

# 1NC---Speak Up!

## 1---Framing

**Prioritize slow violence in the everyday, specifically in the context of how we tell stories in the press---outweighs on topic specificity and subsumes traditional impact framing through threat multiplication**

**Nixon '11** (Rob, Rachel Carson Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor, pgs. 2-3) //recutAHS

Three primary concerns animate this book, chief among them my conviction that we urgently need to rethink-politically, imaginatively, and theoretically-what I call "slow violence." By slow violence I mean a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight, a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all. Violence is customarily conceived as an event or action that is immediate in time, explosive and spectacular in space, and as erupting into instant sensational visibility. We need, I believe, to engage a different kind of violence, a violence that is neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather incremental and accretive, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of temporal scales. In so doing, we also need to engage the representational, narrative, and strategic challenges posed by the relative invisibility of slow violence. Climate change, the thawing cryosphere, toxic drift, biomagnification, deforestation, the radioactive aftermaths of wars, acidifying oceans, and a host of other slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes present formidable representational obstacles that can hinder our efforts to mobilize and act decisively. The long dyings-the staggered and staggeringly discounted casualties, both human and ecological that result from war's toxic aftermaths or climate change-are underrepresented in strategic planning as well as in human memory. Had Summers advocated invading Africa with weapons of mass destruction, his proposal would have fallen under conventional definitions of violence and been perceived as a military or even an imperial invasion. Advocating invading countries with mass forms of slow-motion toxicity, however, requires rethinking our accepted assumptions of violence to include slow violence. Such a rethinking requires that we complicate conventional assumptions about violence as a highly visible act that is newsworthy because it is event focused, time bound, and body bound. We need to account for how the temporal dispersion of slow violence affects the way we perceive and respond to a variety of social afflictions-from domestic abuse to posttraumatic stress and, in particular, environmental calamities. A major challenge is representational: how to devise arresting stories, images, and symbols adequate to the pervasive but elusive violence of delayed effects. Crucially, slow violence is often not just attritional but also exponential, operating as a major threat multiplier; it can fuel long-term, proliferating conflicts in situations where the conditions for sustaining life become increasingly but gradually degraded.

**Thus the role of the ballot and standard is to center discussion of material harm to marginalized people, and the role of the judge is to vote for the debater who best actively confronts oppression. To clarify, through a policy lens this means solutions ought to center marginalized people rather than impact-justify passive benefit to them.**

## 2 – Black Advocacy

**Counterplan text: in a democracy, a free press ought not prioritize objectivity over advocacy for equity, justice, and representation for historically marginalized people. It solves:**

**We shift away from the objectivity regime’s tokenization of marginalized voices and failed representation**

**Mattar 22** Pacinthe Mattar, February 10, 2022, The Walrus. Mattar is a writer and producer in Toronto. Her work has appeared in BuzzFeed, Deutsche Welle, Reader's Digest, and Toronto Life. <https://thewalrus.ca/objectivity-is-a-privilege-afforded-to-white-journalists/#//AHS>

Under the banner of diversity, we are told to bring ourselves and our perspectives. But, if we bring too much of them, we are marked and kept back.

I once applied to a senior editorial position after taking a leadership course only to be told I needed more training. I ended up taking on this role for nine months anyway, to fill in for a maternity leave. After that stint, in a meeting with a manager in which I expressed wanting to take on more leadership opportunities, I was told that I had to bide my time. (The manager remembers discussing other job opportunities but does not recall this part of the conversation.) At this point, I'd been at the organization for ten years, eight of which were at the specific show whose senior leadership I was applying for. The writing was on the wall for me. I left the organization less than two months later.

For many of us, that kind of coded language—about needing more training, about biding our time—is proof that we will never be deemed qualified enough to lead the news that is often not made with us in mind, as audiences or as creators.

In June, Kim Wheeler, an Anishinabe/Mohawk reporter, took to Twitter to write that she had left her job at the CBC after a network manager said she would never be a senior producer at the show she worked on. A Black producer described regularly being asked to fill more senior roles, but only on a temporary basis. It was only after I left my job that someone who had been on the hiring committee for the senior editorial role told me the reason I had been turned down. The director who had decided not to run the 2017 interview from Jerusalem had also been part of the hiring committee and had expressed concerns that I was biased and therefore should not be promoted, an opinion shared by some of the other committee members. And that was that. There's no way of knowing this with absolute certainty, but I can't help but imagine how things might have been different if the hiring committee, which had been made up of predominantly white women, had had another set of eyes, experiences, and world views. The presence of someone else in that room might have challenged the notion that I was biased. "Diversity" is a word that's held up as a solution to the obvious gaps and inequities in media and other industries—in its most

generous and naive interpretation, it's supposed to encapsulate my experience, and yours, and hers, and his, and all of ours. Instead, the language of diversity

and inclusion, to us, ends up feeling like we are being invited to a table as guests, but there are

conditions to keeping our seats. Shake that table just a little bit, and you'll soon find that your invitation

has been rescinded. Many racialized journalists have had enough with the diversity talk. It's long been

clear that Black, Indigenous, and other racialized people must be at the forefront of the change in

leadership that newsrooms so desperately need—at the decision-making tables, with enough power

and security to sit in their seats comfortably, shake the tables, or flip them entirely.

ON AN UNUSUALLY HOT, still day in June, while the world was in the early stages of the reckoning that remains underway, I sat with four women, all Black journalist friends of mine, on my back patio. Many of us had been fielding "Are you okay? Thinking of you" texts, phone calls, and emails for the past week and consulting one another on how to respond, if at all. We sat outside and talked as the sun set. It had been two weeks at least since we had been furiously keeping in touch in a frantic group chat, trying to keep abreast of all the world's events and the shifting media landscape, but this was the first time I'd seen them in months, given the pandemic. We talked, ate, raged, commiserated, ranted, shared, and had tea until almost midnight. As it got dark, I brought out candles and looked at my friends' faces in the glow. Everyone was so tired, so spent, so on edge, but so happy to see one another. The furrowed brows gave way to laughter, calm, relief. We dreamt of what it would be like if we all got to work together. We dreamt, naively, about creating our own news organizations. We dreamt, perhaps more realistically, about getting to do the work we wanted to do in newsrooms that are truly reflective of the worlds we live in. It reminded me of what the Black producer whose name I agreed not to use had told me: "It feels like such a weight to just make sure that the coverage we are doing on race and racism is good. We don't have the luxury of pitching things that are just meant to bring us joy." It's true. There is so much more to us, if only there were space. There's so much more we want to talk about, so much more we want to do. But the burden is now on the Canadian media industry and its leaders to enable that work instead of questioning it.

To get out of the way so it can happen. Many of us have long been lectured to about

journalistic standards and practices: verification, balance, objectivity, and accuracy. I find it ironic. In an

industry that loves to talk to its racialized employees about accuracy when we pitch and cover

experiences that mirror ours, what's become clear is that media organizations themselves have failed

these tests of accuracy. Their very existence and makeup has long been an inaccurate reflection of the

world we live in. The accuracy problem was never ours to fix. It's time newsrooms admit that they regret the error and put real work into correcting a historical mistake.

## **Objectivity is a privilege only afforded to white journalists---minority voices are told to advocate in the name of “diversity” until it conflicts with dominant narratives**

**Mattar 22** Pacinthe Mattar, February 10, 2022, The Walrus. Mattar is a writer and producer in Toronto. Her work has appeared in BuzzFeed, Deutsche Welle, Reader's Digest, and Toronto Life. <https://thewalrus.ca/objectivity-is-a-privilege-afforded-to-white-journalists/#//AHS>

I've since faced several such roadblocks in my journalism career. Combined with the experiences of other racialized journalists, they represent a phenomenon I've come to think of as a deep crisis of credibility in Canadian media. There is the lack of trust toward the Black, Indigenous, and other racialized people whose stories we are supposed to cover as a reflection of the world we live in. Then there is the mistrust of the Black, Indigenous, and other racialized journalists who try to report on those stories. Our professionalism is questioned when we report on the communities we're from, and the spectre of advocacy follows us in a way that it does not follow many of our white colleagues. There is a reckoning underway that has spared almost no industry, sparked by an alarming succession of killings of Black people in the US: Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, and many more. The violence of those deaths, and the inescapable racism that underpinned them all, incited a tidal wave of anger and fatigue from Black people who had long been calling out the discrimination that they face in their daily lives. From academia to theatre, the beauty industry to major tech corporations, Black and other racialized employees are publicly coming forward and detailing how their organizations have perpetuated racism against them. Newsrooms in the US and Canada, for their part, have been forced to acknowledge that they have to do better: in who they hire, who they retain, who gets promoted, what they cover, and how they cover it. This moment has resurrected a question that's haunted me since I returned from Baltimore: How can the media be trusted to report on what Black and other racialized people are facing when it doesn't even believe them? IN MANY AMERICAN CITIES, the protests calling for justice following the killings of Black people like Ahmaud Arbery, George Floyd, and Breonna Taylor have been met with violent responses from police, who have tear-gassed, chased, shoved, beaten, and arrested protesters and journalists. In May, Omar Jimenez, a Black CNN reporter, was handcuffed and led away by police while the cameras rolled. Watching the recent police violence against protesters unfold reminded me of how my interview with the two men in Baltimore had ended. It was 10 p.m., meaning the city-wide curfew was now in effect, and we were standing just outside a subway station in the Penn North neighbourhood. Lonnie Moore, the young Black man who had first approached me, had just left. I was putting my recorder away when police came rushing into the block. They told Jarrod Jones and me we had to leave. We tried to enter a nearby subway station, but a police officer blocked the entrance. We tried to turn down a side street, but another officer told us we couldn't go that way either. We tried every escape we could think of, but we were boxed in. Suddenly, one officer began charging at us, his baton out, swinging, shoving Jones and cursing at him. We ran away from him as fast as we could, my bag with my recording equipment bouncing clumsily behind me. None of this made it to air. I had made the rookie mistake of turning off my radio recorder as soon as the interview ended. But I probably would not have worked it into the documentary anyway; as a journalist, you want to avoid becoming part of the story. One of the core elements of journalism is for reporters to maintain a distance from those they cover, which is meant to provide a sense of objectivity. For many white journalists, that distance is built in to their very life experiences. But, for many other journalists, there is no distance between what happened to George Floyd and what could have happened to them. Distance is a luxury. When I got back to Toronto, I told my deskmates about my time in Baltimore in hushed tones. I felt at the time that to speak of it more openly would somehow implicate me, that my story could be seen through the lens of advocacy instead of hard-and-fast reporting. I also knew you never want to end up on the wrong side of police, especially as a racialized person, and leave it up to others to decide how your actions may have justified violence against you.

## **This legitimizes and perpetuates antiblack violence---Black advocacy journalism is the only check**

**Watson 21** Collette Watson, March 8, 2021, Free Press.

<https://www.freepress.net/our-response/advocacy-organizing/stories-field/how-media-system-fuels-anti-black-racism>

Against the backdrop of Media 2070's exploration of the media system's historical harm of Black lives, Devich-Cyril laid out the stark reality of how that damage has come to a head today: “This past year has been astonishing. A lot of studies have been done about the overrepresentation of Black people as ‘super-predators’ or ‘super-athletes’.” The result is the same: an explicit belief that we are easier to kill with impunity. That we can take pain better, and we don't need the same level of health care. “These are narratives that directly lead to death.” “This isn't a question of

microaggressions, this isn't **about** implicit **bias**, **this is about coverage of the issues of the day**: the **economy, COVID, police violence, elections. All of it explicitly condones the killing of Black people.**

"There's a lot of journalists absolutely struggling to be fair, working within a biased system. But this is not about individuals. "This is about a narrative system that's composed of infrastructure, institutions, policies, people and protocols. We're talking about a narrative system that is quite murderous. "And as outlets have struggled for resources, investigative journalism has waned and punditry has risen. We've seen the emergence since the '80s of a right-wing echo system, and what it's echoing is that Black life doesn't matter." **Torres laid out a**

**compelling throughline of anti-Black harm**, from the earliest U.S. media outlets to today's multimedia landscape: "Our media system is the same as any other system in this country: It wasn't created to help Black folks, it was created to harm Black folks. **From the first continuous newspaper to the present day, the media system has worked to uphold a white-racial hierarchy.** "Its goal has always been to create a myth of Black inferiority. **Narratives are a political tool that have been weaponized to harm Black and Indigenous folks and other people of color.** "We have a narrative that Black folks are a danger to this country, and that narrative has carried on for centuries because we mainly have **white media owners.**

And now we see it in the **algorithms and how online platforms use these narratives to shape conflict** in order to synthesize traffic. **"Fortunately** throughout the history of [our] country, there have been **Black folks who [have fought] these narratives.** From the first Black newspaper, Freedom's Journal in 1827 New York, to Ida B. Wells and today's Black newspapers.

"When one of the first race commissions was formed to examine what happened in the 1919 Chicago race riot, that report talked about how white-dominated newspapers helped to incite violence that resulted in many more Black folks being harmed. "And so we go to today, we have all these right-wing networks and we have hate groups organizing online, but also we have so-called progressive media outlets as well, MSNBC or CNN, for example, where they cover race as a spectator sport. They do the same thing as social-media companies: use conflict to get more viewers. **"But you also see a lot of activists use mass media to try to keep their communities informed,**

**and they may not see themselves as journalists but they are performing acts of journalism. And more Black journalists spoke up last year than any other time in recent history, leading major newsrooms to reckon with their histories of racism."** Connecting the past to the present When we talk about anti-Black oppression, most people visualize black-and-white photos of enslaved people and civil-rights marches. Dominant media culture gives the sense that these fights took place many centuries ago, in a time completely disconnected and removed from the present age. When he was asked in 2018 about reparations for slavery, then-Sen. Majority Leader Mitch McConnell voiced a belief that many white people hold when it comes to historical harm of Black communities: "I don't think reparations for something that happened 150 years ago for whom none of us currently living are responsible is a good idea." The reality is that today's media narratives still broadly display the artifacts of that time, and use those ideas to entrench cultural beliefs that have shaped laws, policies, court decisions and so much more. Devich-Cyril reflects: "Growing up in Brooklyn in the 1980s, I remember how Trump was part of amplifying this media misrepresentation of Black youth that led to the conviction of five Black kids [the Central Park Five]. He put out a full-page newspaper ad calling for their deaths, and he could do that — because he was rich, he was white and he was a man. "I remember the language of that time: 'Crack baby. AIDS patient. Super-predator. Welfare mom.' And how all of these portrayals became part of this official story with books like The Bell Curve and others that told the story of our inferiority. "This is the '80s and the '90s. Not the '50s, the '30s and the '20s ... not the 1800s. This is just a few years ago, within my lifetime. And it's happening today."

Devich-Cyril noted that the corporate media system is not the only media system. **Much of Torres' work as a historian has involved unearthing the work of courageous freedom fighters who have used media and narrative in the fight for Black liberation.** But these fights have had to take place **against the backdrop of a highly profitable media machine that enriches white media owners while extracting Black labor and cashing in on the amplification of white supremacy.** Black truth tellers have risked their lives to inform our communities and challenge harmful narratives. **And their work is central to the larger fight for Black lives.**

Devich-Cyril discussed being raised by a mother who was a member of the Black Panther movement, and how their own **activism evolved to center on the pursuit of media justice:** "It was because of my mother that I began to understand that the media hasn't just played a primary role in structuring these narratives, but it has also historically provided the infrastructure for Black enslavement and surveillance. "In his book [News for All the People], Joe reveals with great clarity how early newspapers were used to unfold enslaved Black people. But also, in the 1950s and '60s, AT&T colluded with the police and the FBI to surveil Black activists. "AT&T continues to collaborate with the NSA today. AT&T provides direct backbone access to raw data including emails, web-browsing history, social media and other unencrypted online activity. We know the NSA uses the web of AT&T hubs for a surveillance operation codenamed Fairview. "We know this: It's been written about in reputable outlets and AT&T has admitted to it. "So, the question is not whether this media system is racist. My mother taught me that. **But she also taught me that democratizing culture is a liberation strategy.** It's a tool to our freedom and a parallel freedom structure. **"To transform the material conditions of our lives, we also have to transform the cultural conditions."** The conversation rounded out with a discussion of what brings these two longtime activists hope, even amid such challenging times. Torres mentioned the newsroom reckonings that continue to unfold nationally from The Los Angeles Times to The Kansas City Star, The Philadelphia Inquirer and beyond: "What makes me hopeful is the reckonings that are happening today. The coronavirus laid bare for journalists to see that many media don't cover those issues of structural racism. That gives me hope that we can create the change." And Devich-Cyril uplifted the hope that is inherent in the Media 2070 vision: "We need some truth, we need some reconciliation. We also need some reparations. We can reclaim the infrastructure of our culture because that will reclaim the infrastructure of our dignity, of our freedom, and of our lives and I believe that that's what this whole thing is all about."

Devich-Cyril noted that the corporate media system is not the only media system. **Much of Torres' work as a historian has involved unearthing the work of courageous freedom fighters who have used media and narrative in the fight for Black liberation.** But these fights have had to take place **against the backdrop of a highly profitable media machine that enriches white media owners while extracting Black labor and cashing in on the amplification of white supremacy.** Black truth tellers have risked their lives to inform our communities and challenge harmful narratives. **And their work is central to the larger fight for Black lives.**

Devich-Cyril discussed being raised by a mother who was a member of the Black Panther movement, and how their own **activism evolved to center on the pursuit of media justice:** "It was because of my mother that I began to understand that the media hasn't just played a primary role in structuring these narratives, but it has also historically provided the infrastructure for Black enslavement and surveillance. "In his book [News for All the People], Joe reveals with great clarity how early newspapers were used to unfold enslaved Black people. But also, in the 1950s and '60s, AT&T colluded with the police and the FBI to surveil Black activists. "AT&T continues to collaborate with the NSA today. AT&T provides direct backbone access to raw data including emails, web-browsing history, social media and other unencrypted online activity. We know the NSA uses the web of AT&T hubs for a surveillance operation codenamed Fairview. "We know this: It's been written about in reputable outlets and AT&T has admitted to it. "So, the question is not whether this media system is racist. My mother taught me that. **But she also taught me that democratizing culture is a liberation strategy.** It's a tool to our freedom and a parallel freedom structure. **"To transform the material conditions of our lives, we also have to transform the cultural conditions."** The conversation rounded out with a discussion of what brings these two longtime activists hope, even amid such challenging times. Torres mentioned the newsroom reckonings that continue to unfold nationally from The Los Angeles Times to The Kansas City Star, The Philadelphia Inquirer and beyond: "What makes me hopeful is the reckonings that are happening today. The coronavirus laid bare for journalists to see that many media don't cover those issues of structural racism. That gives me hope that we can create the change." And Devich-Cyril uplifted the hope that is inherent in the Media 2070 vision: "We need some truth, we need some reconciliation. We also need some reparations. We can reclaim the infrastructure of our culture because that will reclaim the infrastructure of our dignity, of our freedom, and of our lives and I believe that that's what this whole thing is all about."

Devich-Cyril noted that the corporate media system is not the only media system. **Much of Torres' work as a historian has involved unearthing the work of courageous freedom fighters who have used media and narrative in the fight for Black liberation.** But these fights have had to take place **against the backdrop of a highly profitable media machine that enriches white media owners while extracting Black labor and cashing in on the amplification of white supremacy.** Black truth tellers have risked their lives to inform our communities and challenge harmful narratives. **And their work is central to the larger fight for Black lives.**

### **3 – Indigenous Journalism**

#### **Mainstream reporting advances false and harmful narratives about indigenous communities---prevents material policy change and reifies power structures**

**Burrows 18** Burrows, Elizabeth. "Indigenous Media Producers' Perspectives on Objectivity, Balancing Community Responsibilities and Journalistic Obligations." *Media, Culture & Society*, vol. 40, no. 8, Nov. 2018, pp. 1117–1134, doi:10.1177/0163443718764807. //AHS

Ensuring citizens equal access to deliberative debate is an integral part of a pluralistic democracy. Public spheres are spaces (virtual and real) between government and society where information and ideas are circulated and challenged and where citizens harness the power of public opinion to influence the state (Dahlgren and Sparks, 1993; Habermas, 1989). Mainstream and alternative media are the primary communication conduits within contemporary public spheres (Dahlgren and Sparks, 1993; Forde, 2011). They should facilitate the open, inclusive and equal communication of group interests and provide venues where citizens can scrutinize 'centres of power' including government power (Bohman, 1997; Curran, 2002; Dahlgren and Sparks, 1993).

Media should provide safe spaces where marginalized groups are protected and empowered to challenge the status quo and seek redress if required (Curran, 2002). Democratic media allow citizens to 'hear or read, internalize and respond' to ideas and information, and encourage 'give and take' (Goot and Rowse, 2007: 59). Bohman (1997) defines a democratic public sphere as not a structure but a process: it is the process by which emerging collective actors appeal not to a 'phantom' public but to other citizens in ways that are consistent with the requirements of equality, non-tyranny, and publicity. (p. 196). However, while mainstream media are the primary channels delivering information to citizens, they are rarely arenas for peaceful democratic discussion. Rather, they are 'battleground[s] between contending forces' where interested or affected groups wrestle to be heard (Dahlgren and Sparks, 1993: 30). Historically, marginalized groups (including Indigenous peoples) have struggled for access to dominant public sphere debates (Eley, 1992; Fraser, 1992).

Mainstream media Indigenous affairs coverage has often been absent, stereotypical or has negatively represented issues affecting Indigenous peoples (Alia, 2010; Jakubowicz et al., 1994: 159; Meadows, 2001; Mickler, 1998). Mainstream media proprietors, editors and journalists – often from within the dominant group in society – operate within structured organizations that engage with and apply journalistic processes and practices (Weaver and Willnat, 2012). Few mainstream journalists identify as belonging to a minority group (Weaver and Willnat, 2012) or as Indigenous (Forde and Burrows, 2004). These editors and journalists from within society's most dominant group apply news values and source choices that determine what content is published and which voices are included and heard (Jakubowicz et al., 1994: 159–160). The resulting lack of diversity within mainstream media newsrooms maintains the status quo (Jakubowicz et al., 1994: 159), sets the news agenda, frames coverage of issues and inhibits challenges to hegemonic structures (Herman and Chomsky, 2008: 279).

#### **Native journalists trying to advance equity are silenced by mainstream media in the name of objectivity--- mainstream media conflates advocacy with improper bias**

**Burrows 2** Burrows, Elizabeth. "Indigenous Media Producers' Perspectives on Objectivity, Balancing Community Responsibilities and Journalistic Obligations." *Media, Culture & Society*, vol. 40, no. 8, Nov. 2018, pp. 1117–1134, doi:10.1177/0163443718764807. //AHS

Produced within these frameworks, mainstream media Indigenous affairs coverage attracts criticism. Meadows (2001) found that mainstream media's Indigenous affairs coverage 'misinterpreted', 'misquoted' and 'exaggerated' information about Indigenous people and that journalists 'lack[ed] awareness, understanding and concern' (p. 46). Similarly, it ignored issues or Indigenous perspectives or produced 'distorted, inaccurate, down-played and sensationalized, superficial and ethnocentrically slanted, even racially discriminatory and bigoted coverage' that painted Indigenous people as 'problem[s] of social governance' (Mickler, 1998: 16, 154–155). Investigating Australian Aboriginal deaths in custody, Bacon (2005) observed mainstream media 'overemphasized conflict and negative issues', lacked depth, consisted of short 100- to 300-word stories, prioritized official sources and excluded Aboriginal voices (p. 27). Furthermore, she found that mainstream media failed to cover Aboriginal deaths in custody until alternative and community media took up the mantle. Therefore, analysis of mainstream media coverage of Indigenous affairs demonstrates bias and cultural hegemony. Inadequate, misleading and inaccurate mainstream media coverage pressures Aboriginal journalists to feel they

**must correct mainstream media errors, omissions and misrepresentations and provide 'better coverage for our people'**, as former SBS Journal Rhoda Roberts points out (Roberts, in Jakubowicz et al., 1994: 160– 163). While Roberts acknowledges that Aboriginal journalists recognize the need for quality and serious news coverage of issues affecting Aboriginal communities, she suggests that covering sensitive Aboriginal stories could cause Aboriginal journalists stress (Roberts, in Jakubowicz et al., 1994: 163). **Despite Aboriginal journalists' desire to redress poor mainstream media coverage, Indigenous journalism has been denounced as biased and lacking impartiality.** Indigenous media are **accused of 'preaching to the converted'** and of being too soft (Condie, 30 August 2004, telephone interview; Cutting and ThembaNixon, 2006: 42; Graham, 16 August 2004, telephone interview). To develop greater understanding of Indigenous media producers' practices and attitudes, this article

investigates Indigenous media producers' views of objectivity and analyses their news values and source choices. Mainstream and alternative media definitions of objectivity

**Objectivity has been described as an impossible-to-achieve 'illusion and a shibboleth'** (Bell, 1998: 16). **Still, the quest for objectivity remains a cornerstone of traditional journalism and 'the cement of good journalism'** (Maras, 2013: 1). Contemporary definitions of objectivity demand that professional journalists report facts in an unemotional, valuefree manner, prioritizing both sides of political arguments (Schudson, 2001; Wien, 2005). Journalists must report news 'the way it is', apply 'good reporting methods and standards' and present alternative viewpoints in a fair, balanced and unbiased way (Ward, 2004: 19). Objective journalism 'separat[es] facts from opinion' in an 'emotionally detached' way while 'striving for fairness and balance' (Dennis and Merrill, 1984: 11). **However, journalistic practice extends beyond reporting facts and cannot be completely neutral** (Boudana, 2011; Ward, 2004). **Bias is inherent in the journalistic evaluative process and may result in the exclusion of relevant voices** (Waltz, 2005: 15). Waltz (2005) suggests that 'people with disabilities, people of colour, children, and poor people rarely influence mass-media products' (p. 26). As a consequence, mainstream news content may present audiences with a skewed or incomplete impression. In an 'increasingly complex' world, journalists must report, explain and interpret events and issues (Schudson, 2001: 164; Ward, 2004). Journalists sift through 'partisan voices' to identify what is reasonable and factual and in the 'public good'. Similarly, Koch-Baumgarten and Voltmer (2010: 217) contend contemporary journalists must canvass various perspectives and provide sufficient information for audiences to understand issues and problems. Sensationalistic or superficial news coverage risks generating public reactions that pressure decision-makers to implement hasty decisions and policy (Koch-Baumgarten and Voltmer, 2010; McCallum and Waller, 2013). In summary, contemporary 'objective' journalism should be balanced, unbiased, fair, truthful, impartial, factual and unemotional, and present various sides of any discussion. And journalists must provide audiences with sufficient information to understand issues and avoid causing moral panics through inaccurate, sensational coverage.

**Indigenous advocacy must be prioritized to decolonize narratives and break cycles of oppression. Multiple impacts---human rights, cultural genocide, biodiversity loss**

**Garcia 21** Nati Garcia, Maya Mam journalist, November 23, 2021, Cultural Survival. Decolonizing Journalism from an Indigenous

Perspective. <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/news/decolonizing-journalism-indigenous-perspective> //AHS

The responsibility of a journalist is daunting, to provide the clearest, most accurate information for decisions that impact individual lives, communities, government, and society.

**However, for Indigenous Peoples, much of the information that has been eluded since colonial contact are truths that have been hidden to protect the colonial image.** The responsibility of a journalist is to provide accurate truths for people to be able to make informed decisions, therefore, **it is critical to report the dark truths of colonial systems** and break down the hierarchy of truths. As a journalist, it is vital to reflect on the values of journalism **and decolonize one's approach to reporting.** The media influences public opinion. For too long, the public has received misleading information about Indigenous Peoples who have been portrayed in discriminatory, racist, or stereotypical lights. It is time to shift that narrative that uplifts colonial exploitation. Words are powerful and can be harmful when writing a story about Indigenous Peoples and as non-Indigenous journalists, people need to be especially cautious and conscious of word choice as well as make sure Indigenous Peoples serve as collaborators or reviewers. Accountability is important in the work of journalism and being aware not to extract and sensationalize suffering of Indigenous stories but to contextualize solutions is fundamental. Indigenous Peoples have utilized mechanisms since time immemorial to document Indigenous cultures. This sophistication of intergenerational oral transmission, the ceremonial ways in connecting with the unseen, are known today as storytelling. There is power in storytelling and speaking the truth in being a witness to the transmission of stories. It is an ancient tradition practiced by Indigenous Peoples around the world. **The GIJC offered a panel on Indigenous Investigation that featured Indigenous journalists** Tristan Ahtone (Kiowa and Mikmaw), Lorena Allam (Gamilaraay and Yuwalaray), and Trina Roache (Glooscap First Nation). **They highlighted the importance of reporting on colonial systemic issues affecting Indigenous communities and structural injustice** that impact Indigenous sovereignty around the globe. The panelists spoke from their own experiences

being Indigenous journalists from three different regions in Canada, the United States, and Australia and shared about their efforts of writing stories of Indigenous strength and resilience. Trina Roache is an award-winning video journalist who has covered stories in the unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq, Wolastoquey, and Pestomuhkati Nations, from politics to policing to land protection. Her work has earned regional and national awards from the Atlantic Journalism Awards, Amnesty International Canada, and the Canadian Association of Journalists. Roache brings a Mi'kmaq perspective and years of experience in visual storytelling. Roache spoke on the importance of providing accurate context, understanding what happened and why it is relevant today when writing a story. She emphasized the value of investigative research of archives, historical records, and church records of a colonial country, where she shared the challenges in navigating this vast resource that may not always be available to the public. A key message Roache shared was on the responsibility "to be a storyteller not a story taker," to work alongside Indigenous Peoples building relationships stating it is about writing "with us not about us." Roache spoke about Indigenous stories in Canada and residential schools, and the countless hours of digging into

archives and historical records seeking cues for uncovering valuable information to accurately inform the public and inviting the public to understand the histories of Indigenous Peoples. "Investigations for me have looked like police accountability, holding the government accountable, to win an award for human rights reporting I think is indicative of the ongoing impact of colonialism. There is a lot of work to do..." **Indigenous voices need to have weight and we need to legitimize these stories.**

**The colonial records really reveal historic and ongoing policy of assimilation and cultural genocide."** Lorena

Allam is a multiple Walkley award-winner and has been a journalist and broadcaster for over 30 years. Allam is the Indigenous Affairs Editor for The Guardian Australia. Allam spoke about the ongoing impacts of colonization sharing about the Deaths Inside Project that tracks the deaths in custody in Australia. The project began in 2018, and has collected data on the deaths of

Indigenous people in custody since 1991. Her findings were concerning as many records of deaths could not be located. She shared, **"When an Indigenous**

**person dies in custody it is up to the media to ask questions," stressing the importance of a journalist to**

**advocate for justice and telling the truth to the public, and being trauma-informed to uphold**

**accountability to colonial states.**

Tristan Ahtone is Editor-at-large at Grist and previously served as Editor-in-chief at The Texas Observer and Indigenous Affairs Editor at High Country News and is Co-founder of the Indigenous Investigative Collective. He shared three stories published by the Collective: "Anti-Indigenous Handbook," "A Broken System," a publication on how many Indigenous people have died from COVID-19 who have not been accounted for in statistics and an investigation of Tribal fraud. Ahtone states, "There is no ethical investigative reporting about Indigenous communities without an Indigenous person writing, reporting, photographing, or editing that story." History and context are vital when investigating in

Indigenous stories. Ahtone states, **"What separates Indigenous journalism from other forms is its reason for**

**existence and its place it holds outside of and often in opposition to institutions that mainstream**

**journalists are tied to."** Making Indigenous journalism **fundamentally different because it works**

**towards supporting Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination with ideas at odds against colonial**

**systems.** Ahtone mentions how it is important to understand if one is producing stories for Indigenous people or about Indigenous people. Newsrooms lack support in training

Indigenous people to write, which is a serious problem in the profession and requires the implementation of decolonization approaches. Ahtone ends with a powerful note, "you cannot report on Indigenous communities if you do not have Indigenous representation in your newsroom, to report accurately." Newspapers and newsrooms have converged Indigenous Peoples into

one heavily stereotyped box, influenced by colonial ideology that continues to resonate today and the panelist spoke to this. **Indigenous communities comprise**

**476.6 million people in 90 countries — 6.2 percent of the world's population — and are custodians of**

**80 percent of the world's biodiversity.** **At the same time,** these communities are often **under siege by**

**dominant cultures,** their **resources stolen,** and their **people subjected to discrimination and abuse.** For

this reason, it is **critical to support Indigenous leadership and voices in the field of journalism and**

**community media to amplify the resilience and self-determination of Indigenous sovereignty.** With years of

experience coordinating capacity building efforts through workshops, conferences, radio station exchanges, facilitating the development of regional networks, and supporting advocacy efforts to legalize and democratize community media, Cultural Survival elevates the experience, assets, and expertise of the communities that we partner with through our Indigenous Community Media Fund. We believe that it is crucial to listen and respond to the self-determined needs of the communities in order to provide support that is sustainable and most importantly, pertinent to the needs of the community. Indigenous youth are the future of their communities and developing youth leadership is an integral part of ensuring communities' well being. The Cultural Survival Indigenous Community Media Youth Fellowship is an opportunity to assist fellows to represent the voices of their communities and bring awareness of local issues to global conversations through their proposed projects, all the while strengthening their cultural identities and leadership. At the GUC conference, Cultural Survival supported a fellow in participating. Andrea Katherine Yate Erazo (Pijao) is from Cabildo Ambiká, Bogotá, Colombia. She is a leader interested in strengthening and supporting her own educational journey. She is part of the Abole Guipas y Guambitos Youth Council of her community. Currently, she is studying Economics at the National University of Colombia, and is part of UN-Gen, a student group that seeks to strengthen and recognize gender diversity in all its expressions at the National University of Colombia in Bogotá, as well as a member of the Women's Word Circle-MLK. Yate Erazo shares her reflections from the GUC conference: "Although journalism is not one of the areas that I am involved in personally, I found that this conference can serve as a tool for knowledge, analysis, and investigation of situations. I believe that there is something very important that unites all of us with the objective of investigating and finding the best way to use audiovisual tools. We all seek

to publicize different situations that are important to us, especially from cultural aspects as Indigenous Peoples. **"Journalism and research are fundamental**

**factors for land defense and for keeping our Indigenous cultures strong.**

These are the tools that I found most beneficial for my personal experience as an Indigenous woman, communicator of knowledge, and messenger of ancestral words to Indigenous communities. Thanks to this conference, I found the need to communicate is something that can be used in different ways. Storytelling has allowed knowledge to be passed down through generations and enabled our histories to survive. I am very

grateful for this invitation and I share my experience about this important opportunity." **There is still much work to be done, however, in**

**supporting Indigenous youth in strengthening their abilities in community media to become storytellers**

**and in creating their own content paves aspiration in shifting the narratives in colonial systems.** They educate

the public, spread awareness, and showcase the resiliency and beauty of Indigenous people. **At Cultural Survival, we continue to provide**

**fellowships to Indigenous youth such as Yate Erazo to lead the way in decolonizing and promoting**

**self-determination for their Peoples and future generations.**

## Case

**Fiat doesn't happen in the real world but meaningful discussion about morally excluded populations uniquely matters outside of this round.**

**Auto-negate: objective journalism doesn't and can't logically exist, which makes the resolution lexically false**

**Taflinger 96** Richard Taflinger, Professor of Communication, Washington State University, May 1996.

<https://public.wsu.edu/~taflinge/mythobj.html> //AHS

Granting that a sense of objective reality is not possible, how much less possible objectivity must be when reporting the news. **Journalism requires making a series of decisions**, the first and most important deciding just what is news. Derived from the word "new" it can be any information that an individual has not already received. However, in modern parlance news is a report of recent events or a matter of interest to newspaper readers or newscast listeners. This definition can be narrowed further. After all, if news is that which is of interest to newspaper readers then the comics, the horoscope and the crossword puzzle are news, a conclusion with which few would agree. Let us, for convenience, define news as a report of recent events. **The first decision to make is what is recent: today, yesterday, last week, five minutes ago, since the last news report?** Someone, in journalism usually an editor, makes this decision, and thus that person's world determines what is recent. **Then there is the necessity to determine what events constitute news: disasters, either natural or man-made, economics, politics, religion, people interacting with each other or animals or nature or . . . ; what is of interest?** Anything that happens is an event; does that make whatever happens news? **Again, someone must decide because it is impossible to relate everything that happens. However, the decision of what events are news once again depends on the decision maker's world.** Of course, the decision maker receives that power on the basis of years of experience in determining what is news. However, that merely proves the above point that experience is a basis of a person's world. **It must be obvious that the basis for the selection of events that constitute news is the subjective criteria of the selector rather than objective criteria. However, what about the reporting of the news: can that be objective? The answer is no.** A news report is a series of words describing the event. **As in selecting which events are news, someone must decide which words best describe the event.** **These decisions are based on the reporter's world as he or she examines the facts gathered and decides what words those receiving the report will best understand.** Taking an extreme example, let us assume a reporter who is "pro-life", a description that also assumes a world-view, but is generally accepted as meaning against human abortion. This reporter is to write a story on the technology of abortion. The reporter may unconsciously chose words in writing the report that reflect the pro-life stance and state, "another way to kill the baby is". The statement would merely be a given part of the reporter's world view that any abortion technique is a way to "kill the baby". A "pro-choice" (another self-conscious way to say someone who is not anti-abortion) may write the same story and use the phrase "terminate the fetus". These words do not carry the same emotional weight as "kill the baby". They are thus less likely to evoke a negative reaction in the receiver of the report. Television, using pictures in reporting the news, might allow the argument that pictures don't lie. Since people can actually see what is occurring or has occurred, the event is reported objectively. **Nonetheless, the pictures are as subjective as words. Again decisions based on a world view** are made: at the bottom the reporter or camera operator decide **where to aim the camera, at what focus, at what distance, using a close-up, a medium or long shot, and at what angle.** All are decisions that affect the content of the pictures. An example is the Iran Hostage Episode in which the mobs would sit around basically picnicking until the cameras appeared. The mob would then stand, chant and wave banners. The chants would be in English or French depending on which cameras appeared. A close-up camera shot can make ten people look like a mob; a long-shot can make thousands look like a local dispute. What shots to use are decisions made by people who depend on their world views to determine what is important, what they want to show, what is news. Added to what to say or what to show is how to say or show it. Selecting the order in which news stories appear can be an indication of their relative importance. On television whether or not there are pictures can determine importance. How much time or space devoted to a story can determine importance. Bear in mind that importance is a relative determination, and in news the determination is the province of the editor. He or she determines what is important and, on the basis of his or her world view makes the above decisions. The reporter also makes decisions in determining how to present the information in the news. However, the reporter's world view can alter the information, particularly on radio and television when the reporter is personally presenting the story. Most people are sensitive to voice tone or body language, and take them as cues how to react to words or pictures. A television reporter, by a slight smile or a slight lift of an eyebrow or a tilt of the head can alter the meaning of a word or an entire report; a radio reporter, by an ironic tone or a slight laugh under the words said can make words that would ordinarily be accepted as serious, ludicrous. **Objectivity is not a possible goal in human**

interaction, and that includes journalism. As long as human beings gather and disseminate the news, then subjectivity will be the rule, not the exception.

## **Turn: Objectivity is inaccessible to marginalized communities and perpetuates oppression---negating is an ethical priority and the only equitable way forward**

**Levi 21** Gabriel Levi, April 30, 2021 Column: Why objectivity in journalism does more harm than good to marginalized communities <https://theman eater.com/column-why-objectivity-in-journalism-does-more-harm-than-good-to-marginalized-communities/> //AHS

The education system holding people of color back from top-grade education means many people who look like me will never have the opportunity to study and learn how to use objectivity. Therefore, objectivity as a whole becomes inaccessible and racially biased towards white people. So, I must ask, why uphold a standard set by men who didn't even want to see people like me in this field? The answer is: we shouldn't. In this modern society, the lines between the oppressor and the oppressed are clearer than ever. Simply put, in most situations, there is a right and a wrong, and sometimes not making a choice is choosing the wrong side. By upholding objectivity, journalists tend to side with the oppressor rather than the oppressed, which goes against everything a journalist should be. A journalist should not be a stenographer who presents both sides of an issue 'fairly,' when common sense tells us it's not a fair issue. A journalist should be an active voice for the people, using their voice to side with the people being harmed at all times. To clarify, I am not saying to lose the reporting aspect of our jobs. We should always seek to inform. However, sometimes siding with the people is as simple as word choice. In an extreme example, last summer I watched in horror on social media as Derek Chauvin forced his knee on George Floyd's neck for almost nine minutes. Through video evidence, I saw a murder happen right before my eyes. Instead of news outlets supporting Black people during that traumatic experience by at least calling it murder by name, news outlets went for less biased words like "incident" or "alleged" when I saw it right in front of my face. That was a big slap in the face because news outlets were telling my community that what we saw was a lie. We didn't see a murder, we saw an 'incident,' and that only made a cruel summer even worse. The second issue with objectivity is the sense of privilege it accompanies. For people of color and marginalized communities, we don't get to strip ourselves of these identities for the news. No matter if the story runs, at the end of the day, I am still a Black, queer person living in America who faces the threats reported during the news in my daily life. To be objective about that is to have the privilege to say, 'I can take a step back from this' when others do not have that luxury. So when journalists preach objectivity, they need to check their privilege, because some of us can't be objective when our wellbeing is at stake. On the other side of the argument, some journalists argue that without objectivity, there is no difference between a journalist and a common person, because journalism loses its standards. I don't think there should be a difference. The only difference between a journalist and a common person is a couple journalism classes and a platform. To even assume there is a difference makes journalism pretentious, and once again inhibits us from doing our primary jobs: representing the people. Doing away with objectivity puts journalists and average citizens on a level playing field, which is more important than upholding outdated journalism standards. When it comes to objectivity, journalists need to decide what side of history they want to be on. In 20 years, when history books recount the events of the past few years, I can sleep peacefully knowing I stood with my people against all odds. For those who so vehemently uphold objectivity, can you say the same?

## **Objective reporting props up western white patriarchy---advocacy journalism is key to ensure marginalized voices aren't silenced**

**Gunderson 20** Erica Gunderson, November 21, 2020, WTTW Latino Voices. <https://news.wttw.com/2020/11/21/how-advocacy-journalism-can-help-communities> //AHS

Jackie Serrato, editor-in-chief of South Side Weekly, says that from her publication's perspective, advocacy journalism is simply journalism – and in practice, that means all sources and authorities are subject to fact-checking. "We don't take police statements at face value, or really, any information that is coming from a figure of

authority. We make sure that we always have the community perspective and the input of disenfranchised communities that make up part of our readership,” said Serrato. But, Serrato says, objectivity in reporting is a false ideal. “At South Side Weekly, we’ve gotten rid of the notion of objectivity, which we understand as it being primarily White, male and Western perspective,” she said. “There’s nothing wrong with that point of view, but it’s not a point of view that we place on a pedestal or that we model ourselves after. We are focused on the South Side of Chicago, which is made up of Black and Brown residents, immigrants and other working-class folks, and so we keep our readership in mind when we are writing these stories. We’re not keeping shareholders or sponsors or other interests in mind.”

Injustice Watch reporter Carlos Ballesteros says that for him, dispensing with ideas of a just and equitable society is necessary to accurate and fully realized reporting. “I think it’s silly to pretend that the world we live in is equally good to all people,” Ballesteros said. “I think that it is a fact that Black people, immigrants, working-class people, women, queer folk are all subject to pretend otherwise is silly and inaccurate. Knowing that these things are true informs our reporting. It informs what we should want to cover and how we want to cover it, and what voices we want to include in those stories.”

Agrelo points to Injustice Watch’s judicial voting guide as an example of a publication providing information that is otherwise difficult or inconvenient for readers to obtain to serve a public good. “I think Injustice Watch’s judges guide is a perfect example ... of giving the electorate what they need,” Agrelo said. On the subject of the judicial voting guide, Ballesteros says that the guide is intended to be nonpartisan, but it does include the information they believe is relevant to voters. “We did decide to highlight certain aspects of judges and their careers and some of the controversies that have arisen from their careers,” Ballesteros said. “I think our interest was to give the electorate all the information that we could so that people could make as informed a

decision as they possibly could.” Serrato says that the journalists whose work appears in South Side Weekly bring their lived experience to their reporting, which gives a robust breadth of understanding about the issues that her readership faces. “We value the point of view and the lived experiences of everyone in our beat, and those lived experiences matter. One thing is to write about an issue, but to write about and live through that issue, I think is extra powerful,” Serrato said.