#### **First is definitions**

#### 

#### **Objectivity in journalism is fact-based, non-subjective reporting**

#### **McLaughlin 16** [Greg McLaughlin, senior lecturer in media and journalism at the University of Ulster, 2016, “Journalism, Objectivity and War,” The War Correspondent, https://sci-hub.se/https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19qgf0x.7]/Kankee

#### objectivity under fire Objectivity in journalism has come under serious critique from academics (Glasgow University Media Group, 1976; Lichtenberg, 1996; Streckfuss, 1990; Parenti, 1993). They suggest in various ways that the news media do not simply report and reflect our social world but that they more or less play an active part in shaping, even constructing it; that they represent sectional interests rather than society as a whole.2 When these criticisms are leveled at journalists, their traditional defence is their practice of objectivity but what does it mean to be objective in journalism in the first place? According to Michael Schudson (1978), **objectivity** is based on the assumption that a series of ‘**facts**’ or truth claims about the world **can be validated by the rules and procedures of a professional community**. The **distortions** and **biases**, the subjective value judgements of the individual or of particular interest groups, are **filtered out** so that among journalists at any rate, ‘The belief in objectivity is a **faith in** “**facts**”, a **distrust** of “**values**”, and a **commitment** to their **segregation’** (p. 6). Gaye Tuchman refers to this method as ‘a **strategic** **ritual’**, a method of newsgathering and reporting that protects the journalist from charges of bias or libel (1972, p. 661ff). Radical critiques measure journalistic claims to objectivity against analyses of how the news media produce and represent their version of reality according to sectional interests. Bias is not in the eye of the beholder but is structured within the entire news process; the news filters and constructs reality according to a dominant or institutional ideology (Glasgow University Media Group, 1976). ‘What passes for objectivity’, for American scholar Michael Parenti, ‘is the acceptance of a social reality shaped by the dominant forces of society – without any critical examination of that reality’s hidden agendas, its class interests, and

#### 

#### **A free press is the freedom of expression in media without limitations by others**

**Liberties.EU 21** [Civil Liberties Union for Europe, rights advocacy organization in Europe, 11-9-2021, "Free press: definition and role in democracy," Liberties.eu, https://www.liberties.eu/en/stories/free-press/43809]/Kankee

What is free press? When we say a country has a **free press**, we mean that its news outlets and other publications, **even individual citizens**, have the right to communicate information **without influence** or **fear of retribution** from the state or other powerful entities or individuals. We often use the term “free press” and “independent journalism,” a subject we previously explored, more or less interchangeably. In modern history, a shared understanding of the principle of a free press was outlined by the **U**nited **N**ations in 1948. Article 19 of the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** codifies it along with the right free speech: “**Everyone** has the right to **freedom of** opinion and **expression**; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference, and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media **regardless of frontiers**.” Today, most democracies have some protection for a free press, whether this protection comes from a constitution or individual law. In Europe, a free press is protected under Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, and under Article 11 of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. What is the purpose of a free press? The purpose of a free press is to ensure that the people are free to receive and impart information that is not manipulated or serving a particular person, entity or interest. Its duty, in fact, is often to investigate people of power, and especially the government, to ask the hard questions and to attempt to uncover what’s really happening, **regardless of** the **political fallout**. Why is freedom of the press so important?

#### **The standard is resisting structural violence. Only actively resisting systems and institutions that 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.

**Democratic Relevance-** For a society to truly uphold values of democracy, it needs to recognize every member within it equally. In order to uphold the resolution, Structural violence must be taken into account.

1. **first, If advocacy media hurts democracies and/or the freedom of the press, you vote against it as a resolution burden**

**textuality - the text of the resolution is a question of moral actions in a democracy. This means the round has to be about what actions lead to a better democracy, not other arbitrary frameworks, no matter how good they are. Prefer this for 3 reasons:**

**a) jurisdiction - the judge is bound by the resolution, even if you agree that they are winning that their framework is better, that doesn’t matter if they aren’t winning that it’s better within the context of a democracy.**

**b) ground - the resolution is a fixed point that gives a common ground for debaters to debate on. Allowing any sort of framework that ignores the specific wording of the resolution makes it harder for debaters to prepare well-reasoned responses to common frameworks.**

**c) resolutional burden - The NC has the burden to negate the specific resolution and not just cherry-picked words from it. They have to prove why under the pretenses of an ethical code governed from democracy, that the resolution is bad. If their framework isn’t relevant to democracy, I can concede all their offense and still win the debate because they don’t negate the specific resolution.**

**Thus i affirm resolved: in a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy**

**The first contention is democratic stability**

**Advocacy promotes media bias and government controlled media censors objective reporting to favor their own narratives - kills FOTP**

**Mohan 21’**

Jahani Mohan june 28, 2021 “Media Bias and Democracy in India”

<https://www.stimson.org/2021/media-bias-and-democracy-in-india/>

**As the COVID-19 pandemic rages out of contro**l **in India,** many are rightly focusing on the content of stories on the death toll and months of lockdown. **The lack of journalistic integrity** behind some of the stories deepens this grim situation. In April, [reports emerged](https://www.medianama.com/2021/04/223-twitter-mp-minister-censor/) that, **at the request of the Indian government, Twitter censored 52 tweets criticizing the government’s handling of the pandemic. Meanwhile, pro-government TV channels** [**blamed**](https://www.dw.com/en/covid-why-is-india-censoring-media-during-public-health-crisis/a-57353096) **the farmers’ protests for limited oxygen supplies for COVID-19** patients, though supplies were [actually scarce](https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2021/05/05/989461528/why-is-india-running-out-of-oxygen) due to poor public health infrastructure. **This** reporting **is not only misleading and traumatic** to those affected by the pandemic, **but also poses a major threat to India’s vibrant democracy.** Even before the pandemic, media bias in India existed across the largest newspapers throughout the country, and political forces shape this bias. For example, funds from **the** government are critical to many newspapers’ operations and budgets, and the current **Bhartiya Janata Party** **(BJP) government has previously** [**refused to advertise**](https://www.reuters.com/article/india-media-idINKCN1TT1R6) **with newspapers that do not support its initiatives. This pressure leads media to endorse government policies, creating unbalanced reporting where media bias can affect political behavior in favor of the incumbent.** Many media outlets enjoy a symbiotic relationship with the government, in turn receiving attention, funding, and prominence. **These trends damage India’s democracy and also put journalists critical of the government in danger, threatening their right to physical safety**.Funds from the government are critical to many newspapers’ operations and budgets, and the current Bhartiya Janata Party (BJP) government has previously refused to advertise with newspapers that do not support its initiatives.

**AND Non-objective media and false narratives threaten indian democracy**

**Deo 20’**

Priyanka Deo, march 18, 2020 “Biased Mainstream Media Carries Grave Consequences for Indian Democracy” <https://www.news18.com/news/opinion/biased-mainstream-media-carries-grave-consequences-for-indian-democracy-2541333.html>

majority of people in multiple countries distrust the media. They are justified in doing so. In India, especially, the media is ‘biased’ on multiple counts, not just in political leaning, but going so far as to partially report or misreport big and small news. **As a result, a false narrative is published and consumed by millions.** And **this seriously threatens Indian democracy**. **Partial reporting and misinformation was evident with the coverage of the recent Delhi Riots.** Untruthful narratives were not just seen in Indian media outlets but unfortunately also in major international mainstream media. Exactly how have these platforms sold an incorrect narrative? **All have either distorted, outright lied, misquoted and/or even gone so far as cropped images.** What’s more, in India these days, it seems that it is acceptable that mainstream media ridicules global pandemics and insults national leaders. Take, for instance, a recent article on the nomination of the Chief Justice of India to the Rajya Sabha. ‘Kovind, not Covid, did it,’ read the title on the front page. It was not the article but the headline that sent tremors of anger among citizens across social media. The first thing wrong with the title was that it downplayed a global pandemic with a pun. The author’s attempt at wittiness failed miserably by mocking coronavirus. It was even worse that the article had nothing to do with coronavirus. Even if it did, it is absolutely unacceptable to create a quip out of a sensitive worldwide contagion. **Citizens and leaders are going so far as to socially isolate themselves. Stock markets are plunging. Workplaces are shutting down. The Centre has issued an order for no public gatherings**. The number of cases of coronavirus continues to rise as does fear and paranoia across the planet. Certainly not something for media to make fun of.

**The impact is death of democracy**

**Without objectivity democracy will fall to tyranny**

**Mishra 19’**

Prem Anand Mishra “India needs Aazadi from Biased Media: It is killing Indian democracy” 25 nov 19

<https://www.nationalheraldindia.com/opinion/india-needs-aazadi-from-biased-media-it-is-killing-indian-democracy>

**Indian democracy is in retreat.** Universities which are a centre for critical thinking have been vilified without any evidence and demonised by shared lies. Falsehood has become a reality and journalistic wisdom has been sold to financial or Ideological reasons. But prejudices are not always inversely proportional to education. **A large section of Indians has surrendered their sovereign thinking with the passive recitation of facts and swallowing a large volume of distorted facts on an everyday basis as a rush of dopamine.** Indian masses have developed the art of ‘confirmation biases’ to embrace information that supports their beliefs and rejects information that contradicts them. Voltaire was not wrong when he said, ‘those who make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities.’ There is a distinction between news and truth and it is essential in forming people’s opinion. The famous journalist Walter Lippman once said, **‘What one normally gets is not truth but fact, and that fact is circumscribed by a variety of reporters, fear of libel, and that which is superficial. News, therefore, stereotype, standardization judgment and disregard for subtlety’**. These media biases have one grand agenda: fake news. There is a constant exercise of turning Indian public into a passive consumer by spreading lies in the name of a free press but deep within there is an orthodoxy, a body of ideas which it is assumed that people will accept without questioning. One needs to remember that **If you can’t exercise your freedom you are inviting a tyranny**. Independent thoughts are the only critical voice that stops that tyranny. For the people at large need to ask before submitting to any lies: where is the evidence? **Distortions can’t be facts and lies however comfortable they sound can’t replace the truth**. Malcolm X was dead right when he said ‘media has the power to make the innocent guilty and to make the guilty innocent, and that's the power because they control the minds of the masses’. **The call for** freedom or **Azaadi is incomplete without objective truth and it is a crime and constitutionally wrong to deny it.**

**Contention 2 Advocacy media influences ethnic cleansing**

**Manipulation of free speech is harmful to democracy**

**Jonas 11’**

ANGELA HEFTI & LAURA AUSSERLADSCHEIDER JONAS “FROM HATE SPEECH TO INCITEMENT TO GENOCIDE: THE ROLE OF THE MEDIA IN THE RWANDAN GENOCIDE” 2011 <https://www.bu.edu/ilj/files/2020/08/Article_HeftiJonas.pdf>

<https://www.bu.edu/ilj/files/2020/08/Article_HeftiJonas.pdf>

Free speech is essential in any democratic society. Voiced in a politically charged context, however, hateful speech can incite the “crime of crimes”— genocide. **Democracy cannot be served if free speech is manipulated as a tool to incite the violation of human rights. Limits must be imposed on the media in its enjoyment of free speech.** This paper seeks to establish these limits by using the case of the role of the media in the Rwandan genocide. T**he Rwandan example shows how the media can manipulate an entire population to commit heinous crimes**. It also demonstrates that a context of political unrest can constitute the breeding grounds for incitement to genocide. Currently, President Donald Trump’s speech towards Muslims, although hateful, cannot be considered incitement to genocide. This paper should be seen as a much needed **reminder of what can be done when hateful and untrue messages are broadcasted on new media.**

**AND With the example of the Rwandan Genocide, News Radio advocacy acted out a plan to slowly implement hate speech and extremism to Rwandin listeners.**

### **Grzyb 19**

<https://theconversation.com/debate-continues-about-the-medias-role-in-driving-rwandas-genocide-114512>

Amanda Grzyb, Associate Professor and Faculty Scholar of Media and Information Studies, Western University

Twenty-five years ago, the Rwandan government launched a meticulously planned genocide against its Tutsi minority. It killed approximately 800 000 people in 100 days. We can’t reflect on the history of the 1994 genocide without considering the **critical role the media played in** both **inciting and prolonging** the **violence.** In the summer of 1993 the government, ruled by the pro-Hutu **National Revolutionary Movement for Development**, engaged in a peace process with the mostly-Tutsi rebel army, the Rwandan Patriotic Front. They negotiated an end to the civil war and the repatriation of Tutsi exiles. At the same time, however, the Movement was also preparing for genocide. The youth wing of the National Revolutionary Movement for Development established the Interahamwe. This paramilitary group **would** eventually lead attacks on Tutsi civilians. Hardliners from the party also **launch**ed Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines (**RTLM** - French for “Thousand Hills Free Radio and Television”). It was **a radio station that disseminated hate propaganda and prepared** its **listeners for** the coming **violence.** The broadcaster provided a popular platform for ideas already circulating in *Kangura*, an extremist magazine founded in 1990. In its early broadcasts, the station used Radio Rwanda’s transmission equipment. The new **broadcaster developed** lively, informal and accessible **programming that targeted ordinary citizens.** Unlike Radio Rwanda, it **played popular music** from neighbouring Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo). This was particularly **appealing to younger listeners.** **In** the **weeks prior to the** April 1994 **genocide** the **station ramped up** its **anti-Tutsi**, pro-Hutu **propaganda. Broadcasters used increasingly dehumanising language** to speak about the Tutsi minority. This **mobilised ordinary** Hutu **citizens against the Tutsi.** Historian Alison Des Forges wrote that, **once the genocide was underway,** government **leaders used the station to promote violence.** It also gave specific directions for carrying out the killings. A quarter of a century on, media scholars, historians and journalists are still debating the precise role of RTLM in the genocide. Did radio broadcasts directly incite violence? Or did they simply amplify the fear and genocidal ideology that was already circulating throughout the Hutu population?

**AND The non-static function of advocacy media causes one side to reject any info that contradicts them.**

**Mishra 2**

Prem Anand Mishra “India needs Aazadi from Biased Media: It is killing Indian democracy” 25 nov 19

https://www.nationalheraldindia.com/opinion/india-needs-aazadi-from-biased-media-it-is-killing-indian-democracy

The function of any independent media is to have that investigative curiosity **but this self -appointed defenders of the free press have become road blockers of the truth.** **Stereotyping is not static, it’s a functional process and it aims to construct a myth. These media houses have sold their critical power to separate its truths from their errors. Hatred has become India’s newest religion and fake news is an everyday ritual.** This whole culture has polluted the rationality of Indians at large who have been consistently pushed to behave in a certain manner otherwise to face the wrath. **Indian democracy is failing because the vast majority of citizens do not recognize media biases and supplemented propaganda.** Those **Media** houses are **writing a wrong history by spreading fake news as gospels.** Mischievous speculations and constant disinformation have been whipping large section of Indian into a frenzy. **Lies spread faster than truth and the role of social media has become a major source of recycling absurdities coming from these mainstream media.** In this totalitarian coordination, social media has become instrumental in spreading lies. This mischief from these sold-out media along with social media as a major source of hatred and propaganda has reduced people’s ability to oppose unpopular ideas without any official ban. There is a constant exercise of silencing the unpleasant voice. Media has become a game of circus to divert people, to maintain the status quo, to support the ill policies of demonetisation, crippling the economy, hard truth on unemployment and worsening performance on poverty alleviation. JNU is thus a victim of that nexus between the current regime and its patronized ‘*Godi media’*. Indian democracy is in retreat. Universities which are a centre for critical thinking have been vilified without any evidence and demonised by shared lies. Falsehood has become a reality and journalistic wisdom has been sold to financial or Ideological reasons. But prejudices are not always inversely proportional to education. A large section of Indians has surrendered their sovereign thinking with the passive recitation of facts and swallowing a large volume of distorted facts on an everyday basis as a rush of dopamine. Indian **masses have developed the art of ‘confirmation biases’ to embrace information that supports their beliefs and rejects information that contradicts them. Voltaire was not wrong when he said, ‘those who make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities.’** There is a distinction between news and truth and it is essential in forming people’s opinion. The famous journalist Walter Lippman once said, ‘What one normally gets is not truth but fact, and that fact is circumscribed by a variety of reporters, fear of libel, and that which is superficial. News, therefore, stereotype, standardization judgment and disregard for subtlety’. These media biases have one grand agenda: fake news. There is a constant exercise of turning Indian public into a passive consumer by spreading lies in the name of a free press but deep within there is an orthodoxy, a body of ideas which it is assumed that people will accept without questioning. One needs to remember that If you can’t exercise your freedom you are inviting a tyranny. Independent thoughts are the only critical voice that stops that tyranny. For the people at large need to ask before submitting to any lies: where is the evidence? Distortions can’t be facts and lies however comfortable they sound can’t replace the truth. **Malcolm X was dead right when he said ‘media has the power to make the innocent guilty and to make the guilty innocent, and that's the power because they control the minds of the masses’.**

**AND Non Objective news spread ethnic division that prompted hatred against the Tutsi and labeled them as traitors. Manipulation of truth is exactly what fueled the genocide in the first place**

**Jonas 2**

ANGELA HEFTI & LAURA AUSSERLADSCHEIDER JONAS “FROM HATE SPEECH TO INCITEMENT TO GENOCIDE: THE ROLE OF THE MEDIA IN THE RWANDAN GENOCIDE” 2011 <https://www.bu.edu/ilj/files/2020/08/Article_HeftiJonas.pdf>

It is important to consider RTLM’s propaganda tactics in order to understand how it was possible that thousands of people could be convinced to take up arms against the Tutsi.169 **By spreading lies, personal attacks, and prophecy of impending Tutsi attacks, RTLM created an atmosphere of fear among the Hutu that prompted them to take action.**170 One propaganda tactic included the media’s constant reference to “the truth,” which it pretended to know and conveyed as one message.171 In reality, **the media manipulated the truth and made its audience believe that its word was reality.**172 RTLM frequently claimed that its information came from political authorities, intellectuals, and university professors, which impressed some Rwandans and made them accept the cruel jokes against the Tutsi and their misrepresentations as reality.173 **Cynical and hypocritical broadcasts added to the genocidal environment**.174 RTLM encouraged its listeners by stating that they would never be held accountable for their acts if they won against the Tutsi.175 **Broadcasters also used religion to justify the attacks against the Tutsi.**176 Prayers sometimes preceded the violent acts.177 **Consequently, the policy of Tutsi extermination seemed to be tolerated and even endorsed by religion**.178 Given that 90% of Rwandans were Christians, the references to religion made the propagated violence acceptable.179 **False claims portraying the Tutsi as traitors in times of economic crisis caused contempt for the Tutsi**.180 In October 1993, the media had already underlined the different physical features and the supposedly different origins of the Hutu and the Tutsi.181 By relying on a theory of Tutsi immigration in pre-colonial times, the thought that the Tutsi had no right to inhabit Rwanda was put in the mind of the Hutu living in an overcrowded Rwanda.182 Additionally, the media

**The impact is death**

**The Rwandan genocide caused the death of 800,000 Tutsi**

**Verpoorten 05’**

[Marijke Verpoorten](https://www.cairn-int.info/publications-of-Marijke-Verpoorten--11689.htm) “The Death Toll of the Rwandan Genocide: A Detailed Analysis for Gikongoro Province”

<https://www.cairn-int.info/article-E_POPU_504_0401--the-death-toll-of-the-rwandan-genocide-a.htm>

Many readers may question the estimates regarding the number of survivors. Indeed, we will probably never really know how many Tutsi managed to survive without seeking refuge in camps, and counting in the camps was also prone to error. Moreover, since it is no longer politically correct in Rwanda to talk about ethnicity, the latest census of 2002 does not provide information on the current size of the Tutsi population. Another problem is the reliability of the 1991 census. Two criticisms have been put forward. First, to avoid discrimination, an undetermined number of Tutsi registered as Hutu. Second, the Habyarimana regime is said to have deliberately under-reported the number of Tutsi in order to keep their school enrolment and public employment quotas low. Until now, this allegation has not been documented. However, this strong suspicion alone led G. Prunier (1998) to estimate the actual Tutsi population in 1994 at 12% of the total population instead of 8%, the estimate put forward by the Habyarimana regime. If we repeat the same exercise as above with this larger proportion, **the death toll of the genocide increases from around 500,000 to some 800,000 Tutsi killed** (Prunier, 1998, p. 264), **representing the annihilation of about 84% of the Tutsi population in 1994.**