# State R2 1N

## NC

#### I negate.

#### Starting with a definition of advocacy journalism.

Givens 20

Givens, Dana. “Opinion: When It Comes to Advocacy Journalism, the Truth Should Come Before Emotion - The Click.” *The Click News*, 14 October 2020, https://theclick.news/essay-when-it-comes-to-advocacy-journalism-the-truth-should-come-before-emotion/. Accessed 17 March 2022.

Advocacy journalists take a different kind of stance than other journalists when it comes to crafting a story. This type of writing has a different belief system attached — **it is dedicated to a certain cause, where the journalist takes a direct and intentional stance**. It’s a step above simply an opinion essay because the goal is to createa call to action, to call out injustice.

### 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—Movements

#### Advocacy journalism has a long history of strengthening movements for social justice.

**Froio 21**

Froio, Nicole. “How Journalists Are Challenging Ideas Of Objectivity While Empowering Their Communities.” Current. May 20, 2021. Web. February 12, 2022.

<https://current.org/2021/05/how-journalists-are-challenging-ideas-of-objectivitywhile-empowering-their-communities/>.

‘Neutrality is impossible for me’ The term “movement journalism” and the concept was formalized in a 2017 report by Project South, a Southern organization dedicated to cultivating strong social movements in the region. But Project South noted that a tradition of alternative media in the U.S. that seek to advance social movements goes back to at least 1827, when free African Americans in New York founded the newspaper Freedom’s Journal. Movement journalism also has roots in Hispanic movements for emancipation (the first Hispanic-owned newspaper in the U.S., El Mensagero Luisianés, was established in 1909), Indigenous struggles (The Cherokee Phoenix, the first Indigenous newspaper, debuted a year after Freedom’s Journal) and labor movements in the 1820s (labor journalism gave a platform to unions and people fighting for better working conditions). The work of investigative journalist and antilynching activist Ida B. Wells also foreshadowed the development of movement journalism. More recently, proponents of movement journalism have identified noncommercial radio as a potential seedbed for the practice. In its 2017 report, Project South pointed to low-power FM stations in the South as “a promising platform.” At the time, two Project South board members sat on the board of WRFG, a community radio station in Atlanta. The organization also had a relationship with WMXP, a low-power FM station in Greenville, N.C. Since 2016, Project South has planned a news outlet for social justice coverage that would syndicate programs to community radio. It has yet to launch that platform, but as a first step, Project South has started working with more than 50 Black-owned noncommercial radio stations in the South. The Black Radio Project gives the stations technical assistance, informational spots and public service announcements, according to Angela Oliver, Project South’s communications coordinator. PSAs have covered topics such as COVID prevention, voting rights and the need for civic engagement beyond elections. In addition, Project South is working on a database of experts to help producers in the network find diverse sources for stories. It is also organizing events to bring together DJs, artists and activists to strategize about movement building. “The idea is to create a space for them to be able to strategize and help each other — how can radio help get the message out?” Oliver said. “How can activists provide content to the radio based on whatever work they’re doing at the time?” While public media may offer a forum for movement journalism to grow, Wallace risked his job in the system to highlight the shortcomings of traditional newsgathering.

#### Journalists have an obligation to be advocates of social justice---this requires rejecting the priority of objectivity.

**Winthrop 20**

Winthrop, Zadie. “Should Journalists Rethink Objectivity?.” The Stanford Daily. August 20, 2020. Web. February 12, 2022. <https://stanforddaily.com/2020/08/20/should-journalistsrethink-objectivity-stanford-professors-weigh-in/>.

“Journalists need to be overt and candid advocates for social justice, and it’s hard to do that under the constraints of objectivity,” said Ted Glasser, communications professor at Stanford, in an interview with The Daily. The murder of George Floyd and the racial reckoning that followed have opened a conversation around journalistic objectivity. Glasser believes journalists must step away from the blanket idea of objectivity to achieve social change — but not everyone agrees with him. Many journalists are now asking: Can journalism contribute to social change while maintaining its objectivity? Objectivity became a prominent journalistic principle in the 1920s. According to the Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel’s book, “The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect,” objectivity emerged because the country’s faith in science was growing, so Americans felt journalism should also be a scientific process discerning objective truths rooted in facts and evidence. According to Matthew Pressman, journalism assistant professor at Seton Hall University, objectivity caught on after massive newspaper closures throughout the U.S. Since there were fewer papers, wrote Pressman, each one had to serve larger audiences and thus more diverse viewpoints. To stay afloat, newspapers embraced objectivity as an effort to keep a wider audience happy. But some, like political science assistant professor Hakeem Jefferson, consider objectivity in its current practice to be less focused on determining objective truths and more focused on giving equal weight to different viewpoints so the journalist appears fair.

“[Journalists] are so hell-bent on being ‘objective’ for both sides … they can’t tell the truth,” Jefferson said. Jefferson described journalists having to “pretend racial inequality isn’t normatively bad” or “Black people in this country [don’t] face a criminal justice system that’s grossly unequal” to appear objective in their reporting. Unsurprisingly, Jefferson said, **journalists fail in their duty to be truth-tellers because of their duty to be objective**. The ethical guidelines of McClatchy, a publishing company which operates 30 newspapers nationally, state employees should avoid social media actions that “could call into question” their and their organization’s objectivity. Some McClatchy journalists wanted to support Black Lives Matter on social media, but feared the action could cost them their job. To that, a McClatchy vice president tweeted, “expressing that Black lives matter is not a political statement. It is a fundamental truth. It is not a violation of social media policy to tell the world that Black lives matter.” The dilemma between “truth” and “objectivity” has brought attention to a new principle: “moral clarity.” New Yorker staff writer Masha Gessen suggests in the piece “Why Are Some Journalists Afraid of ‘Moral Clarity?’” that journalists should seek moral clarity instead of the opinion A vs. opinion B reporting that Jefferson sees as what passes for objectivity today. Gessen adopts the definition of moral clarity from Susan Neiman, the author of a book on moral clarity. According to Neiman, moral clarity arises after a writer assesses the facts and context of a particular situation, makes a moral judgment about it and includes that judgment in his or her article. With moral clarity, a journalist could make statements that, say, the criminal justice system is unfair to Black people or that racism is bad because the journalist holds that these claims are, at their root, fact-based claims — despite political polarization that could lead one to see the statements as biased. Wesley Lowery, who has served as a national correspondent for the Washington Post, has been a prominent voice in the moral clarity versus objectivity debate. Lowery wrote in a tweet, “American view-from-nowhere, “objectivity”obsessed, both-sides journalism is a failed experiment…The old way must go. We need to rebuild our industry as one that operates from a place of moral clarity.”

### C2 – Muckracking journalism

#### The US has a long history of 'muckraking' journalism which prioritizes advocacy over objectivity and makes our society better.

**Fisher 16**

Fisher, Caroline. “The Advocacy Continuum: Towards A Theory Of Advocacy In Journalism.” Journalism 17(6). 2016. Web. February 13, 2022.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1464884915582311>.

‘Muckraking’ and ‘crusading’ journalism also fall under the banner of ‘advocacy journalism’. Serrin and Serrin’s (2002) Muckraking: the journalism that changed America documented an ongoing tradition of advocacy journalism in the United States, which has led to significant social and political reforms. Judith Serrin and William Serrin (2002: xxi) argued that **the strength of muckraker journalism lay in the fact that the reporters discarded the disguise of objectivity and followed their own agendas**. Unlike ‘muckraking’, ‘alternative’ and ‘activist’ journalism is often produced outside of the mainstream media because the activists feel the mainstream media represent their issues poorly and unfairly (Atton, 2012; Forde, 2011; Wall, 2003). Based on an historical overview of alternative media, Forde (2011) said **one of the characteristics that distinguished alternative journalists from mainstream journalists was ‘belonging to the campaign or movement for which they write or broadcast’** (p. 53). However, Forde (2011) stressed that does not mean that all alternative media comes from amateur activists. On the contrary, Forde (2011) argued that alternative journalism is also produced by professionally trained reporters ‘often in the form of advocacy journalism’ (p. 54).

#### This sort of journalism rejects big media of journalism and actually provides for more change. This flows under the framing since we actually allow for concrete ways to decrease oppression, since the journalists are going to be allowed to be more connected to the movements and can provide for more empathy.

#### 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