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**Standard is maximizing expected well being**

**Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue**

#### Blum et al. 18
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**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even **produce the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

**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)

### Democracy

#### Indian democracy is *declining*

#### Biswas 21

[Soutik is a correspondent in India. He has covered elections in Afghanistan and Sri Lanka, the tsunami in India and Sri Lanka in 2005, and militancy in Kashmir. Before joining the BBC, he worked in Indian newspapers and magazines. BBC “'Electoral autocracy': The downgrading of India's democracy”https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-56393944] aaditg

\*modi governance

\* democracy index

\*freedom house

Earlier this month, in its annual report on global political rights and liberties, US-based non-profit Freedom House downgraded India from a free democracy to a "partially free democracy". Last week, Sweden-based V-Dem Institute was harsher in its latest report on democracy. It said India had become an "electoral autocracy". And last month, India, described as a "flawed democracy", slipped two places to 53rd position in the latest Democracy Index published by The Economist Intelligence Unit. The rankings blame Mr Modi and his Hindu nationalist BJP government for the backsliding of democracy. Under Mr Modi's watch, they say, there has been increased pressure on human rights groups, intimidation of journalists and activists, and a spate of attacks, especially against Muslims. This, they add, has led to a deterioration of political and civil liberties in the country. Freedom House said civil liberties have been in decline since Mr Modi came to power in 2014, and that India's "fall from the upper ranks of free nations" could have a more damaging effect on the world's democratic standards. Many viewed the 2019 election as a referendum on Mr Modi (L) who won a landslide IMAGE SOURCE,AFP Image caption, Mr Modi won a landslide election in 2019 V-Dem said the "diminishing of freedom of expression, the media, and civil society have gone the furthest" during Mr Modi's rule, and that far as censorship goes India was "as autocratic as Pakistan and worse than its neighbours Bangladesh and Nepal". And The Democracy Index said the "democratic backsliding" by authorities and "crackdowns" on civil liberties had led to a decline in India's rankings. Mr Modi's policies, it said, had "fomented anti-Muslim feeling and religious strife and damaged the political fabric of the country". How has India's government reacted? Not surprisingly, the flurry of downgrades have riled Mr Modi's government and cast a shadow on the global image of India's democracy. Why journalists in India are under attack The jailed Indian activist linked to Greta Thunberg Jailed and 'tortured' for trying to report a rape On the Freedom House report, the foreign ministry said that India had "robust institutions and well established democratic practices" and did not "need sermons especially from those who cannot get their basics right." The political judgements of the report were "inaccurate and distorted", it said. In parliament, the chairman of the upper house, Venkaiah Naidu, did not allow an opposition MP to pose a question related to the V-Dem report saying: "All countries which are commenting on India should first look inward and then comment on India." At the weekend, Foreign Minister S Jaishankar came out with the strongest denunciation of these reports. A resident passes by a burnt house after communal violence in northeast Delhi last week over the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), at Shiv Viihar, on March 5, 2020 IMAGE SOURCE,HINDUSTAN TIMES Image caption, The freedom report criticised the government's response to protests against a controversial citizenship bill "You use the dichotomy of democracy and autocracy. You want the truthful answer…it is called hypocrisy. Because you have a set of self-appointed custodians of the world, who find it very difficult to stomach that somebody in India is not looking for their approval, is not willing to play the game they want to be played," Mr Jaishankar told a news network. "So they invent their rules, their parameters, they pass their judgements and then make out as though this is some kind of global exercise".

#### BJP’s Nationalist views kills democracy – pressed news outlets, advertisement cut-off, and tax investigations.

Goel et al 20 [Vindu Goel, Jeffrey Gettleman and Saumya Khandelwal, 4-2-2020, "Under Modi, India’s Press Is Not So Free Anymore (Published 2020)," No Publication, [https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/02/world/asia/modi-india-press-media.html]//](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/02/world/asia/modi-india-press-media.html%5d//) akhileshp

NEW DELHI — The Media One anchorman Vinesh Kunhiraman went on air as usual on March 6, ready to tell the station’s five million viewers in India’s Kerala State about the death anniversary of a beloved comedian and the latest news on the coronavirus pandemic. Just a few minutes into the broadcast, he saw the managing editor rush to the studio floor, gesturing wildly. “I realized something was not right,” Mr. Kunhiraman recalled. The station’s uplink suddenly went dead. Mr. Kunhiraman’s image dissolved into a blue screen. A bland message told viewers there was no signal. “We regret the inconvenience,” it said. But this was no technical difficulty. The station had been cut off by an order from India’s Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The government decided to block the channel for 48 hours because it had covered February’s biggest news story — the mob attacks on Muslims in New Delhi that flared into broader unrest — in a way that seemed “critical toward Delhi Police and R.S.S.,” the order said. The R.S.S. is a Hindu-nationalist social movement with close ties to Prime Minister [Narendra Modi](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/02/world/asia/india-west-bengal-elections-modi.html) and his Bharatiya Janata Party. “It was shocking the central government took such a decision,” said R. Subhash, an editor at Media One. “It was an attack on the freedom of the press.” India’s free press has played a crucial role in protecting this country’s democracy since its independence from Britain in 1947. But journalists here now feel under attack. Since Mr. Modi came to power in 2014, they say, his government has tried to control the country’s news media, especially the airwaves, like no other prime minister in decades. Mr. Modi has shrewdly cultivated the media to build a cult of personality that portrays him as the nation’s selfless savior. At the same time, senior government officials have pressed news outlets — berating editors, cutting off advertising, ordering tax investigations — to ignore the uglier side of his party’s campaign to transform India from a tolerant, religiously diverse country into an assertively Hindu one. Right before he [announced the world’s largest coronavirus lockdown](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/24/world/asia/india-coronavirus-lockdown.html), on 1.3 billion people, Mr. Modi [met with top news executives](https://caravanmagazine.in/media/hours-before-lockdown-modi-asked-print-media-owners-editors-refrain-negative-covid-coverage) and urged them to [publish “inspiring and positive stories”](https://www.narendramodi.in/prime-minister-narendra-modi-interacts-with-print-media-journalists-and-stakeholders-548937) about the government’s efforts. Then, after the [lockdown](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/29/world/asia/coronavirus-india-migrants.html) stranded half a million migrant workers, with [some dying along the highways](https://thewire.in/rights/coronavirus-national-lockdown-migrant-workers-dead), his lawyers persuaded the Supreme Court this week to [order all media](https://www.barandbench.com/news/litigation/coronavirus-lockdown-fake-news-and-panic-driven-migration-caused-untold-misery-to-migrant-labourers-supreme-court-read-order) to “publish the official version” of coronavirus developments, although outlets are still allowed to carry independent reporting. An association of leading broadcasters was quick to praise the court decision, which many intellectuals said was yet another attack on India’s constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech. Through an aide, India’s information and broadcasting minister, Prakash Javadekar, initially agreed to discuss the government’s media policies. But in the two weeks since then, Mr. Javadekar has declined to answer any questions, including a written list emailed to him. His aide cited the demands of the coronavirus crisis. India’s media universe is vast, perhaps the biggest in the world: More than 17,000 newspapers, 100,000 magazines, 178 television news channels and countless websites in dozens of languages. Thousands of Facebook pages call themselves news publishers, and YouTube is filled with local bulletins on everything from real estate trends to police raids. But Mr. Modi’s ministers have leaned on business leaders to cut off support to independent media, slowly strangling their operations. His government has pressured media owners to fire journalists who have criticized the prime minister and told them to stop running features like hate-crime trackers that have embarrassed Mr. Modi’s party. Mr. Modi is backed up by an army of online allies who discredit and harass independent journalists; female journalists, in particular, have been besieged with abuse and rape threats. And the [police say Hindu nationalists](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/08/world/asia/india-lankesh-kalburgi-gun.html) were behind the [2017 murder of Gauri Lankesh](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/14/magazine/gauri-lankesh-murder-journalist.html), a female newspaper editor hailed as one of India’s most crusading journalists. Like other populist leaders, Mr. Modi and his ministers bristle at any public criticism, whether from [business executives](https://indianexpress.com/article/india/day-after-rahul-bajaj-spoke-up-bjp-and-ministers-hit-back-6145942/), [foreign leaders](https://www.businesstoday.in/current/world/caa-in-eu-parliament-european-parliament-to-not-vote-on-caa-to-thursday/story/394966.html), or even [schoolchildren](https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/karnataka-school-sedition-case-challenged-in-supreme-court-2183845). And for the most part, Indian news outlets have knuckled under, concluding that since much of the public supports the prime minister, they should, too. Even skeptical journalists censor themselves, afraid to be branded anti-national by a government that equates patriotism with support for Mr. Modi. His government has also imposed the strictest restrictions on foreign journalists in decades, suddenly and without explanation. Visas have been tightened, and foreign journalists have been banned from hotbeds of unrest such as northeast India and Jammu and Kashmir, a Muslim-majority area that was stripped of its statehood in August and put under [a severe crackdown](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/07/world/asia/kashmir-doctors-phone.html). The Kashmir story was seismic, but many Indian journalists, looking back on it, feel that they toed the government line and overlooked grave human rights abuses. “We didn’t do justice to the big story,’’ said Rajdeep Sardesai, one of the country’s leading news anchors. “We should have gone out there and reported the situation from the ground aggressively and independently.’’ There were security restrictions on where Indian reporters could go, Mr. Sardesai said, but he admitted it was more than that. “A large section of the Indian media,” he said, “has become a lap dog, not a watchdog.” The business model in India doesn’t help. Well before Mr. Modi first became prime minister in 2014, newspapers and television stations have relied on government advertising, allowing politicians to reward friendly outlets and punish critics. And media owners often run other businesses for which they need the government’s favor, making them reluctant to take on those in power. With the coronavirus pandemic dampening advertising and restricting newspaper circulation, news organizations are now sliding into crisis. One of the most independent, [The Indian Express](https://indianexpress.com/), just decided to cut salaries. Even as Mr. Modi constantly touts India as the world’s largest democracy, its ranking on the [Reporters Without Borders press freedom index](https://rsf.org/en/ranking) is 140 out of 180. “In the past six years, the Indian media has deteriorated,” said Shakuntala Banaji, a media professor at the London School of Economics. “There is no semblance of truth or responsibility left in the vast majority of media reports.” The apologetic calls from advertisers have become so common that NDTV executives are no longer surprised. One corporate boss begged the station to take his company’s logo off the screen, saying the government was squeezing him too hard. Another executive broke down in tears as he canceled a large advertising contract. No TV channel has come under more pressure from Mr. Modi’s government than NDTV, an influential network that airs in English and Hindi. Mr. Modi’s grudge goes back to 2002, when he was chief minister of Gujarat State, and NDTV journalists reported that his government stood by while hundreds of Muslims were massacred in religiously driven violence. When Mr. Modi became prime minister, his administration began a full-scale assault on NDTV. The government accused it of laundering money through a deal with NBC, the American TV network. The accusations have dragged on for years, and NDTV denies any wrongdoing. “The thing in India is, you can file a case, and win it 10 years later,” said Prannoy Roy, one of NDTV’s founders. “The process is the punishment.” The effort to brand NDTV as unpatriotic has been devastatingly effective. In one November 2016 email, the luxury automaker Daimler told NDTV that it would not proceed with a marketing campaign because “there are people associated with the channel that are linked to anti-India stuff, by the public at large.” A Daimler spokeswoman said Friday that the email did not reflect the company’s views and that the campaign had been rejected for economic reasons. As money dried up, the station laid off hundreds of journalists. NDTV now gets much of its advertising from state governments, many of which are controlled by opposition parties. Many within India’s news firmament have embraced Mr. Modi, sensing how much the popular mood has swung away from India’s founding secularism and toward Mr. Modi’s brand of strident Hindu nationalism. Right-wing TV anchors, led by Arnab Goswami of Republic TV, compete to outdo one another as the loudest Modi supporters. As [the government announced the crackdown in Kashmir](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/09/podcasts/the-daily/kashmir-india-modi.html), M.K. Anand, the managing director of Times Network, sent his editors a directive. “We are India’s leading news broadcasters,” he wrote in a WhatsApp message, seen by The New York Times. “It is important that we stay firmly with the national government at this juncture instead of focusing on finding faults.” The Modi government has been particularly concerned about broadcast media, which reach into every corner of the country. It has approved very few new TV channels, and even Bloomberg, the American media giant, has been unable to get a license, despite investing millions of dollars with its Indian partner. In this environment, sharp criticism of Mr. Modi can end careers. After a host at the Hindi news channel ABP questioned the results of one of the prime minister’s initiatives to help poor farmers, the satellite transmission of the show was interrupted every time it was broadcast, said several people who worked at the station. The channel’s owners pressured the host, Punya Prasun Bajpai, to resign, and as soon as he left, the transmission interruptions stopped, the former employees said. And after another ABP anchor, Abhisar Sharma, criticized Mr. Modi on live television about public safety, he was pulled off the air the same day. He, too, said he was pressured to quit. Mr. Sharma then took to YouTube to broadcast his commentary, but pro-Modi trolls followed him into cyberspace. Every time he uploaded a video — and some drew millions of views — YouTube would receive thousands of complaints that he had made inappropriate remarks, Mr. Sharma said. The site’s algorithm then blocked any advertising revenue he would have made. “You can’t escape them,” he said. Small-town journalists have come under government attack, as well. Last August, Pawan Kumar Jaiswal, a part-time journalist who also ran a tiny mobile phone accessories shop, broke a story revealing how poor children in a school near Varanasi, Mr. Modi’s parliamentary constituency, were being fed only flatbread and salt for lunch — a clear violation of government nutrition rules. After his [short video](https://www.indiatoday.in/india/video/watch-school-kids-served-rotis-with-salt-under-mid-day-meal-scheme-in-up-s-mirzapur-1590873-2019-08-23) went viral, a state education officer filed a criminal complaint against Mr. Jaiswal, accusing him of conspiracy, false evidence and cheating, a crime that can draw up to seven years in jail. His source at the school was promptly arrested. Fearing he was next, Mr. Jaiswal fled to New Delhi, where he hid for several weeks. “Sometimes I felt like committing suicide,’’ he said. Even though an investigation eventually vindicated his reporting and the police dropped the charges against him, Mr. Jaiswal continues to be stalked by people connected to the school, he said. He has reason to be afraid. Several Indian journalists have been killed in recent years, from a [Kashmiri newspaper editor shot](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/14/world/asia/kashmir-journalist-killed.html) outside his office to a [young journalist in Jharkhand](https://cpj.org/data/people/chandan-tiwari/index.php) who was abducted and found unconscious in a forest. “This is the life of a local reporter,” Mr. Jaiswal said. The shutdown of Media One and another Kerala television station, Asianet News, in March was a new twist. Both stations broadcast in Malayalam, a local language spoken by less than 3 percent of Indians. And both channels had aired witness accounts that echoed what many other outlets aired during the violence in Delhi: that [the police had done little to stop Hindu mobs as they rampaged](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/12/world/asia/india-police-muslims.html) against Muslims. But the broadcast ministry claimed that what these two stations reported “could enhance the communal disharmony across the country.” After many complaints about the shutdown, the broadcasting minister, Mr. Javadekar, reversed the orders the next morning. “Press freedom is absolutely essential in a democratic setup and that is the commitment of the Modi government,” Mr. Javadekar said at a news conference, implying that the orders had been issued without his consent. “But let me also say,” he concluded, “that everybody accepts that it has to be a responsible freedom.”

#### Current Indian news *cripples* democracy because of lack of objectivity: *fake news*, mob *lynchings*

#### Sharma 20

[Mahak Sharma is working in content and documentation in a women-oriented project. I believe that knowledge is power, and should be used for the upliftment of the society. Chai is life! Animals are love, more so cats! Cats have it all - admiration, an endless sleep and company only when they want it. “Opinion: Journalism, The Crumbling Pillar Of Indian Democracy” YKA <https://www.youthkiawaaz.com/2020/04/journalism-the-crumbling-pillar-of-indian-democracy/>] aaditg

\*defines india as a democracy

\*solvency bc the end explains why recognizing it can fix problems

In these extraordinary times of a global pandemic which has quite literally spread across every nook and corner of the world, from the small island states of Papua New Guinea to the military superpower United States of America, the world and people are filled with a sense of disquietude, making it difficult for all of us to cope with this precariousness. Therefore, many of us consider it wise to rely on news channels, newspapers, online news portals, websites, etc. to stay alert and aware of the disease and its consequences. But the sad state of Indian journalism which is reduced to a ‘Whatsapp University’ has created it difficult for the citizens to count on the Indian media for legitimate information and a sense of security. Lately, it has become a gargantuan task to differentiate between ‘fake’ news and ‘legit’ news, and the onus lies on the viewers and consumers of the news. Amount of ‘fake news’ has increased exponentially, so much so that different media outlets were created to deal with the ‘menace of fake news’. India recently witnessed another lynching where three people (two of them were sadhus) were killed by a mob of over 100 men in Palghar, Maharashtra. The lynching and the angry mob were incited on mistaken identity where they considered the three men to be involved in child kidnapping. The recent ‘panel discussion’ which turned into a shouting match by the panelists and the moderator on ‘Palgtghar Lynching’ completely baffled me. There were ‘news anchors’ who quoted wrong information, and turned themselves into a chest-thumping, liberal-hating, Hindu-loving and anti-opposition puppets, and used communally-charged language and hate speech in a secular, multi-ethnic, and a multi-religious country like India. It is not as if this is the first time that I have seen a mockery being made of journalism but this is definitely the time when I began to forget what journalism stands for, why we need it, what consists of good journalism, and how salient it is for the functioning of a democracy. I began to look at the history of Journalism and understand it, but let us first define what journalism means. “Journalism is collation and distribution of news in print and non-print forms. The essence of the definition lies in the three inevitable cornerstones of journalism – objectivity and truth, autonomy and neutrality, and responsibility and management.” An Overview Print journalism dates back to 17th Century Germany, but the practice of the distribution of news was practiced in the Roman era in 59 B.C. where it was recorded in Acta Diurna through which news was hung in the city center every day for the consumption of the people. In this day and age of capitalism and Information Technology, commercialization of journalism and the abundance of fake and unreliable information are some of the predominant issues eroding the industry in India. The principle of ‘objectivity‘ is one of the foremost lessons in journalism, and it was considered of prime importance by Lichtenberg (1996:225) especially in liberal democracies. The term ‘objectivity’ is a comprehensive term and implies a ‘rational’ perspective on any given situation, and Westerstahl’s model defines it to include several components like truth, facts, and impartiality as well. Objectivity and truth are always considered at the top of the journalistic ethos. In addition, autonomy and neutrality have become equally important to reiterate the first principle of objectivity and truth. If a media house is not autonomous, it would eventually end up losing objectivity for either political or commercial gains. In light of these events, neutrality and autonomy became two very important pillars of the industry. Commercialization along with political pressures has threatened the freedom and autonomy of the industry in this era of capitalism. While these threats were non-existent during the nascent stage of the industry, there was immense political pressure which prevented newspapers or journalists from reporting on parliamentary actions, criticism of the king/government/ruler, and any form of rebellious speech or language. It was with the onset and dissemination of the enlightenment principles of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity that the industry became much more autonomous and free of the political shackles. Today, freedom is one of the inevitable prerequisites for practicing serious and substantial journalism. Over the last 5 centuries, journalism has become a medium to change the world, a medium to share knowledge, ideas, and has played an extraordinary role in revolutions and movements across the world. To rejig our memories, it is important we understand journalism through the most effective outcomes that have been achieved in different parts of the world where journalism challenged and even changed the status quo. History And National Movements Clipping of The Hindu Patriot Historically, journalism has played a prominent role in revolutions, movements, and mass mobilization of people against injustice. Revolutions and mobilization of people are based on an ‘ideology’ which comes from an unbiased assessment of the power centers, therefore, communication of information and ideas becomes the core; and journalism becomes an effective way to disseminate information. The role of press and journalism in India’s freedom struggle dates back to 1857 when Payam-e-Azadi was published in Hindi and Urdu, compelling and calling people to fight against the British in the first war of independence. This was confiscated by the British, but the role of press and journalism had just begun in the larger struggle for freedom. Hindu Patriot, first published in 1853, by Girish Chandra Ghosh became a way of mobilizing people against the hostile policies of the British. One of the plays published under Harish Chandra Mukherjee in 1861 called Neel Darpan highlighted the predicament of the farmers and urged them to stop growing crops for the white traders; this led to the formation of Neel Commission by the British. Several Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, and Marathi newspapers faced trials and convictions for exposing the abuses of the British Empire in the Indian sub-continent while they informed people about the rampant abuse of power by the British. The popularity of Bhagat Singh, Rajguru, and Sukhdev can be attributed to the information that was published in different journals and newspapers during their trial, where their ideas and the injustice was being highlighted through journalism. Likewise, newspapers played an indispensable role in African and Asian countries during the colonial period, fuelling ideas and information among the people, and often questioning the colonial authorities. Also read: From Gauri Lankesh To Shujaat Bukhari, Our Journalists Continue To Pay A Heavy Price Speaking Truth To Power Hannah Dreier receiving the Pulitzer Prize.||Credits: The Pulitzer Prizes Journalism, in essence, implies distributing information and news but the freedom provided to journalists and media in a country reflects the democratic nature of the political system. In a democracy where people can hold their government and administration accountable, the onus placed on journalism is tremendous. It becomes an institution that keeps a check on the government practices and ensures public good, justice, equality, and freedom for its citizenry. Journalism is as diverse as the circumstances that exist in our world, and it is difficult to compartmentalize them in a few separate categories. But these are some primary classification based on methodology and outcome—investigative, citizen, news, reviews, and columns, etc. Investigative journalism is considered to be one of the risky endeavours that only a few daredevils could engage in, as it often involves under-cover agents and working in conflict zones or hostile environments. Hannah Dreier is one such journalist known for her exceptional courage and investigative reports. She won a Pulitzer for covering three case studies of two school students and a mother who were charged and deported back to their country of origin without any due process of law. Xenophobia and the lack of justice and freedom for immigrants is the central theme in these stories throwing light on how the presence of police officials in schools infringes on the human rights of immigrant children, who are looked at with suspicion. The account presents how a few harmless activities are enough to profile a student as belonging to MS-13 without any concrete evidence or facts. There is another investigative journalist, Anas Aremeyaw Anas working with Al Jazeera, who hails from West African country Ghana. He has conducted undercover operations exposing corruption in the judiciary, sports, and ritual killing of children by witch doctors in rural Ghana, among other operations. Journalism And Democracy Journalism and media play an imperative role in maintaining the social fabric and the political system of a country. It does engage in advocacy, protection of rights of the downtrodden and powerless, uncovering illegal practices; and ultimately speaking truth to power. The powerful institutions in the society like the parliament, legislature, corporates, the film industry, and several other institutions and industries that run in the country often disregard the rights and liberties of the powerless; and this is where journalism and media come in. They fill in the gaps and hold all institutions (government and private) working in the country accountable. Democracy, as it exists in most countries, is a representative form of democracy instead of a direct democracy—under which the people of a nation elect their own representatives to fulfill their demands and objectives by ensuring sound governance and administration. This indirect democracy provides power to the people once in every four or five years, and therefore, the citizens lose their control over the government. In addition, the parliamentary bills and paperwork is highly complicated, full of jargon, and often cumbersome to go through for a citizen—then what is it that remains as an effective point of check (apart from judiciary and parliament)? Journalism becomes the third eye of the citizens; it is what enables them to exercise some amount of effective control over the actions of the government; this function is performed by informing the citizens. It is also performed in several cases by engaging in effective and rational discussions on decisions taken by the regime in power, and constructively criticizing the actions when necessary with evidence, facts, and insightful research. This is how it becomes the fourth and invisible pillar of democracy when it stays true to its principles. Also read:Why Was Kashmiri Photojournalist Masrat Zahra Booked Under UA(P)A? While these are examples of great journalism, reiterating the true value of effective journalism, to understand the news reportage on Palghar Lynching, it becomes critical to understand the larger trend of Indian TV journalism where several news media houses often rely on fake information/unverified sources to attract people and create unscrupulous and exaggerated reports. Below are some of the fake stories that were covered by Indian news channels but were later reported as ‘fake’ by Alt-News (a fact-checking news organization): “Republic TV reported that the Jama Masjid has not paid electricity bills to the tune of four crores which was later reported as ‘fake’. The channel deleted the Tweet without posting any tweet or video apologizing to the Imam who was mocked at for owning luxurious cars and not paying electricity.” “In a piece of more ridiculous and bizarre news, Aaj Tak reported that Saudi men can eat their wives when they are hungry. It was earlier picked up by Aaj Tak from India Today’s Hindi Channel, but Aaj Tak way to go!” “A Times Now news anchor spent his time and energy by shouting on top of his lungs over an image that was photoshopped. This image comes straight out of the ‘Whatsapp University’.” “A known news anchor on Zee News, known to rely on Whatsapp University more often than anyone else, spent one entire show on highlighting a conspiracy theory that was plagiarised from a Facebook Page. He started the show by talking about ‘land-jihad’ which was in relation to a recent bill passed by the government, and later went on to include education, love, finance, and films and music jihad among many other jihads.” In several instances, media outlets become lapdogs instead of watchdogs for the government and act as propaganda machines for the central government. The compartmentalization of news channels and newspapers into different ideological camps, and the stifling of the ideals and principles of journalism does not create aware citizens but a misled population. Some of the infamous outcomes for ‘bad journalism’ are the experience of Rwanda and the Radio Mille Collines which instigated hatred between Hutu and Tutsi population of Rwanda, resulting in the largest genocide to take place in the world. Likewise, the colonial press in Algeria during colonization created a conflict of identity for the Algerian people, as it acted as proxy propaganda machinery of the French colonizers. Fake news, whether propagated by Facebook posts or Whatsapp texts, has led to mob-lynching, communal hatred, and caste rivalries, especially in small towns and rural areas of India. Siddharth Varadarajan, founder of The Wire Even during this global pandemic, the irresponsible and communally-coloured reportage by several Indian news channels led to the widespread circulation of fake videos. These news channels held the entire Muslim community responsible for the spike in the cases, and turned COVID-19 into a communal issue instead of focussing on the medical crisis at hand. While television channels and news anchors have stooped to the lowest levels of journalism in terms of quality of content—it is the social media channels and YouTubers that are providing more and more reliable and well-researched content. Akash Banerjee, Dhruv Rathee, The Print, The Wire, Caravan, NDTV, etc. are autonomous institutions or in some cases individuals/teams that are managing to hold the flag of Indian journalism amidst the dwindling voices of sanity in the Indian news channels. It is for the citizens to realize the positive and negative impact of journalism within their society. Therefore, it is the Indian viewers who can determine the direction of Indian journalism; if they give in to the communal and hatred filled cacophony of several over the top news anchors with sub-standard reporting and news distribution, or are they looking for hard-hitting, rational, and objective reporting with sound research and writing. They are the decision-makers because ‘Radio Rwanda’ is soon to become ‘TV India’, given the increasing instances of fomenting of communal hatred.

#### India democracy is key to sustain and predict the state of US democracy

#### Blank 21
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When the G7 group of rich democracies assembles this weekend in southwest England, it will discuss issues including COVID-19, taxes, and climate change. One item overhanging the formal agenda, however, will be the global deterioration of democracy itself, and the nation on which this question may hinge won’t be any of the hosts, but a guest invited to this year’s confab: India. Democracy’s fate there may determine its fate throughout the world. At the moment, the signs aren’t looking good—and that should be a flashing-red warning beacon for the rest of us. Why is India the hinge point? The most obvious answer is the optics: When propagandists in Beijing [describe democracy as a Western ideal](https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202104/1221285.shtml) unsuited to non-Western peoples, having a standard-bearer from the formerly colonized rather than the former colonizers is vital. But India’s importance goes far beyond narrative. The world’s most successful democracies are mostly small, wealthy, and homogenous. Any list you might consult will highlight nations such as Denmark, the Netherlands, and Norway. The Economist Intelligence Unit gives [all of the top 10 spots](https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2020/) in its annual Democracy Index to rich Western nations—most of which have populations smaller than that of Maryland. But these nations look nothing like the places where the mass of humanity lives. Of the world’s 10 most populous nations, only the United States and India are long-established democracies. Two (China and Russia) are undisguised autocracies, and the other six can be charitably described as “democracies in progress.” That a political system works for Iceland—which has 341,000 residents, almost all of them [practically relatives](https://www.bbc.com/news/av/technology-24304415)—means little to Brazil, Indonesia, or Nigeria. A real proof of concept can be found only in a nation that is big, low-income, and abundantly diverse—in ethnicity, language, religion, and every other way a society can be divided. That’s India. If democracy can make it there, it can make it anywhere. Until recently, democracy clearly could make it there. Upon gaining independence in 1947, India established a parliamentary system and enacted [a liberal, far-reaching constitution](https://journalofdemocracy.org/articles/indias-democracy-at-70-the-impact-of-instant-universal-suffrage/). Its sole deviation from the democratic path was a period of [“Emergency”](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-33269607) (1975 to 1977), which stemmed more from then–Prime Minister Indira Gandhi’s paranoia than any challenge to her party’s rule. With this and several other notable exceptions (periods of insurgency in Kashmir and Punjab, too-frequent local injustices against marginalized communities), rule of law has done better in India than in most other nations. But India’s democracy has seen worrisome erosion. On [The Economist’s list](https://www.economist.com/media/pdf/DEMOCRACY_TABLE_2007_v3.pdf), the country has slid from No. 35 in 2006 to No. 53 today. And the ways in which democracy is being undermined there provide a wake-up call to those watching from afar—including in the United States. At the root of the backsliding, in India as elsewhere, is a rejection of the core democratic principle that all citizens are equal. India’s governing Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) champions Hindutva, an ideology that privileges the Hindu majority over religious minorities. First articulated [a century ago](https://aeon.co/ideas/how-hindutva-recast-multi-faith-india-as-the-hindu-homeland), Hindutva has grown from a fringe movement into the focus of national politics. Its immediate target has been the country’s Muslims, who represent [14 percent](https://www.census2011.co.in/religion.php) of the population. If India transforms itself from a secular democracy (as is mandated by its constitution) into an avowedly Hindu nation, 276 million non-Hindus will become second-class citizens. Sectarian tensions flared throughout the BJP’s rise to power, and the flames were often fanned by the party itself. In 2014, Narendra Modi supplanted a generation of soft-edged figures and led the party to electoral victory. Although the only previous BJP prime minister, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, had downplayed Hindutva in favor of less divisive center-right policies, Modi has made it the centerpiece of his governing strategy. The first illiberal thrust was launched not against the hardware of democracy (the electoral system) but the software that enables it to operate—that is, an apolitical judiciary, a free press, and other elements of civil society. India’s judicial system has bent to the wishes of politicians since 2014. In the early years of Modi’s premiership, Uttar Pradesh, India’s biggest state, whose population is larger than all but four of the world’s nations, saw [dozens of murderous attacks](https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/02/18/violent-cow-protection-india/vigilante-groups-attack-minorities) on Muslims by Hindu mobs, who accused their victims (in almost all cases falsely) of cow slaughter. The BJP sided with the killers: When the party won state elections in 2017, it appointed as chief minister a firebrand Hindu cleric who had [promoted](https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/yogi-adityanath-orders-closure-of-slaughter-houses-bans-cow-smuggling-in-up/articleshow/57769113.cms) this vigilante action. Since then, the state’s judicial system has declined to punish most of the offenders—and the nation’s Supreme Court has [contented itself with issuing only tsk-tsks](https://indianexpress.com/article/india/lynchings-by-cow-vigilantes-supreme-court-states-5243938/). Likewise, attacks on India’s press have grown brazen. Of the past decade’s 405 cases filed against journalists under a colonial-era sedition law, [all but a few have been registered since Modi took office](https://www.newindianexpress.com/opinions/2021/feb/26/indiscriminateapplication-ofsedition-law-2269140.html). The Caravan, an outlet known for its dogged investigation of the BJP, has been [singled out for special harassment](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2021/02/narendra-modi-assault-indian-idea/617904/). Less than a month ago, Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram acceded to [government demands](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/25/business/india-covid19-twitter-facebook.html) to block some journalists’ posts. The bans are under review by the platforms, but they have achieved their purpose. Many feisty Indian journalists now choose their words carefully. Weakening these civil-society foundations enabled the next stage of Modi’s program: the use of democracy’s mechanisms to undermine democracy’s core. In 2019, Modi returned to office with an absolute parliamentary [majority](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-48347081). Shortly after, he abrogated the [special status](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/05/world/asia/india-pakistan-kashmir-jammu.html) written into the constitution for Jammu and Kashmir (India’s sole Muslim-majority state). Protests in Kashmir were met with a months-long clampdown. Modi followed up with actions that [officially](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-50670393) and [unofficially](https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/explained-citizenship-amendment-act-nrc-caa-means-6180033/) advantaged Hindus over Muslims nationwide. Demonstrations against these moves peaked in December 2019, and were extinguished only by a COVID-19 lockdown three months later. All of these moves would have been anathema to the drafters of India’s constitution. Yet all were within the technical limits of the law, and none has been seriously challenged in the nation’s now-quiescent courts. The fecklessness of opposition parties made the BJP’s task easier, but the tools were provided by the governing system itself: The BJP has never earned anything close to a majority of the popular vote, but because of India’s first-past-the-post electoral system, its lock on power is firm. In [2019](https://www.thehindu.com/elections/lok-sabha-2019/analysis-highest-ever-national-vote-share-for-the-bjp/article27218550.ece), 37.4 percent of the vote (the BJP’s highest total ever) translated into 55.8 percent of the seats in Parliament. Gyan Prakash, a scholar of the Emergency, sees the greatest threat to democracy in this “shadow legality”: the use of lawfare to subvert the foundation of constitutional government. And he sees India’s example as having global implications. “Modi is part of a much larger phenomenon,” he told me. “This is a project to mobilize all state institutions, and change India’s democratic and plural politics and culture.” Do constitutional questions matter to a farmer scraping by on [$4 a day](https://m.rbi.org.in/Scripts/PublicationsView.aspx?id=20083) (the national average)? They should. As the Nobel laureate Amartya Sen once noted, “[No famine has ever taken place in the history of the world in a functioning democracy](https://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/01/arts/does-democracy-avert-famine.html).” India is now facing its most serious natural disaster since independence, in the coronavirus pandemic. Even by [official figures](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/india-covid-cases.html) (which significantly undercount the victims), India is the world’s coronavirus epicenter: 29 million sickened, more than 350,000 dead, and no end in sight. A great many of these cases were preventable. Modi’s response to the pandemic has swung from [oppressive lockdown](https://www.isas.nus.edu.sg/papers/covid-19-lockdown-in-india-impact-on-the-poor-and-the-governments-response/) to [maskless political rallies](https://www.reuters.com/world/india/indias-modi-scorned-over-reckless-rallies-religious-gathering-amid-virus-mayhem-2021-04-19/) and the encouragement of a [super-spreader Hindu pilgrimage](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-57005563) with 9 million attendees. A political system in which the government could be held accountable might have yielded a different outcome. All of this may sound familiar to American ears. President Donald Trump labeled the press the [“enemy of the people”](https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/437610-trump-calls-press-the-enemy-of-the-people) and attempted to intimidate sitting judges. A critical mass of the Republican Party is at least as motivated by [white grievance](https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/04/22/republicans-and-democrats-move-further-apart-in-views-of-voting-access/) as the BJP base is by Hindutva. And laws recently [passed in Georgia](https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/04/georgia-voting-rights-fiasco/618537/) and [proposed elsewhere](https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2021/03/voting-rights-act-democracy/617792/) would let partisan state officials rather than voters determine elections. This might be technically in accord with the Constitution, but would be at odds with—well, democracy. Perhaps the most dangerous threat of all is complacency. Whether doomscrolling Twitter or ignoring politics completely, most Americans share a baseline confidence that democracy will endure. But will it? American democracy isn’t nearly as deeply rooted as we like to believe. Half of the population (that is: the female half) weren’t generally [permitted to vote](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2019/06/most-dangerous-women-american-politics/590959/) until 1920. Black Americans in Jim Crow states (that is, most of them) had to wait nearly another half century. If measured by universal suffrage, how long has America [been a true democracy](https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2021/03/voting-rights-act-democracy/617792/)? For less time than the Rolling Stones have been touring. This is why Americans should be paying close attention to the politics of India. The U.S. is not Iceland; it’s huge, diverse, and tough to govern. Only one other country with comparable size and complexity has given democracy a sustained, multigenerational shot. If the system fails in India, it can certainly fail closer to home.

**Democracy *solves* climate change but we need an *increase* in pace of action**

#### Casas-Zamora 21

[Dr. Kevin Casas-Zamora is the Secretary-General of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), with over 25 years of experience in democratic governance as a researcher, analyst, educator, consultant and public official. Here he discusses the role that democracy plays in mitigating climate change. 06/29/2021 Why democracy is the key ingredient to battling climate change” <https://www.euronews.com/green/2021/06/29/why-democracy-is-the-key-ingredient-to-battling-climate-change> ] //aaditg

The recent court rulings tell us a lot, not just about the powerful assets that democracy can deploy in the struggle against climate change, but also the long-term robustness of the case for democracy as a political system. Democracies are under pressure from populism, disinformation, inequality and voter frustration, according to the Global State of Democracy report from the intergovernmental organisation International (IDEA). They are also afflicted by a crisis of self-confidence. Fairly or not, the current pandemic has helped cement a narrative portraying liberal democracies as lumbering and too divided to cope with big challenges, while extolling the presumed ability of authoritarian systems to act decisively. Andre Penner/AP2011 Deforestation in the Brazilian AmazonAndre Penner/AP2011 ‘Extremists and populists on the rise’: Why the EU needs a green prosecutor What are the vices to democracy? This narrative is not concocted out of thin air. Democracies do suffer from vices when it comes to slow-burning crises like global warming. Voters and politicians have short attention spans. **Balances** of power **mean reforms can be held hostage to obstinate US Senators or oil lobbyists.** Science can play second fiddle to voters if it entails higher taxes - France’s yellow vest protests, sparked by fuel price rises, are a case in point. And yet, despite all this, the facts are clear - **9 out of the 10 top performers in the 2021 Climate Change Performance Index are democracies.** Sweden tops the list of 57 countries. China is 30th. The reasons for this are not hard to fathom. **Democracies allow for the free flow of information that enables policy makers to debate and find solutions, and for civil society to mobilise**. It is no coincidence that youth campaigner Greta Thunberg helped spark a global movement from a lone street demonstration in Sweden, one of the world’s top performing democracies. It is no coincidence that youth campaigner Greta Thunberg helped spark a global movement from a lone street demonstration in Sweden, one of the world’s top performing democracies. Democracies are more effective against climate change for the same reasons that they don’t experience famines, as Nobel Laureate Indian economist **Amartya Sen suggested long ago - because in allowing freedom of expression, a vibrant civil society, regular elections and the workings of checks and balances, they increase the likelihood that crises will be met and destructive policies corrected.** Democracy is not simply elections - it is the often chaotic workings of myriad institutions and groups as well as a culture of open debate, where climate reform is nudged along by courts, free media, parliaments, and public protests. Democracy’s most powerful weapon against the challenges of this century is its ability to self-correct. And then there is the capacity of democratic systems to forge the social consensus required for long-term transformations to be sustainable. We know this story - participatory decision-making may be slower than executive decrees, but almost always yields outcomes that are more legitimate and accepted by society, and hence more durable. Canva Democracy is a key ingredient to fighting climate changeCanva This is vital for climate change. Decarbonisation is not something governments do by fiat, though act they must - it is something societies as a whole must do by conviction. Consumer habits will need to change, from reducing air travel to adjusting diets. Trillions of dollars will have to be invested in transforming the sources of energy that fuel economies. New social contracts will have to be devised so that the burden of these fiscal bills can be equitably shared. **There is no guarantee that democracies will succeed in building the consensus needed to save our species, but their odds are better than those of any other political arrangement.** Could decarbonising our cities be the answer to climate change? Kids are disappointed in grownups’ ‘un-green’ ways: Here are their plans for a cleaner future Democratic governance could slow down climate change This is, however, the key question – while it is clear that **the attributes of democracy are potentially superior to deal with climate change, it is much less clear that they will be actually deployed with the celerity required**. This is, precisely, what courts are doing in Germany and elsewhere - they are moving forward the deadlines that political systems and societies must meet if our species is to avoid disaster. Those deadlines are tight – a few decades, at most. But courts alone won’t do the trick. **Democratic governments, parliaments, and political leaders must also dramatically increase the pace of their actions.** This is why it is so vital to connect the discussion of climate change with debates on the quality of democratic governance. We must distill, disseminate, and design the institutions and practices that are more likely to allow democracies to build consensus, distribute burdens and make decisions effectively to meet the climate crisis. **Experimenting with new forms of political deliberation**, like citizens’ assemblies, enlarging the representation of young people by lowering the voting age and adopting some of the bargaining practices between industries, workers and governments that **have been** so **instrumental** in **building consensus** in Northern Europe - this is the stuff democratic governance agendas should be made of in the climate crisis era.

#### Democracy solves Nuclear War.

#### Diamond 19

, Larry. Ill winds: Saving democracy from Russian rage, Chinese ambition, and American complacency. Penguin Books, 2019. (professor of Sociology and Political Science at Stanford University, PhD in Sociology)//Elmer

The most obvious response to the ill winds blowing from the world’s autocracies is to help the winds of freedom blowing in the other direction. The democracies of the West cannot save themselves if they do not stand with democrats around the world. This is truer now than ever, for several reasons. We live in a globalized world, one in which models, trends, and ideas cascade across borders. Any wind of change may gather quickly and blow with gale force. People everywhere form ideas about how to govern—or simply about which forms of government and sources of power may be irresistible—based on what they see happening elsewhere. We are now immersed in a fierce global contest of ideas, information, and norms. In the digital age, that contest is moving at lightning speed, shaping how people think about their political systems and the way the world runs. As doubts about and threats to democracy are mounting in the West, this is not a contest that the democracies can afford to lose. Globalization, with its flows of trade and information, raises the stakes for us in another way. Authoritarian and badly governed regimes increasingly pose a direct threat to popular sovereignty and the rule of law in our own democracies. Covert flows of money and influence are subverting and corrupting our democratic processes and institutions. They will not stop just because Americans and others pretend that we have no stake in the future of freedom in the world. If we want to defend the core principles of self-government, transparency, and accountability in our own democracies, we have no choice but to promote them globally. It is not enough to say that dictatorship is bad and that democracy, however flawed, is still better. Popular enthusiasm for a lesser evil cannot be sustained indefinitely. People need the inspiration of a positive vision. Democracy must demonstrate that it is a just and fair political system that advances humane values and the common good. To make our republics more perfect, established democracies must not only adopt reforms to more fully include and empower their own citizens. They must also support people, groups, and institutions struggling to achieve democratic values elsewhere. The best way to counter Russian rage and Chinese ambition is to show that Moscow and Beijing are on the wrong side of history; that people everywhere yearn to be free; and that they can make freedom work to achieve a more just, sustainable, and prosperous society. In our networked age, both idealism and the harder imperatives of global power and security argue for more democracy, not less. For one thing, if we do not worry about the quality of governance in lower-income countries, we will face more and more troubled and failing states. Famine and genocide are the curse of authoritarian states, not democratic ones. Outright state collapse is the ultimate, bitter fruit of tyranny. When countries like Syria, Libya, and Afghanistan descend into civil war; when poor states in Africa cannot generate jobs and improve their citizens’ lives due to rule by corrupt and callous strongmen; when Central American societies are held hostage by brutal gangs and kleptocratic rulers, people flee—and wash up on the shores of the democracies. Europe and the United States cannot withstand the rising pressures of immigration unless they work to support better, more stable and accountable government in troubled countries. The world has simply grown too small, too flat, and too fast to wall off rotten states and pretend they are on some other planet. Hard security interests are at stake. As even the Trump administration’s 2017 National Security Strategy makes clear, the main threats to U.S. national security all stem from authoritarianism, whether in the form of tyrannies from Russia and China to Iran and North Korea or in the guise of antidemocratic terrorist movements such as ISIS.1 By supporting the development of democracy around the world, we can deny these authoritarian adversaries the geopolitical running room they seek. Just as Russia, China, and Iran are trying to undermine democracies to bend other countries to their will, so too can we contain these autocrats’ ambitions by helping other countries build effective, resilient democracies that can withstand the dictators’ malevolence. Of course, democratically elected governments with open societies will not support the American line on every issue. But no free society wants to mortgage its future to another country. The American national interest would best be secured by a pluralistic world of free countries—one in which autocrats can no longer use corruption and coercion to gobble up resources, alliances, and territory. If you look back over our history to see who has posed a threat to the United States and our allies, it has always been authoritarian regimes and empires. As political scientists have long noted, no two democracies have ever gone to war with each other—ever. It is not the democracies of the world that are supporting international terrorism, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, or threatening the territory of their neighbors.

#### Nuke war causes extinction AND outweighs other existential risks

#### PND 16.

internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock’s 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans’ International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf> //Re-cut by Elmer

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest of the world) uninhabitable, potentially inducing global famine lasting up to decades. Toon and Robock note in ‘Self Assured Destruction’, in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, that: 13. “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. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation to reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about **20 percent** for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.” 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/all humans (and severely impact/extinguish other species) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. Gareth Evans’ ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.

#### The Alternatives to Democracy are far-worse – back-sliding causes authoritative governance to fill-in.

Gat 11, Azar. "The changing character of war." (2011). (Professor at Tel Aviv University, Ezer Weizman Professor of National Security at Tel Aviv University)//Elmer

Since 1945, **the decline of major great power war has deepened** further. Nuclear weapons have concentrated the minds of all concerned wonderfully, but no less important have been the institutionalization of free trade and the closely related process of rapid and sustained economic growth throughout the capitalist world. The communist bloc did not participate in the system of free trade, but at least initially it too experienced substantial growth, and, unlike Germany and Japan, it was always sufﬁciently large and rich in natural resources to maintain an autarky of sorts. With the Soviet collapse and with the integration of the former communist powers into the global capitalist economy, the prospect of a major war within the developed world seems to have become very remote indeed. This is one of the main sources for the feeling that war has been transformed: its geopolitical centre of gravity has shifted radically. The modernized, economically developed parts of the world constitute a ‘zone of peace’. **War now seems to be conﬁned to the less-developed parts of the globe, the world’s ‘zone of war’,** **where countries that have** so far **failed to embrace modernization and its pacifying spin-off effects continue to be engaged in wars** among themselves, as well as with developed countries. While the trend is very real, **one wonders if the** near **disappearance of armed conﬂict within the developed world is likely to** **remain as stark** **as it has been since the collapse of communism**. **The post-Cold War moment** may turn out to **be** a **ﬂeeting** one. **The probability of major wars within the developed world remains low**—because of the factors already mentioned: increasing wealth, economic openness and interdependence, and nuclear deterrence. **But the deep sense of change** prevailing since 1989 **has been based on the far more radical notion that the triumph of capitalism** also **spelled the irresistible ultimate victory of democracy**; and that in an afﬂuent and democratic world, major conﬂict no longer needs to be feared or seriously prepared for. **This notion**, however, **is** **fast eroding** **with the return of capitalist non-democratic great powers that have been absent from the international system since 1945**. Above all, there is the formerly communist and fast industrializing authoritarian-capitalist **China**, whose massive growth **represents the greatest change in the global balance of power. Russia**, too, **is retreating from its postcommunist liberalism and assuming an increasingly authoritarian character**.¶ **Authoritarian capitalism may be more viable than people tend to assume**. 8 The communist great powers failed even though they were potentially larger than the democracies, because their economic systems failed them. By contrast, the **capitalist authoritarian/totalitarian powers during the ﬁrst half of the twentieth century, Germany and Japan**, particularly the former, **were as efﬁcient economically as**, **and** if anything **more successful militarily than,** **their democratic counterparts**. They were defeated in war mainly because they were too small and ultimately succumbed to the exceptional continental size of the United States (in alliance with the communist Soviet Union during the Second World War). However, the **new non-democratic powers are both** **large and capitalist.** **China** in particular **is the largest player in the international system in terms of population and is showing spectacular economic growth** that within a generation or two is likely to make it a true non-democratic superpower. Although **the return of capitalist non-democratic great powers** does not necessarily imply open conﬂict or war, it **might indicate that the democratic hegemony since the Soviet Union’s collapse could be** **short-lived** **and that** **a universal ‘democratic peace’ may still be far off**. The new capitalist authoritarian powers are deeply integrated into the world economy. They partake of the development-open-trade-capitalist cause of peace, but not of the liberal democratic cause. Thus, it is crucially important that any protectionist turn in the system is avoided so as to prevent a grab for markets and raw materials such as that which followed the disastrous slide into imperial protectionism and conﬂict during the ﬁrst part of the twentieth century. Of course, the openness of the world economy does not depend exclusively on the democracies. In time, China itself might become more protectionist, as it grows wealthier, its labour costs rise, and its current competitive edge diminishes. With the possible exception of the sore Taiwan problem, China is likely to be less restless and revisionist than the territorially conﬁned Germany and Japan were. Russia, which is still reeling from having lost an empire, may be more problematic. However, **as China grows in power, it is likely to become more assertive,** **ﬂex its muscles, and behave like a superpower**, even if it does not become particularly aggressive. The **democratic and non-democratic powers may coexist more or less peacefully**, albeit warily, side by side, armed because of mutual fear and suspicion, as a result of the so-called ‘security dilemma’, and against worst-case scenarios. **But there is** also **the prospect of** **more antagonistic relations**, **accentuated ideological rivalry**, **potential and actual conﬂict,** **intensiﬁed arms races**, and even new cold wars, with spheres of inﬂuence and opposing coalitions. Although great power relations will probably vary from those that prevailed during any of the great twentieth-century conﬂicts, as conditions are never quite the same, they may vary less than seemed likely only a short while ago.

### 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.

### 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 destroying BJP support

#### 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.

#### Prefer our approach that prioritizes Objectivity but still maintains some level of Advocacy – our parallel but separate approach is better than combination.

Ingram 18 Matthew Ingram 6-14-2018 "Advocates are becoming journalists. Is that a good thing?" <https://www.cjr.org/analysis/advocates-journalism.php> (CJR’s chief digital writer. Previously, he was a senior writer with Fortune magazine. He has written about the intersection between media and technology since the earliest days of the commercial internet. His writing has been published in the Washington Post and the Financial Times as well as by Reuters and Bloomberg.)//Elmer

IT WAS AN IMPRESSIVE DISPLAY OF JOURNALISM: An in-depth look at Amazon’s marketing of a controversial facial recognition software product to US law enforcement. It involved record searches in multiple jurisdictions, along with the collection of other evidence about the campaign and its impact. But this tour-de-force didn’t come from a media organization like The New York Times or The Washington Post—it came from the American Civil Liberties Union. In many ways, the story was a perfect fit for an organization like the ACLU: Matt Cagle, a lawyer for the ACLU in Northern California, noticed online marketing materials posted by Amazon for its software, which listed several law-enforcement organizations as users. So Cagle and his team started a records search, got two other ACLU bureaus involved, and the group’s national editorial team pulled the project together. In all, Cagle says, the project involved more than two dozen lawyers and advocates, as well as legal advisers at the national level, editors, and the ACLU’s communications team, and it took several months to come to fruition—the kind of resources many media companies would find hard to marshall for a single story. As the media landscape continues to fragment and many outlets struggle to afford more ambitious reporting projects, non-governmental organizations and advocacy groups like the ACLU and Human Rights Watch are increasingly taking on the role of reporter—breaking stories and in some cases even helping to change policy. But even those leading the new NGO-as-muckraker efforts acknowledge that they’re no replacement for traditional news organizations. “We can definitely bring some skills to bear on this kind of story, but that’s by no means a substitute for the amazing work that journalists do around the country right now,” says Cagle. “But I think if we can help supplement that work and also do our part to educate the public and advocate for civil liberties, then we are doing something good.” There’s no question that work like that done by Human Rights Watch, Greenpeace, and Amnesty International around issues like immigration, the environment, and totalitarianism can help fill gaps in traditional media coverage—especially in foreign countries, where few media companies have the resources to invest in on-the-ground reporting. But these groups are not fundamentally journalistic in nature. Although they may look and behave like modern media organizations, they are advocacy groups, and have an explicit agenda; they’re looking for impact. That agenda may coincide with the news, and they may use traditional journalistic techniques to advance it, but in most cases the larger goal of this work is in service of some kind of policy change or other action, and not information or the public record per se. “Can some of the losses in international journalism be offset by advocacy groups, to the extent that they can provide coverage from areas not getting attention? Clearly the answer is yes,” says Matthew Powers, a professor of communications at the University of Washington and author of NGOs as Newsmakers: The Changing Landscape of International News. “But at the same time it’s also easy to imagine a world where this causes problems, where journalism could become a platform for advocacy purposes and for fundraising.” The line between advocacy groups and media organizations has been blurring for some time. As the internet enabled the democratization of information production and distribution, and social platforms have given everyone the ability to reach an audience, smart NGOs long ago realized they could use these tools to spread their own message, instead of having to rely on partnerships with traditional media. Journalism professor Dan Gillmor wrote a decade ago about the work the ACLU was doing around Guantanamo Bay, and the reporting Human Rights Watch did on issues such as domestic workers in Saudi Arabia. A number of academics have also written about the increasing overlap between NGOs and journalism. “As traditional journalism companies are firing reporters and editors right and left, the almost-journalist organizations have both the deep pockets and staffing to fill in some of the gaps,” Gillmor wrote. He also encouraged NGOs to concentrate on applying journalistic principles such as fact-checking and transparency. Powers says that most NGOs didn’t get into reporting because they were interested in doing journalism or becoming media companies—they did it in order to improve their standing with governments and other policy groups so their lobbying would be taken seriously. “They started doing it primarily so they could look more legitimate to policy makers,” says Powers. Most well-established advocacy organizations still work with media partners to get their message out, as the ACLU did with its face-recognition story: The group reached out to several writers at prominent outlets such as The New York Times and gave them an embargoed version of the research; stories were published by them and the ACLU simultaneously. But many groups have also become standalone media outlets in their own right, with websites and social-media accounts that are widely followed. The ACLU’s newsroom of editors and reporters produce between 14 and 20 stories a week. The group’s editorial director, Terry Tang—who worked as a senior editor at the Times for two decades before joining the ACLU last year—tells CJR she is hiring journalists and looking to expand the ACLU newsroom into new areas, including a podcast and more video production. “We have the legal expertise and policy expertise for a lot of these kinds of stories—people who have been plowing these fields for a long time and really know those issues,” Tang says. “So when something happens it’s not like they’re just reporting the news, they already understand the issues and so they are able to produce analysis as well. It’s not terribly different than having a very seasoned beat reporter.” Others have also been expanding in similar ways: Greenpeace, which has always been media savvy when it comes to getting coverage of its activities, launched an ambitious effort to do its own reporting in 2015, hiring experienced editors and reporters from the Times and the BBC to add to its existing in-house editorial operation, which is called Unearthed (formerly known as Energy Desk). At the ACLU, Tang says the organization is thinking about how to balance the need for longterm research and coverage with the demand to be on top of the news with something relevant to say, so that it will get picked up by social platforms. In other words, she’s working her way through exactly the same kinds of considerations faced by traditional media outlets. Does the desire to promote a specific viewpoint on an issue or news story ever get in the way of producing this kind of journalistic content? Tang says it doesn’t, and that the editorial group makes a point of sticking to a very traditional, fact-based approach. In the end, she says, it’s a matter of trust—if the organization were to bend the rules, eventually people would stop trusting what it was saying. “I came to work at Human Rights Watch because I was interested in figuring out what it looked like to have a different financial model and a different trust model for achieving the good that accountability journalism achieves,” says communications director Nic Dawes, the former editor-in-chief of South Africa’s Mail & Guardian, who joined HRW in 2016. “The whole model relies on the idea that our information is trustworthy, so we put a huge premium on accuracy. I would say in many ways it exceeds what’s done in most journalism organizations.” Some advocacy groups have blurred traditional journalistic lines. For example, Powers says, Greenpeace’s Unearthed site did a report on climate change in 2015 and used journalists who pretended to be executives from the oil and gas industry and found several academics who were willing to be paid for their pro-industry opinions without saying where the money came from. While the organization argued that the outcome was worth it, the group did face some criticism that the tactic amounted to entrapment. “In fairness to Greenpeace, their argument was they couldn’t have gotten the story any other way and that it was important to do it,” Powers says. “But there’s a definite risk that the advocacy element will outweigh the journalistic aspect. I think in the long run that could actually work to their detriment when it comes to trust.” Damian Kahya, a former BBC reporter who runs Greenpeace’s investigative unit, says the team are all professionally trained journalists and the agency only uses fake identities “where we have a suspicion of wrongdoing, clear public interest, and where we believe the information cannot reasonably be obtained by other means.” Kahya added that Greenpeace’s team is separate from the environmental advocacy part of the organization, and that it adheres to “the highest editing and reporting standards.” Other incursions into journalism are less controversial, but still raise questions. In 2007, an intergovernmental body known as UNAIDS acknowledged that the organization had systematically overstated the spread of AIDS. Critics said the organization misstated the numbers in an attempt to create a sense of urgency around the issue to help with fundraising. And in 2015, a number of NGOs and advocacy groups reported that as many as 75 percent of the women in Liberia had been raped during the civil war in that country, but independent surveys put the number closer to between 10 percent and 20 percent. This kind of behavior can come into play not because NGOs are trying to deliberately mislead people, Powers says, but because they need to raise awareness of an issue for practical reasons—it shows that they are doing their jobs, that the organization is necessary, and it helps with fundraising. If the problem of civil rights or AIDS or sex trafficking isn’t a big one, why donate to a group dedicated to addressing it? Of course, traditional media organizations often get accused of distorting the news in similar ways—of selectively including certain facts or quoting certain individuals—because those facts or views fit a certain worldview. In some cases it’s done in order to generate traffic and advertising revenue, but there can also be ideological elements at work (Fox News, or at least the version of it that exists in primetime, springs to mind). But the lines separating one kind of journalism from another are getting increasingly blurry. Some media organizations have become so dependent on advocacy groups for their reporting and coverage that they run their videos or other content without saying where it came from—in a new book about NGOs and the news, Kate Wright from Edinburgh University looked at a week of news about Africa from UK sources, and found nearly half of those that used material produced by NGOs didn’t identify the source. That’s not good for transparency, and it’s not good for readers who think they are getting an independent view. There’s also a risk that journalistic organizations that become intertwined with NGOs or advocacy groups won’t devote the same kind of scrutiny to those groups as they would otherwise. In the end, the world of journalism and the world as a whole are probably better off now that there are activist organizations that are trying to use the tools of modern media to tell stories. The more sources of information there are, especially from remote or developing nations, the better. In some ways, that’s one of the biggest benefits of a democratized media environment—anyone anywhere can become a news source, and that’s fundamentally a good thing, even if some take advantage of it for their own purposes.

#### Prioritizing Objectivity shifts Media Reporting to the Public Interest of Truth and Free Information Flows – that’s vital to any Functioning Democracy.

#### Asogwa et Al 12,

Chika Euphemia, and Ezekiel S. Asemah. "News commercialisation, objective journalism practice and the sustenance of democracy in Nigeria." Higher education of social science 3.2 (2012): 27-34. (Head, Department of Mass Communication, Kogi State University, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria.)//Elmer

OBJECTIVE JOURNALISM BUILDS DEMOCRACY Journalism has a lot to contribute to the development of democracy, not only in Nigeria, but the entire world. Objective journalism entails that the journalist should detach him or herself from whatever stories that are being conveyed to the people. When journalist collects bribe from news sources to twist stories, it will definitely lead to one problem or the other. The press articulates public conscience through focusing attention on issues and concerns of public interest. It sets the public agenda. As a purveyor of public opinion, it expresses public sentiment on any given subject, which is entertained by the best informed, most intelligent and most moral persons in the community. If journalism is to serve humanity, then the press should operate objectively. The press always takes on the form and the correlation of the social and political structures within which it operates. To see the difference between press system in full perspective, then one must look at the social systems in which the press functions. To see the social systems in their true relationship to the press, one has to look at certain beliefs and assumptions, which the society holds; the nature of man, the nature of society and the state, the relation of man to the state and the nature of knowledge and truth. The information role of the media in the democratic process involves creating a platform for public dialogue and ensuring diversity of views, values and perspectives on public affairs. The public sphere theory posits that by generating a plurality of understanding, the media should enable individuals to re-interpret their social experiences and question the assumptions and ideas of the dominant culture… it will give subordinate classes increased access to ideas and arguments opposing ideological representation that legitimate their subordination and enables them to explore more fully, ways of changing the structure of society to their advantage (Curran, 1991, p.103). He further notes that the mass media have a role to play in the democratic process, by creating an arena for free dialogue between and among the people and to ensure that their views are observed and adhered to, which includes helping to create the conditions in which alternate viewpoints and perspectives are brought fully into play. In a way, this is a restatement of the old notion of the mass media acting as a market place of ideas. More than this however, is the social purpose of this role. Mass media diversity and pluralism is not just progressive social engineering, it is for emancipation and empowerment, giving people the right to define their normative vision of the world and their place in it through access to alternative perspective of society (Curran, 1991). The media, both the print and electronic, have a very crucial role to play in every democratic process. Ogor, in NBC (2002, p.74) notes that broadcasting is regarded as the oxygen of democracy. Ogor further notes that it is the responsibility of the broadcast media to help increase the level of general awareness and mobilisation of the population and an active participant in the shaping of democratic values, through education and public enlightenment. According to Ogor, in NBC (2002, p.79): Public broadcasting upholds the principles of true speech and expression, as well as, free access to communication. It enables all criticizes to communicate openly on a level playing field. It also serves the interests of all people, irrespective of religion, political background, belief, culture, race, etc. In its overall programming, broadcasting reflects as comprehensively as possible, the range of existing opinions and free flow of information to the people is a must. Going by Ogor’s assertion, information is crucial to the sustenance of democracy in any given society. Democracy cannot thrive without adequate information and communication. There must be free flow of information about the activities of the government to the populace. The populace must be aware of all the activities of the government, whether at the federal, state or local government level. For democracy to be solidified in any country, there must be press freedom. But, how can the media effectively carry out this role, if they are not objective. Schramm (1963) observes that broadcasting is expected to lay a concrete foundation for the democratic culture of a nation and this democratic culture has to be based on equity, truth, fairness, justice and respect for human rights, access itself, as an actor, as well as, evolve new strategies for growth and enduring democracy. The media should be seen as agents of socialisation and source of unity. This would be done through information dissemination and sharing of ideas, so that individuals become aware of a given situation and are able to participate in the task of nation building. Commenting on the role of information in democratic government, Uche (1999, p.79) argues that democracy entails more than electing the so–called representatives of the people into government. What the government later does with the mandate is even much more important and of higher concern to democracy than mere act of being elected. Uche (1999, p.79) further argues that: The essence of democracy can be gotten from the age-long simple definition of the concept, which is government of the people, by the people and for the people. Democracy represents our popular power, a form of government that is centred on the sovereign authority of the people. For the people to retain their power over democratic governance, there must be an unfettered flow of information from the government, through the pluralistic media.

## Underview

### 1AC – Underview

#### [1] 1AR theory –

#### A. AFF gets it because otherwise the neg can engage in infinite abuse, making debate impossible.

#### B. Drop the debater – the short 1AR irreparably skewed from abuse on substance and time investment on theory.

#### C. No RVIs – the 6-minute 2nr can collapse to a short shell and get away with infinite 1nc abuse via sheer brute force and time spent on theory.

#### D. No new 2NR theory, paradigm issues, or recontextualizations – allows them to spam frivolous shells in the 2NR and prove why theirs outweighs which gives them a 6-3 structural skew where they can always win on uplayering or outspreading

### 1AC – Method

**Policy analysis is key to critical skills and real world policy change**

#### Hird 17

John **Hird 17**. Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Professor of Political Science and Public Policy, University of Massachusetts Amherst. “How Effective is Policy Analysis,” in D. Weimer & L. S. Friedman (eds.) Does Policy Analysis Matter? Exploring Its Effectiveness in Theory and Practice. University of California Press. 44-76.

Classical policy analysis, however absent from actual policy making, remains an important vehicle for teaching policy analysts the connections between their analysis and the policymaking world in which their recommendations would live. **Even if** it implies more power than analysts will ever have, classical **policy analysis** teaches that politics, law, implementation, social structures, organizational behavior, and other factors are **critical to policy outcomes** and must play key roles in **thinking through** possible ways to address policy problems. **Bringing policy ideas to fruition**, bridging the worlds of research and policy making, is a **critical skill** for analysts to develop. In addition, policy schools are instilling in prospective policy analysts the structure and habits of mind to engage successfully in the policy enterprise. 28 Teaching **disciplined thinking** for public service is important. Policy analysts not only have a **problem-oriented**, **interdisciplinary** approach to policy and the **ability to synthesize** and **bring policy relevance** to problems that social scientists are not trained for, but they understand the "rational lunacy of policy-making systems" (Weiss 2009). In the absence of written classical policy analyses, policy analysts become their human embodiment. Their training will provide a mental picture of how a classical policy analysis should be performed. They can derive elements of policy analysis from writing position papers, briefing policy makers, and controlling meetings. They **anticipate counterarguments** and frame their analyses recognizing alternative options. In short, the **mental map** of a policy analysis allows good policy analysts not only to be effective in their jobs but also to **advance** into the **public debate** the appropriate elements of a policy analysis. Further, the **problem orientation** of policy analysis **focuses** at least some **attention** on **social problems**, not just political expediency. The role of policy analysts is not merely to translate research for policy makers, but to use creative means to turn available knowledge about the implications of various policy options into actionable policy recommendations appropriate for their clients. This is a subtle skill requiring attention to both political realities and the best available research. Finally, prospective policy analysts are instructed repeatedly about the importance of their relationship to the client(s), yet far less attention is paid to the other part of the policy analyst's relationship: to the community of knowledge producers. Policy analysts play **critical roles as intermediaries** between "custodians of the knowable" and policy makers. Their training should include the ability to **understand** and **interpret** the academic literature on a topic at a **far deeper level** than most journalists have the time or, often, the analytic skill set to uncover. Identifying and **connect**ing **pertinent knowledge** and **analysis** with policy makers should be a core principle of a public policy education. Policy analysts may offer the central means to provide policy makers with the key elements of classical policy analysis, though not in the way, through written reports, it was originally conceived. Creating a profession for committed, accomplished, and well-trained individuals to participate in the world of public policy may be among the most important contributions of policy analysis education.

#### Making demands on the state does not mean we defend that the state is good in all instances or that we are reaffirming it’s legitimacy.

#### Newman 10

Saul Newman 10, Reader in Political Theory at Goldsmiths, U of London, Theory & Event Volume 13, Issue 2

There are two aspects that I would like o address here. Firstly, the notion of demand: making certain demands on the states- say for higher wages, equal rights for excluded groups, to not go to war, or an end to draconian policing-is one of the basic strategies of social movements and radical groups. Making such demands does not necessarily mean working within the state or reaffirming its legitimacy. On the contrary, demands are made from a position outside the political order, and they often exceed the question of the implementation of this or that specific measure. They implicitly call into question the legitimacy and even the sovereighnty of the state by highlighting fundamental inconsistencies between, for instance, a formal constitutional order which guarantees certain rights and equalities, and state practices which in reality violate and deny them.

**A particularist approach is key- overarching theories ignore material injustice.**

#### Pappas 16.

(Gregory Fernando Pappas [Texas A&M University] “The Pragmatists’ Approach to Injustice”, The Pluralist Volume 11, Number 1, Spring 2016, BE

The pragmatists’ approach should be distinguished from nonideal theories whose starting point seems to be the injustices of society at large that have a history and persist through time, where the task of political philosophy is to detect and diagnose the presence of these historical injustices in particular situations of injustice. For example, critical theory today has inherited an approach to social philosophy characteristic of the European tradition that goes back to Rousseau, Marx, Weber, Freud, Marcuse, and others. Accord- ing to Roberto Frega, this tradition takes society to be “intrinsically sick” with a malaise that requires adopting a critical historical stance in order to understand how the systematic sickness affects present social situations. In other words, this approach assumes that¶ a philosophical critique of specific social situations can be accomplished only under the assumption of a broader and full blown critique of soci- ety in its entirety: as a critique of capitalism, of modernity, of western civilization, of rationality itself. The idea of social pathology becomes intelligible only against the background of a philosophy of history or of an anthropology of decline, according to which the distortions of actual social life are but the inevitable consequence of longstanding historical processes. (“Between Pragmatism and Critical Theory” 63)¶ However, this particular approach to injustice is not limited to critical theory. It is present in those Latin American and African American political philosophies that have used and transformed the critical intellectual tools of ¶ critical theory to deal with the problems of injustice in the Americas. For instance, Charles W. Mills claims that the starting point and alternative to the abstractions of ideal theory that masked injustices is to diagnose and rectify a history of an illness—the legacy of white supremacy in our actual society.11 The critical task of revealing this illness is achieved by adopting a historical perspective where the injustices of today are part of a larger historical narrative about the development of modern societies that goes back to how Europeans have progressively dehumanized or subordinated others. Similary, radical feminists as well as Third World scholars, as reaction to the hege- monic Eurocentric paradigms that disguise injustices under the assumption of a universal or objective point of view, have stressed how our knowledge is always situated. This may seem congenial with pragmatism except the locus of the knower and of injustices is often described as power structures located in “global hierarchies” and a “world-system” and not situations.12¶ Pragmatism only questions that we live in History or a “World-System” (as a totality or abstract context) but not that we are in history (lowercase): in a present situation continuous with others where the past weighs heavily in our memories, bodies, habits, structures, and communities. It also does not deny the importance of power structures and seeing the connections be- tween injustices through time, but there is a difference between (a) inquiring into present situations of injustice in order to detect, diagnose, and cure an injustice (a social pathology) across history, and (b) inquiring into the his- tory of a systematic injustice in order to facilitate inquiry into the present unique, context-bound injustice. To capture the legacy of the past on present injustices, we must study history but also seek present evidence of the weight of the past on the present injustice.¶ If injustice is an illness, then the pragmatists’ approach takes as its main focus diagnosing and treating the particular present illness, that is, the particular situation-bound injustice and not a global “social pathology” or some single transhistorical source of injustice. The diagnosis of a particular injustice is not always dependent on adopting a broader critical standpoint of society in its entirety, but even when it is, we must be careful to not forget that such standpoints are useful only for understanding the present evil. The concepts and categories “white supremacy” and “colonialism” can be great tools that can be of planetary significance. One could even argue that they pick out much larger areas of people’s lives and injustices than the categories of class and gender, but in spite of their reach and explanatory theoretical value, they are nothing more than tools to make reference to and ameliorate particular injustices experienced (suffered) in the midst of a particular and unique re- lationship in a situation. No doubt many, but not all, problems of injustice are a consequence of being a member of a group in history, but even in these cases, we cannot a priori assume that injustices are homogeneously equal for all members of that group. Why is this important? The possible pluralism and therefore complexity of a problem of injustice does not always stop at the level of being a member of a historical group or even a member of many groups, as insisted on by intersectional analysis. There may be unique cir- cumstances to particular countries, towns, neighborhoods, institutions, and ultimately situations that we must be open to in a context-sensitive inquiry. If an empirical inquiry is committed to capturing and ameliorating all of the harms in situations of injustice in their raw pretheoretical complexity, then this requires that we try to begin with and return to the concrete, particular, and unique experiences of injustice.¶ Pragmatism agrees with Sally Haslanger’s concern about Charles Mills’s view. She writes: “The goal is not just a theory that is historical (v. ahistori- cal), but is sensitive to historical particularity, i.e., that resists grand causal narratives purporting to give an account of how domination has come about and is perpetuated everywhere and at all times” (1). For “the forces that cause and sustain domination vary tremendously context by context, and there isn’t necessarily a single causal explanation; a theoretical framework that is useful as a basis for political intervention must be highly sensitive to the details of the particular social context” (1).13¶ Although each situation is unique, there are commonalities among the cases that permit inquiry about common causes. We can “formulate tentative general principles from investigation of similar individual cases, and then . . . check the generalizations by applying them to still further cases” (Dewey, Lectures in China 53). But Dewey insists that the focus should be on the indi- vidual case, and was critical of how so many sociopolitical theories are prone to starting and remaining at the level of “sweeping generalizations.” He states that they “fail to focus on the concrete problems which arise in experience, allowing such problems to be buried under their sweeping generalizations” (Lectures in China 53).¶ The lesson pragmatism provides for nonideal theory today is that it must be careful to not reify any injustice as some single historical force for which particular injustice problems are its manifestation or evidence for its exis- tence. Pragmatism welcomes the wisdom and resources of nonideal theories that are historically grounded on actual injustices, but it issues a warning about how they should be understood and implemented. It is, for example, sympathetic to the critical resources found in critical race theory, but with an important qualification. It understands Derrick Bell’s valuable criticism as context-specific to patterns in the practice of American law. Through his inquiry into particular cases and civil rights policies at a particular time and place, Bell learned and proposed certain general principles such as the one of “interest convergence,” that is, “whites will promote racial advantages for blacks only when they also promote white self-interest.”14 But, for pragma- tism, these principles are nothing more than historically grounded tools to use in present problematic situations that call for our analysis, such as deliberation in establishing public policies or making sense of some concrete injustice. The principles are falsifiable and open to revision as we face situation-specific injustices. In testing their adequacy, we need to consider their function in making us see aspects of injustices we would not otherwise appreciate.15