# SJ AC – Democracy

## Framing [2:00]

#### All actions are ethically relevant since humans are inescapably related to others. Social enculturation is the only coherent explanation for how we can know anything in the first place which comes first since it’s impossible to explain actions otherwise.

Seyla Benhabib. Situating the Self. 1992. Routledge. –ilake MW [ask me for pdf if needed]

Moral judgment differs from these other domains in one crucial respect: the exercise of moral judgment is pervasive and unavoidable; in fact, this exercise is coextensive with relations of social interaction in the lifeworld in general. Moral judgment is what we “always already” exercise in virtue of being immersed in a network of human relationships that constitute our life together. Whereas there can be reasonable debate about whether or not to exercise juridical, military, therapeutic, aesthetic, or even political judgment, in the case of moral judgment this option is not there. The domain of the moral is so deeply enmeshed with those interactions that constitute our lifeworld that to withdraw from moral judgment is tantamount to ceasing to interact, to talk and act in the human community. To justify my claim that moral judgment is what we “always already” exercise in virtue of being immersed in a network of human relations, I want to begin by recalling the most salient features of action as Arendt introduces them in The Human Condition.7 These are natality, plurality and the immersion of action in a web of interpretations which I shall call“[is] narrativity.” Natality is like a “second birth,” according to Arendt. It is that quality through which we insert ourselves into the world, this time not through the mere fact of being born but through the initiation of words and deeds. This initiation of words and deeds, which Arendt names “the prin- ciple of beginning” (HC, p. 177), can no more be avoided than the fact of birth itself. The child becomes a member of a human community in that it learns to initiate speech and action. Although an unavoidable aspect of human acculturation, the condition of natality implies no determinism. Just as every speaker of a language has a capacity to generate an infinite number of grammatically well- formed sentences, the doer of deeds has a capacity to initiate always the unexpected and the improbable which nonetheless belongs to the possible repertoire of human action and conduct. Whereas action corresponds to the fact of birth,“ s p e e c h cor- responds to the fact of distinctness and is the actualization of the human condition of plurality, that is, of living as a distinct and unique being among equals” (HC, p. 178). Plurality, which is re-vealed in speech, is rooted in the fact of human equality, which in this context does not mean moral and political equality but rather a generic equality of the human constitution that allows humans to understand each other (HC, p. 175). Whereas in the case of other species, this generic equality defines the individuality of each member of a species, in the case of humans the distinctness of individuals from one another is revealed through speech. We can say that the human capacity to use speech leads to a differentiation of the repertoire of activities beyond those which are species specific as well as allowing the emergence of a differentiated subjectivity in the inner life of the self. Speech differentiates action from mere behavior; the one who speaks is also the one who thinks, feels and experiences in a certain way. The individuation of the human self is simultaneously the process whereby this self becomes capable of action and of expressing the subjectivity of the doer. Speech and action are fundamentally related, and “many, and even most acts,” observes Arendt, “are performed in the manner of speech” (HC, p. 178). Speech and action have a revelatory quality: they reveal the “whoness” of the doer. This revelation of the whoness of the actor is always a revealing to somebody who is like oneself. Only if somebody else is able to understand the mean- ing of our words as well as the whatness of our deeds can the identity of the self be said to be revealed. Action and speech, there- fore, are essentially interaction. They take place between humans. Narrativity, or the immersion of action in a web of human rela- tionships, is the mode through which the self is individuated and acts are identified. Both the whatness of the act and the whoness of the self are disclosed to agents capable of communicative under- standing. Actions are identified narratively. Somebody has always done such-and-such at some point in time. To identify an action is to tell the story of its initiation, of its unfolding, and of its immersion in a web of relations constituted through the actions and narratives of others. Likewise, the whoness of the self is constituted by the story of a life– a coherent narrative of which we are always the protagonist, but not always the author or the producer. Narrativity is the mode through which actions are individuated and the identity of the self constituted. Of course, these claims concerning the role of narrative in the individuation of actions and the constitution of self-identity are not uncontested. The tendency in the philosophical tradition has been to view these phenomena along the models of substance and accidents or a thing and its properties. The self becomes the “I know not what” underlying or suspending its actions. These, in turn, are not considered as meaningful deeds that reveal something to someone but rather as properties of bodies. The self whom Hume stumbles upon while ruminating in his consciousness, or the Kantian “I” that accompanies all my representations is not the self in the human community, the acting or interacting self, but the self qua thinker, qua subject of consciousness withdrawn from the world. There is a fundamental connection between the tradition’s ignor- ing of the question of judgment in moral life and the neglect of the specificity of action as speech and action or communicative inter- action. Once we see moral action as interaction, performed toward others and in the company of others, the role of judgment emerges in at least three relevant areas of moral interaction.8 These are the assessment of one’s duties, the assessment of one’s actions as fulfill- ing these duties, and the assessment of one’s maxims as embodied, expressed or revealed in actions.

#### And, my framework’s account of how we learn comes logically prior to a discussion of how to apply learned knowledge since we can’t have the latter absent the former. A priori accounts of ethics fail since a) abstract principles are inaccessible if we’re never taught about them—I couldn’t read Korsgaard if nobody taught me to read, and b) principles can never be justified independent of application: all agents have unique desires, so attention to particulars is necessary—doing otherwise would be as error-prone as using wikihow to diagnose every illness. Even senses can’t inform anything beyond basic instinct—simple accounts of pain or oppression’s repulsiveness can’t inform hyper-specific policies, just like how we can’t send a rocket to the moon if we only know that things fall when we drop them. Only my framing resolves these issues since I give an account of how knowledge is formed.

#### Political actions are constitutive of moral citizenship, but seeking the best politics necessitates deliberative democracy.

Seyla Benhabib. Situating the Self. 1992. Routledge. –ilake MW [ask me for pdf if needed]

In the case of moral and political judgment matters are different. Since I take moral judgment to be fundamentally distinct from all other forms of judgment in one crucial respect, which I will explain below, let me deal with political judgment first. At first sight, there appears to be no reason as to why we should not ascribe the expertise of political judgment to certain special individuals like statespersons, diplomats, elected representatives, administrative officers and the like. In fact, we might assume that ideally, even when not in practice, one reason for these individuals to hold the offices they do is their ability to exercise the kinds of judgments demanded from them by their tasks. This model of political judgment, which views it as a form of expert opinion, is inadequate from the standpoint of a theory of democracy. Even if we abstract for a moment from the question of representative versus participatory democracy, the exercise of political judgment in a democratic polity cannot be relegated only to experts. Even in narrow models of representative democracy, the public, the citizens, are still expected to exercise their political judgment at least on election day. Citizens in a democratic polity are capable of exercising judgment in several areas. First, they have to be able to judge the relation between the possible in a social and political system and the desirable from some normative standpoint of justice, fairness, equality and freedom. Second, they have to be able to judge [and] the capacity of this specific [an] individual and organization to carry out their mandate. Finally they have to be able to judge the forseeable consequences of their choices from the standpoint of the past, present and future of their polity. Participatory models of democracy see participation as a good in itself, to be extended as widely as possible. In these theories, both the domains in which the public is entitled to exercise political judgment and their institutional possibilities for doing so become political issues. A critique of the culture of experts, and the transfer of the power and prerogative of judgment from experts to the public are thus viewed as essential to the constitution of a democratic ethos. In other words, the very definition of political judgment – what it is, who is entitled to exercise it, and how people can be further enabled to exercise it– is itself a political and normative question, invoking principles of the politically desirable as well as crucial assessments of the politically feasible. There can be no value- neutral theory of political judgment; a theory of political judgment is itself a normative theory of the most desirable political order. This contestable and contested quality of political judgment sheds new light upon all other domains of judgment– legal, aesthetic, therapeutic, military and medical. In each of these domains, judg- ment, as a social process of appropriating and exercising knowledge, can become a political question that involves debate and contesta- tion about the limits, duties and capacities of expert authority in relation to the lay public.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with deliberative democracy.

#### Democracy necessitates total inclusion and the free flow of information—three warrants. Anything else risks egregious moral wrongs and would be an epistemically invalid way of knowing.

Hélène Landemore, Prof. at Yale. *Democratic Reason: the Mechanisms of Collective Intelligence in Politics*. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e1ec/0373f81e14ac06e9764205707a788ecff5cf.pdf> --ilake MW

The first mechanism that arguably makes democracy an epistemically reliable collective decision-rule is inclusive deliberation, i.e., deliberation that involves, directly or indirectly, all the members of the group.12 Deliberation is classically defined as an exchange of arguments for or against something (Aristotle, Rhetoric, I, 2). Contemporary deliberative democrats have added to that definition the goal of a rational agreement or consensus on the better answer or argument. Deliberation is also opposed to voting or bargaining and is not supposed to involve threats, promises, sophistry, or any form of “strategic” rather than “communicative” action.13 The better argument is supposed to triumph through what Habermas famously calls its “forceless force,” that is, its irresistible epistemic superiority.14 Notice that this does not make unanimity a necessary goal of a successful deliberation, but simply its regulative ideal.15 Deliberation is generally credited for three properties arguably conducive to its epistemic properties. Deliberation is supposed to: 1) Enlarge[s] the pools of ideas and information 2) Weed[s] out the good arguments from the bad 3) [and] Lead[s] to a consensus on the “better” or more “reasonable” solution. In order to illustrate such alleged effects of deliberation, let me consider two stylized situations of what occurs in a deliberative process. I borrow the first example from the film “Twelve Angry Men.” In the famous film by Sidney Lumet, one brave dissenting jury member—number 8, played by the actor Henri Fonda—manages to persuade the other 11 jurors to reconsider the guilty sentence they are about to pass on a young man charged with murder. Asking the other jurors to “talk it out” before making up their mind, juror number 8 takes the group on a long deliberative journey, which ultimately ends in unanimous acquittal. “Twelve Angry Men” can be seen, in my view, as illustrating the phenomenon of collective intelligence emerging from deliberation. Juror number 8, left to his own devices, would have been unable to demonstrate that the sentence was beyond reasonable doubt. Only by harnessing the intelligence of the other members, including against their own passions and prejudice, does the group ultimately reach the **truth. The contributions vary and complement each other: juror number 5**, a young man **from a violent slum, notices** that **the suspect could not** possibly **have stabbed** his victim **with a switch-blade**. No other juror was acquainted with the proper way to use a switch- blade. Juror number 9, an old man, then questions the plausibility of the time it took one of the key witnesses to cross the corridor. He too contributes to changing the collective perspective on the way the crime took place. **One of the most rational jurors**, a stock broker unconvinced by any of the other arguments, finally **has to admit that a shortsighted woman is not credible** when she pretends to have seen the murderer from her apartment across the street, through the windows of a passing subway, while she was lying in bed, most likely **without her glasses**. **The deliberation process** in this scenario nicely idealizes real-life deliberative processes **in which participants contribute an argument, an idea, or a piece of information and the group can reach a conclusion that no individual by himself could have reached**. Notice that in this scenario deliberation among several people has the three properties of good deliberation. **Deliberation enlarged the pool of information and ideas** for all jurors, bringing **to the surface** knowledge about the proper use of a switch-blade and a contradiction between this proper use and the description by the visual witness of the way the victim was supposedly stabbed. Deliberation also brought to the surface a fact that many in the group had noticed—the red marks on the sides of the nose of the witness—but did not know how to interpret or use. Here the proper interpretation of the fact was that the witness wears glasses, is most likely short-sighted, and the conclusion that this fact leads to is that the testimony cannot be trusted. Deliberation also allowed the group to weed out the good arguments from the bad. Once they reach the conclusion that the visual witness is short-sighted, knowing that she reports having witnessed the murder while lying in bed, what is most likely: that she was, or wasn’t wearing her glasses? Even the most stubborn juror has to admit that the argument that she was not wearing her glasses is stronger than the argument according to which she was wearing them. Finally, deliberation leads to a unanimous consensus on the “better” answer, namely the decision to consider the young convict “not guilty” given the doubts raised by deliberation. According to Lu Hong and Scott Page’s results on the components of collective intelligence (Page 2007), what matters most to the quality of collective problem-solving of the type described in the previous example is “cognitive diversity.” Cognitive diversity is the difference in the way people will approach a problem or a question. It denotes more specifically a diversity of perspectives (the way of representing situations and problems), diversity of interpretations (the way of categorizing or partitioning perspectives), diversity of heuristics (the way of generating solutions to problems), and diversity of predictive models (the way of inferring cause and effect) (Page 2007: 7). Cognitive diversity is not diversity of values or goals, which would actually harm the collective effort to solve a problem. Because of the importance of cognitive diversity thus defined, given four specific conditions, “a randomly selected collection of problem solvers outperforms a collection of the best individual problem solvers” (Page 2007: 163).16 The general point is that it is often better to have a group of cognitively diverse people than a group of very smart people who think alike. This is so because whereas very smart people thinking the same way will tend to get stuck quickly on the solution that seems best to them, a more cognitively diverse group has the possibility of guiding each other beyond that local optimum towards the global optimum. We can imagine that, in the scenario of Twelve Angry Men, if the jury had been composed of clones of juror number 8, the smartest person in the lot, they might have all shared the suspicion that the kid was not guilty but unable to turn it into the firm and argued conviction reached by the more diverse group.

## Plan

#### **I defend that in the United States, student reporters ought to have the right to protect the identity of confidential sources.**

Hu 15 clarifies (“A Shield Does Not Fall in Hazelwood: Privileging the Legitimate Journalism of High School Student Reporters”, HU, A SHIELD DOES NOT FALL IN HAZELWOOD, 38 COLUM. J.L. & ARTS 207 (2015), pdf available online no paywalls) LHSLA JC

In the last few years, the main pushback against broad coverage under the reporter’s privilege has centered around whether blogs qualify as legitimate press outlets.104 Mr. LoMonte lamented that student reporters have become “collateral damage” of judicial and legislative efforts to eject amateur bloggers and national security leakers from the reporter’s privilege.105 High school student reporters rarely report on crimes, let alone national security secrets.106 The fear that privileging non-traditional newsgatherers would allow irresponsible news providers to publish high-stakes state secrets, then, seems particularly irrelevant in the high school journalism context.107 As a news outlet, high school newspapers resemble the core First Amendment press much more than blogs. High school newspapers take significant effort and time to cultivate. At 133 years old, the Williston Northampton School’s Willistonian is the oldest high school newspaper in the country.108 Fifty years ago, the Saratoga Falcon was already in print, run by a staff that included future director Steven Spielberg.109 Where official high school newspapers are involved, judges would have no need to suspect a sham news outlet. Over the last several years, Congress has seen numerous proposals for a federal shield law.202 Many of these proposals would exclude high school and college student reporters by making professional employment a threshold requirement.203 The most recent Congressional proposal—the “Free Flow of Information Act”— was amended after journalists demanded stronger press protections.204 It now reserves a niche for student reporters in its three-tier definition of “covered journalists.”205 The first tier covers traditional, salaried journalists who gathered the subpoenaed material with intent of public dissemination.206 The second tier covers career freelancers, former employees of a “news dissemination service” or participants on journalistic media at an “institution of higher education.”207 The final, catchall tier gives judges the discretion to privilege individuals who are not covered under the first two tiers when it “would be in the interest of justice and necessary to protect lawful and legitimate news-gathering activities.”208 The third tier seems coterminous with the scope of a qualified constitutional reporter’s privilege, 209 and would therefore strengthen a claim of constitutional privilege for student reporters. If the current federal shield bill does become the first federal shield law in the United States, it would only protect reporters in a narrow set of circumstances— subpoenas issued by a federal actor and arising out of federal causes of action.210 A student-friendly state shield law would strengthen privilege in both state and federal cases, since federal courts look to state law for definitions of privileged persons.211 West Virginia, the latest state to enact a reporter’s shield law, provides a two-tier definition of privileged persons that is similar to the definition in the proposed Free Flow of Information Act.212 While the first tier requires the reporter to earn a “substantial livelihood” from newsgathering, the second tier allows judges to protect student reporters whose work closely models traditional journalism.213 Shield laws like the federal bill and the West Virginia statute protect a narrow core of traditional press, but provide a catchall category that gives judges discretion to award privilege to non-traditional reporters based on whether the reporters conducted legitimate journalism and the interest of justice in the subpoenaed material. This type of shield law would give judges the flexibility to withhold the privilege from leakers, sham newsmen and cyberbullies. At the same time, because the inquiry focuses on the newsgatherer’s process and product rather than employment status or income, this type of shield law extends protection to student reporters whose work resembles the work of professional journalists. Wide adoption of such state shield laws would increase a high school student reporter’s chances of succeeding on her privilege claim in jurisdictions that do not recognize a constitutional reporter’s privilege, as well as in jurisdictions that would not clearly cover student reporters under the constitutional privilege. The greater likelihood of receiving a reporter’s privilege would allow young student reporters to continue engaging in high-caliber investigative reporting, reducing the double-bind of risking imprisonment if they protect sources and social stigma if they snitch.

#### Student journalists are tomorrow’s professional journalists—lack of protections breeds self censorship and important stories won’t come to light.

Hu 15 (“A Shield Does Not Fall in Hazelwood: Privileging the Legitimate Journalism of High School Student Reporters”, HU, A SHIELD DOES NOT FALL IN HAZELWOOD, 38 COLUM. J.L. & ARTS 207 (2015), pdf available online no paywalls) LHSLA JC

Other influential theories of the First Amendment focus on the importance of producing courageous and engaged citizens who are committed to the project of self-government.111 Examining these theories and applying them in a case that dramatically expanded press protections, the Supreme Court held that a legal regime that “dampens the vigor and limits the variety of public debate . . . is inconsistent with the First and Fourteenth Amendments.”112 If student reporters are categorically excluded from a reporter’s privilege, they could be deterred from reporting on the kinds of stories that would expose them to court-ordered disclosures. In other words, categorical exclusion of student reporters increases the likelihood of reporter self-censorship that “is inconsistent with the First and Fourteenth Amendments.” Privileging student reporters helps them inspire[s] confidence in the independence of the press, and makes their peers more likely to provide information to the press in the future. Privileging student reporters promotes “a free, vigorous student press” that not only offers “a healthy ferment[s] of ideas and opinions,”118 but also [and] serves as a check[s] on the government.119 Granted, student newspapers do not often uncover federal or state governmental abuses, but they do frequently expose the wrongdoing of smaller scale governmental actors, such as schools and school boards. In Dean v. Utica Community Schools, for instance, high school junior Katy Dean investigated her school district’s alleged wrongdoing after finding out that the school district was being sued for school bus pollutions that caused lung cancer. 120 The checking function of the First Amendment does not justify scaling protection for speech on the basis of the level of government that it checks, since small government is as prone to abuse as big government.121 Shielding high school reporters against subpoenas does not unduly impede the interests of justice.122 Denying student reporters a reporter’s privilege, on the other hand, creates negative repercussions for the future of the press. In their objections to proposed federal shield laws that would exclude student reporters from coverage, professional reporters have expressed their firm belief that the freedom of the high school press plays a critical role in shaping the future of the press.123 Serving on school newspapers, students begin to develop the professional courage and internalize the professional ethics of journalism.124 High school students participate in activities like the school newspaper to develop career interests and broaden career opportunities.125 Many of today’s high school journalists will become tomorrow’s professional journalists. Giving high school students less protection for their newsgathering not only chills the vigor of the journalism they produce today, 126 but also breeds a habit of self-censorship that the student[s] reporters will carry with them if and when they become professional journalists.127

## Contention 1 - Accessibility

#### Newspapers are failing to digitize, which harms democracy by creating information deficits and unequal access to news. Students specifically key—working with news organizations gives them crucial experience and are the only financially sustainable model for newspapers.

Brown 15, Rachel, "A New Role for Student Media: College Newspapers and the Crisis in Journalism" (2015). Media and Communication Studies Honors Papers. Paper 3. –ilake MW

The role of journalism in American democracy was confirmed with the founding of the nation. By protecting freedom of the press, the First Amendment to the Constitution emphasized the central role of journalism in providing citizens with the information needed to be active participants in the nation’s governance. Journalists enable citizens to make informed democratic decisions and gain a more holistic perspective of the issues that impact their lives. However, the rapidly evolving landscape of the journalism industry has fostered conditions that make it difficult for the value of commercial media to withstand its audience’s access and attraction to the free content available online. Circulation has dwindled, spurring a diversion of advertiser interest to the digital market, newspapers’ primary source of revenue. This has forced newsrooms to [have] cut their payrolls by 30% since 2000, weakening their ability to report information that is not also available online, free of charge (“Overview: State of the Media” 2014). This snowball effect of losses has crippled the commercial journalism industry, leav[es]ing it “undermanned and unprepared to uncover stories, dig deep into emerging ones or to question information put into its hands” (Mitchell, 2014) Local newspapers were hit the hardest in these times of economic uncertainty. The scope of local publications is inherently narrow, making their content less widely desirable and more easily attainable online. An article in The Independent explains that, “The problem is that the internet can do most of what local newspapers have been doing for decades, such as telling people what is on at the cinema or giving them a medium through which to buy or sell a car,” (“Leading Article: Decline and Fall of the Local Press” 2012). Further, the cost of news gathering at a local paper often exceeds profits garnered from publishing it (Farhi 2014). Hyperlocal news sites, such as the Patch Media, EveryBlock, and Placeblogger, have proven to have sustainable business models by cutting the print out of local news coverage and crowdsourcing information, shouldering local print publications closer to extinction while still relying on them for much of their content. “Local news and information is a key area of interest to the American public, but how that news is supported remains a question,” said Amy Mitchell, Pew’s director of journalism research, in an interview (Mitchell 2014) While the industry has not been able to establish how to sustain commercial journalism, the reason why it is critical to do so has become abundantly clear. The role of journalism in promoting a successful democracy has been continuously reaffirmed since commercial news began to flounder with the rise of the digital age in the early 2000s. The Knight Commission on the Information Needs of Community in a Democracy, the first major commission on media since the Kerner and Carnegie commissions of the 1960s, is dedicated to assessing how communities access information and whether the channels of accessing information are functioning to the extent that is necessary to foster democratic participation (“Executive Summary: Knight Commission” 2013). The Knight Commission calls for “informed communities,” or elevating every American’s access to information to a standard that enables them to meet their personal and civic needs (“Informing Communities: Sustaining Democracy in the Digital Age: KnightComm” 2013). According to the Knight Commission, “this means people have the news and information they need to take advantage of life’s opportunities for themselves and their families. They need information to participate fully in our system of self-government, to stand up and be heard” (“Executive Summary: KnightComm” 2013). Journalism is the facilitator of the connection between citizens and the relevant and credible information they need to be active democratic participants. As the depth of local newspaper’s coverage shrinks, a primary concern of the Knight Commission is that information regarding local governance, which likely does not receive attention from larger media outlets, will not become disconnected from the public that it is intended to serve (“Executive Summary | KnightComm” 2014). Further, the media industry has been forced into passivity by a lack of resources. Since news outlets lack the staff and resources to accomplish the same caliber of investigative journalism that they were capable of in their prime, politicians have been able to use the media as a “megaphone;” with “direct relaying of assertions made by the campaigns and less reporting by journalists to interpret and contextualize them” (Mitchell 2014). The ease with which political and corporate organizations can breach the pages of local newspapers with their messaging prevents the paper’s readership from discerning hand-crafted, strategic communication from a balanced perspective of the political landscape, since both are being presented in a forum that theoretically prioritizes the democratic interests of the reader. A loss of local journalism poses the risk[s] of citizens living in an “information vacuum,” therefore reinforcing inequalities for people who do not have the resources to participate in democracy as access to technology is becoming increasingly critical (“Information Stories Tell of Personal Stakes in Healthy Info Communities: KnightComm” 2014). Citizens who cannot readily access online content are becoming disconnected from the information necessary to make informed democratic decisions. Many critics point out that without universal access to broadband, information will remain inaccessible to many citizens, regardless of their civic intentions (“Thinking about the Future of Informed Communities and Journalism” 2011). The journalism industry has been struggling to come up with solutions to the information void that is plaguing both their profits and the well-being of informed communities, but some courses of action have been debated. A shift to non-profit journalism has been proposed as a solution to the commercial industry’s seemingly irreversible loss of financial momentum. David Swensen and Michael Schmidt wrote an opinion piece for the New York Times that echoes the perspectives of those watching the journalism industry struggle, suggesting that newspapers might be better off if they adopted a business model dependent on endowments, similar to universities and institutions. Swensen and Schmidt propose that, “endowments would enhance newspapers’ autonomy while shielding them from the economic forces that are now tearing them down” (Swensen and Schmidt 2009). If commercial newspapers were organized like non-profits, they would be free of the financial constraints that limit the scope and depth of their reporting, allowing resources to be allocated to quality of coverage, not just survival, of a newspaper. To this end, college newspapers have been another suggested means of achiev[e]ing the democratic ideals that the media was intended to accomplish. Similarly to non-profit organizations, the majority of college newspapers are not impacted by the same profit pressures as commercial publications. Campus newspapers often have the freedom to publish more content and fewer advertisements, allowing more room for informative copy. Further, since college newspapers are less dependent on profits, they have the freedom to produce more content that might not draw in the most readership, but is critical information to disseminate (Downie and Schudson 2009). Some commercial newspapers, such as the The Miami Herald and the Sun Sentinel, enlisted student journalists to fill the gaps in their staffs. Newspapers have taken advantage of this mutually-beneficial situation, since student reporters are often looking for professionally published bylines and commercial papers are struggling to maintain the full staffs that they supported in the past. Extending from this trend, campus and commercial newspapers have coordinated their coverage to enable the two publications to share content. By maximizing the resources of each reporter, student and professional, some local papers have been able to expand the scope of their coverage without increasing their production costs (Downie and Schudson 2009). This system has allowed student journalists to gain value experience in a professional setting, while also enabling local newspapers to maintain the depth of coverage necessary to succeed financially and democratically. Another model that has been proposed to support the struggling local news industry is a hybrid between university and local publications, maximizing both organizations’ resources to best serve their community. The Columbia Missourian is a local daily newspaper that is staffed by a team of professional editors and student reporters. Students have covered local news, while the editors ensure that the copy is up to the standards of a professional publication. This hybrid structure has also been employed at the Columbia School of Journalism in New York, where students are responsible for beat coverage for professional newspapers. The content is often shared between the campus publication and various local news outlets (“Toni Stabile Center for Investigative Journalism” 2014).

## Contention 2 – Campus censorship

#### Student journalism faces institutional censorship despite its crucial function of informing students of issues on campuses like free speech and sexual assault.

Sullivan 17 (“When student journalists need defending, these lawyers swoop in. For free”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/when-student-journalists-need-defending-these-lawyers-swoop-in-for-free/2017/06/18/e160d1d6-5144-11e7-91eb-9611861a988f_story.html?utm_term=.0ddf50cc17ef>, By Margaret Sullivan Media columnist June 18, 2017) LHSLA JC

In recent months, millions of dollars in donations have rained down upon journalism organizations, prompted by President Trump’s verbal attacks on the news media and citizen support for the press’s role in America’s democracy. That’s been great news for worthy recipients such as the Committee to Protect Journalists, the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, ProPublica and others. But one tiny outfit, working out of a windowless Washington office, has not benefited. That’s unfortunate since its constituency — vast numbers of high school and college journalists — is far bigger than the number of professional journalists. “There are probably three times more journalists in America working for school credit than for a paycheck,” said Frank LoMonte, a First Amendment lawyer and the executive director of the nonprofit Student Press Law Center. **Thousands of times a year, student journalists** in crisis call the SPLC’s hotline. They may **have had** a **camera confiscated by police**, or had **their public-records requests denied**, **or** be **fac[e]ing censorship or stonewalling.** “We’re like the public defenders for student journalists,” LoMonte told me. They respond to every request, and they never charge a fee. The problems cut across ideology and political lines. **LoMonte helped a reporter at the student newspaper** **at** New Jersey’s **Kean University** as she tried to **pr[ied]**y **loose a surveillance video that the university’s police department was wrongly withholding**. Once the reporter had the video, **she wrote an important story that brought to light** a former student’s claim that he suffered **excessive force and racial profiling in** a 2013 arrest by **campus cops**. **At an Omaha high school**, **the student newspaper wanted to publish a column suggesting that teachers keep their politics out of the classroom**. (It observed that some of them were trash-talking Trump, using words such as “Nazi” and “Hitler.”) **The school administration found the column unacceptable**. Then, when **students tried to write about** the **censorship**, **that article was killed**, too. With SPLC’s intervention, both pieces were published — and won a state high school journalism award **In Lafayette**, La., **a high school principal decided that a yearbook page on a student’s gender transition was “inappropriate.”** The student, Scotty Jordan, told me the yearbook page might never have been published without the center’s involvement. “We really didn’t know what to do, so they helped us a lot,” Jordan said. The group is meeting a critical need and doing it on a shoestring, said Andy Alexander, longtime Cox News Washington bureau chief and a former Washington Post ombudsman. “**Student[s] journalists** often **lack the** **sophistication** **or** the **financial means to fight back against things like** **unlawful censorship or denial of access to public information**,” said Alexander, who now advises the Committee to Protect Journalists. On the high school level, censorship tends to be the biggest issue. For college journalists, it’s getting access to public records. But LoMonte said, “There’s a grab bag.” “**I’ve gotten people out of jail, I’ve gotten cameras back from police** — this is an urgent-level service,” said LoMonte, who will leave his post this summer, after nine years, to do journalism law work at the University of Florida. Founded in 1974, the center works in a spartan rented office in northwest Washington. The four-member staff, which includes paid interns and law students, not only responds to crises, but also sends a network of more than 200 lawyer-volunteers from all corners of the country to do workshops for student journalists, intended to prevent problems before they arise. Laws that help professional journalists do their jobs — including freedom of information and shield regulations — often apply to student journalists, too. But in school-censorship situations, LoMonte often begins with a practical, rather than legal, argument: That schools would be acting in their own self-interest to let students publish because, in the social-media era, they’ll find a way to get their message out in some other (perhaps less accurate) form, anyway. Meanwhile, the center is successfully leading a grass-roots effort to get states to pass legislation giving student journalists protections for gathering and publishing news of public concern. It all takes money, but the center’s budget of $650,000 “has been stuck there forever,” LoMonte said, with funds coming from foundations and individuals. **Student journalists**, said LoMonte, **are doing** “really high-end, sophisticated, **societally important work**” **on** **topics including** drug addiction, **sexual assault and free speech on campus**. And, as Nieman Reports wrote recently, college journalists are both benefiting from their extended online reach and struggling with **university administrations** who **want to keep a lid on controversies** **that may hurt their reputation**. That means more legal challenges to come. For LoMonte, the solutions may not always be clear, but the mission certainly is.

#### Campus sexual assault is uniquely bad, but democratizing education through papers about it is key.

Vanessa Grigoriadis 17, 11-15-2017, "Opinion," The New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/15/opinion/campus-sexual-assault-weinstein.html> --ilake MW

The number of students who have come forward publicly with stories of sexual assault has skyrocketed, but the number of students who are willing to report sexual assault to their administrators is still relatively tiny. In 2014, 20.2 million students attended college in the United States, but they reported only about 6,700 sexual assault incidents to their universities compared with 2,200 reports in 2001. The increased visibility of victims in college may seem alarming, but it almost certainly does not reflect a spike in the number of sexual assaults. It reflects a much more positive trend: Like today’s actresses, college students are casting off the shame of victimhood to tell their stories. I witnessed this firsthand as I traveled to four-year residential universities around the country to interview students, administrators and parents about the state of sex on campus. What I heard was exciting in many respects: Young women are becoming more comfortable with asserting their bodily autonomy. Their growing refusal to submit to nonconsensual encounters should count as progress. How this plays out on campus is different from the Weinstein effect in key ways, but the point is, students have been at the forefront of what it means to be more outspoken about misconduct. They also offer us a preview of where the country might be going next. Campus sexual assault may be a trickier problem for society than workplace harassment of subordinates. When one of the most successful producers in the history of Hollywood uses his lofty position to lure powerless young actresses into hotel rooms to violate them, it’s easy to regard him as a monster. There’s a different dynamic on college campuses. Despite the clichés about predatory football stars targeting defenseless freshman girls, student-on-student sexual assault often doesn’t involve an obvious power differential. It also rarely happens during daytime classes or university-sponsored activities, or in the regulated spaces that might be more analogous to a workplace. Sexual assault happens mostly in students’ social lives, at fraternity houses, off-campus apartments and dorms. The dynamics of sexual immaturity at colleges have also blurred the lines slightly. Students have varying amounts of sex education and were more likely to learn what they know from pornography or other media that perpetuate America’s toxic gender norms — the kind that may teach a boy to push an unwilling girl as hard as he can in the bedroom because that’s how a real man has sex. Add to that parties, drinking, lack of supervision and an absurd amount of student leisure time on some residential campuses, and you get all sorts of messy situations, particularly of the type involving blacked-out students. What’s more, on campuses today, the definition of sexual assault is broader than elsewhere in the country. The criminal standard for sexual assault varies greatly from state to state, but groping isn’t usually much more than a misdemeanor, if that. Yet at many universities, both public and private, students must hew to an extraordinarily high standard of communication to ensure that their sexual conduct is appropriate and consensual. These students must follow some principle of “affirmative consent,” which is colloquially called “yes means yes.” Reckless abandon in the bedroom doesn’t cut it. Students must receive a spoken “yes” or an unmistakable sign of pleasure or consent from a partner to escalate, and proceed with, each stage of a sexual encounter. “Yes means yes” is a great standard. It could help many men (both in college and out of it) proceed not only with caution but also with compassion for their sexual partners, because they must regard them as individuals with sexual desires rather than merely objects of gratification. But “yes means yes” is still a high bar for students, who as a cohort know very little about sex, let alone how to talk about it. By and large, kids aren’t taught the right vocabulary to distinguish between sexual assault and bad sex. This means that a number of accused college men are caught in a time of transition about our understanding of the definition of sexual assault. On campus, the young college women and men I met were not, by and large, arguing about whether certain acts occurred in the bedroom. Many young men who say they have been falsely accused of sexual assault do not deny that the sex at issue happened in the way their accusers described it. Instead, they argue that their conduct — while perhaps not outstanding and worthy of gold stars — was still acceptable. It’s not “yes, you did!” versus “no, I didn’t”; it’s “yes, it was consensual!” versus “no, it wasn’t!” The solution is not to roll back protections for students, but to be clearer about expectations for them and create more avenues in college (and earlier) to talk about sexual respect and ethics. Because what students complain about — even when it doesn’t rise to the level of assault — is often deeply demeaning. While most students I met agreed that a student who snakes a hand under a girl’s dress is guilty of assault, some of them argued that a guy who grinds on a classmate on the dance floor without permission is guilty of the same. Both are examples of disrespect, though to me the first is the only one that rises to the level of sexual assault.

## Contention 3 – Democratic Education

#### Campus newspapers have a direct effect on election results since partisan lines don’t apply to local issues and students from different areas aren’t as familiar.

Atkin 73, Charles K et al. The Role of the Campus Newspapers in the New Youth Vote. Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Dept. of Communication. August 1973. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism Conference. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED082225.pdf> --ilake MW

With the Passage of the 26th Amendment lowering the voting age to 18, millions of college students became eligible to cast ballots for the first time. This paper assesses the impact of the student newspaper at Michigan State University on the decision making of student voters in both local and national election contexts. Most states have ruled that students may vote in the college towns where they attend school, giving the young voters a numerical advantage over permanent residents in many locations. A study was conducted during the 1971 East Lansing City Council campaign, one of the first elections where 18-year olds could vote. For a number of reasons, it was expected that the student newspaper would have a major effect on voting behavior in this local election. A second study focused on the 1972 Presidential Primary in Michigan, where students were voting on nationally prominent candidates. This provided a very different context for the local media influence process, and a much more limited impact was anticipated. Why should the campus newspaper be so influential in the local election? First, the incoming student[s] seldom possesses any knowledge or attitudes about the local politic[s]al environment. Previous exposure to the partisan preferences of the family, the civics 'program in school, and the political coverage in the hometown and national mass media cannot be readily transferred to the new political context. The local candidates and issues are typically unfamiliar to the student first arriving on a college campus, and to many of those who have spent a year or two on campus. The nonpartisan nature of many city and county elections precludes using party labels as voting guidelines; besides, almost half of the new voters do not identify with either major party. Finally, it can be argued that partisan primary group norms for voting behavior are less pervasive in the student community than in the adult world. Although certain segments of the college society are highly politicized, the average student is not exposed to the extensive family and working group pressures of the typical adult. Thus, many students must turn to the mass media for both information and advice regarding local politics. Since student usage of off-campus newspapers and television is often restricted, the campus daily tends to be the primary source of political news and opinion. Roper has shown that the general public tends to rely on the newspaper for coverage of local politics, and on television for state and national political affairs. This tendency may be stronger among Collegians who typically place a high degree of trust in campus periodicals staffed by fellow students rather than establishment journalists. On the other hand, state and national political figures-- and issues are more familiar to the transient student. His political socialization from such agents as the family, school, and mass media has generally been a more fully developed process in this sphere. Even without party labels as the primary source of guidance, collegians tend to readily distinguish the major candidates and arrive at voting decisions without direct mass media inputs at the decisional stage. Thus, a utilitarian reliance on the campus daily is less necessary in such situations. Of course, the media still provide a major avenue for informational stimuli regarding the, key candidates and issues. This basic 'argument is supported by a number of studies indicating that newspaper editorial endorsements of political candidates have the most influence in less salient campaigns. Gregg found that about three-fourths of the local and regional candidates endorsed by eleven California newspapers won in the newspaper's home county between 1948 - 1962. The relationship was not as strong for statewide and national offices, leading Gregg to conclude that the greatest influence occurs where there are few other determinants affecting the voter's decision (1). A survey by LicCombs during the 1966 election in Los Angeles suggested that up to one fifth of the voters where influenced by newspaper and television endorsements, with the highest rate for offices where there we7c informational inputs or were conflicting pressures on the voter (2). There is also supportive evidence from elections where there were unusually long ballots, such as the 1964 Illinois at-large contest (3). Three studies suggest that a substantial proportion of the' electorate rely on newspaper reccommendations for non-national contests. When Vinyard and Siegel asked a Detroit sample how much they depended on the newspaper in voting decisions in nonpartisan elections, more than three-fourths responded "quite a bit" or "a lot" (4). Rarick reported that more than two-fifths of an Oregon sample indicated that they, would take the advice of the local newspaper on ballot referrenda, and one- quarter of an Ohio sample interviewed by Blume. and Lyons said they considered their newspaper's endorsement during decision-making at election time (5).

## Underview

#### 1. It takes democratic engagement to solve extinction—sequencing means you affirm. Small 06

(Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition, “Moving Forward,” The Journal for Civic Commitment, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, the new century will present challenges that require collective action, unity, and enlightened self-interest. Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates, and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability will require[s] cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all solidarity – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. Our very existence depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society. With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation. Unlike any other crisis before, the noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events. Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, we need to teach cooperation, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. It will require a radical transformation of our conception of education. We’ll need to trust a bit more, control a bit less, and put our faith in the potential of youth to make sense of their world. In addition to a declaration of the gauntlet set before educators in the twenty-first century, this paper is a proposal and a case study of sorts toward a new paradigm of social justice and civic engagement education. Unfortunately, the current pedagogical climate of public K-12 education does not lend itself well to an exploratory study and trial of holistic education. Consequently, this proposal and case study targets a higher education model. Specifically, we will look at some possibilities for a large community college in an urban setting with a diverse student body. Our guides through this process are specifically identified by the journal Equity and Excellence in Education. The dynamic interplay between ideas of social justice, civic engagement, and service learning in education will be the lantern in the dark cave of uncertainty. As such, a simple and straightforward explanation of the three terms is helpful to direct this inquiry. Before we look at a proposal and case study and the possible consequences contained therein, this paper will draw out a clear understanding of how we should characterize these ubiquitous terms and how their relationship to each other affects our study. Social Justice, Civic Engagement, Service Learning and Other Commie Crap Social justice is often ascribed long, complicated, and convoluted definitions. In fact, one could fill a good-sized library with treatises on this subject alone. Here we do not wish to belabor the issue or argue over fine points. For our purposes, it will suffice to have a general characterization of the term, focusing instead on the dynamics of its interaction with civic engagement and service learning. Social justice refers quite simply to a community vision and a community conscience that values inclusion, fairness, tolerance, and equality. The idea of social justice in America has been around since the Revolution and is intimately linked to the idea of a social contract. The Declaration of Independence is the best example of the prominence of social contract theory in the US. It states quite emphatically that the government has a contract with its citizens, from which we get the famous lines about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Social contract theory and specifically the Declaration of Independence are concrete expressions of the spirit of social justice. Similar clamor has been made over the appropriate definitions of civic engagement and service learning, respectively. Once again, let’s not get bogged down on subtleties. Civic engagement is a measure or degree of the interest and/or involvement an individual and a community demonstrate around community issues. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world. Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government and commerce, have the potential for positive change. Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context. Service learning is a methodology and a tool for teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and deepening practical understanding of a subject. Since it is a relatively new field, at least in the structured sense, service learning is only beginning to define itself. Through service learning students learn by experiencing things firsthand and by exposing themselves to new points of view. Instead of merely reading about government, for instance, a student might experience it by working in a legislative office. Rather than just studying global warming out of a textbook, a student might volunteer time at an environmental group. If service learning develops and evolves into a discipline with the honest goal of making better citizens, teaching social justice, encouraging civic engagement, and most importantly, exposing students to different and alternative experiences, it could be a major feature of a modern education. Service learning is the natural counterbalance to our current overemphasis on standardized testing. Social justice, civic engagement, and service learning are caught in a symbiotic cycle. The more we have of one of them; the more we have of all of them. However, until we get momentum behind them, we are stalled. Service learning may be our best chance to jumpstart our democracy. In the rest of this paper, we will look at the beginning stages of a project that seeks to do just that.

#### Two, Aff gets RVI on T and theory if I win a counter-interp. A) Reciprocity: I don’t have the ability to read T against you but you always have the option of reading both T and theory, giving you a 2-to-1 structural advantage that only the RVI rectifies. If you read only T or only theory you still had both options available, so in the 1AR I should have two options as well. B) Aff speaks first so I’m always forced to choose some interp of the topic and of what’s fair meaning there’s always the potential I violate. RVI is the only check against the use of frivolous T and theory. C) Having to prove that the AC is topical or fair skews my ability to cover substance given the time-crunched 1AR so I need to be able to win on these issues.

#### Three, Aff gets access to 1AR theory since otherwise it becomes impossible to check back for infinite NC abuse which outweighs on magnitude. 1AR theory needs to be drop the debater—I don’t have time to split between substance and theory so it’s the only way to rectify abuse. No neg RVIs because they don’t need it—they can split the NR, which would equalize NR-2AR time skew. Competing interps on aff theory—shields the 2ar from a 2nr counterinterp dump since it holds them to a higher standard of what they have to do to win theory. And, neg abuse outweighs aff abuse since they can react whereas I’m forced to adapt. No new 2nr framing issues—be paradigmatically opposed to new in the 2 arguments and they had their chance in the NC.

## Extensions

### framing

#### Extend the standard of consistency with deliberative democracy.

To be immersed in relationships is intrinsically political since all relationships involve power and desires for pursuing actions. society-wide systems of interpersonal relationships are impossible without deliberative democracy since they'd fail to consider all perspectives would exclude their own members, and wouldn't reach the best solutions--that's Landemore.

[epistemology] We can’t know anything without deliberation—to make claims makes us obligated to preserve the best deliberative models so that we can ensure our claims can be tested and are correct

[political participation] to be immersed in relational networks is intrinsically political since each agent makes choices that affect others and participate in relations with power differentials—means formulating deliberative communities is key since anything else would be exclusive of its own members and risks egregious moral wrongs.

[how to weigh !] The framing's procedural--in order to know things, we're dependent on others for that knowledge, so preserving that structure entails a deliberative democratic structure. Asking why we should know things or participating in debate concedes the need to know things.

### substance

Extend the plantext: Student journalists should be protected by federal and state shield laws. Hu 15 clarifies that they’re not currently protected since they’re not paid, but lack of protections leads to self-censorship that carries forward into their professional careers and forecloses on important sotries.

EXTEND CONTENTION 1—newspapers are losing money since people want digital media that papers can’t provide, but Brown 15 shows that student reporting solves for profit pressures that silence local reporting and create undemocratic information inequalities.

EXTEND CONTENTION 2—students face institutional censorship and need expanded legal protections to have the safety to publish stories about sexual abuse and racial profiling—that’s Sullivan 17. Democratizing education’s key since teaching students about consent requires discussing and breaking down oppressive notions.

EXTEND CONTENTION 3—[1] empirically disproves their claim that democracy is infinitely regressive and fails since public student deliberation impacted voting patterns at a grassroots level [2] link turns the disad—the only way to get the political results we want is to influence through newspapers—neg conceptually misunderstands how opinions are formed—they don’t just arise, they’re influenced which means contention 3 link turns them

### Case turn f/l

#### AT "truth is a priori" or "sense doesnt need community"

They conceded the internal warrants of the analytic under Benhabib 1. Whether or not truth is a priori, we need deliberative democracy to access those truths--even if there are lower-case t truths like feeling cold that we can access, expressing those in thought or achieving things like policy and evaluating complex situations needs groups of people in deliberation.

#### AT democracy is racist/capitalist/whatever

1/ democracy relies on diversity of perspectives--i normatively and proactively prove that exclusion and dehumanization is bad--prefer my framing since i justify those things, and justifications are necessary so we don't fall into a slippery slope to fascism/unjustified beliefs

2/ benhabib 2 describes transfer of epistemic and political power to the people in a democracy as well as opening up the question of who is able to participate--that's how change is made

3/ TURN - democracy's key to changing bad attitudes--dialogue is the only way to change someone's mind

#### AT aff sets too broad of a precedent [Alexander]

1/ college students are journalists and precedent is wrong--they work in newsrooms and do highqual work, reporters who are protected are their peers--the only difference is them being paid [which is capitalist]

2/ we have an obligation to try even if it might be struck down [which is all that ur evidence indicates]

#### AT legitimization through judicialization (kinda like banning smth increases violations)

1/ nuq--most states have shield laws--only think to do is to protect students

2/ doesnt turn self-censorship/deterrence

#### AT anonymity is dangerous for witnesses [eliason]

1/ it was the source's choice to tell reporters--means they're comfortable with those risks even though their story would be public

2/ the aff's argument is that the onus shouldnt be on the reporter to disclose the source's identity in the first place, not that non-anonymity is intrinsically bad

#### AT empirical no chilling effect warrant [eliason]

1/ even if sources still come forward, Hu 15 says students will be hesitant to publish stories--our ev indicates that DOES have a lasting impact since students become future journalists

2/ the internal link isn't about sources being chilled, its about reporters being chilled--eliason doesnt interact

#### AT anonymity -> #fakenews [barendt]

1/ nuq - known sources can give false info too.

2/ false--anonymity doenst mean unverifable, few actions happen totally in private especially national security profiling--alt sources of inforation used.

3/ well respected publications like NYT and wapo have rigorous fact checking--publications know the identity of the source even if the public doesnt

### AT SEXUAL ASSUALT

#### Universities and the State force student journalists to reveal sources in sexual assault allegations, outing survivors of abuse to the public

Klamann 17 (“After police and administrators press student journalists for sources, UW may change sexual assault reporting policy”, <https://trib.com/news/local/education/after-police-and-administrators-press-student-journalists-for-sources-uw/article_b973e10c-e5f4-561f-ace8-2b4037b9b60a.html>, Seth Klamann joined the Star-Tribune in 2016 and covers education and health. A 2015 graduate of the University of Missouri and proud Kansas City native, Seth worked for newspapers in Milwaukee and Omaha before coming to Caspe) LHSLA JC

**The University of Wyoming** **and its police department pressured student journalists to name their** **source for a story alleging sexual assaults** by an unnamed resident assistant, prompting a lawyer to get involved and the school to consider changing its reporting policies. On Nov. 3, the UW student paper, the Branding Iron, published a report headlined “Number of sexual assault reports increases.” **The article begins with an allegation that an unnamed** **r**esident **a**ssistant **had** **been accused of** **sexual**ly **assault**ing “girls” in a dorm during the spring and fall 2017 semesters. **The report does not provide sources for that claim**, nor does it offer details about who the resident assistant is or in what dorm the assaults allegedly took place. Chad Baldwin, a spokesman for the university, said Tuesday that the University of Wyoming Police Department had concluded that the claim was false. “It’s a baseless report,” he said. Taylor Hannon, the editor in chief of the Branding Iron and a UW student, said the newspaper was “working on completing the story to further investigate.” She said she and the other editors felt the story was appropriately backed up and “wouldn’t have run it” otherwise. In any case, authorities did not know that the story was apparently rumor at the time it was posted. After its publication, a University of Wyoming Police Department detective contacted its author, according to a letter sent to the university by Bruce Moats, an attorney retained by the newspaper’s advisor. Moats also represents the Star-Tribune on some legal matters. The detective spoke with the story’s author, a freshman, in what Hannon described as a setting that was like an interrogation. The author felt very pressured to give the detective information, Hannon said. The journalist told the detective that she heard the story from another staff member, who told the detective that she’d “overheard the rumor” from another student in a class, according to Moats’ letter. “The reporter was told to go find that student and get her name and number,” Moats wrote in his letter to Tara Evans, the general counsel for UW. “The reporter did so, but the student refused. The reporter informed police of the refusal and was told to try again or to give the source the office’s number.” In a Dec. 1 editorial calling for more protection for journalists, the Branding Iron said **the** **detective** “**continued to pressure another staff writer**, **calling her personal cell several times demanding information regarding a source** that (the detective) should have obtained herself as a detective.”

### AT Whistleblower PIC

#### The PIC makes no sense against the aff- leakers don’t share state secrets with students since they want visibility on a larger platform than the local press

Hu 15 (“A Shield Does Not Fall in Hazelwood: Privileging the Legitimate Journalism of High School Student Reporters”, HU, A SHIELD DOES NOT FALL IN HAZELWOOD, 38 COLUM. J.L. & ARTS 207 (2015), pdf available online no paywalls) LHSLA JC

In the last few years, the main pushback against broad coverage under the reporter’s privilege has centered around whether blogs qualify as legitimate press outlets.104 Mr. LoMonte lamented that student reporters have become “collateral damage” of judicial and legislative efforts to eject amateur bloggers and national security leakers from the reporter’s privilege.105 High school student reporters rarely report on crimes, let alone national security secrets.106 The fear that privileging non-traditional newsgatherers would allow irresponsible news providers to publish high-stakes state secrets, then, seems particularly irrelevant in the high school journalism context.107 As a news outlet, high school newspapers resemble the core First Amendment press much more than blogs. High school newspapers take significant effort and time to cultivate. At 133 years old, the Williston Northampton School’s Willistonian is the oldest high school newspaper in the country.108 Fifty years ago, the Saratoga Falcon was already in print, run by a staff that included future director Steven Spielberg.109 Where official high school newspapers are involved, judges would have no need to suspect a sham news outlet.

## NC F/L

### AT Hobbes

1. They can’t explain the metaphysics of what the sovereign is—kills the nc. Benhabib 2 warrants why every citizen is part of the state because states are just self governing social entities premised on relations, so if you think their framework’s true, affirm because the state still has to deliberate internally to find the right answer. They’ll say any solution proposed by the sovereign is right, but that’s an overgeneralization—we have rights to life and property
2. Contention 1 link turns the NC – if people don’t have information on what the sovereign says and what’s happening politically, it’s impossible for them to be consistent with the will of the sovereign—free press is a prerequisite to knowing being consistent with the state

### AT Kant NC

#### Turns

1. AC link turns the NC—extend Hu 15, which says that students are less likely to come forward to peers who are reporters if their identities aren’t protected. Denying speech is a denial of freedom since it prevents full expression of the self, and also outweighs the NC offense since my claim derives from the nature of agency itself, whereas the nc just uses arguments about contradictions.
2. Press freedoms are key to ensuring rights and the legitimacy of the state—either the sovereign is always right, which is impossible, or the sovereign can be wrong and it’s important to speak against abuses of the state, which necessitates a free press—that’s hu 15. Brown 15 also specifically warrants why participation is impossible absent flow of information.
3. Turn—AC is key to making sure the truth is told—silencing of narratives about sexual assault outweighs an inability to verify truth since a) forcing people to reveal their identity coerces survivors through bad things like intimidation

### AT Rodl

1. Conceded Benhabib 1 warrant--Actions can only be defined narratively—to say “I went to the store with my brother” tells the narrative of an action that you took with other people and places involved in the action. Proves a) it doesn’t make sense to evaluate actions in a vacuum bc all actions are conneted to all other actions and b) explains why the ac framework is better—only we stably identify what an action is, and without doing so, we wouldn’t be able to explain what actions are best

## K F/L

### AT Cap

1/ Turn—the aff is anticapitalist—multiple warrants in the brown 15 evidence, aff reduces the need to run ads which decreases profit pressure, and independent news agencies won’t be forced out by larger for profit agencies.

2/ L\* --Deliberative democracy returns power to the people—discourages reliance on elite narratives and mandates that we find the truth

### AT Berardi [debatedrills]

#### Links

1/ Turn—the AC decreases reliance on memory—recording things in the fabric of the news liberates citizens from the drive to memorize since it’s all recorded outside the mind.

2/ Turn—the aff is anticapitalist—multiple warrants in the brown 15 evidence, aff reduces the need to run ads which decreases information overload, and independent news agencies won’t be forced out by larger for profit agencies.

3/ no link—they’ll try to derive links to the idea of accessing truth in the framework, but a) the framework doesn’t say that truth is created, it exists regardless of what people do—the framework just gives us a procedure for accessing truth b) the aff outweighs—if we don’t look at diverse perspectives, we risk being irreparably racist and exclusive, which is worth adding another drop of information to the ocean that exists.

4/ no link—I don’t fiat the aff—I would love it if we hypothetically implemented the aff, but debaters don’t have the power to just will that congresses would want the aff.

#### alt

1/ alt links too—a) if not changing the world is the link to the aff, the alt is literally to take a passive orientation to the world and just feel exhausted about it b) performatively links back—the language used in the tags of the K posits this round as a space entirely divorced from the “real world” without consideration to the fact that debaters are often student journalists—they link because they create yet another wall between debate and “reality”—worse for them to link since a) intention matters; murder is worse than manslaughter b) disrespects scholarship; you can’t conflate berardi and baudrillard

2/ perm doublebind—the impact is massively nonunique since berardi’s describing a mental illness epidemic of the 70s and 80s, not nowadays-it already happened and if the k is tru, we’re beyond the point of changing it. Means do aff then alt because the alt should be good enough to solve the small link to the aff, but if it can’t, vote aff because the k fails to disprove the aff.

3/ perm aff as an instance of the alt—debaters who hear the k being read and are also students should write about the k in student papers, but they can’t do it without protections since the k is seditious—net ben is double solvency.

4/ perm aff then alt—keeping spaces or scholarship open is the only way to ensure that enough people know about exhaustion—passivity will never reproduce their message.

5/ perm vote aff—be exhausted, but only with the k—they’ve conceded the internal links in the aff which proves I have more liberatory potential.

### AT Deleuze

#### Overview—the k doesn’t clash with the aff—it just re-describes it in different terms.

1. NL - Ethical community—the aff’s model of community is relational; it’s an assemblage
2. NL - There’s no one model of subjecthood the aff endorses—the framework just says that subjects who are citizens are bound to act only on what can be stably known *given that their actions affect others*.
3. L\* - Seeking out new interpretations and information like Landenmore says is what the k says we should do.
4. L\* - the aff critiques territorialization of the state—landenmore justifies why if its not broadly expansive and proactively inclusive, it’s a bad state

#### alt

1. Perm—aff as an instance of the alt since there’s no link so no competition. Net benefit is the material solvency we get for things like information inequities and sexual assault.
2. Perm—aff as the method to the alt—means you affirm and shields link since deliberative democracy is methodologically alt, but describes it in concrete terms that students will be able to communicate and model for themselves.
3. Perm—aff then alt—people need access to public spheres of communication before they’ll be able to access niche philosophies like deleuze. Shields link bc try or die—alt will never happen without the aff so it’s better to make gradual progress than insist on ideological purity that will never happen
4. Perm doublebind—either the alt is strong enough to revise and improve on residual links to the k so perm aff then alt, OR the alt can’t fix any small link by the aff and you should affirm because it doesn’t do anything. Shields link since voting on the perm doesn’t result in a static world—conditions will shift since both the aff and alt are both continually self-revising processes.

### AT reporters are employed

Counterinterp—reporters are anyone who reports on the news.

#### Merriam Webster defines “reporter” as

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reporter

: one that reports: such as a : a person who makes authorized statements of law decisions or legislative proceedings b : a person who makes a shorthand record of a speech or proceeding c (1) : a person employed by a newspaper, magazine, or television company to gather and report news (2) : a person who broadcasts news

proves reporting for a news agency isn’t central to being a reporter. Prefer:

1. This is etymologically true, it’s the act of recording or issuing statements that makes a reporter, which is what White House press secretaries and declarations by Trump do.
2. Our definition is listed before yours—means mine is most common. Common usage controls the interal link to semantics because the semantic meaning of words changes over time so common usage is the only stasis for meaning.
3. pragmatics—having a broader definition of who is and isn’t a reporter allows more clash; limiting the debate to only newspapers kills 90% of the topic lit- a lot of lit deals w/ politicans reporting stuff like the PIC and ppl like online reporters