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## PIC

#### Text: In the United States, reporters ought to have the right to protect the identity of confidential sources except in reports issued by the White House.

#### Turns the AC—Trump’s White House misuses its power to cite anonymous sources—Osnos 17 is the solvency advocate

Evan Osnos 17, The New Yorker staff writer since 2008, and covers politics and foreign affairs. He is the author of “Age of Ambition: Chasing Fortune, Truth, and Faith in the New China.”, 2-25-2017, "Can the White House Pick Its Press?," New Yorker, <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/can-the-white-house-pick-its-press> -ilake MW

And, yet, over the years, almost every President has adopted a fruitful, if tense, mutual dependence with the press. Each needs something from the other, and both sides know it. Bruce Catton, a correspondent in the nineteen-forties, defined the constant business of leaking as information that officials were “either unwilling or unready” to reveal by name. Anonymity, ritually bemoaned and practiced by both sides, endures because it allows members of government, high and low, to speak more freely. Earlier this month, anonymity allowed the Washington Post to report, on the basis of nine sources, that Michael Flynn, the national-security adviser, had discussed Obama Administration sanctions with the Russian ambassador before Donald Trump took office, contrary to what Flynn told his colleagues. (Three days later, Flynn resigned.) Early Friday, CNN cited unnamed officials to report that the F.B.I. had rejected a White House request to dispute media reports that Trump’s campaign advisers were frequently in touch with Russian intelligence agents. Anonymity, of course, is also a tool of the White House. On Thursday, one of Trump’s advisers e-mailed me a statement that began with the words “A WH official confirmed.” In Washington, anonymity, as Winston Churchill said of democracy, is a lousy solution, except for all the others. But under Donald Trump, the dynamic between the press and the President has turned toxic. As a real-estate developer, Trump was, for many years, an energetic anonymous source (even pretending to be his own P.R. man to salt the local papers with news about himself), but Trump has bridled against the scrutiny applied to every President since Cleveland. On Friday morning, about an hour after his press secretary, Sean Spicer, and chief of staff, Reince Priebus, held an anonymous briefing for the press, Trump publicly excoriated the press’s use of anonymity. In a speech at the Conservative Political Action Conference, he said, “I called the fake news ‘the enemy of the people’—and they are. They are the enemy of the people. Because they have no sources, they just make them up when there are none.” At one point, he posed changes that would effectively alter the First Amendment, saying, “They shouldn’t be allowed to use sources unless they use somebody’s name.” He added, “We’re going to do something about it.” And do something they did. Shortly after Trump’s speech, his press office narrowed the day’s briefing to what’s known as a “gaggle”—a smaller, off-camera format that is useful for impromptu or informal updates. It turned away CNN, the Times, BuzzFeed, Politico, and other outlets that have published tough stories about his Administration lately. It ushered in Breitbart, the Washington Times, and a conservative outlet called One America Network. When Zeke Miller, of Time magazine, and Julie Pace, of the Associated Press—both of whom are on the board of the White House Correspondents Association—realized that organizations were being excluded, they left in protest. Reporters who stayed later shared the contents of the briefing in full. The White House defended its actions by saying that every White House holds handpicked, off-the-record sessions, but reporters noted that this was an on-the-record briefing. “In the six years I’ve been here, I’ve never been a party to a gaggle that was not on Air Force One or on the road,” Mark Landler, a senior White House correspondent at the Times, told me. “Handpicking the participants is totally new.” By day’s end, news organizations still couldn’t decipher whether the change was temporary—a kind of press-office panic attack—or a more permanent turn. Davan Maharaj, the editor-in-chief and publisher of the Los Angeles Times, which was among the excluded, told me, “We don’t know what this means. We don’t know if Spicer is under pressure to show that he’s being tougher with the press. We don’t know if this is another effort at manipulation to shift the topic from whether the Administration inappropriately tried to influence the F.B.I. on the Russian investigation. What it does seem like is another effort to target the press as the disloyal opposition and an attack on what objective truth is.” There was, of course, no shortage of reasons for the White House to shift the topic. In addition to contacting the F.B.I., according to the Washington Post, the White House also “enlisted senior members of the intelligence community and Congress in efforts to counter news stories about Trump associates’ ties to Russia”—a development that drew comparisons to Richard Nixon’s attempts to stifle the Watergate investigation. In another blow, the White House was confronting an article in the Forward, headlined, “Senior Trump Aide Forged Key Ties to Anti-Semitic Groups in Hungary,” which focussed on Sebastian Gorka, a deputy assistant to the President, who rose through the far-right edge of Hungarian politics. “I think there are two things going on,” Maharaj said. “I think there is a clear effort to bring the press to heel, something that’s not going to happen to the people who are the purveyors of high-quality journalism in the press in the United States. There’s also a clear effort to delegitimize credible sources of information so when something happens, when we or the New York Times or the Wall Street Journal or the Washington Post pop a story, that there’s a record of already discrediting the source.” So far, news organizations have been galvanized by the pressure. The Washington Post has added a new motto to its front page: “Democracy Dies in Darkness.” And the L.A. Times has printed up T-shirts, for staff and the public, with the phrase “We will not shut up” in thirteen languages. “Look, we all joined this business to hold officials accountable and to search for truth and to be vigorous in that search,” Maharaj said. In the days to come, there will be questions to settle. Will the White House Correspondents Association, which said it was “protesting strongly” the exclusions, urge members to boycott the briefings? (For its part, The New Yorker will not attend White House briefings until the exclusions are ended, according to David Remnick, the editor of the magazine.) Will members of Congress see it as another sign of the President’s authoritarian turn? In a telling sign of displeasure, Representative Darrell Issa, the California Republican who had supported Trump in the campaign, called, on Friday, for a special prosecutor to manage the investigation into contacts between Trump associates and Russia.

#### Trump’s increased ability to attack the media via anonymous sources kills media credibility- it adds a key tool to his overarching strategy

Greenblatt 17 (<https://www.americanpressinstitute.org/publications/reports/white-papers/future-of-fact-checking/single-page/>, “The Future of Fact-Checking: Moving ahead in political accountability journalism”, BY ALAN GREENBLATT PUBLISHED 04/04/17 7:27 AM) LHSLA JC

Politicians have lied throughout history, but today’s political climate presents particular challenges to fact-checkers — and that was the concern of journalists and others gathered at our summit earlier this year. Throughout the 2016 election cycle and into the new White House administration, some politicians’ habit of making “demonstrably false claims” has kept fact-checkers exceptionally busy. (Andy Borowitz, a humor writer for The New Yorker, has joked that President Trump has created “10 million jobs for fact-checkers.”) But while fact-checkers have tried to hold those in power to account, the current administration has complained about fact-checkers’ work. The Trump administration has publicly repudiated journalistic fact-checking and dismissed critical news coverage as “fake.” It is a deliberate strategy, media and communications experts say, and one that appears to resonate with some (mostly) conservative audiences who were already primed to mistrust the media during the 2016 campaign. The verbal attacks on reporters during the campaign, particularly at rallies where journalists were kept in “pens” and taunted by Trump supporters, went largely unaddressed by media leaders and continue today. For fact-checkers, a key concern is how to cover the administration’s prevaricators and supporters of this “dishonest media” theme, without appearing to justify administration claims that the news media are “the opposition party” or “enemies of the people.” “ For fact-checkers, a key concern is how to cover the administration’s prevaricators and supporters of this ‘dishonest media’ theme. ” Consider some carefully fact-checked claims from the first month of the new administration. There were administration claims about massive voter fraud in the November election that had no basis in fact; misinformation about the nation’s murder rate; and inflations of the inauguration crowd size. From the president’s official Twitter account came statements about “any negative polls” — that is, those that are not favorable to his immigration policies — being “fake news.” At a news conference, the president said his electoral vote total beat every president since Ronald Reagan, even though every subsequent president but one had higher totals. When questioned on NBC about the conflicts between administration claims about the inauguration size, a counselor to the president explained the White House was simply offering “alternative facts.” The instantly immortal phrase was widely critiqued. Perversely, the power and reach of the president’s bully pulpit is demonstrated most amply when he says something that is demonstrably untrue. In a series of tweets on March 4, Trump alleged that President Obama had ordered a wiretapping of Trump’s office while Trump was still a candidate and a private citizen. Trump offered no evidence and his claim has since been denied by an Obama spokesman, Obama’s national intelligence director, members of Congress (including Republicans), and the current directors of the National Security Agency and the FBI. Nonetheless, a CBS News poll released March 29 found that 74 percent of Republicans surveyed believed it was “very likely” or “somewhat likely” that Trump’s office had been wiretapped during the campaign. The incidents also contributed to a debate among fact-checkers that began well before election day: whether to call such comments “lies.” The New York Times called Trump’s comments about voter fraud a lie on its front page; NPR, by contrast, has stated that it does not want to ascribe lies to Trump without knowing for certain his intent was to deceive. Fact-checkers at the conference made it clear they want their role to be understood as sifting through truth as finely as they can, not seeking to undermine any particular politician or party. Still, they’re aware that’s not a message that resonates in this politically charged post-election climate. “ I don’t think you’ve got a fact-checking problem as much as you have a problem with the idea of the news business being impartial observers. ” Neil Newhouse, a Republican pollster and a summit participant, told the group, “I don’t think you’ve got a fact-checking problem as much as you have a problem with the idea of the news business being impartial observers. Americans simply don’t trust the news media in general.” Newhouse cited numerous polls that demonstrate a declining faith in news outlets. A Gallup poll released last September, for example, found that Americans’ trust in mass media “to report the news fully, accurately and fairly” had plunged to a new low. Only 32 percent of those surveyed said they had a “great deal” or “fair amount” of trust in the media, which was a drop of 8 percentage points from 2015. The numbers were even lower among Republicans, with only 14 percent saying they had faith in the media. In an American Press Institute survey last year, only 6 percent of people said they have a great deal of confidence in the press. In October, Quinnipiac University released a poll that found 55 percent of likely voters believed the media were biased against Trump, including nearly 90 percent of Republicans. “Your industry is losing the public opinion battle,” Newhouse told the group. “Americans believe that reporters are biased and try to help the candidates that they support win.” This poses a challenge for democracy, Newhouse added: If Americans can’t agree on what facts are, how can they agree about how to respond? Lack of trust in the media unquestionably undermines the credibility of fact-checkers, noted Angie Drobnic Holan, the editor of PolitiFact. “While we are clear in our minds about the differences between reporting and opinion, what’s clear to us is not at all clear to readers,” she said. “Fact checks come out of the reportorial tradition, but people see us as opinion [writers], because we’re weighing in.” “ If Americans can’t agree on what facts are, how can they agree about how to respond? ” Readers don’t always distinguish between analysis — a considered judgment about how, for instance, a policy is likely to play out — and opinion. The push in recent times to offer more analysis as a means of distinguishing their coverage may have undermined the credibility of media outlets, suggested Greg Linch, a data developer at McClatchy. Jessica Arp of WISC-TV in Madison, Wis., one of the pioneers in fact-checking at the local level, said reporters must work harder to engage their audiences in the story development process. That effort should help readers and viewers understand that reporters are not trying to promote their own agendas; rather, they are attempting to help people to sort truth from fiction themselves. “The more we can make fact-checking about trying to help you, maybe the more trust people will have,” Arp said. More examples of reader engagement are discussed below. The context in which fact-checking often appears on digital platforms — draped within news coverage and opinion and even advertising — affects its credibility. “One thing that’s important to consider is the role that shady sponsored content plays in diminishing trust in fact-checking and the press,” said Joyce Garczynski, a communications librarian at Towson University. “When you have fact-checking side-by-side with ads for less-than-reputable products and services, and users can’t tell the difference, it can only hurt news outlets’ overall credibility.”

#### **Media distrust in the age of Trump has two widespread implications- it allows governments in other nations to suppress their press which enables abuse of human rights to go unchecked; it also enables the legitimacy of TRULY fake news like conspiracy theories**

Editorial Board 18 (“The True Damage of Trump’s ‘Fake News”, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/04/opinion/trump-washington-post-amazon.html>, April 4, 2018, By The Editorial Board The editorial board represents the opinions of the board, its editor and the publisher. It is separate from the newsroom and the Op-Ed section) LHSLA JC

Many people, including many Republican lawmakers, dismiss President Trump’s attacks on The Washington Post, CNN and other news organizations as just one of those crazy — but ultimately harmless — things he does to blow off steam. They’re wrong. Yes, Mr. Trump hasn’t been able to implement many of his worst proposals to undermine the press. Congress hasn’t tried to change the First Amendment or pass new libel laws, for example, and journalists — including at the “failing New York Times” — regularly unearth new scandals in the Trump administration. But the president’s rhetoric is clearly having an effect in the United States and especially around the world, where political leaders have seen it as a green light to crack down on the press. Malaysian lawmakers this week passed a law that would impose prison sentences of up to six years on people found to be spreading “fake news,” an ill-defined term that will put tremendous power in the hands of government officials to punish journalists and publishers. In India, the government of Prime Minister Narendra Modi proposed revoking the accreditation of journalists who traffic in “fake news” before scrapping the idea after journalists denounced it. In recent days, Mr. Trump turned his guns on The Post, accusing it of trying to advance the business interests of its owner, Jeff Bezos, and the company he founded and runs, Amazon. Much has been made of the accusations the president has hurled at Amazon’s business practices, like its unwillingness for many years to collect state and local sales taxes. Some of these practices are indeed troubling. But don’t be distracted. Mr. Trump isn’t really distressed about the coffers of state and local governments, small retailers or whether the United States Postal Service suffers losses delivering Amazon packages. He is trying to undermine the credibility of The Post because it is holding his administration to account. Such attacks on the integrity of news organizations confuse the public about what’s true. Many Republican voters have long been skeptical of the mainstream news media, but their trust in it has fallen sharply since 2016, according to the Pew Research Center. And a study by two Yale professors found that Republicans were much more likely to trust hyperpartisan media outlets and news sites that peddle outright falsehoods than are Democrats. That phenomenon has undoubtedly been bolstered by Mr. Trump’s embrace of conspiracy theories and his endorsements of Fox News and Sinclair Broadcasting, which has compelled news anchors at its local TV stations to read outrageous statements questioning the credibility of other news organizations. “Trump seems to be succeeding just through the force of his daily verbal assaults in shaking trust in the press and in other institutions that are crucial to our democracy,” says Jameel Jaffer, director of the Knight First Amendment Institute at Columbia University. You have 4 free articles remaining. Subscribe to The Times When the president calls every piece of information he does not like “fake news,” he also encourages politicians in other countries who are not constrained by constitutional free speech protections or independent judiciaries to more aggressively squelch the press. They know that there will be little international condemnation of their actions because one of the most important standard bearers for a free press — the American government — is led by a man trying to discredit the free press. Malaysia’s democracy is clearly flawed — the same coalition has ruled it since it became independent in 1957, and it has jailed opposition leaders on trumped-up charges — but it is not in the same league as countries like China and Russia, where freedom of speech is extremely circumscribed. By criminalizing “fake news,” it is heading in that direction. Indian democracy is much hardier, but journalists and free speech advocates are worried about the government’s hostility toward an independent press and fear it will become even more aggressive as next year’s parliamentary elections draw closer. This is not a problem just in these countries. The Committee to Protect Journalists has documented an uptick in attacks on the press in Egypt, Myanmar, Poland, Turkey and other countries. Last year, 21 journalists were imprisoned for reporting false news, twice as many as the year before, according to the committee. EDITORS’ PICKS War Without End Billionaire Yogi Behind Indian Prime Minister’s Rise What the Mystery of the Tick-Borne Meat Allergy Could Reveal Mr. Trump is unlikely to change his ways, and his most loyal supporters will support him no matter what he does. It is up to everybody else, Republicans and Democrats alike, to stand up and speak out against his destructive attacks on the press and the truth.

# 2nr

## ov-xt

#### The only difference between voting aff and neg is whether you believe the White House should have the ability to propagate conspiracy theories via “anonymous sources”—Trump’s “confidential informers” spread racist fictions about Obama and delegitimize fact checking on an international scale.

#### Extend Greenblatt—independent impact—the Trump Administration’s rejection of the media damages credibility AND casts fact checking in doubt. “anonymous sources” are a rhetorical strategy that strip away key media checks on Trump like fact checking—turns case since aff prevents long-term press freedoms and ADDS to Trump’s ability to discredit criticism.

#### Extend Editorial Board—the White House’s suppression of press freedoms spills over globally and enables blatant conspiracy theories from America’s head of state.

#### Outweighs on probability—empirically proven since Editorial Board cites Malaysian suppression of “fake news”—a term coined by Trump—that gives the government power to quash any dissent.

#### scope—our impacts are global—supercharged by the fact that countries like India and Malaysia coopting the “fake news” moniker have few constitutional protections that prevent arbitrarily suppressing journalists.

## AT Misc

### AT solvency advocate presses

#### Osnos advocates the plan minus the exception—he says that anonymity is a useful tool but that “In Washington: anonymity is a poor solution

#### The article’s focus is on the White House decreasing press conference attendees but they haven’t disproved that a) Trump uses anonymous sources to defend conspiracy theories and b) it’s part of a targeted effort to delegitimize quality criticisms of his administration.

### AT AT Greenblatt

#### Aff says anonymous sources are key to bringing wrongdoing by the Trump Administration to light but we never contest this—the only difference between the PIC and the aff is that we remove Trump’s ability to retaliate to criticism by MAKING THINGS UP. Vote aff and you endorse lies like a) President Obama isn’t a citizen and wiretapped Trump Tower, b) the FBI and GOP were spying on his campaign, c) his racist attacks against Mexicans and Muslims based in sketchy alt-right reporting

#### Here’s how you weigh:

#### Probability—their offense is only a RISK that some source could provide information that destabilizes Trump, but the risk of that is ZERO since he’s survived 3 years since announcing his candidacy and multiple major scandals. Prefer ours—we give you examples of now widely believed fictions that are directly traceable to anonymous accounts of reality so we empirically have 100% probability- stuff like Qanon taking over Trump’s rallies and Alex Jones, Breitbart, etc straight up making news stories up that based off of Trump’s lies that rally

#### his supporters against a bigoted cause; things like made-up statistics to make Immigrants appear as rapists, drug dealers, criminals for example have REAL WORLD IMPACTS; allows subjugation of bodies to continue unchecked which turns the AFF

#### Their impact is nonunique—Mueller probe is working since trump is trying harder and harder to block him—proves the media isn’t uniquely key as a check on trump if destabilizing him’s the goal. Prefer our impact—Trump’s base is CONTINUALLY inventing new lies like QAnon to detract from criticisms of his presidency. That keeps enthusiasm alive before midterms in a matter of weeks—affirming has a tangible effect on voting patterns and base strength but negating would force trump to abandon his biggest strategy.

## Perm F/L

### AT perm – White House isn’t reporter

#### 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

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. Prefer this definition pragmatically- 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

(also trump uses twitter as a huge means of communication—public media communications from the highest elected official in the country via major online sources sounds a lot like reporting)

#### Government officials are most users of anonymous sourcing—prefer our ev since it surveys academic literature on the issue which is what would be used legally

Taegyu Son (2002) Leaks: How Do Codes of Ethics Address Them?, Journal of Mass Media Ethics: Exploring Questions of Media Morality, 17:2, 155-173, DOI: 10.1207/S15327728JMME1702\_05 --ilakeMW

The literature that provides the foundation for this study can be placed in two categories: (a) literature discussing leaks that focuses on the definition of the term, the use of leaks by officials, and the negative impact of leaks on both government and journalism; and (b) studies of codes of ethics that examine what functions codes of ethics have for journalists and what codes of ethics should say about journalistic practices. Leaks Anonymity is an inevitable element of news leaks. Every leaker is an anonymous or unnamed source, but not every anonymous source is a leaker. The most important difference between leakers and other anonymous sources lies in the process of getting the information. Richard Kielbowicz (1979/1980) said The term “leak,” coined in the early twentieth century, was originally applied to inadvertent slips in which information was picked up by reporters. The word quickly acquired a broader, more active meaning: any calculated release of information to reporters with the stipulation that the source remains unidentified. (p. 53) Most authors use the term leaks to refer only to information provided by government officials. Differentiating leakers from backgrounders, which are also anonymous sources, Leon Sigal (1973) said that in leaks, “the official deals with reporters as individuals, never in a group. … The contact is non-routine and initiated by the officials. Some background briefings are held on a regular basis at the instigation of the reporters themselves” (p. 144). Martin Linsky (1991) explained that “a leaker is more regularly someone who takes the initiative with the journalists; an anonymous source is a person the journalist contacts, often routinely, for information and insight” (p. 170). To support his definition, Linsky quoted Albert Hunt, then Washington bureau chief for the Wall Street Journal, “Leaks are stories that are instigated, sometimes by the government, for a purpose” (p. 170). Melvin Mencher (1997) added, “The leak is one of the instruments of government. … The other common characteristic of the leak is that it serves the leaker’s pur pose” (p. 313). The line drawn between leakers and general anonymous sources is based on whether the contact is initiated by the official or the journalist, as well as the source’s motivation in providing information.