# 1NC v. Westwood

### Spec advocacy

#### Interp: Affirmatives must define the term “advocacy” in a delineated card in the 1AC

#### There’s no fixed definition for advocacy

Thomas 18 [Thomas, Ryan J.. "20. Advocacy Journalism". Journalism, edited by Tim P. Vos, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2018, pp. 391-414. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501500084-020>] *// CHS AD*

“Part of the problem is that there is no single, agreed upon definition of advocacy journalism or what it constitutes (Fisher 2016). While we would likely spend little time arguing about whether newspaper editorials fit the genre, we would probably spend quite a bit more time on whether or not “interpretive journalism” joins them (Salgado & Strömbäck 2012). Political talk shows like This Week would be a safe bet, less so comedy shows like The Daily Show. This is to say that if drawing the exterior boundaries of journalism is a difficult task, it is no less difficult in drawing its interior boundaries. For Fisher (2016), “advocacy is about pleading another’s cause or arguing in support of an idea, event, or a person” (p. 712) which indicates that this is a form of journalism where the objectivity norm does not apply. Yet this broad container encompasses a large swathe of journalistic output across time, place, and medium, and hinges also on whether we regard objectivity as possible, desirable, both, or neither. In effort to account for the diversity of the genre, it is important to begin with a definition that is broad and adaptable. I therefore proceed with a preliminary, working definition of advocacy journalism as journalism that takes a point of view.”

#### Violation: you didn’t

#### Vote neg on stable ground – 1AR clarification of “advocacy” links out of disads, counterplans, and PICs and decks clash along with critical thinking. For example, I could read a DA about how watchdog journalism is really good and restricted by the aff, but the 1AR can redefine advocacy to exclude watchdog journalism. Makes it impossible for the neg to construct a 1NC because I don’t know what links into the aff.

#### CX doesn’t check because A] Not flowed B] Skews 6 min of prep C] They can lie and no way to check D] Debaters can be shady.

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

#### Fairness is a voter – it’s constitutive of this activity and provides incentive to play the game which turns every other voter

#### Drop the debater a] deters abuse b] dta is incoherent bc we indict their advocacy

#### No RVIs – a] illogical you don’t win for being fair b] chills abuse checking c] incentivizes being abusive to go for the RVI on theory

#### Prefer competing interps – a] reasonability is arbitrary and requires intervention b] reasonability creates a race to the bottom where we see how abusive we can be c] competing interps creates a race to the top to create the best norms

### Aspec

#### Interp: Debaters must specify the actor of their advocacy in a delineated text in the 1AC.

#### Violation: You didn’t. 1AC doesn’t explicitly specify who’s going to be implementing the plan. The word “plan” in the plantext implies that it’s a government that implements the aff, but the solvency advocate implies that it’s a journalist

#### Standards –

#### 1] Stable advocacy – not speccing an actor allows you to shift out of neg offense in the 1ar – if I read a government crackdown DA, you’ll just say that the aff defends that the media should implement the aff - outweighs since the 2nr is too late to read new links so I lose every round after the 1ar. It’s not regressive since it’s part of the advocacy text which is limited in terms of plan action.

#### 2] Topic education – different actors produce different solvency and advantages, which makes specification key to nuanced topic ed – outweighs because we only have two months to debate the topic.

#### 3] Prep skew – I don’t know what they will be willing to clarify until CX which means I could go 6 minutes planning to read a disad and then get screwed over in CX when they spec something else. This means that CX can’t check because the time in between is when I should be formulating my strat and waiting until then is the abuse. Key fairness because I won’t be able to use the strat I formulated if you skewed my prep and will have a time disadvantage. Can’t check also since judges don’t flow and debaters are trained to be shifty in CX so I can’t hold you.

#### c/a voters and paradigm issues from above

### E-spec

#### Interpretation: affirmative debaters must delineate their enforcement mechanism by which they prioritize in the 1AC

#### Violation – you didn’t. The 1AC just says that journalists need to be objectivity, they don’t specify what law or policy media companies will pass that enforces the plan.

#### Negate:

#### 1] Shiftiness- they can redefine what degree of enforcement the 1ac defends in the 1ar which decks strategy and allows them to wriggle out of negative positions which strips the neg of specific politics DAs, process CPs, etc. They will always win on specificity weighing

#### 2] Real World- policy makers will always specify what the object of change is. That outweighs since debate has no value without portable application. It also means zero solvency since if we can’t enforce the aff it doesn’t happen and vote neg on presumption. We get presumption since the aff has the psychological benefit of speaking first and last.

#### This spec shell isn’t regressive- it literally determines how the affirmative is implemented and who it affects

#### C/A paradigm issues and CX doesn’t check from other shells

### Free press

#### Interp: Debaters must only defend that a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy

#### Violation: you didn’t. India doesn’t have a free press. Modi’s cracking down on the media

Goel & Jeffrey 20 [Goel, Vindu, and Jeffrey Gettleman. “Under Modi, India's Press Is Not so Free Anymore.” The New York Times, The New York Times, 2 Apr. 2020, [www.nytimes.com/2020/04/02/world/asia/modi-india-press-media.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/02/world/asia/modi-india-press-media.html).] *// CHS AD*

“The station’s uplink suddenly went dead. Mr. Kunhiraman’s image dissolved into a blue screen. A bland message told viewers there was no signal. “We regret the inconvenience,” it said.

But this was no technical difficulty. The station had been cut off by an order from India’s Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The government decided to block the channel for 48 hours because it had covered February’s biggest news story — the mob attacks on Muslims in New Delhi that flared into broader unrest — in a way that seemed “critical toward Delhi Police and R.S.S.,” the order said.

The R.S.S. is a Hindu-nationalist social movement with close ties to Prime Minister [Narendra Modi](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/02/world/asia/india-west-bengal-elections-modi.html) and his Bharatiya Janata Party.

“It was shocking the central government took such a decision,” said R. Subhash, an editor at Media One. “It was an attack on the freedom of the press.”

India’s free press has played a crucial role in protecting this country’s democracy since its independence from Britain in 1947. But journalists here now feel under attack.

Since Mr. Modi came to power in 2014, they say, his government has tried to control the country’s news media, especially the airwaves, like no other prime minister in decades. Mr. Modi has shrewdly cultivated the media to build a cult of personality that portrays him as the nation’s selfless savior.

At the same time, senior government officials have pressed news outlets — berating editors, cutting off advertising, ordering tax investigations — to ignore the uglier side of his party’s campaign to transform India from a tolerant, religiously diverse country into an assertively Hindu one.

With the coronavirus pandemic, Mr. Modi has gotten more blatant in his attempt to control coverage and, as with other difficult stories, some Indian news executives seem willing to go along.

Right before he [announced the world’s largest coronavirus lockdown](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/24/world/asia/india-coronavirus-lockdown.html), on 1.3 billion people, Mr. Modi [met with top news executives](https://caravanmagazine.in/media/hours-before-lockdown-modi-asked-print-media-owners-editors-refrain-negative-covid-coverage) and urged them to [publish “inspiring and positive stories”](https://www.narendramodi.in/prime-minister-narendra-modi-interacts-with-print-media-journalists-and-stakeholders-548937) about the government’s efforts. Then, after the [lockdown](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/29/world/asia/coronavirus-india-migrants.html) stranded half a million migrant workers, with [some dying along the highways](https://thewire.in/rights/coronavirus-national-lockdown-migrant-workers-dead), his lawyers persuaded the Supreme Court this week to [order all media](https://www.barandbench.com/news/litigation/coronavirus-lockdown-fake-news-and-panic-driven-migration-caused-untold-misery-to-migrant-labourers-supreme-court-read-order) to “publish the official version” of coronavirus developments, although outlets are still allowed to carry independent reporting.

An association of leading broadcasters was quick to praise the court decision, which many intellectuals said was yet another attack on India’s constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech.

Through an aide, India’s information and broadcasting minister, Prakash Javadekar, initially agreed to discuss the government’s media policies. But in the two weeks since then, Mr. Javadekar has declined to answer any questions, including a written list emailed to him. His aide cited the demands of the coronavirus crisis.

India’s media universe is vast, perhaps the biggest in the world: More than 17,000 newspapers, 100,000 magazines, 178 television news channels and countless websites in dozens of languages. Thousands of Facebook pages call themselves news publishers, and YouTube is filled with local bulletins on everything from real estate trends to police raids.

But Mr. Modi’s ministers have leaned on business leaders to cut off support to independent media, slowly strangling their operations. His government has pressured media owners to fire journalists who have criticized the prime minister and told them to stop running features like hate-crime trackers that have embarrassed Mr. Modi’s party.”

#### A free press isn’t pressured by the government

Liberties.EU 21 [Civil Liberties Union for Europe, rights advocacy organization in Europe, 11-9-2021, "Free press: definition and role in democracy," Liberties.eu, [https://www.liberties.eu/en/stories/free-press/43809]/Kankee *//*](https://www.liberties.eu/en/stories/free-press/43809%5d/Kankee%20//) *recut CHS AD*

“When we say a country has a free press, we mean that its news outlets and other publications, even individual citizens, have the right to communicate information without influence or fear of retribution from the state or other powerful entities or individuals. We often use the term “free press” and “[independent journalism](https://www.liberties.eu/en/stories/independent-journalism/43789),” a subject we previously explored, more or less interchangeably.”

#### CX proves – they say they apply to all media companies

#### Standards-

#### 1] Precision — allowing the aff to arbitrarily jettison words in the resolution at their whim decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Means that I can’t predict what the aff will be so I will have no prep against it which decks clash.

#### 2] Jursidiction – judges can’t vote on a non-topical aff

#### 2] TVA – Read the COVID and threat construction advantages under a different country with a free press

#### C/A all paradigm issues

## Case

### Adv 1

#### Advocacy is still facts based – aff doesn’t solve misinfo

Berney 8 (Jane. Jane C. Berney; Auckland University of Technology, School of Communication Studies, Graduate Student), and David Robie. "Don't publish and be damned: an advocacy media case study." Global Media Journal (2008): 1-21.

While the global press was “distinctly partisan” well into the 19th century, objectivity norms eventually dominated and today define the ethos of the corporate and commercial news media. But this objectivity standard has been increasingly seen by a growing body of journalists as, at best, inadequate as a norm for contemporary journalism, or seriously flawed (see Berman, 2004; Careless, 2000; Jensen, 2007; Johnson, 2007; Solomon, 2006). Since the 1970s, advocacy journalism has emerged whereby journalists identify with a particular view yet remain independent. Advocacy journalism is practised by a wide range of mainstream media publishers and broadcasters and alternative media outlets. It is a genre of journalism that is fact-based but supports a specific viewpoint on an issue. It is generally in opposition to so-called objective journalism.

#### Government misinfo thumps – Ray 21 proves – hospitals listen, govt no prepare

### Advantage 2

#### Objectivity doesn’t change minds – empirically proven that presenting people with facts proving they’re wrong makes them double down on their beliefs – turns case

Beck 19 (Julie Beck is a senior editor at The Atlantic, where she oversees the Family section, and is the creator of “The Friendship Files.”), “THIS ARTICLE WON’T CHANGE YOUR MIND”, The Atlantic, 12-11-19, <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/03/this-article-wont-change-your-mind/519093/> NT

The theory of cognitive dissonance—the extreme discomfort of simultaneously holding two thoughts that are in conflict—was developed by the social psychologist Leon Festinger in the 1950s. In a famous study, Festinger and his colleagues embedded themselves with a doomsday prophet named Dorothy Martin and her cult of followers who believed that spacemen called the Guardians were coming to collect them in flying saucers, to save them from a coming flood. Needless to say, no spacemen (and no flood) ever came, but Martin just kept revising her predictions. Sure, the spacemen didn’t show up today, but they were sure to come tomorrow, and so on. The researchers watched with fascination as the believers kept on believing, despite all the evidence that they were wrong. “A man with a conviction is a hard man to change,” Festinger, Henry Riecken, and Stanley Schacter wrote in When Prophecy Fails, their 1957 book about this study. “Tell him you disagree and he turns away. Show him facts or figures and he questions your sources. Appeal to logic and he fails to see your point … Suppose that he is presented with evidence, unequivocal and undeniable evidence, that his belief is wrong: what will happen? The individual will frequently emerge, not only unshaken, but even more convinced of the truth of his beliefs than ever before.” This doubling down in the face of conflicting evidence is a way of reducing the discomfort of dissonance, and is part of a set of behaviors known in the psychology literature as “motivated reasoning.” Motivated reasoning is how people convince themselves or remain convinced of what they want to believe—they seek out agreeable information and learn it more easily; and they avoid, ignore, devalue, forget, or argue against information that contradicts their beliefs. It starts at the borders of attention—what people even allow to breach their bubbles. In a 1967 study, researchers had undergrads listen to some pre-recorded speeches, with a catch—the speeches were pretty staticky. But, the participants could press a button that reduced the static for a few seconds if they wanted to get a clearer listen. Sometimes the speeches were about smoking—either linking it to cancer, or disputing that link—and sometimes it was a speech attacking Christianity. Students who smoked were very eager to tune in to the speech that suggested cigarettes might not cause cancer, whereas nonsmokers were more likely to slam on the button for the antismoking speech. Similarly, the more-frequent churchgoers were happy to let the anti-Christian speech dissolve into static while the less religious would give the button a few presses. Outside of a lab, this kind of selective exposure is even easier. You can just switch off the radio, change channels, only like the Facebook pages that give you the kind of news you prefer. You can construct a pillow fort of the information that’s comfortable. Most people aren’t totally ensconced in a cushiony cave, though. They build windows in the fort, they peek out from time to time, they go for long strolls out in the world. And so, they will occasionally encounter information that suggests something they believe is wrong. A lot of these instances are no big deal, and people change their minds if the evidence shows they should—you thought it was supposed to be nice out today, you step out the door and it’s raining, you grab an umbrella. Simple as that. But if the thing you might be wrong about is a belief that’s deeply tied to your identity or worldview—the guru you’ve dedicated your life to is accused of some terrible things, the cigarettes you’re addicted to can kill you—well, then people become logical Simone Bileses, doing all the mental gymnastics it takes to remain convinced that they’re right. People see evidence that disagrees with them as weaker, because ultimately, they’re asking themselves fundamentally different questions when evaluating that evidence, depending on whether they want to believe what it suggests or not, according to psychologist Tom Gilovich. “For desired conclusions,” he writes, “it is as if we ask ourselves ‘Can I believe this?’, but for unpalatable conclusions we ask, ‘Must I believe this?’” People come to some information seeking permission to believe, and to other information looking for escape routes. In 1877, the philosopher William Kingdon Clifford wrote an essay titled “The Ethics of Belief,” in which he argued: “It is wrong always, everywhere, and for anyone to believe anything on insufficient evidence.” Lee McIntyre takes a similarly moralistic tone in his 2015 book Respecting Truth: Willful Ignorance in the Internet Age: “The real enemy of truth is not ignorance, doubt, or even disbelief,” he writes. “It is false knowledge.” Whether it’s unethical or not is kind of beside the point, because people are going to be wrong and they’re going to believe things on insufficient evidence. And their understandings of the things they believe are often going to be incomplete—even if they’re correct. How many people who (rightly) believe climate change is real could actually explain how it works? And as the philosopher and psychologist William James noted in an address rebutting Clifford’s essay, religious faith is one domain that, by definition, requires a person to believe without proof. Still, all manner of falsehoods—conspiracy theories, hoaxes, propaganda, and plain old mistakes—do pose a threat to truth when they spread like fungus through communities and take root in people’s minds. But the inherent contradiction of false knowledge is that only those on the outside can tell that it’s false. It’s hard for facts to fight it because to the person who holds it, it feels like truth. At first glance, it’s hard to see why evolution would have let humans stay resistant to facts. “You don’t want to be a denialist and say, ‘Oh, that’s not a tiger, why should I believe that’s a tiger?’ because you could get eaten,” says McIntyre, a research fellow at the Center for Philosophy and History of Science at Boston University. But from an evolutionary perspective, there are more important things than truth. Take the same scenario McIntyre mentioned and flip it on its head—you hear a growl in the bushes that sounds remarkably tiger-like. The safest thing to do is probably high-tail it out of there, even if it turns out it was just your buddy messing with you. Survival is more important than truth. “Having social support, from an evolutionary standpoint, is far more important than knowing the truth.” And of course, truth gets more complicated when it’s a matter of more than just “Am I about to be eaten or not?” As Pascal Boyer, an anthropologist and psychologist at Washington University in St. Louis points out in his forthcoming book Minds Make Societies: How Cognition Explains the World Humans Create: “The natural environment of human beings, like the sea for dolphins or the ice for polar bears, is information provided by others, without which they could not forage, hunt, choose mates, or build tools. Without communication, no survival for humans.” In this environment, people with good information are valued. But expertise comes at a cost—it requires time and work. If you can get people to believe you’re a good source without actually being one, you get the benefits without having to put in the work. Liars prosper, in other words, if people believe them. So some researchers have suggested motivated reasoning may have developed as a “shield against manipulation.” A tendency to stick with what they already believe could help protect people from being taken in by every huckster with a convincing tale who comes along.