# NC

## T-Objectivity

### 1NC Shell

#### 1] Interpretation – Objective Journalism is constituted of three things: factual information, impartial and unbiased viewpoints, and emotional detachment

Calcutt and Hammond 11 Andrew Calcutt and Philip Hammond, 11 [Andrew Calcutt, (Andrew Calcutt is Principal Lecturer in Journalism at the University of East London, where he leads Master courses in journalism and magazines. He is vice-chair of the London East Research Institute and editor of Proof: Reading Journalism and Society (www.proof-reading.org). Previous publications include White Noise: An A–Z of Contradictions in Cyberculture (1999) and Arrested Development: Pop Culture and the Erosion of Adulthood (1998)). Philip Hammond (Philip Hammond is Reader in Media and Communications at London South Bank University. He is the author of Media, War and Postmodernity (2007) and Framing Post-Cold War Conflicts (2007) and is co-editor, with Edward Herman, of Degraded Capability: The Media and the Kosovo Crisis (2000)).]. "Journalism Studies: A Critical Introduction." Routledge & CRC Press, 3-8-2011, Accessed 3-4-2022. https://www.routledge.com/Journalism-Studies-A-Critical-Introduction/Calcutt-Hammond/p/book/9780415554312 // duongie

Objectivity in journalism is a complex idea, used to refer to at least three distinct, though interrelated, concepts. First, it primarily entails a commitment to truthfulness: reporting factually accurate information. Second, objectivity is often thought to imply neutrality in the sense of fairness and balance: seeking to be impartial and unbiased in the process of reporting and, where there are conflicting interpretations of an event, presenting different viewpoints even-handedly. Third, objectivity is also often understood to imply neutrality in the sense of emotional detachment: a dispassionate approach that separates fact from comment and allows news audiences to make up their minds about events rather than being offered a journalist’s own response. These are interrelated in that – at least in theory – journalists are dispassionate and neutral so as not to let their own emotional responses and political allegiances get in the way of reporting truthfully.

#### Prefer –

#### a] Context – The resolution isn’t about just Research, it’s about what a Free Press should do with regards to other reporting which only our Evidence assumes – outweighs – words aren’t intrinsically defined but defined with context.

Cambridge Dictionary No Date "Free Press" <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/free-press> //Elmer

If a country has a free press, its newspapers, magazines, and television and radio stations are able to express any opinions they want, even if these criticize the government and other organizations: How can there be democratic elections without a free press?

#### b] Intent to Define – 1NC Calcutt and Hammond are making a holistic description about what Objective Journalist Ethics entail, the [1AC card] is merely defining a subsection which can’t constitute a model of Debate since it arbitrarily defines the limits of the Topic beyond Framers Intent to always favor the Aff.

#### 2] Violation – the Aff only interprets Objectivity as factual reporting which isn’t sufficient to constitute Objectivity – [that’s the 1AC Definition and CX proves].

#### If the 1AR makes a No Link or a Permutation on the CP, it proves the Violation since they don’t defend an Objective Free Press as being impartial or emotionally detached, thus not meeting their resolutional burden. At worst, view this as auto-competition for our CP’s and links for our DA’s.

#### 3] Standards:

#### a] Neg Ground – Making the Debate Facts Good/Bad is physically impossible to Negate since both Advocacy and Objective Journalists agree Lying is Bad – removing perspective, solution, and point of view Journalism, all of which are factual but disagree w/ the detached and impartial aspects of Objective Journalism destroys all Core Generics.

#### b] Topic Ed – Topic Lit Controversy isn’t Objectivity Good/Bad BUT about distinctions of Impartial Reporting and Point of View – the Topic is about tensions between Advocacy and Objectivity which ISN’T Factual Research Good/Bad – that outweighs since we only debate the Topic for one tournament.

#### 4] 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.

## Peace Journalism PIC

### 1NC Shell v1

#### 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 East Stability goes Nuclear.

Silverstein 21 “Iran-Israel tensions: The threat of nuclear disaster looms large,” Richard Silverstein [writes the Tikun Olam blog, devoted to exposing the excesses of the Israeli national security state], 23 April 2021 <https://www.middleeasteye.net/opinion/iran-israel-tensions-threat-nuclear-war-looms-large> SM

Israel had a near-miss of potentially catastrophic proportions on Thursday. As it has done hundreds of times in the past decade, the Israeli air force attacked Iranian bases inside Syria. In response, Syrian forces fired anti-aircraft missiles of a rather primitive Soviet model, one of which overflew its target and landed some 30 kilometres from Israel’s Dimona nuclear reactor. Israel said recently that it was bolstering its defences around Dimona for just such an eventuality. Although an Iranian general taunted Israel, implying that Iran had some responsibility for the attack, that doesn’t appear to be the case. But the missile landing inside Israel does show that if Iran wanted to attack Dimona, it has the capacity. And despite Israel’s best efforts, an Iranian missile could hit its target. With that, one of the worst nuclear disasters in the region’s history could unfold, including a Chernobyl-type radioactive leak that could endanger not only all of Israel, but also many of its neighbours.A US general has assured a Senate committee that the Syrians weren’t intending to attack Israel. Rather, a misguided missile meant to target an Israeli warplane overshot its target. He blamed it on “incompetence”, as if that was supposed to be somehow reassuring; rather, it only reinforces how easy it is even for a mistake to cause a nuclear disaster.Campaign of terror Certainly, if either Israel or Iran wanted to bomb each other’s nuclear facilities, they could do so successfully. An Israeli attack would probably cause less catastrophic damage, but only because Iran’s nuclear programme is not nearly as developed as Israel’s. An Iranian direct hit on Dimona would cause incalculable damage due to the plutonium reactor at the facility. Nor does this happen in a vacuum: Israel has maintained a decade-long campaign of terror attacks on Iranian military bases and nuclear scientists. Most recently, it bombed the Natanz nuclear facility, destroying the power generation source and damaging older-generation centrifuges. It also attacked an Iranian Revolutionary Guard spy ship off the Yemeni coast this month. Iran has responded in its own limited way, restrained by its need to maintain good relations with nuclear-deal signatories. For Israel, the attacks are a low-risk proposition. It defies US opposition (if there is any) with a wink and a nod, and the attacks look good on Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s résumé. To weather his corruption trial and retain public support, he needs external enemies (and internal enemies, but that’s a different story). Iran provides these in spades.Eliminating Israeli leverage The US could exert control over this scenario by eliminating Israeli leverage. If it agreed to lift sanctions in exchange for Iran’s return to low levels of uranium enrichment, as designated in the nuclear deal negotiated by the Obama administration, Israel’s rejectionist approach would become moot. The problem is that US President Joe Biden is running scared from Republican opposition to any nuclear deal with Iran. Besides, he has designated the Middle East a low priority for his administration. There is some faint hope in the US announcement that it is ready to lift a partial set of sanctions. However, the list on offer is quite limited, and will certainly not satisfy the Iranians. Such half-measures present an example of the limitations of the Biden approach. He should instead make a full-throated commitment to end this dithering once and for all. Israel is mounting a full-court press this coming week as it sends its Mossad and military intelligence chiefs, along with its army chief of staff, to Washington in an attempt to influence nuclear negotiations as they enter what may be a final stage. According to Haaretz, army chief of staff Aviv Kochavi “will also raise other issues, including Iran’s military expansion in Syria and the instability of Lebanon. Israel is concerned about the possibility that Hezbollah will try to … [foment] conflict with Israel.” The hypocrisy of Israel’s refusal to acknowledge its own massive military interventions in Lebanon, Syria, Gaza and even Iraq, while decrying Iran’s involvement in Syria, is almost breathtaking. There is next to no chance that any of this will enter into the considerations of negotiators in Vienna. Unlike Israel, they are interested in doing a nuclear deal, not engaging in wishful thinking. Combustible Middle East mix Returning to the Biden administration’s global goals, the Middle East doesn’t care about presidential priorities. It contains a combustible mix of corrupt elites and overbearing dictators who do not shirk from causing mayhem in their domains. And one of them, perhaps a desperate Israeli prime minister or an ageing ayatollah eager to preserve his honour and legacy, could inadvertently (or intentionally) set the entire region aflame. If Biden doesn’t act quickly and decisively, there is a sizeable risk that another missile from one country or the other will hit a target and cause devastation. That would mark a point of no return, like the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914, which led to World War One. The difference is that in 1914, armies fought with guns, bayonets and artillery. Today, they will fight with F-35s, ballistic missiles and possibly nuclear weapons.

# case

#### Objective journalism threatens democracy

Wijnberg 17 Rob Wijnberg, 10-7-2017, "Why objective journalism is a misleading and dangerous illusion", The Correspondent, https://thecorrespondent.com/6138/why-objective-journalism-is-a-misleading-and-dangerous-illusion/157316940-eb6c348e, (The founding editor of The Correspondent. Before founding this platform for unbreaking news, Rob served as the editor-in-chief of NRC.next, the morning edition of NRC Handelsblad, one of Netherlands' premier daily national newspapers. At the age of 27, he was the youngest editor-in-chief in Europe ever to lead a national print newspaper) //Miller

1. There’s no such thing as objectivity Marcel Gelauff says he doesn’t want his editorial team to take a position on the news. Let me be the first to say that, alas, it’s a vain hope. Describing the world with no idea of what’s good or bad, relevant or trivial, true or false is literally impossible. Behind every report, every feature, every news item, lies a worldview rooted in assumptions ontological (what’s real?), epistemological (what’s true?), methodological (how do we find out?), and moral (why does it matter?). Or, to put it in Gelauffian terms, all news comes from a position. Why doesn’t the evening newscast ever lead with crop circles made by UFOs? Because the editorial department takes the position that UFOs don’t exist. Why doesn’t the news ever lead with a delayed train between St. Petersburg and Novosibirsk? Because the editors take the position that a late Russian train doesn’t matter here. Why does the news never open with the biggest, most powerful Dutch company in the world, the oil and gas trader Vitol? Because the editors take the position that Vitol isn’t doing anything wrong. The reverse is true too: why does the news open with a Trump tweet, a bombing in Syria, a domestic policy proposal, chaos at a national transportation hub? Because the editors take the position that statements by a US president, wars in the Middle East, our own leaders’ plans, and travel snafus in our own country matter. And why does the news always call bombings by ISIS “terrorist attacks” and those by Western governments “bombardments”? Because the editors take the position that that’s what they are. Why does the news always frame the growth of the economy as something positive and not as a disaster for the climate, the environment, or the corals in the ocean? Because the editors take the position that economic growth is good. So when an editor claims not to take a position on the news, he or she is making the most basic misrepresentation possible. And it’s also the worst instruction you can give your editorial team. 2. Objectivity is a poor ideal So there’s no such thing as objectivity. But even if there were, journalists would need to steer clear of it. That’s because the word “objectivity” is usually understood in terms of its moral dimension. Journalists are expected to suspend moral judgment. They’re not supposed to say what they think. Yet this has never been an amoral business. On the contrary, journalism is moral through and through. It’s about what we as a society consider important, or should. All journalism, then, begins and ends with ideas about good and evil. The planet getting hotter isn’t news because it’s fact. The planet getting hotter is news because that’s a bad thing. Journalism is moral through and through. It begins and ends with ideas of good and evil If you order journalists to check their moral judgments at the door, one of two things will happen. Either they’ll have no clue what to report on and go home without a story, or they’ll figure it out in the only way possible: by letting others decide. In practice, that means becoming a mouthpiece for the establishment – the people with the power to decide what’s important, trivial, good, or bad. (Or, like the Dutch premier, to define what’s “normal” and what isn’t.) Objective journalism, defined as not taking a position or having an opinion, has become precisely the opposite of what it was originally intended to be. Today, it equates to unquestioningly repeating the opinions of the powerful. By leaving the position-taking to the public, we reduce our task as journalists to issuing press releases on behalf of elites. In short, we fail to fulfill our most basic duty. That brings us to the third and most urgent problem with objectivity. 3. Objectivity threatens democracy News is one of the most important sources of information in a democratic society. Today more than ever, it determines what we know, understand, and think about the world. It influences our voting behavior and how we see other people, cultures, and countries. To a large degree, it even shapes our image of ourselves. Our view of the world is increasingly fueled by half-truths, whole fairytales, and bald-faced lies issuing from the uppermost ranks of global politics, amplified by the loudest yellers in domestic politics, and spread across millions of phones, laptops, and TVs in milliseconds. Today it’s more crucial than ever that journalism stand for something. We must commit to the values that are essential to a democratic society: to a check on power, to the pursuit of truth, to providing context and perspective. When the president of the United States fabricates the number of attendees at his inauguration and then lashes out at every media organization that presents the evidence to show he’s lying, it’s not enough to report “Trump accuses media despite ample counterevidence,” as the NOS news did. Or to broadcast some even-handed variant that leaves the public in the lurch: “So-and-so reports X number of people, Trump says there were Y. And now over to Philip with the weather.” Instead, you need to clearly announce that one of the world’s most powerful politicians is demonstrably lying yet again. And you’d better figure out why. Meanwhile, you should be keeping track of his actions and not just his words. Otherwise, “not taking a position” means being not only a mouthpiece for power but a conduit for lies.