====I AFFIRM. ====

====The resolution questions what a democracy ought to do. The resolution is not merely a question of what is consistent with democracy, but in a democracy, what would be moral. Thus, the value is a normatively legitimate democracy. ====

====First, democracy necessitates util. Woller '97:====

(Gary Woller, BYU Prof; An Overview by Gary Woller; A Forum on the Role of Environmental Ethics, June 1997, pg. 10)

Moreover, virtually all Public policies entail some redistribution of economic or political resources,

AND

perhaps at times a necessary, basis for public policy in a democracy.

====Second, consequentialism is the only moral option for a government which is the actor in the resolution per the phrase "in a democracy." ====

====A~~] No act-omission distinction: Governments are responsible for everything in the public sphere so inaction is implicit authorization of action. They have to yes/no bills, which means everything collapses to aggregation.  
B~~] No intent-foresight distinction: The actions we take are inevitably informed by predictions from certain mental states, meaning consequences are a collective part of the will.====

====C~~] Actor specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings. ====

====Third, util is the only framework that makes sense for this topic. Naveed '20: ====

(Fakhar Naveed, "Consequentialism and Utilitarianism in Media Ethics and Governance", 4/29/20, https://www.masscommunicationtalk.com/consequentialism-and-utilitarianism-in-media-ethics-governance.html)

In media and journalism, we can identify examples of a utilitarian way

AND

public about this accident and to warn them about risky behavior.

====This outweighs because ====

====~~[A~~] Predictability - Most articles about the free press are written through util which means other frameworks can never engage the core questions of the literature which decks predictability.====

====~~[b~~] Clash – other fws only flow one direction – our fw allows for both sides to win insofar as we can debate about the consequences of our action which makes for fair and educational debates bc clash is the only unique model of pedagogy that we get from debate. ====

====~~[c~~] Theoretically Justified Framework's come first – substance begs the question of a framework being good for debate. Fairness is a gateway issue to deciding the better debater and education is the reason behind the activity and is key to in depth topic discussions of the real world. ====

====Fourth, given moral uncertainty prioritize extinction. Bostrom '80:====

(Nick Bostrom, Professor at Oxford, "Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority"; 2013; Global Policy, Vol 4, Issue 1; http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html)

Keeping our options alive These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way

AND

, finally, makes humanity more likely to want to realize human values.

====Thus, the criterion is maximizing hedonistic act-utilitarianism. Util indicts fail. Asking why we value pain and pleasure is nonsensical because the answer is intrinsic since we just do. This means you should prefer util despite shortcomings.   
====

===Contention One: Harms===

====A) Advocacy has historically been a tool to incentivize U.S. humanitarian interventions. Carpenter '20: ====

(Ted Galen Carpenter, Cato, "Samantha Power in Bosnia: A Poster Child For Toxic Advocacy Journalism", 1/1/20, https://www.cato.org/commentary/samantha-power-bosnia-poster-child-toxic-advocacy-journalism)

The adverse consequences flowing from Yugoslavia's slow‐​motion disintegration in the 1990s impacted the

AND

.S. Ambassador to the United Nations) in Barack Obama's administration.

====B) Advocacy has been weaponized by the media to encourage U.S. political actors to intervene in other countries. Carpenter '20: ====

(Ted Galen Carpenter, Cato, "Samantha Power in Bosnia: A Poster Child For Toxic Advocacy Journalism", 1/1/20, https://www.cato.org/commentary/samantha-power-bosnia-poster-child-toxic-advocacy-journalism)

She showed noticeable tenacity in seeking an opportunity to go to Bosnia to cover the

AND

of 1995 and imposed the Dayton Peace Accords later that year.

====C) This is not limited to Bosnia. The U.S. media continues to use advocacy to further U.S. humanitarian policy. Carpenter '20: ====

(Ted Galen Carpenter, Cato, "Samantha Power in Bosnia: A Poster Child For Toxic Advocacy Journalism", 1/1/20, https://www.cato.org/commentary/samantha-power-bosnia-poster-child-toxic-advocacy-journalism)

Unfortunately, the  ~~[this~~] approach that Power adopted would epitomize~~[s~~]

AND

of the Aleppo coverage, Finding it excessively emotional and one-sided.

====D) The way the media frames humanitarian conflicts has a significant influence on U.S. policy decisions. Balabanova '10:====

(Ekaterina Balabanova, Sage, "Media Power During Humanitarian Interventions: Is Eastern Europe Any Different From the West", Jan '10, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ekaterina-Balabanova/publication/227574626\_Media\_power\_during\_humanitarian\_interventions\_Is\_Eastern\_Europe\_any\_different\_from\_the\_West/links/5e3be699299bf1cdb9116f50/Media-power-during-humanitarian-interventions-Is-Eastern-Europe-any-different-from-the-West.pdf)

Framing generally refers to the 'specific properties of ... ~~[a~~] narrative that encourage

AND

as discussed above, this latter critical coverage is unlikely to influence policy.

====E) U.S. humanitarian intervention perpetuates terrorism and studies confirm. Choi '11:====

(Seung Choi, "Does US military Intervention Reduce or Increase Terrorism", 2011,  PG. 3, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1900375)

The empirical results ofThis study show~~[s~~] that U.S. military

AND

be an effective foreign policy tool in reducing both terrorist incidents and casualties.

====F) U.S. humanitarian intervention exacerbates terrorism through interference and imperialism. Choi '11:====

(Seung Choi, "Does US military Intervention Reduce or Increase Terrorism", 2011,  PG. 7-9, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1900375)

More importantly, U.S. military intervention may incite retaliatory terrorist attacks.

AND

States can be explained as retaliation for U.S. intervention abroad"

====G) Terrorism is an impact multiplier and outweighs. Ahmed '04: ====

 (Sid-Ahmed in 2004, Mohamed, staff writer, Al-Ahram, Sept. 1, issue number 705, "Extinction!", http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)

We have reached a point in human history where the phenomenon of Terrorism has to

AND

When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

====H) U.S. humanitarian intervention violates I-Law. Modeme '12:====

("The Libya Humanitarian Intervention: Is It Lawful in International Law?", 2012,  http://www.academia.edu/576116/The\_Libya\_Humanitarian\_Intervention\_Is\_it\_Lawful\_in\_International\_Law, PG. 2-3)

Non-intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states is a fundamental doctrine of

AND

another through diplomatic means and not by means of armed or coercive intervention.

====I) The doctrine of nonintervention is codified in international law. Humanitarian intervention violates. Ocran '06: ====

(Modibo Ocran, "The Doctrine of Humanitarian Intervention in the Light of Robust Peacekeeping", 2006, http://www.bc.edu/dam/files/schools/law/lawreviews/journals/bciclr/25\_1/01\_FMS.htm)

Yet, we simply cannot ignore The 1970 General Assembly Declaration of Principles of International

AND

trespass against this principle are not infrequent, the court considers that it is

====J) Effective I-Law solves every impact and U.S commitment is key. IEER '02:====

(Institute for Energy and Environmental Research and the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy. Rule of Power or Rule of Law? An Assessment of U.S. Policies and Actions Regarding Security-Related Treaties. May 2002. <http://www.ieer.org/reports/treaties/execsumm.pdf)

The evolution of international law since World War II is largely a response to the

AND

has followed the U.S. example and opted out of compliance.

====  
  
Thus, the plan: In the United States, the free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy. I reserve the right to clarify and definitions will be provided upon request. Prefer AFF spec because whole resolution decks AFF ground. NEG gets access to more and better arguments since they have generics and specifics while AFF is pigeonholed into generics. This answers TVA and flips limits since it gives NEG an unreciprocal prep advantage. Outweighs on reversibility-NEG can still use generics to engage specific AFFs but there's no check to 2NR scripts and NEG monopolization of strategy with only one AFF.====

===Contention Two: Solvency===

====A) Objectivity demands all sides of a story rather than promoting narratives through dichotomies such as good versus evil. These subjective media framings have been used by U.S. politicians to advance humanitarian aims. Lovell '20:====

(Kristopher Lovell, "History: Fireside Chats 7: Journalism of Attachment. War Reporting During the Bosnian War", 8/20/20, https://kristopherlovell.com/2020/08/20/history-fireside-chats-7-journalism-of-attachment-reporting-the-bosnian-war/)

But not all journalists have agreed with Bell and his supporters. And the idea

AND

that Bosnian Serbs bear responsibility for the overwhelming preponderance of war crimes.'

====B) Objectivity fosters detachment and that's key to resisting humanitarian media advocacy which often guides the behavior of Western involvement. Hammond '02: ====

(Phillip Hammond, "Moral Combat: Advocacy Journalists and the New Humanitarianism", 2002, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9781403914262\_10?noAccess=true)

A striking feature of media coverage of post-Cold War conflicts has been the

AND

Western powers has often left the consequences of actual Western involvement largely unexamined.

====C) Objectivity challenges the propaganda of emotive journalism that incentivizes U.S. humanitarian intervention. Hammond '19:====

(Phillip Hammond and Sumaya Al Nahed and Tara McCormack, "Advocacy Journalism, The Politics of Humanitarian Intervention and the Syrian War", 2019, https://openresearch.lsbu.ac.uk/download/f1f9cc89c1e877e9947784cc7ee492fffd5d1314ecd5d17747d664f5295db0e3/200536/Advocacy\_journalism\_the\_politics\_of\_huma.pdf)

Since 2011 the international media have done much to highlight the suffering

AND

part of a larger effort at bringing about regime change and escalating war.

===Underview: ===

====A~~] Critique is useless without a concrete policy alternative– intellectual stances are worthless. Bryant '12: ====

( Levi Bryant, Professor of Philosophy at Collin College, "A Critique of the Academic Left" 2012 https://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/underpants-gnomes-a-critique-of-the-academic-left)

Unfortunately, The academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It's

AND

. Instead we prefer to shout and denounce. Good luck with that.

====B~~] Weigh offense in favor of the AFF advocacy against the offense in favor of a functionally competitive NEG advocacy. ====

====1. Offense/defense is most fair because it gives reciprocal burdens to both sides instead of allowing the NEG to moot the 1AC by denying the many assumptions it is grounded on.====

====2. Offense/defense is most educational because it deals with how philosophy is applied to the real world. I.e. as a guide for action instead of a pointless thought experiment. ====

====For all these reasons I AFFIRM. I'm now open for cross-examination. ====