# FW

## Value

#### Our value for today is morality because of the word ought in the resolution implying a moral obligation

## Criterion

#### Morality means we must treat others as ends in themselves.

Korsgaard ’83 (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR) // LEX JB [brackets for gendered language]

The argument shows how Kant's idea of justification works. It can be read as a kind of regress upon the conditions, starting from an important assumption. The assumption is that **when a rational being makes a choice or undertakes an action, [they] supposes the object to be good, and its pursuit to be justified**. At least, if there is a categorical imperative there must be objectively good ends, for then there are necessary actions and so necessary ends (G 45-46/427-428 and Doctrine of Virtue 43-44/384-385). **In order for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a sufficient condition of their goodness**. Kant considers what this might be**: it cannot be an object of inclination**, for those have only a conditional worth, "**for if the inclinations and the needs founded on them did not exist, their object would be without worth**" (G 46/428). It cannot be the inclinations themselves because a rational being would rather be free from them. Nor can it be external things, which serve only as means. So, Kant asserts, **the unconditionally valuable thing must be "humanity"** or "rational nature," which he defines as "the power set to an end" (G 56/437 and DV 51/392). Kant explains that **regarding your existence as a rational being as an end in itself is a "subjective principle of human action."** By this I understand him to mean that **we must regard ourselves as capable of** conferring **value upon the objects of our choice, the ends that we set, because we must regard our ends as good**. But since "every other rational being thinks of his existence by the same rational ground which holds also for myself' (G 47/429), **we must regard others as capable of conferring value by reason of their rational choices and so also as ends in themselves**. Treating another as an end in itself thus involves making that person's ends as far as possible your own (G 49/430). The ends that are chosen by any rational being, possessed of the humanity or rational nature that is fully realized in a good will, take on the status of objective goods. They are not intrinsically valuable, but they are objectively valuable in the sense that every rational being has a reason to promote or realize t hem. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happiness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

#### Prefer additionally –

#### [1] Kantian theory has the best tools for fighting oppression through combatting ethical egoism and abstraction

Farr 02 [Arnold (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32 // LEX JB]

**One of the most popular criticisms of Kant’s** moral philosophy is that it is too formalistic.13 That is, the universal nature of the categorical imperative leaves it devoid of content. Such a principle is useless since moral decisions are made by concrete individuals in a concrete, historical, and social situation. This type of criticism lies behind Lewis Gordon’s rejection of any attempt to ground an antiracist position on Kantian principles. The rejection of universal principles for the sake of emphasizing the historical embeddedness of the human agent is widespread in recent philosophy and social theory. I will argue here on Kantian grounds that although a distinction between the **universal and the concrete is a valid distinction, the unity of the two is required** for an understanding of human agency. The attack on Kantian formalism began with Hegel’s criticism of the Kantian philosophy.14 The list of contemporary theorists who follow Hegel’s line of criticism is far too long to deal with in the scope of this paper. Although these theorists may approach the problem of Kantian formalism from a variety of angles, the spirit of their criticism is basically the same: The universality of the categorical imperative is an abstraction from one’s empirical conditions. Kant is often accused of making the moral agent an abstract, empty, noumenal subject. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Kantian subject is an embodied, empirical, concrete subject. However, this concrete subject has a dual nature. Kant claims in the Critique of Pure Reason as well as in the Grounding that human beings have an intelligible and empirical character.15 It is impossible to understand and do justice to Kant’s moral theory without taking seriously the relation between these two characters. The very concept of morality is impossible without the tension between the two. By “empirical character” Kant simply means that we have a sensual nature. We are physical creatures with physical drives or desires. The very fact that **I cannot simply satisfy my desires without considering the rightness or wrongness of my actions suggests that my empirical character must be held in check** by something, or else I behave like a Freudian id. My empiri- cal character must be held in check by my intelligible character, which is the legislative activity of practical reason. **It is through our intelligible character that we formulate principles that keep our empirical impulses in check. The categorical imperative is the supreme principle of morality that is constructed by the moral agent in his/her moment of self-transcendence.** What I have called self-transcendence may be best explained in the following passage by Onora O’Neill: In restricting our maxims to those that meet the test of the categorical imperative we refuse to base our lives on maxims that necessarily make our own case an exception. The reason why a universilizability criterion is morally signiﬁcant is that it makes our own case no special exception (G, IV, 404). In accepting the Categorical Imperative we accept the moral reality of other selves, and hence the possibility (not, note, the reality) of a moral community. **The Formula of Universal Law enjoins no more than that we act only on maxims that are open to others also**.16 O’Neill’s description of the universalizability criterion includes the notion of self-transcendence that I am working to explicate here to the extent that like self-transcendence, universalizable moral principles require that the individ- ual think beyond his or her own particular desires. **The individual is not allowed to exclude others as rational moral agents who have the right to act as he acts in a given situation.** For example, if I decide to use another person merely as a means for my own end I must recognize the other person’s right to do the same to me. I cannot consistently will that I use another as a means only and will that I not be used in the same manner by another. Hence, the universalizability criterion is a principle of consistency and a principle of inclusion. That is, in choosing my maxims I attempt to include the perspective of other moral agents. … Whereas most criticisms are aimed at the formulation of universal law and the formula of autonomy, our analysis here will focus on the formula of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends, since we have already addressed the problem of universality. The latter will be discussed ﬁrst. At issue here is what Kant means by “kingdom of ends.” Kant writes: “By ‘kingdom’ I understand a systematic union of different rational beings through common laws.”32 The above passage indicates that Kant recognizes different, perhaps different kinds, of rational beings; however, the problem for most critics of Kant lies in the assumption that Kant suggests that the “kingdom of ends” requires that we abstract from personal differences and content of private ends. The Kantian conception of rational beings requires such an abstraction. Some feminists and philosophers of race have found this abstract notion of rational beings problematic because they take it to mean that rationality is necessarily white, male, and European.33 Hence, the systematic union of rational beings can mean only the systematic union of white, European males. I ﬁnd this interpretation of Kant’s moral theory quite puzzling. Surely another interpretation is available. That is, the implication that in Kant’s philosophy, rationality can only apply to white, European males does not seem to be the only alternative. The problem seems to lie in the requirement of abstraction. There are two ways of looking at the abstraction requirement that I think are faithful to Kant’s text and that overcome the criticisms of this requirement. **First, the abstraction requirement may be best understood as a demand for intersubjectivity or recognition. Second, it may be understood as an attempt to avoid ethical egoism in determining maxims for our actions.** It is unfortunate that Kant never worked out a theory of intersubjectivity, as did his successors Fichte and Hegel. However, this is not to say that there is not in Kant’s philosophy a tacit theory of intersubjectivity or recognition. The abstraction requirement simply demands that in the midst of our concrete differences we recognize ourselves in the other and the other in ourselves. That is, we recognize in others the humanity that we have in common. Recognition of our common humanity is at the same time recognition of rationality in the other. We recognize in the other the capacity for selfdetermination and the capacity to legislate for a kingdom of ends. This brings us to the second interpretation of the abstraction requirement. **To avoid ethical egoism one must abstract from (think beyond) one’s own personal interest and subjective maxims. That is, the categorical imperative requires that I recognize that I am a member of the realm of rational beings.** Hence, I organize my maxims in consideration of other rational beings. Under such a principle other people cannot be treated merely as a means for my end but must be treated as ends in themselves. **The merit of the categorical imperative for a philosophy of race is that it contravenes racist ideology to the extent that racist ideology is based on the use of persons of a different race as a means to an end rather than as ends in themselves.** Embedded in the formulation of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends is the recognition of the common hope for humanity. That is, maxims ought to be chosen on the basis of an ideal, a hope for the amelioration of humanity. This ideal or ethical commonwealth (as Kant calls it in the Religion) is the kingdom of ends.34 Although the merits of Kant’s moral theory may be recognizable at this point, we are still in a bit of a bind. It still seems problematic that the moral theory of a racist is essentially an antiracist theory. Further, what shall we do with Henry Louis Gates’s suggestion that we use the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime to deconstruct the Grounding? What I have tried to suggest is that instead of abandoning the categorical imperative we should attempt to deepen our understanding of it and its place in Kant’s critical philosophy. A deeper reading of the Grounding and Kant’s philosophy in general may produce the deconstruction35 suggested by Gates. However, a text is not necessarily deconstructed by reading it against another. Texts often deconstruct themselves if read properly. To be sure, the best way to understand a text is to read it in context. Hence, if the Grounding is read within the context of the critical philosophy, the tools for a deconstruction of the text are provided by its context and the tensions within the text. Gates is right to suggest that the Grounding must be deconstructed. However, this deconstruction requires much more than reading the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime against the Grounding. It requires a complete engagement with the critical philosophy. Such an engagement discloses some of Kant’s very signiﬁcant claims about humanity and the practical role of reason. With this disclosure, deconstruction of the Grounding can begin. **What deconstruction will reveal is not necessarily the inconsistency of Kant’s moral philosophy or the racist or sexist nature of the categorical imperative, but rather, it will disclose the disunity between Kant’s theory and his own feelings about blacks and women. Although the theory is consistent and emancipatory and should apply to all persons, Kant the man has his own personal and moral problems. Although Kant’s attitude toward people of African descent was deplorable, it would be equally deplorable to reject the categorical imperative without ﬁrst exploring its emancipatory potential.**

#### [2] Consequences Fail:

#### [A] Every action has infinite stemming consequences, because every consequence can cause another consequence so we can’t predict or calculate.

#### [B] Induction is circular because it relies on the assumption that nature will hold uniform and we could only reach that conclusion through observation of past events.

#### [C] Aggregation fails – suffering is not additive you can’t compare between one migraine and 10 headaches

#### [D] Util justifies any atrocity, i.e., an incredibly miniscule and unlikely chance of extinction would categorically outweigh a 100% chance of genocide –causes cyclical violence and is extremely problematic

#### This is why I affirm: In a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

# Case

## C1 Universality

#### The Kantian idea of the universality principle means that if organizations push an agenda by twisting the truth and exploiting fears, those institutions are immoral

Penn State no date

Penn, State. Ethical Orientations: Categorical Imperative, Penn State Public Media, https://www.pagecentertraining.psu.edu/public-relations-ethics/ethical-decision-making/yet-another-test-page/ethical-orientations-categorical-imperative/.

**The Categorical Imperative**, which **comes from** sixteenth century German philosopher, Immanuel **Kant**, is an ethical orientation that **holds that one’s actions should be undertaken as** if s/he had the power to make them **universally applicable. Thus, to decide if** lying is acceptable, one should ask oneself what would happen if everyone lied? Or from a public relations position, what of **deceiving the media,** not being honest with stakeholders or publics, **using fear appeals to get people to take action, or any** number of **other dubious communication strategies**? For Kant, the answer is easy, **if everyone did it, we could not trust** individuals or **organizations.** Kant further argues that we should treat people as ends (or inherently valuable), and not as means to ends (taking advantage of people for personal gain as a situationalist might). The categorical imperative in not about doing what is easy or what people like; rather, the categorical imperative is about doing what is “right.”

#### Advocacy in the news is a violation of the univeralisty principle aswell as the categorical imperative as it uses people as a means to an end

McGowan 10

McGowan, Sean. “Https://Dc.cod.edu/Cgi/Viewcontent.cgi?Referer=Https://Www.google.com/&amp;Httpsredir=1&amp;Article=1129&amp;Context=Essai.” ESSAI, vol. 7, no. 34, 1 Apr. 2010, pp. 109–112.

This example brings me to the next point, **Kant’s** “means to an ends” **theory** (a.k.a. practical imperative) and how it **relates to media ethics.** This theory, developed by philosopher Emmanuel **Kant, explains** that **no person can be used as a means to someone’s end** because that person is an end in himself or herself (Thiroux and Krasemann 59). In other words, no human being that can think and reason towards a happy life, can be rightfully used solely to another’s benefit. T 1 McGowan: Ethics and Its Relation to the Media Published by DigitalCommons@C.O.D., 2009 110 The issue of **the Clinton affair applies** to this theory because **journalists used** the **controversy as a means to bring out the dirt** on President Clinton. From my perspective, **this** type of reporting **is immoral** because I do not see this as fulfilling the job of a journalist. **Journalism should be a means to share the latest news** to the general public **in an unbiased manner**, thus letting the public decide whether the story deserves more attention. In other words, **journalists cannot simply drag out a story** that they believe is of interest **without truly understanding public concern**. Thus it would appear a good time to bring up the point of what it is to be tenacious, especially from a journalistic perspective. “Tenacity”, as stated by Thiroux and Krasemann, “is the principle of being persistent” (Thiroux and Krasemann 392). In the world of journalism, one must uncover facts, details, and news by means of interviewing, undercover reporting, research, etc. Sometimes the ability to obtain necessary information can be more of a difficult process than others; therefore, one’s ability to persist would be the most important aspect of news coverage. This is not to be confused with the point made earlier about overly pursuing a story, which, as explained earlier, can lead to controversy. Now I will discuss the principle of truth-telling relative to media ethics. Truth-telling can be viewed in many different ways; though I will explain how **the categorical imperative is used to justify truth telling** since **it is** most used by American media (Christians, Fackler and Rotzoll 8). First I must define that Kant’s categorical imperative is **a universal law** in **that it applies to all without exception** (Thiroux and Krasemann 58). To display how it is used by journalists to logically support truth-telling, it would be stated “**In order to tell a lie, then the truth must be known; however, if everyone lied then there would be no truth; therefore, this is illogical because it is a contradiction**.” This is one of the most influential moral principles of today and is esteemed highly by journalists.

## C2 Categorical imperative

#### News outlets that put out hit pieces to “advocate” use defamation to make others means to the end, this violates the categorical imperative and is inherently immoral

Varden 10

Varden, Helga. “A Kantian Conception of Free Speech.” Freedom of Expression in a Diverse World, 2010, pp. 39–55., https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8999-1\_4.

It is because people typically cannot deprive them of what is theirs by means of their speech alone that most immoral uses of words, including lies, do not involve private wrongdoing. Instead of tracking immorality in general and lies in particular, private wrongdoing merely tracks the few instances in which speech alone has coercive power. It should therefore not come as a surprise that these instances involve lying and that Kant argues that there are two cases in which the general rule does not protect the liar: first, lying as part of contractual negotiations, and second, defamation. In both cases the lies have coercive power and so constitute private wrongdoing. The reason contractual lies have coercive power is that if I lie when I make a contract with you and you believe me, then my intention is to deprive you non-consensually of something that is yours. For example, assuming that were I honest about what you will receive for your hard-earned money, I strongly suspect you would not contract with me, say, to buy swampland in Florida. Therefore, I lie, since otherwise you would not consent to the exchange. Thus, by lying I nonconsensually deprive you of something that is yours and lying as a part of contractual negotiations is a private wrong (6: 238, 238n). What about defamation, how does it involve coercion? Attempts at **defamation** also **constitute attempts non-consensually to deprive others** of what is theirs, namely their good reputations as determined by their actions. Corresponding to a person’s innate right to freedom, Kant argues, is that person’s duty to “Be an honourable human being… Rightful honour… consists in asserting one’s worth as a human being in relation to others” (6: 236). To defend one’s rightful honor is to defend one’s right to be recognized by others solely by the deeds one has performed. Indeed, one’s reputation, Kant explains, “is an innate external belonging” (6: 295); it can originally belong only to the person whose deeds are in question. **If others spread falsehoods** about the life she has lived, then **she has the right and duty to challenge their lies** publicly, for **her reputation belongs only to her** and to no one else. A person’s **reputation is not a means subject to other people’s choice**; it is not a means others have a right to manipulate in order to pursue their own ends. **To permit this, Kant argues, would be to permit others to use your person as their own means, or to “make yourself a mere means for others”** rather than also being “at the same time an end for them” (6: 236).

#### Respect for rational beings requires that journalism adopt the categorical imperative of providing the public with information to participate in the public sphere.

**Chillon 16**, Jose Manuel. “Aristotle, Kant And Weber - Preliminary Philosophical For Journalism Ethics.” Athens Journal of Humanities & Arts 3:2. April, 2016. Web. February 12, 2022.

<https://www.athensjournals.gr/humanities/2016-3-2-2-Chillon.pdf>.

The illustrated practical reason meets the “majority” when it breaks its metaphysical or religious links, when he leaves forever the easements that do not allow it to be autonomous.23 Moral and free conscience, which are self imposed rules issued by their own reason, is the sacred tabernacle. So Kant exposes it: “It was found that the idea of **freedom was inseparably linked to** the concept of **autonomy, and** with it the universal principle of **morality** that underlies the idea of all actions of rational human beings.”24 But the **autonomy of reason** and moral law that **requires** the same **reason is not governed by** particularistic **principles seeking individual interests but principles that have** only **moral value** that is universal and unconditioned: **these principles should be respected by** everyone and **always**. **Duties**, therefore, **are not subordinated to** the **results**. Thus it is possible to act out of duty and while doing so to respect the dignity of the moral subject, a true universal legislator. **The categorical imperative**, the fundamental law of pure practical reason,25 **is the ultimate expression of duty** which is not subordinated to benefits, which is not subordinated to ends. It is an imperative which is not able to be strategically used or manipulated. There is no doubt that this conception of moral autonomy has features appreciated by contemporary moral consciousness, as can be seen in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, therefore, achievements that have shaped the moral conscience of society. The dignity of the human person can be the moral imperative for journalism too. **The categorical imperative** of journalism news is understood as a term about which there are no room privileges or negotiations. This imperative **is a**n unconditional and universalizable **cornerstone of journalistic ethics**, and its respect, that is, the representation of the law itself, a symptom, the best sign of the moral stature of professional information. In the words of Kant: “Rational beings are persons because their nature distinguishes them as ends in themselves, that is, as something that cannot be used merely as means and, therefore, limited in that sense every whim.”26 **If** the **media enforces respect for human dignity**, if the impassable limit of their professional actions is marked by respect for commonly shared moral standards and expressed in human rights, **it will** help **foster the sense of illustration**. **And this is** the **key**: the formation of a moral philosophy **of journalism**, in Kantian terms, **it is the expression of** an informative task that is committed primarily with the **freedom** of man. And, the ability of reason to determine the will and to become this way in practical reason, aims to analyze the present in which freedom has to deal with time. And this is the permanent legacy of the Enlightenment: analyze the present with critical capacity. But isn’t the present essentially a temporal dimension of media? Isn’t the present the time dimension built properly by the journalism news? Well, here is the contribution of the Kantian moral proposal to the journalistic ethics: that any **information has as a principle, moral and professional** **imperative**. An imperative that has the following formulation: **act** in **such** a way **that your** professional informative **action, promotes respect for** the **man and** his **dignity**. The kantian principle of universalization (principles valid for everyone and forever), according to Habermas, seems indisputable but not in the form of an individual imperative. It is human reason that is constitutively dialogical. Here is the essential thesis of discoursive ethics. We have to remember that these ethical theories are based not on moral consciousness, the capacity of human reason to make moral judgments, but in the language. That is, based on the ability of people to understand and to reach agreements. Thus, it is understood that language is the human faculty that makes us move from the individual person to the intersubjective one. The speaker implicitly recognizes the ability of the listener to utter words, to understand and to reach agreements. What are the rational budgets of the communicative actions, as Habermas calls them? One of these budgets is the correction of the standards, so that, every rule can be discussed. This means that their validity claims, as a rule, can become argued. If the argument about the truth claims of propositions is called the theoretical discourse, in this case, as we are concerned about the correctness of moral standards, we mean a practical discourse. A discourse that occurs when there are communication conditions as the following: to maintain a minimal logic in the argument, that the speaker states only what he believes, that every subject capable of speech and action can participate and may problematize any assertion. It seems clear that the legitimacy of the rules, in pluralistic societies such as ours, cannot be achieved regardless of the inclusive dialogue of all those involved in discursive conditions. In short, there is no prior and independent principles of intersubjetive dialogue. Communicative rationality discovers that the telos of language is understanding the agreement. From Aristotle, we know that to utter words is an eminently rational activity only if these words are understood, only if the society that surrounds the speaker knows what this means. Could it be the language and its intrinsic search for agreements, the best sign to know that the Enlightenment freedom project is still an unfinished project? And **the media, born to serve freedom, does not meet** the guidelines for the creation of professional **ethics** in their ability to colonize the world of life and, therefore, in his decisive contribution to enlightened the progress and emancipation of man? The proximity of the proposed discursive and the **deliberative democracy is guaranteed by** a **free public opinion** and a mature and responsible public opinion. So, also **the moral dimension of journalism has its** obvious political **implications**, and therefore, **good journalistic practice depends on accelerating the construction of** the deliberative **public space where citizens not only have** the **information needed to participate in the system** available, **but** they **find in media, authentic channels** for participation **in public affairs**. But beware because the media can also influence the opposite direction. In knowledge societies like ours, the close link between information and overwhelming power and influence of the media makes these have an authoritarian face almost inseparable from its emancipatory potential,27 a dual nature that greatly affects the moral discourse on media. The author has insisted that, the authenticity of the democratic system depends on good journalistic practice, according to the discursive ethics. But what determines that good practice? What conditions must be met for the rules governing the professional informative task pass the discursive test?

#### Journalists have a duty under the Categorical Imperative to tell the truth, which requires objective, accurate reporting---deception treats readers as a mere means to an end.

**Beggs 19**, Ernie. “The Importance Of Kantian Ethics For Journalists.” The Circular. April 22, 2019.

Web. February 12, 2022. <https://thecircular.org/if-youre-a-journalistyou-kant-and-you- must/>.

In the doctrine Critique of Pure Reason, **Kant considers** time and space as mentalities of **how a mind perceives the world**. **If that mind is that of journalist**, then **there is a moral obligation to** make proper sense of the how **accurately** that mind **perceive**s **events** prior to reporting of same **to** media **consumers who have put their trust in a** noble **profession to tell truths**. (Frankfurt) **Kant stated that humans must never lie** and that **this is a** perfect **duty** **which must always hold true**. **If a journalist alters a story** in any way, be it **by embellishment,** positive or negative subjective **bias,** **withholding of** essential **facts** etc, and **in doing so** alters **the true** reporting of the **story and** thereby **rendering it** a **fiction**. According to Kant’s “means to an end” preposition **this was an immoral choice** where **truthfulness is** one of **the** cornerstones of **Categorical Imperative**”. (Warburton) Otherwise, all parties to the story engage in a conspiracy of “fake news” which is a Hypothetical Imperative desire driven action and not

# Underview

### 2 Theory

#### [A] vote aff if I win a counter interp- a) time skew- skew means I need to be able to generate offense on the theory layer to rectify the skew, otherwise the neg will read theory every time to shorten the 1ar which kills engagement and education b) deters frivolous theory since neg is held accountable and only real abuse would be valid C) competing interps justifies voting for the best model of debate which is key to norming and OWs on duration in future rounds

**[B] Grant me an auto-I meet on interps that are not checked in CX. That’s key to education and fairness—there’s infinite different interps or things I can specify which proliferates frivolous theory and kills predictability. CX checks solves-- it gives me a chance to meet the interp**

#### [C] Reasonability on neg theory – Grant me RVI otherwise the neg can be infinitely abusive and there’s no way to check against this.

### 3 Prempts

#### [1] Journalists spreading misinformation impedes on others external freedom, clouding their judgements

Varden 10

Varden, Helga. “A Kantian Conception of Free Speech.” Freedom of Expression in a Diverse World, 2010, pp. 39–55., https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8999-1\_4.

Three further clarifications are in order before we can see how this conception of virtue and right delineates the boundaries of free speech. First, even though lying is not a wrongdoing from the point of right, it is important to emphasize that **if one lies, one is** indeed **responsible for** the bad **consequences** of the lie. The reason is that by **lying** one voluntarily **sets the framework** within **which another person acts**. If the other person accepts an invitation to trust a false statement, then the bearer of the lie is responsible for the bad consequences of the lie. For example, say I ask you for directions to the library and you, due to your extraordinarily bad sense of humor, lie thereby sending me in the wrong direction. It happens that your lie directs me through the most dangerous part of town, where I become the victim of wrongdoing. Because your lie sets the framework within which I make my choices, namely the set of facts by which I make my choice, you become partly responsible for what happens to me. Your **words** have **set** the **framework** within **which I exercise my external freedom** and consequently, even if unbeknownst to you, you send me into a dangerous neighborhood, **you are** still partly **responsible for what happens to me** there. **Since** the **wrongdoing befell** me **as a result of your lie,** you are responsible for the bad consequences resulting from it. Second, it is important to distinguish threats of coercion from merely immoral speech. When you threaten me, you tell me that you do not intend to interact rightfully with me in the future. Simply saying so does not deprive me of anything that is mine, of course, but if you are serious and have the ability to make a strike against me, that is, if you really are threatening me, then you intend to back up your words with physical force. When you really threaten me, neither are you uttering ‘empty words’ nor are you taking yourself to be doing so. For example, assume that instead of yielding to your threat, I begin to walk away. You then move forward to block my retreat. This signals your intention to follow through with the threat. In fact, you might engage in other acts to signal that the threat is not empty. Perhaps you crush my hat under your foot or take a baseball bat to my car. In cases like these the words contained in the threat no longer function merely as speech but take on the role of communicating an intended future wrongdoing against me. Hence, threats are not considered mere speech on this view.

#### [2] Objective journalists can cover important stories without being an advocate.

Ryan 01

Ryan, Michael. “Journalistic Ethics, Objectivity, Existential Journalism, Standpoint Epistemology, And Public Journa.” Journal of Mass Media Ethics 16:1. 2001. Web. February 13, 2022. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/S15327728JMME1601\_2>.

Comment. **Objective journalists are not** moral **spectators**, unless one defines objective only as uncritically presenting two sides of a story. In fact, **it is the moral duty** of objective journalists **to collect and to disseminate the information a community needs to make sound decisions.** Objective journalists **evaluate the veracity of all information**, and they do reveal the superior sides of issues (when one side is, in fact, superior) by disseminating objective reports. It is a cliché, but the facts do speak for themselves**. If one side is more compelling**, **that is apparent from the** objective journalist’s **report. It is not necessary** or desirable for the journalist **to become an advocate** for that position. Objective journalists do not permit their employers to assume responsibility for their news reports or actions, as the Commission on Freedom of the Press (1947) asserted. They feel an ethical obligation to disseminate stories that describe reality as accurately as possible, and they are true to the highest standards of objective journalism— regardless of their employers’ views.

#### Journalists using the categorical imperative will curb disinformation and rebuild public trust in media, This turns the Neg.

Whitson 17

WHITSON, RYAN. “Reading Your Own Front Page: How Kant Can Save Journalism in America.” Media Ethics , vol. 28, no. 2, 2017.

Recently I encouraged a friend to read *Media Ethics* magazine*,* to which she replied, “There is no such thing!” Instantly I wondered: Did she mean this publication did not exist or there is no such thing as media ethics? For this person it was the latter, and I suspect she is not alone in her view. Most Americans today, and for good reasons, have very little trust in journalism to provide truthful, unbiased reporting of facts.1 The loss of trust in news media in America has led some to announce that “journalism is dead.” But I strongly suggest that, for the sake of our republic, we reject this idea as unacceptable and not the “new normal.” Good journalism, which provides truth and accountability to leading institutions and personalities, still matters, maybe today more than ever. Simple autopsies of now-defunct national news outlets show their usual cause of death was having forsaken their role of providing checks and balances to power, politics, and harmful ideas. In exchange, journalists seem to have become the editorial arm to the powerful and often have a political agenda. The result has been the threat and loss of both *individual freedoms* and *national values*. All this is seen today in what has been labeled “Fake News”—news that is published with little or no fact-checking (or outright deceit) in order to grab the first headline or push ahead the desired narrative. The insanity of this journalistic practice of *creating* stories instead of *reporting* them has resulted in *all* reported news now being received with eyes of skepticism; nobody knows what to believe any more and people are frustrated.2 But the practice of Fake News gets even worse. It has become the go-to defense for any lack of personal accountability**. If anyone, anytime, publishes anything unfavorable to a personality or political agenda it is simply labeled “Fake News”** and, at least initially, the scandal has been avoided. **Due to this dishonest and slanted reporting people naturally assume all of what they hear and see is dishonest and slanted**—and the American people are **no longer an informed electorate.** I suggest we blow the dust off Immanuel Kant’s 1785 book Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals (sounds exciting, right?) and we reconsider his ethical theory, the “Categorical Imperative,” as one way to address this problem. **Kant**’s way of thinking about morality basically **says**, “**We should not do anything unless** we can honestly say **everyone else should also be able to do the same thing**.” In other words, live your life in such a way that all you do, say, and think becomes tomorrow’s front page news. If you’re thinking this sounds a lot like the Golden Rule, you’re correct. Most people are taught to treat others as they would like to be treated.3 The bottom line is this: Every journalist wants their work and words to be taken seriously, but this is rarely the case anymore. **If a reporter, editor, or publisher embraced the Categorical Imperative, it just might curb** any tendencies toward their **dishonesty**; after all, having a voice that influences culture because there is an audience listening is more important than precisely what they use their voice (or image or reputation) to say. News organizations and journalists should, because it is the right thing to do and good for our nation, start to hold themselves accountable for their work if for no other reason than because others would not do to them what they do to others. **The Categorical Imperative can resurrect dead media and is a solution any journalist can embrace, regardless of medium, worldview, politics, race or religion**. Of course, I have little faith CNN, The New York Times, or any other source or “outlet” of news will make this adjustment, so it becomes the task of the American people to demand the journalism they deserve. The American people should stop consuming biased news sources that are more interested in furthering a political agenda than in doing their job. The American people should pay more attention to the responsibilities of corporate sponsors who support dishonest media and stop being patrons of these companies. Finally, since it is much easier to have new babies than resurrect the dead, so the American people should demand and support new media efforts that make it their goal to return to values-based journalism that is working for the good of the people.4 **When** (if?) **this happens,** I believe the results will be: **Journalism will be in the service of justice**, civility, investigation, asking questions, and inspiring those in power and vote to do the right thing and not in the service of political initiatives, polls, personalities, or audience selection. Journalism **will set aside presuppositions and anyone’s goal to manipulate their consumers and** will report truthful accounts in a fair and accurate manner what Americans have a right to hear. **Journalism will stop perpetuating lies and serve as a lie detector for the citizenry**. We need journalists who are curious and skeptical.