# 1NC

### Off – Contact info [~1:05]

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose at least one (1) form of contact info on their page of the NDCA Wiki. This can be any way I can reach them before the round (Facebook, Phone number, Email, Discord, etc).

#### Violation: you didn’t. Screenshots prove the violation:

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

#### Standards-

#### 1] Accessibility – If debaters require accommodations or need you to read trigger warnings there’s no way for them to request that until it’s too late. Kills accessibility because there’s no way to make the round accessible if they can’t ask you to.

#### 2] Pre round prep – Contact info is key to ask for the aff or clarify disclosure. Without the aff I don’t know what the 1nc should be and can’t make one. 4 minutes of prep is not enough prep to put together a good 1NC to test the aff. Key to education because we won’t get clash. Also key to fairness because big schools have the connections to get the affs people read but small schools and independent debaters don’t.

#### Voters:

#### 1] Education is a voter else schools don’t fund debate.

#### 2] Fairness is a voter else we have no incentive to do debate

#### 3] Accessibility is a voter and comes first since rejecting it is morally abhorrent and it’s a prereq to debate

#### Drop the debater

#### 1] Rectify time spent on theory

#### 2] Deter future abuse

#### 3] DTA is incoherent I don’t indict their argument I indict their form

#### Prefer Competing interps

#### 1] Reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

#### 2] Reasonability creates a race to the bottom where people try to find out how abusive they can be

#### 3] Competing interps creates a race to the top where we try to create the best norms

#### No RVIs

#### 1] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance

#### 2] chills abuse checking

#### 3] Incentivizes people to be abusive to bait theory then win the RVI

### Off

#### Interp: Debaters must specify a mechanism to implement aff

#### Violation – you didn’t – cx proves

#### Standard is real world education

### Exclusion DA [~1: 20]

#### The disadvantage is exclusion

#### Norms of objectivity are used to exclude minority reporters

Shapiro 21 [Shapiro, Ivor – Emeritus professor of the school of journalism @ Ryerson University in Toronto, using facts and logic to destroy the racists. “Skepticism, Not Objectivity, Is What Makes Journalism Matter.” The Conversation, 18 Apr. 2021, theconversation.com/skepticism-not-objectivity-is-what-makes-journalism-matter-158777.] BRACKETS FOR CLARITY *// CHS AD*

“’That reporter is too biased to cover this story.’ It’s a too-familiar complaint from news consumers — and sometimes also from newsroom managers — because people expect journalists to be impartial, detached or even “objective.”

The fraught idea of journalistic objectivity was at the centre of a recent controversy at the Washington Post.

The story of Post politics reporter Felicia Sonmez began with her 2018 allegation of sexual assault against a fellow journalist. Soon, she’d been banned from covering stories that “hinged on sexual misconduct” and, by extension, the #MeToo movement — a ban finally lifted on March 29.

Similar perceptions of “bias” have stymied Canadian journalists in [relationships](https://j-source.ca/article/how-do-you-know-if-youre-too-close-to-your-source/) with politicians, [gay reporters](https://www.nlgja.org/blog/2011/02/chick-fil-a-and-nlgja-can-a-lesbian-be-objective-about-chick-fil-as-problems/) covering marriage reform and [Jewish](https://archives.cjr.org/feature/the_times_and_the_jews.php) or [Muslim](https://readpassage.com/uncovering-canadian-medias-devastating-pro-israel-bias/) reporters in the Middle East.

Journalists, apparently, should not report from territory to which they’ve spent their lives acclimating — unless you count education, health care, war, sports, travel, cars or real estate.

The O-word

Racialized reporters, for instance, often get hit with the word “objective” when they pitch or file stories about race.

“Our professionalism is questioned when we [they] report on the communities we’re [they’re] from, and the spectre of advocacy follows us in a way that it does not follow many of our white colleagues,” [Pacinthe Mattar](https://thewalrus.ca/objectivity-is-a-privilege-afforded-to-white-journalists/) recently wrote in The Walrus.

Mattar quoted a news producer as saying: “There seems to be the assumption that racialized journalists cannot co-exist with the journalistic standards of being fair and balanced and impartial. Really, what we are fighting for, what we’ve always been fighting for, is just the truth.”

And that’s the problem: does telling the truth require journalists to detach themselves from their life experiences? Is this degree of balance or impartiality even possible?”

#### White reporting of racialized issues is racist

Johnson et. al. 11 [Johnson, Kirk A., et al. “Speaking of Looting: An Analysis of Racial Propaganda in National Television Coverage of Hurricane Katrina.” Howard Journal of Communications, vol. 22, no. 3, 1 Aug. 2011, pp. 302–318., doi:10.1080/10646175.2011.590404.] *// CHS AD*

* Slightly underhighlighted

“In this content analysis of television broadcasts in the first week of Katrina reporting from New Orleans, we found support for our two hypotheses. First, in a story that had a disproportionate impact on the African American community, the news featured disproportionate numbers of Whites, particularly in speaking roles. Second, while these newsworkers expressed sympathy for storm victims, they criticized looting without contextualizing it, thereby marginalizing residents who seemed to reject White middle-class norms regarding theft and crime. The combination of sympathy for and criticism of African Americans is consistent with aversive racism.

These data signal an ideological divide between news organizations, whose personnel and sources favor established norms (Schudson, 2003, pp. 134–153), and residents, whose perspectives may be more fluid. Newsworkers’ White middle-class etic (outsiders’) perspective (Pike, 1967) was particularly apparent in looting stories. For example, when NBC reporter Martin Savidge asked the looter who was carrying tennis shoes to explain her behavior, he did not say, ‘‘Why are you doing this?’’ Instead, he said, ‘‘You know you’re not supposed to do that,’’ a verbal scolding not unlike a parent reproaching a child, and one that implies that the woman was morally deficient. Similarly, when Savidge noted the looter at the Convention Center, he said, ‘‘This woman confesses she stole this fruit’’ (italics added for emphasis). This word choice, unlike more-neutral language (e.g., ‘‘This woman says she took this fruit’’), signals inherent wrongdoing.

We believe that their etic perspective led reporters to imply that looters were more rapacious than eyewitness accounts suggest. While some looters clearly took nonessential goods from stores (Anderson, Perlstein, & Scott, 2005; Perlstein & Thevenot, 2005), many grocery stores were looted for food and beverages (Anderson et al., 2005; ‘‘Peeling open a store’’, 2005; Varney, 2005) and drug stores were pilfered for medication, all of which was in notoriously short supply. Indeed, at least one storeowner invited neighborhood residents to take food before it spoiled in the summer heat (Anderson et al., 2005). In this way, the typical looting story, like coverage of urban disturbances in 1967, was racially inflammatory because it was decontextualized, that is, presented without emic (insiders’) descriptions or explanations (Pike, 1967).

Reflexively attributing looting to wanton opportunism overlooks alternative explanations for such behavior beyond simple post-disaster survival. For example, disaster survivors may view catastrophic events as opportunities to erase longstanding injustices and to realize wishes that are normally unattainable (Fritz, 1961, p. 685). Thus, some storm victims may have viewed stealing as their only opportunity to compensate for their second-class citizenship.

For others, looting may have reflected despair. Whatever day-to-day anguish low-income Blacks felt before Katrina was undoubtedly heightened by the devastation of the hurricane and agonizing rescue delays. Abusive treatment from National Guard soldiers and police officers who routinely approached unarmed residents with weapons drawn, and who reportedly threatened to shoot residents for stealing clean underwear (Bradley, 2005) or for reporting the death of an elder (Wayne, 2005), undoubtedly exacerbated survivors’ despair. And when people despair, ‘‘they see no point in trying or caring any more’’ (Reading, 2004, p. 150). Katrina looters may have understood the futility of trying to adhere to mainstream behavior norms that may not have been germane to a marginalized community under great stress.

Indeed, such norms might not have applied to New Orleans in the first place. The city is notorious for corrupt police officers and public officials (Range, 2000); survivors may have taken their cues from such official misconduct. As one resident remarked at a looting site, ‘‘It must be legal. The police are here taking stuff, too’’ (Perlstein & Thevenot, 2005). Thus, it may be inappropriate to evaluate post-Katrina looting with norms that apply to other locales.

Finally, the etic view also helps to explain why reporters announced as ‘‘news’’ statements that most persons of color probably take for granted. For example, on September 2, 2005, CNN anchor Aaron Brown announced that because of Katrina, ‘‘Once again, race has become part of the national story.’’ But one need not be a historian to appreciate how race has always been a part of ‘‘the national story.’’ Likewise, millions of persons of color routinely confront problems related to race, as well as class, and are therefore well aware from daily experience that race does matter. We suspect that comments such as Brown’s emerged from a newsroom culture where journalists universalize a White middle-class perspective and thus produce news that seems revelatory only to middle-class Whites.

Similarly, a journalist more intimately familiar with the Black community’s history of victimization by the police may not have uttered a statement about efforts to restore law and order in New Orleans. On September 1, 2005, Aaron Brown announced, ‘‘Some National Guard troops have arrived, 300 out of Arkansas with ‘shoot to kill’ orders. They are working the streets trying to take them back. That’s a bit of good news we can report tonight’’ (italics added for emphasis). Police officers are typically authorized to use deadly force when a suspect poses a threat of serious physical harm to the officers or to other people (Hall, n.d.). But using deadly force against African American suspects to discourage property crime such as breaking and entering, which does not involve the use or threat of force against a person, is a highly controversial tactic that critics say shows disregard for African American lives (Flamm, 2005, p. 155). A journalist more familiar with the history of African Americans’ troubled relationship with police officers might have presented a shoot-to-kill order in New Orleans as a potential problem rather than as ‘‘good news.’’

We are not suggesting that White news personnel cannot cover the black community competently. But in New Orleans, overreliance on White journalists and White sources diminished insiders’ explanations of African Americans’ attitudes and behavior, which we believe were more credible. In so doing, Katrina news propagated racial propaganda. Accordingly, we propose that E. Herman and Chomsky’s (2001) model be revised to account for the racial dimensions of propaganda by (a) incorporating journalists’ reliance on White sources; and (b) asserting aversive racism (replacing anticommunism) as an ideology that helps to preserve the power of elites (in this case, middle-class Whites). Like other analyses (e.g., Sparks, 2007), ours is a sympathetic reading of E. Herman and Chomsky that attempts to extend their model from one genre (international news) to another (domestic news). E. S. Herman (2000) himself recognized the rolling nature of the constituents of the propaganda model. Our work joins research by Voorhees et al. (2007) as one of few studies to offer statistical support for qualitative reports (e.g., M. J. Davis & French, 2008; Kahle, Yu, & Whiteside, 2007; Shah, 2009; Thevenot, 2005–2006) that Katrina news propagated racism.”

#### Racism from the media spills up to the public

Van Dijk 12 [Van Dijk, Teun A. “The Role of the Press in the Reproduction of Racism.” Migrations: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 19 Mar. 2012, pp. 15–29., doi:10.1007/978-3-7091-0950-2\_2.] *// CHS AD*

“Biased news production and news reports would be pretty harmless if they would not have a tremendous influence on the readers. Although traditional effect research in mass communication often has found that the media are not that influential at all and that most people make up their own minds, more or less independently of the media (Bryant and Zillmann 1994, see also Graber 1984; Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983), this is certainly not the case for the role of the press in the reproduction of ethnic prejudice. In our study on communicating racism, we found, for instance, that many people use the mass media as a source and legitimation of their prejudices (Van Dijk 1987a). As long as people have no direct personal experiences with minorities or immigrants, as is the case in, for instance, Latin America, where indigenous people (e.g., in Bolivia and Peru) or people from African descent (as in Brazil) form large minorities or majorities, they have no concrete mental models as a basis for the formation of general attitudes. In that case, such mental models are taken from the mass media. It is in this way that prejudices are reproduced in society and not examined critically by comparing them to personal experiences or scholarly studies. On the other hand, even daily experiences are no guarantee for the development of antiracist attitudes or media practices, as we know from the absence or the biased representations of blacks in Brazilian telenovelas (D’Adesky 2001; Van Dijk 2009b).”

#### Racism has terrible impacts

Lewsley 20 [Lewsley, Joanne. “The Effects of Racism on Health and Mental Health.” Medical News Today, MediLexicon International, 28 July 2020, [www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/effects-of-racism](http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/effects-of-racism).] *// CHS AD*

“Racism, or discrimination based on race or ethnicity, is a key contributing factor in the onset of disease. It is also responsible for increasing disparities in physical and mental health among Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC).

This article looks at some of the ways that racism can affect health, how a person can live healthfully while facing the burden of racism, and how socioeconomic factors associated with racism can continue to pose risks to both physical and [mental health](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/154543).

In adults

A [2015 systematic review](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4580597/)  collated the results of almost 300 studies to look at how racism affects the physical and mental health of Asian American, African American, and Latinx American people.

The sections below will detail the conclusions of this review, as well as those of other studies.

Physical health

The aforementioned [systematic review](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4580597/) found that experiencing racism is associated with poor mental health and, to a lesser extent, poor physical health.

There is considerable research to suggest that the stress associated with experiencing racism can have long lasting physical effects.

Stress can elevate [blood pressure](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/270644) and weaken the immune system, which, in turn, raises the risk of developing long-term health conditions.

Racism is [associated](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4580597/) with higher rates of stress, increasing a person of color’s risk of developing [high blood pressure](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/159283). In fact, the [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)Trusted Source](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/hus15.pdf) report that Black people are more likely to have hypertension than any other racial or ethnic group.

Stress as a result of racism can also lead to behaviors that may cause further risk to physical health. For example, [research](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3775007/) has found that discrimination is linked to higher rates of smoking, alcohol use, drug use, and unhealthful eating habits.

Also, a [2019 study](https://europepmc.org/article/med/31029930) found that racist experiences appear to increase [inflammation](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/248423) in African American people, raising their risk of developing chronic conditions such as [heart disease](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/237191) and kidney disease.

Another [study](https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Fcdp0000233) found that unfair treatment of people of color has a significant consequential effect on sleep and physiological functioning in midlife.

Many studies have cited structural racism within medical care as a key factor in poor physical health. For example, a [2016 study](https://www.pnas.org/content/113/16/4296) into racial bias and pain management found a link between undertreating pain in Black patients and false biological beliefs, such as, “Black people’s skin is thicker than white people’s skin.”

A [2015 study](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/article-abstract/2441797)  found that compared with other racial groups, Black children with severe pain from appendicitis are less likely to receive pain medication. This suggests that racial bias is causing medical professionals to use different thresholds of pain for different racial groups, either inadvertently or purposefully, before administering care.

Mental health

The [2015 meta-analysis](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4580597/)  found that racism is twice as likely to affect mental health than physical health. Of those the researchers sampled, BIPOC who reported experiences of racism also experienced the following mental health issues:

[depression](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/8933)

stress

emotional distress

[anxiety](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/323454)

[post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/156285)

[suicidal thoughts](https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/193026)

A [2011 meta-analysis](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0011000010381791) of studies into racism and mental health among Asian American people also revealed significant relationships between racial discrimination and depression and anxiety.

A [2018 paper](https://synergicollaborativecentre.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/The-impact-of-racism-on-mental-health-briefing-paper-1.pdf) suggested that fear of racism itself is harmful, and that it can undermine good mental health characteristics, such as resilience, hope, and motivation. The paper also underlined how verbal and physical assault can cause PTSD.”

### Fairness doctrine CP [~0:45]

#### CP text: A democracy ought to regulate that a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy. It’s conditional

#### We’ll defend that democracies ought to model the fairness doctrine

Zelizer 17 [Julian E. Zelizer, William E. Huntington Professor of History at Boston University with a Ph.D. from Stanford University, 2017, “How Washington Helped Create the Contemporary Media: Ending the Fairness Doctrine in 1987,” Media Nation: The Political History of News in Modern America, [https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.9783/9780812293746-012/html]/Kankee *//*](https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.9783/9780812293746-012/html%5d/Kankee%20//) *recut by CHS AD*

“Despite the victory for commercial radio, the FCC did offer liberals a compromise, a much weaker measure that would provide some obligation to the public interest and balanced reporting— within the context of an unfettered commercial industry.2 The FCC released a report in 1949 stating that radio and television stations receiving licenses had to provide equal time to different political perspectives and to deal with issues of public concern. According to the doctrine, broadcasters had to “devote a reasonable portion of broadcast time to the discussion and consideration of controversial issues of public importance” and “that in doing so [the broadcaster must be] fair— that is must affirmatively endeavor to make . . . facilities available for the expression of contrasting viewpoints held by responsible elements with respect to the controversial issues presented.” They based this rule on the argument that since access to the airwaves was limited, the federal government had the authority to impose certain requirements on those companies to which they granted the right to broadcast.

The Fairness Doctrine was a modest regulation. It didn’t provide much enforcement power, and it depended on the government checking into what stations were doing at the time of the renewal of their license. Dealing with violations depended on individuals bringing complaints to the government.

Though it was not nearly as strong as the Mayflower Doctrine, the regulation still mattered within the industry and provided a check against how far major stations were willing to go in allowing for openly biased shows to reach the airwaves. The FCC strengthened the Fairness Doctrine in 1967 with two new decisions. The first was the “editorial rule,” which stipulated that if a station broadcast an editorial against a specific candidate, that candidate was to be given twenty-four hours’ notice and allowed to provide a response. The second rule stipulated that a station must provide notice to an individual whose personal character was maligned and to offer them ample time on the airwaves to respond to the charges

Conservative radio talk show hosts hated the Fairness Doctrine. Conservative voices, for instance, found a greater number of opportunities to make their way onto the airwaves through religious broadcasting, which often eluded the regulators.3 During the 1950s and 1960s, there were a growing number of these right- wing radio broadcasters who were taking to the airwaves and openly challenging the FCC regulation. Th e rules were not well enforced, so there were a number of opportunities for opponents to get on the air. In 1963, Myer Feldman reported to the president, in a secret study of right-wing movements, that conservative philanthropists were spending between $15 and $25 million every year to provide support to conservative broadcasts that aired on one thousand stations all over the country.4

In a dramatic surge of right-wing talk, conservatives were openly flouting the Fairness Doctrine. Th ere were over a thousand shows by 1964 broadcasting all over the nation, funded by wealthy conservative philanthropists like H. L. Hunt and Howard Pew, which were sound pieces for the right. The Twentieth Century Reformation Hour featured Reverend Carl McIntire of New Jersey, who called civil rights a movement “working for a Socialist order in this free land,” and whose show played every weekday in forty- five states, and the Manion Forum, hosted by the former dean of the Notre Dame law school, Clarence Manion, who had a huge following on over 261 radio stations.5

During a fifteen-minute show that aired on the Pennsylvania Christian Crusade Radio Hour (on a station owned by the Red Lion Broadcast Company), Reverend Billy James Hargis delivered a blistering speech in which he attacked everything that he felt was liberal, from UAW President Walter Reuther to the United Nations. In this particular broadcast, Hargis charged that a well-known investigative journalist named Fred Cook, who had published hard-hitting books about the FBI and Barry Goldwater as well as a controversial article in Th e Nation entitled “Radio Right: Hate Clubs on the Air,” 6 had written for a communist publication and had defended Alger Hiss. Hargis also charged that Cook had attempted to bribe New York officials. Cook was a well- respected print journalist who had been receiving information about conservative talk radio from the Democratic National Committee, which had been increasingly concerned about rightwing organizations that were sprouting up around the country.7

Listening to the show from his home near Asbury Park, New Jersey, Cook was furious when he heard the charges that Hargis was making about him. As soon as the show ended, Cook sent a letter to the owners of the station saying, “I shall expect you to grant me equal time, at your expense, as provided in FCC regulations, to answer in appropriate fashion this scandalous and libelous attack.” Executives at Red Lion sent him back a notification that included the costs for airtime, asking him what he wanted to purchase.8 In their minds, they owed him nothing.

Cook believed that the company was violating the FCC regulation. Th e FCC concurred with Cook. Red Lion still resisted and took the case to court. Th e Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia upheld the decision of the FCC. “The requirement that a broadcaster seek out any person who is alleged to have been personally attacked, furnish him a script, tape or summary of the broadcast, and grant him free time to reply, irrespective of ability to pay, places an obvious and unreasonable burden on the exercise of free speech,” complained Reverend John Norris, who owned Red Lion. “I don’t feel this is a fair decision. I won’t take it.” He challenged the decision.

Th e case ended up in the Supreme Court. As the justices were reviewing the case, many network leaders were saying that the regulation should be eliminated. “Th e decision will have a major impact not only upon the entire broadcasting industry but upon the vigor and quality of the discussion of public affairs in the United States,” claimed CBS, NBC, and the Radio Television News Director Association.9

In 1969, the Supreme Court issued, in a unanimous decision, Red Lion Broadcasting Co., Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission, in which they upheld the constitutionality of the Fairness Doctrine. The Court said that the FCC had the right to uphold the regulation, though it was not required to do so. Equal time had survived. The Court ruled that the FCC had the authority to impose these kinds of requirements in exchange for granting a license. The doctrine, the Court said, followed the wishes of Congress, which had decided that the public interest should be a guiding principle in determining who gained access to the airwaves. Th e FCC had very clearly defined the public interest as meaning “ample play for the free and fair competition of opposing views,” and the decision on this conservative broadcaster fi t those guidelines. Th e Court rejected the claim that the broadcaster had made in saying that this regulation violated free speech. At the heart of the Court’s decision was the “scarcity rationale.” According to the Court, given that there were a limited number of radio frequencies, Congress had the right to maintain certain requirements in determining who would be granted a license. Free speech, the Court said, was “the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters.”10

Although enforcement of the Fairness Doctrine had been spotty, the existence of the federal rules, with the potential of court action, had created ongoing pressure against the political presentation of news. The rules also helped to support the kind of journalistic norms that Michael Schudson has written about, which made objectivity a goal of everyone in the news business.”

#### Exclusion DA doesn’t link – we only regulate that the content of the media ought to be objective, not the process. Journalists who have personal relationships to a subject can still produce unbias articles on that subject. However, in the aff world, they’re still hit with suspicion by news agencies that their reporting is bias even if their articles aren’t

## Case

#### Lack of advocacy in media leads to uncertainty regarding climate change

Brüggemann and Engesser 17 [Michael Brüggemann, educator at the University of Hamburg, and Sven Engesser, educator at the Technical University of Dresden, 2017, “Beyond false balance: How interpretive journalism shapes media coverage of climate change,” Research Gate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312015168\_Beyond\_false\_balance\_How\_interpretive\_journalism\_shapes\_media\_coverage\_of\_climate\_change]/Kankee

22 1. Introduction 23 While scientific consensus on anthropogenic climate change has been growing in recent 24 decades (Anderegg et al., 2010; Cook et al., 2013; Oreskes, 2004), public opinion has also become 25 increasingly uncertain about the urgency of climate change as a problem (Patt and Weber, 2014; 26 Ratter et al., 2012). Citizens of the biggest carbon emitters of the world (the United States and China) 27 are even less concerned about climate change than people from other countries (PEW, 2015). 28 Outright denial of climate change persists among salient minorities in the United States, United 29 Kingdom, and Australia, and in small niche publics in other countries (Capstick and Pidgeon, 2014; 30 European Commission, 2014; Leiserowitz et al., 2013, 2013; Whitmarsh, 2011). One reason for this 31 entrenched denialism in public opinion may be the way the media portray the scientific consensus on 32 climate change as represented by the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 33 (IPCC). By providing a forum for contrarian views, the media “perpetuate the myth of a lack of 34 international scientific consensus on anthropogenic climate change—and thereby succeed in 35 maintaining public confusion” (Antilla, 2005: 350). Various studies have shown the detrimental 36 effects of ‘balanced’ media coverage that depict climate change as an open debate between 37 ‘skeptics’ and ‘warners’ (with regards to public debates about vaccines, see: Dixon and Clarke, 2013; 38 Lewandowsky et al., 2013). Thus, the study of media content and its influencing factors is not only 39 relevant for scholars of journalism, but also for everyone seeking to understand how societies 40 struggle to deal with the challenge of climate change. 41 Our study tackles this challenge by analyzing how the IPCC stance on climate change and its 42 challengers are covered in different journalistic media. We seek to explain different patterns of 43 media content by taking into account the influence of different editorial and national contexts. The 44 study contributes to our understanding of how and why contrarian views remain salient in media 45 debates. It is based on a content analysis of articles (N = 936) published in four different types of 46 leading news outlets There is also evidence that the ideological stance of the individual 99 author matters: right-wing columnists in the United States cultivate hard-core denialism of climate 100 change in their columns (Elsasser and Dunlap, 2013). Hence, different interpretations of climate 101 change, which are often strongly related to political ideology, influence the coverage of this issue. 102 Explanations drawing on media logics – particularly the professional norms of journalism – 103 are strongly connected to the work of Boykoff and Boykoff (2004) who emphasize the professional 104 norm of balance as an important influencing factor: "[...] journalists present competing points of 105 views on a scientific question as though they had equal scientific weight, when actually they do not’’ 106 (127). The norm of balance is part of the broader concept of objectivity (Westerstahl, 1983), which 107 calls on journalists to provide a ‘neutral’ account by giving equal voice to both sides in a conflict 108 (Hopmann et al., 2012). Journalists follow this practice as it allows them to demonstrate their 109 professional objectivity and to fend off accusations of one-sided coverage (Gans, 1979; Tuchman, 110 1972). Balance also serves as a "surrogate for validity checks" (Dunwoody and Peters, 1992: 129) if 111 journalists lack the time or expertise to assess the validity of conflicting statements from different 112 sources. Earlier research on environmental and science journalists in the United States cited evidence 113 of their lack of knowledge about what climate experts consider to be basic common in climate 114 research (Wilson, 2000). The norm of balance is particularly powerful in cases of contested 115 knowledge claims and a lack of expertise among the journalists who cover the respective issue. 116 Finally, conflicts create news value and thus stories that grasp audience attention. The presence of 117 contrarians in media coverage may therefore be explained by either bias (ideological fit) as outlined 118 above or as part of journalistic norms (objectivity/balance) and routines (news values). Yet applying 119 the norm of balance amplifies the views of contrarians (which may attract audience attention) and 120 distorts coverage of the issue. By quoting contrarian voices out of context, journalists give them 121 legitimacy and ‘media standing’ that might also translate into political power (Gamson and Wolfsfeld, 122 1993). 123 Boykoff and Boykoff (2004) examined the coverage of climate change in US newspapers from 124 1988 to 2002, and found that half of the articles presented a balanced account of the issue; slightly 125 more than half of the television newscasts analyzed during that time did so (Boykoff, 2008). A 126 replication of the study found the share of balanced coverage reduced from more than a third of all 127 articles in 2003 to about three percent in 2006 in US newspapers (Boykoff, 2007). Thus, balanced 128 reporting may be retreating, but contrarians have not necessarily vanished from the media. Painter 129 and Gavin (2016) find that the British press quoted contrarians in every fifth article during the years 130 2007 to 2011. Schmid-Petri et al. (2015) find that almost a third of articles in the US press contain 131 contrarian voices. Have journalists therefore moved on to a one-sided promotion of denial of climate 132 change, which would be proof of ideological bias, rather than adhere to professional logics such as 133 the norm of balanced coverage? 134 A recent survey of journalists covering climate change in different countries found that most 135 of them strongly agreed with the climate change consensus (Brüggemann and Engesser, 2014). 136 Therefore, it seems that they quote contrarians despite being aware that their claims defy the 137 findings of climate science. A much earlier US study identified a journalistic tendency to amplify 138 outlier views and give ‘mavericks’ a forum: Dearing (1995) analyzed US newspaper coverage of three 139 maverick science stories (e.g., propagating an alternative theory on the cause of AIDS). Our study 140 follows his model of analyzing the content of coverage and then conducting a survey of the authors 141 of the articles. Dearing found that the surveyed journalists were aware that the ‘maverick scientists’ 142 did not represent credible science, yet the articles’ neutral coverage of their views gave the 143 mavericks credibility. Dearing explained this with news values such as conflict that attract larger 144 audiences as well as a general sympathy for mavericks in US public culture, which values 145 individualism expressed through outlier views (also see Gans (1979)). 146 Another trend in journalism should be considered for making sense of the finding that 147 balanced coverage may be gone, but not so, the quoting of contrarian voices. Studies find a trend 148 towards interpretive reporting among online science journalists (Fahy and Nisbet, 2011) and in 149 political journalism in different Western countries (Esser and Umbricht, 2014). Hiles and Hinnant 150 (2014) found a radically redefined understanding of objectivity among experienced climate 151 journalists that goes beyond ‘balanced coverage.’ They found that while these specialist journalists 152 still attempted to refrain from letting their biases influence their coverage, they followed “weight-of153 evidence reporting” (Dunwoody, 2005) in which stories reflect scientific consensus and are “written 154 with authority” (Hiles and Hinnant, 2014: 15), thereby distinguishing between views that represent 155 valid, peer-reviewed science and those that represent outliers with no backing from scientific 156 evidence or peers (Boykoff, 2011). Another qualitative interview study with science journalists in the 157 United States confirms this trend: journalists claim that they want to go “beyond balance” and even 158 ignore contrarian voices (Gibson et al., 2016). 159 Yet, whether these approaches are put into practice has not been comprehensively 160 investigated with regards to different media types in different cultural contexts. Most studies focus 161 on the US and British contexts or on the coverage of upmarket newspapers (Schäfer and Schlichting, 162 2014). Grundmann and Scott (2014) also include France and Germany from 2000 to 2010 and a great 163 number of newspapers using corpus linguistic methods. Their study shows that, overall, contrarians 164 are much less prominent in media discourses than speakers who support the climate change 165 consensus. They also show that countries consistently diverge on the salience of contrarians, with a 166 much stronger entrenchment of contrarian voices in the United States. This is in line with findings 167 from Painter and Ashe (2012), who also included quality papers from Brazil, China, France, and India 168 in their analysis. They compared the coverage in 2007 and 2009/2010 during the UN Climate summit 169 in Copenhagen and, at the same time, ‘Climategate’ (the pseudo scandal constructed around 170 personal e-mails between climate researchers that were published by contrarian bloggers in order to 171 discredit climate research, Holliman (2011)).