I affirm the resolution

#### **Resolved: In‌ ‌a‌ ‌democracy,‌ ‌a‌ ‌free‌ ‌press‌ ‌ought‌ ‌to‌ ‌prioritize‌ ‌objectivity‌ ‌over‌ ‌advocacy.‌**

For sake of clarification, the [UN](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/events/prizes-and-celebrations/celebrations/international-days/world-press-freedom-day/previous-celebrations/worldpressfreedomday20090000/freedom-of-information-and-the-press/) defines a free press as the freedom of journalists to report without fear of retribution and a public’s right to knowledge and information.

I value **democracy**, defined by the Stanford [dictionary](https://diamond-democracy.stanford.edu/speaking/lectures/what-democracy) as a political system with free and fair elections, active participation of citizens in civic life, and the protection of human rights for all citizens.

The most suitable value criterion to measure whether democracy is being achieved is **Maximizing Societal Welfare**. Societal welfare encompasses all the dues a society ought to provide including rights, health, and order.

#### **Contention 1: Advocacy Journalism Polarizes political Action**

​Globally, [democracies](https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/10/01/how-to-understand-global-spread-of-political-polarization-pub-79893) have been met with a recent rise in political polarization or a measure of the ideological divides between political party groups. There are two key warrants that show how prioritizing objectivity over advocacy in a free press solves polarization.

* 1. First, advocacy press actively pushes individuals to political extremes. In a 2013 study of American voting patterns, [Hopkins and Ladd](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2070596) found that registered republicans and independents were significantly more likely to vote Republican when they had access to local Fox News Channels. [DellaVigna 07](https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w12169/w12169.pdf) replicates these findings. Not only are voters more likely to be pushed into a political party by advocacy reporting, but those views become more extreme. [Jones et al. 14](https://www.brookings.edu/research/what-americans-want-from-immigration-reform-in-2014/) find that only 42% of Republicans who most trust Fox News supports a path to citizenship, compared to 60% of Republicans who most trust other news sources.
* 2. Second, the pursuit of objectivity allows constituents to make judgments without media influence. [Loyn 0](https://www.park.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/good-journ-or-peace-journ.pdf)7 concludes that, rather than embodying truth itself, objective reporting is a way to achieve truth through the minimization of bias. If [journalists](https://sci-hub.se/10.1007/s11158-013-9226-6) commit to objective journalism, they prioritize presenting information in a way that can be accepted by all sides of the political aisle.

The rise of advocacy-first journalism increases the impacts of political polarization and demands that a free press prioritizes objectivity. There are three impacts of increased partisanship.

* 1. First, political polarization increases violence in democracy. [Carothers 19](https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/10/01/how-to-understand-global-spread-of-political-polarization-pub-79893) finds that India, Poland, and the United States have all seen increases in hate crimes and political violence in recent years, matching the rise in partisanship.
* 2. Second is a self-perpetuating distrust in other media services. As individuals increasingly consume biased media, they become less likely to trust reporting that is objective or from the opposing side. In [a Pew Research survey from 2020,](https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2020/01/24/u-s-media-polarization-and-the-2020-election-a-nation-divided/) 66% of Democrats trusted the New York Times while 50% of Republicans distrusted it. A polarized news cycle means that as viewers consume more advocacy journalism, they become less likely to accept their political opponent’s opinions as legitimate.
* 3. Last is legislative inaction. [Barber 13](http://www.apsanet.org/portals/54/Files/Task%20Force%20Reports/Chapter2Mansbridge.pdf) finds that the American congress produced 166% more legislation in the least-polarized congressional term than in the most-polarized term. The result of a lack of legislation is decreased access to essential public services. As the executive and legislative branches become excessively stagnant, a delegation of political action to private actors and courts occurs. This increases the influence of lobbying and private actors in the government, hindering the true democratic process.

As advocacy journalism increasingly pushes partisan polarization onto viewers, society becomes more violent and distrustful, and less democratic.

#### **Contention 2: Advocacy journalism leads to media desensitization**

​Media desensitization is the process by which repeatedly viewing media violence warrants a lower emotional response after each [subsequent](https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/desensitization) viewing. Advocacy journalism inherently utilizes graphic imagery in reporting while objectivity reduces media desensitization. There are two warrants for this:

* 1. The perceived effectiveness of violent imagery at eliciting emotional responses ensures advocacy in a free press will consistently use it. [Snyder 21](https://faunalytics.org/how-moral-shock-makes-an-impression/) finds that advocates frequently return to this strategy to motivate viewers from apathy to action. On its own, individual advocates showing graphic images is not the problem, but when infinite violent conflicts are occuring, graphic imagery and advocacy become inherently intertwined.
* 2. Statistically, objective press reduces the amount of graphic imagery in media. In a comparison of advocacy print media versus objective newspapers, [Hanusch 13 f](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0267323113491349)ound that the advocating media were significantly more likely to show graphic imagery. Similarly, [Maenpaa 21](https://sci-hub.cat/downloads/2021-05-17/ca/10.1177@1464884921996308.pdf) found that one of the largest predictors of the inclusion of violent images is the expectations of the publication; if editors felt more strongly about a subject, the more likely they were to include graphic content.

A free press that prioritizes objective reporting minimizes the instances of explicitly violent content in the media. There are two impacts of increased media desensitization.

* 1. First, media desensitization inhibits legislative processes. The over-use of violent media in content desensitizes viewers to such violence, leaving them [feeling](https://newrepublic.com/article/143788/power-peril-climate-disaster-porn) hopeless and feeding a sense of doom and inevitability. [Doomism](https://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/why-doomism-is-part-of-the-latest-frontier-in-the-climate-wars-20191018-p531y7.html) shields legislative bodies from true action, fueling a soft-deniability that allows elected officials to ignore existential problems as unsolvable.
* 2. Second, repeated exposure to violent content has extensive psychological ramifications on the viewer. Not only does Kr[ahé 1](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4522002/#:~:text=In%20the%20context%20of%20media,%26%20Bushman%2C%202007%2C%20p.)5 and [Huesmann 06](https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.26.021304.144640) tell us that violent images lead to more aggressive actions in viewers, but violent imagery makes individuals less likely to feel sympathy for others. [Buschmann 09](https://www.jstor.org/stable/40575012?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents) completed a study in which individuals were subjected to graphic media then measured on their likelihood to help a woman with an injured leg. Participants that had just watched violent content took longer to help the woman than any of the control groups.\*

When the press relies on value judgements and graphic depictions of violence instead of objective reporting, the impacts are felt on a large scale. Whether through legislative inactions or increased violence, objectivity and a commitment to truth must be prioritized over advocacy to best preserve democracy.

Thus I affirm and stand open for cross examination.

## **Evidence Cards:**

#### **Loyn 07:**

David Loyn, foreign correspondent for BBC News, with authority in Afghan History.

**“Good Journalism or peace Journalism”**

This paper argues agalnst the prescriptve notions of peace jourmalsm, and in partiaular ts exclusive nature and attempt to define

itself as a new orthodoxy. Most of the paper is a ritique of the work of Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick, in a book published in 2005,

as well as their earlier Reporting the World series. They condemn all other ways of reporting as War Journalism, biased in favour of war.

I argue instead that the opposite of peace jourmalism is good journalism.

Much of this peace journalism argument is derlived from the work of Johan Galtung, who accuses war journalists' of reporting war in an

encdosed space and time, with no context, concealing peace initiatives and making wars 'opaque/secret.' Galtung specifically calls on jour-

nalists as part of their mission to search out peace proposals which might begin as something small and beneath notice, but which might

then be plcked up and owned by politicians as their own. My response is clear and simple: creating peacemaking politicians is not the

business of a reporter.

I examine the traditional journalistic methods of using objectivity to get at a version of the truth. I concede that perfect tnth, truth or trưthfulness is unattain

able, (and paradoxically the tool of objectivity we use to get there is slippery too.) I concdude that a sistance of Thomas Nagel that

is though a manageable goal. 1engage wui psop nainino how nractices such as peace-reporting are bound to be less

dccoun

commit themselves to the adoption of particular perspectives, in effect giving up on the ideal of

strioping away as much.as possible

I examine the responses of the so-called journalism of attachment' framed as a desire of journalists faced by the horrors of Bosnia to cast

off impartiality and emotional detachment and take sides in their reporting. I arque that holding onto objectivity could be a useful vaccine

against the relativism of 'attached journalists.

I conclude with a detailed examination of two case studies, Kosovo, and Northern Ireland, arguing that in these complex visceral conflicts,

the solution to known problems is better appicauon o oo tu an vicion of war as a continuation of politics by other

n the ane t a situation where threts of asymmetric conflicts will continually wrong-foot diplomatic solutions, as they are normally con-

structed, as well as conventional armies - war amongst the people' in the new jargon. The tools of the reporter need to be sharpened not

altered

2007 by verlag irena regener berlin
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#### **Bushman 09:**

# **Comfortably Numb: Desensitizing Effects of Violent Media on Helping Others**

Brad J. Bushman and Craig A. Anderson

Two studies tested the hypothesis that exposure to violent media reduces aid offered to people in pain. In Study 1, participants played a violent or nonviolent video game for 20 min. After game play, while completing a lengthy questionnaire, they heard a loud fight, in which one person was injured, outside the lab. Participants who played violent games took longer to help the injured victim, rated the fight as less serious, and were less likely to "hear" the fight in comparison to participants who played nonviolent games. In Study 2, violent-and nonviolentmovie attendees witnessed a young woman with an injured ankle struggle to pick up her crutches outside the theater either before or after the movie. Participants who had just watched a violent movie took longer to help than participants in the other three conditions. The findings from both studies suggest that violent media make people numb to the pain and suffering of others.

#### **Linz 89**

‘Opinion: Media violence desensitizing, decreases awareness”

Daniel Linz, Edward Donner-stein and Steven Penrod conducted a study in 1984 measuring men's reactions to films portraying sexual violence against women. With each day of watching the violence, their anxiety decreased. With each day of watching, they considered the films less and less violent though it was in fact the same content. The men were presented a mock trial where a woman was a victim of sexual assault. The men who saw the films were less sympathetic toward the victim and sexual assault as a whole.

This is how this gross desensitization can affect our real lives past the screen. Violence on TV or on social media, though it may be footage of actual happenings, is not the same as being in a real life run in with violence or being in a courtroom determining what violence is. How does one determine that if they have seen it so much that it is the norm?

#### **Huesman 06**

#### **- The Role of Media Violence in Violent Behavior: Media violence poses a threat to public health inasmuch as it leads to an increase in real-world violence and aggression. Research shows that fictional television and film violence contribute to both a short-term and a long-term increase in aggression and violence in young viewers. Television news violence also contributes to increased violence, principally in the form of imitative suicides and acts of aggression. Video games are clearly capable of producing an increase in aggression and violence in the short term, although no long-term longitudinal studies capable of demonstrating long-term effects have been conducted. The relationship between media violence and real-world violence and aggression is moderated by the nature of the media content and characteristics of and social influences on the individual exposed to that content. Still, the average overall size of the effect is large enough to place it in the category of known threats to public health.**

#### **Krahe 15**

### **Barbara Krahé**

Department of Psychology, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany

This study examined the links between desensitization to violent media stimuli and habitual media violence exposure as a predictor and aggressive cognitions and behavior as outcome variables. Two weeks after completing measures of habitual media violence exposure, trait aggression, trait arousability, and normative beliefs about aggression, undergraduates (*N* = 303) saw a violent film clip and a sad or a funny comparison clip. Skin conductance level (SCL) was measured continuously, and ratings of anxious and pleasant arousal were obtained after each clip. Following the clips, participants completed a lexical decision task to measure accessibility of aggressive cognitions and a competitive reaction time task to measure aggressive behavior. Habitual media violence exposure correlated negatively with SCL during violent clips and positively with pleasant arousal, response times for aggressive words, and trait aggression, but it was unrelated to anxious arousal and aggressive responding during the reaction time task. In path analyses controlling for trait aggression, normative beliefs, and trait arousability, habitual media violence exposure predicted faster accessibility of aggressive cognitions, partly mediated by higher pleasant arousal. Unprovoked aggression during the reaction time task was predicted by lower anxious arousal. Neither habitual media violence usage nor anxious or pleasant arousal predicted provoked aggression during the laboratory task, and SCL was unrelated to aggressive cognitions and behavior. No relations were found between habitual media violence viewing and arousal in response to the sad and funny film clips, and arousal in response to the sad and funny clips did not predict aggressive cognitions or aggressive behavior on the laboratory task. This suggests that the observed desensitization effects are specific to violent content.

#### **Doomism**

# Why 'doomism' is part of the latest frontier in the climate wars [**Deborah Snow**](https://www.smh.com.au/by/deborah-snow-hvf8e) **Deborah Snow is a senior writer for The Sydney Morning Herald.**

# Once if you were a climate scientist the chief enemy was denial. Now, says Michael E. Mann, it’s more likely to be “doomism”: the idea that taking action to reduce the threat of runaway climate change is pointless because it’s already too late.

# Doomism, argues the internationally renowned climate scientist, is part of the latest frontier in the climate wars - a new tool being exploited by those resisting change in the way the world does business.

# It sits alongside what he calls “soft denialism” (climate change is happening but it's OK, we can adapt) and “deflection” (sowing division by making it all about individual lifestyle choices). Such tactics, he says, are in some ways “even more pernicious” than the old arguments flatly rejecting human-induced climate change.

#### **Feelings:**

#### **The Power and Peril of “Climate Disaster…”**

#### **Emily Atkin Emily Atkin is a contributing editor to The New Republic and the author of the climate newsletter** [**Heated**](https://heated.world/about)

*New York* magazine’s latest opus on climate change, “[The Uninhabitable Earth](http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2017/07/climate-change-earth-too-hot-for-humans.html),” is a horror story. Over 7,000 words, reporter David Wallace-Wells lays out global warming’s worst-case scenario in excruciating and apocalyptic detail. If humanity does nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, Wallace-Wells writes, prehistoric ice could unleash million-year-old bacteria, sparking devastating disease outbreaks. Thicker, hotter air could bring a “rolling death smog that suffocates millions.” Drought, heat, and crop failure in conflict-ridden zones could create “perpetual war” and violent death. “It is, I promise, worse than you think,” he declares. “No matter how well-informed you are, you are surely not alarmed enough.”

# But there is also a danger in overstating the science in a way that presents the problem as unsolvable, and feeds a sense of doom, inevitability and hopelessness.”

#### **Maenpaa 21**

Jenni Mäenpää University of Helsinki, Finland

**“Distributing ethics: Filtering images of death at three news photo desks”**

**This article explores the practices of selecting news images that depict death at a global picture agency, national picture agency and a news magazine. The study is based on ethnographic observations and interviews (N=30) from three Westernbased news organisations, each representing a link in the complex international newsimage circulation process. Further, the organisations form an example of a chain of filters through which most of the news images produced for the global market have to pass before publication. These filters are scrutinised by the empirical case studies that examine the professionals’ ethical reasoning regarding images of violence and death. This research contributes to an understanding of the differences and similarities between media organisations as filters and sheds light on their role in shaping visual coverage. This study concludes that photojournalism professionals’ ethical decisionmaking is discursively constructed around three frames: (1) shared ethics, (2) relative ethics and (3) distributed ethics. All the organisations share certain similar conceptions of journalism ethics at the level of ideals. On the level of workplace practices and routines, a mixture of practical preconditions, journalism’s self-regulation, business logic and national legislation lead to differences in the image selection practices. It is argued that the ethical decision-making is distributed between – and sometimes even outsourced to – colleagues working in different parts of the filtering chain. Finally, this study suggests that dead or suffering bodies are often invisible in the images of the studied media organisations.**

#### **Hanusch 13**

# **Sensationalizing death? Graphic disaster images in the tabloid and broadsheet press**

[**Folker Hanusch**](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0267323113491349)**, writer for the European Journal of Communication**

**First Published July 9, 2013Debates over the extent of graphic imagery of death in newspapers often suffer from generalized assertions that are based on inadequate or incomplete empirical evidence. Newspapers are believed to display death in very graphic ways, with particularly the tabloid press assumedly leading a race to the bottom. This article reports the results of a study of tabloid and broadsheet images of death from the 2010 Haiti earthquake in eight Western European and North American countries. It shows that, far from omnipresent, graphic images of death are relatively rare. While tabloids overall display a larger percentage of graphic images, this was not the case everywhere, with particularly the UK, Canada and the US displaying strong similarities between tabloids and broadsheets. In Austria, Germany, Norway and Switzerland, on the other hand, there were distinct differences between the two types. The article argues that different extents of tabloidization may account for these differences.**

#### **Snyder 21**

# **How Moral Shock Makes An ImpressionBeth Snyder, has a BA in Economics and worked as a data analys**

To better understand the role of graphic images in animal advocacy, the author of this study conducted interviews with 60 animal advocates in Denmark, Sweden, and Spain to learn what effect explicit visuals of animal exploitation have had on them, and how they have used these visuals in their advocacy work. She recruited interview subjects using the snowball method, with participants referring her to additional participants. The participant pool was diverse in age, gender, years of activism, and advocacy strategies, though it was skewed in the same ways as the animal advocacy movement at large — female, educated, young, and white.

Interviewees reported that exposure to graphic visuals often causes a reaction of moral shock — a visceral reaction to something ethically appalling that impels someone to action. It is the very fact that these images are so jarring that makes them effective at rousing people from apathy and ignorance to action. In most circumstances we try to avoid subjecting ourselves or others to the kind of distress that graphic visuals cause, but sanitized depictions cannot fully convey the urgency and magnitude of the problem.

#### **Subsequent**

## [Violence in Films and Television](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B0123876702003125)

Joanne Cantor, in [Encyclopedia of International Media and Communications](https://www.sciencedirect.com/referencework/9780123876706/encyclopedia-of-international-media-and-communications), 2003

Desensitization is another well-documented effect of viewing violence. Desensitization is a psychological process by which a response is repeatedly elicited in situations where the action tendency that arises out of the emotion proves to be irrelevant. Desensitization is sometimes used to treat phobias by gradually and repeatedly presenting the frightening stimulus under nonthreatening conditions. Over time, when desensitization works, the phobic response becomes less and less intense. Analogously, exposure to media violence, particularly that which entails intense hostilities or the graphic display of injuries, initially induces an intense emotional reaction in viewers. Over time and with repeated exposure, however, viewers often exhibit decreasing emotional responses to the depiction of violence and injury. Desensitization to violence has been documented in a variety of outcomes. For example, it has been observed as reduced arousal and emotional disturbance while witnessing violence, as greater hesitancy to call an adult to intervene in a witnessed physical altercation, and as less sympathy for the victims of domestic abuse. Special concern has recently been raised about the desensitizing effect of violent video games, and there has been much speculation about the contribution of “shooter” games—which provide both training in gun-wielding techniques and strong desensitization training experiences—to recent school shootings.

#### **Barber 13**

Causes and Consequences of Polarization\* Michael Barber-Founder and Chairman

Sir Michael Barber is **a world leading expert on government delivery, education systems, systemic innovation and education reform**. Sir Michael led the Prime Minister's Delivery Unit for the Blair administration in the UK from 2001-2005 and Nolan McCarty- the Susan Dod Brown Professor of Politics and Public Affairs at Princeton University. He has written extensively on political polarization, the politics of inequality, and economic and financial policy making.

Using a multivariate model that controls for other factors that contribute to legislative productivity, McCarty found substantively large and statistically significant effects of polarization on legislative productivity. At the upper end of the range of his estimates, Congress produced 166% more legislation in the least-polarized congressional term than in the most-polarized term. Even at the lower range of his estimates, there is a still large—60% —difference in legislative output. His estimates are robust to the use of other data sources, which extend the time-series back to the nineteenth century

#### **Pew Research**

# **U.S. Media Polarization and the 2020 Election: A Nation Divided**

# BY [MARK JURKOWITZ](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/mark-jurkowitz), [AMY MITCHELL](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/amy-mitchell), [ELISA SHEARER](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/elisa-shearer) AND [MASON WALKER](https://www.pewresearch.org/staff/mason-walker)

# **The partisan gaps become even more dramatic when looking at the parties’ ideological poles – conservative Republicans and liberal Democrats.**[**1**](https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2020/01/24/u-s-media-polarization-and-the-2020-election-a-nation-divided/#fn-78243-1) **About two-thirds of liberal Democrats (66%) trust The New York Times, for example. In comparison, just 10% of conservative Republicans trust the Times, while 50% outright distrust it**

#### **Carothers 19**

# How to Understand the Global Spread of Political Polarization

[THOMAS CAROTHERS](https://carnegieendowment.org/experts/9),-HARVEY V. FINEBERG CHAIR FOR DEMOCRACY STUDIES

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDIES

Thomas Carothers is the senior vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is a leading authority on international support for democracy, human rights, governance, the rule of law, and civil society.

[ANDREW O’DONOHUE](https://carnegieendowment.org/experts/1550)

Partisan conflict takes a heavy toll on civil society as well, often leading to the demonization of activists and human rights defenders. More seriously still, divisions can contribute to a spike in hate crimes and political violence: India, Poland, and the United States have all seen such increases in recent years.

#### **Jones et al 14**

**“What Americans Want from Immigration Reform in 2014”**

**Robert P. Jones, Daniel Cox, Juhem Navarro-Rivera, E.J. Dionne, Jr., and William A. Galston Tuesday, June 10, 2014,Robert P. Jones (he/him) is the CEO and Founder of PRRI and a leading scholar and commentator on religion, culture, and politics.**

**Only 42% of Republicans who most trust Fox News to provide accurate information about politics and current events** support a path to citizenship, compared to 60% of Republicans who most trust other news sources. In fact, trust in Fox News as an accurate news source is the most powerful indepen­dent predictor of opposition to a path to citizenship

#### **.Della Vigna 07**

“THE FOX NEWS EFFECT: MEDIA BIAS AND VOTING”Stefano DellaVigna UC, Berkeley Department of Economics

Does media bias affect voting? We address this question by looking at the entry of Fox News in cablemarkets and itsimpact on voting.Between October 1996 and November 2000, the conservative Fox News Channel wasintroduced in the cable programming of 20 percent of US towns. Fox News availability in 2000 appears to be largely idiosyncratic. Using a data set of voting data for 9,256 towns, we investigate if Republicans gained vote share in towns where Fox News entered the cable market by the year 2000. We find a significant effect of the introduction of Fox News on the vote share in Presidential elections between 1996 and 2000.Republicans gain 0.4 to 0.7 percentage points in the towns which broadcast Fox News. The results are robust to town-level controls, district and county fixed effects, and alternative specifications. We also find a significant effect of Fox News on Senate vote share and on voter turnout. Our estimatesimply that Fox News convinced 3 to 8 percent of its viewersto voteRepublican. We interpret the resultsin light of a simple model of voter learning about media bias and about politician quality. The Fox News effect could be a temporary learning effect for rational voters, or a permanent effect for voters subject to non-rational persuasion.

\\

#### **Hopkins and Ladd 20**

# The Consequences of Broader Media Choice: Evidence from the Expansion of Fox News

## [Daniel J. Hopkins](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=1305535)

University of Pennsylvania

## [Jonathan McDonald Ladd](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=957925)

Georgetown University - Department of Government

In recent decades, the diversity of Americans' news choices has expanded substantially. This paper examines whether access to an ideologically distinctive news source --- the Fox News cable channel --- influences vote intentions. It focuses on whether any such effect is concentrated among those likely to agree with Fox's viewpoint. To test these possibilities with individual-level data, we identify local Fox News availability for 22,595 respondents to the 2000 National Annenberg Election Survey. For the population overall, we find a pro-Republican average treatment effect that is statistically indistinguishable from zero. Yet, when separating respondents by party, we find a sizable effect of Fox access only on the vote intentions of Republicans and pure independents, a result that is bolstered by placebo tests. Contrary to fears about pervasive media influence, access to an ideologically distinctive media source reinforces the loyalties of co-partisans and possibly persuades independents without influencing out-partisans.

#### **Democracies:**

How to Understand the Global Spread of Political Polarization

THOMAS CAROTHERS, ANDREW O’DONOHUE

A lot of research shows how populist and illiberal leaders are putting democracy in danger. But it rarely addresses what we feel is a more fundamental, underlying problem: severe political polarization.

Polarization is tearing at the seams of democracies around the world, from Brazil and India to Poland and Turkey. It isn’t just an American illness; it’s a global one.

We wanted to know: Why has polarization come to a boil in so many places in recent years? Are there any telling similarities in the patterns of polarization across different countries? And perhaps most importantly, once societies have become deeply polarized, what can they do to start healing their divisions?

#### **dictionary**

What is Democracy? Lecture at Hilla University for Humanistic Studies January 21, 2004

Democracy consists of four basic elements: I want to begin with an overview of what democracy is. We can think of democracy as a system of government with four key elements: A political system for choosing and replacing the government through free and fair elections. 2. The active participation of the people, as citizens, in politics and civic life. 3. Protection of the human rights of all citizens. 4. A rule of law, in which the laws and procedures apply equally to all citizens.

#### **United nations 2016**

**UNESCO promotes freedom of expression and freedom of the press as a basic human right.**

UNESCO, in keeping with its Constitution, advocates the basic human right of freedom of expression, enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and its corollary, press freedom. Indeed, since its creation in 1945, UNESCO has been called upon to “promote the free flow of ideas by word and image”, and the Organization’s Member States have repeatedly confirmed this mandate over the years in decisions adopted by the General Conference, the highest authority of the United Nations agency. UNESCO promotes freedom of expression and freedom of the press as a basic human right.

**Public’s right of access to information**

A free press is not a luxury that can wait for better times; rather, it is part of the very process which can bring about better times. Freedom of the press should not be viewed solely as the freedom of journalists to report and comment. It is strongly correlated with the public’s right of access to knowledge and information. Communication often acts as a catalyst for the development of civil society and the full exercise of free expression enables all parts of society to exchange views and find solutions to social, economic and political problems. Free media play a crucial role in building consensus and sharing information, both essential to democratic decision-making and to social development.

#### **Journalists:**

Public Reasons, Objectivity, and Journalism in Liberal Democratic societies by Carl Fox,Lecturer in Applied and Inter-Disciplinary Ethics, [University of Leeds](https://theconversation.com/institutions/university-of-leeds-1122)

How should we understand the familiar demand that jourmalists "be objective”? One possibility is that journalists are under an obligation to report only the facts of the matter.

However, facts need to be interpreted, selected, and

communicated. How can this be done objectively? This paper aims to explain the

concept of joumalistic objectivity in methodological terms. Specifically, I will argue

that the ideal of journalistic objectivity should be recast as a commitment to John

Denaeratie Societies.

Rawls's conception of public reason. Journalism plays a vital role in the operation

of all modern liberal democracies, functioning as the public watchdog, the fourth

estate, or the conduit through which vital information flows to the citizenry. Jour-

nalism is, therefore, an institution that is best understood as part of the basic

structure of society. In Political Liberalism, Rawls explicitly excludes media of any

kind from the demands of public reason because he doesn't think that they play a

political role that is important enough to bring them under the official auspices of

public reason. I will argue that overlooking the political significance of journalism is

a mistake, but one that can be corrected while keeping within the spirit and most

important elements of his theory. This revision will widen the scope for what counts

as journalism beyond traditional outlets and forms of media but will impose the

demands of public reason on anyone who intends to participate in the institution.