### Advocacy

#### Plan text-In the Peoples Republic of Poland, the free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy

#### Advocacy is at the root of the problem-journalists become politically involved and ignore facts-only framing media through objectivity can reverse the trends. Even if advocacy can be good it is drowned out by populist media turning its impacts

**Dzięciołowski 17** Krzysztof Dzięciołowski 2017 Reuters <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2017-12/Is%20there%20a%20chance%20for%20non-partisan%20media%20in%20Poland%20-%20Krzysztof%20Dzieciolowsk%20Paper.pdf> //SJJK

**As the journalists take a tougher stance on so many issues, the public has lost trust in the media. A 2012 poll showed that people’s perception of journalists partisanship has in- creased by 12% since 2002 (from 34 to 46). At the same time, respondents pointed to impar- tiality and objectivism (59%)57 as the virtues they most desire from journalism**. In 2017 79% of **Poles agree that “the message in the media is so diverse that Poles no longer know where the truth lies” while 64% of those polled think journalists express their views instead of pro- viding information**.58 Bartosz Węglarczyk observes his colleagues: sometimes write quite well. **I personally know journalists who privately admit that there is a war in Poland and you need to take one of the sides**. They say it openly in private talks, but soon they will say it publicly. It has nothing to do with journalism. These are politicians, who can write and can Once on the same side of the political anti-communist struggle, Adam Michnik and Jarosław Kaczyński are today in stark opposition to each other. Poland is locked in the narratives of the post Second World War generation that has shaped the country post-1989 and influenced younger generations of journalists. There is no better illustration of this di- vision than the Kurski brothers. Jarosław and Jacek Kurski were young and politically en- gaged students in the rebellious city of Gdańsk59 in the 1980s. Over time Jarosław Kurski has become Adam Michnik’s deputy at Gazeta Wyborcza while the younger Jacek Kurski, was appointed the head of the state broadcaster TVP by the Law and Justice party led by Jarosław Kaczyński. Polish politicians and journalist to a large extent share the same background, come from the same anti-communist opposition groups, universities or student organisations, such as NZS.60 In 2005, two post-Solidarność political parties dominated the elections effectively eliminating the post-communist party. The Civic Platform and the Law and Justice party promised a grand coalition and a big change in the campaign. Both parties have been con- servative with the Civic Platform appealing to the winners of the transformation and the Law and Justice addressing poorer and less successful class of the society. One was out- ward looking the other inward looking. The Law and Justice party’s surprise victory stunned the campaign frontrunner. Televised negotiations to form the promised grand coalition government failed. The political rivalry between Kaczyński brothers and Donald Tusk was growing day by day. And so **the journalists were pulled into the political game**. But it was the Smolensk air crash that helped to turn those two splitting tribes of politicians and journalists from the same anti-communist camp into warring factions. **The logic of tribal war has led to a situa- tion when both sides use the same language, fight for the same symbols but have built their position in opposition to each other**. Krzysztof Skowroński sees these divisions as the two faces of the same coin: There were two manifestations in Warsaw: of the Law and Justice and the Committee for the Defence of Democracy. There were two ladies there and they were telling the same sto- ry. In 1981 my husband was imprisoned for political activism and I am here to fight for freedom. In 1981 my husband was a political prisoner and I fight for freedom today. Two groups that think in the exact same way. The trauma of the crash in the national psyche drives divisions in the world of politics that runs through the society and increases the level of partisanship of the journalistic commu- nity. Krzysztof Skowroński notes: There is the planet of the conservative journalists who say that Poland is this and that. And the second planet is composed of the liberal journalists, who say this and that. The conser- vative journalists say: “Poland is a country who has been regaining its freedom, indepen- dence” and there is the second group that says: “the end of freedom of speech, dictatorship, evolution towards the totalitarian regime.” From this perspective this narrative is absurd like a train with wings. Agnieszka Romaszewska-Guzy has seen **Polish journalists getting close to politicians for many years. She notes two attitudes rooted deeply in the experience of communism**. One was a submissive and service-like attitude of a journalist working for the regime media and the other was rebellious. That is why, in my journalistic opinion, we have this on-going fight ethos. **It means, that in general as a journalist you are more of a politician than a politician himself. Journalists are this more aggressive side, not politicians.** Not always of course, but very often. Therefore, on both sides of this political spectrum, we find journalists who turn out to be more dedicated to the politics than the politicians themselves. In pursuit of audience and with little funding available, the cheapest television or radio shows have been made of politicians with opposing views invited to the studio to fight each other. So the Polish political debate has been largely reduced to the contest of values where there is no more middle ground, as Bartosz Węglarczyk notes: about emotions now. Poland’s media market has been heavily influenced by the Western style and capital but not by its values and standards. So the market has undergone the process of tabloidisation and commercialisation without any proper debate on the journalistic role of private and public media. As Bartosz Węglarczyk **notes journalists “become politicians and political ac- tivists and in fact the readers have accepted that”. As Polish journalists continue to solidify their opinions, Skowroński says the narrative has replaced truth**: **hat’s what the journalists do — they deliver a narrative. Those** in politics send them text messages “say this and that”. We do it, we go to the TV stations, a journalist accepts that and says “ok”. But it’s not! Journalists’ partisanship and political bias have become a sought-after commodity in the new market economy driven by internet, social media, speed and simplification. And, with the arrival and spread of the internet, the entry barrier to the market fell. Jacek Karnowski together with his twin brother Michał have successfully built the conservative Fratria media group behind wSieci weekly and the wPolityce.pl web portal. The brothers had a solid work experience in legacy media; Jacek Karnowski worked for the BBC Polish Service and TVP. Michał Karnowski worked for Newsweek Polska and Polska the Times. Jacek Karnowski says this experience helped them understand “the media are businesses. Apart from fulfilling an important role, they are businesses.” **They too have embraced a form of jour- nalistic engagement that has emerged in Poland under the name of “dziennikarstwo tożsamościowe” or “journalism of identity” that offers ideologically engaged narratives that help build a community of like-minded readers**.61 A joint wPolityce.pl and wSieci sub- scription call reads: We invite you to the **bevy of the members of our community**. We believe that thanks to a fixed subscription of our publications prepared especially for our Friends we will be **last- ing guests in Your houses** — on computer screens, on tablets and mobile devices. Thanks to technology development we can offer You access to a bigger collection of interesting arti- cles, good political writing and opinions, to media created with passion and mission, with belief in **strength of the national interest**, media based on Polish capital and conservative values.

#### Objectivity does not refer to the journalist’s personal beliefs but their method

**Dean 17** Dean, Walter. “The Lost Meaning of 'Objectivity'.” *American Press Institute*, 18 July 2017, https://www.americanpressinstitute.org/journalism-essentials/bias-objectivity/lost-meaning-objectivity/. // FC

One of the great confusions about journalism, write Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel in [The Elements of Journalism](http://www.amazon.com/The-Elements-Journalism-Newspeople-Completely/dp/0307346706), is the concept of objectivity.

When the concept originally evolved, it was not meant to imply that journalists were free of bias. Quite the contrary.

The term began to appear as part of journalism after the turn of the 20th century, particularly in the 1920s, out of a growing recognition that journalists were full of bias, often unconsciously. Objectivity called for journalists to develop a consistent method of testing information – a transparent approach to evidence – precisely so that personal and cultural biases would not undermine the accuracy of their work.

In the latter part of the 19th century, journalists talked about something called “realism” rather than objectivity. This was the idea that if reporters simply dug out the facts and ordered them together, truth would reveal itself rather naturally. Realism emerged at a time when journalism was separating from political party affiliations and becoming more accurate. It coincided with the invention of what journalists call the inverted pyramid, in which a journalist lines the facts up from the most important to the least important, thinking it helps audiences understand things naturally.

At the beginning of the 20th century, however, some journalists began to worry about the naïveté of realism. In part, reporters and editors were becoming more aware of the rise of propaganda and the role of press agents.

At a time when Freud was developing his theories of the unconscious and painters like Picasso were experimenting with Cubism, journalists were also developing a greater recognition of human subjectivity.

In 1919, Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz, an associate editor for the New York World, wrote an influential and scathing account of how cultural blinders had distorted the New York Times coverage of the Russian Revolution. “In the large, the news about Russia is a case of seeing not what was, but what men wished to see,” they wrote. Lippmann and others began to look for ways for the individual journalist “to remain clear and free of his irrational, his unexamined, his unacknowledged prejudgments in observing, understanding and presenting the news.”

Journalism, Lippmann declared, was being practiced by “untrained accidental witnesses.” Good intentions, or what some might call “honest efforts” by journalists, were not enough. Faith in the rugged individualism of the tough reporter, what Lippmann called the “cynicism of the trade,” was also not enough. Nor were some of the new innovations of the times, like bylines, or columnists.

The solution, Lippmann argued, was for journalists to acquire more of “the scientific spirit … There is but one kind of unity possible in a world as diverse as ours. It is unity of method, rather than aim; the unity of disciplined experiment.” Lippmann meant by this that journalism should aspire to “a common intellectual method and a common area of valid fact.”

To begin, Lippmann thought, the fledgling field of journalist education should be transformed from “trade schools designed to fit men for higher salaries in the existing structure.” Instead, the field should make its cornerstone the study of evidence and verification.

Although this was an era of faith in science, Lippmann had few illusions. “It does not matter that the news is not susceptible to mathematical statement. In fact, just because news is complex and slippery, good reporting requires the exercise of the highest scientific virtues.”

In the original concept, in other words, the method is objective, not the journalist. The key was in the discipline of the craft, not the aim.

This point has some important implications.

One is that the impartial voice employed by many news organizations – that familiar, supposedly neutral style of newswriting – is not a fundamental principle of journalism. Rather, it is an often helpful device news organizations use to highlight that they are trying to produce something obtained by objective methods.

## Advantage

#### The Populist PiS is in control of Poland. EU sanctions are effective, but the PiS continues to rebel

**Moskwa and Jefferson 20**Moskwa, Wojciech, and Rodney Jefferson. “Poland's Populist Turn.” Bloomberg.com, Bloomberg, 31 Oct. 2020, <https://www.bloomberg.com/quicktake/poland>.//SJEP

PiS- Law and Justice Party

If Poland had a tumultuous 20th century, the 21st started off pretty well. Having just joined NATO, the country entered the European Union and cemented its transition to capitalism with unrivaled economic growth. **Then a 2015 election unleashed a populist backlash, delivering unprecedented power to a party that promised a shakeup in the name of ordinary Poles. They were fed up with uneven wealth and tossed out what they saw as a self-serving elite that had misruled the country. The Law & Justice Party’s drive to control the courts and remove checks on its power sparked sporadic protests and criticism from the EU, which accuses Poland’s leaders of flouting the rule of law.** Former Polish Prime Minister Donald Tusk warned in 2017 that the country was moving “backwards and eastwards.” Is eastern Europe’s biggest economy risking the democratic order it has built since escaping communism? In October, there was a national outcry after a Constitutional Court ruling tightened what was already one of Europe’s most restrictive abortion laws. Women staged a strike and protesters flooded the streets in the biggest threat to the government since it came to power. **The Law & Justice Party had won followers by reducing the tax burden on the poor and providing bigger subsidies for raising children. Winning a second term in 2019, it pushed through more judicial reforms after revamping the constitutional court, nearly doubled the minimum wage and exerted more control over the media. The EU, which gives more money to Poland than any other country on a net basis, has pursued a series of disciplinary measures against Poland for failing to adhere to democratic values; it’s talked of tying future funds to rule-of-law standards, though little has been done.** Poland’s ruling party struck a nerve at home and abroad by calling for the country to assert its national identity, uphold Catholic values and control its borders. It’s also sought to rewrite history, turning Solidarity freedom fighter Lech Walesa into a communist collaborator, making it illegal to suggest that the Polish nation had a role in the Holocaust and backing the creation of “LGBT Free” zones. While it re-nationalized banks and power companies, the economy has remained robust, though the coronavirus pandemic created new challenges. **Jaroslaw Kaczynski, the Law & Justice leader and the man who pulls the strings in Poland, says the government upholds the rule of law and that history shows Poland suffers when outsiders interfere in its politics. He says EU leaders in Brussels should focus on their own problems. He has an ally in Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban, who is also challenging the European mainstream. The Polish government has replaced much of the country’s establishment since it came to power, justifying the moves with the same “drain the swamp” appeal used by U.S. President Donald Trump. Foreign banks and retailers have also been criticized for not sharing enough of their profit. Critics say Poland’s leaders have eroded civil liberties, turned the media into a party mouthpiece and transformed state companies into political machines.**

#### The PiS controlled Polish media is key to guarantee future elections and sway voters to the PiS.

**Kalan 19** Kalan, Dariusz. “Poland's State of the Media.” Foreign Policy, 25 Nov. 2019, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/11/25/poland-public-television-law-and-justice-pis-mouthpiece/.//SJEP

**WARSAW, Poland—Asked about the difference between Poland’s public television station, TVP, before 2015 and after, a veteran journalist who works at the network was quick to respond. “Ruling politicians,” they said, “had never had that kind of impact on television” before. “They have audacity and courage to approach reporters and say, ‘I want to say something, and you have to record me.’ This is our everyday life,” the journalist, who insisted on anonymity, said in early October. After a long moment of reflection, they added: “You will not find true information in our television.” TVP, whose two flagship channels were among the country’s** [**most popular**](https://businessinsider.com.pl/media/tv-radio/najpopularniejsze-programy-i-kanaly-w-2018-roku/24lx5c1) **in 2018, has for the last several years been squarely under the control of Poland’s right-wing Law and Justice (PiS) party, which clung to power in elections in mid-October. According to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, these elections were “administratively prepared well.” But the voters’ “informed choice was undermined by a lack of impartiality in the media, especially the public broadcaster,”** [noted](https://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/435941) Jan Petersen, the head of an election observation mission**. It was not the first time TVP’s reporting raised concerns. This fall, 54 members of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe** [**called**](https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=28221&lang=en) **TVP “a propaganda channel for the ruling party.” Reporters Without Borders similarly** [**stated**](https://rsf.org/en/poland) **that Poland’s public media outlets “have been transformed into government propaganda mouthpieces.” This fall, in interviews with almost a dozen current and former TVP journalists and executives, most asked to go unnamed. None argued that TVP’s political news has been objective. In fact, many openly admitted that TVP is purposefully keeping quiet about PiS scandals, gives airtime almost exclusively to pro-PiS voices, and has campaigned against the party’s opponents. Those I spoke to who back PiS largely argued that the hard line was both necessary to ensure a second PiS term and a legitimate response to the private media’s alleged support of the opposition. Interlocutors on both sides believe that there is nothing unique in what is happening in Poland. Rather, their country is just one among many suffering the rise of fake news. According to Ryszard Bankowicz, the head of the Polish Council of Media Ethics, a nonpartisan body promoting principles of ethical journalism, readers and viewers around the world have ceased to want real information.** “They chose a given newspaper or TV station not in order to find the truth but to confirm their own beliefs or take a side against or for someone,” Bankowicz said. “And many journalists do not know principles of ethical journalism. This is a worldwide trend, and Poland is its victim.” But not everyone has given up. This year, Bankowicz, took a public stand on one of the [most serious accusations](https://www.rp.pl/Platforma-Obywatelska/190119723-Borusewicz-To-skutek-nagonki-na-Adamowicza.html) against TVP, made by Bogdan Borusewicz, a former democratic opposition activist under the communist regime and a former speaker of the Senate, among others: that it had incited hatred against Pawel Adamowicz, Gdansk’s mayor, who was stabbed to death at a January charity event. Adamowicz, a popular liberal politician, had been a target of numerous TVP reports that had suggested he was corrupt and had close ties with local businessmen. In a [report](http://www.rem.net.pl/data/20190211.pdf) published in February, Bankowicz wrote that “the authors of these publications manipulated the facts … in order to present Adamowicz as an unreliable person.” He concluded that “TVP spews propaganda, which serves to destroy opponents of the ruling party.” However, he refused to comment on whether violations of journalistic ethics contributed to Adamowicz’s death. “TVP is certainly not to blame for this tragic event,” said Maciej Stanecki, who was TVP’s deputy chairman from 2016 to 2019. But he was quick to add: “But for allowing the radicalization of the public opinion, of the crowd … well, I think that every media person must be aware that such responsibility exists.” Stanecki, a film producer, is proud of his achievements at TVP during his leadership, which include the television’s technological development, but he is aware that the network’s reputation has been tarnished.

#### Biased polish media shifts public perception to the PiS and alters election outcomes.

**Gipson 21** Gipson, Abigail. “New Report: Poland's Public Media Serve as Propaganda Tool.” International Press Institute, 17 Dec. 2021, https://ipi.media/new-report-polands-public-media-serve-as-propaganda-tool/.//SJEP

**A** [**recent report**](http://www.batory.org.pl/upload/files/Programy%20operacyjne/Masz%20Glos/RaportTDEnglFin_June%2010N.pdf) **by Poland’s Society of Journalists and the Batory Foundation finds that public media in Poland do not fulfil their role as a source of independent and balanced news, but rather function as a propaganda tool for the government. “We saw that the government was using public service media, which is under its control, to support its own programme and its own candidates in the election”, Krzysztof Bobiński, who is a board member for the Society of Journalists, explained in an interview with the International Press Institute (IPI). The report observes that Wiadomości, the main news programme on Poland’s public broadcasting station TVP, demonstrates notable bias in favour of the ruling Law and Justice party (PiS). The bias manifests in both proportionally higher screen time for members of PiS and overwhelmingly positive coverage of the party and its interests. In addition to favourable coverage of the ruling party, the programme often casts opposition politicians and their supporters in a negative light.** At times it neglects to cover the opposition at all and omits stories that may reflect poorly on PiS. TVP receives about 28 percent of viewing share, the highest among Polish broadcasters, and Wiadomości averages 2.4 million viewers daily. However, according to a poll conducted earlier this year, Wiadomości ranked very low in public trust, Andrzej Krajewski, the author of the report, said in an interview. Public broadcasters should be independent, giving fair and balanced coverage to all political parties. But according to the report, Wiadomości has neglected to live up to that standard. The report concludes that Wiadomości has “failed to observe the conditions of [article 21.1 of Poland’s law](http://prawo.sejm.gov.pl/isap.nsf/download.xsp/WDU19930070034/O/D19930034.pdf) on radio and TV, which requires public service television to be ‘pluralistic, unbiased and independent’.” “This is public media we are all paying for, it’s our public media, and they’re breaking the law”, Bobiński commented. “They’re not only breaking the law because they’re biased, but also they’re breaking the law because they’re [PiS] using this media as part of their election campaign, and that should be in their election campaign expenses. Really, they are using our money to bamboozle us.” In a statement accompanying the report, the Society of Journalists, an independent group affiliated with the European Federation of Journalists, noted that in 2019 TVP received a one billion złoty (250 million euro) subsidy from the government on top of its advertising and license fee income. From 2016 TVP budget subsidies were more than two billion złoty (500 million euro). Poland’s media regulator, the National Council for Radio and Television (KRRiT), is legally obligated to monitor media activity and ensure Poland’s public broadcast laws are implemented. However, when the Council was approached with complaints about TVP’s failure to comply with impartiality laws, it failed to take action, Bobiński said. This inaction by the KRRiT is part of what spurred the media monitoring behind the report. “At that point, what does a citizen do? You either don’t do anything or you try to fill the gap that’s been left by a state institution, which is mandated by the constitution to do this work”, Bobiński said. **The report examined Wiadomości coverage from May 10 to 23, the period leading up to the 2019 European Union parliamentary elections. During this time, two-thirds of the news items reported by Wiadomości were election-related. All but one of the stories covering PiS were positive, and the outlier was neutral. The opposition European Coalition was covered negatively in all 33 news items in which it appeared. Liberal and left-wing parties contesting the election were not mentioned at all. The report also notes that Wiadomości “did not mention climate change, a key issue in many other member states.” Shortly after coming to power in the fall of 2015, PiS made moves to disrupt and reform Polish public media.** Parliament passed a law that terminated the contracts of the heads of Poland’s public television and radio broadcasters. The treasury minister was given the power to hire and fire broadcasting directors, a matter that was previously decided by a media supervisory committee. In early 2016, Jacek Kurski, a former PiS member of the European Parliament, was appointed director of TVP, and he remains in this role today. **TVP has not been PiS’s only target. Recently PiS officials** [**announced plans**](https://www.ft.com/content/1a4f9232-9358-11e9-aea1-2b1d33ac3271) **to “re-polonize” media in Poland if they maintain the majority in the upcoming parliamentary elections. Bringing private media in Poland under Polish ownership has been part of PiS’s agenda for several years, though legally it would be difficult to force out non-Polish media companies that are from within the EU, Krajewski explained. However, these companies could be bought out by Polish enterprises.** Foreign-owned broadcasters are some of the most critical in the Polish media landscape, and the threat of their capture by the government presents a serious risk to plurality in Polish news PiS’s [capture of Polish public media](http://ipi.media/polish-public-broadcaster-veers-from-impartial-mission/) poses ominous repercussions not only for Poland but for the European Union as well. **In its statement, the Society of Journalists expressed concern that the “transformation of the public service media into a propaganda tool violates the right […] to a fair election”, and that this transformation “poses the question of whether the election of the Polish members of the European Parliament in May 2019 was conducted in an honest and fair manner”. Wiadomości’s election coverage will continue, as Poland will hold parliamentary elections this fall. Wiadomości and TVP have the potential to significantly affect voters’ perceptions of both PiS and the opposition. “Watching Wiadomości every day, they are doing exactly what they did during the previous election period”, Krajewski said. “It’s propaganda. For instance, almost every day they denigrate [President of the European Council and former Polish Prime Minister] Donald Tusk because possibly he will be a candidate for Polish president, so they want to lower his chances in the local elections.” Without fair, balanced, and transparent coverage of all political parties, Polish citizens cannot make informed decisions at the polling booths. “With such strong propaganda by public media, which is illegal, the results of the elections are questionable”, Krajewski said.**

#### Poland will never leave the EU, but PiS power ensures packed courts and decisions that deck legitimacy-that spills over and causes a massive crisis

**Economist 21** Economist, Oct 21 2021, "Poland is a problem for the EU precisely because it will not leave," https://www.economist.com/europe/2021/10/14/poland-is-a-problem-for-the-eu-precisely-because-it-will-not-leave//SJJK

Brexit, before it happened, was imagined in many forms. Hard, soft, Norwegian, Swiss or Turkish. Briefly, an Albanian option was discussed. Often it was just “clean”. A “clean Brexit” would free Britain from the eu’s single market, customs union and its courts, advocates said. Just as there are many ways of leaving the eu, there are many ways of remaining. There is the clean version, in which countries quietly accept the eu’s strictures. Then there is the messy version, where governments foul up the club. Think of it as “dirty remain”. **To see dirty remain in action, look at Poland. Its Constitutional Tribunal challenged the legal order of the club in a ruling on October 7th. In a case brought by the Polish prime minister, the court, which is stuffed with allies of the government**, **ruled that fundamental parts of eu law do not trump Poland’s constitution. The judgment, which was exactly what the government wanted, has punctured six decades of European case law. In short, the eu’s supreme court is no longer supreme, as far as Poland is concerned. Poles protested in droves, claiming that the government was attempting to drag the country out of the bloc against their will. But anyone expecting a British-style “Polexit” will be disappointed**. S**upport for the eu within the country is among the highest in the union. Standing for an election in Poland on a platform of quitting the eu would be akin to a manifesto promising to drown puppies.** **The problem is not that Poland is trying to leave the eu; the problem is that it intends to stay.** Dirty remain is more pernicious than Polexit. **The risk is that the eu’s legal order in Poland slowly fades,** argues Daniel Sarmiento of the Complutense University of Madrid**. A domino effect takes over**. **If courts across the eu cannot trust their Polish peers, then the eu’s legal system starts to gum up**. An arrest warrant here is not honoured there; a banking licence granted in one country may not be honoured in another. **Over time, an area over which people, goods, capital and services can flow freely turns into one where they can move only with trouble. Bad behaviour can spread**. Eurosceptics have mostly given up on leaving the eu. It is, as Britain has shown, rather stressful. **Eric Zemmour, the nationalist radical mulling a run in the French presidential election, has pledged to restore the primacy of French law over eu law**. Even more mild-mannered figures, such as Michel Barnier, the eu’s Brexit negotiator, toy with the same idea. **If one government can avoid abiding by unpopular rulings by the eu’s top court with little fear of sanction, it becomes a tempting option for all**. As an idea, “dirty remain” has a veneer of respectability. Its Polish proponents argue that everyone else does it, but only Poland is attacked. Polish judges are fond of citing their German counterparts, who have accused the European Court of Justice (ecj) of overstepping the mark in recent years. In such rulings, the medium counts as much as the message. No one doubts the independence of Germany’s constitutional court. No one believes in the independence of Poland’s. The messages are different, too. The German court accused the ecj of exceeding its mandate in approving a programme of bond-buying by the European Central Bank. **The Polish court said the country’s constitution trumped fundamental parts of eu law, such as “ever closer union”, a much more sweeping ruling**. The German court was playing with matches; **its Polish counterpart doused the eu’s legal system in petrol and deliberately started a fire. On paper, the solution to such a disagreement is simple: leave the eu**. Britain made things easy for the club when it departed. Rather than hanging around blocking things and generally causing a fuss, it followed the procedures as laid down in Article 50 of the treaties it was so keen to leave. Doing this without a clear plan was “like putting a gun in your mouth and pulling the trigger” according to Dominic Cummings, the man who led the Vote Leave campaign. Yet to the surprise of eu diplomats this is exactly what the British government did. **Instead, Poland is following a strategy that played out in Watchmen, a comic**. **In it, Rorschach, a vigilante, is sent to jail, where he greets a fellow inmate in the canteen by tipping the contents of a deep-fat fryer over his head**. “None of you seem to understand,” he says to his now-crispy foe. **“I’m not locked in here with you. You’re locked in here with me.”** **In the eu, destinies are linked. If one person starts hurling a fryer, everyone must duck**. David Cameron, Britain’s prime minister at the time, begged for concessions from the eu ahead of Britain’s referendum on leaving it, including an opt-out from “ever closer union”. **Poland threw its fryer without warning.** Such dirty **tricks are difficult to deal with inside the club**. **A nation-state can enforce its will internally, sending in the police or even, in extremis, the army to quell insurrection. The eu has no such tools.** The European Commission could refuse to sign off on Poland’s share of its covid-19 recovery fund, depriving the country of €57bn ($66bn), for instance. **The danger is that this will prompt Poland to bring the eu’s workings to a halt in protest.** Amicable divorce or poisonous marriage Bad behaviour outside the club is less of a problem. After doing things by the book as a member, Britain has discovered a rebellious streak, trying to renege on the terms of its deal with the eu. This causes little trouble for the eu. Rather than an existential problem, Brexit is a tedious one involving the movement of sausages across the Irish sea. Britain has been cauterised. By contrast, **the rule of law in Poland is an open wound**. **It is a long-term threat, which needs to be solved if the eu is to thrive**. **Just as a financial crisis in one country can spread to another, so can a constitutional crisis.** Dealing with a departure is relatively easy for the eu. Handling dirty remain is much harder.

#### And the EU is already weak and Poland is at the front of their issues-further legitimacy crisis destroys global democracy and emboldens further russian invasions

**Tisdall 21** Simon Tisdall Guardian, 11-21-2021, "Instability grips a weakened Europe as global predators smell blood," https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/nov/21/instability-grips-a-weakened-europe-as-global-predators-smell-blood//SJJK

**Threats from Russia and China, a weaker US security alliance and internal discord expose fundamental strategic weaknesses** Is [Europe](https://www.theguardian.com/world/europe-news) entering a dangerous new age of instability? **Not since the height of the cold war with the Soviet Union has it looked so vulnerable to hostile forces.** Accumulating external threats and internal divisions, coupled with a weakening US security alliance, relentless Russian subversion, and power-hungry China’s war on western values are exposing fundamental strategic weaknesses. Europe increasingly resembles a beleaguered democratic island in an anarchic world, where a rising tide of authoritarianism, impunity and international rule-breaking threatens to inundate it. Some European leaders understand this, notably French president [Emmanuel Macron](https://www.theguardian.com/world/emmanuel-macron), yet long-term policy remedies elude them. For example, Belarus dictator Alexander Lukashenko’s use of migrants to pressure the EU is plainly outrageous. Yet it worked, in the sense that Germany’s caretaker chancellor, Angela Merkel, phoned him for a chat, ending his post-coup isolation. [Her unilateral demarche](https://www.france24.com/en/europe/20211117-merkel-and-lukashenko-agree-to-talks-about-belarusian-border-crisi) understandably infuriated Baltic states. It was a concession to a thug, not a lasting solution. Talking of thugs, Russian president Vladimir Putin’s ongoing intimidation of Ukraine risks widening conflagration. The latest border build-up of 90,000 Russian troops may be [sabre-rattling,](https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/nov/14/uk-must-be-ready-for-war-with-russia-says-armed-forces-chief) similar to provocations in the Donbas and Black Sea last spring. If not, Europe will only have itself to blame. Putin’s importunities stem directly from its de facto acquiescence in his illegal 2014 annexation of Crimea. Instability on Europe’s periphery extends to the Balkans amid well-founded fears that Bosnia-Herzegovina is slipping back into conflict 26 years after the [Dayton peace accords.](https://www.theguardian.com/world/from-the-archive-blog/2020/nov/18/the-dayton-accords-a-peace-agreement-for-bosnia-archive-1995) Resurgent ethnic nationalism, embodied by the separatist Bosnian Serb leader, Milorad Dodik, is fuelled by Belgrade and Moscow. **A larger, strategic problem is the EU’s inability** [**to fulfil promises**](https://ecfr.eu/article/western-balkans-in-trouble-why-the-eu-should-make-a-new-offer-to-the-region/) **of closer integration with the region**. Europe’s relationship with Turkey, a key gatekeeper, is dysfunctional, too, thanks partly to Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, its deeply unpleasant president. When he menaced EU members Greece and Cyprus last year, Macron [sent naval forces](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/29/greece-turkey-standoff-france-send-warships-east-mediterranean) to the eastern Mediterranean. The rest of Europe sat on its hands. Erdoğan is also meddling in Ukraine and the Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict, which [flared up again](https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/tensions-high-after-deadly-clashes-between-armenia-and-azerbaijan-gwmpfqgdd) last week. Yet Brussels pays him to keep out Middle Eastern refugees, so it **hardly dares challenge him. The vice-like circle of instability squeezing Europe is about more than actual or potential armed conflict.** One of its bigger dilemmas is migration. Despite the searing 2015 Syrian refugee crisis, **the EU still lacks an agreed, humane policy**. **That guarantees more trouble down the road.** **One of the main objectors, ironically,** [**is Poland,**](https://notesfrompoland.com/2021/11/10/eu-council-president-visits-poland-to-express-solidarity-in-face-of-hybrid-attack-by-belarus/) **which rejects migrant quotas.** **Yet faced by border mayhem, its hypocritical rightwing leaders who, like Hungary’s Viktor Orbán, are in a bitter fight with Brussels over rule of law and democracy issues, appealed for EU solidarity.** Disturbing, too, is the way **much European opinion appears to have accepted illegal pushbacks and routine mistreatment of asylum-seekers**, whether in camps in Libya or on the beaches of Greece, in breach of EU law. This reflects another self-inflicted wound: the increased influence of xenophobic, rightwing populists and the re-normalisation of circa 1914 ultra-nationalist politics across Europe. **If Europeans will not stand up for western democratic values in a world overrun by Donald Trump clones and copycats, who will?** Sadly, they cannot look to Britain. No longer a trusted friend, the UK under Boris Johnson, sniping and sneering from the sidelines, has become another peripheral conflict zone for the EU. Britain is more irritant than ally. Defence minister Ben Wallace used the linked Belarus-Ukraine crises last week to advance the Brexit agenda and seal arms deals with Warsaw and Kiev. Tellingly, the [UK sent troops,](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/nov/18/british-soldiers-to-give-more-support-to-poland-amid-belarus-border-crisis) not humanitarian aid, to the Polish border. Europe’s age of instability also owes much to events beyond its control. Few forecast Trump would try to blow up what Franklin D Roosevelt called the “arsenal of democracy”, and the western alliance with it. [He may yet try again](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/15/us/politics/republicans-2022-redistricting-maps.html). Likewise, few predicted, as [Merkel now admits,](https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/exclusive-germany-may-have-been-naive-china-first-merkel-says-2021-11-17/) that China would emerge as such a domineering, economically aggressive, anti-democratic global competitor. **US president Joe Biden reassures Europeans that Nato, even after Afghanistan, is as vital as ever. But his** [**edgy video summit**](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/nov/16/biden-xi-summit-highlights-tensions-and-desire-for-cooperation) **with China’s Xi Jinping last week showed where his true focus lies. Putin sees this, and smells blood. Europe’s gas supply is one pressure point. Covert cyber-attacks are another. Russia’s reckless anti-satellite missile test, scorning European safety concerns, was the first recorded act of** [**hooliganism in outer space.**](https://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/nov/16/a-wild-west-out-there-russian-satellite-debris-worsens-space-junk-problem) **Europe’s inability to make Putin pay a serious price for aggression in Georgia and Crimea, his decimation of Russian democracy, his foreign election meddling, and his murderous attacks on Alexei Navalny – and other opponents on European soil – heightens a sense of decline. On China, there is nothing close to a united front. Such weakness encourages other predators. So what is to be done?** Europe, as ever, is a house divided. East Europeans continue to place their faith in Washington rather than Brussels, despite clear portents of another transatlantic rupture if the Democrats lose the White House in 2024. **The EU bureaucracy is feebly led, its parliament toothless. Germany lacks a proven leader. In France, Macron faces** [**a vicious spring election**](https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/eric-zemmour-macrons-far-right-rival-wins-backing-from-russia-t25c086kc) **scrap against the Russian-backed far right.** Yet it is Macron’s ideas about enhanced European political, security and military “strategic autonomy”, and a stronger, more fiscally and economically integrated EU, that offer the most hopeful path forward. EU defence ministers last week discussed [a “Strategic Compass” plan](https://www.politico.eu/article/eu-policy-document-against-russia-china/) to boost joint capabilities. But agreement on proposed “rapid-deployment forces” and the like seems a long way off. As [France](https://www.theguardian.com/world/france) prepares to assume the EU presidency, will other leaders recognise this critical moment and back Macron? In a world of sharks, snakes and scary monsters, Europe’s independence, cohesion and values are on the line like never before.

#### Independently Global Democracy solves a laundry list of impacts---economic growth, public goods, alliances, and war

**Lee ’18** (Carrie; is an assistant professor at the U.S. Air War College and a Security Fellow with Truman National Security Project. Any views expressed are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. government, the Department of Defense, Air University, or Truman National Security Project; *The Truman Project*; September 10th; “Why Democracy Promotion is in the Strategic Interest of the United States”; <https://medium.com/truman-doctrine-blog/why-democracy-promotion-is-in-the-strategic-interest-of-the-united-states-ae959c111b2f>; accessed 7/9/19; ME)

However, reducing the United States’ emphasis on a values-driven foreign policy is wrong, and contrary to the strategic interests of the United States. **Democracy promotion** in particular serves a **key role in safeguarding U.S. interests** and promoting global, long-term growth in ways fundamentally compatible with U.S. strategic interests. After all, **democracies protect private property** in important ways, **invest in public goods**, are more politically stable, make for **more dependable allies**, and empirically **do not go to war with one another**. Ultimately, a world full of democratic governments is safer, more prosperous, and more stable — all states of being that the United States has an interest in promoting. Democracy guarantees that the public has a stake in its own institutions and government, which leads to **investor confidence and growth**. Since elected politicians are accountable to property owners and are held in check by an independent judiciary, democracies tend to have better mechanisms for **protecting private property** than their autocratic counterparts. This makes democracies a **particularly attractive type of country for investors** — both public and private — because checks and balances make it difficult for the state to nationalize industries. Further, private property rights protected by the legal system **encourage entrepreneurship and small business development**, both of which are **key to a growing and modernizing economy**. As a result, democracies tend to be wealthier and more economically stable than their autocratic counterparts. This is fundamentally in the interest of the United States in that both private and public investors have an interest in seeing returns on their investments, thereby potentially making **countries less willing to go to war if that would require severing economic ties**. Democratic institutions ensure that citizens with both economic and political power are heard. Democracies also **invest in public goods at much higher rates than autocratic governments**. Because politicians must cater to the median voter, they **approve policies that invest in public education and healthcare**, both of which promote long-term growth and development. Public education invests in a country’s human capital, setting the stage for long-term innovation, adaptability, and advancement. Public healthcare, meanwhile, has been shown to **increase overall societal productivity** and well-being as people take fewer sick days, citizens are able to afford their healthcare without going bankrupt, and ultimately, the overall **costs of healthcare are driven down** as citizens become healthier. Productive, innovative societies are also better for the United States — innovation around the world improves global quality of life, results in more educational and vocational opportunities for Americans (both because other universities and jobs become more attractive to Americans who want to go abroad and because potential immigrants are more likely to want to stay in their own country, opening up opportunities for U.S. citizens at home), and may reduce friction between countries over resources and labor. Democracies are also generally more politically stable because regular election cycles ensure an established process for the habitual and peaceful removal of leaders from power. Elections ensure the non-violent transition of power and reduce the need for mass protest, rioting, and revolution — which **makes countries more politically stable**. Further, when citizens are granted rights and protections from government abuse, enforced by an independent judiciary, they have fewer grievances against the government and are thus less able to mobilize large numbers of people to violently overthrow the regime. Revolution, while not always violent, often leads to political instability, challenges to growth, **increased incentives for diversionary war and conflict**, and oftentimes civil war. The externalities of civil war and international conflict then put pressure on the United States to intervene, protect human rights, and otherwise expend resources on other countries’ issues. Further, civil wars are highly destructive to institutions, human capital, and resources, and can have significant security spillover effects, increasing global risk of political instability and **violent extremism**. This political stability, in addition to institutional checks and balances, makes **democracies better international partners and allies in the long-term**. Treaties ratified by multiple branches of government are more durable than executive agreements signed by a single leader who may be replaced within a short period of time. While democracies may be more reluctant to commit to alliances and formal security pacts, once a party to them, they are more dependable than other states with concentrated power at the executive level. **These kind of durable commitments are of interest to the United States as it seeks to preserve the liberal world order**; it is far more effective to ally with partners whose institutions make withdrawal from the alliance costly. Finally, it has been empirically observed that **democracies do not go to war with one another**. While there is a robust debate around the exact nature of the so-called “democratic peace,” it appears that there are qualities particular to democracies that make war between them particularly unlikely: a **dovish public constrains leaders’ ability to wage war**, competitive elections and a free press make it **easier to credibly communicate resolve to potential adversaries**, consolidated democracies tend to be **more wealthy and economically interdependent**, like-minded people are more hesitant to wage war against one another, and so on. Regardless of the precise mechanisms, however, a world of democracies is inherently safer, more prosperous, and less likely to initiate a war against the United States — a key factor in protecting American security and interests.

#### Extinction

Ng 19 [Yew-Kwang; May 2019; Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technology University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of the Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, Ph.D. in Economics from Sydney University; Global Policy, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism,” vol. 10, no. 2, p. 258-266; RP]

Catastrophic climate change Though by no means certain, CCC causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non‐linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points (e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0005); Belaia et al., [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0008); Buldyrev et al., [2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0016); Grainger, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0027); Hansen and Sato, [2012](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0029); IPCC [2014](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0031); Kareiva and Carranza, [2018](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0033); Osmond and Klausmeier, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0056); Rothman, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0066); Schuur et al., [2015](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0069); Sims and Finnoff, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0072); Van Aalst, [2006](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0079)).[7](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-note-1009_67) A possibly imminent tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt ice sheet collapse [that] could cause a rapid sea level rise’ (Baum et al., [2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0006), p. 399). There are many avenues for positive feedback in global warming, including: the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and increases the absorption of sunlight, leading to faster warming; the drying of forests from warming increases forest fires and the release of more carbon; and higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane trapped under the ocean floor, producing runaway global warming. Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, [2007](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0065)). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation ([2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0026), p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’. The threat of sea‐level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber ([2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0071)) emphasize the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet‐bulb temperature. They show that ‘even modest global warming could … expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making extinction much more likely and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low. While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves ([2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0004), pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] … to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable. Even if there is only a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times.

#### And Russian invasions beyond Ukraine cause NATO draw in-they wont let Putin go beyond Ukraine

**Finnis 3-3** Alex Finnis, 3-3-2022, "Whether Russia could attack other countries after Ukraine and if Nato members are under threat," inews.co.uk, https://inews.co.uk/news/world/will-russia-attack-other-countries-what-putin-after-ukraine-invasion-nato-members-threat-1495774//SJJK

[Russia’s invasion of Ukraine is days behind schedule](https://inews.co.uk/news/ukraine-russia-advance-kyiv-little-progress-three-days-uk-officials-1495416?ico=in-line_link), but **fears remain Vladimir Putin** [**may still have eyes on pushing further into Europe**](https://inews.co.uk/news/world/russia-will-stop-ukraine-what-putin-want-invasion-how-likely-attack-other-countries-1491685?ico=in-line_link)**.** [Officials say a 40-mile Russian convoy heading for Kyiv](https://inews.co.uk/news/world/ukraine-live-stream-watch-latest-video-updates-kyiv-as-russian-convoy-approaches-capital-1494144?ico=in-line_link) has made little progress in several days, and remains 30km away from the centre of the capital, having been thwarted by [Ukrainian resistance](https://inews.co.uk/news/ukrainian-civilians-block-russian-troops-throw-themselves-on-ground-video-1494371?ico=in-line_link), mechanical breakdown and congestion. President Putin’s forces have managed to capture the city of Kherson, but Kharkiv, Chernihiv and Mariupol are still in Ukrainian hands despite days of heavy shelling. The [Ukrainian Government has claimed](https://inews.co.uk/news/ukraine-war-death-toll-human-cost-russias-invasion-growing-civilians-killed-unclear-1494274?ico=in-line_link) that more than 5,300 Russians and more than 2,000 Ukrainian civilians have died, although these numbers have not been verified. The United Nations said the real toll was likely to be “much higher”. [Russia has ramped up the ferocity of its attacks](https://inews.co.uk/news/russias-war-on-ukraine-who-is-winning-the-war-one-week-in-1495000?ico=in-line_link) in response to the frustration, and has been accused of war crimes for its use of cluster bombs. [Foreign Secretary Liz Truss said the UK and its allies need “to do more to contain this aggression”](https://inews.co.uk/news/ukraine-russia-attack-baltic-states-war-europe-nato-warns-liz-truss-eu-allies-1495619?ico=in-line_link), with fears President Putin could attack the Baltic region. Here’s what we know about the chances of Russia’s invasion going beyond Ukraine. Will Russia attack other countries? Russia has not stated any intentions to push beyond Ukraine, but Moscow also previously said it would not invade Ukraine. Karin von Hippel, who was a nonpolitical senior adviser at the US State Department during the Obama administration told [NBC](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/finland-nato-baltics-putin-threat-ukraine-invasion-europe-rcna17805) President Putin could potentially target non-Nato nations in Eastern Europe, [such as Moldova and Georgia](https://inews.co.uk/news/world/moldova-part-nato-ukraine-not-member-russia-invasion-mean-for-country-1493549?ico=in-line_link). He added that if **the Russian leader “starts to slowly expand his empire, there will be several other places that are in Nato that are going to be getting extremely stressed out”. “It’s very unclear at this stage that anyone can convince Putin to do anything other than what he wants to do,”** he said. [**Belarusian dictator Alexander Lukashenko**](https://inews.co.uk/news/world/belarus-nato-why-isnt-part-russia-invasion-ukraine-lukashenko-helping-putin-explained-1491006?ico=in-line_link) **may have revealed Russian** [**plans to invade Moldova**](https://inews.co.uk/news/world/moldova-part-nato-ukraine-not-member-russia-invasion-mean-for-country-1493549?ico=in-line_link)**.** [His troops are believed to have joined Russia’s invasion of Ukraine](https://inews.co.uk/news/world/belarus-troops-ukraine-join-russia-invasion-president-lukashenko-army-1491050?ico=in-line_link), having reportedly entered the Chernihiv region in the north of the country on Tuesday morning. [The UK has imposed sanctions on Belarus](https://inews.co.uk/news/belarus-sanctions-uk-punishes-alexander-lukashenkos-military-allies-role-ukraine-invasion-1492829?ico=in-line_link) for its role in the war. President Lukashenko is a close ally of President Putin, and Russia has been able to use his country as a launchpad for attacks. [**But their plans could go beyond Ukraine**](https://inews.co.uk/news/world/russia-will-stop-ukraine-what-putin-want-invasion-how-likely-attack-other-countries-1491685?ico=in-line_link) **based on a map shown during a televised broadcast from President Lukashenko. The map showed attack plans for Ukraine, but also displayed a possible route into Moldova from the Ukrainian port city of Odessa, via a large red arrow.** It also showed red shading around the Moldovan border, potentially indicating plans for an occupation. If Russia were to invade Moldova or Georgia the situation is likely to be similar to that of Ukraine, in that Nato forces including the UK and US would support Moldova by sending both military and non-military aid, but would not engage in battle with Russian troops directly. Are Nato members under threat? The Foreign Secretary has said the UK will join its Baltic allies in moving from “deterrence to defence” on its borders. Speaking at a press conference in Lithuania, she said: “The UK’s commitment to the Baltics and to Article 5 are unyielding.” Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania are all part of Nato. [Nato uses a principle of collective defence under Article 5 of its treaty](https://inews.co.uk/news/world/article-5-nato-what-pact-explained-collective-defence-russia-ukraine-war-1484451?ico=in-line_link). It means an attack against one Nato member is considered an attack against all. “We are reinforcing Nato’s eastern flank and supporting European security through the UK-led Joint Expeditionary Force,” Ms Truss added. “We are here in the Baltic region. We lead and have doubled our enhanced forward presence in Estonia. Our allies are leading troops across the Baltics. “At the Nato foreign ministry meeting tomorrow we will be working together to strengthen our collective defensive in light of the changed security situation across Europe.” The Foreign Secretary echoed comments made by Lithuanian foreign minister Gabrielius Landsbergis, who said it is vital the Baltic states move from “deterrence to defence”. “This is why we need a change in political approach,” he said. “We also need practical means for that and they are needed for all three Baltic states. “So that if Putin decides to test Nato resistance in this region it would be responded right way. “It would get a political response and also a clear defensive response, if that would be needed.” **The comments imply that if Russia were to attempt to annex any of the Baltic states, Nato would respond with full military might, plunging the West into a war with Russia.**

#### Ukraine wont go nuclear but if other countries get drawn in nuclear escalation is inevitable

**Majumdar 17** Dave Majumdar, 9-7-2017, "A War with Russia Would Go Nuclear. Here's Why.," National Interest, https://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/war-russia-would-go-nuclear-heres-why-22202//SJJK

Simply put, **if Russia were faced with a large-scale attack that could defeat its conventional forces, Moscow might resort to nuclear weapons.** While a recent [RAND Corporation study](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1200/RR1253/RAND_RR1253.pdf) concluded that **Russia could overrun NATO’s member states Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in the Baltics within sixty hours**, the war games did not simulate the use of nuclear weapons. **If, however, a war were to breakout between NATO and Russia, nuclear weapons would certainly come into play**—especially if the conflict were going poorly for Moscow. **Unlike the Soviet Union, which had a stated “no first use” policy, modern Russia explicitly rejected that pledge in 1993**. In fact, as Moscow’s conventional forces continued to atrophy during the economic and social meltdown of the 1990s, Russia developed a doctrine [called de-escalation in 2000](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2000_05/dc3ma00). Simply put, if Russia were faced with a large-scale attack that could defeat its conventional forces, Moscow might resort to nuclear weapons. In 2010, Russia revised the doctrine somewhat as its conventional forces started to recover from the aftermath of the Soviet collapse—the current version states [Moscow would use nuclear weapons in](https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL32572.pdf) situations “that would put in danger the very existence of the state.” While the RAND study shows that Russia would be able to take the Baltics fairly easily, the war game didn’t explore what would happen in the event of a NATO counter offensive. The RAND study simply states: Such a rapid defeat would leave NATO with a limited number of options, all bad: a bloody counteroffensive, fraught with escalatory risk, to liberate the Baltics; to escalate itself, as it threatened to do to avert defeat during the Cold War; or to concede at least temporary defeat, with uncertain but predictably disastrous consequences for the Alliance and, not incidentally, the people of the Baltics. A NATO counter-offensive would be bloody and fraught with escalatory risk—but it’s one of the probable outcomes of a Russian invasion. **In that eventuality, Russian conventional forces—of which only a portion are well trained and well equipped—would likely be severely damaged or even destroyed**. Moreover, if NATO forces hit targets inside Russia or crossed over into Russian territory, Moscow might conclude that there is a danger to the existence of the state. After all, Moscow has expressed concerns in the past that regime change by the West is an all too real danger. **In that situation, Russia might counter advancing NATO forces with its arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons**. The Russian tactical nuclear arsenal is not nearly as large as the Soviet arsenal had once been, but concrete numbers are hard to come by. The Soviet Union was thought to have possessed between 15,000 and 25,000 tactical nuclear weapons of all types ranging from suitcase-sized containers and nuclear mines to short-range aircraft delivered missiles, nuclear gravity bombs and artillery shells—as well as short-, medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missile warheads. While Moscow has been slowly eliminating its non-strategic arsenal since the end of the Cold War, Russia many still have as many as [4,000 tactical nuclear weapons](https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/RL32572.pdf), according to the Congressional Research Service. However, other analyses suggest that Russia has as few as [2,000 operational tactical nuclear weapons.](http://bos.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/04/13/0096340215581363.full) A more recent analysis by [Royal United Service Institute’s Igor Sutyagin suggests](https://rusi.org/sites/default/files/201211_op_atomic_accounting.pdf) that Russia has a maximum of 1,040 non-strategic nuclear weapons. Of those about 128-210 warheads are assigned to the Russian ground forces. The Russian navy has about 330 tactical nuclear weapons, while the Russian air force has 334 non-strategic weapons. Meanwhile, Russian air defense forces have a further sixty-eight to 166 tactical nuclear weapons mounted on various surface-to-air missiles. Another report, this one by the [Federation of American Scientists, suggests that](http://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/) Russia doesn’t have any deployed non-strategic nuclear weapons. “All are declared to be in central storage. Several thousand retired non-strategic warheads are awaiting dismantlement,” reads the FAS’s Status of World Nuclear Forces.

#### Nuclear detonations cause nuclear winter and extinction, and the rainout effect is wrong – self-lofting means soot goes above the clouds

**Starr 15** Steven Starr, 10-14-2015, "Nuclear War, Nuclear Winter, and Human Extinction," Federation Of American Scientists, [Steven Starr is the director of the University of Missouri’s Clinical Laboratory Science Program, as well as a senior scientist at the Physicians for Social Responsibility. He has been published in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction (STAR) website of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology.], https://fas.org/pir-pubs/nuclear-war-nuclear-winter-and-human-extinction/, SJBE

While it is impossible to precisely predict all the human impacts that would result from a nuclear winter, it is relatively simple to predict those which would be most profound. **That is, a nuclear winter would cause most humans and large animals to die from nuclear famine in a mass extinction event similar to the one that wiped out the dinosaurs**. **Following the detonation** (in conflict) **of** US and/or Russian launch-ready **strategic nuclear weapons, nuclear firestorms would burn simultaneously over a total land surface area of many thousands or tens of thousands of square miles. These mass fires, many of which would rage over large cities and industrial areas, would release many tens of millions of tons of black carbon soot and smoke** (up to [180 million tons](http://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/pdf/ToonRobockTurcoPhysicsToday.pdf), according to peer-reviewed studies), **which would rise rapidly above cloud level and into the stratosphere.** [For an explanation of the calculation of smoke emissions, see [Atmospheric effects & societal consequences of regional scale nuclear conflicts](http://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/pdf/acp-7-1973-2007.pdf).] **The scientists who completed the most recent peer-reviewed studies on nuclear winter discovered that the sunlight would heat the smoke, producing a self-lofting effect that would not only aid the rise of the smoke into the stratosphere (above cloud level, where it could not be rained out), but act to keep the smoke in the stratosphere for 10 years or more**. The longevity of the smoke layer would act to greatly increase the severity of its effects upon the biosphere. **Once in the stratosphere, the smoke** (predicted to be produced by a range of strategic nuclear wars) **would rapidly engulf the Earth and form a** [**dense stratospheric smoke layer**](http://www.nucleardarkness.org/warconsequences/hundredfiftytonessmoke/). **The smoke from a war fought with strategic nuclear weapons would quickly prevent up to 70% of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere and 35% of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Southern Hemisphere.** Such an enormous loss of warming sunlight would produce Ice Age weather conditions on Earth in a matter of weeks. **For a period of 1-3 years following the war, temperatures would fall below freezing every day in the central agricultural zones of North America and Eurasia.** [For an explanation of nuclear winter, see [Nuclear winter revisited with a modern climate model and current nuclear arsenals: Still catastrophic consequences](http://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/pdf/RobockNW2006JD008235.pdf).] Nuclear winter would cause average global surface temperatures to become colder than they were at the height of the last Ice Age. **Such extreme cold would eliminate growing seasons for many years, probably for a decade or longer.** Can you imagine a winter that lasts for ten years? The results of such a scenario are obvious. **Temperatures would be much too cold to grow food, and they would remain this way long enough to cause most humans and animals to starve to death. Global nuclear famine would ensue in a setting in which the infrastructure of the combatant nations has been totally destroyed,** resulting in massive amounts of chemical and radioactive toxins being released into the biosphere. We don’t need a sophisticated study to tell us that no food and Ice Age temperatures for a decade would kill most people and animals on the planet. Would the few remaining survivors be able to survive in a radioactive, toxic environment? It is, of course, debatable whether or not nuclear winter could cause human extinction. There is essentially no way to truly “know” without fighting a strategic nuclear war. Yet while it is crucial that we all understand the mortal peril that we face, **it is not necessary to engage in an unwinnable academic debate as to whether any humans will survive.**

## Framing

#### The standard is maximizing life.

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### Impact calc –

#### Extinction outweighs:

#### A] Structural violence- death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### B] Objectivity- body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical.

#### C] Moral uncertainty –

## Underview

#### 1] 1AR theory and RVIs on NC theory are legit – anything else means infinite abuse – drop the debater, competing interps – 1AR are too short to make up for the time trade-off- no RVIs on 1ar theory or 2n theory-the 2n can uplayer for 6 minutes and easily beat any theory 2ar-also key to check back against infinite abuse-

#### 2] Reasonability on 1NC theory with the brightline of link and impact turn ground – there are infinite bidirectional interps that I can never meet – the four minute 1AR doesn’t have enough time to line by line every argument, make offense, and go for substance.

## Method

#### 1] Evolution proves our theory true

**Johnson and Thayer 16** – Dominic D. P. Johnson, D.Phil., Ph.D.\* and Bradley A. Thayer, Ph.D., “The evolution of offensive realism Survival under anarchy from the Pleistocene to the present,” https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/56B778004187F70B8E59609BE7FEE7A4/S073093841600006Xa.pdf/div-class-title-the-evolution-of-offensive-realism-div.pdf

Few principles unite the discipline of international relations, but one exception is anarchy—the absence of government in international politics. Anarchy is, ironically, the ‘‘ordering’’ principle of the global state system and the starting point for most major theories of international politics, such as neoliberalism and neorealism.42,43,44,45 Other theoretical approaches, such as constructivism, also acknowledge the impact of anarchy, even if only to consider why anarchy occurs and how it can be circumvented.46,47 Indeed, the anarchy concept is so profound that it defines and divides the discipline of political science into international politics (politics under conditions of anarchy) and domestic politics (politics under conditions of hierarchy, or government). Given the prominence of the concept in present-day international relations theory, it is striking that anarchy only took hold as a central feature of scholarship in recent decades, since the publication of Kenneth Waltz’s Theory of International Politics in 1979. In fact, however, **anarchy has been a constant feature of the entire multimillion year history of the human lineage (and indeed the 3.5 billion–year history of the evolution of all life on Earth before that). It is not just that we lack a global Leviathan today; humans never had such a luxury. The fact that human evolution occurred under conditions of anarchy, that we evolved as hunter-gatherers in an ecological setting of predation, resource competition, and intergroup conflict, and that humans have been subject to natural selection** for millions of years **has profound consequences for understanding human behavior**, not least how humans perceive and act toward others. Scholars often argue over whether historically humans experienced a Hobbesian ‘‘state of nature,’’ but—whatever the outcome of that debate—it is certainly a much closer approximation to the prehistoric environment in which human brains and behavior evolved. **This legacy heavily influences our decision-making and behavior today, even—perhaps especially—in the anarchy of international politics**. We argue that **evolution under conditions of anarchy has predisposed human nature toward the behaviors predicted by offensive realism: Humans**, particularly men, **are strongly self-interested, often fear other groups, and seek more resources, more power, and more influence** (as we explain in full later). **These strategies** are not unique to humans and, in fact, **characterize a much broader trend in behavior among mammals as a whole—especially primates**—as well as many other major vertebrate groups, including birds, fish, and reptiles. **This recurrence of behavioral patterns** across different taxonomic groups **suggests that the behaviors characterized by offensive realism have broad and deep evolutionary roots**. This perspective does not deny the importance of institutions, norms, and governance in international politics. On the contrary, it provides or adds to the reasons why we demand and need them, and indeed why they are so hard to establish and maintain. Until recently, **international relations theorists rarely used insights from the life sciences to inform their understanding of human behavior**. However, **rapid advances in the life sciences offer increasing theoretical and empirical challenges to scholars in** the social sciences in general and **international relations** in particular, who are therefore under increasing pressure to address and integrate this knowledge rather than to suppress or ignore it. Whatever one’s personal views on evolution, **the time has come to explore the implications of evolutionary theory for mainstream theories of international relations**. **The most obvious challenge that evolutionary theory presents to international relations concerns our understanding of human nature**. Theories purporting to explain human behavior make explicit or implicit assumptions about preferences and motivations, and mainstream theories in international politics are no exception. Many **criticisms of international relations theories focus on these unsubstantiated or contested assumptions about underlying human nature. The parsimony of general theories depends on how well they explain phenomena across space and time**; in other words, the more closely they coincide with empirical observations across cultures and throughout history. The most enduring theories of international relations, therefore, will be ones that are able to incorporate (or at least do not run against the grain of) evolutionary theory. Although Thomas Hobbes claimed to have deduced Leviathan scientifically from ‘‘motion’’ and the physical senses, he was writing two hundred years before Darwin and so had no understanding of evolution. International relations scholars have tended to claim to deduce their own theories from Hobbes, or subsequent philosophers who followed him, and we suggest it is time to revisit the idea of foundational scientific principles. **Starting with biology, or with human evolutionary history, has never been typical in international relations scholarship**, but this approach is now less exotic than it once seemed as innovators in a range of social sciences, including economics, psychology, sociology, and political science, pursue this line of inquiry. **International relations stands to gain from** similar **interdisciplinary insights**. At the dawn of the 21st century, an era that will be dominated by science at least as much as philosophy, **we have the opportunity to move away from untested assumptions about human nature. Instead, we can make more concrete predictions about how humans tend to think and act in different conditions, based on new scientific knowledge about human cognition** and behavior, **and in particular a greater understanding of the social and ecological context in which human brains and behaviors evolved**. But what was that context?

#### 2] Youth participatory action research enables *transformative resistance* and is crucial to make activism work

Cammarota and Fine 08

(Julio, Education@Arizona, Michelle, UrbanEducation@TheGraduateCenterNYU, *Youth Participatory Action Research*

In the Matrix, Morpheus, played by Laurence Fishburne, places Keanu Reeves’ character Neo in a chair to tell him face to face about the real truth of his experience. Morpheus shows Neo a red pill in one hand and a blue one in the other, describing that the red pill will lead him “down the rabbit hole” to the truth while the blue pill will make him forget about their conversation and return everything back to “normal.” Neo looks confused and worried, hesitates for a moment, and then reaches to grab and then swallow the red pill. " e “blue and red pill” scene in ! e Matrix serves as an excellent metaphor for the relationships some educators/activists have with their students, and the kinds of choices we ask them to make. The critical educational experience offered might lead the student “down the rabbit hole” past the layers of lies to the truths of systematic exploitation and oppression as well as possibilities for resistance. A$ er he ingests the red pill, Neo ends up in the place of truth, awakening to the reality that his entire world is a lie constructed to make him believe that he lives a “normal” life, when in reality he is fully exploited day in and day out. What is “normal” is really a mirage, and what is true is the complete structural domination of people, all people. " is book, Revolutionizing Education, literally connects to the metaphorical play on chimera and veracity forwarded by the narrative in ! e Matrix. Examples are presented throughout in which young people resist the 1 normalization of systematic oppression by undertaking their own engaged praxis—critical and collective inquiry, re% ection and action focused on “reading” and speaking back to the reality of the world, their world (Freire, 1993). The praxis highlighted in the book—youth participatory action research (YPAR)—provides young people with opportunities to study social problems affecting their lives and then determine actions to rectify these problems. YPAR, and thus Revolutionizing Education, may extend the kinds of questions posed by critical youth studies (Bourgois, 1995; Fine and Weis, 1998; Giroux, 1983; Kelley, 1994; Macleod, 1987; McRobbie, 1991; Oakes et al., 2006; Rasmussen et al., 2004; Sullivan, 1989; Willis, 1977). How do youth learn the skills of critical inquiry and resistances within formal youth development, research collectives, and/or educational settings? How is it possible for their critical inquiries to evolve into formalized challenges to the “normal” practices of systematic oppression? Under what conditions can critical research be a tool of youth development and social justice work? The Matrix infers revolution by showing how Neo learns to see the reality of his experiences while understanding his capabilities for resistance. " e YPAR cases presented in this book also follow a similar pattern: young people learn through research about complex power relations,histories of struggle, and the consequences of oppression. They begin to re- vision and denaturalize the realities of their social worlds and then undertake forms of collective challenge based on the knowledge garnered through their critical inquiries. As you will read in this volume, the youth, with adult allies, have written policy briefs, engaged sticker campaigns, performed critical productions, coordinated public testimonials—all dedicated to speaking back and challenging conditions of injustice. What perhaps distinguishes young people engaged in YPAR from the standard representations in critical youth studies is that their research is designed to contest and transform systems and institutions to produce greater justice—distributive justice, procedural justice, and what Iris Marion Young calls a justice of recognition, or respect. In short, YPAR is a formal resistance that leads to transformation—systematic and institutional change to promote social justice. YPAR teaches young people that conditions of injustice are produced, not natural; are designed to privilege and oppress; but are ultimately challengeable and thus changeable. In each of these projects, young people and adult allies experience the vitality of a multi- generational collective analysis of power; we learn that sites of critical inquiry and resistance can be fortifying and nourishing to the soul, and at the same time that these projects provoke ripples of social change. YPAR shows young people how they are consistently subject to the impositions and manipulations of domi-nant exigencies. These controlling interests may take on the form of white supremacy, capitalism, sexism, homophobia, or xenophobia—all of which is meant to provide certain people with power at the expense of subordinating others, many others. Within this matrix or grid of power, the possibilities of true liberation for young people become limited. Similar to the film the Matrix, the individual, like Neo, may be unaware of the infections of power fostering oppression. The dawning of awareness emerges from a critical study of social institutions and processes in influencing one’s life course, and his/her capacity to see differently, to act anew, to provoke change. Critical youth studies demonstrate that the revolutionary lesson is not always apprehended in schools; sometimes, young people gain critical awareness through their own endogenous cultural practices. Such is the case of Willis’ (1977) Lads in Learning to Labor. Working- class youth attain insights about the reproductive function of schools through their own street cultural sensibilities. However, they use these insights to resist education en masse by forgoing school for jobs in factories. Scholars (Fine, 1991; Solórzano and Delgado- Bernal, 2001) identify this form of resistance as “self- defeating,” because the students’ choice to forgo school for manual labor contributes to reproducing them as working class. Although the Lads resist the school’s purpose of engendering uneven class relations, their resistance contributes to this engendering process by undermining any chance they had for social mobility. Young people also engage in forms of resistance that avoid self- defeating outcomes while striving for social advancement. Scholars (Fordham, 1996) identify this next level of resistance as “conformist”—in the sense that young people embrace the education system with the intention of seeking personal gains, although not necessarily agreeing with all the ideological ! ligree espoused by educational institutions. " ey use schooling for their own purposes: educational achievements that garner individual gains with social implications beyond the classroom, such as economic mobility, gender equality, and racial parity. Solórzano and Delgado- Bernal (2001: 319–20) contend that students may attain another, yet more conscious form of resistance, which they call “transformational resistance.” A transformational approach to resistance moves the student to a “deeper level of understanding and a social justice orientation.” Those engaged in transformational resistance address problems of systematic injustice and seek actions that foster “the greatest possibility for social change” (ibid.). Although Solórzano and Delgado- Bernal (2001) provide a useful typology (self- defeating, conformist, and transformational) that acknowledges the complexities of resistance, the education and development processes leading to resistances are somewhat under- discussed. Apparently, the production of cultural subjectivities (Bourgois, 1995; Levinson et al., 1996; Willis, 1977) is related to resisting ideological oppressions. However, these cultural productions tend to occur in more informal settings (non- institutional, non- organizational) such as peer groups, families, and street corners. The work presented in this volume agitates toward another framework— where youth are engaged in multi- generational collectives for critical inquiry and action, and these collectives are housed in youth development settings, schools, and/or research sites. With this series of cases, we challenge scholars, educators, and activists to consider how to create such settings in which research for resistance can be mobilized toward justice. A key question is whether resistance can develop within formal proces ses (pedagogical structures or youth development practices). If this question is left $ unattended, we risk perceiving youth resistances as “orientations” as opposed to processes. In other words, the kinds of resistances, whether self- defeating, conformist, or transformational, will be identified as emerging from some inherent fixxed, cultural sensibility. This perspective of young people sustains the ridged essentialization trap that has plagued studies of youth for years (Anderson, 1990; Newman, 1999; Ogbu, 1978). The traditional essentialized view maintains that any problem (poverty, educational failure, drug and alcohol abuse, etc.) faced by youth results of their own volition, thereby blaming the victim for the victim’s problems. Critical youth studies goes beyond the traditional pathological or patronizing view by asserting that young people have the capacity and agency to analyze their social context, to engage critical research collectively, and to challenge and resist the forces impeding their possibilities for liberation. However, another step is needed to further distance critical youth studies from essentialized perspectives by acknowledging that resistances can be attained through formal processes in “real” settings, through multi- generational collectives, and sometimes among youth alone. YPAR represents not only a formal pedagogy of resistance but also the means by which young people engage transformational resistance. (1-4)

#### 3] Traditional conceptions of objectivity exclude marginalized perspectives – prioritizing new conceptions of objectivity through the AFF solves.

**Lowery 20** [Wesley. Wesley Lowery ([@WesleyLowery](https://twitter.com/WesleyLowery?ref_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Eauthor)) is a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist and correspondent for “60 Minutes’s” “60 in 6.”. “Opinion”. 6-23-2020. New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/23/opinion/objectivity-black-journalists-coronavirus.html.] SJ//VM

It was a brief interaction, during the first weeks of my career. There had been a stabbing, and I’d been dispatched to a block in Roxbury, a predominantly black section of Boston, to snag quotes from anyone who might know anything about what had happened. “Who are you with?” inquired the first person I had approached, a black man in his 50s. “The Globe?” he exclaimed after hearing my response. “The Globe doesn’t have black reporters. What are you doing over here? You lost? Y’all don’t write about this part of town.” His complaints and his skepticism were familiar, voiced for decades by black people both outside newsrooms and within them — that most American media organizations do not reflect the diversity of the nation or the communities they cover and too often confine their coverage of black and brown neighborhoods to the crime of the day. Now, almost a decade later, as protesters are taking to the streets of American cities to denounce racism and the unabated police killings of black people across the country, the journalism industry has seemingly reached a breaking point of its own: Black journalists are publicly airing years of accumulated grievances, demanding an overdue reckoning for a profession whose mainstream repeatedly brushes off their concerns; in many newsrooms, writers and editors are now also openly pushing for a paradigm shift in how our outlets define their operations and ideals. While these two battles may seem superficially separate, in reality, the failure of the mainstream press to accurately cover black communities is intrinsically linked with its failure to employ, retain and listen to black people. Since American journalism’s pivot many decades ago from an openly partisan press to a model of professed objectivity, the mainstream has allowed what it considers objective truth to be decided almost exclusively by white reporters and their mostly white bosses. And those selective truths have been calibrated to avoid offending the sensibilities of white readers. On opinion pages, the contours of acceptable public debate have largely been determined through the gaze of white editors. The views and inclinations of whiteness are accepted as the objective neutral. When black and brown reporters and editors challenge those conventions, it’s not uncommon for them to be pushed out, reprimanded or robbed of new opportunities. The journalist Alex S. Jones, who served as a longtime director of Harvard’s Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy, wrote in “Losing the News,” his 2009 book, “I define journalistic objectivity as a genuine effort to be an honest broker when it comes to news.” To him, “That means playing it straight without favoring one side when the facts are in dispute, regardless of your own views and preferences.” But objectivity, Mr. Jones wrote, “also means not trying to create the illusion of fairness by letting advocates pretend in your journalism that there is a debate about the facts when the weight of truth is clear.” He critiqued “he-said/she-said reporting, which just pits one voice against another,” as “the discredited face of objectivity. But that is not authentic objectivity.” It’s striking to read objectivity defined that way — not because it’s objectionable, but rather because it barely resembles the way the concept is commonly discussed in newsrooms today. Conversations about objectivity, rather than happening in a virtuous vacuum, habitually focus on predicting whether a given sentence, opening paragraph or entire article will appear objective to a theoretical reader, who is invariably assumed to be white. This creates the very illusion of fairness that Mr. Jones, and others, specifically warn against. Instead of telling hard truths in this polarized environment, America’s newsrooms too often deprive their readers of plainly stated facts that could expose reporters to accusations of partiality or imbalance. For years, I’ve been among a chorus of mainstream journalists who have called for our industry to abandon the appearance of objectivity as the aspirational journalistic standard, and for reporters instead to focus on being fair and telling the truth, as best as one can, based on the given context and available facts. It’s not a novel argument. Scores of journalists across generations, from gonzo reporters like Hunter S. Thompson to more traditional voices like Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel, have advocated this very approach. Mr. Kovach and Mr. Rosenstiel lay it out in detail in their classic text “The Elements of Journalism.” Those of us advancing this argument know that a fairness-and-truth focus will have different, healthy interpretations. We also know that neutral “objective journalism” is constructed atop a pyramid of subjective decision-making: which stories to cover, how intensely to cover those stories, which sources to seek out and include, which pieces of information are highlighted and which are downplayed. No journalistic process is objective. And no individual journalist is objective, because no human being is. And so, instead of promising our readers that we will never, on any platform, betray a single personal bias — submitting ourselves to a life sentence of public thoughtlessness — a better pledge would be an assurance that we will devote ourselves to accuracy, that we will diligently seek out the perspectives of those with whom we personally may be inclined to disagree and that we will be just as sure to ask hard questions of those with whom we’re inclined to agree. The best of our profession already does this. But we need to be honest about the gulf that lies between the best and the bulk. It’s possible to build journalism self-aware enough to bridge that gap. But it will take moral clarity, which will require both editors and reporters to stop doing things like reflexively hiding behind euphemisms that obfuscate the truth, simply because we’ve always done it that way. Deference to precedent is a poor excuse for continuing to make decisions that potentially let powerful bad actors off the hook and harm the public we serve. Neutral objectivity trips over itself to find ways to avoid telling the truth. Neutral objectivity insists we use clunky euphemisms like “officer-involved shooting.” Moral clarity, and a faithful adherence to grammar and syntax, would demand we use words that most precisely mean the thing we’re trying to communicate: “the police shot someone.” In coverage of policing, adherents to the neutral objectivity model create journalism so deferential to the police that entire articles are rendered meaningless. True fairness would, in fact, go as far as requiring that editors seriously consider not publishing any significant account of a police shooting until the staff has tracked down the perspective — the “side” — of the person the police had shot. That way beat reporters aren’t left simply rewriting a law enforcement news release. Moral clarity would insist that politicians who traffic in racist stereotypes and tropes — however cleverly — be labeled such with clear language and unburied evidence. Racism, as we know, is not about what lies in the depths of a human’s heart. It is about word and deed. And a more aggressive commitment to truth from the press would empower our industry to finally admit that. The failures of neutral objective journalism across several beats in the news media are countless. And these shortcomings have real consequences for the readers we are sworn to serve — particularly black readers, who we know are more likely to have interactions with the criminal justice system (whose leaders we court), more likely to be the targets of white supremacists (whom we commonly indulge) and more likely to have lives made more difficult by racist politicians and implicitly racist policies that we repeatedly refuse to call out. Black journalists are speaking out because one of the nation’s major political parties and the current presidential administration are providing refuge to white supremacist rhetoric and policies, and our industry’s gatekeepers are preoccupied with seeming balanced, even ordering up glossy profiles of complicit actors. All the while, black and brown lives and livelihoods remain imperiled. Ideally, the group of journalists given the power to decide what and whom to give a platform in this moment would both understand this era’s gravity and reflect the diversity of the country. Unfortunately, too often that is not the case. Perhaps the most recent controversy to erupt because of such thoughtlessness and lack of inclusion was provided by The New York Times Opinion section, when it published an essay by Senator Tom Cotton, a Republican from Arkansas, calling for, among other things, an “overwhelming show of force” by the American military in order to quell civil unrest at protests that, while at times violent, have largely been made up of peaceful demonstrations. A method of moral clarity would have required that leadership think very hard before providing the section’s deeply influential platform to any elected official — allowing him or her to opine, without the buffer of a reporter’s follow-up questions, using inflammatory rhetoric. It would require, at the very least, that such an article not contain several overstatements and unsubstantiated assertions. “We find the publication of this essay to be an irresponsible choice,” the NewsGuild of New York, a union that represents many Times employees, said in a statement. “Its lack of context, inadequate vetting by editorial management, spread of misinformation, and the timing of its call to arms gravely undermine the work we do every day.” Let’s take a moment to be honest about what actually happened in this case: An op-ed page accepted an essay from a firebrand senator. It published that column without adequate line or conceptual editing. Then it got called out for it, leading to the resignation of one man in top leadership and the reassignment of another. It was a rare case of accountability, yet it remains to be seen if the changes at The Times will include aggressively tackling a culture that leaves its own staff members so internally powerless that they have to battle their own publication in public. Despite the suggestions of an increasingly hysterical set of pundits, this fallout was not an attack on the very concept of public debate. It’s the story of a group of Times employees concluding that a specific piece of content and the process by which it was published was beneath the standards they are asked themselves to uphold — then having the audacity to say so. The journalists — the black journalists — who pushed back most forcefully on the Cotton Op-Ed essay were not calling for an end to public discourse or the censorship of opinions they dislike. They were responding to the particularly poor handling of a particularly outlandish case during a particularly sensitive moment. The turmoil at The Times and the simultaneous eruptions inside other newsrooms across the country are the predictable results of the mainstream media’s labored refusal to racially integrate. It’s been more than 50 years since the first black journalists appeared in mainstream American newsrooms. For all of that time, black journalists have made meager demands: Please hire some more of us. Please pay us the way you do our colleagues. Please allow us to ascend to leadership roles. Please consider our opinions about how accurate and fair coverage of all communities, especially our own, can be achieved. Collectively, the industry has responded to generations of black journalists with indifference at best and open hostility at its frequent worst. Black journalists are hired and told — sometimes explicitly — that we can thrive only if we don’t dare to be our full selves. Frequently, when we speak out about coverage that is inaccurate or otherwise lacking, we are driven from newsrooms — which results in fewer experienced black candidates in the room when it comes time to hire for senior editorships. That, in turn, results in coverage that continues to miss the mark, which leaves the now dwindling ranks of black journalists both ostracized and fighting to speak out. Similarly negative experiences have been shared by Hispanic, Asian, Native, immigrant (both documented and undocumented), Muslim, gay and lesbian, transgender and gender-nonconforming journalists, too. What’s different now, in this moment, is that the editors no longer hold a monopoly on publishing power. Individual reporters now have followings of our own on social media platforms, granting us the ability to speak directly to the public. It is, then, no coincidence that after decades of pleading with management, black journalists are now making demands on Twitter. If recent years have taught black journalists anything, it’s that public embarrassment appears to make our bosses better hear us. But humility and attentiveness don’t have to be isolated to crises. Instead of consistently attempting to censor the crucial personnel of color on their own staffs — who consistently deliver the best of their journalism — the leaders of America’s newsrooms could consider truly listening to them. As I stood on that street corner in Roxbury as a cub reporter all those years ago, the man I’d approached told me that years earlier a family member had been wrongfully arrested. He said the paper printed his relative’s full criminal history, as well as a mug shot from an unrelated incident. There had been no follow-up when his loved one was later cleared of the crime. I told him that I understood why he was still upset and that it did sound pretty messed up, before tucking my notebook into my back pocket and turning to leave. “Hey, kid! What was it you wanted to know about?” he asked. “The stabbing?” For years, he’d waited for the chance to tell off a Globe reporter. And now that he had, and had been heard, he wanted to help me tell the story, and get it right.

#### 4] Analysis through the lens of statehood and security is good – vigilance solves their offense and turns the alt.

Robin Luckham 17, Emeritus fellow at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, “Whose violence, whose security? Can violence reduction and security work for poor, excluded and vulnerable people?” Peacebuilding, 5:2, 99-117

6. The two faces of security – and of peace Security, especially state security, tends to be enacted in contexts of the violently contested political authority. Often it is enacted through violent power, rebranded as legitimate force. Small wonder that some in the development community, including those who drafted SDG 16, hesitate to use the word at all. But although security is a deeply disputed idea, it is also a highly necessary one. Security functions simultaneously as an analytical construct, as a frame for policy and as a moral narrative. It is distinct from the equally ambiguous if less contentious concept of peace. Yet, at the same time, it is often seen as essential to the preservation of peace. Most of the things that international decision-makers, political and security elites and development practitioners do in security’s name are supposed to protect the safety and welfare of people in a world of multiple challenges and threats. However, there is a tendency to slide from global, to national, to citizen and to human security and back again, without enough serious reflection on how they interconnect and on where tensions and contradictions lie hidden. Development agencies have too often plunged into security policies and programmes, without a clear understanding of where they might lead, who would benefit and how they might go wrong. The ambiguities stem in part from a deep-seated tension between two distinct visions of security (summarised in Table 3), which interconnect, yet are in deep tension with eachother. On the one hand, security can be seen as a process of political and social ordering, aiming to reduce violence and keep the peace. As such it is territorially organised and kept in place globally as well as nationally through the authoritative discourses and practices of power, including socially sanctioned violence. It connects to conceptions of what Galtung termed ‘negative peace’: the ending of overt violence, without necessarily transforming the conditions giving rise to this violence or attending to the quality of the subsequent peace. In this view security is a public good delivered in principle by states, much like official or donor-driven development.29 Yet in a world where states and indeed the international order face sustained challenges, security is often kept in place also through alternative nonstate or ‘hybrid’ networks of violence and protection.30 Moreover, security is far from being an unalloyed public good. In principle, it is equally shared and socially inclusive, even if in practice it is anything but, especially at the insurgent margins where insecurity is most acute. For in practice it protects socially embedded power, established property relations and social privilege – and reinforces global, national and local inequalities. On the other hand, security can be seen (in the vernacular) as an entitlement of citizens and more widely human beings to social peace and protection from violence, abuses of rights and social injustice, along with other existential risks such as famine or disease. It connects to the idea of ‘positive peace’, including transformations in the social conditions giving rise to violence and deepening the relationships between states and their citizens. The vernacular understandings, day-to-day experience, resilience and agency of the people and groups who are ‘secured’ and ‘developed’ are in this view the touchstone by which to evaluate security and violence reduction. Most people fall back upon their social identities – as women and men, members of families, clans, castes, ethnic groups, sects, religions and nationalities – to navigate their social worlds, to respond to insecurity