structure of their interaction, they recognize a place for mutual constraint, and so for a moral dimension in their affairs.

#### Contractarianism justifies international law since it’s the biggest contract – it includes the perspectives of all countries that participated in deliberation of the contract.

#### The standard is consistency with international law – Prefer

#### [1] Actor specificity – The rez says “in a democracy” which implies multiple democracies, otherwise, the topic would specify the one democracy that exists, only international law creates a transnational obligation.

#### [2] Regress – ILaw solves regress since when an agent asks why they should follow Ilaw, they should follow it since they agreed to it in the first place.

#### [3] State Accountability: Only our FW can hold states accountable and restrict their actions within certain defined norms. Key to checking back state abuse and is constitutive to the rez which restricts state actions.

#### [4] Hijacks any framework since it your framework is really key to morality it would be included in international law or any other contract since we derive these contracts from deliberation which is able to solve for inherent epistemic weakness.

#### [5] TJFs –

#### [A] Real World Policy Making: states actively abide by international norms for example things like human rights have been adopted by states due to their international prevalence. This outweighs on time frame and portability since our framework forces debaters to understand international contracts.

#### [B] Anti-Colonial Pedagogy: We force debaters to research nations outside the US and treaties within international relations. Shifts away from standard Eurocentric interpretations that only place emphasis on the US rather than a larger field of studies.

### Offense

#### I affirm the resolution - In a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy. Definitions for spec.

#### Objectivity in reporting is removing one’s own biases from their stories

Tony Rogers, M.S. in Journalism from Columbia University and has worked for the Associated Press and the New York Daily News, 12-4-2019, “Objectivity and Fairness in Journalism,” https://www.thoughtco.com/objectivity-and-fairness-2073726 (accessed 7-12-21)

Objectivity means that when covering hard news, reporters don’t convey their own feelings, biases or prejudices in their stories. They do this by writing stories using neutral language and by avoiding characterizing people or institutions either positively or negatively.

#### Prioritize means “to arrange or do in order of priority”.

HarperCollins Publishers Ltd. (n.d.). Prioritize definition and meaning: Collins english dictionary. Prioritize definition and meaning | Collins English Dictionary. Retrieved February 21, 2022, from https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/prioritize

in American English (praiˈɔrɪˌtaiz, -ˈɑr-) (verb -tized, -tizing) TRANSITIVE VERB 1. to arrange or do in order of priority learning to prioritize our assignments

#### [1] The IFJ Global Charter affirms – international journalistic ethics instruct the free press to prioritize objectivity over advocacy

IFJ ‘19

“Global Charter of Ethics for Journalists.” IFJ, 12 June 2019, https://www.ifj.org/who/rules-and-policy/global-charter-of-ethics-for-journalists.html/. The IFJ Global Charter of Ethics for Journalists was adopted at the 30th IFJ World Congress in Tunis on 12 June 2019. It completes the IFJ Declaration of Principles on the Conduct of Journalists (1954), known as the ”Bordeaux Declaration". // rc Phoenix

The right of everyone to have access to information and ideas, reiterated in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, underpins the journalist's mission. The journalist's responsibility towards the public takes precedence over any other responsibility, in particular towards their employers and the public authorities. Journalism is a profession, which requires time, resources and the means to practise – all of which are essential to its independence. This international declaration specifies the guidelines of conduct for journalists in the research, editing, transmission, dissemination and commentary of news and information, and in the description of events, in any media whatsoever. 1. Respect for the facts and for the right of the public to truth is the first duty of the journalist. 2. In pursuance of this duty, the journalist shall at all times defend the principles of freedom in the honest collection and publication of news, and of the right of fair comment and criticism. He/she [they] will make sure to clearly distinguish factual information from commentary and criticism. 3. The journalist shall report only in accordance with facts of which he/ she knows the origin. The journalist shall not suppress essential information or falsify any document. He/she will be careful to reproduce faithfully statements and other material that non-public persons publish in social media. 4. The journalist shall use only fair methods to obtain information, images, documents and data and he/she will always report his/her status as a journalist and will refrain from using hidden recordings of images and sounds, except where it is impossible for him/her to collect information that is overwhelmingly in the public interest. He/she will demand free access to all sources of information and the right to freely investigate all facts of public interest. 5. The notion of urgency or immediacy in the dissemination of information shall not take precedence over the verification of facts, sources and/or the offer of a reply. 6. The journalist shall do the utmost to rectify any errors or published information which is found to be inaccurate in a timely, explicit, complete and transparent manner. 7. The journalist shall observe professional secrecy regarding the source of information obtained in confidence. 8. The journalist will respect privacy. He/she shall respect the dignity of the persons named and/or represented and inform the interviewee whether the conversation and other material is intended for publication. He/she shall show particular consideration to inexperienced and vulnerable interviewees. 9. Journalists shall ensure that the dissemination of information or opinion does not contribute to hatred or prejudice and shall do their utmost to avoid facilitating the spread of discrimination on grounds such as geographical, social or ethnic origin, race, gender, sexual orientation, language, religion, disability, political and other opinions. 10. The journalist will consider serious professional misconduct to be plagiarism distortion of facts slander, libel, defamation, unfounded accusations 11. The journalist shall refrain from acting as an auxiliary of the police or other security services. He/she will only be required to provide information already published in a media outlet. 12. The journalist will show solidarity with his/her colleagues, without renouncing his/her freedom of investigation, duty to inform, and right to engage in criticism, commentary, satire and editorial choice. 13. The journalist shall not use the freedom of the press to serve any other interest and shall refrain from receiving any unfair advantage or personal gain because of the dissemination or non-dissemination of information. He/she will avoid - or put an end to - any situation that could lead him/her to a conflict of interest in the exercise of his/her profession. He/she will avoid any confusion between his activity and that of advertising or propaganda. He/she will refrain from any form of insider trading and market manipulation. 14. The journalist will not undertake any activity or engagement likely to put his/her independence in danger. He/she will, however, respect the methods of collection/dissemination of information that he / she has freely accepted, such as "off the record", anonymity, or embargo, provided that these commitments are clear and unquestionable. 15. Journalists worthy of the name shall deem it their duty to observe faithfully the principles stated above. They may not be compelled to perform a professional act or to express an opinion that is contrary to his/her professional conviction or conscience. 16. Within the general law of each country the journalist shall recognize in matters of professional honour, the jurisdiction of independent self-regulatory bodies open to the public, to the exclusion of every kind of interference by governments or others.

#### [2] UNESCO Journalism Ethics holds objectivity first

Ethical Journalism Network ‘83

“International Principles of Professional Ethics in Journalism.” Accountable Journalism, [https://accountablejournalism.org/ethics-codes/International-Principles. (prepared under the auspices of UNESCO by meetings of international and regional organisations of journalists between 1978 and 1983, issued by the Fourth Consultative Meeting  , representing 400 000 working journalists in all parts of the world, in Paris on 20 November 1983.) //](https://accountablejournalism.org/ethics-codes/International-Principles.%20(prepared%20under%20the%20auspices%20of%20UNESCO%20by%20meetings%20of%20international%20and%20regional%20organisations%20of%20journalists%20between%201978%20and%201983,%20issued%20by%20the%20Fourth%20Consultative%20Meeting %20,%20representing%20400%20000%20working%20journalists%20in%20all%20parts%20of%20the%20world,%20in%20Paris%20on%2020%20November%201983.)%20%20//) Phoenix

(prepared under the auspices of UNESCO by meetings of international and regional organisations of journalists between 1978 and 1983, issued by the Fourth Consultative Meeting  , representing 400 000 working journalists in all parts of the world, in Paris on 20 November 1983.)

Principle I : Peoples' right to true information

People and individuals have the right to acquire an objective picture of reality by means of accurate and comprehensive information as well as to express themselves freely through the various media of culture and communication.

Principle II : The journalist's dedication to objective reality

The foremost task of the journalist is to serve the people's right to true and authentic information through an honest dedication to objective reality whereby facts are reported conscientiously in their proper context, pointing out their essential connections and without causing distortions, with due deployment of the creative capacity of the journalist, so that the public is provided with adequate material to facilitate the formation of an accurate and comprehensive picture of the world in which the origin, nature and essence of events, processes and states of affairs are understood as objectively as possible.

### U/V

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best proves the truth or falsity of the resolution. Prefer:

#### Truth testing’s best for predictability since debaters only know the rez before the round so it’s the best starting point. Best for clash since our interp is most predictable both on the theory and substantive flows.

#### Truth Testing allows for the more ground than any other ROB since it allows for a literal infinite amount of arguments on a range of argumentation style giving the most breadth and depth of topic and phil ed

#### All debates are questions of truth or falsity, which means you should default to our ROB.

#### The framework debate is bidirectional which means both aff and neg have equal access to the ballot on that level – prefer truth testing over a K ROB or util since only our ROB isn’t self-serving.

#### Interp – negatives must only the defend the converse of the resolution. Violation – it’s preemptive. [1] Textuality – rez is innately comparative as per the word “prioritize” which means neg should defend the converse since the negation of a comparative is the contrapositive. Logic is a voter since it’s the only way arguments can be evaluated to be valid or sound. [2] Predictability – converse is the most predictable since it’s tied to the rez which is the only stasis point in debate before the round – that incentivizes better research since affs can prep topic literature and write frontlines which compare warrants which is most educational. [3] Strat skew – defending the converse makes the debate 1:1 which is most fair – fairness is a voter since it’s key to evaluating who’s the better debater. It’s best for clash since it prevents uplayering and incentivizes comparative analysis of the warrants. Comparative analysis of the warrants incentivizes topic research – especially important since there’s only one tournament on the topic. Running positions not converse to the resolution take more time to argue against than the alternative and remove the affirmatives ability to extend evidence from the AC as defense or turns on the NC requiring the aff to either take extended time for extensions or rebuttals making the already short 1ar excessively difficult. Skew is irreversible and the highest impact since it’s always actual abuse and can’t be resolved without dropping the debater for violating the interp. [4] Ground – Neg intrinsically has more strategy since there’s always more reasons why something is wrong than why it’s right – forcing them to defend the converse equalizes ground which equalizes access to the ballot. Also it’s impossible to turn an argument which denies an assumption of the rez without double turning yourself but defending the converse solves this.

#### Objectivity is a process not an ends and thus claims of subjectivity are misapplied as they are critiques of truth not 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).

#### No single cause of violence.

Muro-Ruiz, London School of Economics, 2002

[Diego, Politics Volume 22, Issue 2, pages 109–117, May 2002, “The Logic of Violence” Wiley]

Violence is, most of the time, a wilful choice, especially if it is made by an organi-sation. Individuals present the scholar with a more difficult case to argue for. Scholars of violence have now a wide variety of perspectives they can use – from sociology and political science, to psychology, psychiatry and even biology – and should escape easy judgements. However, the fundamental difficulty for all of us is the absence of a synthetic, general theory able of integrating less complete theories of violent behaviour. In the absence of such a general theory, researchers should bear in mind that violence is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that resists mono-causal explanations. Future research on violence will have to take in account the variety of approaches, since they each offer some understanding of the logic of violence.