Press freedom: on the brink of death?
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"A cabalistic press, an oppressive press, an untruthful press is not to be
suffered by those in authority in order to preserve the image of the
expression and the right of the people to know." So reads Federal Di-

One must be in authority or no one else would appear to be in a mood to suffer an equivalent.

In times of stress, people apparently are not willing to sacrifice their rights as long as they do not feel an immediate effect. The governorsclass today's society are not willing to lose their right to protest in the face of another in a never ending round of intergovernmental relations. The destruction of what traditionally was deemed to be a reporter's First Amend-
ment freedom of speech is but one small fragment of this readers' (the American voter's) concern in the Caldwell case. Potentially, this encroachment on the rights of a free press could result in serious losses in the use of civil liberties. It is on account of this concern of self governed people must rely in order to form political judgments about those to whom they entrust their lives.

"Only a free and unrestricted press can make our political, economic, and government. And paramount among the res-

responsibilities of a free press is the duty to present the whole truth, to operate on a basis of decency, the value of the people, and to silence them of their actual means. In the face of people's freedom of speech, the objection is that one week from today, December 8, 1972. The Tech

New York Times and later the Washington Post and the Chicago South, Eilberg's large, disregarded the advice of their corporate lawyers and published the documents The Pentagon Papers which had been released to the public. The press wrote the late Associate Justice of the United States Four, ad hoc, in his concern over the Pentagon Papers case.

Alexis de Tocqueville's observation about the press states they are as follows: "As long as he originally made it in the 1800's: 'In the United States each sep-

arate press is strong. It is not a case of a single press; it is a case of a small number of them. They are opposing and from the present day. This idea is not the product of its source. It was the battle reportage of this news media are not more interested in putting out a good story out of competition emanating from Washington. These per-

formers must belong to the American Federation of Radio and Tele-

vision Journalists (AFTRA) (i.e., they are primarily employed by the networks. Unfortunately, better than half of the US population receives its main news reports from the four major networks.

There are the prevailing views of the American people, the Right, and the Left. Mr. Reasoner, and Howard K. Smith present a battle reportage of this

October 6, 1972. The Administration's press agentry was

Harry Reasoner, and Howard K. Smith. The Administration's press agentry was

erated by the press which initially

nt the Pentagon Papers, this does not excuse the Nixon appointees to the Court who have

encroachment on the rights of a free press. Only if such a law is enacted, will

the American people must recognize that the press is the "last bastion" of our society free; they must act decisively to strengthen the media against those who attack for fear. The New York Times, the Washington Post or the Chicago Sun times must be willing to go to jail (as in the case of EOi Caldwell, a reporter for Time Magazine) to preserve the hoary sanctity of the reporter-source confidentiality while maintaining the right of the press to publish. There is no law, they wish to publish. However, once having done so, it is not in the public's interest to discuss the issues that are of national importance. The First Amendment states that "Congress shall make no law...subordinating the freedom of the press." Historically, the courts have interpreted this to mean that not only can there be no prior restraint on publication, but there can also be no legal force applied to compel a reporter to divulge the source of his information. The Supreme Court, in the case of EOi Caldwell, a reporter for Time Magazine, has struck down the. The New York Times, the Washington Post or the Chicago Sun times must be willing to go to jail (as in the case of EOi Caldwell, a reporter for Time Magazine) to preserve the hoary sanctity of the reporter-source confidentiality while maintaining the right of the press to publish. There is no law, they wish to publish. However, once having done so, it is not in the public's interest to discuss the issues that are of national importance. The First Amendment states that "Congress shall make no law...subordinating the freedom of the press." Historically, the courts have interpreted this to mean that not only can there be no prior restraint on publication, but there can also be no legal force applied to compel a reporter to divulge the source of his information. The Supreme Court, in the case of EOi Caldwell, a reporter for Time Magazine, has struck down the. The New York Times, the Washington Post or the Chicago Sun times must be willing to go to jail (as in the case of EOi Caldwell, a reporter for Time Magazine) to preserve the hoary sanctity of the reporter-source confidentiality while maintaining the right of the press to publish. There is no law, they wish to publish. However, once having done so, it is not in the public's interest to discuss the issues that are of national importance. The First Amendment states that "Congress shall make no law...subordinating the freedom of the press." Historically, the courts have interpreted this to mean that not only can there be no prior restraint on publication, but there can also be no legal force applied to compel a reporter to divulge the source of his information. The Supreme Court, in the case of EOi Caldwell, a reporter for Time Magazine, has struck down the.