## I affirm the resolution Resolved: In a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

## Definitions:

**1. Objective**

**Merriam-Webster**

Merriam-Webster, No Date, “objective”

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/objective

expressing or **dealing with facts** or conditions **as perceived without distortion by personal** feelings, **prejudices**, or interpretations

**2. Advocacy**

**Cambridge Dictionary**

Cambridge Dictionary, No Date, "advocacy,"

https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/advocacy

public **support for an idea**, plan, or way of doing something:

**3. Prioritize**

**Collins Dictionary**

Collins Dictionary, No Date, “Prioritize”

https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/prioritize

If you prioritize something, you **treat** it **as more important than other things.**

# The standard is mitigating structural violence. Prefer for three reasons.

## 1. Structural violence is a form of oppression that is formed through moral exclusion. Recognition of this is key to stopping 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 become 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 appreciation 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.

## 2. Prereq to debate- unless we deconstruct structural violence, debate becomes unfair and uneducational as different groups will be excluded from having a voice making this framework necessary to participating in the activity

## 3. 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.

# C1: Polarization is Harmful to Democracy

## 1. Extreme polarization is dangerous concerning democracy: it encourages authoritarian behavior by reinforcing the us vs them mentality

### McCoy 18

https://theconversation.com/extreme-political-polarization-weakens-democracy-can-the-us-avoid-that-fate-105540

McCoy is a distinguished professor of Political Science at Georgia State University

A collaborative **research** project I led on polarized democracies around the world **examines** the **process**es **by which societies divide** into political “tribes” **and democracy is harmed.** Based on a study of 11 countries including the U.S., Turkey, Hungary, Venezuela, Thailand and others, we found that when **political leaders** cast their opponents as immoral or corrupt, they **create** “us” and “them” camps – called by political scientists and psychologists **“in-groups” and “out-groups”** – in the society. In this tribal dynamic, **each side views the** other “out group” party with increasing distrust, bias and enmity. Perceptions that “If you win, I lose” grow. Each side views the **other** political party and their supporters **as a threat to the nation** or their way of life **if that** other political **party is in power.** For that reason, the incumbent’s **followers tolerate** more illiberal and increasingly **authoritarian behavior** to stay in power, **while** the **opponents are** more and more **willing to resort to undemocratic means** to remove them from power. **This damages democracy.** Are Americans now stuck in animosity and anger that will undermine democracy, or can the nation pull out of it? Our research finds that severe polarization is affected by three primary factors. First, it is often stimulated by the rhetoric of political leaders who exploit the real grievances of voters. These politicians choose divisive issues to highlight in order to pursue their own political agenda. In other words, what a leader says is as important as what she or he does. Since launching his campaign, President Donald Trump has vilified so-called external enemies such as “criminal and rapist” Mexican immigrants, terrorist Muslims and foreign allies out to drain America’s coffers through “unfair trade deficits.” Now, the president is targeting internal enemies. He has famously labeled the media “the enemy of the people” and recently accused the Democrats of unleashing an “angry mob” unfit to govern. Such unprecedented attacks by a president of the United States seemed designed to discredit his critics and delegitimize his political opponents. But they also trigger the dynamics of polarized politics by reinforcing the notion that politics is an “us versus them” contest. By August 2017, just eight months after Trump took office, three-quarters of Republicans had negative views of Democrats, and 70 percent of Democrats viewed Republicans negatively. This was a large increase compared with the mid-1990s, when about 20 percent of each party had unfavorable views of the other party. Even **more disturbing for democracy, roughly half of voters** of each party **say the other** party **makes them feel afraid**, **and growing numbers view the** policies of the **other** party **as a threat** to the nation. America’s recent political polarization did not begin with Trump. It has been growing since the 1990s and accelerated under President Barack Obama, when the Tea Party formed in reaction to his election, and bipartisanship broke down in the Congress. By 2016, 45 percent of Republicans felt threatened by Democratic policies, and 41 percent of Democrats viewed Republican policies as a threat, up nearly 10 points in just two years. Our research shows that **in extreme polarization, people feel** distant from and suspicious of the “other” camp. At the same time, they feel **loyal to**, and trusting of, **their own camp – without examining** their **biases or factual basis of** their **information.** Although this is a common phenomenon long identified by social psychology, it is even more pronounced in the age of social media 24-hour news cycles and more politicized media outlets who repeat and amplify the political attacks. Most dangerously, words can unleash actual violence by avid supporters seeking approval from the leader or simply inspired to carry out an attack against the designated “enemy,” as we saw when supporters of Hugo Chávez in Venezuela attacked a media mogul whom Chávez had labeled public enemy number one. Similarly, last week an avid Trump supporter sent pipe bomb mailers to prominent Trump opponents, and the killings in a synagogue in Pittsburgh were carried out by a man who used similar language to Trump’s assertion that the U.S. was being invaded by a caravan of Central Americans.

# C2: Advocacy Media Polarization and Extremism

## 1. Advocacy media creates a cycle encouraging polarization: when they become more polarized, they further polarize their consumers. This fosters the ‘us’ vs ‘them’ mentality and creates echo chambers, leading to extremist behavior.

### Roscini 21

<https://sites.bu.edu/pardeeatlas/back2school/how-the-american-media-landscape-is-polarizing-the-country/#_ftn1>

**Media polarization has increased** in the past half-decade (fig. 2), and both liberal and conservative partisan media are likely **contributing to polarization** in the U.S. Cable **news networks** – of which Fox News and MSNBC are frequent targets of media bias allegations – **have become “birthing centers for polarizing rhetoric.”**[5] In the 21st century, modern Americans have access to a plethora of news sources, and the competition for audience and “the threat to journalistic business models” has changed the way political news is produced and consumed.[6] Cable **news** is a business that runs on ratings and advertisements and, in order to capture people’s attention, it needs to be engaging. It **has**, therefore, increasingly **blurred** the **lines between information and entertainment.** Fox News has established itself as the most-watched cable news network in the country by airing less news and more “opinions-about-the-news” to garner larger audiences.[7] While this may negatively affect the American political system, it is profitable for founder Rupert Murdoch.[8] To compete, MSNBC has “pumped up its ratings by recasting itself as a left-leaning riposte to Fox News.”[9] It is important to note that although both MSNBC and Fox have strong viewpoints and ‘opinion’ hosts, the former lives in the world of fact while the latter “spins its own reality.”[10] According to Jones “**much of what we see** on Fox News, especially in primetime, **is not based in truth.**”[11] Fox News is therefore **deliberately misleading the public while causing dissension.**[12] The divisive tone of cable news has become the very nature of its appeal, and this type of journalism **hardens polarization** because “**the more political media one consumes, the more warped their perspective of the other** side **becomes.**”[13] Partisans tend to view each other negatively because polarized media weaponizes the differences between political and social groups instead of emphasizing commonalities. This type of ‘identity journalism’ **reinforces identity and binds people into communities.** During the 2020 presidential election, Fox News’ Tucker Carlson – television’s most popular political host with an average of more than three million viewers a night – claimed that “the leaders of today’s Democratic Party despise this country… we cannot let them run this nation because they hate it. Imagine what they would do to it.”[14] His wording is carefully selected to categorize people into groups and create a shared sense of belonging to a threatened community. Byers believes that MSNBC also presents ideologically biased information, although in a less outrageous manner.[15] **This** tribal **mentality** – engrained in our evolutionary need to belong to a group – **aims to** oversimplify and distort “complex problems by **divid**ing **the world into an ‘us’ and a ‘them,’** vilifying the latter.”[16] **This** mindset **can** lead to irrational group favoritism and **produce hostilities. Polarization is** further **exacerbated by echo chambers**, spaces **where** “**the reinforcing effect of media** and beliefs **drive people to wall themselves off from a wider range of media.**”[17] Having many news options available means that consumers can choose to hear messages that reinforce their beliefs while avoiding those from alternative points of view. For example, Fox News and MSNBC “only tell us how right we are, and **that’s making us more extreme.**”[18] The more media people see that encourages them to think of themselves as part of a group, the deeper their identity roots become engrained, and the more resistant they are to change their views. Therefore, Klein hypothesizes that the solution may be for liberals to watch more of Fox News and for conservatives to tune into MSNBC.[19] However, studies have shown that hearing contrary opinions drives partisans towards “not just a deeper certainty in the rightness of their cause but more polarized policy positions.”[20] Thus, rather than expanding viewpoints, hearing the other side’s rhetoric entrenches viewers further in their political identities, as all arguments are perceived as biased and duplicitous. If left unchecked, cable news’s dissenting language and angry rhetoric will foster even stronger feelings of animosity toward the other side and impede any chances of conducting constructive conversations. It is important to note that certain partisans feel this way *because* they actively pay attention to politics and listen to cable news daily. The effects of partisan media on attitudes are concentrated primarily among those who already have extreme opinions. Although these shows may command a modest audience, they are influential because they have the *right* audience. Those who watch these shows drive politics, as they are more partisan and politically involved. Thus, “these programs contribute to polarization not by shifting the center of the ideological distribution, but rather by lengthening the tails.”

## 2. Recently, polarized advocacy-based news stations have been directly agreeing with far-right extremist and white supremacist ideology. This could cause massive harms for marginalized communities.

### ADL 21

<https://www.adl.org/news/media-watch/adl-letter-to-fox-news-condemns-tucker-carlsons-impassioned-defense-of-great>

Letter was written to Tucker Carlson by the ADL

Carlson is a is an American television host and conservative political commentator who has hosted the nightly political talk show Tucker Carlson Tonight on Fox News since 2016. His show is one of the most popular one air.

The ADL is a leading anti-hate organization that was founded in 1913 in response to an escalating climate of antisemitism and bigotry. Today, ADL is the first call when acts of antisemitism occur and continues to fight all forms of hate. A global leader in exposing extremism, delivering anti-bias education and fighting hate online, ADL’s ultimate goal is a world in which no group or individual suffers from bias, discrimination or hate.

Last night, in a segment **on his program** dealing with voting rights and allegations of voter disenfranchisement, Tucker **Carlson disgustingly gave an impassioned defense of the white supremacist “great replacement theory,” the hateful notion** that **the white race is in danger of being “replaced” by** a rising tide of **non-whites.** While couching his argument in terms of what he described as the Democratic Party attempting to replace traditional voters with immigrants from third-world countries, Carlson’s rhetoric was not just a dog whistle to racists – it was a bullhorn. **Make no mistake: this is dangerous stuff. The** “great replacement **theory**”is a classic white supremacist trope that **undergirds the modern white supremacist movement** in America. It is a concept that is discussed almost daily in online racist fever swamps. It is **a notion that fueled the hateful chants** of “Jews will not replace us!” **in Charlottesville** in 2017. And **it has lit the fuse in explosive hate crimes**, most notably the hate-motivated mass shooting attacks in Pittsburgh, Poway and El Paso, as well as in Christchurch, New Zealand. In short, **this is not legitimate political discourse.** It is dangerous race-baiting, extreme rhetoric. And yet, unfortunately, **it is the culmination of** a pattern of **increasingly divisive rhetoric** used by Carlson over the past few years. **His** anti-immigrant **rhetoric has embraced** subtle appeals to **racism** and, at times more blatantly has put him on the same side as white supremacists. Furthermore, Carlson has suggested that the very idea of white supremacy in the U.S. is a hoax, earning him plaudits from former Klansman David Duke and white supremacist Richard Spencer, who have both praised Carlson’s show for echoing their own talking points. Here’s a sampling of the myriad examples our researchers have gathered from his Fox show: In January, Carlson offered his viewers a full-throated defense of the antisemitic QAnon conspiracy theory. In December 2020, Carlson parroted white supremacist and antisemitic conspiracy theories by blaming Jewish philanthropist George Soros for Americans being “robbed, raped and killed.” Last July, he questioned the patriotism of two Democratic members of Congress who are both women of color: Rep. Ilhan Omar and Sen. Tammy Duckworth of Illinois. He said, in reference to the congresswomen’s immigrant backgrounds, “Maybe we are importing people from places whose values are simply antithetical to ours.” Days after the mass shooting attack in August 2019 at an El Paso Walmart at the hands of an avowed white supremacist, Carlson suggested that white supremacy in America was “not a real problem.” In January 2021 he again questioned whether white supremacy was even real, saying, “So again, what is a white supremacist? You might be surprised to learn just how broad the definition for that has become.” In December 2018, Carlson suggested immigrants make the U.S. “dirtier.” **Carlson** has **attacked ethnic diversity** in this country, **saying**, in 2018, that **it was** “radically and permanently” **changing America for the worse. He** has also **claimed** that **immigration makes the country “poorer**, **and dirtier**, and more divided.” Past guests on his show have included Pete D’Abrosca, who has expressed sympathy for alt-right leaders; British commentator Katie Hopkins, who was banned from Twitter for violating its hateful content policy; and U.S. Rep. Steve King of Iowa, whom he defended for tweeting that America could not “restore our civilization with somebody else’s babies.” And I’m able to share many additional examples we’ve found of such rhetoric being employed on his program. It was shocking to hear this kind of open-ended endorsement of white supremacist ideology from an anchor and commentator on your network. At ADL, we believe in dialogue and giving people a chance to redeem themselves, but Carlson’s full-on embrace of the white supremacist replacement theory on yesterday’s show and his repeated allusions to racist themes in past segments are a bridge too far.

## 3. Furtherance of extremist rhetoric, especially when coming from influential people and news sources, leads to hate crimes

### Byman 21

<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2021/04/09/how-hateful-rhetoric-connects-to-real-world-violence/>

Daniel L. Byman is a Senior Fellow - Foreign Policy, Center for Middle East Policy at Brookings

Part of the problem is that leaders’ remarks do not fade away after they are given. Incendiary **rhetoric** from political leaders **against** their political opponents, **minority groups**, and other targets **is** often **quickly magnified.** Leaders with large social media followings will see their remarks retweeted and otherwise shared with millions of followers. Leaders’ rhetoric then drives the coverage of more traditional news outlets, which broadcast it to their viewers and listeners. Rhetoric from national leaders also serves as a cue for local figures, particularly if the national leaders have loyal personal followings. The local leaders’ rhetoric in turn is amplified by social media and traditional outlets. Ordinary people play an important role too in spreading the message, sharing it with their own commentary with their friends and family. **Widely shared extreme rhetoric** shifts the so-called “Overton Window,” **signal**ing that **an issue is** now **the subject of acceptable discourse** when, in the past, discussing it might have been taboo. Prejudiced elite speech, one study found, is particularly powerful if other elites endorse it, emboldening audiences to declare their own prejudices and act on them accordingly. As one expert noted, referring to President Trump’s **anti-Muslim and anti-Hispanic rhetoric:** “The president’s rhetoric has **helped to shift discourse norms** in our country such that **it is** more **acceptable** among more people **to denigrate and attack other groups** of human beings.” An academic study found that **rhetoric** did not change attitudes but rather **emboldened individuals to** express, and **act on**, pre-existing **views they had** once **hidden. Anti-Muslim discourse prompted** by remarks **by** candidate **Trump** **grew** on Facebook and other social media sites in 2016. This, in turn, led followers to increase their anti-Muslim tweets and to get more attention from cable news channels. **In subsequent days, hate crimes against Muslims increased 32%**, with a significant, but lesser, increase against the Hispanic community, another target of Trump’s rhetoric. Specific tweets would lead to increases in hate crimes, with the level rising and falling depending on the prevalence of the social media activity. **Hateful rhetoric** can also stir dangerous emotions. A study of violence in Sweden found that hateful speech **spurs negative emotions toward** the **target community among listeners**, and another study of European audiences found that **exposure to** politicians’ **violent rhetoric increases support for** political **violence** among those surveyed. Such rhetoric also **makes** political **violence** against the target community **seem more legitimate.** In Germany, another study found that increases in anti-refugee sentiments on Facebook led to increases in violence against refugees: When Facebook had an outage, or when different events dominated the news, violence fell. Incendiary rhetoric also creates a more dangerous political climate in general. An analysis of the manifesto issued by El Paso Walmart shooter Patrick Crusius, who killed 23 people, mostly of Hispanic heritage, found that he used words like “invasion” and “replacement,” drawing on conspiracy theories promoted by conservative media hosts. Another study found the politicians’ hate speech increases political polarization and that this, in turn, makes domestic terrorism more likely. A spiral of reciprocal radicalization is a particular danger. Fringe groups in the targeted population can exploit hateful rhetoric directed against them, justifying their own violence and mobilizing additional support. The risk of reciprocal radicalization can be overstated, but even a low probability of it occurring is of concern, as it can worsen violence from both sides and empower even more demagogues. GIVING VIOLENCE DIRECTION Leaders lead. That truism highlights an obvious point when considering violent rhetoric: violence against whom? Political rhetoric not only highlights the problem but also the obstacles to solving it, often in the form of supposedly dangerous individuals and communities. Thus, if a leader targets them rhetorically, violence may increase sharply against communities that, in the past, had experienced relatively little violence. Some **individuals charged with terrorism**-related crimes **claim** that **the rhetoric of** President Trump and **right-wing news media** convinced them of the danger of Muslims and other groups and **led them to act.** A 2020 news report found that 54 cases involving assaults and threats were linked to individuals who invoked Trump and his rhetoric during their actions. Of these, 41 cases involved pro-Trump violence, and 13 cases involved supposed defiance of Trump. A number of participants in the Capitol riots saw themselves as loyal soldiers for President Trump and claimed they were “awaiting direction” regarding how to act. When President Trump tweeted out the phrase “Chinese virus” as COVID-19 began to spread in 2020, the use of the term exploded, according to a study in the American Journal of Public Health. Many of the tweets had virulent anti-Asian sentiments. Reporting from StopAAPIhate.org indicates that numerous hate incidents occurred after this tweet, with many falsely linking Asian-Americans to the virus.

## 4. The impacts the AFF speaks of are not outlandish and theoretical. Polarized advocacy media was a significant contributing factor within the Rwanda Genocide of 1994 - 800,000 people died.

**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?

# Contention 3: Solvency

## 1. Advocacy media uniquely increases polarization: When a member of one group comes across an opposing opinion, they actually become more polarized. Therefore, the objective approach is the only option.

### Bail et al 18

<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1804840115>

Authors were members of the following institutions: Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham - Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University, Provo - Department of Statistical Science, Duke University, Durham - Department of Sociology, New York University, New York

There is mounting concern that social media sites contribute to political polarization by creating “echo chambers” that insulate people from opposing views about current events. We surveyed a large sample of Democrats and Republicans who visit Twitter at least three times each week about a range of social policy issues. One week later, we **randomly assigned respondents to a treatment condition** in which they were offered financial incentives **to follow a** Twitter **bot for one month that exposed them to messages produced by** elected officials, organizations, and other **opinion leaders with opposing** political **ideologies.** Respondents were re-surveyed at the end of the month to measure the effect of this treatment, and at regular intervals throughout the study period to monitor treatment compliance. We find that **Republicans who followed a liberal** Twitter **bot became** substantially **more conservative** post-treatment, **and Democrats who followed a conservative** Twitter **bot became** slightly **more liberal** post-treatment. These findings have important implications for the interdisciplinary literature on political polarization as well as the emerging field of computational social science.

## 2. Objectivity is a solution to polarized news media: by removing the opinions, we remove the polarization.

### Williams and Stroud 20

<https://mediaengagement.org/research/objectivity-in-journalism/>

Though the country is not facing the same economic hardships as it was back then, the same argument can be made today that appealing to a broader audience is ultimately desirable – not just to keep a news company afloat, but to provide a space where broad sections of the public can receive the exact same information and use it to form their own interpretation of events. Even if it hasn’t been the standard forever, those who hold **the** professional **objective model** in high regard nonetheless believe it **is one we should keep because “the injection of opinion** and insinuation **deprives** viewers and **readers of a neutral set of facts** upon which to make their own decisions and opinions” (Solomon, 2018). In other words, for a journalist to include their own voice is to risk exerting influence over their audience, whereas the publication of “only facts” allows for the consumers to make judgements for themselves, not be *told* what to think by a reporter. As journalist George Reedy used to tell his students before his passing: “You don’t use a bullhorn filled with opinion and emotion when a flashlight’s illumination of facts will do” (Solomon, 2018). Given recent advancements in technology, these points may be even more consequential today than they were before the 1920s. As most Americans now own a smart device, have access to news coverage 24/7, and even have the ability to communicate with strangers online, **supplying unbiased coverage** could be the best way to **encourage dialogue among diverse people.** In fact, the casual acceptance of **non-objective journalism** may **already** be **negatively affecting civil discourse and citizen unity**, evidenced by the proliferation of echo chambers on social media. As **people engage in confirmation bias**, seeking out comforting partisan news pages on sites like Facebook, they only see one-sided stories and engage only with members of that community who already share the same opinions. Thus, rather than seeking out neutral stories and connecting with people unlike themselves, they **become entrenched in their beliefs and estranged from others.** Perhaps **if biased journalism didn’t exist, neither would such** technology-fueled **polarization.**

#### **Turn—Objective journalism is key to successful social justice movements by increasing public awareness---journalists themselves can only be good activists if they uphold professional standards for accuracy.**

**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/>.

Similarly, Communications Professor Fred Turner said in an interview with The Daily that **objective reporting can be an impactful way to achieve social change**. Turner argues that journalists in the 1960s, ostensibly working under the guidelines of objectivity, exposed the world to protests against the Vietnam War. In doing so, Turner said, journalists helped the antiwar movement grow. Turner believes the same thing is happening today with the Black Lives Matter movement. “Each time people see one of these killings or see the protests,” Turner said, “it stops being a purely local matter and becomes a matter of public concern, and then it becomes something that we can all take action on.” Journalists, he said, are partially to thank for spreading these stories. Because journalists report what they see, whether positive or negative, journalism is “by definition an activist occupation,” Turner said. Turner does not believe objectivity restricts journalists’ abilities to engage in social change. On the contrary, he said, “you must be objective — and that’s the key to your ability to be an activist for democracy: calling things as you see them, and staying objective, and staying out of the fray.”