## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must define “free press” in a delineated line in the 1AC

#### Multiple types of press that fit into the definition- explicit clarification needed

Cambridge Dictionary, ND, "free press," No Publication, https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/free-press

If a country has a [free](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/free) pres[s](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/press), [its](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/its) newspapers, magazines, and [television](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/television) and [radio](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/radio) stations are [able](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/able) to express any opinions they want, even if these [criticize](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/criticize) the government and other organizations:

#### Violation: They didn’t

#### Negate:

#### 1] Shiftiness- they can redefine what free press the 1ac defends in the 1ar which decks strategy and allows them to wriggle out of negative positions which strips the neg of social media DAs, specific news stations DAs, and case answers. They will always win on specificity weighing.

#### CX can’t resolve this and is bad because A] Not flowed B] Skews 6 min of prep C] They can lie and no way to check D] Debaters can be shady.

#### 2] Real World- policy makers will always specify who the actor of change is. That outweighs since debate has no value without portable application.

#### This spec shell isn’t regressive- it literally determines who the affirmative implements the aff through.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Education – terminal impact of debate

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 2

#### Counterplan: Democracies should enact compulsory media literacy courses in high schools and create media literacy community outreach programs.

Albano 21 [Teresa Albano (Freelance writer), 8/31/21, Illinois Becomes the First State to Require Media Literacy Classes for High School Students, <https://progressive.org/latest/illinois-first-state-media-literacy-albano-210831/>]

Amidst a new era of widespread misinformation on elections, the COVID-19 pandemic, and vaccines, some states are pushing back: Illinois recently enacted a [law](https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=102-0055) requiring high schools to teach media literacy.

While many schools in the state and throughout the country teach media literacy in some way or another, Illinois is the [first](https://lasvegassun.com/news/2021/aug/15/with-misinformation-weaponized-media-literacy-is-n/) state in the nation to make it compulsory.

Starting in the 2022-2023 school year, high schools in Illinois will provide [instruction](https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=102-0055) for students to learn how to analyze and communicate information from a variety of mediums, including digital, interactive, audio, visual, and print.

The law also asks students to consider how media affects information consumption as well as its impact on human emotions and behaviors. A civics and social responsibility section allows students to engage with each other in thoughtful, respectful, and inclusive dialogue.

The bill passed the General Assembly almost exclusively along party lines, with only three [Republican](https://openstates.org/vote/660f72e1-19f5-4dad-bc55-4e5c5f107a70/) state senators voting for it. Governor J.B. Pritzker, a Democrat, [signed](https://www.capitolnewsillinois.com/NEWS/media-literacy-requirement-animal-products-ban-among-latest-53-bills-signed-by-pritzker) the bill into law on July 9, 2021. It amends the state’s school code to add media literacy to the already [required](https://patch.com/illinois/chicago/senate-bill-seeks-add-media-literacy-high-school-curriculum) computer literacy mandate.

**Creates an infrastructure for effective Adult-Ed which solves quickly**

Kavanagh 18 [political scientist at the RAND Corporation and associate director of the Strategy, Doctrine, and Resources Program in the RAND Arroyo Center; and Michael D. Rich, president and chief executive officer of the RAND Corporation, 2018, Truth Decay: An Initial Exploration of the Diminishing Role of Facts and Analysis in American Public Life] Recut Jet Recut Cookie JX Recut SJKS Recut SJ//VM Recut Justin Recut SJ//JK //Re-cut Elmer Recut SJ//DL Recut sjvc Recut B1ack ZD Recut Ph1l1m0nst3r Recut SJCP//JG Recut SJBE Recut SJ AMe Recut 4n33l Recut Aadit Recut n33l Recut Jay Recut Plano RP Recut SJMS Recut Yaters but for real Recut Jet

As noted, a lack of attention to civic education and media literacy can also affect adults. The absence of effective community outreach and adult or continuing education programs at the national level in these areas is as much a driver of Truth Decay as the gap between school curricula and the demands of the information system. Just as students without the proper training may be vulnerable to consuming and disseminating misinformation, adults who are unable to critically evaluate sources, to seek out unbiased sources of information, or able to distinguish between fact and opinion will be equally likely to become victims of opinion sold as fact or disinformation spread intentionally and equally likely to spread this information to others, perpetuating and worsening the challenges posed by Truth Decay. Attacking this problem in elementary, middle, and high schools may be easier than targeting adults, who would need to come voluntarily and who might already have well-formed biases that would prevent them from fully absorbing any program that aims to increase civic and media literacy. However, it might be possible to use community outreach programs (offered through libraries or operated through schools but also targeted at parents) to promote media and civic literacy among adults who are out of school or even in a family-based forum where children and adults could learn skills together. Were it created, this type of infrastructure could help relieve some of the pressure on schools, as it would provide another form of outreach targeted at older generations. This type of program might be difficult to implement or scale, but it is an approach worth exploring.

**Solves –**

**1] Training and demand for high quality content**

ASP 17 [American Security Project, With Fake News, Knowledge is Power – The Case for Media Literacy, November 7, https://www.americansecurityproject.org/knowledge-is-power-media-literacy/] Recut Jet

In the US, there are myriad organizations that focus on the issue of media literacy. One of the most prominent is the National Association of Media Literacy Education (NAMLE), the organization behind US Media Literacy Week. The organization has been advocating for media literacy since the 90s, but since the 2016 elections, it’s been getting a lot more attention. NAMLE partners with local schools and teachers to implement curriculum that focuses on source evaluation and gives students the tools they need to navigate the changing media environment. However, there are some challenges to implementing media literacy programs across the US. Education is an issue largely left to the states, so it’s much more difficult to pass a sweeping media literacy law. There’s currently active legislation in 12 states concerning media literacy, and NAMLE is working with lawmakers to do more. Even so, progress has been slow. Another challenge for media literacy advocates is the lack of research. When I spoke to Michelle Ciulla Lipkin, Executive Director of NAMLE, over the phone, she told me that although there are large amounts of anecdotal evidence, the field still lacks research and assessment. More research would help fine tune the methods used for media literacy education. Fortunately, the limited research that does exist on this topic shows reason for optimism. A 2016 study published in the American Educational Research Journal found that students exposed to media literacy training showed a “large, statistically significant difference” in their ability to evaluate the accuracy of a source, compared to students who had no exposure to media literacy training. Other countries have also been using media literacy to fight against Russian disinformation. One of the best examples is the [Learn2Discern](https://www.irex.org/project/learn-discern) program in Ukraine, a training methodology program that uses interactive modules to teach citizens about media. Learn2Discern was able to provide [concrete statistics](https://www.irex.org/insight/ukrainians-self-defense-against-information-war-what-we-learned-learn-discern) that showed that the program was working. The program observed a 24% increase in participants’ ability to distinguish trustworthy news from fake news, a 22% increase in those who cross-check the information in the news they consume, and a 26% increase in participants’ confidence in analyzing news. Coupled with other measures to limit foreign media influence (such as forcing RT to register as a foreign agent), media literacy provides a good path forward. The media literacy approach allows the US to avoid impinging on freedom of the press, while simultaneously creating a greater demand for accurate news sources. This long-term solution would aid national security by making the US less likely to fall victim to foreign propaganda and influence.

#### 2] Literacy builds immunological resistances against disinformation and signals political costs which immediately reduces propaganda

Chessen 17 [Foreign Service Science, Technology and Foreign Policy Fellow at The George Washington University, UNDERSTANDING THE PSYCHOLOGY BEHIND COMPUTATIONALPROPAGANDA, PUBLIC DIPLOMACY SURVIVE THE INTERNET? BOTS, ECHOCHAMBERS, AND DISINFORMATION, <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/271028.pdf>] Recut Jet

Computational propaganda is not a vision of the future. Computational propagandists are using MADCOMs now to exploit all of these persuasive techniques. Emerging artificial intelligence technologies will improve the effectiveness of MADCOMs and computational propaganda significantly over the nextseveralyears.21 These insights from cognitive psychology and persuasion may imply or suggest best practices for public diplomacy professionals, but there are multiple— and sometimes conflicting—perspectives on nearly any topic. Emily Thorson, an assistant professor of media and public affairs at the George Washington University, illustrates one facet of this complexity: “The existence of belief echoes provides an enormous incentive for politicians to strategically spread false information with the goal of shaping public opinion on key issues. However, results from two more experiments show that politicians also suffer consequences for making false claims, an encouraging finding that has the potential to constrain the behavior of politicians presented with the opportunity to strategically create belief echoes. While the existence of belief echoes may also provide a disincentive for the media to engage in serious fact-checking, evidence also suggests that such efforts can also have positive consequences by increasing citizens’ trust in media”22 Similarly, much of the literature suggests that directly counter-messaging disinformation with corrections may be ineffective or counterproductive. This implies that any counter-messaging should be focused on short-circuiting misinformation before it goes viral, a difficult and resource intensive proposition. This messaging would be immunological rather than counter—designed to build resistance to the disinformation in targeted communities before the disinformation has time to infect them, rather than directly contradicting the disinformation. However, other research suggests that there are specific conditions under which corrections of disinformation can be effective.23 This would call for more selective and precise applications of counter-messaging. Other studies show that many of the misinformed are likely to have already encountered and rejected correct information that was discomforting to their self-concept or worldview.2

## 3

#### Policies that promote objectivity become the pretext for government crackdowns on legitimate journalism

West 17 Darrell M. West (Vice President and Director - Governance Studies Senior Fellow - Center for Technology Innovation Douglas Dillon Chair in Governmental Studies) 12/18/2017, How to combat fake news and disinformation, Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/>Karan

Government harassment of journalists is a serious problem in many parts of the world. United Nations Human Rights Council Special Rapporteur David Kaye notes that “all too many leaders see journalism as the enemy, reporters as rogue actors, tweeps as terrorists, and bloggers as blasphemers.”[[23]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-23) In Freedom House’s most recent report on global press freedoms, researchers found that media freedom was at its lowest point in 13 years and there were “unprecedented threats to journalists and media outlets in major democracies and new moves by authoritarian states to control the media, including beyond their borders.”[[24]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/" \l "footnote-24) Journalists can often be accused of generating fake news and there have been numerous cases of legitimate journalists being arrested or their work being subject to official scrutiny. In Egypt, an Al-Jazeera producer was arrested on charges of “incitement against state institutions and broadcasting fake news with the aim of spreading chaos.”[[25]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/" \l "footnote-25) This was after the network broadcast a documentary criticizing Egyptian military conscription. Some governments have also moved to create government regulations to control information flows and censor content on social media platforms. Indonesia has established a government agency to “monitor news circulating online” and “tackle fake news.”[[26]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-26) In the Philippines, Senator Joel Villanueva has introduced a bill that would impose up to a five-year prison term for those who publish or distribute “fake news,” which the legislation defined as activities that “cause panic, division, chaos, violence, and hate, or those which exhibit a propaganda to blacken or discredit one’s reputation.”[[27]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/" \l "footnote-27) Critics have condemned the bill’s definition of social networks, misinformation, hate speech, and illegal speech as too broad, and believe that it risks criminalizing investigative journalism and limiting freedom of expression. Newspaper columnist Jarius Bondoc noted “the bill is prone to abuse. A bigot administration can apply it to suppress the opposition. By prosecuting critics as news fakers, the government can stifle legitimate dissent. Whistleblowers, not the grafters, would be imprisoned and fined for daring to talk. Investigative journalists would cram the jails.”[[28]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/#footnote-28) In a situation of false information, it is tempting for legal authorities to deal with offensive content and false news by forbidding or regulating it. For example, in Germany, legislation was passed in June 2017 that forces digital platforms to delete hate speech and misinformation. It requires large social media companies to “delete illegal, racist or slanderous comments and posts within 24 hours.” Companies can be fined up to $57 million for content that is not deleted from the platform, such as Nazi symbols, Holocaust denials, or language classified as hate speech.[[29]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/" \l "footnote-29) The German legislation’s critics have complained that its definition of “obviously” illegal speech risks censorship and a loss of freedom of speech. As an illustration, the law applies the rules to social media platforms in the country with more than 2 million users. Commentators have noted that is not a reasonable way to define relevant social networks. There could be much smaller networks that inflict greater social damage. In addition, it is not always clear how to identify objectionable content.[[30]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/" \l "footnote-30) While it is pretty clear how to define speech advocating violence or harm to other people, it is less apparent when talking about hate speech or “defamation of the state.” What is considered “hateful” to one individual may not be to someone else. There is some ambiguity regarding what constitutes hate speech in a digital context. Does it include mistakes in reporting, opinion piece commentary, political satire, leader misstatements, or outright fabrications? Watchdog organizations complained that “overly broad language could affect a range of platforms and services and put decisions about what is illegal content into the hands of private companies that may be inclined to over-censor in order to avoid potential fines.”[[31]](https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-to-combat-fake-news-and-disinformation/" \l "footnote-31) Overly restrictive regulation of internet platforms in open societies sets a dangerous precedent and can encourage authoritarian regimes to continue and/or expand censorship. This will restrict global freedom of expression and generate hostility to democratic governance. Democracies that place undue limits on speech risk legitimizing authoritarian leaders and their efforts to crackdown basic human rights. It is crucial that efforts to improve news quality not weaken journalistic content or the investigative landscape facing reporters.

#### Gov. crackdowns on media are a form of soft authoritarianism that escalates into complete tyranny

Christensen 21 Christensen, Devin (PhD in Political Science, UNC, Chapel Hill), John Lovett, and John A. Curiel. "Mainstream Media Recirculation of Trust-Reducing Social Media Messages." American Politics Research (2021): 1532673X211023931.

Trump’s consistent hostility and violent reactivity to criticism on Twitter mimicked the media outreach strategies of so-called “soft” authoritarian leaders seeking to undermine democratic norms and institutions in order to consolidate power in themselves. **“Soft” authoritarianism differs from the more brutal “hard” authoritarianism associated with tyrannical regimes such as Nazi Germany and Stalin’s USSR. While infamous authoritarians, such as Stalin or Pol Pot, could compliment their cult of personality with the unfettered coercive power of the state, soft authoritarians are forced to grapple with adversarial democratic institutions that split and balance authority (Gandhi & Okar, 2009; Márquez, 2016, 2018; Schatz, 2009). In order to consolidate power, soft authoritarians must play a long game where they start by undermining these adversarial institutions until the institutions are too weak to resist the authoritarian’s bid for power (Cheibub et al., 2010; Gandhi & Okar, 2009; Márquez, 2016, 2018). The media is one adversarial institution that soft authoritarians must either degrade or coopt in order to consolidate power in themselves.** As Schatz (2009) notes, through “discursive preemption,” the soft authoritarian seeks to “maintain the upper hand in guiding the media to project images that strengthen his position” in a way that “may flirt with outright propaganda” but which maintains a veneer of transparency and legitimacy (207). For example, in 2005, Kazahki President Nazarbaev preempted charges of electoral fraud in his reelection with what appeared to be leaked documents showing that the opposition planned to allege fraud against the regime regardless, which in turn blunted the impact of the scandal (Schatz, 2011). By diluting public discourse with misinformation and false labels of inaccuracy, citizens lose faith in journalistic credibility (Freeze et al., 2020) and “no one can criticize power, because there is no basis upon which to do so” (Snyder, 2017, p. 65, 71**). Authoritarians then capitalize on growing distrust in institutions by promulgating their own salvation narrative, usually in defense of the “common man” (Schatz, 2009). Effective salvation narratives require the social amplification of a crisis, followed by blaming the “other” for the crisis and other problems that can stick (Waring, 2013; Waring & Glendon, 1998; Waring & Paxton, 2018). By controlling the media, authoritarians can deny wrongdoing, delegitimize their opponents and oppositional institutions (including traditional media outlets themselves), and spin a narrative that the state is sick. The only cure for this sickness, the authoritarian claims, is to trust in the leader and grant them the authority to set things straight (Svilicic & Maldini, 2014).**

#### Authoritarianism causes a laundry list of catastrophic impacts.

Kasparov and Halvorssen 17 [Garry Kasparov and Thor Halvorssen \*Chairman of the New York-based Human Rights Foundation \*\*Thor Halvorssen is the foundation’s president and chief executive. “Opinion: Why the rise of authoritarianism is a global catastrophe.” Washington Post. 2/13/17. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/democracy-post/wp/2017/02/13/why-the-rise-of-authoritarianism-is-a-global-catastrophe/>] Justin

Last month the world’s elite listened politely as Chinese President Xi Jinping offered the keynote address at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. Of course, the leader of the Chinese dictatorship didn’t mention how he and his cronies jail and disappear human rights activists, persecute ethnic minorities and religious groups, and operate a vast censorship and surveillance system, among other evils. It is striking that a forum dedicated to “improving the state of the world” would offer such an important stage to the leader of a repressive regime. Xi began his remarks in part by asking “What has gone wrong with the world?” The fact is, he’s part of the problem. At present, the authoritarianism business is booming. According to the Human Rights Foundation’s research, the citizens of 94 countries suffer under non-democratic regimes, meaning that 3.97 billion people are currently controlled by tyrants, absolute monarchs, military juntas or competitive authoritarians. That’s 53 percent of the world’s population. Statistically, then, authoritarianism is one of the largest — if not the largest — challenges facing humanity. Consider the scale of some of the world’s other crises. About 836 million live under extreme poverty, and 783 million lack clean drinking water. War and conflict have displaced 65 million from their homes. Between 1994 and 2013 an annual average of 218 million people were affected by natural disasters. These are terrible, seemingly intractable problems — but at least there are United Nations bodies, aid organizations and State Department teams dedicated to each one of them. Dictators and elected authoritarians, by contrast, get a free pass. The World Bank bails out repressive regimes on a regular basis. There is no anti-tyrant U.N. task force, no Sustainable Development Goals against tyranny, no army of activists. We, the authors, have experienced the ills of authoritarianism personally. One of us has been beaten, blacklisted and forced into exile by operatives of the Kremlin. Russian President Vladimir Putin has relentlessly pushed to crush freedom of speech, brazenly annex Crimea and increase his global military activities in ways that hark back to the Cold War. The other author has seen his mother shot by Venezuelan security forces and his first cousin languish for nearly three years in a military jail as a prisoner of conscience. Today Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro runs a regime that regularly imprisons dissidents, abuses protesters and engages in such widespread graft and corruption that the country is now undergoing a catastrophic economic collapse. Putin and Maduro have co-conspirators in all parts of the world, fellow would-be tyrants who are dismantling the free press, jailing opponents, manipulating elections and committing a host of human rights violations. In Turkey, a once-promising democracy is gasping for air. Its president, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, has shut down 149 media outlets, shuttered more than 2,000 schools and universities, fired more than 120,000 civil servants and jailed more than 45,000 suspected dissenters. In North Korea, Kim Jong Un rules the most totalitarian government on Earth, brainwashing 25 million people and terrorizing them with public executions, forced famines and a vast network of concentration camps that reminded U.N. investigators of Pol Pot’s Cambodia and Nazi Germany. And there are so many lesser-known dictators in countries such as Bahrain, Kazakhstan and Equatorial Guinea, where tyrants pilfer their countries’ natural resources and pocket the profits in private off-shore accounts. To cover their atrocities, they hire lobbyists, public relations firms and even policy groups in the free world to whitewash their actions. If injustice and oppression aren’t bad enough, authoritarian governments bear an enormous social cost. Dictator-led countries have higher rates of mental illness, lower levels of health and life expectancy, and, as Amartya Sen famously argued, higher susceptibility to famine. Their citizens are less educated and file fewer patents. In 2016, more patents were filed in France than in the entire Arab world — not because Arabs are less entrepreneurial than the French, but because nearly all of them live under stifling authoritarianism. Clearly, the suppression of free expression and creativity has harmful effects on innovation and economic growth. Citizens of free and open societies such as Germany, South Korea and Chile witness advances in business, science and technology that Belarusans, Burmese and Cubans can only dream of. And consider that free nations do not go to war with each other. History has shown this to be the only ironclad law of political theory. Meanwhile, dictators are always at war, often with a foreign power and always with their own people. If you are worried about public health, poverty or peace, your mandate is clear: Oppose tyranny. Tragically, world institutions and organizations have failed to properly address authoritarianism. Western governments sometimes protest human rights violations in countries such as Russia, Iran, and North Korea — but routinely ignore them in places such as China and Saudi Arabia, in favor of upholding trade deals and security agreements. The United Nations, established to bring peace and justice to the world, includes Cuba, Egypt and Rwanda on its Human Rights Council. Here, a representative from a democracy carries the same legitimacy as a representative from a dictatorship. One acts on behalf of its citizens, while the other acts to silence them. Between June 2006 and August 2015 the Human Rights Council issued zero condemnations of repressive regimes in China, Cuba, Egypt, Russia, Saudi Arabia and Turkey. Despite the fact that dictatorship is at the root of many global ills — poor health, failing education systems and global poverty among them — authoritarianism is hardly ever addressed at major conferences worldwide. And no wonder: Many, including the World Economic Forum and the now-defunct Clinton Global Initiative, receive ample funding from authoritarians. Few human rights groups focus exclusively on authoritarianism, and most establishment ones spend significant chunks of their budgets on criticizing democratic governments and their policies. Dictators are rarely in the spotlight. The noble struggle against tyranny has fallen upon individual activists and dissidents living under authoritarian rule or working from exile. Citizen journalists Abdalaziz Alhamza and Meron Estefanos found that few people in peaceful, free countries were interested in reporting on Syria and Eritrea, so they took it upon themselves to do so, despite the enormous danger this put them in. Hyeonseo Lee defected from North Korea to find that victims of sex trafficking in China are often abandoned and ignored, so she started pressuring the Chinese government herself. When Rosa María Payá’s father, Cuban democracy leader Oswaldo Payá, died in mysterious circumstances in 2012, it fell to her to demand a formal investigation and fair treatment for dissidents in Cuba. Such individuals are in constant need of support, because in their home countries there is no legal way to protest, no ACLU, no Washington Post and no opposition party to stand up for their rights. If authoritarianism and dictatorship are to be properly challenged — and if so many resulting crises, including military conflict, poverty and extremism, are to be addressed at their root cause — such dissidents need funding, strategic advice, technical training, attention and solidarity. To turn the tide against repression, people across all industries need to join the movement. Artists, entrepreneurs, technologists, investors, diplomats, students — no matter who you are, you can reach out to a civil society organization at risk and ask how you can help by using your knowledge, resources or skills. Today, authoritarians rule an increasingly large part of the globe, but the leaders of the free world lack the motivation and gumption to create a new U.N.-style League of Democracies. In the meantime, as individuals living in a free society, we believe it is our moral obligation to take action to expose human rights violations and to use our freedom to help others achieve theirs.

#### That culminates in rogue tech, nuclear war, and climate change.

Orts ’18 [Eric; June 27; Guardsmark Professor in the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania; LinkedIn Pulse, “Foreign Affairs: Six Future Scenarios (and a Seventh),” https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/foreign-affairs-six-future-scenarios-seventh-eric-orts]

7. Fascist Nationalism. There is another possible future that the Foreign Affairs scenarios do not contemplate, and it’s a dark world in which Trump, Putin, Xi, Erdogan, and others construct regimes that are authoritarian and nationalist. Fascism is possible in the United States and elsewhere if big business can be seduced by promises of riches in return for the institutional keys to democracy. Perhaps Foreign Affairs editors are right to leave this dark world out, for it would be very dark: nationalist wars with risks of escalation into global nuclear conflict, further digital militarization (even Terminator-style scenarios of smart military robots), and unchecked climate disasters.

The global challenges are quite large – and the six pieces do an outstanding job of presenting them. One must remain optimistic and engaged, hopeful that we can overcome the serious dangers of tribalism, nationalism, and new fascism. These "isms” of our time stand in the way of solving some of our biggest global problems, such as the risks of thermonuclear war and global climate catastrophe.

## 4

#### Ethics must begin a priori and the meta-ethic is bindingness.

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [2] Bindingness – I can keep asking “why should I follow this” which results in skep since obligations are predicated on ignorantly accepting rules. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason which is self-justified.

#### That means we must universally will maxims— any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] All other frameworks collapse—non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will.

#### [2] Aspec: JOURNALISTS CAN’T USE UTIL, PREFER DUTY BASED ETHICS

Christians 7 Christians, Clifford (Research Professor of Comunications, Professor of Journalism and Professor of Media Studies Emeritus at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign) "Utilitarianism in media ethics and its discontents." Journal of Mass Media Ethics 22.2-3 (2007): 113-131.

Utilitarian ethics has major weaknesses, despite its democratic appeal. It depends on assessing the consequences accurately, when in everyday affairs the results of our choices are often unknown, at least in the long term. Blogging is a revolution in journalism at present, but how can we calculate all the changes even a decade from now? The short-term benefits of exposing corruption in a political campaign may be offset by long-term negative consequences—public hostility to an overly aggressive press. The results are frequently complicated and intertwined so that a theory staking itself on results often does not provide adequate guidelines for morally acceptable action. Among moral philosophers, the most influential critique of utilitarianism has been developed by W. David Ross.9 Ross argued against the utilitarian claim that others are morally significant to us only when our actions impact them pro or con (1930, pp. 17–21).10 We usually find ourselves confronting more than one moral claim at the same time involving different ethical principles. Asking only what produces the most good is too limiting. It does not cover the ordinary range of human relationships and circumstances. People recognize promise keeping, equal distribution, nonviolence, and preventing injury as moral principles. In various situations any of them might be the most stringent. Ordinary moral sensitivities suggest that when someone fulfills a promise because he thinks he ought to do so, it seems clear that he does so with no thought of its total consequences:: : : What makes him think it’s right to act in a certain way is the fact that he has promised to do so—that and, usually, nothing more. (Ross, 1930, p. 17) Utilitarianism as a single-consideration theory does not simply demand that we maximize general happiness, but renders irrelevant other moral imperatives that conflict with it. As Charles Taylor argued, the exactness of this one-factor model is appealing, but represents only ‘‘a semblance of validity’’ by leaving out whatever cannot be calculated (Taylor, 1982, p. 143; cf. Bowers, 2002). In some media situations, consequences are a reliable guide. But in many of the most crucial issues we face at present, utility is not adequate—for understanding distributive justice, diversity in popular culture, violence in television and cinema, truth telling, digital manipulation, conflict of interest, and so forth. We face the anomaly that the ethical system most entrenched in the media industry is not ideally suited for resolving its most persistent headaches. In an ethics of consequences, ‘‘only the future counts with respect to what is morally significant, and not the past’’ (Dyck, 1977, p. 60). Future results, even though they are hypothetical, are determinative. But why should possible benefits in the future count more, for example, than gratitude to parents for their deeds of the past? If I made a promise in the pxast, for instance, this moral duty would be the most urgent in the present. If my previous acts have harmed someone, I have a duty of reparation, that is, making up for earlier wrongs. There are duties of justice that require us to ignore or even upset the balance of happiness (Ross, 1930, p. 21). Thus an ethics of duty is a more compelling model of moral decision making. It covers the entire time frame rather than only anticipating future effects. Duty responds to a broader range of human experiences and relations. Duty recognizes that the human community requires dutiful actions to maintain its humanness. H. Richard Niebuhr, in fact, saw responsibility as inherent in our personhood. Our selfhood is manifest in the action of answering. Our relation to other selves carries moral obligation; we respond to responders; we live in responsive relations (1963, pp. 59–61, 152–160). With a similar understanding of humans as responsible agents, Emmanuel Levinas (1981) insisted that our duties to others are more fundamental to human identity than are individual rights. An ethics of duty provides a critical framework that prevents us from having our ethical theory and democratic practice slide into one another. In terms of the overall task of developing a theoretically credible media ethics, the most promising direction is a deontological one.

#### Negate:

#### [1] Objectivity censors’ journalists’ personal views and biases- that’s non universalizable

Greven 21 Greven, Alec, "Speech and Sovereignty: A Kantian Defense of Freedom of Expression" (2021). Honors Theses. 1579.  
https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/1579 Karan

I will now outline the value of communication. The capacity to effectively communicate with others is crucial for an agent to realize their distinct ends, projects, and values. All agents need to will a world in which the value of communication is preserved in order to realize their ends. Lying and censorship are two actions that subvert the value of communication. Thus, engaging in lying and censorship is usually a hypocritical action that commits an agent to a practical contradiction. It simultaneously commits an agent to a principle that the value of communication in the world should be preserved while performing actions that subvert the value of communication. If everyone lied and censored at will then the structure of communication that the agent is practically committed to would collapse. Therefore, the liar or censor makes themselves an exception to a rule which is hypocritical and fails to respect the unity of their agency and treat others with equal moral standing.

#### [2] Journalists are required to respect those they report on, thus, advocacy journalism is required to alleviate suffering

Leshilo 18 Thabo Leshilo [A research report submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, Applied Ethics for Professionals.] “Morality and Journalists: Objectivity versus Duty of Care” 13 July 2018, Johannesburg https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10539/26530/Morality%20and%20Journalists%20(markup)\_2.pdf?sequence=1

My view is that Detached Kevin Carter used the Sudanese child as a mere means to fame and (some mini-) fortune by simply photographing her and selling her photo; he did not treat her as a human being worthy of respect when he failed to come to her aid. In another formulation of the Categorical Imperative, Kant expresses the universal imperative of duty thus: “Act as though the maxim of your action were to become, through your will, a universal law of nature” ([1785] 2005, 24). The word ‘maxim’ refers to the basis on which one acts: what informs one’s action. What, indeed, would become of the world if all of us were to refuse to help people facing great hardship the way (some) journalists claim to be entitled to do? Kant also implores us to act beneficently, and might as well have had the Detached Kevin Carter in mind when he admonishes someone in a position to help, who does not: What concern of mine is it? Let each one be as happy as heaven wills, or as he can make himself; I won’t take anything from him or even envy him; but I have no desire to contribute to his welfare or help him in time of need. (25) According to Kant, although it is possible that a maxim such as the one quoted above should be a universal law of nature “it is impossible to will that it [be] so . . . [f]or a will that brought that about would conflict with itself, since instances can often arise in which the person in question would need the love and sympathy of others, and he would have no hope of getting the help he desires, being robbed of it by this law of nature springing from his own will” (ibid.). Expanding on this, Charles Fried (2007,206) says that we are all required to recognise that human beings have certain basic rights to which they are all entitled as human beings: These rights are subject to qualification only in order to ensure equal protection of the same rights in others. In this sense the view is Kantian; it requires recognition of persons as ends, and forbids the overriding of their most fundamental interests for the purpose of maximizing the happiness or welfare of others. (ibib.) Fried goes on to say that this recognition that all humans have moral entitlements, correlates with the concept of respect – the attitude which is manifested when a person observes the constraints of the principle of morality in his dealings with another person, and thus respects the basic rights of the other. Respect is also an attitude which may be taken in part as defining the concept of a person: persons are those who are obliged to observe the constraints of the principle of morality in their dealings with each other, and thus show respect towards each other. (207) On Kant’s account, a person commands respect by virtue of being a rational being. “I maintain that man – and in general every rational being – exists as an end in himself and not merely as a means to be used by this or that at its discretion” ([1785] 2005, 28). I argue that Kant’s ‘Formula of the End in Itself’ (or ‘Principle of Humanity’) compels journalists to go the extra mile to help alleviate the suffering of those that they report on, and even take action to save their lives. When they fail to do that and instead simply report on such plight with the clinical detachment displayed by Detached Kevin Carter towards the Sudanese child, they simply use their subjects as mere means to make money and build their careers. By acting this way, journalists act unjustly and wrongfully. That is because a victim of such tragedy would ordinarily expect another human being to help to alleviate his or her suffering.

## Case

#### Facts can’t convince climate skeptics but advocacy can.

Spencer Bokat-Lindell 20 (Writer, NY Times) 1/2/2020, So You Want to Convince a Climate Change Skeptic, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/02/opinion/climate-change-deniers.html

Lead with values, not facts

If you want to convince someone about climate change, don’t lead with data, [writes Katharine Hayhoe](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/31/opinion/sunday/climate-change-evangelical-christian.html) in The Times. Dr. Hayhoe is a climate scientist at Texas Tech University, and she’s also an evangelical Christian, two identities she realized after moving from Canada were “supposed to be entirely incompatible” in the United States. Understanding why that’s the case is crucial when attempting to convert climate change skeptics, she writes, explaining:

It turns out, it’s not where we go to church (or don’t) that determines our opinion on climate. It’s not even our religious affiliation. Hispanic Catholics are [significantly more likely](https://www.pewforum.org/2015/06/16/catholics-divided-over-global-warming/) than other Catholics to say the earth is getting warmer, according to a 2015 survey, and they have the same pope. It’s because of the alliance between conservative theology and conservative politics that has been deliberately engineered and fostered over decades of increasingly divisive politics on issues of race, abortion and now climate change, to the point where the best predictor of whether we agree with the science is simply where we fall on the political spectrum.

In her experience, Dr. Hayhoe has found that the best way to neutralize the partisan charge on climate change is not by appealing to science — which some prominent Republicans, such as [Senator Ted Cruz](https://www.cnbc.com/video/2016/04/15/global-warming-a-religion-not-science-ted-cruz.html), have cast as a competitor to religion — but by emphasizing shared values. “For some, this could be the well-being of our community,” she writes. “For others, our children; and for fellow Christians, it’s often our faith.”

In such conversations, it may be important to remember how your interlocutor’s values differ from your own. In Vice, [Maggie Puniewska points to](https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/a3d35a/how-to-sway-a-climate-change-skeptic) the [moral foundations theory](https://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/25/books/review/the-righteous-mind-by-jonathan-haidt.html), according to which liberals and conservatives prioritize different ethics: the former compassion, fairness and liberty, the latter purity, loyalty and obedience to authority. Ms. Puniewska writes:

If you’re trying to convince someone who leans left, you can stick with the polar bear and keep tugging at their heart strings with talk of how unfair it will be to our children if the world is poisoned, but if you’re with a conservative, it’s wise to change up your approach — science has found that personalized climate-related messages work better.

For example, [research has found](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295677478_Red_White_and_Blue_Enough_to_Be_Green_Effects_of_Moral_Framing_on_Climate_Change_Attitudes_and_Conservation_Behaviors) that conservatives are more likely to support a pro-environmental agenda when presented with messages containing themes of patriotism and defending the purity of nature.

#### Data proves.

University of Oregon, 5/27/21, Climate skeptics not easily persuaded by available evidence, now or later, <https://phys.org/news/2021-05-climate-skeptics-easily-evidence.html>

Climate skeptics who aren't persuaded by the existing evidence from climate change are unlikely to change their minds for many years, according to a newly published quantitative study by a University of Oregon environmental economist.

The central question posed by the study published in the journal Climate Change was "How much evidence would it take to convince skeptics that they are wrong?" The answer depended on the degree of skepticism. The study modeled two types of hypothetical skeptics—those who were less extreme and believed the change in temperature was slight, as well as more extreme skeptics who believed the change was nonexistent—and exposed them to climate data recorded between 1866 and 2005, as well as future projections until the end of the century.

"If a climate skeptic is unpersuaded by the evidence that is already available to them today, my model implies that they will likely remain a skeptic for many years into future," said author Grant McDermott, an assistant professor in the University of Oregon Department of Economics interested in the interaction between human and natural systems. "Why? Because it suggests their prior beliefs are so strong that even decades of continued warming may not be enough to convince them."

#### On democracy-the internal link is about having a press

#### Republicans don’t care about citizens who want to act on Climate Change

Samantha Gross 21 (Director - Energy Security and Climate Initiative Fellow - Foreign Policy, Energy Security and Climate Initiative AT Brookings Institution)5/10/21, Republicans in Congress are out of step with the American public on climate, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/planetpolicy/2021/05/10/republicans-in-congress-are-out-of-step-with-the-american-public-on-climate/

A majority of Americans understand that climate change is a problem. A recent poll found that about six in 10 adults in the United States say the effects of global warming are already happening and a slightly greater proportion believe human activities are to blame for the Earth’s rise in temperature. Another study found that 65% of Americans believe that climate change is an emergency. Americans’ concern about climate translates into approval for action: 83% favor tax breaks for utilities that develop renewable power and 62% favor taxing companies for their greenhouse gas emissions. Such opinions are not just held among Democratic voters. A poll just before the 2020 election showed more than three-quarters of Republican voters favor government action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It’s not just the American people that are concerned about the climate and favor action. The American Petroleum Institute (API), a trade association that represents America’s oil and gas industry, announced in March 2021 a slate of actions that it favors to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including a price on carbon. Several large European oil and gas companies have set goals of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050. U.S.-based companies generally haven’t taken this step, but several have come out in favor of a price on carbon emissions. Some skeptics believe that oil company support for carbon policy is cynical, an attempt to prevent even more onerous regulation or a ploy to protect investments in natural gas or carbon capture. But even if the shift is tinged with cynicism, it still provides an opening for conversation and policymaking. The U.S. financial industry is on board as well. The Climate Finance Working Group is made up of several trade associations for banks and financial institutions. In February 2021, the group issued a list of policy principals that would encourage financing for a low-carbon transition, including science-based policy in alignment with the Paris Agreement, long-term policy signals to foster innovation, and a price on carbon. Living and working in Germany for the past few months, I am frequently asked why U.S. greenhouse gas policy is behind Europe, when the United States will establish a price on carbon, and similar questions. The answer to those questions is Congress, where Republicans stand steadfast against serious legislation to deal with climate. Many Republicans legislators still reject the science of climate change, a position not held by other mainstream parties in democratic countries, but rising among far-right parties in Europe. Their positions have not kept up with their constituents, or even some business groups with which they are typically aligned. After the API made its announcement, Senator John Barrasso of Wyoming, the ranking Republican on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, issued a statement saying, “Proposals that impose a cost on carbon will hurt American families.” In April, Representative Scott Perry of Pennsylvania announced at a hearing of a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that he planned to introduce a bill to withdraw the United States from the United Nations Framework Commission on Climate Change. He introduced his bill, which has no chance of passing, on Earth Day. How did we get here? A total unwillingness to cooperate with Democrats is part of the problem. The polarized atmosphere in Washington is such that it is difficult for a Republican to support anything proposed by the Biden administration, lest they be demonized by right-wing media and the party’s activist base. A lack of honesty exacerbates this problem. Just in the last few days there was a flareup on the political right that President Joe Biden’s climate plan intended to severely limit Americans’ meat consumption. His plan said no such thing, but as the saying goes, a lie can travel around the world while the truth is lacing up its boots. The climate policies that Biden has proposed so far are a mix of executive action and proposals for Congress to fund climate-friendly investments. His American Jobs Plan includes encouragement for electric vehicle purchases and charging station construction, a clean electricity standard and tax credits for clean electricity development, and support for low-carbon industrial processes. He’s more focused on carrots than sticks, in part because carrots are easier to get through a skeptical Congress. Yet those policies are condemned by Republicans as “socialism.” “Our best future won’t come from Washington schemes or socialist dreams,” said Senator Tim Scott of South Carolina in response to President Biden’s first address to a joint session of Congress, on April 28. The situation of one political party out of step with a majority of the American people seems like an unsteady state, a disequilibrium that cannot hold. As an American concerned about climate and looking toward a low-carbon future, I wish that were so. But the Republican Party is sticking together in opposition. Although 57% of Republican voters support the American Jobs Plan, Republicans in Congress are saying no. The anti-majoritarian structure of the Senate gives the minority power to block legislation and require 60 votes for passage. Democrats can take advantage of their narrow control of the Senate to pass support for green investments through the budget reconciliation process, and perhaps afterward point out the popularity of the legislation among average Republicans. But in today’s tribal political environment, will it matter? Ultimately, hope for change among Congressional Republicans lies with voters, who say they care about climate, but haven’t made it a central issue determining their vote. Unless and until that changes, I fear that U.S. climate gridlock will continue.

#### Shanahan 11 is wrong

#### The card repeatedly says “may” or “might” – the only empirical example of climate journalism changing opinions is that Costa Rica drew up a strategy in 2007 calling for carbon neutrality by 2021. That example should count against the aff – some bureaucrats drew up a plan but it was never implemented. They made a new plan which wouldn’t reach carbon neutrality until 2050, but they’re not even following that and won’t reach neutrality until 2085. My evidence outweighs on recency.

Climate Action Tracker 2020 Climate Action Tracker (The Climate Action Tracker is an independent scientific analysis that tracks government climate action and measures it against the globally agreed Paris Agreement aim of "holding warming well below 2°C, and pursuing efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C." A collaboration of two organisations, Climate Analytics and NewClimate Institute, the CAT has been providing this independent analysis to policymakers since 2009.) “Costa Rica,” <https://climateactiontracker.org/countries/costa-rica/> Last Update December 2020.

The CAT rates Costa Rica’s climate targets and policies as “Almost sufficient”. The “Almost sufficient” rating indicates that **while Costa Rica’s climate policies are consistent with the Paris Agreement**’s 1.5°C temperature limit, **its climate commitments are not, but could be with moderate improvements.**

Costa Rica’s 2030 emissions reduction target of “maximum absolute net emissions of 9.11 MtCO2e incl. LULUCF” is rated as “Almost sufficient” when compared to modelled domestic emissions pathways and “1.5°C Paris Agreement compatible” when compared with its fair-share contribution to climate action. Costa Rica’s policies are in line to what is needed to limit warming to 1.5°C, but its target need some improvements. **While Costa Rica’s target meets its fair-share contribution to limiting warming to 1.5°C, it needs additional support to implement additional policies and to strengthen its reduction target**, in order to get national emissions on a pathway compatible with 1.5°C.

We rate Costa Rica’s policies and actions—based on our assessment from 30 July 2020—as “1.5°C Paris Agreement compatible”. The “1.5°C Paris Agreement compatible” rating indicates that Costa Rica’s climate policies and action are consistent with limiting warming to 1.5°C. Costa Rica’s climate policies and action do not require other countries to make comparably deeper reductions. Costa Rica’s projections from policies and action will be updated in the coming months, and its rating could change.

Costa Rica is the first Latin American country where a COVID-19 case was reported but, due to its swift political response, the government has so far been able to keep transmission rates low. A recession in 2020 is nonetheless inevitable due to the drop in tourism, which resulted in a loss of over 350 million USD in the month of April 2020 alone, and domestic activity. In a recent speech, President Carlos Alvarado recognised the importance of a green recovery, stressing that in these difficult times Costa Rica “raises the voice of solidarity and union to tell the world to invest its resources in the fight against climate change.”

**The National Decarbonisation Plan is more ambitious than Costa Rica’s Paris Agreement** **targets for 2030 and 2050**. The government presented an updated Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) in December 2020, which was informed by the National Decarbonisation plan, as well as other climate policy planning documents, including the National Strategic 2050 plan.

Costa Rica has had ambitious goals on climate for the last ten years, but its policies are now catching up. **According to our analysis, under a pathway following the current NDC commitments, Costa Rica would achieve carbon neutrality in 2085**. However, **if Costa Rica were to implement all the new policies mentioned in its new Decarbonisation Plan, it could achieve carbon neutrality 35 years earlier, i.e. by 2050.**