### 1AC – plan

#### Plan text : In the republic of India, a free press should prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

Express News Service 98 [ Express News Service is a subset of Indian Express. Nov 18 1998 Indian Express “Journalists should strive for objectivity”https://indianexpress.com/article/news-archive/journalists-should-strive-for-objectivity/lite/ ] // aaditg

\*solvency advocate

SURAT, Nov 18: Journalists should constantly strive for objectivity and always stick to the truth. This was stated by senior journalist and noted litterateur Bhagwati Kumar Sharma, while speaking at `Media Discussion’ organised by the District Information department for students of the Journalism faculty of the South Gujarat University at the University campus on Wednesday. Entitled `National Issues and the Role of Media’, speakers spoke on a number of topics and problems faced by the country at present. During the discussion, Sharma stressed on the causes and origin of a number of major burning issues and how journalism could be used to solve these. Commenting on the credibility of news, the senior journalist who has spent about 50 years in the profession, told the aspiring journalists that one must beware the pitfalls while in the field. He added that a feeling for welfare of the society along with a deep sense of responsibility were essential in everyone aspiring to be in the field, though he regretted the decline in sincerity and values among the journalistic fraternity in the past few years. Acting vice-chancellor of the university R N Shelat, in his speech said that the aspiring journalists could take up issues like illiteracy, health, unemployment, poverty and do whatever possible to help in solving these national problems. Also speaking on the occasion, Daksha Vamdatt, head of Journalism and English Literature departments in the SGU strongly criticised vulgarity being portrayed through the print and electronic media and said that journalists ought to be very careful as they influenced a large number of readers and viewers. Kalpana Rao, a lecturer at the journalism department said that students should rather focus on developmental journalism than sensationalising news. She sharply criticised the role of newspapers in creating “communally sensitive situations” by printing provocative stories. Earlier Deputy Information Director Narhari Barot cited examples of social themes being taken up by journalism students of Ahmedabad. The vote of thanks was offered by Assistant Information Director Cecil Christie.

#### Definitionally objective news rejects fake news

**Kovach and Rosenstiel., 1** (Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel., Bill Kovach, a 1989 Nieman Fellow, was curator of the Nieman Foundation from 1989 to 2000. He is the co-author of “The Elements of Journalism.”, Tom Rosenstiel is executive director of the American Press Institute and co-author of “The Elements of Journalism.”, 6-15-2001, accessed on 2-19-2022, Nieman Reports, "The Essence of Journalism Is a Discipline of Verification | Nieman Reports", https://niemanreports.org/articles/the-essence-of-journalism-is-a-discipline-of-verification/)

“In the end, the discipline of verification is what separates journalism from entertainment, propaganda, fiction, or art…. Journalism alone is focused first on getting what happened down right…. Perhaps because the discipline of verification is so personal and so haphazardly communicated, it is also part of one of the great confusions of journalism— the concept of objectivity. The original meaning of this idea is now thoroughly misunderstood, and by and large lost. When the concept originally evolved, it was not meant to imply that journalists were free of bias. Quite the contrary…. Objectivity called for journalists to develop a consistent method of testing information—a transparent approach to evidence—precisely so that personal and cultural biases would not undermine the accuracy of their work…. In the original concept, in other words, the method is objective, not the journalist. The key was in the discipline of the craft, not the aim. The point has some important implications. One is that the impartial voice employed by many news organizations, that familiar, supposedly neutral style of newswriting, is not a fundamental principle of journalism. Rather, it is an often helpful device news organizations use to highlight that they are trying to produce something obtained by objective methods. The second implication is that this neutral voice, without a discipline of verification, creates a veneer covering something hollow. Journalists who select sources to express what is really their own point of view, and then use the neutral voice to make it seem objective, are engaged in a form of deception. This damages the credibility of the whole profession by making it seem unprincipled, dishonest, and biased. This is an important caution in an age when the standards of the press are so in doubt…. A more conscious discipline of verification is the best antidote to the old journalism of verification being overrun by a new journalism of assertion, and it would provide citizens with a basis for relying on journalistic accounts. 1.Never add anything that was not there. 2.Never deceive the audience. 3.Be transparent about your methods and motives. 4.Rely on your own original reporting. 5.Exercise humility. …we began to see a core set of concepts that form the foundation of the discipline of verification…. The willingness of the journalist to be transparent about what he or she has done is at the heart of establishing that the journalist is concerned with the truth…. Too much journalism fails to say anything about methods, motives, and sources.”

#### Objectivity *deconstructs* threat construction

Qadri 20 [ Nasser Qadr has a Ph.D., PMP and is Director of Data Science. ‘Framing terrorism and migration in the USA: the

role of the media in securitization processes.” 2020 University of Glasgow <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/77872/1/2020QadriPhD.pdf>] //aaditg

The wide audience that the press commands, the high level of engagement between the public and the press (as discussed in section 1.4.1), and the press’ powerful role as a mediator between political elites and the public makes it a particularly indispensable part of the securitization process. Per Entman (2004: 3), political elites may have the upper hand in shaping the domains of security discourse, but they are “conditioned in part by how fully the media cooperate.” The general public’s reliance on mass media – particularly accessible and low cost formats like television, print and radio news for political learning (Page et al., 1987: 24) – as the primary source of information on political content (Iyengar & Kinder, 1987; Krosnick & Kinder, 1990; McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Zaller, 1992) is likely intensified for security issues given that “[i]n times of crisis, citizens turn to political leaders and the media to make sense of new and frightening events” (Gadarian, 2010: 469). This layer of mediation between political elites and the public, however, can transform messages through partisan filters, as well as selection, emphasis and omission of certain features and frames, thus shaping audience evaluations and influencing voters’ political preferences (Dalton, Beck, & Huckfeldt, 1998; Page et al., 1987). In a democratic environment, these influences can trickle back up to shape “the public policy agenda, including the response to events by government officials and the security services” (Norris et al., 2003: 13). While other non-state actors – NGOs, religious elites, corporations, lobbyists – may have similar influences, their influence is constrained to specific domains and issue areas, and thus

#### Objective news *increases* democracy and brings awareness to rise of Hindu nationalism

Stockman 2/1 [Ms. Stockman is a member of the editorial board. 2/1/2022 “What an All-Women News Network in India Shows Us About Democracy” NYT <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/02/01/opinion/all-women-newspaper-india.html>] //aaditg

It started out as a literacy project. Dalit women, formerly known as untouchables, hand-wrote a newsletter about issues that mattered to them: Broken water pumps. Unpaved roads. Known rapists walking free. In 2002 they started a newspaper that covered everything from illegal mining to murders. Perhaps because Dalits make up about 20 percent of the population of the Indian state of Uttar Pradesh, some government officials started paying attention. Roads got paved. Toilets got built. Hospitals got stocked with medicines. “Almost every month, our reporting brings justice to people,” Kavita Devi, the paper’s editor in chief, told me in an email originally written in Hindi. Today the paper, Khabar Lahariya, whose name in Hindi means “news waves,” is a digital-first rural news network with its own talk shows and nearly 550,000 subscribers on YouTube. The publication ran up against the many familiar hurdles that can make news gathering as difficult as it is essential to the success of democracy. Reporters were intimidated and belittled. It was hard to get taken seriously in a country where media giants often hire high-caste men from big cities who kowtow to the party in office. The powerful don’t like pushback. And for a group of women who were viewed as powerless by virtue of their gender and caste, the power of the press was their only option. Democracy, their story shows us, requires not just courage and hard work but also constant vigilance and ingenuity in the face of change. The story of how newly literate rural women became investigative journalists is chronicled in a new documentary, “Writing With Fire,” which made the Academy Awards shortlist this year. If it wins, it will make history as the first film about India directed by Indians to receive an Oscar. It will also give a boost to democracy’s unsung champions at a time when democratic norms are under threat around the world. The movie opens with Meera, the chief reporter, interviewing a woman who recounts being raped in her home on six separate occasions in a single month. The woman’s husband tried to file a complaint, but police officers refused to take it. In the film, Meera walks into the police station and demands an explanation. “Journalism is the essence of democracy,” she says afterward. “When citizens demand their rights, it is us journalists who can take their demands to the government.” The married team that made the film, Sushmit Ghosh and Rintu Thomas, who are not Dalit, began shooting footage in 2016, the year Khabar Lahariya’s reporters made the leap to digital news. In the film, women, some of whom don’t have electricity in their homes, unwrap boxes of brand-new cellphones gingerly, like bricks of dynamite. By the end of the film, Meera and her colleagues are pushing through crowds at political rallies with their cellphone cameras rolling. Although the staff members are from marginalized groups — Dalits, tribal people and the so-called backward castes — they don’t see themselves as part of any political movement. First and foremost, they are reporters who claim objectivity and independence as core values. “A lot of people say: ‘Where do you think they get this crazy courage from? Is it that they have nothing to lose?’” Ms. Thomas told me. “I don’t see it like that. Each one of them is so aware of how rare it was to have had access to education and how much it means to people whose voice they have become. They know that if they don’t show up reporting that story, nobody else will.” Editors’ Picks? One Couple Made Their Choice in the San Fernando Valley. “Writing With Fire” is a road map of sorts for how to stand up for democracy even in the face of great danger. In 2017, Yogi Adityanath, a Hindu monk who once announced that he was preparing for a religious war, took the helm as chief minister in Uttar Pradesh. Members of the Hindu Youth Brigade, an organization he founded, brandished swords in the streets, vowing to protect Hindus and punish Muslims. Khabar Lahariya’s reporters created a game plan for how to cover the rise of Hindu nationalism. They tread carefully, assigning only the most experienced reporters. In the film, Meera interviews a leader of the Hindu Youth Brigade and gets him to explain his vision for the country. “My absolute priority is to protect our holy cows,” he tells her. Meera doesn’t have to add commentary to display the truth: In a place where women must beg for protection from rape, aspiring politicians were making a name for themselves by pledging to protect cows. Some high-caste journalists expressed shock at how quickly the political culture in India turned. In a matter of just a few years, people once considered extremists were suddenly running large swaths of the country. But reporters at Khabar Lahariya saw it coming. “They seem to know how to respond to the times we are in,” Mr. Ghosh said.

### 1AC – advantage –war

#### Status quo Indian news *threat constructs* Pakistan

Knoop et al 21[ Joseph Knoop is a free lance writer for PC Gamer. PC Gsmer “Indian news channel uses Arma 3 gameplay footage to claim Pakistan bombed Afghanistan” September 8 2021 [https://www.pcgamer.com/arma-3-pakistan-footage/]//aaditg](https://www.pcgamer.com/arma-3-pakistan-footage/%5d//aaditg)

\*news footage is from video games

\*anchors accused Pakistani airforce of air strikes

In a bizarre development, some Indian news broadcasts claimed that the Pakistani airforce attacked the Panjshir valley, an Afghanistan mountain province home to about 170,000 people, which is currently the last major holdout of anti-Taliban forces. The only problem? The footage used to report the supposedly pro-Taliban airforce attack came from the popular military simulation game Arma 3. The footage first appeared on Indian news channels including Republic TV, Times Now Navbharat, Zee Hindustan, and TV9 Bharatvarsh. The original video was credited to a source called "Hasti TV" on Facebook, which has since been deleted. These Indian news sources claimed the video showed a military jet attempting a bombing run on Panjshir. See more In fact, the footage came from this January Arma 3 video from the YouTube channel Compared Comparison, which has now been viewed 23 million times. The gameplay shows players engaging in a ground-to-air battle between a jet and a vehicle-mounted anti-air turret with tracer rounds seen firing through the sky at the jet. In a statement to PC Gamer, a representative for Arma 3 developer Bohemia Interactive confirmed that the original footage does indeed come from the game. "Strangely, we've seen this particular game footage be used several times by certain media outlets in support of their real-life news coverage," the Bohemia Interactive rep said. "We know this because we've been previously approached regarding similar occurrences by fact-checkers from organizations such as Agence Frrance-Presse, Check Your Fact, PolitiFact, and if I remember correctly, also Reuters." Bohemia Interactive added that the game footage used in the erroneous Indian news broadcasts may also have come from two other Arma 3 gameplay clips. "The clip in the [original viral tweet] is so cropped and low-res that I find it hard to compare and say for sure which it is, but I'm confident it is Arma 3 footage," Bohemia Interactive's rep said. It's easy to see how the deceptive edit was made. In Compared Comparison's YouTube video, zoomed-in shots of the attacking aircraft do look moderately convincing, at least until the video zooms out to show the digital anti-air vehicle firing and later blowing up in a not-so-realistic fashion. During Republic TV's broadcast, the anchor can be heard repeating the claim that the Pakistani airforce performed an airstrike in Panjshir. The claim was originally recognized as fraudulent by Boom, a group that calls itself India's "first and leading fact checking website and initiative," and is a member of the Poynter Institute's International Fact-Checking Network initiative. Republic TV meanwhile has a sordid history of far right-wing reporting and supporting India's prime minister Narendra Modi's Hindu nationalist policies, according to Aljazeera. Vikas Khanchandani, CEO of ARG (owner of Republic TV) was arrested in December 2020 for allegedly rigging ratings in order to charge advertisers more.

#### Status quo News *falsifies* Chinese events *threat constructing* them *by emboldening*

Paudyal 20 [ Mahabir Paudyal is the contributor for Republica. July 27, 2020 01:35 PM NPT “Fake news can destroy Nepal's relations with India, China and the US” My Republica <https://myrepublica.nagariknetwork.com/news/fake-news-can-destroy-nepal-s-relations-with-india-china-and-the-us/> ]//aaditg
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A document claiming Nepali land encroachment by China. Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development on June 25 issued a statement saying that such a report has never been published by the ministry and the news reports based on this bear no truth in them. All news reports on encroachment story have cited this document as evidence. It’s hard to trace when it actually began (blogger Salokya has done a good study on it and I derive some information for this article from his blog), but it comes out firston May 31, 2019, in Nepal News, which is quickly followed by Hamrakura.com on June 2. For about four months, this issue almost disappears. On November 7, 2019, however, it reappears in Khabarhub.com which states that China has encroached upon around 36 hectares of Nepali land in Nepal’s Sankhuwasabha, Rasuwa, Sindhupalchowk and Humla districts. “China, too, has encroached upon Nepali land,” says the headline citing “survey department.”On November 8, it appears again in Thahakhabar, followed up by Pahilopost on November 14, with additional information of Nepalis launching protest against China for encroachment of Nepali land. On November 8, 2019, online version of Nagarik carried this report, followed by Annapurna Post on November 9 (Nagarik removed this ‘inadvertently published content’ from its online page, as explained by its editor Gunaraj Luitel). On November 10, the same online newspaper (Khabarhub) gave a ‘backoffChina’ twist to the encroachment subject. It said that social media including Twitter and Facebook are flooded with “BackOffChina” hashtag and that Nepal Students Union, a student wing of Nepali Congress, also chanted slogans against China and India in Kathmandu. By November 13, according to Khabarhub, protests against China were intensifying in Nepal “against the encroachment of Nepali land by China.” In a protest staged in Kapilvastu, Chinese President Xi Jinping’s effigy was burnt, it said. It further said “the protest comes after a survey report recently released by the Survey Department stated that China has encroached upon 36 hectare land of Nepal.” This went all over India too. On November 8, 2019, ANI published the news which was republished in several other outlets. Citing this report, The New Indian Express reiterated the same message on its November 8 news. The Hindustan Times, too, did the same on its November 12, 2019 news, followed by The Times of India’s coverage on November 13. On November 12, 2019,The South China Morning Post also published it. The month November is significant here because it was on November 2 that India had published the new political map including territories of Lipulekh, Limpiyadhura and Kalapani into it and this had become a major irritant in Nepal-India relations. Across the country, sentiments were building up against Indian government and Indian move was being seen as an act of cartographic aggression. ‘Fake’ news returns The report of alleged encroachment of Nepali land by China, based, again, on the same leaflet-like page ‘issued’by Ministry of Agriculture makes a comeback in June. On June 21, Annapurna Post published the report that China has been occupying entire Rui village of Gorkha district for the last 60 years. This news was quickly picked by Khabarhub.com on the same day. “Rui Gaun: Nepal’s land under Chinese control. The land is under Chinese control for more than 60 years,” it said.

#### Indo- china tensions uniquely high right now – relations shouldn’t be allowed to sink

**Pollard 21** [ Ruth Pollard is a columnist and editor with Bloomberg Opinion. Bloomberg “China and India Relations Shouldn't Be Allowed to Sink Any Lower” 10-11 – 21 <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-10-11/china-india-and-pakistan-are-raising-temperatures-along-their-disputed-borders> ] //aaditg

To be facing tension on both fronts — and with no diplomatic levers left to pull — is not a great place for India to find itself coming out of a punishing second Covid-19 wave and the accompanying economic slowdown. Despite a couple of high-profile summits, the last one in 2019 in the southern Indian state of Chennai, Prime Minister Narendra Modi and President Xi Jinping have failed to find common ground. Instead, notes Ian Hall, deputy research director at the Griffith Asia Institute and author of a book on India’s foreign policy under Modi, China continues to apply more and more pressure, both along the border, and in regular online onslaughts critical of New Delhi’s military stance and its deepening ties with Washington. **Nothing Modi has done to try to change that dynamic has worked.** However, India is not alone. Hall says Japan, Taiwan, Australia and, of course, the U.S., are all dealing with the challenge of an increasingly assertive China. Foreign Minister Subrahmanyam Jaishankar told his Chinese counterpart Wang Yi last month that bilateral ties will only move forward once there’s troop disengagement from the border areas. But each time India pushes back, China responds with fresh incursions. Opinion. Data. More Data. Get the most important Bloomberg Opinion pieces in one email. Email Enter your email Sign Up By submitting my information, I agree to the Privacy Policy and Terms of Service and to receive offers and promotions from Bloomberg. Just last week, there was a minor face-off between the two sides in Arunachal Pradesh. **Though the situation was quickly resolved, it added to the tensions in the lead up to Sunday’s unsuccessful talks.** In August, more than 100 Chinese soldiers briefly entered Indian territory in the Himalayan state of Uttarakhand. Military experts say that as both sides expand their troop numbers and aggressively patrol, the chances of a miscalculation leading to another set of deadly clashes increases. **Beijing’s abandonment of decades of established protocols agreed with New Delhi along its disputed border is contributing to alarm across the Indo-Pacific.** Other episodes in the region include the increasing sorties into Taiwan’s air-defense-identification zone and the expanded deployment of ships into disputed areas of the South China Sea. **No one has found the magic formula for dealing with China’s expansionism while maintaining restraint.** India is just the latest nation to be tested, and the jury is out on whether relations have hit their lowest point since the border war of 1962 or if there’s still further to fall.

#### That causes nuclear prolif

Abraham 09 [ Itty Abraham is Associate Professor of Southeast Asian Studies at the National University of Singapore and the former director of the South Asia Institute, the Marlene and Morton Meyerson Centennial Chair, and former associate professor of government and Asian studies and edited the book this card is from. Indiana University Press “SOUTH ASIAN CULTURES OF THE BOMB: Atomic Publics and the State in India and Pakistan” https://muse.jhu.edu/book/3857]//aaditg

The last interconnected area is the threat of the external Others, specifically China and Pakistan. the nuclear race was accelerated by the fear that neighboring countries would avail themselves of military technology to harm Indian national interests.The mechanism of “threat construction” has underpinned these fears, whether it is China in the 1960s or the later status of Pakistan. Previous wars, border skirmishes, and the threat of invasion and iniltration involving these two countries have provided grist to India’s nuclear mill. The notion of the Other sitting right outside the door is a constant reminder of India’s precarious geopolitical position, and provides an extra boost to nuclear armament. But the Other is also a changing category that has both internal and external constituents, and where other countries can switly become enemies in the vagaries of shiting alliances: “blaming the others (be they Muslims, China, Western hypocrisy, or whatever) has found powerful resonance.”23 Thus this vigilant awareness is supplemented with a penumbra of other nations that are against India’s aspirations to go nuclear. The West, or perhaps more to the point, countries already in the nuclear club, have come under repeated attack as Indian politicians appeal for equality in the world of nuclear treaties. But this tension is also complemented with a desire to be like Raminder Kaur · them. So whereas with long-term enemies such as Pakistan the Indian government’s desire is to expunge and control , in relation to other nuclear countries its desire is to mimic and attain a comparable international ranking. We now turn to examine how all these discursive elements are invoked in Ganapati Festival displays and narratives among working- and lower-middle-class residents of Mumbai.25 Each of the following festival tableaux presents a creative and selective combination of the discourses described above.26 he tableaux not only reproduce elements of the discourses, they re-produce them. the hairline hyphen in re-production alludes to the fact that every practice or display becomes itself a production, not a facsimile copy. Mandal members, in their creation of tableaux, select, reject, and recombine elements of these discourses in an interactive and innovative way.27 Occasionally the re-production leads to some notable ambiguities which we explore below.

#### Nuclear Proliferation causes Nuclear War.

Kroenig 15(Matthew Kroenig; Associate Professor and International Relations Field Chair in the Department of Government and School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University; 2015, “The History of Proliferation Optimism: Does It Have a Future?”; *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Volume 38, Issue 1-2)//Re-cut by Elmer

The spread of nuclear weapons poses at least six severe threats to international peace and security including: nuclear war, nuclear terrorism, global and regional instability, constrained US freedom of action, weakened alliances, and further nuclear proliferation. Each of these threats has received extensive treatment elsewhere and this review is not intended to replicate or even necessarily to improve upon these previous efforts. Rather the goals of this section are more modest: to usefully bring together and recap the many reasons why we should be pessimistic about the likely consequences of nuclear proliferation. Many of these threats will be illuminated with a discussion of a case of much contemporary concern: Iran’s advanced nuclear program. Nuclear War The greatest threat posed by the spread of nuclear weapons is nuclear war. The more states in possession of nuclear weapons, the greater the probability that somewhere, someday, there will be a catastrophic nuclear war. To date, nuclear weapons have only been used in warfare once. In 1945, the United States used nuclear weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, bringing World War II to a close. Many analysts point to the 65-plus-year tradition of nuclear non-use as evidence that nuclear weapons are unusable, but it would be naïve to think that nuclear weapons will never be used again simply because they have not been used for some time. After all, analysts in the 1990s argued that worldwide economic downturns like the Great Depression were a thing of the past, only to be surprised by the dot-com bubble bursting later in the decade and the Great Recession of the late 2000s.48 This author, for one, would be surprised if nuclear weapons are not used again sometime in his lifetime. Before reaching a state of MAD, new nuclear states go through a transition period in which they lack a secure-second strike capability. In this context, one or both states might believe that it has an incentive to use nuclear weapons first. For example, if Iran acquires nuclear weapons, neither Iran, nor its nuclear-armed rival, Israel, will have a secure, second-strike capability. Even though it is believed to have a large arsenal, given its small size and lack of strategic depth, Israel might not be confident that it could absorb a nuclear strike and respond with a devastating counterstrike. Similarly, Iran might eventually be able to build a large and survivable nuclear arsenal, but, when it first crosses the nuclear threshold, Tehran will have a small and vulnerable nuclear force. In these pre-MAD situations, there are at least three ways that nuclear war could occur. First, the state with the nuclear advantage might believe it has a splendid first strike capability. In a crisis, Israel might, therefore, decide to launch a preventive nuclear strike to disarm Iran’s nuclear capabilities. Indeed, this incentive might be further increased by Israel’s aggressive strategic culture that emphasizes preemptive action. Second, the state with a small and vulnerable nuclear arsenal, in this case Iran, might feel use them or lose them pressures. That is, in a crisis, Iran might decide to strike first rather than risk having its entire nuclear arsenal destroyed. Third, as Thomas Schelling has argued, nuclear war could result due to the reciprocal fear of surprise attack.49 If there are advantages to striking first, one state might start a nuclear war in the belief that war is inevitable and that it would be better to go first than to go second. Fortunately, there is no historic evidence of this dynamic occurring in a nuclear context, but it is still possible. In an Israeli–Iranian crisis, for example, Israel and Iran might both prefer to avoid a nuclear war, but decide to strike first rather than suffer a devastating first attack from an opponent. Even in a world of MAD, however, when both sides have secure, second-strike capabilities, there is still a risk of nuclear war. Rational deterrence theory assumes nuclear-armed states are governed by rational leaders who would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war. This assumption appears to have applied to past and current nuclear powers, but there is no guarantee that it will continue to hold in the future. Iran’s theocratic government, despite its inflammatory rhetoric, has followed a fairly pragmatic foreign policy since 1979, but it contains leaders who hold millenarian religious worldviews and could one day ascend to power. We cannot rule out the possibility that, as nuclear weapons continue to spread, some leader somewhere will choose to launch a nuclear war, knowing full well that it could result in self-destruction. One does not need to resort to irrationality, however, to imagine nuclear war under MAD. Nuclear weapons may deter leaders from intentionally launching full-scale wars, but they do not mean the end of international politics. As was discussed above, nuclear-armed states still have conflicts of interest and leaders still seek to coerce nuclear-armed adversaries. Leaders might, therefore, choose to launch a limited nuclear war.50 This strategy might be especially attractive to states in a position of conventional inferiority that might have an incentive to escalate a crisis quickly to the nuclear level. During the Cold War, the United States planned to use nuclear weapons first to stop a Soviet invasion of Western Europe given NATO’s conventional inferiority.51 As Russia’s conventional power has deteriorated since the end of the Cold War, Moscow has come to rely more heavily on nuclear weapons in its military doctrine. Indeed, Russian strategy calls for the use of nuclear weapons early in a conflict (something that most Western strategists would consider to be escalatory) as a way to de-escalate a crisis. Similarly, Pakistan’s military plans for nuclear use in the event of an invasion from conventionally stronger India. And finally, Chinese generals openly talk about the possibility of nuclear use against a US superpower in a possible East Asia contingency. Second, as was also discussed above, leaders can make a ‘threat that leaves something to chance’.52 They can initiate a nuclear crisis. By playing these risky games of nuclear brinkmanship, states can increase the risk of nuclear war in an attempt to force a less resolved adversary to back down. Historical crises have not resulted in nuclear war, but many of them, including the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, have come close. And scholars have documented historical incidents when accidents nearly led to war.53 When we think about future nuclear crisis dyads, such as Iran and Israel, with fewer sources of stability than existed during the Cold War, we can see that there is a real risk that a future crisis could result in a devastating nuclear exchange. Nuclear Terrorism The spread of nuclear weapons also increases the risk of nuclear terrorism.54 While September 11th was one of the greatest tragedies in American history, it would have been much worse had Osama Bin Laden possessed nuclear weapons. Bin Laden declared it a ‘religious duty’ for Al- Qa’eda to acquire nuclear weapons and radical clerics have issued fatwas declaring it permissible to use nuclear weapons in Jihad against the West.55 Unlike states, which can be more easily deterred, there is little doubt that if terrorists acquired nuclear weapons, they would use them.56 Indeed, in recent years, many US politicians and security analysts have argued that nuclear terrorism poses the greatest threat to US national security.57 Analysts have pointed out the tremendous hurdles that terrorists would have to overcome in order to acquire nuclear weapons.58 Nevertheless, as nuclear weapons spread, the possibility that they will eventually fall into terrorist hands increases. States could intentionally transfer nuclear weapons, or the fissile material required to build them, to terrorist groups. There are good reasons why a state might be reluctant to transfer nuclear weapons to terrorists, but, as nuclear weapons spread, the probability that a leader might someday purposely arm a terrorist group increases. Some fear, for example, that Iran, with its close ties to Hamas and Hizballah, might be at a heightened risk of transferring nuclear weapons to terrorists. Moreover, even if no state would ever intentionally transfer nuclear capabilities to terrorists, a new nuclear state, with underdeveloped security procedures, might be vulnerable to theft, allowing terrorist groups or corrupt or ideologically-motivated insiders to transfer dangerous material to terrorists. There is evidence, for example, that representatives from Pakistan’s atomic energy establishment met with Al-Qa’eda members to discuss a possible nuclear deal.59 Finally, a nuclear-armed state could collapse, resulting in a breakdown of law and order and a loose nukes problem. US officials are currently very concerned about what would happen to Pakistan’s nuclear weapons if the government were to fall. As nuclear weapons spread, this problem is only further amplified. Iran is a country with a history of revolutions and a government with a tenuous hold on power. The regime change that Washington has long dreamed about in Tehran could actually become a nightmare if a nuclear-armed Iran suffered a breakdown in authority, forcing us to worry about the fate of Iran’s nuclear arsenal. Regional Instability The spread of nuclear weapons also emboldens nuclear powers, contributing to regional instability. States that lack nuclear weapons need to fear direct military attack from other states, but states with nuclear weapons can be confident that they can deter an intentional military attack, giving them an incentive to be more aggressive in the conduct of their foreign policy. In this way, nuclear weapons provide a shield under which states can feel free to engage in lower-level aggression. Indeed, international relations theories about the ‘stability-instability paradox’ maintain that stability at the nuclear level contributes to conventional instability.60 Historically, we have seen that the spread of nuclear weapons has emboldened their possessors and contributed to regional instability. Recent scholarly analyses have demonstrated that, after controlling for other relevant factors, nuclear-weapon states are more likely to engage in conflict than nonnuclear-weapon states and that this aggressiveness is more pronounced in new nuclear states that have less experience with nuclear diplomacy.61 Similarly, research on internal decision-making in Pakistan reveals that Pakistani foreign policymakers may have been emboldened by the acquisition of nuclear weapons, which encouraged them to initiate militarized disputes against India.62 Currently, Iran restrains its foreign policy because it fears major military retaliation from the United States or Israel, but with nuclear weapons it could feel free to push harder. A nuclear-armed Iran would likely step up support to terrorist and proxy groups and engage in more aggressive coercive diplomacy. With a nuclear-armed Iran increasingly throwing its weight around in the region, we could witness an even more crisis prone Middle East. And in a poly-nuclear Middle East with Israel, Iran, and, in the future, possibly other states, armed with nuclear weapons, any one of those crises could result in a catastrophic nuclear exchange.

**Nuclear war causes extinction through winter, firestorms, EMP blasts, ozone damage, and meltdowns**

-Immediate death -Climate destruction spurring an ice age (Nuclear winter) via nuclear firestorms and smoke -Ozone collapses -2 Billion insta-die in famine -kills biodiversity -Meltdowns and grid collapse via EMPs -Remaining fallout

**Starr 14** {Steven, Senior Scientist for Physicians for Social Responsibility, Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program (Missouri), commentator in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, “The Lethality of Nuclear Weapons: Nuclear War has No Winner,” Global Research: Centre for Research on Globalization, 6/5, http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-lethality-of-nuclear-weapons-nuclear-war-has-no-winner/5385611}

Nuclear war **has no winner**. Beginning in 2006, several of the world’s **leading climatologists** (at Rutgers, UCLA, John Hopkins University, and the University of Colorado-Boulder) published a series of studies that evaluated the long-term environmental consequences of a nuclear war, including baseline scenarios fought with **merely 1%** of the explosive power in the US and/or Russian launch-ready nuclear arsenals. They concluded that the consequences of even a “small” nuclear war would include **catastrophic disruptions** of global climate[i] and **massive destruction** of Earth’s protective ozone layer[ii]. These **and more recent studies** predict that global agriculture would be so negatively affected by such a war, a global famine would result, which would cause up to **2 billion people to starve to death**. [iii]¶ These **peer-reviewed** studies – which were analyzed by the **best scientists in the world** and found to be without error – also predict that a war fought with less than half of US or Russian strategic nuclear weapons would **destroy the human race**.[iv] In other words, a US-Russian nuclear war would create such extreme long-term damage to the global environment that it would leave the Earth **uninhabitable** for humans and most animal forms of life.¶ A recent article in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “Self-assured destruction: The climate impacts of nuclear war”,[v] begins by stating:¶ “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, **even after the arsenal reductions** planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be **suicidal**, resulting in self-assured **destruction**.”¶ In 2009, I wrote an article[vi] for the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament that summarizes the findings of these studies. It explains that nuclear firestorms would produce millions of tons of smoke, which would rise above cloud level and form a global stratospheric smoke layer that would **rapidly encircle the Earth**. The smoke layer would remain for at least a **decade**, and it would act to destroy the protective ozone layer (vastly increasing the UV-B reaching Earth[vii]) as well as block warming sunlight, thus creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last **10 years** or longer.¶ Following a US-Russian nuclear war, temperatures in the central US and Eurasia would fall below freezing every day for one to three years; the intense cold would **completely eliminate growing seasons for a decade** or longer. No crops could be grown, leading to a famine that would **kill most humans and large animal populations**.¶ Electromagnetic pulse from high-altitude nuclear detonations would destroy the integrated circuits in all modern electronic devices[viii], including those in commercial nuclear power plants. Every nuclear reactor would almost **instantly** meltdown; every nuclear spent fuel pool (which contain many times more radioactivity than found in the reactors) would boil-off, releasing vast amounts of **long-lived** radioactivity. The fallout would make most of the US and Europe **uninhabitable**. Of course, the survivors of the nuclear war would be **starving to death anyway.** Once nuclear weapons were introduced into a US-Russian conflict, there would be little chance that a **nuclear holocaust** could be avoided. Theories of “limited nuclear war” and “nuclear de-escalation” are **unrealistic**.[ix] In 2002 the Bush administration modified US strategic doctrine from a retaliatory role to permit preemptive nuclear attack; in 2010, the Obama administration made only incremental and miniscule changes to this doctrine, leaving it essentially unchanged. Furthermore, Counterforce doctrine – used by both the US and Russian military – emphasizes the need for preemptive strikes once nuclear war begins. Both sides would be under immense pressure to launch a preemptive nuclear first-strike once military hostilities had commenced, especially if nuclear weapons had already been used on the battlefield.

### FW

**Standard is maximizing expected well being**

**Actor Spec— States must use util. Any other standard dooms the moral theory**

**Goodin 90.** Robert Goodin 90, [professor of philosophy at the Australian National University college of arts and social sciences], “The Utilitarian Response,” pgs 141-142 //RS

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules or conduct.

**Extinction comes first under any framework.**

**Pummer 15** [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether “these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But ***that is a huge mistake.*** Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; ***it is not the view that the latter don’t matter***. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” ***Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good***, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. ***We should also take into account moral uncertainty.*** What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, ***all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world***. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)
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I fall squarely on the side of disclosure. I find that the largest advantage of widespread disclosure is the educational value it provides. First, disclosure streamlines research. Rather than every team and every lone wolf researching completely in the dark, the wiki provides a public body of knowledge that everyone can contribute to and build off of. Students can look through the different studies on the topic and choose the best ones on an informed basis without the prohibitively large burden of personally surveying all of the literature. The best arguments are identified and replicated, which is a natural result of an open marketplace of ideas. Quality of evidence increases across the board. In theory, the increased quality of information could trade off with quantity. If debaters could just look to the wiki for evidence, it might remove the competitive incentive to do one’s own research. Empirically, however, the opposite has been true. In fact, a second advantage of disclosure is that it motivates research. Debaters cannot expect to make it a whole topic with the same stock AC – that is, unless they are continually updating and frontlining it. Likewise, debaters with access to their opponents’ cases can do more targeted and specific research. Students can go to a new level of depth, researching not just the pros and cons of the topic but the specific authors, arguments, and advocacies employed by other debaters. The incentive to cut author-specific indicts is low if there’s little guarantee that the author will ever be cited in a round but high if one knows that specific schools are using that author in rounds. In this way, disclosure increases incentive to research by altering a student’s cost-benefit analysis so that the time spent researching is more valuable, i.e. more likely to produce useful evidence because it is more directed. In any case, if publicly accessible evidence jeopardized research, backfiles and briefs would have done LD in a long time ago.
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