# 1

#### Multiple links. Authorship. Affirmative makes authorship critical. One must assess quality of the source. Moral Panics: Aff creates moral panic over the constant question of democracy and the identity of media professionalism. Regimes of truth: Aff manufactures frames using SQ as guide. Discourses of power underlie journalism. Without properly addressing them, there is no solution. Biopolitics will undermine any solution.

Mitchelson 2012 [Alana, Journalist, October 26] “The journalistic relevance of Foucault’s theory,” **Ink** <https://inkedhistoryofnow.wordpress.com/2012/10/26/the-journalistic-relevance-of-foucaults-theory/EM>

While the media as an industry encapsulates a particular discourse, one must also consider the many discourses that constitute an individual journalist; Foucault’s concept of the ‘author.’ In addition to this, his theories more broadly indicate that the power structures in a society control all knowledge and social control over that particular group of people. This not only refers to the government and the way politicians may take advantage of time poor journalists to churn out articles tainted by spin, but also to the concentration of media ownership itself which may prevent the exposure of all aspects of the truth. Foucault’s ideas may be considered fundamental for one to develop a richer understanding of journalism as information, knowledge, truth and power are elements so deeply engrained in media reporting. A journalist’s role is to mirror society and report the facts however when considering Foucault’s concept of discourses, it is difficult to discern the whole truth as societies have different versions of the truth through the development of their own discourses over time; in Foucault’s words “each society has its own regime of truth” (Foucault, 2009, pp. 68). Foucault’s notion of historical events influencing that of the future holds especially true when considering the development of technology. Journalists have had to adapt to the changing environment by changing the way in which they communicate news to the masses. Before attempting to fully comprehend the current state of the world, one must first look back as to the reasons for these societal advances in relation to journalism. The internet presented people with an avenue whereby one could communicate and absorb information at a faster rate. Society takes preference to the online media platform for their news consumption over the traditional print form for which society’s demand continues to diminish. Therefore journalists have had to change the product in order to cater for human needs, where the inverted pyramid is far more appropriate to a narrative structured article that does not reveal the most important points in the first paragraph. A noteworthy aspect of Foucault’s societal discourses is that of moral panics. Stories that hold particular traits of a widely known story in the past are more likely to resonate more soundly in a society. The ideas of the previous story will inevitably resurface and cause similar upset in society. This was evident in the case of the recent murder of Jill Meagher. While acknowledging the tragedy of this event, there are many similar deaths that occurred around the same time that did not receive anywhere near as much media coverage. This may be considered a result of the moral panic surrounding the issue of a woman, in particular a young, white woman, fearing walking home alone in her own neighbourhood at night. Likewise, the case of Lindy Chamberlain and the death of her baby Azaria gave rise to the moral panic of the ‘mad mother.’ These ‘moral panics’ almost hold an element of control over people in society, including journalists, as the human mind seems to inadvertently categorise stories in order to make sense of them and give them meaning. Journalism is its own discourse within itself. According to Foucault’s theory, there is a certain perception among members of a society as to what a journalist looks like, how they behave and what kind of a person they are. Notably, these judgments rather superficially revolve around basic stereotypes that do not take individual differences into account. These are the discourses within individual journalists. An example of this may be the ethical choices a journalist makes in their career based on their moral code which is defined by the composition of all the discourses to which they relate. Foucault indicates that “journalism can be viewed as an intersection of many conflicting interests,” meaning that there are many angles to a story and many different, and at times incompatible, interpretations of the facts (Conboy, 2004, pp. 4). It further conveys the way in which power structures of society will shape a story to suits their own ambitious interests at the expense of the truth. Foucault acknowledges that “we must always keep in mind the multiple relationships of journalism with society, with the economy, with politics and also a relatively autonomous cultural practice in its own right with its own traditions” as discourses should be considered in juxtaposition with one another rather than contemplated as single entities (Conboy, 2004, pp. 4). Advertisements REPORT THIS AD In terms of Foucault’s work regarding the ‘death of the author,’ he proposes that the meaning of a ‘work’ is dependent on the person to which the work is associated; the ‘author.’ As reasoned by Foucault, “an author’s name is not simply an element in a discourse; it performs a certain role with regard to narrative discourse, assuring a classificatory function” (Foucault, 1984, pp. 107). The attribution of a ‘work’ to an author leads to the subconscious grouping of that writer’s other works and hence, the contrasting of that particular collection of pieces with that of other authors. In this way, the ‘work’ almost becomes characterised solely by the author rather than being defined on its own terms. As summarised by Foucault, the ‘author function’ is the way “the author’s name manifests the appearance of a certain discursive set and indicates the status of this discourse within a society and culture” (Foucault, 1984, pp. 107). He touches on the way in which the attribution of a statement to an author is received as merely a ‘demonstrated truth.” He is referring to the way attribution to an authoritative source places a sense of confidence in the minds of readers as personal opinions may be conveyed in a statement even though they may be carefully selected and constructed within an article to convey certain meaning out of context from when the statement was originally delivered. According to Foucault’s notion of ‘discursivity,” the author is also not necessarily only the author of their own work, but suggests that they may also hold some relationship to other authors’ pieces of a similar discourse or genre of writing (Foucault, 1984, pp. 114). The notion of power is deeply embedded within Foucault’s theory of discourse as he proposes that knowledge and truth are vital aspects which contribute to power. The discourse of journalism possesses many characteristics such as the way in which an individual journalist structures an article, the effect of a piece of journalism on the composition of society, and the way members of society prioritise stories. It ultimately defines the way in which people perceive the concept of journalism and its role in society; the notion of a free press, its function as the ‘fourth estate’ and the provision of objective accounts based on evidence and fact. “Journalism can be viewed as an intersection of many conflicting interests” which relates back to the way discourse is inevitably linked to power (Conboy, 2004, pp. 4). This holds particularly true within the discourse of journalism as journalists act to give a voice to the unheard groups in society, giving them a sense of empowerment as they have access to some form of representation. When information and knowledge within societal discourses become widely accepted norms, it is difficult for people to objectively challenge their credibility. In this way, one may argue that discourses place restrictions on an individual’s ability to accurately understand the world around them. Foucault however disagrees with this notion. He argues that discourses present people with the desire to conform to social norms in order to succeed in life and that it is rather institutions of power who blur an individual’s ability to see the truth. For example Rupert Murdoch’s near monopoly over the distribution of information through his concentrated ownership over a large scope of media organisations cause his content to provide a remarkably partisan and unbalanced view of the truth. Foucault acknowledges that power cannot solely be defined by repression or else society would arguably fail to obey the rules set out by our leaders. He therefore argues that bodies of power must offer some benefits to society in addition to enforcing such rules. In this way, some media organisations may argue that they offer stories that are likely to entertain over more serious stories in order to cater for the needs of society. This is a trend that one could argue is undermining to the journalism profession. Foucault’s theories should not be thought of as research of the past that bears no relationship to today’s society. His concepts of discourse, the ‘author’ and that of knowledge and power are still very relevant and may be applied to journalism in order to better understand what the future has to hold for the profession in this digital age. It lays a firm foundation for aspiring journalists as they enter the working world as for one who had not studied social theories such as that of Foucault, they could potentially become lost in the spin provided by political figures which would distract from the real story. It is of uppermost importance that journalist separate ‘power’ from ‘truth.’

#### Objectivity is gatekeeper for Free Press. Upholds the regulatory impulse driving sovereignty. Brings sovereignty into workplace biopolitics. Creates state of exception between professionals who practice scientific rationalism and outsiders who must be regulated and ostracized for their blatant subjectivity.

Blagaard 2013 [Bolette, Aalborg University Copenhagen] “Shifting boundaries: Objectivity, citizen journalism andtomorrow’s journalists,” **Journalism** <https://www.academia.edu/7452532/Shifting_boundaries_Objectivity_citizen_journalism_and_tomorrows_journalists_Article/EM>

New journalism, public journalism and citizen journalism may be seen as pockets of resistance to or even backlashes against the dominating journalistic concept, particularlyin American journalism, of objectivity, by attempting to decentre the readers rather than unify them (Muhlmann, 2008). While professional journalism’s history helps connect and construct national societies (Anderson, 1991; Muhlmann, 2008), it seemingly more-over carries an inbuilt contradiction between universal objectivity and national specificity which calls on the profession to veil its bias and national situatedness through discourses of professionalism (Schudson, 1978). Journalistic objectivity is therefore adisputed and fiercely discussed concept, which continues to draw strong opinions fromscholars and practitioners alike. However, recent scholarship has uncovered a more nuanced picture of practiced objectivity. This scholarship suggests that journalistic objectivity should not be confused with scientific objectivity, and that the former in fact is a set of practices(Hampton, 2008; Richards and Rees, 2011; Ward, 2008), a ritual (Tuchman, 1972) or performance (Boudana, 2011). Although within the professional modern practice of journalism it is widely accepted that objectivity is an ideal that cannot be reached, itis equally acknowledged that the history of journalism has provided resistance and alternatives to the discourse of objectivity. Objectivity is then both an occupational norm and an object of ‘struggle within the larger struggle of professional jurisdiction [over definitions and particular forms of expertise]’ (Schudson and Anderson, 2009:96). The occupational values are internalised and define the journalistic episteme(Tumber and Prentoulis, 2003). Moreover, journalists perceive emotions to imply contamination of objectivity (Richards and Rees, 2011: 863). Objectivity is then a‘performance’, which can be ‘evaluated by the degree of truth that characterizes [the journalist’s] report’ (Boudana, 2011: 396). In order to perform adequately and to avoid contamination, journalists adhere to a set of principles and practices that restrict access of emotions, value judgments and political biases to journalistic products.These principles may be termed journalistic objectivity as opposed to scientific objec-tivity and include factuality, fairness, non-bias, independence, non-interpretation, and neutrality and detachment (Ward, 2008: 19). Save factuality, these principles make journalistic objectivity into an ethical concept that relies on the individual professional journalist to maintain the moral standard.

#### No value to life in a biopolitical framework—everyone is exposed to the possibility of being reduced to bare life in the name of instrumentality

Agamben 1998 [Giorgio, professor of philosophy at university of Verona, Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life, pg. 139-140]

It is not our intention here to take a position on the difficult ethical problem of euthanasia, which still today, in certain coun­tries, occupies a substantial position in medical debates and pro­vokes disagreement. Nor are we concerned with the radicaliry with which Binding declares himself in favor of the general admissibility of euthanasia. More interesting for our inquiry is the fact that the sovereignty of the living man over his own life has its immediate counterpart in the determination of a threshold beyond which life ceases to have any juridical value and can, therefore, be killed without the commission of a homicide. The new juridical category of “life devoid of value” (or “life unworthy of being lived”) corre­sponds exactly—even if in an apparently different direction—to the bare life of homo sacer and can easily be extended beyond the limits imagined by Binding. It is as if every valorization and every “politicization” of life (which, after all, is implicit in the sovereignty of the individual over his own existence) necessarily implies a new decision concerning the threshold beyond which life ceases to be politically relevant, becomes only “sacred life,” and can as such be eliminated without punishment. Every society sets this limit; every society—even the most modern—decides who its “sacred men” will be. It is even pos­sible that this limit, on which the politicization and the *exceprio* of natural life in the juridical order of the state depends, has done nothing but extend itself in the history of the West and has now— in the new biopolitical horizon of states with national sovereignty—moved inside every human life and every citizen. Bare life is no longer confined to a particular place or a definite category. It now dwells in the biological body of every living being.

#### The role of the ballot becomes a negotiation of knowledge, a deciding of axes and boundaries. Evaluate our critique by its ability to reorient political perception and action.

Bleiker 2000 [Roland, coordinator of the Peace and Conflict Studies Program @ U of Queensland, Popular Dissent, Human Agency, and Global Politics]

Describing, explaining and prescribing may be less unproblematic processes of evaluation, but only at first sight. **If one abandons** the notion of **Truth,** the idea that an event can be apprehended as part of a natural order, authentically and scientifically, as something that exists independently of the meaning we have given it – if one abandons this separation of object and subject, then **the process of judging a** particular approach to describing and explaining an event **becomes a** **very muddled affair. There** is **no** longer an **objective measuring device that can set the standard to evaluate whether or not a particular insight into an event**, such as the collapse of the Berlin Wall, **is true or false**. The very nature of a past event becomes indeterminate insofar as its identification is dependent upon ever-changing forms of linguistic expressions that imbue the event with meaning.56 The inability to determine objective meanings is also the reason why various critical international relations scholars stress that there can be no ultimate way of assessing human agency. Roxanne Doty, for instance, believes that the agent–structure debate ‘encounters an aporia, i.e., a self-engendered paradox beyond which it cannot press’. This is to say that the debate is fundamentally undecidable, and that theorists who engage in it ‘can claim no scientific, objective grounds for determining whether the force of agency or that of structure is operative at any single instant’.57 Hollis and Smith pursue a similar line of argument. They emphasise that there are always two stories to tell – neither of which is likely ever to have the last word – an inside story and an outside story, one about agents and another about structures, one epistemological and the other ontological, one about understanding and one about explaining international relations.58 The value of an insight cannot be evaluated in relation to a set of objectively existing criteria. But this does not mean that all insights have the same value. Not every perception is equally perceptive. Not every thought is equally thoughtful. Not every action is equally justifiable. How**,** then, can one judge? **Determining the value** of a particular insight or action **is always a process of negotiating knowledge, of deciding where its rotating axes should be placed and how its outer boundaries should be drawn.** The actual act of **judging can** thus **be made in reference to the very process of negotiating knowledge**. The contribution of the present approach to understanding transversal dissent could, for instance, be evaluated by its ability to demonstrate that a rethinking of the agency problematique has revealed different insights into global politics. The key question then revolves around whether or not a particular international event, like the fall of the Berlin Wall, appears in a new light once it is being scrutinised by an approach that pays attention to factors that had hitherto been ignored. Expressed in other words, knowledge **about agency can be evaluated by its ability to orient and reorient our perceptions of events and the political actions that issue from them**. The lyrical world, once more, offers valuable insight. Rene´ Char: A poet must leave traces of his passage, not proofs. Only traces bring about dreams.

#### Alternative is “problematization.” I introduce bio-politics into the discussion and we understand the true diffuse nature of power which makes the statements made by the 1AC very problematic. The affirmative attempt to simplify it into basic terms of the mechanisms of power is inadequate. Problematization is key to activist movements, also challenges the effectiveness of non-reformist reforms

Terwiel, 2020 (Anna, Professor of political theory at Trinity College that focuses on carceral feminism and prison abolition, “Problematization as an Activist Practice” Theory and Event, Vol 23 NO.1 January 2020 68-70

Rather than seek solutions to practical policy questions, problematization aims to disrupt how problems and solutions alike are perceived. Such disruption, Foucault suggests, enables a radical rethinking of an issue and the creative development of new approaches. Problematization is usually understood as a style of philosophy that allows individuals to engage in ethical practices of self-transformation.[12](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f12) Foucault's archaeologies and genealogies, for instance, can both be seen as forms of problematization: they use different methods to "clarify and intensify" the problems of our time and thereby make room for "experimentation on what we take to be the limits of our selves."[13](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f13) However, scholars have not yet pursued Foucault's suggestion that problematization can also be [End Page 67] understood as an activist practice.[14](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f14) Specifically, Foucault described the Prisons Information Group [Groupe d'Information sur les Prisons or GIP], an activist collective he co-founded in the early 1970s, as "an initiative of 'problematization.'"[15](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f15) This article considers Foucault's late work alongside his writings for the GIP to theorize problematization as a collaborative activist practice. Problematization is activist because it seeks to enable social change, and collaborative because theorists are seen as "relays" in problematization rather than its originators. As I describe in greater detail below, the GIP formed in a moment of intense political contestation of the prison and tried to help translate prisoners' grievances, protests, and uprisings into a more generalized and widely shared "active intolerance" of the prison and punishment. Bringing together insights from the GIP's activism and Foucault's philosophical writings, I theorize problematization as a way of responding to protests that seeks to affirm and amplify their disruptive power by unsettling the ways of thinking used to adjudicate them. This interpretation of problematization, I will suggest, has the advantage of more clearly connecting the work of radical thinking with practical efforts at change than Foucault himself was able or willing to. Moreover, it expands the relevance of Foucault's work to prison politics beyond the tendency to use either specific Foucauldian concepts (such as biopower or neoliberalism) or scholarly methods (such as genealogy) to analyze punitive practices.[16](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f16) And in the context of contemporary debates about mass incarceration, a problematization approach can help energize critiques of the prison while resisting their limitation to demands for better prisons.[17](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f17) More generally, this essay proposes to consider Foucauldian problematization alongside other approaches that challenge justification and problem-solving as the primary contributions of political theory. Akin to Judith Butler's critical analysis of the "frames" that justify state violence and reproduce unequal vulnerability to death across the globe, problematization urges theorists to consider how dominant ways of thinking enable some practices and lives while obscuring or eliminating others.[18](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f18) Butler's work further highlights the importance of problematizing the norms of gender, sexuality, and race that enable state violence and the unequal distribution of precariousness. Such problematization takes us beyond Foucault's own analyses of punishment to intersectional feminist analysis,[19](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f19) critical trans politics,[20](https://muse.jhu.edu/article/747095" \l "f20) and other scholarly and activist efforts to "trouble the system we have."

Foucault depicts the work of diagnosing and defamiliarizing our ways of thinking—problematization—as a crucial part of collective efforts to change practices (such as punishment) and institutions (such as the prison). Intellectuals, he suggests, should work alongside "very different people such as magistrates, penal law theorists, penitentiary practitioners, lawyers, social workers, and persons who have experienced prison" in a shared "endeavor of reflection and thought."29 While these categories are by no means mutually exclusive—just think of the work of (formerly) incarcerated intellectuals such as George Jackson, Angela Davis, and Assata Shakur—I will focus, in this essay, on how theorists on the outside can contribute to prison activism.30 Yet problematization is not typically seen as a collaborative activist practice. Rather, scholars tend to interpret it more narrowly as a form of philosophy that can inspire ethical self-transformation. In the most in-depth analysis to date, Colin Koopman, for instance, depicts problematization as a type of genealogy that, by tracing the emergence of our ways of thinking, provides the materials needed "to constitute ourselves otherwise" or "rework[…] ourselves."31 The philosopher's diagnostic work, Koopman argues, should be "followed up by self-transformative responses," i.e. by "experimentation on what we take to be the limits of our selves."32 Foucault indeed often mentions the transformative effects of philosophy on the self, and his last published works analyze ethical practices through which individuals shape their subjectivity, such as dieting and regulating one's sexual appetites.33 But as I have begun to show, there are grounds for a more political reading of problematization also, which Koopman does not pursue. My aim is not to draw a sharp line between ethics and politics, or between individual and collective change, but to ask: What are the political and theoretical costs of restricting our understanding of problematization to individual ethics? What possible responses to mass incarceration open up when we approach problematization as a collaborative activist practice instead? One risk of restricting problematization to individual ethics is that we inadvertently reinforce the belief that problematization is inappropriate [End Page 70] for politics, understood as a domain that demands practical solutions to policy issues.

# 2

#### CJ is advocacy journalism. Objective journalism = rejection of CJ.

Darbo and Skjerdal 2019 [Katherine, graduate of NLA University College and teaches Media and Communication at Sam Eyde High School; Terje, Associate Professor in Journalism at NLA University College in Kristiansand] “Blurred boundaries: Citizens journalists versus conventional journalists in Hong Kong,” **Global Media and China** <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2059436419834633/EM>

Citizen journalists are seen as individual contributors, while conventional journalists are seen as members of a professional collective. In fact, one of the first ideas which comes to mind when the informants are asked to describe conventional journalism is the requirement of a media institution. Conventional journalists are portrayed as a collective of professionals who work together in an institutional environment, follow a common set of ethics, and share the same “goals.” This supports Örnebring’s (2013) argument that collectivity has surfaced as a new demarcation in journalism, replacing autonomy as one of the distinguishing attributes for the profession. What nevertheless complicates the issue from a Hong Kong perspective is that not just conventional journalists but also citizen journalists expose collective attributes. They are often organized in one way or another, and they are faithful to the channel which they report for. When submitting material, an editor will often proofread the text and give feedback before the article is published. The channels in question therefore resemble professional media channels, except that contributors are volunteers and the journalistic style slightly more advocacy-oriented than in the typical mainstream media channel.

#### Plan initiates a new biopolitics of journalistic identity that ends the state of exception, empowers social change that will ensure human survival in the long term. Resists the growing surveillance society.

Neme Forum 2021 “Monitorial Citizen: the ordinary witness,” **Cyprus Conference Summary** <https://www.neme.org/projects/state-machines/monitorial-citizen/EM>

Selecting in the new planetary humanity those characteristics that allow for its survival, removing the thin diaphragm that separates bad mediated advertising from the perfect exteriority that communicates only itself – this is the political task of our generation. (Giorgio Agamben, *The Coming Community,* University of Minnesota Press, 1993, p63) Agamben’s statement implies a sense of urgency, a call to humanity to form a completely new engagement with politics, a shared uniting form of representation, the perfect exteriority. This may be seen as an unachievable ideal, even for informed citizens, especially in context to the current condition[s] of uncertain notions of citizenship, disuniting nationalisms, refugees and internal displacement caused by incessant wars, migration caused by climate change and bots generating fake news. Corporate and government media’s insistence on defending a collapsing political, economic and social system has created reverberations of disillusionment and mistrust leading to a decline in conventional forms of political involvement. Nonetheless, we are witnessing an alternative form of participatory democracy and a higher level of engagement on the web by citizen bloggers, described by Michael Schudson as “monitorial citizens.” (Michael Schudson, *Good Citizens and Bad History: Today’s Political Ideals in Historical Perspective,* Communication Review 1, no. 4, 2000). This ubiquitous presence of citizen journalism is in itself not without issues. Stuart Allan addresses these concerns and conceptualises social media outreach from ordinary citizens as “citizen witnessing.” (Stuart Allan, *Citizen Witnessing: Revisioning Journalism in Times of Crisis,* Polity Press, 2013) It is from both these scholars we take the title for this conference. The importance of social media activism was already well established by bloggers in Tunisia and Algeria then spreading to other countries in the MENA region with the case of several bloggers in Egypt receiving substantial international exposure due to their effective use of media activism. This outreach via the so called egalitarianism of cyberspace is not without problems. Apart from the obvious political crackdown of arrest and temporarily removing internet access, citizen blogging is more often established through ‘weak links’ without secure tools and platforms such as self-data privacy management. Jonathan A Obar questions what type of interface in this increasingly technocratic world would allow very large groups of monitorial citizens to raise issues for debate to the point where change is possible. Obar addresses Walter Lippmann’s (1927) concern on whether citizens can be self-governing in a participatory democracy, “What I term the fallacy of data privacy self-management, or the mis-conception that digital citizens can be self- governing in a digital universe defined by Big Data, is perpetuated by governments the world over, refusing to move beyond flawed notice and choice policy.” (Jonathan *A Obar, Big Data and The Phantom Public: Walter Lippmann and the fallacy of data privacy self-management,* 2015 , p2 Retrieved from SAGE Open Access). Of course, most users do not read the fine print of the convoluted terms of service and privacy policies and thus inertly sanctioning Big Data’s monopoly of personal data and this is another area of concern regarding the issue of transparency. The growing demand for political and corporate clarity is a manifold topic of discussion on social media. The speed with which data-processing is conducted provides the citizen blogger with almost instant access to information but it also ensures that crucial issues may become evanescent. The acuity with which we address these issues requires serious attention in order to secure increased citizen participation, to expand and reinforce the demand for greater individual security, privacy and transparency of governance. Accomplishing these would provide tangible credibility for technology’s claim of democratising the world.

#### CJ modernizes journalism. Deconstructs governmentality. Aff embrace of traditional media objectivity upholds elitism and undermines democracy. Turns case. CJ solves.

Schudson 2013 [Michael, Fellow of the American Academy; Professor of Journalism at Columbia University] “Reluctant Stewards: Journalism in a Democratic Society,” **Daedulus** <https://www.amacad.org/publication/reluctant-stewards-journalism-democratic-society/EM>

It may also be that the shift we have witnessed in recent decades away from covering government itself does more to foster features of good citizenship than a preoccupation with government. And it provides an opening for social-empathy reporting that informs us about some neighbor or group of neighbors, often suffering visibly or silently from some personal or social or political ill fortune, that we would not know about otherwise.36 Finally, it may even be that efforts to cater to the marketplace sometimes serve the public good better than efforts to fashion news as a type of pedagogy in which elites who “know best” work to educate the untutored masses. Without idealizing either the general public or the logic of the marketplace, sometimes the aggregated desires and interests of millions prove a better guide to what matters than the views of the professionals. I do not mean to argue that the press that stewards least stewards best. However, I think that the news media have grown as institutional stewards of democratic citizenship by adapting: they were once organizations of elites speaking to elites, and then became for a long time political parties speaking through the newspapers to their own troops, and then emerged in an original blend of commercial organization and professional pride. And now, when the leading institutions of professional news-gathering are buffeted by gale-force winds in every direction, and when “professionalism” itself is under scrutiny, journalism is nowhere close to a clearly articulated understanding of its plan and purpose in democracy. And that, we need to understand, may be exactly right for us. It gives play to journalism. It offers running room for new ideas and projects – woefully undercapitalized as many of them are – to find audiences, to impassion young (and older) journalists, and to teach the grand thinkers of public life that there just might be a few new things under the sun.

# Case

#### First, don’t allow AC offense weighing:

#### Your aff analysis starts from the wrong point, that’s an epistemological indict, all your offense just feeds back into bio politics.

#### The role of the ballot precludes your standard for a few reasons.

#### It question our role in debate, the consequences of the plan don’t matter if our orientation in debate is flawed.

#### Is fait is illusory, giving the aff a ballot does nothing outside of the round, the ROB function to alter our perception of thing like political engagement, we need to stop creating mindless drones of the state from debate.

#### Claim about fairness don’t matter a) they don’t spill up b) debate is innately an unfair playing field c) voting on fairness is just the sovereign exercising control over what is fair and what is not, link back into our critique.

#### My role of the ballot is a question of ontology and epistemology – your framework presupposes both epistemology and ontology in the process of making its claims about life. If I win that even ONE of those presuppositions is bad, that’s enough to consider the ROB first.

### Adv:

#### Dem value is a link – veils the sovgrein, means K proves bad value and indecently is a link

#### No climate impact – exaggerated and inevitable

Curry 17 [Judith President of Climate Forecast Applications Network (CFAN), previously Professor and Chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at the Georgia Institute of Technology, 1/29/17, “The ‘threat’ of climate change,” https://judithcurry.com/2017/01/29/the-threat-of-climate-change/]

I think that use of these words mislead the public debate on climate change — any damages from human caused climate change are not imminent, we cannot quantify the risk owing to deep uncertainties, and any conceivable policy for reducing CO2 emissions will have little impact on the hypothesized damages in the 21st century. ‘Threats’ or ‘reasons for concern’? I do not question that the possibility of adverse impacts from human caused climate change should be under consideration. However, the human caused impacts of climate change have been overhyped from the beginning — the 1992 UNFCCC treaty on avoiding dangerous human interference on the climate. This implied warming was dangerous before any work had actually been done on this. Some much needed clarification is presented in a recent article published in Nature: IPCC reasons for concern regarding climate change risks. This article provides a good overview of the current IPCC framework for considering dangerous impacts. A summary of the main concerns: The reasons for concern (RFCs) reported in AR5 are: Risks to unique and threatened systems (indicated by RFC1) Risks associated with extreme weather events (RFC2) Risks associated with the distribution of impacts (RFC3) Risks associated with global aggregate impacts (RFC4) Risks associated with large-scale singular events (RFC5) The eight overarching key risks are: Risk of death, injury, ill-health, or disrupted livelihoods in low-lying coastal zones and small island developing states and other small islands due to storm surges, coastal flooding, and sea-level rise. Risk of severe ill-health and disrupted livelihoods for large urban populations due to inland flooding in some regions. Systemic risks due to extreme weather events leading to breakdown of infrastructure networks and critical services such as electricity, water supply, and health and emergency services. Risk of mortality and morbidity during periods of extreme heat, particularly for vulnerable urban populations and those working outdoors in urban or rural areas. Risk of food insecurity and the breakdown of food systems linked to warming, drought, flooding, and precipitation variability and extremes, particularly for poorer populations in urban and rural settings. Risk of loss of rural livelihoods and income due to insufficient access to drinking and irrigation water and reduced agricultural productivity, particularly for farmers and pastoralists with minimal capital in semi-arid regions. Risk of loss of marine and coastal ecosystems, biodiversity, and the ecosystem goods, functions, and services they provide for coastal livelihoods, especially for fishing communities in the tropics and the Arctic. Risk of loss of terrestrial and inland water ecosystems, biodiversity, and the ecosystem goods, functions, and services they provide for livelihoods.” I think that qualitatively, these are the the appropriate risks to consider. Where I don’t find this analysis particularly convincing is their links of ‘undetectable’, ‘moderate’, ‘high’, ‘very high’ to specific levels of temperature increase. The confounding societal effects on all of these risks are overwhelming, IMO, and very likely to be of greater concern than actual temperature increase. Apart from (vii) and (viii) related to ecosystems, these risks relate to vulnerability of social systems. These vulnerabilities have put societies at risk for extreme weather events throughout recorded history — adding a ‘delta’ to risk from climate change does not change the fundamental underlying societal vulnerabilities to extreme weather events. The key point IMO is one that I made in a previous post Is climate change a ‘ruin’ problem? The short answer is ‘no’ — even under the most alarming projections, human caused climate change is not an existential threat on the timescale of the 21st century.

#### We turn climate – biopolicts is root cause

#### No way they solve for climate alt cause –

#### Also double bind – either can adv for policy action

### Turns:

#### Turn: Climate change.“Balance” mutes climate message. Makes people less concerned.

Rollmann 2019 [Rhea, writer, editor, and broadcaster] “THE VIEW FROM SOMEWHERE’ EXPOSES THE DANGEROUS MYTH OF ‘OBJECTIVE’ REPORTING,” **PopMatters** <https://www.popmatters.com/lewis-raven-wallace-view-somewhere-2640867119.html/EM>

In order to protect themselves from accusations of bias, journalists will frequently invent false equivalencies and fake forms of balance. One example: hunting down climate-change deniers to ‘balance out’ a report on the destructive effects of climate change. (This is but a variation on the New York Times‘ past practice of demanding stricter sentences for Black men’s purported crimes at the same time as calling for an end to lynching). The present moment is just as fraught for journalists. They’re struggling to do more honest and insightful reporting than conservative journalistic norms of ‘balance’ permit.

#### Turn: Objectivity = tool for right wing. To achieve balance, they must talk to far right. Right uses “objectivity” as bludgeon to enforce authoritarianism against the marginalized.

Rollmann 2019 [Rhea, writer, editor, and broadcaster] “THE VIEW FROM SOMEWHERE’ EXPOSES THE DANGEROUS MYTH OF ‘OBJECTIVE’ REPORTING,” **PopMatters** <https://www.popmatters.com/lewis-raven-wallace-view-somewhere-2640867119.html/EM>

Wallace’s book – [*The View from Somewhere*](https://www.press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/V/bo29172094.html)*: Undoing the Myth of Journalistic Objectivity* – is an exceptional study in the history and development of the concept of journalistic objectivity – and all the problems associated with it. ‘Objectivity’ (even defining it is a matter of contention, but it is usually assumed to have something to do with impartiality and detachment) has come to claim a central place in journalistic orthodoxy. It stands uneasily on a shaky throne. Never fully accepted by journalists – especially those who do not identify with the white, cis-men elites who defined that orthodoxy – objectivity came under increasing attack in recent years. Notions of ‘objectivity’ and ‘balance’ are wielded in ever more brazen and manipulative ways by an ever more aggressive right-wing in the United States and elsewhere.

Nowhere, perhaps, was this gatekeeping quality of ‘objectivity’ more evident than in the battles surrounding public broadcasting in the United States. ‘Objectivity’ was seized upon by right-wing and conservative activists who were determined to stop the progressive and democratizing potential of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Right-wing pundits honed ‘objectivity’ and ‘balance’ as catchphrases for their attacks on anything they didn’t like, never mind that such attacks were unfair and untrue. This highly successful right-wing practice continues today. The outcome of this was to curtail the very good journalistic work being done by public broadcasters, as they first began censoring themselves out of self-consciousness over the attacks of the right-wing. They soon found their ranks infiltrated and defunded by right-wing politicians and activists (appointed by Republican governments). “The question was not whether the documentaries were factual, or even whether the journalism was slanted in some way; it was whether the documentaries might be fodder for conservative activists to attack. This fear of angering major sponsors or politicians set up a dangerous precedent: cautions against not checking one’s facts gave way to cautions against doing anything that might be accused of ‘bias’…right-wing activists saw bias in any programming they didn’t like, especially programming that concerned Black people and gay people,” explains Wallace, in his excellent account of how this process played out.

#### Turn: Trans/Queer Identity. Objectivity in journalism is used to regulate trans and queer identity. This props up authoritarianism and racism. Leads to intersectional oppression . Undermines case.

Rollmann 2019 [Rhea, writer, editor, and broadcaster] “THE VIEW FROM SOMEWHERE’ EXPOSES THE DANGEROUS MYTH OF ‘OBJECTIVE’ REPORTING,” **PopMatters** <https://www.popmatters.com/lewis-raven-wallace-view-somewhere-2640867119.html/EM>

Trans-perspectives offer an unexpectedly important vantage from which to consider the growing challenge to objectivity in journalism, and Wallace develops a tremendously useful theoretical discussion on the subject. Early social and medical understandings of trans identity were premised on the idea that there are two binary genders: male and female. Transgenderism or transsexualism, according to this early paradigm, was about realigning the trans person’s identity from the one they were assigned at birth to the one they truly identified with. Yet all this was premised within a gender binary, which expected the individual to ultimately identify either as male or female. Today, this simplistic and reductionist gender binary is widely challenged, even though it is still often prevalent in medical and legal institutions. In the last couple of decades, it has become more common to acknowledge “a massive expansion of possibility – trans, genderqueer, gender nonconforming, nonbinary, agender, Two Spirit, and many other categories were birthed or rebirthed,” writes Wallace. “Many young trans activists today reject the medical terminology of ‘transsexual’ altogether.” All of this has important consequences for the broader consideration of subjectivity and objectivity. The corollary is that gender identity is subjective, not objective; and consequently “there is no ‘objective’ criteria for reporting on trans people.” For example, newsrooms already struggle with how to report on trans people who use pronouns or self-identifiers that run contrary to rigidly enforced styleguides (styleguides, however seemingly innocuous, are ultimately about imposing consistency, order and universalisms upon journalism’s persistently rebellious, inconsistent and disorderly subjects). But more significantly, it raises questions about authority in objective reporting – who gets to decide how to report on someone else’s identity?

“[G]ender changes, bodies change, language changes. It is a gift of being human to have power and agency over these changes. And Gessen, expert at living under a totalitarian government, observes that agency – a sense of choice – is precisely the thing that threatens autocrats and dictators,” Wallace writes. “Totalitarian regimes aim to make choice impossible,” [Gessen] write[s], arguing that autocracy is always about choicelessness: the autocrat relieves people of the need to make a choice, brings comfort to the masses by limiting their options. Choice, as they depict it, requires imagination, and imagination is the fabric of resistance.” Trans identity is about claiming desire and choice, explains Wallace — about liberating one’s self-expression, perception by others, self-identity and self-articulation. Respecting that is about society at large learning to respect people’s self-expressed desires and choices. It opens the door to a new, better and more democratically empowering form of journalism. “Journalists in the twenty-first century could use a similarly nuanced take on subjectivity and power. The journalist whose stories show what is possible threatens and undermines the concentration of power in the hands of a few. So does the transgender person, the queer person, the border-crosser. Black Lives Matter activists…When we choose to tell these stories, or ignore them, we are shaping what is possible. The same is true when we choose to refer to transgender women as women, or use nonbinary pronouns in a story, or discuss trans people on their own terms. I hope journalists can face these choices – and make them from a place of hope and principle, rat

#### Turn: Regulatory Violence. Aff upholds regulatory approaches to objectivity. Framing inside regulatory apparatuses re-creates killing machine. Combining objectivity with subjectivity fails. 1AC optimism misplaced.

Humphreys 2006 [Stephen, Sidney Sussex College, University of Cambridge] “Legalizing Lawlessness: On Giorgio Agamben’s State of Exception,” **European Journal of International Law** <https://academic.oup.com/ejil/article/17/3/677/2756274/EM>

And just as structural linguists once feared that the physical world risks becoming inaccessible per se, trapped outside a self-referential and abstract ‘prisonhouse of language’,33 so too law can shape and limit the politically possible, rendering a world without sovereign ascendancy unthinkable or unattainable. Fundamentally, Agamben worries that attempts like Schmitt’s, both past and contemporary, to legislate for anomie – that is, to encompass the non-legal within the law – amount to a denial of the existence of an extralegal reality: the existing ‘juridical order’ becomes total. The thesis is stated most clearly in the last paragraph of the book: To show law in its nonrelation to life and life in its nonrelation to law means to open a space between them for human action, which once claimed for itself the name of ‘politics’. Politics has suffered a lasting eclipse because it has been contaminated by law, seeing itself, at best, as constituent power (that is, violence that makes law), when it is not reduced to merely the power to negotiate with the law.34 As a final figure of illustration, Agamben follows the Roman relation of auctoritas (first of the Senate in ratifying the will of the people, later of the emperor) to the potestas of the magistrate. Auctoritas, which is ‘the power to suspend or reactivate the law, but is not formally in force as law’ is located in the figure of authority, and is an attribute not of law but of life itself, deriving originally from the people of the republic, later from the person of the emperor.35 It exists in a binary relationship ‘at once of exclusion and supplementation’ to potestas, the magistrate’s power to execute the law.36 Through Augustus’ auctoritas, he ‘legitimates and guarantees the whole of Roman political life’.37 Bringing the parallel forward to contemporary experience, Agamben writes: As long as the two elements [i.e. auctoritas and potestas or life and law] remain correlated yet conceptually, temporally and subjectively distinct . . . their dialectic . . . can nevertheless function in some way. But when they tend to coincide in a single person, when the state of exception, in which they are bound and blurred together, becomes the rule, then the juridico-political system transforms itself into a killing machine.38

her than hiding behind ‘objectivity.’ Standing to the side of history is impossible when we are the ones

#### Turn: Monopolies. Objectivity is a tool exploit workers in journalism. Upholds media monopolies.

Rollmann 2019 [Rhea, writer, editor, and broadcaster] “THE VIEW FROM SOMEWHERE’ EXPOSES THE DANGEROUS MYTH OF ‘OBJECTIVE’ REPORTING,” **PopMatters** <https://www.popmatters.com/lewis-raven-wallace-view-somewhere-2640867119.html/EM>

In the 20th century, socialist and labour journalists like Heywood Broun and Marvel Cooke likewise centred the pursuit of social justice in their reporting and journalism. They applied theory to practice by working to form some of the first labour unions at newspapers. Publishers and owners retaliated by seeking to retrench objectivity as an essential characteristic of journalists and argued that union members could not report objectively. The owners and bosses argued “that a union would compromise impartiality, a key part of ‘objectivity’ for journalists.” Objectivity, in other words, was more a part of corporate newspaper owners’ profit-making and union-busting toolkits, rather than an impartial virtue intrinsic to good journalism. “News outlets, grappling with questions of trust and authority in the twentieth century, sought out a new stable ground,” writes Wallace. “They adopted ‘objectivity’ first as an aspiration, but they transformed it too quickly into a bludgeon, a weapon to regulate who gets to tell stories. And as journalism professionalized, ‘objectivity’ was defined by the bosses. The people in management were usually white men who generally sought to maintain the status quo. It quickly became a tool for gatekeeping.”