I negate the resolution

# 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.

**The value criterion is minimizing structural violence. Prefer this because:**

**[1] In order to achieve Morality, we must not exclude or ignore structurally marginalized groups. Naturally, humans divide people into groups that allow for historical moral exclusion, and minimizing our suffering is the highest priority.**

**[2] Exclusion of minorities means there is an incomplete understanding of what pain and pleasure is and how much there is--So, resolving SV is prior to being able to purely aggregate pain and pleasure. This pattern demonstrates why a framework focused on challenging structural violence is a prerequisite to any other morality-based framework. (TRUE MORALITY CAN NEVER BE ACHIEVED UNDER OTHER FRAMEWORKS IF THESE GROUPS ARE ALWAYS THE RECEIVER OF SUFFERING)**

**[3] Prefer our framing in place of a collective impact calculus that includes those that are not structurally oppressed that silences the experiences of the minority. The debate space has a duty to maximizing education, because discussions spill out into the real world and create real world impacts and allows people who cannot access policy to talk about their experiences in an inclusive format. Therefore, things that most people don’t have to even think about or experience should take priority in this round as having the highest educational and inclusive value**

# Define objective

Cambridge

[**based**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/based) **on** [**real**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/real)[**facts**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/fact) **and not** [**influenced**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/influence) **by** [**personal**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/personal)[**beliefs**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/belief) **or** [**feelings**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/feeling)**:**

# Contention 1: Objective journalism lacks morality

## a. Objective journalism can create a false sense of balance between two unequal ideas

**Stroud and Williams 20**

Stroud, Scott R., and Kat Williams. “Objectivity in Journalism.” *Media Ethics Initiative*, Scott R. Stroud, 24 July 2020, https://mediaethicsinitiative.org/2020/07/28/objectivity-in-journalism/.

Moreover, the professional objective model is said to be problematic on a practical level as well. The expectation to only report facts essentially reduces a journalist to a stenographer and may even deprive the audience of additional knowledge they need to make an informed judgement (Pressman, 2019). Even professional practices concerning opinions and accounts runs into trouble when it reaches for objectivity because it can “give false equivalence to ideas that do not deserve equal amounts of time” (Driftwood, 2016). As Christopher Meyers notes. Truthful journalism establishes the context that makes accurate facts meaningful by discerningly providing multiple perspectives and by recognizing that a strict adherence to balance – in the sense of giving equal weight and credence to all sides on a contentious issue – can mislead more than inform. See, for example, coverage of climate change in which equal space is given to deniers (Meyers, 2020).

## b. Objectivity allows journalists to take a place of privilege above the people who are suffering

**Levi 21**

Levi, Gabriel. “Column: Why Objectivity in Journalism Does More Harm than Good to Marginalized Communities.” *The Maneater*, 30 Apr. 2021, https://themaneater.com/column-why-objectivity-in-journalism-does-more-harm-than-good-to-marginalized-communities/.

The second issue with objectivity is the sense of privilege it accompanies. For people of color and marginalized communities, we don’t get to strip ourselves of these identities for the news. No matter if the story runs, at the end of the day, I am still a Black, queer person living in America who faces the threats reported during the news in my daily life. To be objective about that is to have the privilege to say, ‘I can take a step back from this’ when others do not have that luxury. So when journalists preach objectivity, they need to check their privilege, because some of us can’t be objective when our wellbeing is at stake.On the other side of the argument, some journalists argue that without objectivity, there is no difference between a journalist and a common person, because journalism loses its standards. I don’t think there should be a difference. The only difference between a journalist and a common person is a couple journalism classes and a platform. To even assume there is a difference makes journalism pretentious, and once again inhibits us from doing our primary jobs: representing the people. Doing away with objectivity puts journalists and average citizens on a level playing field, which is more important than upholding outdated journalism standards.

**This reality of objective journalism proves to be espically true in the reporting of minority cases where journalist try to seem objective by being vague about the cause of cases that are specifically motivated by racism, sexism, and/or ableism**

## c. the existence of objectivity is questionable at best because it is just the point of view of the stronger party

**Delgado 92**

**Delgado,** Law Prof at U. of Colorado, 19**92** [Richard, “Shadowboxing: An Essay On Power,” In Cornell Law Review, May]

We have cleverly built power's view of the appropriate standard of conduct into the very term fair. Thus, the stronger party is able to have his/her way and see her/himself as principled at the same time. Imagine, for example, a man's likely reaction to the suggestion that subjective considerations -- a woman's mood, her sense of pressure or intimidation, how she felt about the man, her unexpressed fear of reprisals if she did not go ahead-- ought to play a part in determining whether the man is guilty of rape. Most men find this suggestion offensive; it requires them to do something they are not accustomed to doing. "Why," they say, "I'd have to be a mind reader before I could have sex with anybody?" "Who knows, anyway, what internal inhibitions the woman might have been harboring?" And "what if the woman simply changed her mind later and charged me with rape?" What we never notice is that women can "read" men's minds perfectly well. The male perspective is right out there in the world, plain as day, inscribed in culture, song, and myth -- in all the prevailing narratives. These narratives tell us that men want and are entitled [\*820] to sex, that it is a prime function of women to give it to them, and that unless something unusual happens, the act of sex is ordinary and blameless. We believe these things because that is the way we have constructed women, men, and "normal" sexual intercourse. Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? The "objective" approach is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about administrability, fairness, stability, and ease of determination points us away from what [\*821] really counts: the way in which stronger parties have managed to inscribe their views and interests into "external" culture, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts.

# Contention 2: objectivity exists within advocacy journalism

## a. Objectivity and advocacy are not mutually exclusive

**Caceres 19**

Cáceres, Ingrid Bachmann. “Advocacy Journalism.” *Oxford Research Encyclopedias*, 25 June 2019, https://oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-776.

A contested term with defenders and critics, advocacy journalism refers to a genre of journalism that combines reporting with a point of view. With roots as far as the origins of journalism itself, as a contemporary practice it can be found—to varying degrees—in all kinds of media outlets across the globe. Its key premise is that journalists participate in the mass-mediated public sphere and that their work deliberately and transparently stands for specific perspectives, with stories actively championing for certain ideas and values. While some authors have labeled advocacy as the binary opposite of objective (factual) reporting, in recent decades several journalism scholars and practitioners have argued that this is not the case, and that advocacy and informing are not necessarily mutually exclusive. At the core of this discussion are normative considerations of how journalism should be, the role of objectivity in news reporting, and professional models shaping news cultures and news content in different regions. Ethical concerns are also common arguments in this debate. Advocate journalists do not necessarily dismiss objectivity—although some do—and insist they adhere to professional standards nonetheless, since they still do journalism rather than propaganda. Promoters of advocacy also argue that having a situated viewpoint is more transparent, whereas critics argue against what they deem news reporting with an agenda or promoting an ideological campaign. More recently, advocacy journalism has been adopted—and adapted—by nongovernmental organizations and civic movements, which highlights the constant redefinitions of journalism practice outside of legacy media and traditional contexts.

# Blocks

# Democracy

they say Democracy is key and outweighs our impacts but democracy useless if we lack morality which not only their framework outlines but ours as well--this is important as they have mishandled an important argument that turns their case and this particular contention--extend our evidence from the first contention-- objectivity results in the destruction of democracy in terms of the freedom of speech by not only silencing of people of color such as the New York Times prohibiting Black and Brown reports from using the words such as “racism” due to the fact that it is “objective and quantifable” but also objectivity and democracy create a false sense of equivlency which ignore how ppwer relaitons suchs as racism, transphobia, and ableism are intertwined in the concepts such as “objectivity and democracy” and prohibit the ability for certain voices to be heard--this means until they have provens why democracy hasn’t already collapsed and isn’t historically attached to legacies of violence their impacts are not probably, non-unque, and leads to a net increase in supprssion of voices and violence

# Climate change

1. Advocacy journalism turns the climate change advantage because **Stroud and Williams 20** prove that objectivity creates a false sense of balance between two sides of an argument. So people believe that there is not actually wide concenses among scientist on the causes and effects of climate change because that is what the objective media presents.
2. Objective journalism lacks the full picture because they might tell viewers that the earth’s tempature has risen 0.14oF in the last decade, but lacks the advocacy portion of the scientis telling people why that is a big deal.
3. Advocacy journalism solves better because advocacy jounalism is built on truth and not lies and motivates people to make change.

#### 

#### **ONLY--A disproportionate contrarian presence in news compared to the scientific consensus on climate change prevents further climate action--simply put, only advocacy based jouranalism can reduce the public’s and academia’s attempt to deny climate change**

**Petersen et al. 19** [Alexander Michael Petersen, Associate Professor at UC Merced, Emmanuel M. Vincent, Research Scientist with a PhD at the University Pierre et Marie Curie and a post-doctoral fellowship at MIT, and Anthony LeRoy Westerling, professor at UC Merced with a PhD from UC San Diego, 2019, “Discrepancy in scientific authority and media visibility of climate change scientists and contrarians,” Nature Communications, https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-019-09959-4]/Kankee

We juxtapose 386 prominent contrarians with 386 expert scientists by tracking their digital footprints across ∼200,000 research publications and ∼100,000 English-language digital and print media articles on climate change. Projecting these individuals across the same backdrop facilitates quantifying disparities in media visibility and scientific authority, and identifying organization patterns within their association networks. Here we show via direct comparison that contrarians are featured in **49% more** media articles than scientists. Yet when comparing visibility in mainstream media sources only, we observe just a 1% excess visibility, which objectively demonstrates the crowding out of professional mainstream sources by the proliferation of new media sources, many of which contribute to the production and consumption of climate change **disinformation** at scale. These results demonstrate why climate scientists should **increasingly** exert their **authority** in scientific and public discourse, and why professional journalists and editors should adjust the **disproportionate** attention given to contrarians. Introduction Since the early 2000s there has been **little disagreement** among scientific experts over the fundamental evidence supporting the existence, origin, and societal significance of anthropogenic climate change (CC)1,2,3,4. Yet, while an anthropogenic cause is supported by an overwhelming majority of climate change scientists (CCS)5, climate change contrarians (CCC) have **successfully** organized a **strong voice** within politics and science communication in the **U**nited **S**tates6,7. Historians of science have detailed the political origins of the CCC movement, documenting how its strategic efforts succeeded in distorting the science-based narrative on multiple fronts, e.g., by promoting the idea that there is a lack of scientific consensus concerning anthropogenic CC6,8,9,10,11,12, despite the fact that objective research has found **little evidence** for such a claim. One study comparing consensus scientists with unconvinced scientists found that the 2–3% of researchers unconvinced by evidence for anthropogenic CC were not only small in group size but also had substantially lower levels of authority in the CC literature10. Another study surveying ∼3000 earth scientists found the highest levels of CC consensus to be among the most expert climatologists5. Public confusion over science affects various other domains13, in addition to CC communication14, and requires a better understanding of the human, social, and technological factors that facilitate widespread disinformation efforts15,16,17,18. One salient human factor that contributes to the public’s susceptibility to information manipulation is cognitive bias. A particularly relevant example is motivated reasoning—the tendency for individuals to bias their judgements according to personal- and group-level values, even when faced with documented facts19,20,21. Another class of factors are prominent external influences, owing to elite political cues22, ideological biases23,24, cultural worldviews25, and even personal weather experiences26,27. Not least among these external factors is the news media15, which has a longstanding and dominant role empowering cultural politics28. A third decisive technological factor is the paradigm of new media and the nearly boundless scalability of content distribution across the internet. Even in the case where individuals have complete control in choosing their sources of information, they are nevertheless susceptible to significant disparities in content production in addition to being susceptible to media coverage that is disproportionate to the authority and number of scientists holding the consensus viewpoint. Recent research highlights the ramifications of this problem, finding that the **acceptance** of CC increases (respectively decreases) with consumption of media content that **acknowledges** (respectively dismisses) CC realities, other factors being equal24. Susceptibility to information manipulation may continue to be a **serious problem** until society fully adapts to managing the sheer range and volume of new media sources. As such, addressing the opportunities and threats facing CC communication requires an integrated understanding of these human, social, and technological factors. Accordingly, the literature on CC communication is multi-disciplinary. Research efforts draw on a wide range of methods that typically target a single entry point—such as applying content and meta-analysis methods to select collections of scientific publications2,3,10,29, news media articles7,8,9,12,28,30,31,32,33,34, or surveys4,22,23 or by developing behavioral experiments and survey instruments5,11,19,24,25,35. For example, applying in-depth content analysis to select media article sets, researchers identified common factors among skeptical critics, estimated the percentage of CC articles that contain skeptical elements, and developed a typology of CC skeptics30. Building on this framework, another recent study reports that contrarians have strategically shifted away from their external narrative—initially based upon challenging fundamental tenets of CC science (e.g., its anthropogenic origins), thereby positioning themselves as skeptics with legitimate scientific motives for dissent—to instead challenging assessments of CC impacts in an effort to impede the development of proactive regulations33. However, a separate large-scale analysis of internal documents from 19 contrarian organizations shows that the inward contrarian narrative is still rather focused on CC science, with the relative frequency of science-related topics increasing relative to policy-related topics over the period 2009–201334. We complement these extensive efforts by investigating the degree to which socio-technical factors facilitate the visibility and emergence of authority among contrarian claims-makers36. To address this literature gap, we focus our analysis on a group of 386 prominent contrarians, denoted both individually and collectively by CCC. We compare these CCC with 386 prominent scientists active in CC research, denoted hereafter by CCS. These experts in CC science serve as an objective measurement baseline for juxtaposing visibility in the media with authority in the scientific domain. To operationalize this integrative comparison, we collected two large datasets through 2016, comprised of ∼200,000 CC research articles from the Web of Science (WOS) and ∼100,000 English-language CC media articles from the Media Cloud (MC) project37. By focusing on a fixed set of individuals, we leverage large-scale data-driven methods of computational social science38 in an effort to reveal individual-, pair-wise-, and group-level phenomena at the intersection of science and the media. In what follows, we characterize and compare these CC actors at various levels of aggregation: first, by comparing their scientific authority and media visibility at both the individual and group levels; and second, by mapping their associations that are manifest in media co-visibility networks and scientific co-citation networks. Our approach accounts for the variation in visibility across a wide range of sources, from main-stream to non-mainstream sources. By simultaneously accounting for each individual’s scientific authority, our quantitative analysis contributes to the CC communication literature by revealing the degree to which prominent contrarian voices benefit from the scalability of new media, in particular the large number of second-tier news sources and blogs that do not implement rigorous information quality assessment standards. Such disproportionate media visibility of contrarian arguments and actors not only **misrepresents** the distribution of expert-based beliefs28,36,39, it also manifestly **undermines** the **credible authority** of career CCS experts and reinforces the trend of CCC presiding over public scientific discourse40, which all together **hinders** prospects for **rapid** public action on CC41. Results

# Structural violence

1. Objective news contributes to structural violence by silencing minority voices in the name of objectivity as explained by **Levi 21**
2. Objectivity is just the view of the stronger party according to **Delgado** and therefore is inherently structural violence
3. Advocacy journalism solves better because it empowers minority voices to speak truth and advocate for change

#### **Objectivity is a tool to silence black voices and issues in media**

**Schneider 20** [Gabe Schneider, political journalist with a degree in Political Science and Urban Planning from University of California San Diego, 12-21-2020, "Journalism outlets need new social media policies," University of Missouri Reynolds Journalism Institute, https://rjionline.org/reporting/journalism-outlets-need-new-social-media-policies/]/Kankee

What should they look like? Pittsburgh Post-Gazette journalist Alexis Johnson was barred from protest coverage after joking about a Kenny Chesney concert on Twitter. She tweeted: “Horrifying scenes and aftermath from selfish LOOTERS who don’t care about this city!!!!! …. oh wait sorry. No, these are pictures from a Kenny Chesney concert tailgate. Whoops.” Johnson, a Black journalist, was punished for making a joke about the media framing of “riots” and “looting.” While one of her white colleagues called one alleged looter a “scumbag,” it was Johnson who was punished. “I was told it violated our social media policy. They kept calling it an educational conversation, but there was no warning, no ‘Hey can you take the tweet down?’ By Monday morning, they had decided I would no longer be able to cover it,” Johnson told CBS2. The harsh reactionary punishment applied to Johnson is ridiculous, but not unique. Other Black journalists have faced similar **repercussions**: Wesley Lowery was punished by the Washington Post for correctly framing the Tea Party as a racist reactionary movement. So was Kendra Pierre-Louis, who was punished by the New York Times for saying white supremacy is racist. The trend line is that reporters, often Black, are punished for their perspective, even if it’s rooted in reporting and facts. **Punishment** can mean being barred from covering a topic that is close to the reporter’s identity, like Johnson was, or an implied **threat** of being **fired**. The dynamic is so **crystalized** that, instead of individually challenging The New York Times for their op-ed calling on the president to use force against civilians, Black New York Times employees and their allies responded as a collective on Twitter, all tweeting: “This puts Black New York Times staff in **danger**.” But even in the wake of massive protests, even as management at many legacy newspapers committed to better social media policies, and even as journalism has shifted to a mostly online workforce, there’s been a lack of movement in newsrooms to craft a social media policy that allows journalists of color to just do their jobs. “Since the events of January 2020 and the summer, there’s been **zero** further conversation,” said B, a social media producer at a large legacy newspaper. “It’s just a standstill right now.” Journalists and social media managers I spoke with, like B, did not want their names published out of concern for how their managers might react to them being candid or because press requests required approval from newsroom leadership. But all of them, all younger reporters of color, had extensive thoughts on how newsrooms are **failing** to craft good social media policies and move the conversation beyond humanizing reporters of color. While social media has become a driving force for digital readership, and therefore ad revenue or donors, many legacy newsrooms have barely pushed the envelope in changing their social media policies. The New York Times adopted a new policy in 2017, which makes the blanket statement: “Our journalists should be especially mindful of appearing to take sides on issues that The Times is seeking to cover objectively.” The Washington Post also updated its policy in 2017, with many of the same themes. R, who recently interned for a different large legacy newspaper, said that they received clear instructions from management when they started: “They asked us not to tweet about **B**lack **L**ives **M**atter, but didn’t address the complexity of that issue.” R said it is **problematic** to frame supporting a **human rights** issue, like Black Lives Matter, similarly to taking an open political stance. R doesn’t believe any reporter should be explicitly partisan (“don’t tweet about ‘blue’ or ‘red’”), but they do believe it makes you a better reporter if you’re able to be empathetic to readers who are affected by human rights issues, like police violence. “At the end of the day, it makes me a better reporter,” R, who is non-Black, said of saying “Black Lives Matter.” “I’m being empathetic to a movement that’s affecting my Black brothers and sisters. So therefore it would help me connect to readers who identify with that. And two: [It] just makes me more of a human, because I don’t think that people of another race should be shot and killed by police for no reason. I think that makes me a better reporter.” Z, an audience engagement editor at a newer digital publication, said the false **equivalencies** and **double standards** in current social media policy are **exacerbated** by the fact that racist readers are more willing to **flag** tweets for newsroom management. “It’s always been easier for white reporters to get away with saying things like that is because they’re white,” she said. “People **automatically** assume they don’t have any ties to a community and they don’t have any reason to say that thing other than it’s a fact.” Z said that the current conversation is way behind the times, in that newsrooms are still trying to figure out how to humanize their own Black and brown reporters. Instead, she’s looking to the future and thinking about the ways in which newsrooms should be expanding their audience. “I don’t see why more newsrooms aren’t sending out tweets in native languages,” she said. “I think that there is a huge population of people on the internet that are not being properly served; readers and persons of the community that don’t have access or can’t understand tweets that are coming from newsrooms because they’re not accessible.” Ultimately, B said that the divide in newsrooms is clear: on one side, there’s management, which is often whiter and older; on the other is the younger journalists, who are often more diverse. She said that management believes that you can **separate** your **humanity** from your work and younger journalists do not (although some editors, like The New York Times Dean Baquet, do not believe “there is a big gap”). “It’s like two schools of thought. And they’re both clashing in really ugly, really ugly ways. And one of the schools of thought is almost in every leadership position in the newsroom.” Newsrooms, especially older institutions, need to move on from the conversation of whether or not these social media policies are racist: if journalists of color are saying that the current structure of social media policies are applied **unevenly** and are **racist**, then they are racist. If journalists and social media managers from around the newsroom, especially those who are most impacted by these policies are given space to craft these policies, then perhaps we’ll soon see the necessary changes. If B were in charge of social media, she said her changes across the board are easy to articulate: No more penalizing reporters for the experiences they bring to the table. Instead: “Be honest, be truthful, be transparent when you get things wrong and just don’t be a bad person online. It’s very simple. It’s very short.”

#### **AND That bothsidesism allows racist disinformation campaigns and victim blaming, justifying police violence against black people**

**Sullivan 21** [Margaret Sullivan, Washington Post media columnist and journalism educator at Columbia University and the City University of New York, 4-7-2021, "How right-wing media keeps smearing George Floyd with the racist ‘no angel’ narrative," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/media/george-floyd-right-wing-media/2021/04/07/db58716c-9796-11eb-a6d0-13d207aadb78\_story.html]/Kankee

In an appalling bit of shorthand, the riveting courtroom drama in Minneapolis has come to be called “the George Floyd trial.” Floyd died in police custody last spring and is obviously not the one on trial. It was a Minneapolis police officer, Derek Chauvin, who knelt on his neck for more than nine unrelenting minutes, who now faces second- and third-degree murder and second-degree manslaughter charges. But some in right-wing media keep doing their **utmost** to make this **tragedy** about Floyd’s drug use and troubled life, in what seems like an attempt to **absolve** Chauvin long before the jury reaches a verdict. In effect, they are putting Floyd on trial. It feels all too familiar. This is the “well, he was **no angel**” narrative, obliquely **blaming** the victim for his fate. It’s a narrative all **too often** applied to Black men who **die** at the hands of police. It might remind you of the way that women who make accusations about sexual assault are so often portrayed as crazy or promiscuous (and just look at how short her skirt was!). When teenager Michael Brown got the same “he’s no angel” treatment after he was shot to death in 2014 by a police officer in Ferguson, Mo., the author Touré was one of many who objected. “It’s as if a black person must be a **perfect victim** to escape being **thuggified**,” he wrote, “an angel with an **unblemished** history in order to warrant **justice**.” In a recent opinion piece for Town Hall titled “Derek Chauvin, Human Sacrifice,” outrage-stoker Ann Coulter went so far as to misrepresent the basic facts. “The chief medical examiner’s report establishes that, however else Floyd died, it wasn’t from Chauvin’s knee,” she wrote. Simply untrue: The Hennepin County medical examiner ruled Floyd’s death a homicide, as did a private autopsy. The county called the cause of his death “cardiopulmonary arrest complicating law enforcement subdual, restraint, and neck compression.” “Two autopsies of George Floyd differ on exactly what caused his death,” The Washington Post noted in a deep look into the case last year, “but they agree on this much: The 46-year-old African American man was a victim of homicide.” Experts did note the high level of fentanyl in Floyd’s body, which Coulter, who specializes in nastiness, claimed was “enough to bump off an entire team of Budweiser Clydesdales.” Fox’s bigfoot prime-time host, Tucker Carlson, has been on board with this campaign for months. “There was no physical evidence that George Floyd was murdered by a cop,” he confidently told his audience in February. “The autopsy showed that George Floyd almost certainly died of a drug overdose, fentanyl.” Carlson returned to the topic in a lengthy segment in March as jury selection was underway. He dismissed the idea that Floyd represented every Black man who gets unfair treatment from the American criminal justice system. Showing video of Minneapolis in flames, he mocked the racial-justice movement that followed Floyd’s death: “Because he died, we have something called ‘equity.’ ” In fact, Carlson believes the unfairness runs in the opposite direction. “It’s likely that Derek Chauvin won’t receive a fair trial,” he declared, using words such as “mob justice.” Carlson also found it necessary to go through Floyd’s previous arrests. These have exactly nothing to do with Chauvin’s murder trial — except that they nicely fit the “no angel” narrative: Whatever happened, it’s his fault. Last week, Fox’s trial coverage got the same point across in slightly more subtle ways: “DARK PAST DETAILED” blared a headline after Floyd’s girlfriend described her struggles with opioid addiction as well as Floyd’s. Even Fox’s media critic, Howard Kurtz, the former Washington Post reporter who is usually a relatively fair-minded voice, saw fit to use the coded language. “George Floyd was not an angel,” Kurtz said on air last weekend. “He was a drug addict who initially resisted arrest. Yet I’m not seeing too many commentators saying Derek Chauvin is getting a raw deal in being charged with second-degree murder and manslaughter.” It’s hard to see a clear connection between Floyd’s past and the supposed need for more-sympathetic media coverage of Chauvin. But then again, this kind of thing goes back many years. In 2000, when 26-year-old security guard Patrick Dorismond was killed outside a New York nightclub after shoving undercover officers, then-Mayor Rudy Giuliani sniffed that Dorismond was “no altar boy.” Whatever that was supposed to mean, it wasn’t factual. To Rudy’s chagrin, it turned out that Dorismond had, in fact, been an altar boy. Two decades later, not much has changed, but it needs to. The “no angel” narrative, and its variations, are racist smears. Unlike George Floyd, they deserve to die.

# 1nr overview

Vote in negation because morality cannot exist unless everyone in society is valued and cared for. Objectivity has been used for decades to silence the voices of the minority groups. Black reporters have been silinced or even fired in the name of objectivity according to **Schneider 20**. Allowing for advocacy would not destroy objectivity but simply provide a way for minority groups to speak from their point of view on an issue which allows reporter to better express the racist, sexist, and/or ableist context for critical issues. Reject the concept of absolute objectivity because history has shown us that “objectivity” is just what the oppressors define it to be according to **Delgado 92** . This structural violence outweighs all other impacts in this round because morality can not exist if we continue to let marginalize groups suffer under the SQ that justifies oppression in the name of objectivity. Morality can never exist unless we negate this form of SV. Even if you don’t buy the structural violence impact argument, we turn the climate change advantage because we don’t link to false climate change information because **Caceres 19** defines advocacy journalism as the combonation of truth and POV therefore propganda is not advocacy journalism. And when objectivity is viewed as the end all be all then media outlets are pressured to create a false sense of balance between two ideas which undermines the wide concensus among scientist about the reality of climate change and its effects.The only way to change people’s minds about climate change is through advocacy journalism which gives proper context to the issue.