### Framework

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

#### I value Justice, defined as giving each their due, because the only reason to value something is because humans value it, which concedes that humans are valuable and deserving.

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### 1] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only the consequences of breaking the promise explain why the second one is much worse than the first.

#### 2] Actor specificity—governments must aggregate because their policies benefit some and harm others. The only non-arbitrary way to prioritize is by helping the most amount of people

Mack 4 [(Peter, MBBS, FRCS(Ed), FRCS (Glasg), PhD, MBA, MHlthEcon) “Utilitarian Ethics in Healthcare.” International Journal of the Computer, the Internet, and Management Vol. 12, No.3. 2004. Department of Surgery. Singapore General Hospital.] SJDI

Medicine is a costly science, but of greater concern to the health economist is that it is also a limitless art. Every medical advance created new needs that did not exist until the means of meeting them came into existence. Physicians are reputed to have an infinite capacity to do ever more things, and perform ever more expensive interventions for their patients so long as any of their patients’ health needs remain unfulfilled. The traditional stance of the physician is that each patient is an isolated universe. When confronted with a situation in which his duty involves a competition for scarce medications or treatments, he would plead the patient’s cause by all methods, short of deceit. However, when the physician’s decision involves more than just his own patient, or has some commitment to public health, other issues have to be considered. He then has to recognise that the unbridled advocacy of the patient may not square with what the economist perceives to be the most advantageous policy to society as a whole. Medical professionals characteristically deplore scarcities. Many of them are simply not prepared to modify their intransigent principle of unwavering duty to their patients’ individual interest. However, in decisions involving multiple patients, making available more medication, labour or expenses for one patient will mean leaving less for another. The physician is then compelled by his competing loyalties to enter into a decision mode of one versus many, where the underlying constraint is one of finiteness of the commodities. Although the medical treatment may be simple and inexpensive in many instances, there are situations such as in renal dialysis, where prioritisation of treatment poses a moral dilemma because some patients will be denied the treatment and perish. Ethics and economics share areas of overlap. They both deal with how people should behave, what policies the state should pursue and what obligations citizens owe to their governments. The centrality of the human person in both normative economics and normative ethics is pertinent to this discussion. Economics is the study of human action in the marketplace whereas ethics deals with the “rightness” or “wrongness” of human action in general. Both disciplines are rooted in human reason and human nature and the two disciplines intersect at the human person and the analysis of human action. From the economist’s perspective, ethics is identified with the investigation of rationally justifiable bases for resolving conflict among persons with divergent aims and who share a common world. Because of the scarcity of resources, one’s success is another person’s failure. Therefore ethics search for rationally justifiable standards for the resolution of interpersonal conflict. While the realities of human life have given rise to the concepts of property, justice and scarcity, the management of scarcity requires the exercise of choice, since having more of some goods means having less of others. Exercising choice in turn involves comparisons, and comparisons are based on principles. As ethicists, the meaning of these principles must be sought in the moral basis that implementing them would require. For instance, if the implementation of distributive justice in healthcare is founded on the basis of welfare-based principles, as opposed to say resource-based principles, it means that the health system is motivated by the idea that what is of primary moral importance is the level of welfare of the people. This means that all distributive questions should be settled according to which distribution maximises welfare. Utilitarianism is fundamentally welfarist in its philosophy. Application of the principle to healthcare requires a prior understanding of the welfarist theory as expounded by the economist. Conceptually, welfarist theory is built on four tenets: utility maximisation, consumer sovereignty, consequentialism and welfarism. Utility maximisation embodies the behavioural proposition that individuals choose rationally, but it does not address the morality of rational choice. Consumer sovereignty is the maxim that individuals are the best judge of their own welfare. Consequentialism holds that any action or choice must be judged exclusively in terms of outcomes. Welfarism is the proposition that the “goodness” of the resource allocation be judged solely on the welfare or utility levels in that situation. Taken together these four tenets require that a policy be judged solely in terms of the resulting utilities achieved by individuals as assessed by the individuals themselves. Issues of who receives the utility, the source of the utility and any non-utility aspects of the situation are ignored.

#### Definitions are available upon request. I reserve the right to define a word in a future speech if necessary.

### Observation 1

#### Because the resolution states that news media must prioritize objectivity over advocacy, the role of the negative is not to prove that we shouldn’t be using objectivity, only that it shouldn’t be prioritized over advocacy.

### Contention 1 is the Systematic Exclusion of Minorities

#### First of all, objectivity is impossible. It’s not a question of whether certain evidence is true; rather, it’s a question of which evidence we’re being told. Neuroscience demonstrates that humans can’t experience all the information in the world, so what information is distributed to us is necessarily based on biased omission. Taflinger 96 writes,

Richard F. Taflinger (I'm an associate clinical professor in the Edward R. Murrow College of Communication at Washington State University in Pullman, Washington, where I teach some of everything: advertising, broadcasting, media criticism, and speech communication. My particular area of interest is psychophysiological responses to communication messages, especially those in advertising and television. I have a BA in Speech/Theatre, a MA in Drama, and a PhD in Theatre, emphasizing Mass Media Theory and Criticism), 5-29-1996, "The Myth of Objectivity in Journalism: A Commentary," Washington State University, <https://public.wsu.edu/~taflinge/mythobj.html>, //hzheng

The oft-stated and highly desired goal of modern journalism is objectivity, the detached and unprejudiced gathering and dissemination of news and information. Such objectivity can allow people to arrive at decisions about the world and events occurring in it without the journalist's subjective views influencing the acceptance or rejection of information. Few whose aim is a populace making decisions based on facts rather than prejudice or superstition would argue with such a goal.

It's a pity that such a goal is impossible to achieve. As long as human beings gather and disseminate news and information, objectivity is an unrealizable dream.

Perhaps a good place to begin would be with a definition of terms. I think we can generally agree that the definition of objective is being without prejudice or bias, the presence of full understanding, honest, just and free from improper influence. Subjective, on the other hand, would be peculiar to a particular individual as modified by individual bias and limitations. Can we all agree those are reasonable definitions? Then let's see how they apply to journalism.

Let's begin with an examination of how people gather information about the world around them in order to arrive at what they consider an objective view of it.

The brain has no actual, physical contact with the world. It doesn't even have pain nerves, and thus needs no anesthesia when operated upon (of course, the skin of the scalp and the bone of the skull are not likewise blessed and do require anesthesia when the brain is operated on). Everything the brain knows or reacts to comes to it in only one way: through the senses.

People, like all other sensate beings on Earth, gather their information through their senses. Human senses include the ability to detect electromagnetic waves in the 3900-7500 angstrom range, air waves in the 20 to 20,000 beats per second, air-borne and liquid-borne molecules of proper size, quantity and configuration, and to generate nerve impulses triggered by objects impinging on body surfaces with enough force. These senses are better known as sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch, and are the only methods, as far as we know, of perceiving what exists and happens in the world around us.

However, when one notices the limits on each sense, one cannot fail to realize that it is impossible for any person to perceive all there is to perceive. The electromagnetic spectrum extends far below into the ultraviolet and radiation and above into the infrared and radio than the narrow visible light range that humans can see. Many animals can hear and smell far better than humans. Touch requires an actual physical presence with the object being touched.

Humans, however, do not have to rely only upon their personal senses to gather information about the world. They can also make use of extrasomatic (meaning "out of the body") senses.

Humans construct instruments and machines, extrasomatic senses, that can perceive what humans can not. The microscope and the telescope can make the too small or the too distant to see visible. Radio telescopes, X-ray machines and infrared film and nightvision scopes can allow a human to see mechanically or by computer generated views far above and below visible light. Microphones, amplifiers and speakers can detect and convert to the audible range sounds above and below the human range of audibility. However, no machine can replace the sense of touch, and the most advanced gas chromatograph mass spectrometer (a machine designed to detect, analyze and identify minute quantities of molecules that humans can smell or taste) is not even close to as sensitive as the human tongue and nose, and the latter has only one-millionth the sensitivity of a bloodhound dog's.

Of course, the above has very little to do with the average person since the average person does not walk around with either a radio telescope or a gas chromatograph mass spectrometer. Average people depend on their own senses to identify what is in the world around them. In addition, people design instruments and machines to detect what the builders expect to detect: if the unexpected appears often it is rejected as anomalous, a flaw in the equipment, or misreading of the data. A prime example of this is the Bell scientists who serendipitously discovered the background radiation of the universe. They spent weeks trying to get the noise created by the radiation out of their instruments and finally concluded that the fault wasn't in the instruments but in what they expected the instruments to do. That did not include detecting the noise.

There are other extrasomatic senses. Such extrasomatic senses include printed material such as books and newspapers, films, video and audio tapes, and radio and television. With these it is possible to be told or shown what other people have sensed. However, such sources of information have the built-in drawback of being [are] constructed from the limited senses of the authors. Add the complicating factor of the limited communication media of words and images rather than a direct communication of the sensations experienced and vicarious experience is a mere shadow of the real thing.

Due to the limitations on perception[,] the world must be a construct, an illusion created from the raw material of photons, pressure waves, and other forms of primary sensory stimuli. These stimuli people process into abstract symbols such as "red" for a color or "sweet" for a taste. The abstract symbols are then assembled via the nervous system into conscious experience of people, places, and things.

As external realities, the people, the places, and the things exist only as bare frameworks. The mind projects covering, form, warmth, color, and other attributes which the mind itself creates onto them. Thus each mind manufactures its own illusory world upon a minimum of shared reality. The shared reality is those things that people sense in common: the feel of corduroy, the smell of a rose, the appearance of a tree, the sound of a violin, the taste of an apple.

People may share reality, but the world constructed from that reality can and does var[ies]y according to each individual's perception. Each person's world conforms to its own set of culturally defined expectations and in such a way as to appear satisfyingly real in total to its creator. The taste of roasted beetle grubs can be delicious or repulsive depending upon the taster's culture. The definition of feminine or masculine beauty depends on if the viewer is European or Australian bushman. As Arthur Clarke says, "any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic." Thus if a culture does not include television as a natural part of its world, it must be un- or supernatural. Any report of television to others in that culture is considered unreliable, no matter how much a part of the reality of other cultures television might be.

Preconceptions, prejudices, biases, [and] cultural norms and mores, education, superstition, peer opinion, all play their role in an people creating their own realities. This process I call filtering.

#### Objectivity is Impossible

**Samuel Peleg 2007**Samuel Peleg (professor of political communication at the School of Communication at Tel Aviv University, and a senior lecturer at the Inter‑Disciplinary Center in Herzlia; academic director of the Strategic Dialogue Center, at Netanya College; an expert in conflict and conflict resolution processes and a research fellow at the Stanford Center for Conflict Resolution and Negotiation). “In defense of peace journalism: A rejoin‑ der.” Conflict & Communication Online,Vol. 6, No. 2, 2007 Date accessed 2/27/2022 by OHS JL
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The concept of **objectivity** has always been **somewhat slippery**, and it is mainly **evoked when it is perceived to be absent**. **Few reporters could attest** to **total neutrality** or impartiality. At best, journalists will admit a measure of detachment from their own personal biases in practicing their craft. The critical sociologist Michael Schudson claims that ”the belief in objectivity is a faith in ’facts,’ a distrust in ’values,’ and a commitment to their segregation” (1978). This fascination with gathering and reporting hard and raw data sanctifies the what is and foregoes the what if. This inclination for emphasizing eyewitness accounts of events and validating facts through a variety of sources to establish a balanced picture of what happened echoes the traditional role of journalism as the fourth estate: telling the story independently of the other estates, or authorities, namely, government, religion and business. Unlike the latter three which promote biased narratives of reality, the fourth estate‑‑the press, stands firm in its impartial and unyielding account of the real world. This idea dates back to Thomas Carlyle, when he wrote “The affairs of the nation were there deliberated and decided; what we were to do as a nation. But does not, though the name Parliament subsists, the parliamentary debate go on now, everywhere and at all times, in a far more comprehensive way, out of Parliament altogether? Burke said there were Three Estates in Parliament; but, in the Reporters’ Gallery yonder, there sat a Fourth Estate more important far than they all. It is not a figure of speech, or a witty saying; it is a literal fact,‑‑very momentous to us in these times. Literature is our Parliament too. Printing, which comes necessarily out of Writing, I say often, is equivalent to Democracy: invent Writing, Democracy is inevitable. Writing brings Printing; brings universal everyday extempore Printing, as we see at present.” This is surely a noble **idea** but **completely unsustainable**. Objectivity on an issue, certainly significant and noteworthy enough to be mentioned on the news, **denotes more unawareness or even ignorance than a predisposition**. A more realistic depiction of the spirit of journalism maintains that **objectivity is simply untenable** and that **journalists** should aspire for something like a neutral perspective on any controversial issue. As such, they **should carefully study** and then report the **viewpoints of both sides**. It does not mean that the journalist has no stand in the conflict, only that his or her personal opinion does not interfere nor misrepresent the professional conduct of reporting an event “as it is”. Unlike **objectivity** that **boasts no opinion and no judgment**, **neutrality** is an **opinion restrained and judgment reserved**.

#### Objectivity is impossible. It’s not a question of whether certain evidence is true; rather, it’s a question of which evidence we’re being told. Neuroscience demonstrates that humans can’t experience all the information in the world, so what information is distributed to us is necessarily based on biased omission. Taflinger 96 writes,

Richard F. Taflinger (I'm an associate clinical professor in the Edward R. Murrow College of Communication at Washington State University in Pullman, Washington, where I teach some of everything: advertising, broadcasting, media criticism, and speech communication. My particular area of interest is psychophysiological responses to communication messages, especially those in advertising and television. I have a BA in Speech/Theatre, a MA in Drama, and a PhD in Theatre, emphasizing Mass Media Theory and Criticism), 5-29-1996, "The Myth of Objectivity in Journalism: A Commentary," Washington State University, <https://public.wsu.edu/~taflinge/mythobj.html>, //hzheng

The oft-stated and highly desired goal of modern journalism is objectivity, the detached and unprejudiced gathering and dissemination of news and information. Such objectivity can allow people to arrive at decisions about the world and events occurring in it without the journalist's subjective views influencing the acceptance or rejection of information. Few whose aim is a populace making decisions based on facts rather than prejudice or superstition would argue with such a goal. It's a pity that such a goal is impossible to achieve. As long as human beings gather and disseminate news and information, objectivity is an unrealizable dream. Perhaps a good place to begin would be with a definition of terms. I think we can generally agree that the definition of objective is being without prejudice or bias, the presence of full understanding, honest, just and free from improper influence. Subjective, on the other hand, would be peculiar to a particular individual as modified by individual bias and limitations. Can we all agree those are reasonable definitions? Then let's see how they apply to journalism. Let's begin with an examination of how people gather information about the world around them in order to arrive at what they consider an objective view of it. The brain has no actual, physical contact with the world. It doesn't even have pain nerves, and thus needs no anesthesia when operated upon (of course, the skin of the scalp and the bone of the skull are not likewise blessed and do require anesthesia when the brain is operated on). Everything the brain knows or reacts to comes to it in only one way: through the senses. People, like all other sensate beings on Earth, gather their information through their senses. Human senses include the ability to detect electromagnetic waves in the 3900-7500 angstrom range, air waves in the 20 to 20,000 beats per second, air-borne and liquid-borne molecules of proper size, quantity and configuration, and to generate nerve impulses triggered by objects impinging on body surfaces with enough force. These senses are better known as sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch, and are the only methods, as far as we know, of perceiving what exists and happens in the world around us. However, when one notices the limits on each sense, one cannot fail to realize that it is impossible for any person to perceive all there is to perceive. The electromagnetic spectrum extends far below into the ultraviolet and radiation and above into the infrared and radio than the narrow visible light range that humans can see. Many animals can hear and smell far better than humans. Touch requires an actual physical presence with the object being touched. Humans, however, do not have to rely only upon their personal senses to gather information about the world. They can also make use of extrasomatic (meaning "out of the body") senses. Humans construct instruments and machines, extrasomatic senses, that can perceive what humans can not. The microscope and the telescope can make the too small or the too distant to see visible. Radio telescopes, X-ray machines and infrared film and nightvision scopes can allow a human to see mechanically or by computer generated views far above and below visible light. Microphones, amplifiers and speakers can detect and convert to the audible range sounds above and below the human range of audibility. However, no machine can replace the sense of touch, and the most advanced gas chromatograph mass spectrometer (a machine designed to detect, analyze and identify minute quantities of molecules that humans can smell or taste) is not even close to as sensitive as the human tongue and nose, and the latter has only one-millionth the sensitivity of a bloodhound dog's. Of course, the above has very little to do with the average person since the average person does not walk around with either a radio telescope or a gas chromatograph mass spectrometer. Average people depend on their own senses to identify what is in the world around them. In addition, people design instruments and machines to detect what the builders expect to detect: if the unexpected appears often it is rejected as anomalous, a flaw in the equipment, or misreading of the data. A prime example of this is the Bell scientists who serendipitously discovered the background radiation of the universe. They spent weeks trying to get the noise created by the radiation out of their instruments and finally concluded that the fault wasn't in the instruments but in what they expected the instruments to do. That did not include detecting the noise. There are other extrasomatic senses. Such extrasomatic senses include printed material such as books and newspapers, films, video and audio tapes, and radio and television. With these it is possible to be told or shown what other people have sensed. However, such sources of information have the built-in drawback of being [are] constructed from the limited senses of the authors. Add the complicating factor of the limited communication media of words and images rather than a direct communication of the sensations experienced and vicarious experience is a mere shadow of the real thing. Due to the limitations on perception[,] the world must be a construct, an illusion created from the raw material of photons, pressure waves, and other forms of primary sensory stimuli. These stimuli people process into abstract symbols such as "red" for a color or "sweet" for a taste. The abstract symbols are then assembled via the nervous system into conscious experience of people, places, and things. As external realities, the people, the places, and the things exist only as bare frameworks. The mind projects covering, form, warmth, color, and other attributes which the mind itself creates onto them. Thus each mind manufactures its own illusory world upon a minimum of shared reality. The shared reality is those things that people sense in common: the feel of corduroy, the smell of a rose, the appearance of a tree, the sound of a violin, the taste of an apple. People may share reality, but the world constructed from that reality can and does var[ies]y according to each individual's perception. Each person's world conforms to its own set of culturally defined expectations and in such a way as to appear satisfyingly real in total to its creator. The taste of roasted beetle grubs can be delicious or repulsive depending upon the taster's culture. The definition of feminine or masculine beauty depends on if the viewer is European or Australian bushman. As Arthur Clarke says, "any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic." Thus if a culture does not include television as a natural part of its world, it must be un- or supernatural. Any report of television to others in that culture is considered unreliable, no matter how much a part of the reality of other cultures television might be. Preconceptions, prejudices, biases, [and] cultural norms and mores, education, superstition, peer opinion, all play their role in an people creating their own realities. This process I call filtering.

#### Prioritizing “objectivity” comes from a place of profound privilege – advocacy for marginalized groups is good and necessary. Levi 20 writes,

* CONTENT WARNING – antiblack violence

Gabriel Levi, 4-30-2021, "COLUMN: Why objectivity in journalism does more harm than good to marginalized communities," No Publication, <https://themaneater.com/column-why-objectivity-in-journalism-does-more-harm-than-good-to-marginalized-communities/>, //hzheng

The objectivity conversation is to journalists as garlic is to vampires: deadly. Instead of tackling the conversation head-on, journalists tend to silently make a decision on objectivity and hope no one asks them about it. So, today, I am going to be journalism’s worst nightmare, because I’m going to talk about objectivity and why it is the bane of my existence.

To talk about objectivity, we have to talk about its origins. Back in the day before Beyonce’s internet, journalism used to be a lot more partisan, meaning journalism used to be openly biased. Newspapers would support political parties and use their influence to sway the public’s opinion.

To fix this issue, a bunch of old white guys decided, ‘Hey! We need to set some standards for journalism so we can be taken seriously.’ Thus, objectivity (amongst many other things) was born. They defined objectivity in journalism as reporting without bias and making sure to represent both sides of an issue fairly.

Over time, an ‘expert’ approach to journalism emerged where some people believed you had to have certain qualifications and training in order to understand and uphold journalism standards, such as objectivity.

Therein lies the first issue with objectivity. Even in its (very simplified, I will admit) origins, objectivity has always been something inaccessible to a lot of people. The standards for journalism were created with rich white men who could afford an education in mind. And in today’s world, this mentality simply won’t make the cut.

In today’s world, I would hope we all have a little more understanding of this big idea I like to call ‘systemic racism.’ For those who don’t know, systemic racism explicitly states that all ‘systems’ in America such as housing, jobs, education, etc. are all biased against people of color.

People of color have always had the short end of the education system’s stick. Black Americans were legally kept out of “white” schools until the late 1900s, and we still see the effects of this today. Talented young Black kids don’t have access to top-grade education because of something white people tend to think we resolved years ago.

News flash: we didn’t!

The education system holding people of color back from top-grade education means many people who look like me will never have the opportunity to study and learn how to use objectivity. Therefore, objectivity as a whole becomes inaccessible and racially biased towards white people.

So, I must ask, why uphold a standard set by men who didn’t even want to see people like me in this field?

The answer is: we shouldn’t. In this modern society, the lines between the oppressor and the oppressed are clearer than ever. Simply put, in most situations, there is a right and a wrong, and sometimes not making a choice is choosing the wrong side.

By upholding objectivity, journalists tend to side with the oppressor rather than the oppressed, which goes against everything a journalist should be. A journalist should not be a stenographer who presents both sides of an issue ‘fairly,’ when common sense tells us it’s not a fair issue. A journalist should be an active voice for the people, using their voice to side with the people being harmed at all times.

To clarify, I am not saying to lose the reporting aspect of our jobs. We should always seek to inform. However, sometimes siding with the people is as simple as word choice.

In an extreme example, last summer I watched in horror on social media as Derek Chauvin forced his knee on George Floyd’s neck for almost nine minutes. Through video evidence, I saw a murder happen right before my eyes.

Instead of news outlets supporting Black people during that traumatic experience by at least calling it murder by name, news outlets went for less biased words like “incident” or “alleged” when I saw it right in front of my face.

That was a big slap in the face because news outlets were telling [us] my community that what we saw was a lie. We didn’t see a murder, we saw an ‘incident,’ and that only made a cruel summer even worse.

The second issue with objectivity is the sense of privilege it accompanies. For people of color and marginalized communities, we don’t get to strip ourselves of these identities for the news. No matter if the story runs, at the end of the day, I am still a Black, queer person living in America who faces the threats reported during the news in my daily life.

To be objective about that is to have the privilege to say, ‘I can take a step back from this’ when others do not have that luxury. So when journalists preach objectivity, they need to check their privilege, because some of us can’t be objective when our wellbeing is at stake.

On the other side of the argument, some journalists argue that without objectivity, there is no difference between a journalist and a common person, because journalism loses its standards.

I don’t think there should be a difference. The only difference between a journalist and a common person is a couple journalism classes and a platform.

To even assume there is a difference makes journalism pretentious, and once again inhibits us from doing our primary jobs: representing the people. Doing away with objectivity puts journalists and average citizens on a level playing field, which is more important than upholding outdated journalism standards.

When it comes to objectivity, journalists need to decide what side of history they want to be on. In 20 years, when history books recount the events of the past few years, I can sleep peacefully knowing I stood with my people against all odds. For those who so vehemently uphold objectivity, can you say the same?