I stand in negation of resolved: In a democracy, a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

**Framework**

**The value is morality, as suggested by ‘ought’ in the resolution itself. A system of morality is expected to exist in the reality (or resolution) being debated – thus morality will serve as our value in the debate.**

**The criterion is continuity. To support morality, the aspect of continuity is necessary before all else in order for morality to have any meaning. If morality was a constantly morphing idea that is allowed to transition to whatever concept fulfills our delusions, then morality has no other meaning than any other word used to describe the instant gratification of whatever whim or desire presents itself. If that were the true definition of morality, then this debate would also be meaningless as any ideology plugged in to the resolution could be deemed “morally permissible”.**

**Contention 1: Hyperreality**

**In order to fulfill the criterion of continuity to further perpetuate morality, reality must be fully and completely understood for as it is, devoid of societal and contemporary distractions, “signs” and “simulacra”. It is impossible to affirm on objectivity without the ability to *be objective.***

***From the [Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/baudrillard/):***

***People are now, Baudrillard claims, in a new era of simulation in which social reproduction (information processing, communication, and knowledge industries, and so on) replaces production as the organizing form of society. In this era, labor is no longer a force of production but itself “one sign amongst many”. Labor is not primarily productive in this situation, but is a sign of one’s social position [status], way of life, and mode of servitude. Wages too bear no rational relation to one’s work and what one produces but to one’s place within the system. But, crucially, political economy is no longer the foundation, the social determinant, or even a structural “reality” in which other phenomena can be interpreted and explained. Instead people live in the “hyperreality” of simulations in which images, spectacles, and the play of signs replace the concepts of production and class conflict as key constituents of contemporary societies.***

***In addition, his postmodern universe is one of hyperreality in which entertainment, information, and communication technologies provide experiences more intense and involving than the scenes of banal everyday life, as well as the codes and models that structure everyday life. The realm of the hyperreal (e.g., media simulations of reality, Disneyland and amusement parks, malls and consumer fantasylands, TV sports, virtual reality games, social networking sites, and other excursions into ideal worlds) is more real than real, whereby the models, images, and codes of the hyperreal come to control thought and behavior. Yet determination itself is aleatory in a non-linear world where it is impossible to chart causal mechanisms in a situation in which individuals are confronted with an overwhelming flux of images, codes, and models, any of which may shape an individual’s thought or behavior.***

***In this postmodern world, individuals flee from the “desert of the real” for the ecstasies of hyperreality and the new realm of computer, media, and technological experience. In this universe, subjectivities are fragmented and lost, and a new terrain of experience appears that, for Baudrillard, renders previous social theories and politics obsolete and irrelevant.***

***It is essential that we escape this hyperreality, as the signs that perpetuate it disfigure our perception of the world and distort our idea of morality. Of course, it is not necessary to wipe all aspects of modern experience from reality, only to uncover the aspects of it that are used to escape it, and tear away the hyperreal.***

***Contention 2: “Free” Press***

***Sub. A - News for Profit***

***Fox News, CNN, and MSNBC. Unquestionably, these organizations are the largest sources of mainstream media consumption, specifically in the US, but largely in the worldwide arena as well. Major press offices claim to uphold themselves as pillars of journalistic integrity- and thus, objectivity. However, with those 3 examples in particular, ideas and biases come to mind. Fox News conjures images of far-right talking heads, while CNN shows images of Ivy educated commentators. Here’s a problem: while we may view them as aesthetically starch, a key problem is that they rely on the same central node: their own thin veils of objectivity.***

***From [Harvard Crimson](https://www.thecrimson.com/column/little-nuances/article/2019/10/22/singh-objective-journalism/) ”Objective Journalism Doesn’t Exist” in [21](https://www.thecrimson.com/column/little-nuances/article/2019/10/22/singh-objective-journalism/)***

***The idea of “objective journalism,” the theoretical ability to stay completely neutral in recounting current events, is nice and comforting to think about. It’s also a complete illusion, an utterly ahistorical approach to understanding how journalism affects society. Objective journalism assumes that all parties in a conversation, or all groups concerned with a single event, have an equal claim to freedom of expression. It therefore assumes that there’s nothing else at stake when covering events of political and social consequence than a difference of opinion. This couldn’t be further from the truth.***

***While this passage simply demonstrates the way that knowledge and expertise on a topic is never equal between individuals, it highlights a key issue in journalism in the status quo: perceived truth. Very often, information given by a talking head in a suit can be and is taken immediately at face value, whether or not what is being said is true. While the idea of understanding biases of certain news networks and “not trusting just one source” exists, we can see how one can get tangled in how many grains of salt to take when reading or listening to anything, and shows that this veil of objective journalism only serves to perpetuate the hyperreality.***

***Sub. B - Advocacy as Solvency***

***Given that even the knowledge of biases in news media isn’t a safe bet to escape the hyperreality and simulacra regarding objectivity, the only way to escape the hyperreal is by negating. By prioritizing and touting our ideas as “objective”, we can only further entrench ourselves into the hyperreal, as even if they are truly objective, it’s impossible to know due to the current signs clouding our perception.***

***By prioritizing advocacy, we begin to disrupt the current reality and make way for something, anything else. The only way to fulfill morality as a standard and keep it consistent is to find a way out of Baudrillard's nightmare, and it can only be done by embracing our moral biases and ridding ourselves of the simulacra that do so.***