I affirm: Resolved: In a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

# Value: Morality because the word ought implies morality

**Hoban 12**

Hoban, Jack. “What Are Values, Morals, and Ethics?” *Managementhelp.com*, 2 Jan. 2012, managementhelp.org/blogs/business-ethics/2012/01/02/what-are-values-morals-and-ethics/.

Moral values are relative values that protect life and are respectful of the dual life value of self and others. The great moral values, such as truth, freedom, charity, etc., have one thing in common. When they are functioning correctly, they are life protecting or life enhancing for all. But they are still relative values. Our relative moral values must be constantly examined to make sure that they are always performing their life-protecting mission. Even the Marine Corps core values of “honor, courage and commitment” require examination in this context. Courage can become foolish martyrdom, commitment can become irrational fanaticism, honor can become self-righteousness, conceit, and disrespect for others. Our enemies have their own standard of honor, they have courage, and they are surely committed. What sets us apart? Respect for the universal life value sets us apart from our enemies.

## My Value Criterion is consequentialism

#### **O*nly* pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. All other values can be explained with reference to pleasure.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, **Research Fellow in Philosophy** at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” **Journal of Value Inquiry** (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281]

I think several things should be said in response to Moore’s challenge to hedonists. First, I do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain why we should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable. Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, there is something peculiar about the list of additional intrinsic values that counts in hedonism’s favor: the listed values have a strong tendency to be well explained as things that help promote pleasure and avert pain. To go through Frankena’s list, life and consciousness are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; activity, health, and strength bring about pleasure; and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as “pleasures and satisfactions.” The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and “proportion in objects contemplated,” and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena’s list, such as understanding, wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly. Morally good dispositions and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, contribute a happy society, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after. To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values. Indeed, pluralists’ suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism’s: “Hedonists,” he writes “do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend.”24 Ross writes that “[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors.”25 Roger Crisp observes that “those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy.”26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that if the suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values are potentially explainable by appeal to just pleasure and pain (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), then—by appeal to Occam’s razor—we have at least a pro tanto reason to resist the introduction of any further intrinsic values and disvalues. It is ontologically more costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case all values admit of explanation by reference to a single intrinsic value and a single intrinsic disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts. The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists. The challenge can be phrased as the following question: If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they tend to point toward pleasure and away from pain?27

## Define prioritize

**Oxford**

prioritization of something (over something) *(formal)* the treatment of something as being more important than other things

We also have an observation that is important for how you understand the resolution

**Observation 1: the affirmative has the burden of proving that reporting objectivity must be more important than advocating for an agenda. I do not need to prove that advocacy is always bad just that advocacy is bad when it throws truth to the side.**

# Contention 1: propaganda

## a. journalism that does not prioritize objectivity is propaganda

**Smith**

Bruce Lannes Smith Emeritus Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing. Coauthor of *Propaganda, Communication and Public Opinion.https://www.britannica.com/contributor/Bruce-Lannes-Smith/2760*

**propaganda**, dissemination of information—facts, arguments, rumours, half-truths, or lies—to influence [public opinion](https://www.britannica.com/topic/public-opinion).

[Propaganda](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Propaganda) is the more or less systematic effort to manipulate other people’s beliefs, attitudes, or actions by means of symbols (words, gestures, banners, monuments, music, clothing, insignia, hairstyles, designs on coins and postage stamps, and so forth). Deliberateness and a relatively heavy emphasis on manipulation distinguish propaganda from casual conversation or the free and easy exchange of ideas. Propagandists have a specified goal or set of goals. To achieve these, they deliberately select facts, arguments, and displays of symbols and present them in ways they think will have the most effect. To maximize effect, they may [omit](https://www.britannica.com/dictionary/omit) or distort pertinent facts or simply lie, and they may try to divert the [attention](https://www.britannica.com/science/attention) of the reactors (the people they are trying to sway) from everything but their own propaganda.

## 

## b.The modern age of technology allows propaganda to spread to billions

**Essin 15**

[Stephanie Essin](https://medium.com/@stephanieessin?source=post_page-----e71b64ecba4-----------------------------------) Video Producer, Storyteller | Portland, OR https://medium.com/uo-mmj/propaganda-advocacy-how-to-tell-the-difference-e71b64ecba4

Knowing what a credible source looks like is really important as a news consumer. It is critical to be able to identify those who are using ethical standards to tell you true things, in order to promote positive change, versus groups whom tell you things using unethical, hyperbolic strategies for their own agenda.

With no reign on who can post what, its hard to know if what you’re reading and watching is coming from an accurate source. Since any kind of media can go viral, inaccurate information could influence billions.

## c. Propaganda dehumanizes people

**NPR**

<https://www.npr.org/2011/03/29/134956180/criminals-see-their-victims-as-less-than-human>

During the Holocaust, Nazis referred to Jews as rats. Hutus involved in the Rwanda genocide called Tutsis cockroaches. Slave owners throughout history considered slaves subhuman animals. In *Less Than Human*, David Livingstone Smith argues that it's important to define and describe dehumanization, because it's what opens the door for cruelty and genocide.

"We all know, despite what we see in the movies," Smith tells NPR's Neal Conan, "that it's very difficult, psychologically, to kill another human being up close and in cold blood, or to inflict atrocities on them." So, when it does happen, it can be helpful to understand what it is that allows human beings "to overcome the very deep and natural inhibitions they have against treating other people like game animals or vermin or dangerous predators."

## d. propaganda leads to mass indoctrination and genocide

**Hobbs**

Professor Hobbs is an internationally-recognized authority on digital and media literacy education. Through community and global service and as a researcher, teacher, advocate and media professional, Hobbs has worked to advance the quality of digital and media literacy education in the United States and around the world. She is Founder and Director of the [**Media Education Lab**](https://mediaeducationlab.com/), whose mission is to improve the quality of media literacy education through research and community service. https://mediaeducationlab.com/sites/default/files/Hobbs%20KONY.pdf

At the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington D.C., the State of Deception exhibit reveals the powerful ways in which propaganda was used to target audiences, define the enemy, indoctrinate youth, and rally the nation. At its worst, propaganda leads to genocide.

## e. democracy collapses when voters are misinformed by alternative news sites

**Hollyer 19**

Hollyer, James R., et al. “Analysis | Fake News Is Bad News for Democracy.” *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 5 Apr. 2019, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/04/05/fake-news-is-bad-news-democracy/.

Last week, Facebook CEO [Mark Zuckerberg](https://www.facebook.com/4/posts/10107013839885441) welcomed government regulation of content on the Internet in several areas, including “election integrity.” Around the world, there are increasing concerns that “[fake news](https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2018/07/fake-news-threatens-future-uk-democracy-report-180729063712697.html)” threatens democracy. Our [recent research](http://hrvtransparency.org/) supports this view — democracy is less likely to survive in a poor informational environment. [Our book](http://hrvtransparency.org/) shows that when voters are poorly informed, enough voters are more likely to make mistakes at the polls. This leads to the election of incompetent — and perhaps corrupt or self-dealing — governments.

Here’s why this matters: Such outcomes at the polls lower [public confidence](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/political-foundations-of-democracy-and-the-rule-of-the-law/564FB92EE1808897FD0041E25289CF1F) in democracy and generate support for emergent [anti-democratic forces](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/ajps.12005).

Unreliable information shapes voter choices Our research focuses on the economy. Voters like a [healthy economy](https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/157825) — and often rely on official pronouncements or publicly available information like jobs data or growth forecasts to decide for themselves how well the economy is doing. This information can be more or less precise or accurate. In a highly transparent society, public pronouncements tend to be on target — the government releases accurate information. Voters then make informed decisions at the polls. They reelect governments that produce solid economic performance and vote out governments that fail to address economic woes. [*Here’s a way you can combat fake news*](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/11/08/heres-a-way-you-can-combat-fake-news/?utm_term=.0301dcc3b91f&itid=lk_interstitial_manual_11) When official announcements of economic performance are less trustworthy, voters rely more on their own personal, perhaps idiosyncratic, experience with the economy to make choices at the polls — and are more likely to make collective mistakes. After they see the election results, voters often figure out that [misinformation](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2019/04/india-misinformation-election-fake-news/586123/) impacted the outcome. Bad information bungles elections If the challenger receives more votes than expected (relative to what the actual state of the economy would have suggested is warranted), the voters are likely to realize they’ve made a collective error. And when incompetent or corrupt governments win reelection, the disappointed public may align with anti-democratic forces.

Our book, “Information, Democracy, and Autocracy,” and a recent [article](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/british-journal-of-political-science/article/transparency-protest-and-democratic-stability/ECB1EA975C03A03DA66E3957908AE689) present evidence in line with our theory. Using an [original measure](http://hrvtransparency.org/) of the transparency of economic outcomes, we show that democracies with low levels of transparency are less likely to survive. Incumbents are more likely to be removed from office through extra-constitutional means — coups or assassinations — especially when the economy is performing poorly. Highly transparent democracies survive, even under poor economic conditions.

Fake News changes the story Our analysis focuses on credible information governments provide regarding the economy. Yet the world of fake news and social media trolling exacerbates the problems we identify. Ironically, greater connectivity and access to information makes for less transparency. Fake news leads to the dissemination of false narratives, which exposes voters to a “noisier” signal of government performance. If the stories vary widely, voters may not know what to believe or may believe false information. Some individuals may come to believe that others are in thrall to false information and regard their views as illegitimate. In some ways, this noise is similar to situations in which no credible information is available at all.

[*Russia has been meddling in foreign elections for decades. Has it made a difference?*](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/01/05/russia-has-been-meddling-in-foreign-elections-for-decades-has-it-made-a-difference/?utm_term=.3534ea220711&itid=lk_interstitial_manual_23)

In such an environment, elections function poorly as a means of removing underperforming politicians. When voters don’t believe the electoral process is working and lose trust in democracy, they may be more likely to encourage violent coups. Or they might even offer popular support as a democratically elected government turns authoritarian by undermining the systems that keep it accountable, such as the rule of law, an independent judiciary or a free press.

# Contention 2: Journalist have a moral responsibility to tell the truth

**Society of Proffessional Journalists the code of ethics**

https://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp

Ethical journalism should be accurate and fair. Journalists should be honest and courageous in gathering, reporting and interpreting information.

Journalists should:

Take responsibility for the accuracy of their work. Verify information before releasing it. Use original sources whenever possible.

Remember that neither speed nor format excuses inaccuracy.

Provide context. Take special care not to misrepresent or oversimplify in promoting, previewing or summarizing a story.

# Blocks:

## 1ar overview

Vote affirmative to prioritize objectivity before advocacy in order to maintain democratic citizenry and eliminate the spread of propaganda and the commercialization of media outlets. Cross apply **Smith** evidence currently in the SQ news outlets are not held accountable for the circulation of misinformation. Our **Hollyer 19** evidence says that the circulation of misinformation results in the collapse of democratic societies, spreads derogatory propaganda which dehumanizes individuals and justifies genocidal astrocites such as Nazi Germany and Rwanda. Only prioritizing objectivity journalism resolves the neg impacts

## 2ar

Vote affirmative to priortize obejctivty -- the negative has mishandled the arguement that objective journalism is possible meaning all the negative’s arguments can be accesses through a lens of objecivty. \even though there are good types of advocacy, the negative does not get to pick and chose which exmaples they do or not defend as proven in CX. Advocy for (Neg Adv) is not just advocacy for that but is a philisophical justification for proganda and misinfomration via the press. Yes there is historical precendent for this -- Nazi Germany and Rwanda genocide. And allows for people to become isolated in their views.

Vote affirmative to support the prioritization of objective journalism in order to avoid the mass dehumanization and genocide while still solving for neg impacts through allowing for advocacy that priorizes objectivity. In the SQ news outlets prioritize advocating for an agenda rather than speaking the truth. This is causing polarization in our society that links to people view each other as subhuman which destroys respect for life and the ability to live in a democratic society.

## Aff burden

You will vote aff in this round if we meet our aff burden. My burden is to prove that objectivity is more important than advocacy because of the word “prioritize”. As I have shown in this round journalist have a moral obligation to priotize objectivity over advocacy in order to avoid the dehuamzation and genocide therefore you have to vote aff.

In order to win this round judge all I have to prove is that advocacy journalist should prioritize telling the truth over selling an agenda. Because of the word priortize in the resolution, I do not need to prove that advocacy journalism is bad all the time but only when it is built off lies. As I have shown in this round journalist have a moral obligation to priotize objectivity over advocacy in order to avoid the dehuamzation and genocide therefore you have to vote aff.

## Racial bias

They have mishandled our propaganda contention cross apply our evidence here. Racial bias is only the by product advocacy not based in fact checking and self reflextivity-- extend our NPR evidence which turns there contention against them. Without objective scientific inqueries within journalism authoritarian regimes like Nazi germany are created due to the lack of them being held accountable for their false anti-semitic statements this means that Racist journalism is advocacy journalism only objective tivity solves

## Impact calculas

Even if you don’t believe that the aff solves the neg impacts our impacts outweigh. History shows that everytime advocacy is prioritized over objectivity it leads to massive amounts of suffering and death. This is not a hypothetical nuclear war scinerio, this is a proven result of propoganda. All other impacts are either have less magnitude or are highly impobable scienos that have no basis in reality. Every case in history of massive human suffering is caused by the use of advocacy journalism becoming more important than objective journalism. Vote aff to avoid future genocides.

# Ukraine DA

1. Soldiers

# Questions:

Can you define advocacy journalism?

Do you support journalism that promotes lies?

Do you support the type of advocacy journalism that the Nazi’s used in WWII to dehumanize Jews?

Why is X VC good?