### DA: Third Person

#### Link Story

#### Best research proves that media has no harmful effect on others, rather it is explained by our assumption about others in what is called third person hypothesis

Clay Calvert, Mr. Calvert is Assistant Professor of Communications and law and Associate Director of the Pennsylvania Center for the First Amendment at the Pennsylvania State University. The First Amendment And The Third Person: Perceptual Biases Of Media Harms & Cries For Government Censorship, CommLaw Conspectus, Vol. 165 1998 – 1

As a society, we fear the harmful effects **of** these and other media-propagated images. But what if our beliefs and perceptions about alleged media harms are systematically wrong? What if we, in fact, typically overestimate the harm caused bymass media messages? What if we unnecessarily censor speech?  
There is a strong and growing body of empirical social science research from the field of communication that suggests that much of our First Amendment jurisprudence and efforts to censor speech may be radically off base. Specifically, the research supports what has been called the third-person effect hypothesis**.**

The hypothesis "predicts that people will tend to overestimate the influence that mass communications have on the attitudes and behavior of others." Parsed differently, the hypothesis, as originally articulated in 1983 by W. Phillips Davison, holds that "[i] n the view of those trying to evaluate the effects of a communication, its greatest impact will not be on 'me' or 'you,' but on 'them'-the third persons.""'

Now, 15 years and many empirical experiments and studieslater, evidencesupports this hypothesis. **That evidence has disturbing ramifications for extant and future First Amendment jurisprudence.** It suggests the government may be unnecessarily censoring **speech** based on a perceptual bias **about its effects on others.**

#### 75 years of research has produced no evidence the media influences people

Brian Winston & is the Lincoln Professor at the University of Lincoln (UK). He is the author of A Right to Offend, The Rushdie Fatwa and After and also writes on documentary film and media technology. He was the founding director of the Glasgow University Media Group. Matthew Winston is the author of Gonzo Text: Disentangling Meaning in Hunter S. Thompson’s Journalism. He teaches in the School of Media, Communication and Sociology at the University of Leicester, THE ROOTS OF FAKE NEWS: Obecting to Objective Journalism, September 2020- Book – pdf available upon request – mavsdebate@gmail.com

Psychologists interested, for example, in the impact of media look to all ‘emerging research in fields such as neuroscience’ because of a belief that these give the researcher looking ‘for indications of how, why and when media messages trigger individual and social change’ -- insights beyond those to be gleaned, for example, from ‘marketing and box office metrics’.20 They do no such thing, of course. They are what they are:  statistics  – and their causation remains a black-box. Threequarters of a century of attaching electrodes have yielded little evidence, say, to convincingly condition social policy. We can plot brain activity and stimulations but, in reality, we do not know what is being thought. This does not, however, deter the search for empirical, quantitative data as a key to understanding the mentality underlying human behaviour. Reporting of such experimental data has, however, fuelled media panics (e.g. approaches to social media platform ‘use’ which, essentially, assume all ‘clicks’ are meaningful, condition received current understanding of new media impact). Journalists, anyway, do not use EEG, fMRI, or PET as newsgathering tools. For all that the press, too often entirely uncritically, reports the findings of those who do, some might think it is rather to journalism’s credit that this is obviously not like the work of journalists. It is no wonder that the protocols of ‘hard’ (or harder) science, even when dealing with humans, in general have little to do with the daily practices of the news media.

#### Impact Story

#### Empirically, the third person hypothesis proves media’s impact are non-existent and encourages us to accept censorship to protect others from *nothing*

Clay Calvert, Mr. Calvert is Assistant Professor of Communications and law and Associate Director of the Pennsylvania Center for the First Amendment at the Pennsylvania State University. The First Amendment And The Third Person: Perceptual Biases Of Media Harms & Cries For Government Censorship, CommLaw Conspectus, Vol. 165 1998 - 2

An example**-censorship of sexually explicit speech-makes the danger clear.** Empirical re- search suggests that people systematically judge others to be more negatively influenced by pornography than themselves. In turn, people "favor restrictions on pornography in line with their perceptions of effects on others**." This is important because some experimental research also suggests that people systematically overestimate media effects on others.** The ramifications**,** communication researcher Albert C. Gunther of the University of Wisconsin-Madison notes, are profound - "if people are systematically overestimating the negative social-level effects of pornography, then the third-person effect may be inflating opinion in favor of censorship.”

#### And, Censorship is an impact filter – multiple impacts triggers

D’Souza**, PhD Phil @Oxford,** 1996(Frances, Prof. Anthropology Oxford, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/hearings/19960425/droi/freedom\_en.htm?textMode=on)

**In the absence of freedom of expression** **which includes a free and independent media**, **it is impossible to protect other rights, including** the right to **life**. **Once governments** are able to **draw a cloak of secrecy over their actions** and to remain unaccountable for their actions then **massive human rights violations can, and do, take place**. **For this reason alone** the right to **freedom of expression**, specifically protected in the major international human rights treaties, **must be considered** to be **a primary right**. It is significant that one of **the first indication**s **of a government's intent**ion **to depart from democratic principles is** the ever increasing **control of information** by means of gagging the media, and preventing the freeflow of information from abroad. At one end of the spectrum there are supposedly minor infringements of this fundamental right which occur daily in Western democracies and would include abuse of national security laws to prevent the publication of information which might be embarrassing to a given government: at the other end of the scale are the regimes of terror which employ the most brutal moves to suppress opposition, information and even the freedom to exercise religious beliefs. It has been argued, and will undoubtedly be discussed at this Hearing, that **in the absence of free speech** and an independent media, **it is** relatively **easy for governments to capture**, as it were, **the media** and to fashion them into instruments of propaganda, **for the promotion of ethnic conflict, war and genocide.** 2. Enshrining the right to freedom of expression The right to freedom of expression is formally protected in the major international treaties including the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. In addition, it is enshrined in many national constitutions throughout the world, although this does not always guarantee its protection. Furthermore, freedom of expression is, amongst other human rights, upheld, even for those countries which are not signatories to the above international treaties through the concept of customary law which essentially requires that all states respect the human rights set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by virtue of the widespread or customary respect which has been built up in the post World War II years. 3. Is free speech absolute? While it is generally accepted that freedom of expression is, and remains the cornerstone of democracy, there are permitted restrictions encoded within the international treaties which in turn allow for a degree of interpretation of how free free speech should be. Thus, **unlike the American First Amendment** Rights **which allow few, if any, checks on free speech** or on the independence of the media, the **international treaties are concerned that there should be a balance** between competing rights: for example, limiting free speech or media freedom where it impinges on the individual's right to privacy; where free speech causes insult or injury to the rights and reputation of another; where speech is construed as incitement to violence or hatred, or where free speech would create a public disturbance. Given that these permitted restrictions are necessarily broad, the limits of free speech are consistently tested in national law courts and, perhaps even more importantly, in the regional courts such as the European Commission and Court of Human Rights. In recent years several landmark cases have helped to define more closely what restrictions may be imposed by government and under what circumstances. In particular, it has been emphasised by the European Court that any restriction must comply with a three-part test which requires that any such restriction should first of all be prescribed by law, and thus not arbitrarily imposed: proportionate to the legitimate aims pursued, and demonstrably necessary in a democratic society in order to protect the individual and/or the state. 4. Who censors what? Despite the rather strict rules which apply to restrictions on free speech that governments may wish to impose, **many justifications are** nevertheless **sought by governments to suppress information** which is inimical to their policies or their interests. **These** justifications **include arguments in defence of** national and/or state **security**, **the public interst,** including the need to protect public morals and public order **and perfectly understandable attempts to prevent racism, violence, sexism**, religious intolerance and damage to the indi-vidual's reputation or privacy. The mechanisms employed by governments to restrict the freeflow of information are almost endless and range from subtle economic pressures and devious methods of undermining political opponents and the independent media to the enactment of restrictive press laws and an insist-ence on licensing journalists and eventually to the illegal detention, torture and disappearances of journalists and others associated with the expression of independent views. 5. Examples of censorship **To some** the right to **free speech may appear** to be one of the **fringe** human rights, especially **when compared to** such violations as **torture** and extra-judicial killings. It is also sometimes difficult **to dissuade the** general **public that censorship**, generally assumed to be something to do with banning obscene books or magazines, **is** no **bad** thing! It **requires a recognition of** some of the **fundamental principles of democracy** **to understand why censorship is** so **immensely dangerous**. **The conditon of democracy is** that **people are able to make choices** about a wide variety of issues which affect their lives, including what they wish to see, read, hear or discuss. While this may seem a somewhat luxurious distinction preoccupying, perhaps, wealthy Western democracies, **it is a comparatively short distance between government censorship** of an offensive book **to the silencing of political dissidents**. **And** the distance **between such silencing and the use of violence** to suppress a growing political philosophy which a government finds inconvenient **is even shorter**. **Censorship tends to have small beginnings and to grow rapidly**. **Allowing a government to** have the power to **deny people information**, **however trivial**, **not only sets in place laws** and procedures **which can and will be used by those in authority against those with less authority, but** **it** also **denies people the information which they must have in order to monitor their governments actions and to ensure accountability**. **There have been** dramatic and **terrible examples of** the role that **censorship** has played **in international politics** in the last few years: to name but a few, the extent to which the media in the republics of former **Yugoslavia** were manipulated by government for purposes of propaganda; the violent role played by the government associated radio in **Rwanda** which incited citizens to kill each other in the name of ethnic purity and the continuing threat of murder issued by the Islamic Republic of **Iran** against a citizen of another country for having written a book which displeased them. 6. The **link** between poverty, war and denial of free speech **There are undoubted connections between access to information**, or rather the lack of it, **and war**, **as indeed there are between poverty**, the right to freedom of expression and development. One can argue that **democracy aims to increase participation** in political and other decision-making at all levels. In this sense **democracy empowers** people. **The poor are denied access to information on decisions which deeply affect their lives**, are thus powerless and have no voice; the poor are not able to have influence over their own lives, let alone other aspect of society. **Because of this** essential **powerlessness, the poor are unable to influence the ruling elite** **in whose interests it may be to initiate conflict and wars in order to consolidate their own power and position.** Of the 126 developing countries listed in the 1993 Human Development Report, war was ongoing in 30 countries and severe civil conflict in a further 33 countries. **Of the total 63 countries in conflict, 55 are towards the bottom scale of the human development index** which is an indicator of poverty. There seems to be no doubt that **there is a clear association between poverty and war**. It is reasonably safe to assume that the vast majority of **people do not ever welcome war**. **They are** normally **coerced,** **more often than not by propaganda**, **into fear, extreme nationalist sentiments and war by their governments**. **If the majority** of people **had a democratic voice they would undoubtedly object** to war. But voices are silenced. Thus, **the freedom to express one's views** and to challenge government decisions and **to insist upon political rather than violent solutions, are necessary aspects of democracy which can, and do, avert war.** Government sponsored propaganda in Rwanda, as in former Yugoslavia, succeeded because there weren't the means to challenge it. **One** **has** therefore **to conclude that it is impossible for** a particular **government to wage war in the absence of a compliant media** willing to indulge in government propaganda. This is because **the government needs civilians to fight wars for them and also because the media is needed to re-inforce government policies and intentions at every turn.**

### CP: Advocacy Announcement

#### CP Text – Free Press should openly and deliberately articulate their advocacies on stories and on issues of relevancy to their writings.

#### CP promotes democracy while breaking the manipulate power of the so-called objective press

Brian Winston & is the Lincoln Professor at the University of Lincoln (UK). He is the author of A Right to Offend, The Rushdie Fatwa and After and also writes on documentary film and media technology. He was the founding director of the Glasgow University Media Group. Matthew Winston is the author of Gonzo Text: Disentangling Meaning in Hunter S. Thompson’s Journalism. He teaches in the School of Media, Communication and Sociology at the University of Leicester, THE ROOTS OF FAKE NEWS: Obecting to Objective Journalism, September 2020-

Given that objectivity is, according to its ideological construction, in a state of binary opposition with subjectivity, it necessarily follows that if objectivity is abandoned, journalism would perform its functions by owning its subjectivity, its biases, and contextualising the information which it presented openly, according to its own clearly and explicitly defined perspectives, political and otherwise. The clarity and logical consistency of this context would condition the credibility of what is reported. And such a change of understanding is not unthinkable. As one of the authors of this book has discussed elsewhere,9 there was a (fairly long) period in the history of American journalism during which the news was openly biased, and, to oversimplify quite a bit, it still worked just fine. It can be argued, as we said at the beginning of this chapter, that this press earned a role for itself in the founding myth(s) of the American republic which conditions, to this day, the high claims made for its journalism. The arrow flies straight from Tom Paine’s time to John Carey now, hitting the bullseye and allowing Carey boldly to assert that ‘journalism is usefully understood as another name for democracy’.10 But for much of this arrow’s flight – how much is a matter of debate – objectivity was not just irrelevant, but unheard of. As another eminent US media scholar, Robert McChesney, observed: During the first two or three generations of the republic such notions for the press would have been nonsensical, even unthinkable. The point of journalism was to persuade as well as inform, and the press tended to be highly partisan.11 Gerald Baldasty, in discussing the ‘opinionated, politically biased, one-sided, argumentative and frequently strident’12 newspapers of the Jacksonian era, which were also publicly subsidised, privately patronised, and openly partisan, noted that in the early 1800s, it was in fact a failure to adopt and espouse clearly defined political positions that was taboo. This was not because of a lack of professionalism, or of a lack of respect for the importance of newspapers in the functioning of a democracy, but rather because journalism was viewed differently. Neutrality, thought Horace Greely, was a gag. In essence, as Baldasty notes, a newspaper’s failing to express a clear opinion would have been viewed as evidence, not of fairness, detachment, etc., but that either the editor did not have an opinion, or did not have the courage to express it. Neither was acceptable. Baldasty says, ‘Evenhandedness or objectivity was not so much bad as inappropriate.’13 While some might view the move from such an ideological position towards professionalism and objectivity as an example of progress, from the primitive to the sophisticated, and from worse to better, we, obviously, do not see it in this way. This admittedly now unfamiliar ideology seems to us far from incomprehensible or obviously inferior, given the nature and importance of lively public debate, informed not just by facts, but by popular understanding of the context(s) and meaning(s) of the news. Conscious that some may reply that much of the news is already openly politically-slanted, a note of clarification: though within the (admittedly fuzzy) borders of the mainstream press, there are of course news outlets of various kinds which might conventionally be considered as highly partisan (e.g. The Daily Mail, but also the likes of The Guardian), even their rhetoric is grounded, invariably, in presenting news/truth, with the only bias ever explicitly acknowledged being the national/common interest. The rhetoric of the spectacularly partisan Fox News network, which until relatively recently had the phrase ‘fair and balanced’ trademarked, exemplifies this point. Since admitting to your bias is no admission at all if you define it as a bias in favour of being right, this type of stance, still ultimately grounded in the ideology of objectivity, must not be confused with the honest, explicit partisanship from which we are suggesting the press should never have departed, and to which it should return. The word ‘objectivity’ comes into the language in 1803 but it is not immediately applied to the press. Nevertheless, according to Dan Schiller, selling what amounted to objectivity had, by the 1830s, become a shrewd commercial move for newspaper publishers.14 He grounds his case for its de facto adoption in the press of that era in terms of a response to the growing scepticism of the age of industrialisation and urbanisation – a new world of trains and electricity, of probabilistics and increasingly democratic modes of government. Objectivity at this point can in fact perhaps best be understood as a hustle, designed to obscure the exercise of power within the realm of news. Schiller describes how the con was pitched: With its universalistic intent, its concern for public rationality based on equal access to the facts, objectivity harbored a profoundly democratic promise. From the 1830s the informational system was not to be the exclusive preserve of a king, a baron, a president or a class but rather, as it seemed, of the political nation itself.15

#### Honest advocacy enhances knowledge whereas objective journalism masks and blocks critical challenging power structures

Greg McLaughlin Journalism, Objectivity and War Book Title: The War Correspondent Book Author(s): Published by: Pluto Press Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19qgf0x.7> The War Correspondent Greg McLaughlin Copyright Date: 2016

It was Kapuscinski, however, who revealed the deeper, broader picture, and like all great writers he forged his own unique style. He did not assume absolute truth or prescribe a moral course but, as James Aucoin (2001) puts it, he took you there, showed you an incomplete picture and then challenged you to find the missing pieces. He implicitly passed responsibility on to the reader. It was not conventional, objective journalism, and it was not the journalism of attachment, but perhaps it was better journalism for that. This is close to the idea of ‘honest journalism’ in conventional reporting, whereby the journalist admits not just to the difficulties of objectivity, but to the constructed nature of journalism as a form. In his study of the US press corps in El Salvador during some of the worst years of its civil war in the 1980s, Mark Pedelty highlights a key difference between American and Salvadoran journalists in how they saw their job. The Americans insisted that they ‘report’ news as fact; the Salvadorans talked in terms of ‘making’ news. The Americans adhered to notions of ‘objectivity’, while the Salvadorans thought the highest aspiration in journalism was ‘honesty’ (1995, p.  226–27). As Pedelty argues, the ethic of honest journalism comes somewhere between objective journalism and propaganda: Objective journalists deny their subjectivities, rather than acknowledge them and critically challenge them. They reduce complexities, rather than explain them. They evade contradiction, rather than letting the reader in on the inevitable doubts and difficulties encountered in any act of discovery. (ibid., p. 227)

this cp solves all of the aff impacts – because journalists are not writing out of their own advocacy but of china’s

### FL: Objectivity Bad – Masks Horrors

#### The aff’s calls to objectivity are an Orwellian lie which masks over the fact that neoliberalism is violent.

**Giroux 13** (Henry, American scholar and cultural critic. One of the founding theorists of critical pedagogy in the United States, he is best known for his pioneering work in public pedagogy, “Public Intellectuals Against the Neoliberal University,” 29 October 2013, http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/19654-public-intellectuals-against-the-neoliberal-university)

Increasingly, as universities are shaped by an audit culture, the call to be objective and impartial, whatever one's intentions, can easily echo what George Orwell called the official truth or the establishment point of view. Lacking a self-consciously democratic political focus, teachers are often reduced, or reduce themselves, to the role of a technician or functionary engaged in formalistic rituals, unconcerned with the disturbing and urgent problems that confront the larger society or the consequences of one's pedagogical practices and research undertakings. Hiding behind appeals to balance and objectivity, too many scholars refuse to recognize that being committed to something does not cancel out what C. Wright Mills once called hard thinking. Teaching needs to be rigorous, self-reflective, and committed not to the dead zone of instrumental rationality but to the practice of freedom, to a critical sensibility capable of advancing the parameters of knowledge, addressing crucial social issues, and connecting private troubles and public issues. In opposition to the instrumental model of teaching, with its conceit of political neutrality and its fetishization of measurement, I argue that academics should combine the mutually interdependent roles of critical educator and active citizen. This requires finding ways to connect the practice of classroom teaching with important social problems and the operation of power in the larger society while providing the conditions for students to view themselves as critical agents capable of making those who exercise authority and power answerable for their actions. Higher education cannot be decoupled from what Jacques Derrida calls a democracy to come, that is, a democracy that must always "be open to the possibility of being contested, of contesting itself, of criticizing and indefinitely improving itself."33 Within this project of possibility and impossibility, critical pedagogy must be understood as a deliberately informed and purposeful political and moral practice, as opposed to one that is either doctrinaire, instrumentalized or both. Moreover, a critical pedagogy should also gain part of its momentum in higher education among students who will go back to the schools, churches, synagogues and workplaces to produce new ideas, concepts and critical ways of understanding the world in which young people and adults live. This is a notion of intellectual practice and responsibility that refuses the professional neutrality and privileged isolation of the academy. It also affirms a broader vision of learning that links knowledge to the power of self-definition and to the capacities of students to expand the scope of democratic freedoms, particularly those that address the crisis of education, politics, and the social as part and parcel of the crisis of democracy itself. In order for critical pedagogy, dialogue and thought to have real effects, they must advocate that all citizens, old and young, are equally entitled, if not equally empowered, to shape the society in which they live. This is a commitment we heard articulated by the brave students who fought tuition hikes and the destruction of civil liberties and social provisions in Quebec and to a lesser degree in the Occupy Wall Street movement. If educators are to function as public intellectuals, they need to listen to young people who are producing a new language in order to talk about inequality and power relations, attempting to create alternative democratic public spaces, rethinking the very nature of politics, and asking serious questions about what democracy is and why it no longer exists in many neoliberal societies. These young people who are protesting the 1% recognize that they have been written out of the discourses of justice, equality and democracy and are not only resisting how neoliberalism has made them expendable, they are arguing for a collective future very different from the one that is on display in the current political and economic systems in which they feel trapped. These brave youth are insisting that the relationship between knowledge and power can be emancipatory, that their histories and experiences matter, and that what they say and do counts in their struggle to unlearn dominating privileges, productively reconstruct their relations with others, and transform, when necessary, the world around them.

#### Calls for objectivity come from those hiding atrocities

Greg McLaughlin Journalism, Objectivity and War Book Title: The War Correspondent Book Author(s): Published by: Pluto Press Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19qgf0x.7> The War Correspondent Greg McLaughlin Copyright Date: 2016

I think the highest thing we can achieve is the truth. The truth is not objective sometimes [and] actually there’s nothing very objective about a pogrom and a sweeping policy of ethnic cleansing across an entire country. It’s very brutal, it’s very calculated and it’s very one-sided. [...] I think the interesting thing about objectivity is that the people who wave those banners are usually either people who’ve got something to hide as in the case of the Serbs who were criticising journalistic coverage and saying we weren’t objective and were biased, that’s one category. Secondly, political, establishment figures...were uncomfortable with the reporting and therefore attacked journalists for lacking objectivity. [...] So you have to ask where are they coming from? [...] I sort of feel that I try for the truth and sometimes the truth’s a good story and sometimes it isn’t and actually that’s all that matters.8 Alex Thomson, for Channel 4 News, is of a similar view regarding his reporting of the Kosovo conflict in 1999. He is clear and unapologetic in his dismissal of objectivity in situations where it invalidates difficult or inconvenient truths or where it appears to legitimise torture, rape or ethnic cleansing: I made no attempt to be objective in my reporting about the Serb pogrom which was being conducted in Kosovo...What is objectivity in that situation? What is objectivity!?...Do we mean by objectivity that there is essentially a kind of middle ground of explanation which can legitimately explain why these people are being raped and tortured and burned out of their houses? That’s bullshit! You just tell people what’s happening. You let them make their own moral judgement about it... But in my own personal feelings...I was overjoyed when they started bombing Novi Sad and wasting the Serb’s infrastructure – absolutely overjoyed!9 CNN’s Christiane Amanpour thinks that in a story like the genocide in Rwanda, in 1994, reporters should certainly be fair but that does not mean treating the perpetrators on an equal basis with their victims equally or ‘insisting on drawing a balance when no balance exists’. She attacks today’s ‘culture of moral equivalence’, where ‘journalism seems uncomfortable with identifying a victim and aggressor.’ In Bosnia, for example, ‘Britain and France kept insisting both sides in that conflict were equally guilty. They were not. That has been recognised in retrospect, but in the meantime it caused international inaction and unnecessary loss of life, not to mention a sense of political impotence on the part of the west.’10

Third person disad solves all parts of the aff case – it proves that the Taiwanese people are not effected by the media, which is china’s press (not free) that they consume. This takes out all of their links and impacts as the impacts will not occur if they are not affected

### **Taiwan moved up the democracy index proving that China’s media hasn’t had an impact on Taiwan democracy. Uniqueness overwhelms the link**

Hale 2/22 - Hale, Erin. “Taiwan Ranks among Top 10 Democracies in Annual Index.” VOA, Taiwan Ranks Among Top 10 Democracies in Annual Index, 12 Feb. 2022, https://www.voanews.com/a/taiwan-ranks-among-top-10-democracies-in-annual-index-/6438806.html.

Taiwan ranked as the eighth-strongest democracy in the world last year, according to the Economist Intelligence Unit's new 2021 Democracy Index, and as the second strongest in Asia and Australasia, even as democracies elsewhere continue to struggle. The news was welcomed by Taiwanese President Tsai Ing-wen, who tweeted Friday that despite many challenges, "the people of #Taiwan have been resolute in their commitment to democracy." In 2020, Taiwan, along with Japan and South Korea, moved up a category from "flawed democracies" to "full democracies," a group that last year counted just 21 members worldwide. The 2[021 EIU Index](https://bit.ly/3uJlFm1), published Thursday, reported the worst declines in average global democracy scores since the index was established in 2006.The global decline pushed Taiwan three slots up from its 2020 ranking, according to EIU Taiwan analyst Nick Marro, who helped compile the list. "Taiwan's movement in 2021 was mostly owing to change elsewhere. The score didn't really materially change for Taiwan last year. The status of democracy in Taiwan is still very much intact," he said.

### A “free press” must be absent of state intervention and preserved through legal methods.

Wikipedia, No date, “Freedom of the Press”, Wikipedia.org, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom\_of\_the\_press (accessed 7/11/2021)

Freedom of the press or freedom of the media is the principle that communication and expression through various media, including printed and electronic media, especially published materials, should be considered a right to be exercised freely. Such freedom implies the absence of interference from an overreaching state; its preservation may be sought through constitution or other legal protection and security.