## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify a democracy in which a free press ought to priortize objectivity over advocacy

#### “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “democracy” in the res – means that you have to prove the resolution true in a VACCUM, not in a particular instance

CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### Violation: they spec [india]

#### Standards:

#### [1] precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### [2] limits – the EIU says there are 75 full or flawed democracies but even that’s not an agreed upon brightline – explodes limits since there are tons of independent affs plus functionally infinite combinations, all with different advantages in different political situations. Kills neg prep and debatability since there are no DAs that apply to every aff –

#### [3] tva – just read your aff as an advantage under a whole res advocacy, solves all ur offense-

#### Fairness – a] its constitutive to debate as competitive activity that requires objective evaluation

#### Education – it’s the only portable impact to debate

#### Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

#### NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea 3] they didn’t disclose changes ss sent

#### Reject 1AR theory A] 7-6 Time skew B] NO 3NR so 2ar gets to weigh however they want C] We only have two speechs to norm over it which means debates become irresolvable and the judge is forced to intervene

## 2

#### The litmus test for ethics is certainty and non-arbitrariness – blurry guidelines for ethics allows agents to inconsistently understand morality or arbitrarily opt out which renders ethics useless since it can’t serve as a guide to action.

#### Thus, the meta-ethic is practical reason.

#### 1] Empirical Uncertainty – only intrinsic and a priori truths like 1+1=2 are certain for agents – relying on the empirics is incoherent because different agents have different interpretations of history, have access contrasting forms of information, or rely on inconsistent methods for calculation but practical reason is universal and applies to all agents

#### 2] Causal Determinism – the physical world removes culpability from the agent – one only does an action because of an antecedent cause or stimulus but isn’t a result of their will – only the a priori world assumes a rational and free agent not subject to physical side constraints.

#### 3] Infinite Regress – certainty must answer “why” because it would otherwise allow agents to infinitely question why it’s true – other frameworks allow agents to question every part of it, but questioning reason concedes its authority which proves its inescapable.

#### 4] Action Theory – any action can be broken down into an infinite number of sub-actions. Without an account of what an action is, it’s impossible to ask questions about which actions are good. Practical reason solves – the intent to follow through on a maxim unites subactions into a full actions.

#### That justifies universal laws of morality.

#### 1] Principle of Equality – there’s no distinction between practical reasoners – its incoherent to claim that 1+1=2 just for me.

#### 2] Particularism justifies treating agents differently and not valuing their moral worth – justifies any norm which fails as a guide to action.

#### Thus, the standard is *consistency with universalizable maxims* – actions are ethical insofar as willing it doesn’t infringe on the ability to will it.

#### Negate -

#### [1] Objectivity censors’ journalists’ personal views and biases- that’s non universalizable

Greven 21 Greven, Alec, "Speech and Sovereignty: A Kantian Defense of Freedom of Expression" (2021). Honors Theses. 1579.  
https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/1579 Karan

I will now outline the value of communication. The capacity to effectively communicate with others is crucial for an agent to realize their distinct ends, projects, and values. All agents need to will a world in which the value of communication is preserved in order to realize their ends. Lying and censorship are two actions that subvert the value of communication. Thus, engaging in lying and censorship is usually a hypocritical action that commits an agent to a practical contradiction. It simultaneously commits an agent to a principle that the value of communication in the world should be preserved while performing actions that subvert the value of communication. If everyone lied and censored at will then the structure of communication that the agent is practically committed to would collapse. Therefore, the liar or censor makes themselves an exception to a rule which is hypocritical and fails to respect the unity of their agency and treat others with equal moral standing.

#### [2] Journalists are required to respect those they report on, thus, advocacy journalism is required to alleviate suffering

Leshilo 18 Thabo Leshilo [A research report submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, Applied Ethics for Professionals.] “Morality and Journalists: Objectivity versus Duty of Care” 13 July 2018, Johannesburg https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10539/26530/Morality%20and%20Journalists%20(markup)\_2.pdf?sequence=1

My view is that Detached Kevin Carter used the Sudanese child as a mere means to fame and (some mini-) fortune by simply photographing her and selling her photo; he did not treat her as a human being worthy of respect when he failed to come to her aid. In another formulation of the Categorical Imperative, Kant expresses the universal imperative of duty thus: “Act as though the maxim of your action were to become, through your will, a universal law of nature” ([1785] 2005, 24). The word ‘maxim’ refers to the basis on which one acts: what informs one’s action. What, indeed, would become of the world if all of us were to refuse to help people facing great hardship the way (some) journalists claim to be entitled to do? Kant also implores us to act beneficently, and might as well have had the Detached Kevin Carter in mind when he admonishes someone in a position to help, who does not: What concern of mine is it? Let each one be as happy as heaven wills, or as he can make himself; I won’t take anything from him or even envy him; but I have no desire to contribute to his welfare or help him in time of need. (25) According to Kant, although it is possible that a maxim such as the one quoted above should be a universal law of nature “it is impossible to will that it [be] so . . . [f]or a will that brought that about would conflict with itself, since instances can often arise in which the person in question would need the love and sympathy of others, and he would have no hope of getting the help he desires, being robbed of it by this law of nature springing from his own will” (ibid.). Expanding on this, Charles Fried (2007,206) says that we are all required to recognise that human beings have certain basic rights to which they are all entitled as human beings: These rights are subject to qualification only in order to ensure equal protection of the same rights in others. In this sense the view is Kantian; it requires recognition of persons as ends, and forbids the overriding of their most fundamental interests for the purpose of maximizing the happiness or welfare of others. (ibib.) Fried goes on to say that this recognition that all humans have moral entitlements, correlates with the concept of respect – the attitude which is manifested when a person observes the constraints of the principle of morality in his dealings with another person, and thus respects the basic rights of the other. Respect is also an attitude which may be taken in part as defining the concept of a person: persons are those who are obliged to observe the constraints of the principle of morality in their dealings with each other, and thus show respect towards each other. (207) On Kant’s account, a person commands respect by virtue of being a rational being. “I maintain that man – and in general every rational being – exists as an end in himself and not merely as a means to be used by this or that at its discretion” ([1785] 2005, 28). I argue that Kant’s ‘Formula of the End in Itself’ (or ‘Principle of Humanity’) compels journalists to go the extra mile to help alleviate the suffering of those that they report on, and even take action to save their lives. When they fail to do that and instead simply report on such plight with the clinical detachment displayed by Detached Kevin Carter towards the Sudanese child, they simply use their subjects as mere means to make money and build their careers. By acting this way, journalists act unjustly and wrongfully. That is because a victim of such tragedy would ordinarily expect another human being to help to alleviate his or her suffering.

#### Interpretation: affirmative teams must not read new offense in the 1ar related to a new fw, weigh aff arguments under our fw, recontextualize aff arguments under a different fw, or turn the 1nc fw

#### 1] Phil Clash and Time Skew- anything else allows them to concede all our framework interactions and just go for 4 minutes of turns against our NC which o/w since phil is the only thing unique to LD Debate and time is the only quantifiable metric of abuse

## 3

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori’s 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means it’s constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I’ve met my burden.

#### 1] In[[3]](#footnote-3) used as a function word to indicate means, medium, or instrumentality but the rez doesn’t specify so vote neg on presumption

#### 2] a[[4]](#footnote-4) “used when expressing rates or ratios; in, to, or for each; per” but there are no numbers in the rez

#### 3] democracy[[5]](#footnote-5) The practice or principles of social equality but its logically impossible to be inside principles.

#### 4] free[[6]](#footnote-6) conveying only the broad sense; not literal, so literal objectivity is impossible, vote neg on presumption

#### 5] press[[7]](#footnote-7) Move or cause to move into a position of contact with something by exerting continuous physical force, but theres no movement in the rez

#### 6] to[[8]](#footnote-8) means “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have direction or location

#### 7] objectivity[[9]](#footnote-9) means the state or quality of being objective and fair, but news has to have one correct literature base

#### 8] over[[10]](#footnote-10) means above or higher than something else, sometimes so that one thing covers the other; above, but theres no positions in the resolution

#### 9] advocacy[[11]](#footnote-11) means the work of defending people in court, but there are no courts in the resolution.

## 4

#### CP Text – In a Democracy, a Free Press ought to prioritize Objectivity over Advocacy, except for instances of Peace Journalism.

#### The CP competes – Peace Journalism is a form of advocacy journalism since it is a form of agenda-setting and framing.

Hakorimana 20, Gratien. Exploring peace journalism practices for conflict prevention in Rwanda: The case study of Pax Press initiative. Diss. University of Rwanda, 2020. (Master's degree, bachelor's and diploma, peace studies and conflict transformation, political science and mass media studies at the University of Rwanda)//Elmer

(viii) Framing theory: it examines how journalists choose what to report on and how they report what they chose. Now, both theories, agenda-setting and framing, are critical in peace journalism because “any meaningful debate about journalism must include some efforts to set out the basis on which some forms of representation should be preferred to others”. Agenda setting and framing theories are often combined together, because they share the focus on the influence of media to the audience. This is why they are recognized as important in the Peace journalism, and other advocacy forms of journalism according to some studies (Ogenga, 2019: 68).

#### Peace Journalism severs Neutrality principles of Objectivity.

Shaw 11 Dr Ibrahim Seaga Shaw (2011) Debates in Peace Journalism, Journal of Peace Education, 8:3, 363-365, DOI: 10.1080/17400201.2011.621380 (Chairman and Information Commissioner, Right to Access Information Commission in Sierra Leone)//Elmer

Chapter 1 sets the context by discussing the more traditional criticisms of peace journalism, based on the view that it undermines some of the important standards of professional journalism – especially ‘objectivity’, which emphasises neutrality and the simple separation of facts from opinion. One of the critics, journalist David Loyn (2007), says peace journalism turns reporters into ‘players’ rather than ‘observers’ and hence renders them ‘over-critical’, which is against the tenets of objective journalism. On the other hand, Thomas Hanitzsch (2007) says it is not possible to associate objective reality with its representation because the latter is inevitably biased; hence he sees peace journalism as not critical enough. Lynch, for his part, criticises ‘objectivity’ that favors ‘event’ (drama) over ‘process’ (structure), ‘official’ over ‘unofficial’ sources, and above all ‘dualism as a template for conflict’, a win–lose kind of situation where the winner takes all. He develops this notion in chapter 2, where he explores pedagogical arguments to help students appreciate the differentiated impact of peace journalism and war journalism as patterns of media response to conflict. Chapter 3 calls for a rethinking of journalism training in countries in conflict to reflect peace journalism as a critical pedagogy, which he describes as a solution-oriented dialogue. Paolo Freire (1970/2000) calls it libertarian education, which promotes reconciliation between the teacher and the student. The author develops this critical pedagogical approach of peace journalism in chapters 4 and 5 with case studies from Indonesia, and in chapters 6 and 7 with case studies from the Philippines. Moreover, these four chapters, as well as chapter 8 (a case study from Australia), use content analysis to demonstrate the extent to which peace journalism’s evaluative criteria are used in the news media discourse. In chapters 9 and 10 the author roundly blames war journalism for the prolonged Palestinian–Israeli crisis as well as terrorism in general, while the final chapter focuses on the reflections of journalists on the reporting and mis-reporting of the 2003 US-led invasion of Iraq.

#### Peace Journalism as advocacy specifically sets up conflict resolution – particularly the Middle East.

Abouaoun 20 Elie Abouanoun 3-13-2020 "Rethinking Media’s Role in Conflict and Peace in the Middle East" <https://www.usip.org/publications/2020/03/rethinking-medias-role-conflict-and-peace-middle-east> (Director, Middle East and North Africa Programs at US Institute of Peace)//Elmer

In 2014, the world watched in disbelief, as global news networks covered the stream of gruesome and horrific beheading videos released by the so-called Islamic State. For the first time, by bringing the terror of the Islamic State directly to the devices in the palm of our hands, it felt personal and close by, rather than across the world in a mysterious land. Without question, the role of the media in peace and conflict is becoming ever more important. While terror groups like IS have been proven effective in their use of media for their sinister agendas, has the rest of the world caught up? As media technologies advance, so too must our strategies to responsibly and effectively harness their power. Sadly, in some cases in the Middle East and North Africa, media have been employed, by both regimes and terrorists, as a tool to cause harm, incite violence and fuel dangerous narratives. With conflict and seemingly unending turmoil ravaging the region today, the role of media is as important as ever in documenting and exposing citizens around the world to the realities on the ground. However, strict requirements and seemingly impossible lists of legalities and compliances imposed by authoritarian regimes result in the suppression of ideas and stories that run counter to the official narrative. This is especially true in states where the government has cracked down on publications that are critical of their policies, which they describe as “fake news.” Too often journalists are targeted for illuminating injustice at the hands of harsh regimes in the region; regimes that are finding it more and more difficult to keep the world in the dark in the modern technological era. It is not surprising then that the region suffers from a lack of access to credible and reliable information; the result of amateurs taking up journalism as part of “democratization” combined with the unfortunate reality that serious journalists are co-opted by regimes to spread disinformation that aligns with official narratives. It is also challenging to decipher fact from fiction, as competing political agendas and international interests try to direct narratives and sway public opinion in their favor. The mix of digital technology, unscrupulous politics and commercial exploitation of the new communications landscape highlights the need for a revised framework of ethics, essential for rebuilding public trust in journalism and media; a framework that reasserts that the core values of accuracy, independence and responsible reporting that have evolved over the past 150 years remain as relevant as ever. The Media’s Power to Build Peace In a recently co-hosted conference in Tunis, Tunisia, the United States Institute of Peace and Al-Hurra Television partnered to address this complex issue and discuss recommendations for how the power of the media can be better employed to promote peacebuilding initiatives and resolve conflict in the region. By enhancing cooperation and coordination among local, independent media outlets in the region to create networks for knowledge sharing, their influence and strength would be consolidated and magnified. Additionally, by educating media practitioners in the region about the critical role they can play in building peace, promoting solidarity and understanding among communities in conflict with one another, they can challenge narratives of hatred and the use of violence as legitimate means to an end. Empowering media practitioners to embrace this role is essential, and there is a great opportunity for the international community to play a role here. With ever advancing media technologies, there are countless creative ways to elevate moderate voices and promote positive chronicles of peace and conflict resolution to change harmful narratives. Looking at the long-term, the region would benefit from developing and delivering media education to communities, beginning from an early age with a focus on using such skills for peacebuilding initiatives and innovatively combatting hate speech. With ever advancing media technologies, there are countless creative ways to elevate moderate voices and promote positive chronicles of peace and conflict resolution to change harmful narratives. Finally, and most essentially, governments of the region must provide the space for peace journalism to flourish to mitigate conflict and reduce tension, embracing the positive role that peace journalism can play in bridging divides. Getting violent and paranoid regimes to provide greater space for independent voices is a major challenge, as the trend line has tended to go in the opposite direction since the so-called “Arab Spring,” toward greater control and even intelligence service dominance over the media. Certainly, media alone cannot reverse decades of deep-seated conflict and turmoil in the region, but it can in fact catalyze modest strides toward understanding, empathy and humanizing the “other.” Restless masses throughout the Middle East are deeply unhappy with the status quo, as demonstrations from Algeria to Iran have made abundantly clear. Despite massive repression and regime media manipulation, many of the old lies don’t seem to work anymore. The region is indeed hungry for truthful representations of its own history with conflict and for accurate depictions of the consequences and human toll of the violence that has devastated the region. Without it, future generations are likely to repeat it.

#### Objectivity hides “War Journalism” that creates Serial Policy Failure and Militarism.

Lynch 8, Jake. Debates in peace journalism. Sydney University Press, 2008. (Jake Lynch is Director of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Sydney, Australia and Senior Research Fellow of the School of Communication, University of Johannesburg, South Africa.)//Elmer

The enduring power of propaganda There is little doubt that the world would be greatly benefited by the spread of peace journalism. Even to posit its existence contributes to our emancipation from the grip of those deadly forms of propaganda so influential in liberal democratic societies. This propaganda remains hegemonic partly because its facade so convincingly claims for itself neutrality and objectivity, which misleadingly implies that the journalist is detached on a principled, professional basis from special interests and ideological agendas. The non-critical pedagogy of war journalism should be viewed as a perfected form of mind control that entraps almost every practicing journalist Most of these war journalists honestly believe that their 'objectivity' makes them truth-tellers, and as such, the indispensable guardians of democracy. Lynch disabuses us of such a perception by showing us persuasively that the beliefs that make war journalism appear respectable are more correctly understood as the results of thorough brainwashing that enlists the fraternity of mainstream journalists into a virtual cult. Despite the many efforts at demystification, war journalism retains its paradigmatic status. This means that those who attempt to explain its harmful social effects are immediately excluded from mainstream channels of communication no matter how strong their credentials. Noam Chomsky, Johan Galtung, Jake Lynch, and many brave others, have done their creative best to open our eyes, and give us healthier ways to conceive of political turmoil, but sadly the long journey to a future where a culture of nonviolence and human security exists has barely begun. It remains a difficult journey that is blocked at every turn by the forces of wealth and privilege in the early 210 century. These forces avoid debate, carrying on their nihilistic struggle to retain pre-eminence by sustaining a near monopoly of sources of information that facilitates the marginalization of competing views. The employers of war journalists have long ago forfeited the benefits of moral and political imagination that might lead to such constructive adjustments in the canon of objectivity due to their addictive reliance on the fixes of violence and war. Despite this marginality there are reasons for peace journalists to work harder than ever. There is gathering evidence that the war system is producing a variety of failures for even the most powerful actors. First, the technology of mass destruction is spreading around the world, and if not eliminated, is almost certain to find its way into the field of battle in the decades ahead. Secondly, the politics of resistance are demonstrating over and over on various blood soaked battlefields again that military superiority does not produce political victory. The United States should have learned this lesson from its defeat in Vietnam, and it did seem intimidated for a while, but it has regressed, presently trying to (mis)represent a disastrous failure in Iraq as victory. Thirdly, the waste of resources devoted to militarism arc watering the roots of mass resentment in many countries, as well as making impossible a series of essential, yet expensive, adjustments to the challenges of climate change. Fourthly, the remarkable transformation of security politics in Europe since the end of World War II provides a laboratory for a framework of relations among sovereign states where war options have been effectively excluded and conflicts are addressed as if nonviolence is the only alternative. If in Europe, long the crucible of war, why not elsewhere, eventually everywhere? Yet so long as war journalism shapes the way we grasp policy options, it is unlikely that any of these realities will be properly appreciated. More likely in the short run is the reinforcement of militarist modes of behaviour; as the utility of military power continues to diminish, war journalists are enlisted to disguise failures by exhibiting enthusiasm for new tactics and the promise of better and more weapons, and to summon the public to display their unified support of official war aims as an expression of patriotic virtue.

#### Middle eastern is unstable now absent the action now goes nuclear

Natasha **Turak, 2/10** [Natasha Turak, (Currently based in Dubai as Middle East digital correspondent and editor for CNBC International. Formerly global markets reporter for fDi Magazine of the Financial Times in London. Areas of focus include energy, geopolitics, foreign investment, emerging markets, security, economic development and geopolitical risk. Previously worked in Tunis, Tunisia in human rights and journalism. Fluent in English and French, intermediate Arabic (MSA and Tunisian dialect). A penchant for current events and all things MENA. Bethesda, Maryland native and Northern Michigan fanatic. Grew up as a foreign service kid living in Washington DC, Guinea, France, Russia, Scotland, Egypt, and New Zealand. Dual French and American national.)]. “Iran nuclear talks restart as critical time pressure and distrust builds.” CNBC, 2-8-2022, Accessed 3-9-2022. https://www.cnbc.com/2022/02/10/iran-nuclear-talks-restart-as-critical-time-pressure-and-distrust-builds.html // duongie

Negotiations aimed at reviving the 2015 Iran nuclear deal restarted in Vienna this week, more than ten months after they first began and weighed down by yet more uncertainty and mutual distrust. And time is of the essence. With each passing week Iran’s nuclear capabilities grow, making a return to a deal less and less likely. U.S. Special Envoy for Iran Rob Malley is in the Austrian capital for indirect talks mediated by European diplomats, since Washington and Tehran aren’t talking directly. The Biden administration believes a deal is in sight – but if nothing is reached within a few weeks, it could be too late. “Our talks with Iran have reached an urgent point,” White House spokeswoman Jen Psaki told reporters on Wednesday. “A deal that addresses the core concerns of all sides is in sight. But if it’s not reached in the coming weeks, Iran’s ongoing nuclear advances will make it impossible for us to return to the JCPOA,” she said, referring to the agreement’s formal name, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. In 2018, the administration of former President Donald Trump unilaterally ditched the deal – which had lifted economic sanctions on Iran in exchange for curbs to its nuclear program. Since then, Tehran has made significant progress in terms of its nuclear activity, increasing uranium enrichment and stockpiles far beyond the parameters of the 2015 agreement. This means it has shrunk its “breakout time,” or the amount of time it would take to be able to build a nuclear bomb. Iran’s leaders say the moves are in response to U.S. sanctions, reimposed by Trump, that have ~~crippled~~ its economy. In need of economic relief, Iran agreed to engage in six rounds of indirect talks revived by the Biden administration between April and June of 2021. But the election of hardline anti-Western cleric Ibrahim Raisi to the Iranian presidency in late June put the talks on hold until November. Since then, they have become bogged down in disagreements over previous negotiations, and no significant progress has been made on solving the remaining points of contention. And those points of contention are, so far, looking very difficult to surmount. The U.S. is demanding a reversal of Iran’s nuclear advancements, and Iran wants sanctions lifted – but both sides want the other to make the first move. And given that the Biden administration can’t guarantee a new deal will be ironclad, considering how quickly the Trump administration tore up the original one, trust is essentially nonexistent. “The biggest current obstacle is lack of trust particularly on the Iranian side,” said Ryan Bohl, a Middle East and Africa analyst at Rane Risk Intelligence. This means the Biden administration could have to make greater concessions to Iran if it wants a deal to happen. “The U.S. is accepting that it needs to go further this time to rebuild a sense of Iranian trust and moreover to accept the political realities that have come with President Raisi’s election,” Bohl told CNBC. “The hardliners were proven right by Trump’s withdrawal from the treaty, and that vindication makes it more difficult for the U.S. to convince that same group that’s now in power that a nuclear deal is worthwhile.” New ballistic missiles At the same time, Iran has been posturing and sending the message that it’s a force to be reckoned with. It revealed a new ballistic missile on Wednesday, as its top security official Ali Shamkhani said that in the U.S., “there is no coherence...to make political decisions in the direction of advancement” of the deal. “The ballistic missile unveiling I tend to think of as a relatively routine demonstration of military technology that’s fitting into their wider strategy of showcasing how much trouble they can cause if military escalations begin,” Bohl said. The talks also come after several weeks of drone and missile attacks on the United Arab Emirates by Yemen’s Houthi rebels, who are supported by Iran. The Biden administration “has essentially laid its cards on the table,” political risk firm Eurasia Group wrote in an analyst note Wednesday. “Washington is willing to accept a deal with substantially weaker nuclear constraints on Iran compared with the 2015 agreement, in terms of breakout time, and to offer Iran sanctions relief or assurances beyond the scope of JCPOA … Washington’s argument is essentially that some limits are better than none,” it said. Tehran’s uranium stockpiles have been enriched to near-weapons grade, and its increasingly advanced centrifuges mean it is reaching a point of no return that could soon render the original JCPOA’s non-proliferation benefits futile. Over the first year of Biden’s term, “Tehran built significant leverage in the form of irreversible nuclear knowledge without having to pay a price,” said Behnam Ben Taleblu, a senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies in Washington D.C. “This success will continue to tempt Iran to escalate further or get a deal more on its terms.” Importantly, there is also very little appetite in Washington for escalation with Iran, and Biden is keen to reverse a major foreign policy legacy of Trump’s by bringing back the deal. Still, continued deadlock could lead the administration to reverse course and take more aggressive measures, though it has not specified what those measures may be. “Put differently,” Ben Taleblu said, “every impression out of Vienna thus far is that Iran remains in the driver’s seat.”

## Case

### UV

#### They say aff rvis – 1] 1AR theory restarts solve like tommy did in the last round 2] putting shells in the 1ac solves 3] judges check underdeveloped positions since they will have low thresholds to vote off it

### FW

#### Off blum – 1] masacists 2] aggregation fails 3] predictions fails

#### Off pummer – 1] freezes action 2] justifies atrocities 3] induction fails

### Democracy

#### **They aff cant solve their impacts none of their evidence says objectivity and says that objectivity would be able to solve for any of the threat construction**

#### All their ils are thumped no reason why media would be able to stop modi he doesn’t care and his base would reject any objective news as fake news

#### No reason awareness is able to solve for their impacts everyone knows modi is a nationalist that’s why they like him

#### Objectivity causes free press to overcorrect and create more populism

Ayala **Panievsky, 21** [Ayala Panievsky (Growing up in Israel, my academic aspiration has always been driven by a search for a path that could lead to a feasible and concrete change within the Israeli society. I was drawn to the academia after years of experience in journalism, politics and NGOs. Before joining the Gates community, I have worked for ‘Haaretz’ newspaper, the Israeli Parliament and the aid organisation for refugees in Israel. Today I am a PhD candidate at the Sociology department at Cambridge and a research associate at ‘Molad – The Centre for the Renewal of Israeli Democracy’. Following my bachelor’s degree in The Hebrew University’s honours programme, I have graduated my master’s degree at Political Communications from Goldsmiths, University of London. My current project explores the ever-changing relationship between media and politics in contemporary democracies, and in particular, the encounter between mainstream media and political extremism in the age of social media and big data. Due to dramatic cultural shifts, both on the local and international levels, a deeper understanding of the mechanisms behind populism, extremism and social polarisation is essential. I find it imperative for academics to contribute to the debate, providing insightful ideas and practical tools for journalists, politicians and citizens. Coming from Israel, where the media, the civil society and democracy itself are increasingly under threat, I perceive this task as both intellectually and politically urgent.)]. "The Strategic Bias: How Journalists Respond to Antimedia Populism." SAGE Journals, 6-3-2021, Accessed 3-3-2022. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/19401612211022656 // duongie

The Origin of Strategic Bias: In Objectivity We Trust? Most of the Israeli journalists I interviewed declared that adhering more forcefully to traditional norms of balance and neutrality was the best way to handle the populist claims against the press. While noting that “there’s no such thing as total objectivity,” they still perceive objectivity as a paramount professional ideal, that should be prac- ticed, but perhaps as importantly, seen. “Even if I thought that we should open up to new theories about the profession, like ‘let’s report from our personal perspective’ – now is not the right time. Now we must go back to basic,” one TV journalist explained. “Journalism that is focused on bringing the facts hasn’t got the luxury of adopting trends and fashions like these. ... I find it unacceptable. Maybe I’m old-school, anachronistic, rigid.” “This is precisely the bottom line: objectivity,” said another political reporter. “There is no journalist who is 100 percent objective ... but today people think they know where each journalist stands—is it helpful? I’m not convinced.” Mostly, journalists interpreted objectivity as political balance, using the terms “balance” and “objectivity” interchangeably. They repeatedly asserted that reinforc- ing their commitment to balance was the best way to respond to Netanyahu’s claims. Recent studies indicate that American and German journalists under populist attack have also advocated for greater commitment to traditional journalistic values (Koliska and Assmann 2019; Koliska et al. 2020). However, when asked about the actual changes they integrated into their reporting due to the populist rhetoric, my interviewees revealed a strategy that clashed with their abstract claims about objectivity. The Strategic Bias: Leaning to the Right in the Name of Balance Israeli journalists attested to intentionally leaning rightwards, for the fear of confirming Netanyahu’s allegations of a left-wing media bias. This tendency conflicts with their efforts to project invigorated adherence to objectivity and balance—but also, paradox- ically, derives from them: “I’ve been a journalist for 30 years now, and always tried to be fair and balanced,” a TV hostess explained. “I’ve never even told my family whom I vote for! But now, if you’re not on the Right—you’re labelled a ‘lefty’. Journalists distance themselves from the Left, and honestly, I did too. I really didn’t want this label.” “[Netanyahu] has convinced everyone that the media is lefty, and now newspapers— including mine—try hard to prove otherwise,” said a print news editor. “We must balance any item that might be perceived as ‘lefty’,” said a radio news editor, “but radical right-wing content is just fine.” The strategic bias has not necessarily reflected journalists’ approval of Netanyahu’s media critique. In fact, even journalists who insisted that the Israeli media was balanced, or in fact biased to the Right—admitted to leaning rightwards in order to dis- tance themselves from the Left, as a strategic move aimed to preempt and refute Netanyahu’s attacks against “the lefty media.” In other words, for some journalists, leaning to the Right was not meant to correct an actual media bias, but rather to perform a “correction” for the bias which they believed their audience believed to exist, as a result of Netanyahu’s accusations. Journalists mentioned concrete implications of this coping strategy: “The media was constantly on the defence in the past few years,” said a senior print jour- nalist. “It feels like we try to prove that we’re ok. Instead of saying—‘you can attack us as much as you want, we’ll keep doing our job’—we keep apologizing and justifying our- selves. We’ve added more Right-wing hosts, for example.” “The other day we noticed that the line-up was left-leaning,” a radio host recalled. “My editor panicked, but I told him: ‘It’s fine, the next programme will be different’. I knew that if the line-up had been completely right-leaning—none of us would be worried. But I admit that I also told him: ‘perhaps we can postpone one item’. We shouldn’t fear from unbalanced line-ups. I’m trying to work on myself about this issue.” My interviewees framed their conscious efforts to lean rightwards as a means to defend journalism and its public legitimacy, naming socially accepted motivations like “preventing further media bashing” and “maintaining the public’s trust” (by proving that despite the allegations, they were not ‘lefties’ at all). It was intended to perform what journalists believed their audience would perceived as “balanced.” Journalists’ hope to escape future attacks could also be interpreted as anticipatory avoidance of pressure, where “journalists ... anticipate their critics, giving in suffi- ciently and in advance to avoid being pressured” (Gans 1979: 249). “Anticipatory avoidance” is, in fact, a form of self-censorship, a journalistic surrender, which por- trays the strategic bias in less of a noble light. Strategic bias should therefore be thought of not only as a type of bias, but also as a type of self-censorship, driven by the belief that self-censorship would help restoring the public’s faith in journalism. In the Israeli context, this political self-censorship joins the existing national security- based censorship and self-censorship (Peri 2011). The majority of interviewees dated the origins of the strategic Right-wing bias to years ranging between 2014 and 2019. They attributed its’ consolidation to Netanyahu’s antimedia rhetoric—which intensified around election campaigns and revelations regarding his corruption scandals—and its impact on his followers and the public conversation. This timeline coincides with a populist turn in Israeli politics (Levi and Agmon 2020) and with the rise in social media use, a powerful tool in Netanyahu’s toolkit. Netanyahu has always been considered a media-savvy politician and his campaigns have led the use of advanced technologies to win elections in Israel. Many interviewees mentioned his “army of trolls” on social media as an additional factor which compels them to moderate their criticism of him and his allies: “Eventually, you get scared,” said a radio news editor, “because you know that Netanyahu has an army of trolls.” “Netanyahu has many supporters, and his rhetoric incites them,” said a journalist who has often been lambasted by Netanyahu. “You know that if you say anything bad about him, you’ll automatically be flooded on Facebook: ‘you lefty ~~slut’~~, ‘go kiss Abu-Mazen’s ~~ass~~’. It affects us.” “Clearly, it’s easier for a journalist in the mainstream media to criticise the Left than the Right,” explained a reporter and commentator. “The feeling is that an army of vilifiers and harassers are waiting for you on social media, and it has a chilling effect.” While in other democratic societies the Left–Right axis is mainly determined by economic positions, in Israel, the dominant rift is the stance toward the Israeli– Palestinian conflict, with the hawkish Right advocating for the annexation of the occu- pied Palestinian territories, and the dovish Left traditionally supporting a peaceful agreement between the nations, based on the two-state solution (Talshir 2018). Netanyahu’s leader-centered populism gave rise to another fissure, which has become increasingly dominant over the past decade, between Netanyahu’s supporters and opponents. These two distinctions largely, but not entirely, overlap. When journal- ists discussed their strategic bias, they referred to both levels: distancing themselves from Left-wing stances on the Palestinian question, as well as fleeing affiliation with the “anti-Netanyahu” camp. It is difficult to distinguish journalists’ responses to Netanyahu’s attacks from their responses to other political phenomena, like the long-standing Right-wing efforts to delegitimize the Israeli Left (Levi and Agmon 2020). These efforts have created an asymmetrical political sphere, where the label “lefty” is used as a derogatory term, associated with antipatriotism and autoantisemitism. Such an environment, interview- ees attested, has made the affiliation with the Left far more damaging to their reputa- tion. Interviewees implied that the asymmetric political environment in which Netanyahu’s accusations resonated has further encouraged the strategic bias: “I prefer getting criticism from the Left, of course—they are considered traitors anyway,” admitted a TV and radio journalist. The populist attacks on the Left and the press are not unrelated, and it is no coincidence that both have accelerated during Netanyahu’s time in office. As the leader of the Israeli Right for the past decade, Netanyahu played a key role in both campaigns—against the Left and the media—with the former facilitating the latter (once the Left is labeled “trea- sonous,” all it takes to discredit journalists is linking them to the Left). Asymmetrical political spheres could thus become a facilitating condition, which pushes journalists to use intended bias as a coping strategy with hostile populism.

#### Objectivity cedes politics to the right wing

Froomkin 20. Dan Froomkin -July 31, 2020. The failed promise of “objective” political reporting. <https://presswatchers.org/2020/07/the-failed-promise-of-objective-political-reporting/> [Dan Froomkin is a trailblazer in the area of online accountability journalism with 21 years of experience building, editing and contributing to websites including the Huffington Post, The Intercept, and the Nieman Foundation's Watchdog Project. Over 12 years at the Washington Post, he served as Editor of the website and wrote its enormously popular White House Watch column, which aggregated and amplified insightful political coverage. He has taught online journalism at the Poynter Institute and the American University Graduate School of Communication]

The obvious answer is that “objectivity” has failed miserably to achieve either goal – and is more likely having the opposite effect. Informed electorate? Some four out of 10 Americans currently believe all sorts of things that aren’t remotely true, like that the Black Lives Matter protests have been mostly violent, or that voter fraud is a problem and that mail-in voting makes it worse, or — despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary — that Trump is doing a good job. Nearly three in 10 believe Covid-19 was made in a lab and that Bill Gates wants to use vaccination to implant trackable microchips in people. Immune from accusations of bias? Those misinformed voters believe these things because they heard them from Fox News or some other right-wing super-spreader of conspiracy theories, after having decided that the “mainstream press” is, like their president says, so biased that it has become “fake news” and the “enemy of the people.” And before you simply blame social media and filter bubbles – which of course are factors here – ask yourself this: Could it be that the “objective” approach to covering major political issues is simply too anodyne to convince anyone who’s on the fence? What if the mainstream, reality-based media armed its audience with facts as emphatically and effectively as Fox News arms its audience with misinformation? What if the New York Times aggressively advocated for the truth, rather than just putting it out there for the record? A large fraction of America has tuned out the elite media, treating it like so much white noise. What if the Washington Post more assertively said in its news stories: “Here’s what we believe are the facts, and why”? What if they said: “Here’s where we’re coming from”? What if they said: “Here’s our best explanation of why all this crazy stuff is happening and why you’re so screwed? And what if the mainstream media provided its audience with a true, overarching narrative in which to situate the day-to-day stories – true, evidence-based narratives as compelling as the false ones that Fox and OAN and others are selling — rather than throwing their hands up in the air and saying “you decide”? The only thing hard about this would be overcoming decades of self-censorship. Reality-based reporters know the truth: Economic stories exist within a narrative of grotesque inequality sustained by the people who benefit from it; the earth is in grave danger from climate change but fossil-fuel interests have blocked necessary action; law enforcement is only one of many institutions that devalue Black lives; and Donald Trump doesn’t fix problems, he exploits them. People hunger for compelling and explanatory narratives – that’s why they respond so strongly to people like George Conway and books like those by Mary Trump and Michael Wolff. My view is that journalism as it is currently practiced by our most elite organizations simply isn’t persuasive. It frustrates the liars enough that they’ll still try to delegitimize it – and succeed, in scary proportions. But printing the truth and the lies and letting the people decide just isn’t working. You have to shout the truth from the rooftops, and fight the lies in the streets. And although Trump and Trumpism have brought these issues to a head, the failure of objectivity is not just a Trump-era phenomenon. Most notably and fatally, the failure of the press to assertively call out the flaws in the case against Saddam Hussein – out of fear of appearing biased — quite arguably led to a devastating war. When a poll in late 2003 showed that a shocking 69 percent of Americans falsely believed Hussein had a role in the 9/11 terror attacks, newsroom leaders across the country should have launched a major reassessment of their approach to fighting misinformation. Today, with Trump openly challenging the basic mechanics of democracy, the question is upon us: When it comes down to a choice between authoritarianism and democracy, will the elite media “take sides”? Or will they be afraid of appearing biased? The alternative: “moral clarity” In a seminal tweet early this summer, during the battle over a particularly abhorrent op-ed, journalist Wesley Lowery set down a marker: Some have depicted this view as radical, demanding some sort of uniform view on all issues. But what Lowery and others (including myself) are arguing for is not moral conformity, just clarity. Government “by the people” depends on voters being exposed to different points of view — but it also requires the media to fight misinformation. So that means journalists should strive to present a variety of political arguments to their audiences. But they need to be based in reality and presented honestly. Alternately, political arguments that gain currency but are made in bad faith – particularly those that are racist, or sexist, inhumane, or anti-democratic — should be clearly identified as such. Moral clarity in news journalism isn’t partisan or polemic. Journalists shouldn’t pretend they know the answers. We should just stop pretending we don’t know what the problems are. Heck, maybe “moral clarity” just means having an occasional open discussion in diverse newsrooms about how to do the work, rather than just doing it the way it’s always been done. “What I argue for is a more deliberate process that acknowledges that there are morals and ethics at all,” Lowery told newsletter journalist Luke O’Neil in early July. “All these folks get off on saying ‘We don’t make any decisions ever. This is what it’s always been’ as a way of shielding the fact that they are constantly making decisions, and those decisions are subject to their biases.”

#### Press objectivity is lose-lose, creates notions of media hostility

Gates Cambridge 2021. Gates Cambridge. May 4, 2021. The censoring effect of populist anti-media messages. https://www.gatescambridge.org/about/news/the-censoring-effect-of-populist-anti-media-messages/

Ironically, journalists’ devotion to objectivity is used to erode the public’s trust in that very same objectivity. Ayala Panievsky Populist attacks on the press should be viewed as a form of soft censorship which uses journalistic norms regarding objectivity to undermine the media, according to a new study by a Gates Cambridge Scholar. The study, Covering populist media criticism: When journalists’ professional norms turn against them, by Ayala Panievsky, is published in the International Journal of Communication. It is based on 40 interviews with Israeli journalists who have been criticised by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu [pictured]. It outlines the ways they have responded to anti-media populism. The article reports that the majority responded to attacks with what they called “business-as-usual” and stuck more strongly to objectivity rules in order to disprove populist accusations that they were biased against Netanyahu, the right and “the people”. However, in the process they often found themselves amplifying the allegations because they felt forced to cover the anti-media rhetoric in live speeches by politicians or in emotive, simplistic comments on social media. Due to their reticence about becoming the story and their desire to maintain an objective distance, some attempted to debunk the comments indirectly while some adopted an overcautious approach, sometimes burying or censoring stories to prevent further criticism. Ayala [2018], who is doing a PhD in Sociology, says: “I suggest studying anti-media populism as a form of censorship: a discursive mechanism that uses (imagined) audiences as a lever to manipulate journalists’ professional norms against them. By framing journalists as biased “enemies”, any future negative coverage becomes an asset that “confirms” the media’s alleged hostility toward the populist and “the people”. Journalists, who fear the potential negative effects on the news audience’s trust, are then trapped in a lose-lose situation: covering anti-media populism “objectively” against their seeming interest, or covering it negatively, thereby confirming the populist accusations.” She adds: “Ironically, journalists’ devotion to objectivity is used to erode the public’s trust in that very same objectivity.” The article ends with a discussion of whether, given the current populist surge, journalists should rethink their commitment to objectivity in light of the need to defend democratic values. Ayala says: “This article joins the calls for democratically engaged journalism, which could be thought of as an evolution of the public journalism movement in that it reemphasises journalists’ commitment to actively advancing democracy as players rather than observers.”
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