==Neg==

====I negate. ====

====The resolution questions what a democracy ought to do. The resolution is not merely a question of what is consistent with democracy, but in a democracy, what would be moral. Thus, the value is a normatively legitimate democracy which is a democracy founded on moral principles. Prefer this value because it's the most intrinsic value based on the resolution context.====

====Oppression is antithetical to a normatively legitimate democracy so the criterion is minimizing oppression which is the state of being subject to unjust treatment. ====

====First, oppression is what separates democracies from other forms of government as democracy is people-centered. The birthplace of democracy was based on resistance to oppressive political systems. Boston '10:====

(Greek Boston, "How the Ancient Athenians Went From Oppression to Democracy", 2010, https://www.greekboston.com/culture/ancient-history/athenians-oppression-democracy/)

When people think of Ancient Greece ~~[was~~] as being the birthplace of democracy

AND

system was corrupt and the ~~[for~~] people had finally had enough.

====Second, oppression comes prior to other ethical theories—====

====A~~] Inclusion is a prerequisite to moral evaluation because we can't form moral theories until all those affected by oppression are included in societal discourse. ====

====B~~] Affirmative frameworks assume a starting position of equality, grounding their framework as if everyone could engage in ethics. This starting point is flawed – if their justifications take into account unequal social orders they would require rectifying these inequalities since it's a precondition to ethical justification. ====

====Third, I shouldn't have to prove why oppression is bad – questioning oppression is an exclusionary practice that makes debate a hostile space. This is a pre-fiat warrant for the criterion. Smith '13: ====

(Elijah Smith, CEDA and NDT champion, "A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate" Victory Briefs Daily, 9/4/13)

At every tournament you attend this year look around the cafeteria and take note of

AND

students who look up to them why risking such an endeavor is necessary.

====Contention One: Objectivity in the free press furthers oppression.====

====Sub-point A) Objectivity inhibits moral judgment which reinforces the establishment. This means the powerful are able to control the status quo and exclude those outside the scope of normalcy. Wijnberg '17:====

(Rob Wijnberg, "Why Objective Journalism is a Misleading and Dangerous Illusion", 10/7/17, https://thecorrespondent.com/6138/why-objective-journalism-is-a-misleading-and-dangerous-illusion/157316940-eb6c348e)

So there's no such thing as objectivity. But even if there were, journalists

AND

brings us to the third and most urgent problem with objectivity.

====Sub-point B) Objectivity uses norms such as fairness and neutrality to reaffirm oppressive ideologies. Meyer '20: ====

(Will Meyer, New Republic, "The Abuses of Objectivity", 2/6/20, https://newrepublic.com/article/156486/abuses-objectivity)

What a commitment to Objectivity meant, however, was often the appearance

AND

the McCarthy era they went after people in the same way."

====Sub-point C) This argument is empirically grounded as objectivity has historically been used to silence and subjugate groups such as queer folk. Meyer '20: ====

(Will Meyer, New Republic, "The Abuses of Objectivity", 2/6/20, https://newrepublic.com/article/156486/abuses-objectivity)

The tendency to exclude gay journalists, on the grounds of "objectivity

AND

of its way to say if the perpetrator of a crime was gay.

====Contention Two: Advocacy in the free press minimizes oppression.====

====Sub-point A) Advocacy provides recourse for the oppressed-there are multiple warrants. Ramachandran '21:====

(Avigna Ramachandran, "Political Union Debates The Roles of Objectivity and Advoacy in Journalism, 10/12/21, https://northbynorthwestern.com/political-union-debates-the-roles-of-objectivity-and-advocacy-in-journalism/)

In his opening remarks, Secker outlined his reasoning in favor of the resolution,

AND

is about~~] having empathy for the topics and the people they're covering."

====Sub-point B) Advocacy has empirically been an effective call to action for the oppressed. Didier '20:====

(Emily Didier, Medium, "The Importance of Advocacy Journalism", 2/22/20, https://medium.com/@emilyd7630/the-importance-of-advocacy-journalism-a1e682d14251)

First, Ida B. Wells used journalism to express herself and developed a strong

AND

discovering a story, possibly from a new perspective, as Wells did.

====For all these reasons I negate today's resolution. ====

===~~[Overview on AFF Case~~] ===

====Allow me to make an overview on the AFFIRMATIVE case.====

====Objectivity does not exist. Wijnberg '17:====

(Rob Wijnberg, "Why Objective Journalism is a Misleading and Dangerous Illusion", 10/7/17, https://thecorrespondent.com/6138/why-objective-journalism-is-a-misleading-and-dangerous-illusion/157316940-eb6c348e)

There's no such thing as objectivity: Marcel Gelauff says he doesn't want his editorial

AND

. And it's also the worst instruction you can give your editorial team.

====Thus, the affirmative has a necessary but insufficient burden to prove that objectivity exists. If objectivity does not exist, the resolution is nonsensical because it would be impossible to value objectivity over advocacy. For example, arguing that unicorns are beautiful animals is a nonsensical statement if unicorns do not exist. This negates since the resolution cannot be true if it's nonsensical; coherence is a side-constraint to truth. ====