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### FWK

#### My value is human dignity, which is defined as an individual or group's sense of self-respect and self-worth, physical and psychological integrity and empowerment.

#### All values are an end to Human Dignity.

**Wood 07-(Human Dignity, Right and the Realm of Ends by Allen Wood. Stanford University. web.stanford.edu/~allenw/.../keynote2007.doc.)**

The Kantian conception of human dignity, however, goes even farther. Kant uses the word ‘dignity’ in a very precise sense. As a basic conception of value, he contrasts ‘dignity’ with ‘price’ (G 4:434). What has price has a kind of value that may be rationally sacrificed or traded away for something else having an equal or greater value. The market price of a commodity, for example, is the ratio at which it may be exchanged for other commodities whose value is deemed equal for the purposes of exchange. **Dignity,** however, **is a value that is incomparable and absolute. It cannot be measured against other values in this way, because it can never rationally be sacrificed or traded away** for anything at all, not even for something else having dignity. Though human beings come and go, the value of a human being is absolute and irreplaceable. It cannot be substituted for, even by the value of another human being. […] In a recent article, Laurie Ackermann argues that equality is an ‘attributive’ rather than a ‘predicative’ term. That is, he holds that to call people equal depends for its meaning on the implicit idea that they are equal in some particular respect – for instance, equal in human dignity. The human equality based on human dignity is not merely a formal equality, like that involved in “treating like cases alike.” Treating like cases alike under the same rules is a canon of fairness or rationality in any system. But it could apply even if people were assumed *not* to be equals. In a social order based on unequal social status, it would require that we treat two dukes in the same way, and two slaves in the same way, but that we not treat a duke as we would a count, a noble as we would a commoner, or a slave as we would a free person. Human dignity, however, requires that all people be treated as alike in dignity, however they might differ in other properties. Equality based on human dignity is also not like the equality of two bills or coins you might find in your pocket. For these are equal only in what Kant would call ‘price’**. Human dignity is equal only in the sense that as a value that is absolute, it is a value that cannot be compared or exchanged, hence a value that cannot be unequal.** The fundamental egalitarianism built into the idea of human dignity can be understood as the most direct basis of many modern political and legal conceptions and principles. These include that governmental authority ought properly to exist and be exercised only with the consent of the governed, that political power should be based on the rule of law, not the arbitrary power of individuals or groups, and that everyone falling under such as system should have the right to participate in the decisions that determine what these laws are and who should be granted the authority to enforce them. These were principles fundamentally denied under apartheid, but even in what we call ‘democratic’ constitutions no honest person can fail to see much in our existing social arrangements that fails to live up to them. […] Perhaps the easiest way go wrong here is to confuse the dignity of a human being with the value of a certain kind of state of affairs or result, namely, the human being’s existing or continuing to exist. This confusion leads some people to think that the chief, perhaps the only, meaning of human dignity is what they like to call “the sanctity of human life.” We are all the more susceptible to this confusion because that if humanity has dignity, then it is true that the existence and continuation of a human life does have great value, and is even the basis of important human rights. But this is only an inference from the fact that humanity has dignity. And it is not even the most immediate inference, or the one having the highest priority. I think **a** more immediate **conclusion from the fact that humanity is an end in itself is that human beings should never be treated in a manner that degrades or humiliates them, should not be treated as inferior in status to others, or made subject to the arbitrary will of others, or be deprived of control over their own lives, or excluded from participation in the collective life of the human society to which they belong. As regards the value of human life, there can be terrible circumstances in which people must sacrifice their lives in order to retain their human dignity. So human dignity is a value prior to that of human life**. Kant held notoriously strict views about the prohibition of suicide, and if we confuse humanity as an end in itself with the value of the preservation of human existence, we might suppose that they follow directly from the idea that humanity is an end in itself. But the most defensible Kantian position on this issue seems to me one which says that in some circumstances the choice to end one’s life is the only way to protect one’s dignity from a state of helpless and hopeless suffering and incapacitation that is degrading to humanity. Kant was aware of this position, and took it seriously, even if in the end he was too rigidly traditional to accept it (MS 6:422-424, VE 27:342-344, 369-375).

#### Thus, my value-criterion is resisting structural violence. Only the act of actively resisting systems and institutions that violate human dignity will make us aware of the issue and give us the ability to counteract it.

**Winter and Leighton 99 [Deborah DuNann Winter and Dana C. Leighton  Winter :Psychologist that specializes in Social Psych, Counseling Psych, Historical and Contemporary Issues, Peace Psychology. Leighton: PhD graduate student in the Psychology Department at the University of Arkansas. “Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century.” 1999]**

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

### C1 : Free Press

#### 1. Even if we’re not always a fan of various media outlets they function as an important role and represent the people by asking questions of those in power and examining the daily events in or communities.

Policinski

Policinski , Gene. “Opinion: There Can Be No American Democracy Without A Free Press.” Milwaukee Journal Sentinel. Web. February 13, 2022.

<https://www.jsonline.com/story/news/solutions/2021/03/16/there-can-no-americandemocracy-without-free-press/4703141001/>.

There’s a reason we need a free press, despite its faults and foibles: Democracy won’t work without it. The grand experiment in self-governance that is the United States is rooted in trust and confidence we all will work toward the greater good. But the nation’s founders had experience with a king and his expected benevolence — and what could happen when things didn’t work out. So, they provided for three branches of government to balance each other, along with periodic elections and the rights for us to assemble and seek change when we think things have gone astray. All fine, but also relatively long-term solutions. How do we know what our government is doing, how well it is operating or whether our elected officials are up to the job? Enter the only profession mentioned in the Constitution: A free press, to serve as a “watchdog on government.” A free press the government cannot control, to offer an independent, regular update on behalf of the rest of us. During this Sunshine Week (celebrating open government), let’s stop to acknowledge that many of us are dissatisfied with the free press we have. Survey after survey shows low public trust in our news outlets and in the journalists who staff them. But in those same Freedom Forum surveys about the First Amendment that began in 1997, the desire for that watchdog role remains high, often supported by a majority of people questioned. How can these two results co-exist? The answers rest in what kind of press we mean. Much of the highly visible kerfuffle on social sites today concerns national reporting, and more narrowly, the political pundits on cable TV and the tiny percentage of journalists who are the White House press corps. For most of us, today’s journalism is something different — and much more relevant to us. We see a news media bringing us the day-to-day information we need to live our lives: What local officials are saying, weather forecasts and crime, health and safety reports for our communities. The work of journalists helps us get things done. Reporters ask the questions we would ask if we could be there.Jurors in Des Moines, Iowa, last week appeared to support the role of journalists as watchdog when they acquitted reporter Andrea Sahouri, who was arrested while covering a Black Lives Matter protest despite her repeated protestations that she was a journalist. Local journalists, who are the vast majority of the 24,000-plus on the job today, live in the communities on which they report. In just the past month, they have reported on COVID-19 vaccination programs — both the successes and failures by officials we depend upon to keep us safe and fight the pandemic. Other recent stories told by big and small news operations alike will benefit hundreds of thousands, if not millions of us.

#### 2. Subjectivity leads to better reporting; consumers relate to news easier and can often bread empathy.

Dholaki 18

Dholaki , Aditi. “OPINION: Subjective Perspectives Are Vital To Effective Journalism.” Technician. May 27, 2018. Web. February 13, 2022.

<https://www.technicianonline.com/opinion/opinion-subjective-perspectives-are-vitalto-effective-journalism/article\_56944d9c-6207-11e8-bd85-7325fe7c6aee.html>.

The bigger issue I want to highlight in all of this is that, firstly, bias is everywhere, in everything. **There is no way to escape bias, or partisanship, or subjectivity of any kind**. News outlets and organizations who claim to offer the most objective news are, in essence, lying to their viewers. What’s worse, the viewers are falling for the rouse. This brings me to the second part of the bigger issue: not only is subjectivity inherent in journalism, but it is in fact necessary in order for consumers to understand and relate to the news being fed to them everywhere they go. Subjectivity leads to empathy, which is something that is often lacking in the race to be the first ones to get the scoop on breaking news. Subjectivity leads to understanding, which is vital to being informed about things going on. Subjectivity leads to thoroughness, in the way that all perspectives are accounted for, rather than just one (in the name of objectivity). At the end of the day, it does a disservice to the reporter’s veracity, the news organization’s credibility and the consumer experience when multiple subjective perspectives are sidelined in the name of objective reporting. If journalism is a vital part of a well-informed democracy, it is important to make sure that the journalism that is being produced represents the democracy it is helping to inform. Embracing the inherent subjectivity in journalism is a part of that process of information

#### 3. A free press functions as an essential watchdog for democracy.

Noris 06

Norris, Pippa. “The Role Of The Free Press In Promoting Democratization, Good Governance, And Human Development.” United Nations Development Program. 2006. Web. February 13, 2022.

<https://www.humanrightsinitiative.org/programs/ai/rti/articles/undp\_rti\_2006/annex 3\_background\_paper.pdf In their ‘watchdog’ role, the channels of the news media can function to promote >.

In their ‘watchdog’ role, the channels of the news media can function to promote government transparency, accountability, and public scrutiny of decision-makers in power, by highlighting policy failures, maladministration by public officials, corruption in the judiciary, and scandals in the corporate sector.12 Ever since Edmund Burke, the ‘fourth estate’ has traditionally been regarded as one of the classic checks and balances in the division of powers.13 Investigative journalism can open the government’s record to external scrutiny and critical evaluation, and hold authorities accountable for their actions, whether public sector institutions, non-profit organizations, or private companies. Comparative econometric studies, and historical case studies of developments within particular countries such as Taiwan, have explored evidence for the impact of the news media upon corruption. Brunetti and Weder, amongst others, found that there was less corruption in nations with a free press. The reason, they argue, is that journalist’s roles as watchdogs promote the transparency of government decision-making process, and thereby expose and hinder misuse of public office, malfeasance, and financial scandals.14 In competitive multiparty democracies, voters can use information provided by the media to hold parties and leaders to account by ‘kicking the rascals out’. By contrast, control of the news media is used to reinforce the power of autocratic regimes and to deter criticism of the government by independent journalists, though official government censorship, state ownership of the main radio and television channels, legal restrictions on freedom of expression and publication (such as stringent libel laws and restrictive official secrets acts), limited competition through oligopolies in commercial ownership, and the use of outright violence and intimidation against journalists and broadcasters.15 In Malaysia, for example, human rights observers report that the state has manipulated the media to stifle internal dissent and forced journalists employed by the international press to modify or suppress news stories unflattering to the regime. 16 Elsewhere governments in Myanmar, Sri Lanka, and Saudi Arabia, among others, commonly place serious restrictions on press freedom to criticize government rulers through official regulations, legal restrictions and state censorship.17 It remains more difficult for governments to censor online communications, but nevertheless in nations such as China and Cuba, state-controlled monopolies provide the only Internet service and thereby filter both access and content.18 Media freedom organizations demonstrate that each year dozens of media professionals are killed or injured in the course of their work. In Colombia, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Zimbabwe and Egypt, for example, many journalists, broadcasters and editors have experienced intimidation or harassment, while journalists in many parts of the world face the daily threat of personal danger from wars or imprisonment by the security services.

## Contention 2: Objectivity Doesn’t Exist

#### Even deciding what news to report is unobjective. Without subjectivity to allow news companies to decide what is real, true, and important, news outlets will have to report on absolutely every single mundane and trivial event.

**Wijnberg 17**

Wijnberg, Rob. “Why objective journalism is a misleading and dangerous illusion.” *The Correspondent*, 7 October 2017, https://thecorrespondent.com/6138/why-objective-journalism-is-a-misleading-and-dangerous-illusion/157316940-eb6c348e. Accessed 1 March 2022.

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 [*Correspondents Maurits Martijn and Tomas Vanheste have written about Vitol: “Nobody’s ever asked a question in Parliament about this Dutch oil giant” (in Dutch only).*](https://decorrespondent.nl/438/over-deze-nederlandse-oliereus-is-nog-nooit-een-kamervraag-gesteld/96941604870-00bd17df)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.

#### Journalists often report on subjective content—this means there’s no way to be objective, especially when some of the content is about things like human rights violations or discrimination. There is a clear right and wrong, and journalists shouldn’t be expected to report both sides.

**Schwartz 21**

Schwartz, Max. “True journalism can't be objective – Massachusetts Daily Collegian.” *Massachusetts Daily Collegian*, 13 April 2021, https://dailycollegian.com/2021/04/true-journalism-cant-be-objective/. Accessed 1 March 2022.

As journalists we begin our careers with different goals, some of us reporting on presidential debates, others on the frontlines of a skirmish with a reporter’s vest and taking photos of it all. What no one signs up for, however, is looking at these events from a press box, reporting on subjective coverage from an objective lens. The fundamental problem with the current state of journalism is the notion that all journalism is objective. Beginning in the 1940s and 50s journalists served more as stenographers for politicians than they did purveyors of the truth. Between Upton Sinclair’s “[The Jungle](https://www.amazon.com/Jungle-Upton-Sinclair/dp/1503331865)” and Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein’s Watergate coverage, the 20th century proved Americans could trust journalists. This sentiment still mostly stands true, which is why good journalism is an integral aspect of any democratic nation. As more diverse groups of people begin taking positions of power in large corporations, politics and educational institutions we’re beginning to see a shift in how this objective narrative is framed. What was objective 10 years ago is subjective today. Over time we will continue to scrutinize and convey these “objective issues” more ethically and fairly. What makes the label of objectivity so comical is that it’s near impossible to be objective about your coverage. There are few issues journalists report on that can be classified as objective, for instance, the weather is objective and the early details of an armed robbery. What’s not objective is how this weather will affect the readers’ moods and whether the armed robbers had bad childhoods, or the system failed them. While readers expect their favorite publications to be truthful and state the facts, there needs to be policy changes within these publications acknowledging that there are some issues where objectivity goes out the window. When we discuss the morality of abortion, LGBTQ+ rights and race relations in the United States, there is no way to report just the facts because “the facts” are someone’s quality of life and integrity. After Republican Senator Tom Cotton wrote his [opinion piece](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/03/opinion/tom-cotton-protests-military.html) for the New York Times arguing the government should deploy the military to handle protestors, he had the privilege of returning to his life as usual. He didn’t need to wash his eyes out with milk or worry that breaking the speed limit is a death wish – but some of his readers may have. While there was nothing objective about Senator Cotton’s piece – after all, it was an opinion piece – there was a subset of people who felt their voice was finally being heard and took these opinions as fact. That’s the danger in claiming objectivity; you can’t be objective about human rights.