# 1NC – TFA State R3

## 1NC -- P -- Wiki

#### Interpretation: Debaters must have an entry on the LD NDCA 2021- 2022 wiki

#### Violation: [Insert Entry Title] does not have an entry on the LD wiki

#### The wiki is the only way to secure a safe debate space -- pronouns, trigger and content warnings is necessary information we need to ensure the safety of the debaters in this space. Wiki key to anonymous or personal disclosure that doesn’t force debaters to uncomfortable disclosures which means preround digital disclosure is key – That’s a voter for safety

#### Solves competition disparities -- the wiki enables small school debaters to understand what stock arguments are on that topic, to see what quality evidence looks like, and allows recutting and the development of research skills and education. Only the wiki democratizes and redistributes knowledge to underprivileged and underserviced debaters – That’s a voter for accessibility

#### It’s a prerequisite to disclosure – It’s the only way to ensure preround prep and equitable transfer of information in a timely manner – That’s a voter for clash because being able to negate is presupposed on an equal playing field and access to previously read arguments

#### Prefer competing interps hold them to the protocols they have implicated themselves in which means they must justify the model they’ve defended

## 1NC -- K -- I believe that information may possibly be dissuasive in fact

#### Endless appeals to objectivity have lost weight – attempts to decipher the world through transparent metaphysics prove to not only be futile but also infinitely destructive as the quest to know everything merely reveals all that we can never know; all information inevitable crumbles into the void of illusion

Shapiro 17 [Alan N, Professor in Transdisciplinary design at Folkwang, 1/5, “*Baudrillard and Trump: Simulation and Object-Orientation, Not True and False,”* http://www.alan-shapiro.com/baudrillard-and-trump-simulation-and-object-orientation-not-true-and-false-by-alan-n-shapiro/, //MW]

I see an op-ed piece in yesterday’s Washington Post (January 2nd, 2017) by Greg Sargent. It is called “Yes, Donald Trump ‘lies.’ A lot. And news organizations should say so.” This article is typical of the entire approach of the “liberal establishment” towards Trump. During the election campaign, journalists and commentators kept pointing out that Trump is a liar, a snake oil salesman, etc. (see the brilliant 1964 Philip K. Dick novel Lies, Inc.) That may all be true, but it doesn’t make a dent in the number of his supporters. Baudrillard comments throughout his work on the difference between critical theory discourse (which liberal journalists like Sargent are stuck in with respect to Trump) and what he called “fatal theory.” Critical theory discourse is ineffective. Trump is the candidate of Reality TV, of the celebrity culture, of media hyper-reality entertainment, of everyone’s 15 minutes of fame (Warhol), of the “trans-political” (Baudrillard), and of object-orientation (OO). OO: Trump will be the Presidency and not the President – end of the distance between human agent and office –Trump is misogyny itself and not a misogynist, he is racism itself and not a racist, Trump hates no one [“nobody loves Group X more than I do”], he simply associates himself rhetorically with the social-psychological “object” which is hatred). Beyond the epistemology of the human subject, Trump will identify with any iconic or mental-image “object” necessary as he performs “the art of the deal” and the practice of “winning” in larger and larger arenas. Trump identifies with the political-science-object that is the historically dormant China-Taiwan conflict itself (and its reawakened provocation). The “social actors” (Bruno Latour) of China and Taiwan are irrelevant. In other words, Trump is the candidate of the era of simulation. Invoking “the truth” against him does not work as a strategy. Trump is already more advanced than the discourse of truth. We are in a hyper-reality where there is no more truth and no more falsehood. Carl “The Truth” Williams, a former heavyweight boxing champion of the world, passed away in April 2013. Alan Cholodenko comments: If hyper-reality was born for Baudrillard during or just after the Second World War, then there have already been several simulation-Presidents: JFK the first televisual President, Reagan the Hollywood actor and first TV show host (of the General Electric Theatre)-President. Trump takes his place in this lineage. He is the second TV show host (of The Apprentice)-President, the first live show, reality TV show CEO host become live show, reality TV show CEO host-President of the live show, reality TV show America, Inc.) The mistake of the multitudes of journalists and editorialists like the Washington Post’s Greg Sargent is to not understand that the system of “truth and lies” is not some eternal, ahistorical or “scientifically objective” reality. It is an historically constructed cultural discourse or arrangement tied to an epoch which is finite in time. As Foucault might say, the concern with “true” and “false” is an epistème – an epistemological a priori, an expression of a specific power-knowledge constellation within an era – whose time has come and gone. The insistent belief in “truth and lies” is also embedded in the Plato-initiated “metaphysics” of the “human subject,” the subject-centered worldview, the sovereign (democratic or scientific) subject who “knows” and can therefore judge and determine when “knowledge” or a “fact” has been betrayed. In the new epistemological system beyond “truth and lies” to which Trump is finely attuned, of which he is the master, and which liberals do not get, the object itself is the hot thing. The spotlight is on objects (conceptual not physical), and they are a relationship, an association which knows nothing of whether they are real or fake. They transcend and straddle true and false. “Things have found a way of avoiding a dialectics of meaning that was beginning to bore them: by proliferating indefinitely, increasing their potential, outbidding themselves in an ascension to the limit, an obscenity that henceforth becomes their immanent finality and senseless reason.” (Baudrillard, Fatal Strategies; p.7) When Trump says something, it becomes true because Trump says it, and there is nothing that the New York Times and the Washington Post can do about it. Trump will change what he says on any given topic from day to day, or on any given Sunday. The liberal media will “prove him wrong” with evidence, but this demonstration will have an effect exactly the opposite than that intended upon and for the “silent majority” of half of Americans for whom they are the liars. The institutional bases for consensus or legitimation of “the truth” have disappeared beneath the sheer load of mountainous piles of information, and the virtualization, delocalization, de-physicalization, and disembodiment of discourse. When did this happen (when was the “Canetti point”)? Impossible to say. To know the point of origin of that would be to overstate the claims of knowledge, to violate the methodological recursivity of our awareness of being lost within the culture of simulation (as Baudrillard has taught us in his fascinating lengthy discussions of the “Canetti point,” and as Gerry Coulter has taught us, for example, in his essay on America). When Trump said that thousands of Muslims were celebrating on rooftops in Jersey City, New Jersey on 9/11, he was right. 100% right, as he later tweeted. Within the epistemology (theory of knowledge) of the humanist-democratic subject and of truth, the alleged rooftop event of course “did not take place.” Yet in the hyper-modernist epistemology, the rhetorical and emotional power of the words invoked and the mental images evoked by Trump (the advent of hyper-imagination) carry the weight and dynamic force of the image-immersed beyond-chimerical “object” of those evil Muslim celebrators. Probably Trump saw on TV in September 2001 some cynical celebrations in the Palestinian territories. The clandestine wormhole connection between physically remote points in space is plausibly extant. In the culture of virtual images, it is perfectly OK to transpose the bin Laden-sympathetic revelers from one geographical location to another, the hyper-space of Trump’s creative memory mingled with the hyper-dimensional expanding televisual space on the interior of the flatscreen. Fantasy is possible in a world that is still real. A fantasy could be said to be not true, some sort of illusion (in the non-Baudrillardian meaning of this word) or deception. But when images are everywhere, and they are universally exchangeable with each other, the made-up mental images become hyper-real. Which now (literally) means (hyper-means) more real than real. Meaning becomes hyper-meaning. Would not the ubiquity of video documentation and recording devices of every kind increase the availability of truth? Whipping the cam around, looking amazing from every angle? No, the effect is just the opposite. When documentation and recording are everywhere, then they are nowhere. They cease to exist in any meaningful sense. They serve no purpose whatsoever anymore. They are pure technology fetish in the bad sense, decoupled through their excess from what they were supposed to enhance or invent. As a hybrid radical-leftist-and-mainstreamer, I do believe that there is a good side to surveillance, a deterrence of crime. But if surveillance is everywhere, then this good side no longer functions. This is the same paradoxical logic that is operative for all virtual and digital media technologies. Yes, all of these wonderful new things are available to us, but we omitted the step of thinking carefully about the appropriate measure of their application. We forgot to humanly judge this. Hybrid posthumanist and humanist. We never took seriously the great thought of Albert Camus, that in almost every area, we need to have a sense of limits (as Dominick LaCapra pointed out). Academic referentiality – which Baudrillard was opposed to – is like this too. If you overdo it, become obsessed with footnotes, then you enter into the twilight zone of hyper-referentiality and then the whole business does not function anymore. You do it because you have to do it and the original purpose is lost. The “proof” (ha ha!) is now upon us that Baudrillard was right all along. We are now fully in the era of simulation and telemorphosis, of the New Truth of the omnipresent image (both picture-image and word-image – the multi-media of the screen having transformed written words from texts into images). The New Truth is not a lie – that would be too easy and the claim is retrograde. The New Truth institutes its own hyper-reality, which is at present our only reality. The only way to contest simulation and the New Truth would be a strategy or perspective of “taking the side of objects” (see, for example, [my most recent IJBS essay](http://www2.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol-13_2/v13-2-shapiro.html), for an elaboration of this). We would have to get to know the codes which underlie and instantiate simulation and reverse them. Reversibility of the code comes from “objects” within the code which want more objecthood. Until we can start to do that, to paraphrase David Cronenberg’s Videodrome: LONG LIVE THE NEW TRUTH! Bernie Tuchman writes: “Your piece on Trump has great power because his election has defeated deniability. Something is Happening and You Don’t Know What It is Mr. Jones. The media continues to ‘analyze’ what it cannot understand. It is like a world which has entered into dementia — where the dream life is more real than the ‘awake’ life, and where no one can say which is which. It is the nervous breakdown of hierarchical order.

#### The affs investment in objectivity only ensures the absolute liquidation of Otherness in the name of transparency – a spectacular genocide against alterity, conducted in the name of nothing at all.

Guignion ‘18

[David, M.A. at the University of Western Ontario. 2018. “The Mirror of Humanism; or, Towards a Baudrillardian Posthuman Theory”, <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7739&context=etd>] pat

Baudrillard’s two books on war, The Gulf War did not take place and The Spirit of Terrorism propose that war has been engulfed by the mass media. According to Rick Roderick, in his eight-part lecture series: The Self Under Siege: Philosophy in the Twentieth Century, Baudrillard wanted to cover the Gulf War on “CNN where it would really happen” (Roderick), because as the “media promote the war, the war promotes the media, and advertising competes with the war” (Baudrillard, Gulf War 31). For Baudrillard, the degree to which these wars were broadcast over television networks attests to a transformation of the nature of war itself. As he explains, “when it has been turned into information, [war] ceases to be a realistic war and becomes a virtual war” (41). The system of war is not the only one affected by this turn toward virtuality. Those fighting, if on the side of the invader, find a great deal of safety in the war zone itself. As Baudrillard writes, “A simple calculation shows that, of the 500,000 American soldiers involved during the seven months of operations in the Gulf, three times as many would have died from road accidents alone had they stayed in civilian life. Should we consider multiplying clean wars in order to reduce the murderous death toll of peacetime?”

(69). Still, Baudrillard’s remarks overlook the enormous casualties suffered by the losing side. In this case, the term “war” does not capture the essence of these military movements as well as the term “invasion,” indicative of a form of neo-colonialism. The transformation of these wars from the domain of reality to that of the virtual performs a dual function for the neo-colonial efforts of the West. First, there is a virtual violence, a violence of the image. In this operation the real events of these wars are substituted for the image of these wars: “The image consumes the event, in the sense that it absorbs it and offers it for consumption” (Baudrillard, The Spirit of Terrorism 27). This process not only replaces the real with the virtual, but filters which images and messages are distributed. The images distributed operate to convince the viewer of the reality of these wars, or, more precisely, their virtual reality. Second, these wars function to destroy the other, virtually and symbolically. The West’s drive toward global hegemony “is a giant project meant to symbolically liquidate all values through consensus or force” (Baudrillard, The Agony of Power 67).

Global power, for Baudrillard, “is the power of the simulacrum” (66). Under the code of the simulacrum, where people are reduced to the status of cybernetician, the other poses an avid challenge to global hegemony. Global hegemony responds to this roadblock by declaring war on “the alterity of the other” by either converting or annihilating it (Baudrillard, Gulf War 37). The simulating machine dabbles in the affairs of reality when zones of resistance that do not subscribe to its oppressive logic emerge. In many ways, Baudrillard’s theorization of war bridges the gap between simulation and reality, pointing to a milieu—the war machine—that simulation mobilizes in the service of eradicating difference.

Baudrillard’s writing on war points to the erasure and eradication of those points on the globe that are outside of the purview of “our truth” where “nothing is true unless it is desecrated, objectified, stripped of its aura, or dragged onstage” (Agony 67). The West strives to make everything seen, everything tangible, everything real through the “museification” (Baudrillard, The Vital Illusion 40) of the other. The virtuality of the scenes of war exist to convince the viewer that the war is real; that there is something to be fought over, as opposed to neo-colonial genocide. The role of the museum in this process is, in a sense, to deliver the final blow to the objects of this neo-colonial effort. Those affected literally die from the bombardment of artillery strikes and drone strikes, but they also die “from being transplanted from a slow order of the symbolic, master over putrefaction and death, to an order of history, science, and museums, our order, which no longer masters anything, which only knows how to condemn what preceded it to decay and death and subsequently to try to revive it with science” (Baudrillard, Simulacra 10).

#### Reality is on the brink now – facts are replacing passion, truth is running rampant, and illusion is at an all-time low – what is now needed are new modes of language and communication that resist the ever-persistent onslaught of meaning and signification, engines of mystery radical enough to muddle and mystify the very fabric of the real, a form of non-meaning capable of pushing networks of transparency to their own logical extremes

Baudrillard, 96 [Jean, “*The Perfect Crime*,” pg. 96, //MW]

Truth to tell, the real world, among all the other possible ones, is unthinkable, except as dangerous superstition. We must break with it as critical thought once broke (in the name of the real!) with religious superstition. Thinkers, one more effort! In any case, the two orders of thought are irreconcilable. They each follow their course without merging; at best they slide over each other like tectonic plates, and occasionally their collision or subduction creates fault lines into which reality rushes. Fate is always at the intersection of these two lines of force. Similarly, radical thought is at the violent intersection of meaning and non-meaning, of truth and non-truth, of the continuity of the world and the continuity of the nothing. Unlike the discourse of the real, which gambles on the fact of there being something rather than nothing, and aspires to being founded on the guarantee of an objective and decipherable world, radical thought, for its part, wagers on the illusion of the world. It aspires to the status of illusion, restoring the non-veracity of facts, the non-signification of the world, proposing the opposite hypothesis that there is nothing rather than something, and going in pursuit of that nothing which runs beneath the apparent continuity of meaning. The radical prediction is always the prediction of the non-reality of facts, of the illusoriness of the state of fact. It begins only with the presentiment of that illusoriness, and is never confused with the objective state of things. Every confusion of that kind is of the order of the confusion of the messenger and the message, which leads to the elimination of the messenger bearing bad news (for example, the news of the uncertainty of the real, of the non-occurrence of certain events, of the nullity of our values). Every confusion of thought with the order of the real -- that alleged `faithfulness' to the real of a thought which has cooked it up out of nothing -- is hallucinatory. It arises, moreover, from a total misunderstanding about language, which is illusion in its very movement, since it is the bearer of that continuity of the void, that continuity of the nothing at the very heart of what it says, since it is, in its very materiality, deconstruction of what it signifies. Just as photography connotes the effacing, the death of what it represents -- which lends it its intensity -- so what lends writing, fictional or theoretical, its intensity is the void, the nothingness running beneath the surface, the illusion of meaning, the ironic dimension of language, correlative with that of the facts themselves, which are never anything but what they are [ne sont jamais que ce qu'ils sont]. That is to say, they are never more than what they are and they are, literally, never only what they are [jamais que ce qu'ils sont]. The irony of the facts, in their wretched reality, is precisely that they are only what they are but that, by that very fact, they are necessarily beyond. For de facto existence is impossible -- nothing is wholly transparent without becoming enigmatic. Reality itself is too obvious to be true. It is this ironic transfiguration which constitutes the event of language. And it is to restoring this fundamental illusion of the world and language that thought must apply itself, if it is not stupidly to take concepts in their literalness -- messenger confused with the message, language confused with its meaning and therefore sacrificed in advance. There is a twofold, contradictory exigency in thought. It is not to analyze the world in order to extract from it an improbable truth,

## 1NC -- DA -- False Balance

#### To prioritize objectivity over advocacy is the impetus for false balance – that intensifies climate misinformation

Climate Discovery 18 [Climate Discovery is an advocacy group, this article heavily cites an article by Declan Fahy a profeesor of communication at Dublin City University, “False Balance in the Media Reduces Climate Science Credibility, Oxford English Dictionary”, <https://climatediscovery.org/false-balance-in-the-media-reduces-climate-science-credibility-oxford-english-dictionary/z>, October 11, 2018

]//Sripad

“Journalists have struggled historically to apply the notion of balance to the reporting of climate change science, because even though the overwhelming majority of the world’s experts agree that human-driven climate change is real and will have major future impacts, a minority of scientists dispute this consensus. **Reporters aimed to be fair by giving both viewpoints equal attention, a practice scholars have labeled false balance**.” This report from The Oxford English Dictionary by Declan Fahy of Dublin City University.

This **false balance affects opinions of all makes. Because we as humans get most of our news from the media, and the media is providing biased information, a great injustice is being innocently and blindly committed.**

False balance has been leveraged by the Climate Change Counter Movement to enhance doubt and denial of climate science and prolong delay of climate pollution reform action. Fahy goes on to tell us **false balance, “remains a pitfall for reporters** to avoid in coverage of two climate change topics: the presentation of the many potential future impacts or risks and the coverage of different policy responses in a climate-challenged society.”

Here, Fahy is displaying his own form of false balance (in my opinion, and I am not a global warming psychologist.) **Major impacts are occurring right now, not in the future, and they are very much worse than anything consensus climate science reporting organizations has suggested so far.**

This false bias thing extends even to environmental advocates. At the highest levels of the most prestigious environmental conservation and climate change advocacy organizations, policy and opinion are far behind, as much as 20 years behind.

How it works goes like this, “**The established notion of objectivity relies on sources to convey facts. When these sources do not present facts, reporting dissolves into** what journalist James Fallows calls ‘**false equivalencies,’ in which journalists place side by side in stories different assertions that do not have the same basis in fact**.”

Because science and antiscience are presented equally without judgement, both are understood by the reader or viewer as being valid. Privileged sources (the president, the wealthy and influential fossil fuel industry, media powerhouses, etc.), “can then present their own economic and social interests as being the common interests of all citizens. Because these sources then dominate news coverage, other voices that might challenge their views are marginalized.”

**The**[**dominance of Fox New**](https://www.thewrap.com/fox-news-continues-28-week-win-streak-as-most-watched-cable-network/)**s is a privileged source for a majority of cable news viewers in the U.S. in July 2017 for example**.

**Fahy tells us** that, “**journalists (have) now amplified uncertainties as they covered climate change as a controversy” because they are presenting inaccurate information form privileged sources to a majority of those seeking news information on climate change**.

When reporting objectively, **journalism ethical requirements of reporting both sides of the story compromises fact badly when the vast minority opinion of climate change denial is delivered as equal to the vast majority opinion**. **Fahy** says, **“In climate coverage, when journalists seek multiple voices, minority viewpoints —like those of scientists who dispute the human influence on global warming—gain a level of attention that is disproportionate to the amount of evidence that supports such a view. Journalists tried to make their coverage balanced by reporting these minority viewpoints, but instead made it biased** (Gelbspan, 1998). This was false balance.”

This false balance as “fairness” balance by Boykoff and Boykoff in 2004. Boykoffs’ [abstract states](http://www.colorado.edu/geography/courses/geog_2412_f04/balance%20as%20bias.pdf), “**Through content analysis of US prestige press— meaning the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, and the Wall Street Journal—this paper focuses on the norm of balanced reporting, and shows that the prestige press’s adherence to balance actually leads to biased coverage of both anthropogenic contributions to global warming and resultant action**.”

#### Empirics prove that false balance is true and caused by press prioritization of objectivity –that leads to inaction

Anderson 19 [Lorena Anderson is the Senior Writer and Public Information Representative for UC MERCED, “Media creates false balance on climate science, study shows”, August 22, 2019, https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/media-creates-false-balance-climate-science-study-shows]//sripad

**The American media lends too much weight to people who dismiss climate change, giving them legitimacy they haven’t earned, posing serious danger to efforts aimed at raising public awareness and motivating rapid action, a new study shows.**

While it is not uncommon for media outlets to interview climate change scientists and climate change deniers in the same interviews, **the effort to offer a 360-degree view is creating a false balance between trained climate scientists and those who lack scientific training, such as politicians.**

“It’s not just false balance; the numbers show that the media are ‘balancing’ experts — who represent the overwhelming majority of reputable scientists — with the views of a relative handful of non-experts,” UC Merced [professor LeRoy Westerling](https://www.ucmerced.edu/content/leroy-westerling) said. “**Most of the contrarians are not scientists, and the ones who are have very thin credentials**. They are not in the same league with top scientists. They aren’t even in the league of the average career climate scientist.”

Westerling is one of three researchers from UC Merced who tracked the digital footprints of climate scientists and deniers across about 200,000 research publications and 100,000 digital and print media articles on climate change over the past few years. Their work is [published in Nature Communications](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-019-09959-4).

Data shows that **about half the mainstream media visibility goes to climate-change deniers, many of whom are not climate scientists. This proportion increases significantly when blogs and other “new media” outlets are included — pointing to the rising role of customized media in spreading disinformation.**

“It’s time to stop giving these people visibility, which can be easily spun into false authority,” [professor Alex Petersen](https://www.ucmerced.edu/content/alexander-petersen) said. “By tracking the digital traces of specific individuals in vast troves of publicly available media data, we developed methods to hold people and media outlets accountable for their roles in the climate-change-denialism movement, which has given rise to climate change misinformation at scale.”

Amplified misinformation

**There are a variety of reasons people don’t accept the results of climate science even though the science is overwhelming. These include cognitive bias and “motivated reasoning”** — the tendency of people to bias their judgements by personal and group-level values, even when faced with documented facts; and external influences, including political cues, ideological biases, cultural worldviews and even personal weather experiences.

But the media’s longstanding and dominant role in empowering cultural politics, the advent of “new media” and the nearly boundless scalability of content distribution across the Internet compound the problem and amplify misinformation, the researchers said.

Even when people have complete control in choosing their sources of information, they are still susceptible to significant disparities in content production and to media coverage.

The proper counterpoint to a climate scientist would be another legitimate scientist who could show competing data from the same experiments or show where the first climate scientist has made mistakes in his or her work. Having a non-expert oil lobbyist or politician respond to a peer-reviewed study or assessment by saying “climate change doesn’t exist” is not a credible argument or a means of balancing, Petersen said.

“**These results show that false balance in the media is alive and well and the growing trend toward customized media that we access via the internet is feeding the disinformation trend**,” said Katharine Hayhoe, a climate scientist at Texas Tech University and a lead author of the U.S. National Climate Assessment. “This study is a wake-up call for all media to do better: to check their sources in order to accurately communicate the reality of human-induced climate change, the relevance of its impacts and the urgency of action.”

Petersen is a computational scientist who specializes in human analytics. He and Westerling, a climatologist known for his state-of-the-art modeling of climate-ecosystem-wildfire interactions, both with the [Department of Management of Complex Systems](https://engineering.ucmerced.edu/soe-bylaw-units/management-complex-systems-mcs) in the [School of Engineering](https://engineering.ucmerced.edu/), partnered with former UC Merced researcher Emmanuel Vincent to conduct a study of 386 prominent climate contrarians and 386 expert scientists’ public statements on climate change to compare the credibility given to those on each side.

“The acute misrepresentation of information aimed at misleading the public for political gain is a pressing problem that threatens various other domains in addition to climate change communication,” the team wrote in the new paper. “It requires a better understanding of the human, social and technological factors that facilitate widespread disinformation efforts.”

“Political reporting focuses its narrative around conflict and looks to highlight competing voices, rather than telling the story of the science.”  
— LeRoy Weserling

Disproportionate visibility

Westerling put it more bluntly:

“It’s well known now that a well-financed propaganda campaign on behalf of conservative fossil fuel interests led mainstream media to frame reporting on climate change science as political reporting rather than science reporting,” he said. “Political reporting focuses its narrative around conflict and looks to highlight competing voices, rather than telling the story of the science.”

This, he said, has led to the false balance between scientists and a handful of climate deniers who have become regular commenters.

Besides the scientists who have published work denying or downplaying climate change, many people will recognize some of the other people who are often called upon to present “balance:” Scott Pruitt, the former head of the EPA; Steve Bannon, former advisor to President Donald Trump’s campaign; Oklahoma Sen. James Inhofe; White House Chief of Staff Mick Mulvaney; former Secretary of State Rex Tillerson.

By featuring them as the counterpoints to legitimate, experienced and disciplined climate scientists, the media gives them a measure of credibility they do not deserve, the researchers said.

“Such disproportionate media visibility of contrarian arguments and actors not only misrepresents the distribution of expert-based beliefs, it also manifestly undermines the credible authority of career climate-change experts, and reinforces the trend of non-experts presiding over public scientific discourse, which all together **hinders prospects for rapid public action on climate change**,” they wrote.

#### Warming is the most probable root cause of human extinction

Hoare, 21. (Callum is a a Senior Special Projects Reporter at Express.co.uk, having joined in November 2018. He previously worked as a Video News Reporter at Daily Star Online) . "End of the world warning: Climate change will be 'biggest contributor to human extinction'." Express.co.uk. https://www.express.co.uk/news/science/1484402/end-of-the-world-climate-change-human-extinction-rising-sea-level-conflict-famine. accessed 9-29-2021 // Gayden

It comes less than a month after the UNs Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) issued a “code red” for humanity over climate change. They warned of increasingly extreme heatwaves, droughts and flooding, and a key temperature limit being broken in just over a decade. And now experts have painted a bleak picture for the human race. Scientists warn that ignoring the climate crisis will yield "untold suffering" for humanity. They say that although climate change will not directly cause an extinction event, that it could play a huge role, such as by leading to food and water scarcity, which has the potential to trigger a societal collapse and set the stage for global conflict. Michael Mann, a distinguished professor of atmospheric science at Penn State University, said: "There’s no reason to exaggerate the climate threat. The truth is bad enough, and reason enough to take dramatic action." Professor Mann believes a global temperature increase of 3C lead to a collapse of our societal infrastructure and massive unrest and conflict. Scientists have sent a doomsday warning The IPCC sent a 'code red' warning One way this could play out is by creating food insecurity. Warming the planet has a range of negative impacts on food production, including increasing the water deficit and thereby reducing food harvests. Luke Kemp, a research associate at the University of Cambridge, studies previous civilisation collapses and the risk of climate change. He told Live Science that extinction events almost always involve multiple factors, but he thinks that if humans were to go extinct, climate change would likely be the main culprit. He said: "If I'm to say, what do I think is the biggest contributor to the potential for human extinction going towards the future? Then climate change, no doubt." We are already seeing the impacts of climate change According to the expert, all major mass-extinction events in Earth's history have involved some kind of climatic change. This includes the cooling during the Ordovician-Silurian extinction about 440 million years ago that wiped out 85 percent of species, and warming during the Triassic-Jurassic extinction about 200 million years ago that killed 80 percent of species. Mr Kemp said: "While Homo sapiens are obviously not extinct, we do have a track record of other hominid species going extinct, such as Neanderthals. "And in each of these cases, it appears that again, climatic change plays some kind of role." There is time to stop the climate crisis It's still not clear exactly why Neanderthals went extinct about 40,000 years ago, but, according to the Natural History Museum, climatic fluctuations may have broken their population up into smaller, fragmented groups. But experts say it isn't too late for us to avoid the worst-case climate change scenarios. Prof Mann added: "It is up to us. "If we fail to reduce carbon emissions substantially in the decade ahead, we are likely committed to a worsening of already dangerous extreme weather events, inundation of coastlines around the world due to melting ice and rising sea level, more pressure on limited resources as a growing global population competes for less food, water and space due to climate change impacts. "If we act boldly now, we can avoid the worst impacts."

## 1NC – Case

#### Watts is about a research agenda to study objectivity that doesn’t solve the affs impacts

#### Sonnemaker says that you need to ensure that the itegrit of the research process must be secured before we can ensure objectivity You cant solve biased research process