## Framing

#### Resisting oppression is a prerequisite to any conception of justice due to moral exclusion

Winter and Leighton 99 [Deborah DuNann Winter, Psychologist that specializes in Social Psych, Counseling Psych, Historical and Contemporary Issues, Peace Psychology. Dana C. Leighton, PhD graduate student in the Psychology Department at the University of Arkansas. Knowledgable in the fields of social psychology, peace psychology, and justice and intergroup responses to transgressions of justice] “Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century.” Pg 4-5

Finally, to recognize the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions which often have painful answers for the privileged e lite who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opotow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that our normal perceptual cognitive processes divide people into in-groups and out-groups. Those outside our group lie outside our scope of justice, injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle. Those who fall outside are morally excluded, and become either invisible, or demeaned in some way so that we do not have to acknowledge the injustice they suffer. Moral exclusion is a human failing, but Opotow argues convincingly that it is an outcome of everyday social cognition. To reduce its nefarious effects, we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to the oppressed, invisible, outsiders. Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity. Like Opotow, all the authors in this section point out that structural violence is not inevitable if we become aware of its operation, and build systematic ways to mitigate its effects. Learning about structural violence may be discouraging, overwhelming, or maddening, but these papers encourage us to step beyond guilt and anger, and begin to think about how to reduce structural violence. All the authors in this section note that the same structures (such as global communication and normal social cognition) which feed structural violence, can also be used to empower citizens to reduce it. In the long run, reducing structural violence by reclaiming neighborhoods, demanding social justice and living wages, providing prenatal care, [and] alleviating sexism, and celebrating local cultures, will be our most surefooted path to building lasting peace.

#### Disregarding foreseeable harm reifies structures of domination

**McCluskey 12** – JSD @ Columbia, Professor of Law @ SUNY-Buffalo

(Martha, “How the "Unintended Consequences" Story Promotes Unjust Intent and Impact,” Berkeley La Raza, doi: dx.doi.org/doi:10.15779/Z381664)

By similarly making structures of inequality appear beyond the reach of law reform, the "unintended consequences" message helps update and reinforce the narrowing of protections against intentional racial harm.

Justice is centrally a question of whose interests and whose harms should count, in what context and in what form and to whom. Power is centrally about being able to act without having to take harm to others into account. This power to gain by harming others is strongest when it operates through systems and structures that make disregarding that harm appear routine, rational, and beneficial or at least acceptable or perhaps inevitable. By portraying law's unequal harms as the "side effects" of systems and structures with unquestionable "main effects," the "unintended consequences" story helps affirm the resulting harm even as it seems to offer sympathy and technical assistance. In considering solutions to the financial market problems, the policy puzzle is not that struggling homeowners' interests are overwhelmingly complex or uncertain. Instead, the bigger problem is that overwhelmingly powerful interests and ideologies are actively resisting systemic changes that would make those interests count. The failure to criminally prosecute or otherwise severely penalize high-level financial industry fraud is not primarily the result of uncertainty about the harmful effects of that fraudulent behavior, but because the political and justice systems are skewed to protect the gains and unaccountability of wealthy executives despite the clear harms to hosts of others. The unequal effects of the prevailing policy response to the crisis are foreseeable and obvious, not accidental or surprising. It would not take advanced knowledge of economics to readily predict that modest-income homeowners would tend to be far worse off than bank executives by a policy approach that failed to provide substantial mortgage forgiveness and foreclosure protections for modest-income homeowners but instead provided massive subsidized credit and other protections for Wall Street. Many policy actions likely to alleviate the unequal harm of the crisis similarly are impeded not because consumer advocates, low-income homeowners, or racial justice advocates hesitate to risk major changes in existing systems, or are divided about the technical design of alternative programs or more effective mechanisms for enforcing laws against fraud and racial discrimination. Instead, the problem is that these voices pressing for effective change are often excluded, drowned out or distorted in Congress and in federal agencies such as the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve, or in the media, in the mainstream economics profession, and to a large extent in legal scholarship about financial markets. More generally, those diverse voices from the bottom have been largely absent or marginalized in the dominant theoretical framework that constructs widespread and severe inequality as unforeseeable and largely inevitable, or even beneficial. Moreover, justice requires careful attention to both harmful intent and to complex harmful effects. But the concept of "unintended consequences" inverts justice by suggesting that the best way to care for those at the bottom is to not care to make law more attentive to the bottom. "Unintended consequences" arguments promote a simplistic moral message in the guise of sophisticated intellectual critique-the message that those who lack power should not seek it because the desire for more power is what hurts most. Further, like Ayn Rand's overt philosophy of selfishness, that message promotes the theme that those who have power to ignore their harmful effects on others need not-indeed should not-be induced by law to care about this harm, because this caring is what is harmful. One right-wing think tank has recently made this moral message more explicit with an economic values campaign suggesting that the intentional pursuit of economic equality is a problem of the immoral envy of those whose economic success proves they are more deserving.169 Legal scholars and advocates who intend to put intellectual rigor and justice ahead of service to financial elites should reject stories of "unintended consequences" and instead scrutinize the power and laws that have so effectively achieved the intention of making devastating losses to so many of us seem natural, inevitable, and beneficial.

#### Thus, the standard is minimizing structural violence.

## Contention One -- Democracy

#### Status quo journalism incentivizes and creates echo chambers that lead to rampant misinformation

**Klein 20** Ian Klein, J.D. Candidate at the Texas A&M University School of Law, 2020, “Enemy of the People: The Ghost of the F.C.C. Fairness Doctrine in the Age of Alternative Facts.” Hastings Communications and Entertainment Law Journal, https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1809&context=hastings\_comm\_ent\_law\_journal

The “Filter Bubble” and Confirmation Bias Problems The problem is that despite there being a plethora of media outlets between television, the Internet, radio, and print, many Americans genuinely believe that there simply is no source of unbiased news; per Gallup, 51% of American adults cannot name a news source that they believe reports neutrally and objectively.175 While some outlets such as the Associated Press and Reuters are generally seen as less biased than the likes of MSNBC and Fox News, the fact remains that a majority of Americans do not even consider these sources free from partisan bias. One option is for people to self-police—get their news from left-leaning sources, right-leaning sources, and as neutral of a source as they perceive to exist. Not only are most people unlikely to do this, as it requires effort, but the nature of the evolving Internet makes it extremely difficult.176 Online outlets like Google and Facebook have algorithms that present news and other content based on what a user has previously viewed, creating a veritable treadmill of one-sided sources.177 Eli Pariser explores this phenomenon in his 2011 book The Filter Bubble. 178 These algorithms essentially learn an individual user’s biases and preferences and agendas based on the user’s frequent search terms, social media posts, preferences, and those of that user’s friends, and tailor the search results, ads, and news feeds that this user sees to conform with those ideas.179 The result is that this user will see content that mostly conforms to their political ideologies, and over time, exclusively such content.180 The user is then left in a “filter bubble,” seeing—through no fault or even awareness of their own—only information online that that conforms to their pre-existing beliefs.181 As Pariser phrased it, “[a] world constructed from the familiar is a world in which there’s nothing to learn . . . [since there is] invisible autopropaganda, indoctrinating us with our own ideas.”182 In other words, people truly have to go out of their way if (and that is a big “if”) they want to see news that challenges their way of thinking. This seems unlikely to occur on a large enough scale to combat the fake news epidemic. Even if people went out of their way to find news sources that challenge their points of view, the human mind is loath to accept ideas that it does not already agree with.183 This phenomenon is called confirmation bias—the notion that people tend to give more credence to ideas and stories that reinforce their preexisting beliefs than to ideas that contradict them.184 In other words, people naturally believe what they want to—we are obstinate by design. Any solution grounded in self-policing or reliance on the private sector rather than a regulatory solution would have to overcome the massive hurdles of the filter bubble and confirmation bias. For a nation like the United States that was founded—and prides itself—upon steadfastness and sticking to one’s convictions, these solutions would therefore likely be unsuccessful. Social Networks Self-Policing—“The Market Will Regulate Itself” As discussed above, the bulk of online fake news is distributed and consumed through links on social media sites like Facebook and Twitter.185 Ordinarily, this is the type of thing that can be regulated by market forces rather than by government intervention. Theoretically, if a product is bad or a business provides poor services, consumers will simply switch to an alternative. Businesses seek to fix bad practices in order to keep existing customers and attract new ones. American history is replete with instances of market forces purging counterproductive and harmful business practices without the need for government intervention; slavery,186 unsanitary food production,187 child labor,188 segregation,189 and the use of asbestos190 are prime examples of this.191 In the context of social media, if one platform becomes notorious for fake news, users will theoretically switch to a different platform, incentivizing the original platform to crack down on that fake news. However, this presupposes that alternatives exist. Facebook and Twitter combine for the overwhelming market share of social media192 (surprisingly, Pinterest accounts for over 16% of the social media market, but the same statistics indicate that Pinterest users do not get news there).193 Because there are so few major social media platforms, users have few real alternatives to switch to. Facebook and Twitter therefore have no economic incentive to take sweeping measures to remove fake news from their platforms. Admittedly, in recent years, these sites have taken moderate steps to reduce the amount of fake news shared on their sites, such as deleting accounts that routinely share fake news articles.194 Facebook has also put public service ads on users’ feeds decrying fake news and the use of fake accounts.195 In June 2018, Twitter announced that it would take efforts to increase transparency by disclosing who pays for political ads on its site, and how much those parties spend on those ads.196 Facebook has implemented several journalistic efforts, including its partnership with fact-checking organizations, the Facebook Journalism Project—which is aimed at helping newsrooms get more digitally savvy— and the News Integrity Initiative, which Facebook helped in part to fund.197 However, as Matthew Ingram notes, these seem to be more public relations stunts than anything else.198 As Ingram points out, “Facebook focuses on engagement—time spent, clicks, and sharing—rather than quality or value.”199 This is because, like most other social media sites, Facebook’s revenue come predominately from advertising,200 which, online, is predicated around gathering views and clicks; the more pageviews or clicks a site gets, the more valuable its ad space is, and the more revenue it can generate through ad sales.201 In other words, Facebook and other social media sites gets paid based on their site’s traffic, regardless of the authenticity of the content they host.202 Because there is no economic incentive for social media sites to take major steps towards purging fake news, it is very doubtful that the Social Media market will regulate away fake news. Watchdog Agencies

#### Media filter bubbles disrupt democratic discourse and lead to rushed policies that don’t reflect the will of the people – this destroys democracy

**Polonski 16** Polonski, Slava. “The Biggest Threat to Democracy? Echo Chambers in Your Social Media Feed.” *Medium*, Medium, 6 Aug. 2016, [https://medium.com/@drpolonski/the-biggest-threat-to-democracy-echo-chambers-in-your-social-media-feeds-cd2c3049f7. //](https://medium.com/@drpolonski/the-biggest-threat-to-democracy-echo-chambers-in-your-social-media-feeds-cd2c3049f7.%20//) FC

The greater diversity and availability of digital content implies that people may choose to only consume content that matches their own worldviews. We choose who to follow and who to befriend. The resulting [echo chambers](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Echo_chamber_%28media%29) tend to amplify and reinforce our existing opinions, which is dysfunctional for a healthy democratic discourse. And while social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter generally have the power to expose us to politically diverse opinions, [research](http://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2016-06-30/social-networks-could-predict-the-next-brexit) suggests that the filter bubbles they sometimes create are, in fact, exacerbated by the platforms’ [personalisation algorithms](https://books.google.co.uk/books/about/The_Filter_Bubble.html?id=wcalrOI1YbQC" \t "_blank), which are based on our social networks and our previously expressed ideas.

This means that instead of creating an ideal type of a digitally mediated “[public agora](http://www.publicspace.org/en/text-library/eng/1-espacios-publicos-en-la-sociedad-informacional)”, which would allow citizens to voice their concerns and share their hopes, the Internet has actually increased conflict and ideological segregation between opposing views, granting a disproportionate amount of clout to the most extreme opinions. The disintegration of the general will

In political philosophy, the very idea of democracy is based on the principal of the [general will](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_will), which was proposed by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the 18th century. Rousseau envisioned that a society needs to be governed by a democratic body that acts according to the imperative will of the people as a whole. However, Rousseau foresaw in [Book IV of the Social Contract](http://www.constitution.org/jjr/socon_04.htm) that “when particular interests begin to make themselves felt […], the common interest changes and finds opponents: opinion is no longer unanimous; the general will ceases to be the will of all; contradictory views and debates arise; and the best advice is not taken without question.”

The Internet, in particular, intensifies the fragmentation of opinions, allowing people who are most passionate, motivated and outspoken to find like-minded others and make themselves heard — as we have seen on social media in the EU referendum.

In a similar vein, sudden attention-grabbing focusing events, such as natural disasters, terrorist attacks or external shocks to the environment, could also sway public opinion and trigger hasty political decisions with potentially unsustainable repercussions. Politicians run the risk of making important policy-decisions based on current emotional bursts in the population or momentary popular opinions, rather than what is best for the country. For instance, important and far-reaching decisions, such as [leaving the EU](http://www.theguardian.com/politics/commentisfree/2016/jun/26/second-referendum-consequences-brexit-grave), would need to be approved by qualified two-thirds majorities in multiple plebiscites over several years.

The critical challenge for policy-makers is, therefore, to learn to distinguish when a seemingly popular movement does actually represent the emerging general will of the majority and when it is merely the echo of a loud, but insignificant minority.

Prospects for a future-proof democracy

There can be no doubt that a new form of digitally mediated politics is a crucial component of the [Fourth Industrial Revolution](https://www.weforum.org/pages/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-by-klaus-schwab/): the Internet is already used for bottom-up agenda-setting, empowering citizens to speak up in a networked public sphere, and pushing the boundaries of the size, sophistication and scope of collective action. In particular, social media has [changed the nature of political campaigning](http://www.referendumanalysis.eu/eu-referendum-analysis-2016/section-7-social-media/impact-of-social-media-on-the-outcome-of-the-eu-referendum/) and will continue to play an important role in future elections and political campaigns around the world.

However, this technology can also be a platform for conflict and malicious agitation by right-wing populists that are dysfunctional for a healthy democratic discourse, while our current governance systems are susceptible to emotional bursts and populist movements that unfold on the Internet. What the EU referendum has taught us is that this accelerating technology is open to all and can be used to influence the public agenda in many different ways. Intimated by the power of Internet users, our current governance institutions are, however, incapable of handling the dynamism and diversity of digitally-mediated citizen opinions.

#### Democratic backsliding causes cycles of oppression and paves the way for alt-right populist groups to take power

**Abramowitz 18** Abramowitz, Michael J. “Democracy in Crisis.” *Freedom House*, 2018, [https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/democracy-crisis. //](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2018/democracy-crisis.%20//) FC

The challenges within democratic states have fueled the rise of populist leaders who appeal to anti-immigrant sentiment and give short shrift to fundamental civil and political liberties. Right-wing populists gained votes and parliamentary seats in France, the Netherlands, Germany, and Austria during 2017. While they were kept out of government in all but Austria, their success at the polls helped to weaken established parties on both the right and left. Centrist newcomer Emmanuel Macron handily won the French presidency, but in Germany and the Netherlands, mainstream parties struggled to create stable governing coalitions.

Perhaps worst of all, and most worrisome for the future, young people, who have little memory of the long struggles against fascism and communism, may be losing faith and interest in the democratic project. The very idea of democracy and its promotion has been tarnished among many, contributing to a dangerous apathy.

The retreat of democracies is troubling enough. Yet at the same time, the world’s leading autocracies, China and Russia, have seized the opportunity not only to step up internal repression but also to export their malign influence to other countries, which are increasingly copying their behavior and adopting their disdain for democracy. A confident Chinese president Xi Jinping recently proclaimed that China is “blazing a new trail” for developing countries to follow. It is a path that includes politicized courts, intolerance for dissent, and predetermined elections.

The spread of antidemocratic practices around the world is not merely a setback for fundamental freedoms. It poses economic and security risks. When more countries are free, all countries—including the United States—are safer and more prosperous. When more countries are autocratic and repressive, treaties and alliances crumble, nations and entire regions become unstable, and violent extremists have greater room to operate.

## Contention Two – Climate Change

#### Conservative media has abandoned objectivity to promote climate change denialism, which causes a massive partisan gap on climate change

**Nuccitelli 16** Nuccitelli, Dana. “Conservative Media Bias Is Inflating American Climate Denial and Polarization | Dana Nuccitelli.” *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 6 Sept. 2016, [https://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2016/sep/06/conservative-media-bias-is-inflating-american-climate-denial-and-polarization. //](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2016/sep/06/conservative-media-bias-is-inflating-american-climate-denial-and-polarization.%20//) FC

Conservative media climate denial is a root problem

Public perception and priorities are also heavily influenced by the media. [A 2013 study](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2013/aug/08/global-warming-denial-fox-news) found that conservative media consumers are more likely to distrust scientific experts and reject climate science realities.

Relatedly, [a new report by Media Matters](http://mediamatters.org/research/2016/09/01/study-newspaper-opinion-pages-feature-science-denial-and-other-climate-change-misinformation/212700) on climate coverage in major American newspaper opinion pages found pervasive misinformation in the Wall Street Journal.

A study last year found that the WSJ’s biased climate coverage extended beyond its opinion pages to its news coverage as well. And during the time of the scandalous #ExxonKnew revelations, Media Matters found that the WSJ was a[n] constant apologist for the oil company.

The WSJ readership is heavily comprised of [wealthy](http://abcnews.go.com/Business/IndustryInfo/story?id=3421988&page=1), powerful [men](http://www.people-press.org/2012/09/27/section-4-demographics-and-political-views-of-news-audiences/), and it has become [an increasingly conservative paper](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/14/business/media/14carr.html) since Rupert Murdoch purchased it. Conservative media consumers are bombarded with climate misinformation and fossil fuel industry propaganda, [usually without the authors’ fossil fuel ties being disclosed](http://mediamatters.org/research/2016/09/01/study-newspaper-opinion-pages-feature-science-denial-and-other-climate-change-misinformation/212700).

The industry has created an echo chamber in which they control the climate messaging of conservative media and party leaders, which in turn trickles down to misinform Republican voters, growing the partisan gap on climate change. The authors of the Oklahoma State study see no easy way break through what they call the “denial countermovement”

#### Partisan gap on climate change causes gridlock which halts all action towards mitigating it

**Gross 21** Gross, Samantha. “Republicans in Congress Are out of Step with the American Public on Climate.” *Brookings*, Brookings, 10 May 2021, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/planetpolicy/2021/05/10/republicans-in-congress-are-out-of-step-with-the-american-public-on-climate/. // FC

Many Republicans legislators still reject the science of climate change, a position [not held by other mainstream parties in democratic countries](https://www.vox.com/2015/12/2/9836566/republican-climate-denial-why), but [rising among far-right parties in Europe](https://e360.yale.edu/features/for-europes-far-right-parties-climate-is-a-new-battleground). Their positions have not kept up with their constituents, or even some business groups with which they are typically aligned. After the API made its announcement, Senator John Barrasso of Wyoming, the ranking Republican on the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, issued a statement saying, “[Proposals that impose a cost on carbon will hurt American families](https://www.energy.senate.gov/2021/3/barrasso-proposals-that-impose-a-cost-on-carbon-will-hurt-american-families#:~:text=%E2%80%9CProposals%20that%20impose%20a%20cost,pandemic%20is%20a%20disastrous%20idea.).” In April, Representative Scott Perry of Pennsylvania [announced](https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/hearings?ID=BF6AF237-9BD4-4D5B-A546-B25DAFE756E6) at a hearing of a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that he planned to introduce a bill to withdraw the United States from the United Nations Framework Commission on Climate Change. He introduced his [bill](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/2798/actions?r=3&s=1), which has no chance of passing, on Earth Day.

How did we get here? A total unwillingness to cooperate with Democrats is part of the problem. The polarized atmosphere in Washington is such that it is difficult for a Republican to support anything proposed by the Biden administration, lest they be demonized by right-wing media and the party’s activist base. A lack of honesty exacerbates this problem. Just in the last few days there was a flareup on the political right that President Joe Biden’s climate plan intended [to severely limit Americans’ meat consumption](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2021/04/26/biden-climate-beef-ban/). His plan said no such thing, but as the saying goes, a lie can travel around the world while the truth is lacing up its boots.

The climate policies that Biden has proposed so far are a mix of executive action and proposals for Congress to fund climate-friendly investments. His [American Jobs Plan](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/03/31/fact-sheet-the-american-jobs-plan/) includes encouragement for electric vehicle purchases and charging station construction, a clean electricity standard and tax credits for clean electricity development, and support for low-carbon industrial processes. He’s more focused on carrots than sticks, in part because carrots are easier to get through a skeptical Congress. Yet those policies are condemned by Republicans as “socialism.” “Our best future won’t come from Washington schemes or socialist dreams,” [said Senator Tim Scott of South Carolina](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/immigration-guns-equity-after-biden-address/2021/04/28/edd6677a-a797-11eb-8c1a-56f0cb4ff3b5_story.html) in response to President Biden’s first address to a joint session of Congress, on April 28.

The situation of one political party out of step with a majority of the American people seems like an unsteady state, a disequilibrium that cannot hold. As an American concerned about climate and looking toward a low-carbon future, I wish that were so. But the Republican Party is sticking together in opposition. Although [57% of Republican voters support the American Jobs Plan](https://www.dataforprogress.org/blog/2021/4/6/voters-support-the-american-jobs-plan), Republicans in Congress are [saying no](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/republicans-struggle-craft-counteroffer-biden-s-2-trillion-jobs-plan-n1264228). The anti-majoritarian structure of the Senate gives the minority power to block legislation and require 60 votes for passage. Democrats can take advantage of their narrow control of the Senate to pass support for green investments through the [budget reconciliation process](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/planetpolicy/2021/05/10/barriers-to-achieving-us-climate-goals-are-more-political-than-technical/), and perhaps afterward point out the popularity of the legislation among average Republicans. But in today’s tribal political environment, will it matter? Ultimately, hope for change among Congressional Republicans lies with voters, who say they care about climate, but haven’t made it a central issue determining their vote. Unless and until that changes, I fear that U.S. climate gridlock will continue.

#### Climate change reifies structural issues and continues the systemic oppression of marginalized communities

**Kaplan 20** Kaplan, Sarah. “Climate Change Is Also a Racial Justice Problem.” *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 29 June 2020, https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-solutions/2020/06/29/climate-change-racism/. // FC

Racism is “inexorably” linked to climate change, said Penn State meteorologist Gregory Jenkins, because it dictates who benefits from activities that produce planet-warming gases and who suffers most from the consequences. [One study](https://www.pnas.org/content/116/13/6001) published last year in the Proceedings of the National Academies of Sciences found that black and Hispanic communities in the U.S. are exposed to far more air pollution than they produce through actions like driving and using electricity. By contrast, white Americans experience better air quality than the national average, even though their activities are the source of most pollutants. [Another paper](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/356/6345/1362/tab-figures-data)in the journal Science found that climate change will cause the most economic harm in the nation’s poorest counties; many of those places, like [Zavala County, Tex](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/zavalacountytexas)., and [Wilkinson County, Miss](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/wilkinsoncountymississippi)., are home to mostly people of color.

In a course he teaches called “Climate Change, Climate Justice and Front Line Communities,” Jenkins traces this connection from slavery, which created the economic foundation for the industrial revolution, to modern-day policies that influence where people live and environmental risks to which they are exposed. [Studies show](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718517302944) that coastal communities in the South, where African Americans are a significant fraction of the population, are at the greatest risk from sea level rise. [Other research](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01944363.2020.1759127) has found that neighborhoods once shaped by discriminatory housing policies known as “redlining” have more pavement, fewer trees and higher average temperatures — a combination that can lead to deadly heat illness.

Racial inequality also means that the people most at risk from climate change have the fewest resources to cope. According to a [study by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies](https://inequality.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/media/_media/pdf/key_issues/Environment_policy.pdf), more than 30 percent of black New Orleans residents didn’t own cars when Hurricane Katrina hit — making it almost impossible for them to evacuate. After the storm, the city’s black population fell because many residents couldn’t afford to return.

“Unless inequity is addressed now,” Jenkins said, “future impacts from climate change will disable many communities of color.”

## Contention Three – Misinformation

#### The repeal of objective media measures led to the rise of alt-right movements and increased their ability to recruit and spread misinformation

Cagliuso 21 Dominique Cagliuso, writer with working on a Master in International Affairs with a concentration in Human Rights and a Specialization in UN Studies at Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs, 2021, “Age of the Alt-Right: New-Age Media and White Nationalism in Trump’s America,” International Social Science Review, https://digitalcommons.northgeorgia.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1529&context=issr

The New-Age of Media Since the turn of the millennium, both social and technological advancements have allowed the white supremacy movement to flourish. Through the use of the internet, they have been able to spread their ideology to millions. While the ideas and beliefs behind the Alt-Right movement are nothing new, the dissemination of their ideas through the internet is. A Senior Fellow at the Southern Poverty Law Center, Mark Potok, stated that the data they were collecting led them to conclude that “the advent of social media and other more dispersed means of sharing information had created a shift in how extremists shared their ideologies and how they recruited, too.”11 The SPLC maintains that most white supremacists today are no longer members of official groups but rather operate over the internet. The origins of the far-right's internet use can be traced back to the creation of the platform Stormfront. This white supremacist platform was created in 1990 as a virtual bulletin board for the Senate campaign of David Duke, a former Grand Wizard of the KKK. Eventually, the website went public in 1995 and became the stormfront.com that is still active today.12 Due to the creation of stormfront.com, around several hundred white supremacists were turning to the internet by 2000.13 In 2004, Robert Futrell and Pete Simi attributed the white power movement's success to the newly developed "free spaces" on the internet. These "free spaces" were defined as "network intersections that link otherwise isolated activist networks through physical and virtual spaces."14 Futrell and Simi concluded that the use of cyberspace would massively affect the white power movement by creating a new and easier platform to find existing members and to seek out potential recruits. With the creation of new platforms and websites gaining traction, the traditional magazine American Renaissance converted their publishings to the internet. After a decade of shipping out the original magazine, in 2000, they added a virtual magazine for their readers. By 2012, they ceased all shipments of the magazine and transitioned entirely to an online presence. The editor of American Renaissance, Jared Taylor, wrote to their subscribers about the decision to go virtual: Dear Subscriber; We will be shifting our efforts from the monthly publication into what we expect to be the very best race-realist website on the internet… We have seen the costs of printing and mailing continue to rise while, at the same time, more and more people look to the internet for information. When we began publishing in November 1990, it was tough to get unorthodox information about race. The only way to find out about them was through luck, word of mouth, or diligent library research… There was only a meager network of racially conscious whites who rarely met each other. The internet has given rise to scores of racially conscious websites, and it has become easy to find like-minded people. 15 In the twentieth century, news organizations tried to present information in an unbiased and objective way. Bias was meant to be avoided at all costs, and facts were supposed to be highly proven with evidence. In 1949, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) enacted the Fairness Doctrine with the purpose of enforcing strict rules on broadcast media. The doctrine required any entity functioning under a broadcasting license needed to present unbiased news and cover all sides of an issue. Under these rules, the media was rewarded by presenting truthful, unbiased, and fair reports. Everything changed, though, when the Fairness Doctrine was repealed in 1987.16 The new media era began with the founding of FOX News in October1996.17 The network purpose was to showcase solely Republican and Conservative ideas and news. This creation of biased news networks quickly led to the "narrowcasting" seen today: where producers of news seek to gain readers for profit rather than share credible and unbiased news. They seek to reinforce the readers’ already existing viewpoints rather than inform them of all sides. The new media also rewards the speed of news rather than accuracy. It is seen as more important to be the first to report on a topic whether or not the content is yet proven as true or false. 18 The rise of the internet created a new medium for political discourse and gave birth to the Alt-Right movement. As it became more challenging for those with a racial bias to openly voice their opinions without persecution, the internet opened an entirely new platform for supremacists to express their ideology without social reproach. The Alt-Right success can be attributed to the internet’s lack of “opportunity costs—the energy, money, and psychological energy it takes to meet people, establish connections, and mobilize actions among groups of people.”19 By anonymously joining a movement for free by merely owning an internet-accessible device, the Alt-Right became the new haven for white nationalists. An expansive network of right-wing platforms has been created during this new digital era. A few of the most successful far-right websites that the Alt-Right frequent are Breitbart, Infowars, 4chan, American Renaissance, and Occidental Dissent. Social media sites such as Twitter, Reddit, and Facebook have also played vital roles in the movement’s growth—although there have been increased monitoring of hate groups on these sites in the past few years. Andrew Anglin created The Daily Stormer in 2013, one of the most well-known Alt-Right sites. It focuses on the sense of victimhood and marginalization that the Alt-Right strongly believes they are the subject of.20 Another significant Alt-Right player, Alex Jones's Infowars, is known as the conspiracymongering site at the center of many Alt-Right ideologies and conspiracy theories.21 Infowars is used to “fuel right-wing paranoia and propaganda.”22 Infowars truly emphasizes the concept of the “false flag,” used as a claim that anything potentially damaging to conservative values must simply be false. It is the concept that anything that has gone wrong, whether it be a scandal, a mass shooting, or an economic crisis, must be the fault of liberal policies or a plot by liberal players to undermine the conservatives.23 Without a doubt, the most prominent way that the AltRight represents themselves in our society today is through the internet. The Ideology of the Alt-Right

#### Journalists use media biases to spread right-wing misinformation which instigates violence and the continuation of oppressive ideals

**Hemsley 21** Hemsley, Jeff [Professor at University of Syracuse] “When Fake News Turns Into Conspiracy Theories: The viral factor in today’s media, landscape, and what we can do to stop it” , Syracuse EDU, February 8, 2021 https://ischool.syr.edu/when-fake-news-turns-into-conspiracy-theories-the-viral-factor-in-todays-media-landscape-and-what-we-can-do-to-stop-it/ // FC

 On January 6, as public officials met to certify Joe Biden’s victory in the 2020 Presidential Election, supporters of Donald Trump stormed the capitol by mob, resulting in a riot that left five people dead. In the days leading up to the riot, supporters of President Trump used a myriad of mainstream and fringe social media sites to organize and discuss the possibility of violence. Websites like Parler and TheDonald.win were “rife with posts about storming the Capitol,” according to an article in The Hill. According to reporting by the New York Times, as Donald Trump ended his afternoon rally by calling on protestors to march on Congress, right-wing groups immediately took to these sites to promote the attack. At least 12 people openly posted about carrying guns inside the Capitol building, with others recommending tools that could help pry open doors. Some were dressed in Viking costumes, some looked like soldiers in camouflage military uniforms, and others carried with them symbols of hate. But they all united — as they had been for months — around a common falsehood: The election had been unlawfully stolen from Trump, who deserved the victory. Fake news, from what it is to how it spreads, has been a hot topic throughout the past few years, especially amidst the recent election. In the weeks following Election Day, President Trump has been making claims of widespread fraud that wrongfully resulted in Joe Biden’s win. Jeff Hemsley, Professor of Information Studies at the iSchool, says that there are always minor amounts of fraud in every election. Out of nearly 160 million votes, he suspects that only a tiny fraction of ballots may have been fraudulent. Probably less than 1%. “[President Trump] is essentially creating and instigating a fake news story,” he said. Hemsley argues that these instances of fake news are really just propaganda — something that has been around since there have been governments and churches at all. At its core, propaganda is simply distorted information that’s published for someone’s political gain. And whether it’s a wartime newspaper ad or a seemingly innocent social media post, propaganda is only successful to the extent that people believe it and it spreads. So what is it that makes something go viral? Hemsley says the key thing to remember is that stories don’t go viral unless a lot of people share it (“a lot” being relative to the audience and platform). A CNN video with a million views, for example, isn’t necessarily viral.  CNN simply has a lot of viewers. But if that video is frequently shared and spreads as a result, then we might call it viral. According to Hemsley, one reason fake news spreads is because it’s often inflammatory in some way. That makes it exciting and worth talking about it. “The things that tend to spread are things that are remarkable,” he said, “Remarkable just means people are talking about it, or remarking on it. And that’s virality.” For example, the Black Lives Matter movement is largely the result of many viral events linked together, Hemsley argues. The general public became aware of the severity of police brutality and racial injustice ultimately because videos from bystanders went viral again and again. Another well-known example is “Pizzagate,” a fake news story started on the conspiracy-oriented online message board 4chan. In 2016, a 4chan user fabricated a story about the Comet Ping Pong pizza shop in Washington, DC, falsely claiming that Hillary Clinton and other Democratic elites used the pizza shop’s basement as a site for child sexual abuse. In response, a North Carolina man attempting to investigate the conspiracy himself drove to the restaurant and fired a semi-automatic rifle inside in order to break the lock to a storage room. As it turns out, Comet Ping Pong doesn’t even have a basement at all — nor does it engage in any of the alleged illicit activities. Pizzagate is often considered to be a predecessor to other conspiracy theories such as “QAnon,” whose central premise is that Satanic cannibals run a global child sex trafficking ring that plots to overthrow Donald Trump. While admittedly far-fetched on its own, in August 2019, the FBI published a report calling QAnon a possible source of domestic terror. These stories and countless others show just how severe the consequences of fake news can be, though the logistics of preventing it can be difficult to sort out at scale.

## Advocacy

#### Thus, the advocacy: In a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

I’ll clarify more in CX – it checks – otherwise I’d spend 6 minutes speccing tiny parts of the plan and never get to substance – guts clash

#### We define objectivity as such:

McLaughlin 16 [Greg McLaughlin, senior lecturer in media and journalism at the University of Ulster, 2016, “Journalism, Objectivity and War,” The War Correspondent, https://sci-hub.se/https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19qgf0x.7]

objectivity under fire Objectivity in journalism has come under serious critique from academics (Glasgow University Media Group, 1976; Lichtenberg, 1996; Streckfuss, 1990; Parenti, 1993). They suggest in various ways that the news media do not simply report and reflect our social world but that they more or less play an active part in shaping, even constructing it; that they represent sectional interests rather than society as a whole.2 When these criticisms are leveled at journalists, their traditional defence is their practice of objectivity but what does it mean to be objective in journalism in the first place? According to Michael Schudson (1978), objectivity is based on the assumption that a series of ‘facts**’** or truth claims about the world can be validated by the rules and procedures of a professional community. The distortions and biases, the subjective value judgements of the individual or of particular interest groups, are filtered out so that among journalists at any rate, ‘The belief in objectivity is a faith in **“**facts”, a distrust of “values”, and a commitment to their segregation’ (p. 6). Gaye Tuchman refers to this method as ‘a strategicritual’, a method of newsgathering and reporting that protects the journalist from charges of bias or libel (1972, p. 661ff). Radical critiques measure journalistic claims to objectivity against analyses of how the news media produce and represent their version of reality according to sectional interests. Bias is not in the eye of the beholder but is structured within the entire news process; the news filters and constructs reality according to a dominant or institutional ideology (Glasgow University Media Group, 1976). ‘What passes for objectivity’, for American scholar Michael Parenti, ‘is the acceptance of a social reality shaped by the dominant forces of society – without any critical examination of that reality’s hidden agendas, its class interests, and its ideological biases’ (1993, p. 52). It is the difference respectively between the journalist as the professional, instutionalised reporter and the journalist as the partial eyewitness and writer. John Pilger points to the transparency of this ideology of professionalism, especially in a public service broadcaster like the BBC whose coverage of domestic and foreign crises has demonstrated its true agenda and its true allegiances: These people waffle on about objectivity as if by joining that institution or any institution they suddenly rise to this Nirvana where they can consider all points of view and produce something in five minutes. It’s nonsense and it’s made into nonsense because the moment there’s any kind of pressure on the establishment you find reporters coming clean, as they did after the Falklands. They were very truculent: ‘These were our people, our side. And now we’ll get back to being objective’. It’s the same with the term ‘balance’. I mean censorship for me always works by omission. That’s the most virulent censorship and what we have is an enormous imbalance one way, ...the accredited point of view, the sort of consensus point of view which has nothing to do with objectivity, nothing to do with impartiality and very little to do with the truth.3 The pressure to pursue objectivity in reporting has had serious consequences for journalism as a form of factual writing. James Cameron thought that ‘objectivity in some circumstances is both meaningless and impossible.’ He could not see ‘how a reporter attempting to define a situation involving some sort of ethical conflict can do it with sufficient demonstrable neutrality to fulfil some arbitrary concept of “objectivity”.’ This was not the acid test for Cameron who ‘always tended to argue that objectivity was of less importance than the truth, and that the reporter whose technique was informed by no opinion lacked a very serious dimension’ (1967, p. 72). There are, however, alternative forms of journalism that subvert the very notion of objectivity: the ‘New Journalism’ of the 1960s and what has been called ‘honest journalism’, described as a compromise between the blind assumption of impartiality and ideological commitment.

#### Moreover, this form of objectivity means reporters recognize that the world is independent from their desires for it

**Haely 03** Haely, Karen Cordrick. “OBJECTIVITY IN THE FEMINIST PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE.” *Ohio State University*, 2003, https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws\_etd/send\_file/send?accession=osu1064415629&disposition=inline. // FC

Keller claims that objectivity, like autonomy, need not be rooted in one’s separation from or dominance over the world. To be objective, on Keller’s view, means that one recognizes that the world is independent of one’s desires about the world, and she explicitly defines objectivity as “the pursuit of a maximally authentic84, and hence maximally reliable, understanding of the world around oneself”.85 How one operates in science distinguishes between “static objectivity” and “dynamic objectivity”.86

#### Objectivity does not refer to the journalist’s personal beliefs but their method

**Dean 17** Dean, Walter. “The Lost Meaning of 'Objectivity'.” *American Press Institute*, 18 July 2017, https://www.americanpressinstitute.org/journalism-essentials/bias-objectivity/lost-meaning-objectivity/. // FC

One of the great confusions about journalism, write Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel in [The Elements of Journalism](http://www.amazon.com/The-Elements-Journalism-Newspeople-Completely/dp/0307346706), is the concept of objectivity.

When the concept originally evolved, it was not meant to imply that journalists were free of bias. Quite the contrary.

The term began to appear as part of journalism after the turn of the 20th century, particularly in the 1920s, out of a growing recognition that journalists were full of bias, often unconsciously. Objectivity called for journalists to develop a consistent method of testing information – a transparent approach to evidence – precisely so that personal and cultural biases would not undermine the accuracy of their work.

In the latter part of the 19th century, journalists talked about something called “realism” rather than objectivity. This was the idea that if reporters simply dug out the facts and ordered them together, truth would reveal itself rather naturally. Realism emerged at a time when journalism was separating from political party affiliations and becoming more accurate. It coincided with the invention of what journalists call the inverted pyramid, in which a journalist lines the facts up from the most important to the least important, thinking it helps audiences understand things naturally.

At the beginning of the 20th century, however, some journalists began to worry about the naïveté of realism. In part, reporters and editors were becoming more aware of the rise of propaganda and the role of press agents.

At a time when Freud was developing his theories of the unconscious and painters like Picasso were experimenting with Cubism, journalists were also developing a greater recognition of human subjectivity.

In 1919, Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz, an associate editor for the New York World, wrote an influential and scathing account of how cultural blinders had distorted the New York Times coverage of the Russian Revolution. “In the large, the news about Russia is a case of seeing not what was, but what men wished to see,” they wrote. Lippmann and others began to look for ways for the individual journalist “to remain clear and free of his irrational, his unexamined, his unacknowledged prejudgments in observing, understanding and presenting the news.”

Journalism, Lippmann declared, was being practiced by “untrained accidental witnesses.” Good intentions, or what some might call “honest efforts” by journalists, were not enough. Faith in the rugged individualism of the tough reporter, what Lippmann called the “cynicism of the trade,” was also not enough. Nor were some of the new innovations of the times, like bylines, or columnists.

The solution, Lippmann argued, was for journalists to acquire more of “the scientific spirit … There is but one kind of unity possible in a world as diverse as ours. It is unity of method, rather than aim; the unity of disciplined experiment.” Lippmann meant by this that journalism should aspire to “a common intellectual method and a common area of valid fact.”

To begin, Lippmann thought, the fledgling field of journalist education should be transformed from “trade schools designed to fit men for higher salaries in the existing structure.” Instead, the field should make its cornerstone the study of evidence and verification.

Although this was an era of faith in science, Lippmann had few illusions. “It does not matter that the news is not susceptible to mathematical statement. In fact, just because news is complex and slippery, good reporting requires the exercise of the highest scientific virtues.”

In the original concept, in other words, the method is objective, not the journalist. The key was in the discipline of the craft, not the aim.

This point has some important implications.

One is that the impartial voice employed by many news organizations – that familiar, supposedly neutral style of newswriting – is not a fundamental principle of journalism. Rather, it is an often helpful device news organizations use to highlight that they are trying to produce something obtained by objective methods.

#### Objectivity is not neutrality – it does not always mean balanced

**Gutman 12** Gutman, David. “Opinion: Objectivity Does Not Mean Neutrality: The Danger of False Equivalency in the Media.” *Common Dreams*, 25 Oct. 2012, [https://www.commondreams.org/views/2012/10/25/objectivity-does-not-mean-neutrality-danger-false-equivalency-media. //](https://www.commondreams.org/views/2012/10/25/objectivity-does-not-mean-neutrality-danger-false-equivalency-media.%20//) FC

Journalists should always exhibit a bias towards objectivity. Being objective -- dealing with facts or conditions as perceived without distortion by personal feelings -- is always the goal. The trouble comes when objectivity is confused with neutrality.

It is fine to be partial, indeed it is imperative if, after a careful examination of the facts, one concludes that the truth lies on one side of the argument. This is being objective. Examining the facts on their merits and presenting the truth is a journalist’s job.

Granted, on many issues there is legitimate debate and disagreement, but this is not always the case, and the media should not treat every issue as if both sides have equally valid points.

The truth does not always lie in the center. In fact, it rarely does.

A journalist’s job is to report the truth, not to neutrally report what both sides say and stake out a safe position in the middle.

#### Objectivity does not give credence to erroneous viewpoints

**Serrano 20** Serrano, Kathryn. “Journalism vs. Activism: How the Social Impact of Journalism Has Evolved .” *Scholarworks UArkansas*, May 2020, https://scholarworks.uark.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5117&context=etd. // FC

Bill Keller, the editor of The Marshall Project and a previous editor at The New York Times, says he maintains the same standards at this new digital publication focused on criminal justice problems as he did at the Times. Journalists should not express personal views in news coverage. Their nonprofit aims to provide the public with information about the criminal justice system rather than advocating for particular ways to fix it (Blanding 2018). Keller has stated that he has “read lots of advocacy journalism” but does not relate that term to The Marshall Project. “I still believe in the discipline of impartiality, reporting that 7 applies skeptical inquiry to all sides of an issue. I don’t advocate equal time for points of view that can’t withstand scrutiny, but I find journalism [is] more credible if it starts with an open mind and follows the evidence,” he said in a Columbia Journalism Review interview (Vernon 2017). Despite the blurred lines between advocacy and journalism, journalism is not going to disappear or professional journalists are not going to be indistinguishable from bloggers, social media activists, or human rights advocates (Simon 2014). It also does not mean that the quality and accuracy of the information is irrelevant. On the contrary, Simon argues, because the line is growing blurrier by the day, those who define themselves as professional journalists need more than ever to maintain standards and report with seriousness and objectivity (Simon 2014).