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Period 1

Debate essay - practice #1

“Should Campaigns be able to alter headlines for political gain without repercussion” -the argument - politicians are buying google ads

“Opinion: McAuliffe shows leadership when it comes to vaccines. Youngkin is all double-talk” into “Another Glenn Youngkin failure - He’s all Double Talk.”

**Essay**:

**Intro paragraph:**

Recently politicians have been purchasing google ads to support their campaign, an example being Virginia's governor candidate Terry McAuliffe’s campaign, that recently changed a *Washington Post* headline to support his campaign and discredit the other candidate. Although it can be thought of as unfair to other candidates, Politicians should be allowed to purchase headlines to support their campaigns. They have a First amendment right to freedom of speech and the press, private companies have the right to decide what they want to promote, and news articles are up to interpretation.

**1st paragraph:**

The first amendment guarantees freedoms concerning religion, expression, assembly, the press and the right to petition. Meaning that people are allowed to express their opinions and in this case support camins in any legal way they want to the press. Terry McAuliffe paid to have a headline changed from “Opinion: McAuliffe shows leadership when it comes to vaccines. Youngkin is all double-talk” into “Another Glenn Youngkin failure - He’s all Double Talk.” Although many could claim that this is unfair to use his money to change the headline, and therefore people's perspectives. It is constitutional that he legally has the right to influence how he is portrayed to the general public. Punishing these politicians for expressing their viewpoints and supporting their cause the best way they can. Would be akin to taking away their freedom and voice.

**2nd paragraph:**

In this scenario, Terry McAuliffe changed the headline of a Washington Post article, which is owned privately and has no reaction to the government, and state politics. Other examples have mentioned the purchase of google ads to support campaigns. Which is also a private company, who can decide whether they want to accept the politicians payment and change their headlines or show ads for a specific candidate. Recently fake news has been a large problem within the US, and has been discussed at length. But so far there has been little to no success in preventing a nation wide spread of fake news. An example being the respect election between Donald Trump and Joe Biden, there were a lot of false allegations directed at Biden by Trump regarding his son and family. In the end most people recognized the falsehood and decided to not believe or recognize the sites or people who spread this information. But, there was no legal action taken to prevent the spread of this information. Showing that the importance does not lie in legal punishment, but in the population's belief. It would also be difficult to say what to punish, since it is difficult to classify what would be considered “fake” or not. Meaning that even if there are repercussions, they would be difficult to implement due to the amount of information being spread. It is much less important to focus on the headlines of news articles, and much more important to conduct your own research, and decide who to support using your own faculties, judgments and beliefs.

**3rd paragraph:**

The article headline changed by Terry McAuliffe was an opinion piece by the Washington Post, meaning that it's written according to someone's personal opinion and not unbiased or biased solely based on facts. Articles are based on many different things, and if a person only believed what they read from one news source met with another person who only believed in a different news source on the other end of the political spectrum. They would have many different views, and believe in different facts. I have a Grandmother who lives in New York and identifies as a member of the republican party. She only watches Fox News, which is not a very reliable source of information. Sometimes she will bring up facts and statistics she has gotten from fox and use it to make a judgment, or as part of an argument. But when I research what she says a lot of the time it is not supported by evidence, or is only tinted with truth. This is just one instance that shows the importance of double checking your information and not only relying on what you see or are told. While some may say that this manipulation is the product of politicians campaigns and things like changing headlines and buying ads. The overall outcome is up to the person, it is up to the person to decide what they want to believe. America is a democracy, giving the power to the people, allowing the citizens to make the decisions. It's up to the people to decide what they want to believe, who they want to promote, elect. And punishing politicians for supporting themselves in legal ways, diminishes this power, this right to vote, and elect.

**Conclusion**:

Overall It is important to recognize the significance of news and the spread of information. At the end of the day, people need to recognize the abundance of everything surrounding them. The creation of society and civilization is multiplied by the product of knowledge, the spread of information has shaped society to be dependent on others. With a constant flow of information flowing in and out of your ears. It becomes difficult to remain neutral, and unbiased. People create unconscious biases shaped by their family, friends, or just the general environment surrounding them. So, sometimes it might be a good idea to stop listening to others and think for yourself.