

The Grand National is a horse racing event held in Aintree, England each year. The race has garnered many opponents and have claimed the race to be “one of the longest and most hazardous in the world.” This past year, three horses met an untimely death in the name of such race. Since the year 2000, a total of 62 horses have died at this very track from broken necks or backs after failing to jump a barrier. Those staggering numbers have not gone unnoticed by animal rights groups in the area. Over 100 activists were arrested ahead of the race. Managing to breach the perimeter of the track and delay the start by nearly 15 minutes. This article is rather short. Showcasing only a couple of different sources on each side. The anti-racing stakeholders consist of PETA, the League Against Cruel Sports, and Animal Aid while the pro-racing points are made by both the owner of the track and the executive officer of the British Horseracing Authority. My primary source is from The Guardian, a well-respected publication. While the author may have accurately presented both sides, they shied away from showing any defense for the teams or event organizers.

It's not that the author outright voiced their opinion on what they think of horse racing, rather they consciously chose to show more anti-racing views. Evidence of this is that the first statement from a pro-racing stakeholder is only shown in about the last 20 percent of the article. Allocating the rest to anti-racing stakeholders and viewpoints. The individual author of this article is not explicitly stated, and the only credits go toward 'PA Media.' This is not helped by The Guardian's largely centrist leanings. Knowing the author would help to find patterns in what they choose to write about, which could then expose a bias they hold. When comparing this article to one authored by someone with clear anti-racing views, it is clear they are written for different audiences and for different purposes. For instance, an article from VeganFoodAndLiving.com covering this issue uses the same stats and source as The Guardian's.

Another piece of evidence toward the author's biases is what quotes are chosen to represent each side of the argument. The pro-racing quotes used here are incredibly brief and hollow by design. An example is the quote, "Our thoughts are with everyone connected to the horses who suffered fatal injuries this week." Take note of its unoriginality and shallowness. Contrast this with language like "brutal horrors," "disgrace," "utter shame," and "carnage" found in quotes by the anti-racing stakeholders. This is evidence of a contextual imbalance between both sides which could lead to the reader feeling that the pro-racing side is weaker to argue for. Though these words didn't come from the author's mouth, they specifically chose to include such language for a greater appeal to emotion.

No real counterarguments are stated by the author. While there may be valid perspectives and reasoning supporting the continuation of racing and the current safety measures in place, these viewpoints are not thoroughly examined or presented in the article. Some simple examples would be them choosing not to mention the money raised for charity or local revenue generated each year. This omission can further contribute to a perception of limited representation of opposing views.

Sometimes it's not what someone says that shows their biases, but rather what they don't say or show. The emotionally charged words and phrases from the activists are given more prominence, while opposing viewpoints do not receive the same level of attention or analysis. By not including sufficient counterarguments or alternative perspectives, the article creates an imbalance in the presentation of viewpoints, which can influence the reader's perception of the issue. These are some of the techniques I found the author using which led to me believe the author is biased against horse racing.