### 1

#### Interpretation: The aff may only garner offense from the hypothetical enactment of resolution of the free press prioritizing objectivity over advocacy in democracies.

#### Violation – they advocate for revolution, the card right under their advocacy, it proves extra T at best. Err neg – cx proves they were shift af and dint clarify how they solved cap through only the res. Defending a model of debate is different from defending the policy actions of the res

**Resolved denotes a proposal to be enacted by law**

Words and Phrases 1964Permanent Edition

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “**to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;**” It is of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is **defined** by Bouvier **as** meaning “**to establish by law**”.

#### Democracy is government ruled by the people

**Merriam Webster** “Merriam-Webster Dictionary.” *Merriam-Webster.com*, 2022, [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/democracy](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/democracy). //Nato

Definition of democracy

1a: government by the people especially : rule of the majority

b: a government in which the supreme power is [vested](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/vest#h2) in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free [elections](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/election)

2: a political unit that has a [democratic](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/democratic) government

#### Objectivity is giving equal weight to different viewpoints

**Winthrop 20** Winthrop, Zadie. “Should Journalists Rethink Objectivity? Stanford Professors Weigh In.” *The Stanford Daily*, The Stanford Daily, 20 Aug. 2020, stanforddaily.com/2020/08/20/should-journalists-rethink-objectivity-stanford-professors-weigh-in/. //Nato

“Journalists need to be overt and candid advocates for social justice, and it’s hard to do that under the constraints of objectivity,” said Ted Glasser, communications professor at Stanford, in an interview with The Daily. The murder of George Floyd and the racial reckoning that followed have opened a conversation around journalistic objectivity. Glasser believes journalists must step away from the blanket idea of objectivity to achieve social change — but not everyone agrees with him. Many journalists are now asking: Can journalism contribute to social change while maintaining its objectivity? Objectivity became a prominent journalistic principle in the 1920s. According to the Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel’s [book](https://www.amazon.com/Elements-Journalism-Revised-Updated-3rd/dp/0804136785), “The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect,” objectivity emerged because the country’s faith in science was growing, so Americans felt journalism should also be a scientific process discerning objective truths rooted in facts and evidence. [According](https://time.com/5443351/journalism-objectivity-history/) to Matthew Pressman, journalism assistant professor at Seton Hall University, objectivity caught on after massive newspaper closures throughout the U.S. Since there were fewer papers, wrote Pressman, each one had to serve larger audiences and thus more diverse viewpoints. To stay afloat, newspapers embraced objectivity as an effort to keep a wider audience happy. But some, like political science assistant professor Hakeem Jefferson, consider objectivity in its current practice to be less focused on determining objective truths and more focused on giving equal weight to different viewpoints so the journalist appears fair. “[Journalists] are so hell-bent on being ‘objective’ for both sides … they can’t tell the truth,” Jefferson said. Jefferson described journalists having to “pretend racial inequality isn’t normatively bad” or “Black people in this country [don’t] face a criminal justice system that’s grossly unequal” to appear objective in their reporting. Unsurprisingly, Jefferson said, journalists fail in their duty to be truth-tellers because of their duty to be objective. The [ethical guidelines](https://www.star-telegram.com/news/article239521643.html) of McClatchy, a publishing company which operates 30 newspapers nationally, state employees should avoid social media actions that “could call into question” their and their organization’s objectivity. Some McClatchy journalists wanted to support Black Lives Matter on social media, but feared the action could cost them their job. To that, a McClatchy vice president [tweeted](https://twitter.com/KLR_Editor/status/1288556048824098817?s=20), “expressing that Black lives matter is not a political statement. It is a fundamental truth. It is not a violation of social media policy to tell the world that Black lives matter.” The dilemma between “truth” and “objectivity” has brought attention to a new principle: “moral clarity.” New Yorker staff writer Masha Gessen suggests in the piece [“Why Are Some Journalists Afraid of ‘Moral Clarity?’”](https://www.newyorker.com/news/our-columnists/why-are-some-journalists-afraid-of-moral-clarity) that journalists should seek moral clarity instead of the opinion A vs. opinion B reporting that Jefferson sees as what passes for objectivity today. Gessen adopts the definition of moral clarity from Susan Neiman, the author of a [book](https://www.amazon.com/Moral-Clarity-Grown-Up-Idealists-Revised/dp/0691143897?ots=1&slotNum=0&imprToken=b0ba0417-95af-9e25-6e0&tag=thneyo0f-20&linkCode=w50) on moral clarity. According to Neiman, moral clarity arises after a writer assesses the facts and context of a particular situation, makes a moral judgment about it and includes that judgment in his or her article. With moral clarity, a journalist could make statements that, say, the criminal justice system is unfair to Black people or that racism is bad because the journalist holds that these claims are, at their root, fact-based claims — despite political polarization that could lead one to see the statements as biased. Wesley Lowery, who has served as a national correspondent for the Washington Post, has been a prominent voice in the moral clarity versus objectivity debate. Lowery wrote in a [tweet](https://twitter.com/WesleyLowery/status/1268366363359354885?s=20), “American view-from-nowhere, “objectivity”-obsessed, both-sides journalism is a failed experiment…The old way must go. We need to rebuild our industry as one that operates from a place of moral clarity.”

#### Vote neg for clash – abdicating government actions sanctions picking any interpretation for debate – incentivizes retreat from controversy and forces the neg to first characterize the aff and then debate it which eliminates the benefit of preround research. A common point of engagement ensures effective clash, which is a linear impact – negation is the necessary condition for distinguishing debate from discussion, but negation exists on a sliding scale. The topic of discussion is up to the affirmative, but depth and nuanced engagement is determined by negative ground.

#### 1] Fairness is constitutive process of debate since debate is a game with a winner and loser, speech times, and flipping 30 min before the round- Constitutive Rules means any DA to our interpretation are inevitable and terminally non-unique

#### 2] Self Defeating- All the 1ar's arguments assume that the judge will evaluate them fairly which concedes it's authority- actively hack against them

#### 3] Dogmatism- absent a fair ability to engage, we can't test alternative liberation strategies. Their interpretation assumes their method is correct which imposes a dogmatic and singular view of the world

#### 4] Deliberation - Every productive discussion of an liberation strategy assumes an equal playing field or fairness with the ability to contribute to a discussion which only our interpretation resolvles

#### 5] Truth testing- their interpretation assumes that affirmative is correct but we can't do that if we couldn’t engage

#### TVA and switch-side solve the 1AC – You can read this on the neg, read the elmer aff that solves objectivity and prevent bad information.

#### Drop the debater – we indict their model of debate. Evaluate the T-shell through competing interpretations – you cannot be reasonably unfair, and reasonability brightlines are arbitrary which requires judge intervention. No RVIs or impact turns – you should not win for proving you’re accessible, and their model deters debaters from indicting oppressive practices.