

FIRST AMENDMENT TELEVISION LLC

Documentary · Narrative Film · Civic Media
Chicago, Illinois · firstatv.com

POSITION PAPER · CIVIC ADVOCACY SERIES

The Unwelcome Word

Why Displeasure Is Never Grounds to Silence the Press

Publication No.	CV-009
Author	First Amendment Television LLC
Version	1.1
Date	September 2026
Status	Active Position Paper
Supersedes	None

The press was to serve the governed, not the governors.

Justice Hugo L. Black, *New York Times Co. v. United States* (1971)

I. The Principle

A free press does not exist to be liked. It exists to pursue and report what the public needs to know, especially what power would rather keep hidden, and to say so out loud. The moment a government, of any party, any ideology, any era, claims the authority to silence, punish, or shut out a newspaper because it dislikes what was printed, that government has stopped governing a free people. It has begun managing them.

This is not a slippery slope. A slippery slope is a gradual descent. What we describe here is a cliff. The first time officials successfully punish reporting for being unwelcome, they establish that the press publishes by permission. A press that publishes by permission is not free. It is licensed.

II. Displeasure Is Not a Legal Standard

Official anger, embarrassment, or political inconvenience, standing alone, is not a lawful reason to suppress the news or punish those who report it. The principle took root before the country existed. In 1735, the printer John Peter Zenger was tried in colonial New York for publishing criticism of the royal governor. His lawyer, Andrew Hamilton, urged the jury to treat truth as a defense, though the law of the day did not recognize it as one. A jury of ordinary citizens acquitted Zenger anyway. The verdict settled no legal question, but it helped shape the American free press tradition: the governed, not the governor, would judge what the press may say.

The Supreme Court carried that principle forward. In *Near v. Minnesota* (1931), it struck down a law that let officials shut down a newspaper as a “public nuisance,” holding that prior restraint, stopping publication before it happens, is the essence of censorship. In *New York Times Co. v. United States* (1971), the Pentagon Papers case, the government sought to block publication of a

classified history of the Vietnam War. The Court refused. Justice Hugo Black wrote that the press was to serve the governed, not the governors.

That sentence is the whole argument. Everything else is commentary.

III. “Fake” Is a Verdict, Not Evidence

Those who wish to suppress reporting rarely say they are suppressing it. They say it is false. They call it fake, misleading, dangerous, irresponsible. Sometimes they are right. Often they are not. But whether a story is false is a question of fact, and a government accused by that story is the last party entitled to answer it alone.

The label “fake” is too frequently a tool, not a finding. It allows officials to skip the burden of proof and go straight to the punishment. It asks the public to accept the word of the accused over the work of the accuser. A free society does not permit the subject of an investigation to decide, by decree, that the investigation never happened.

When reporting is genuinely false, the law already provides remedies, and none of them require silence. A person who is defamed may sue. Public officials may sue too, but under *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan* (1964) they must prove the falsehood was published knowingly or with reckless disregard for the truth. That high bar is deliberate. It exists because the Court understood that officials would otherwise use libel law as a weapon against criticism. And beyond the courts lies the oldest remedy of all. As Justice Louis Brandeis wrote in 1927, the remedy for falsehood is more speech, not enforced silence.

IV. Exclusion Is Suppression by Another Name

Suppression does not always arrive as a court order. It arrives as a revoked credential, a closed briefing room, a reporter removed from the pool, a news organization quietly dropped from the list. Denying access to a journalist because officials dislike what that journalist wrote is not a scheduling decision. It is retaliation. It punishes past reporting and chills future reporting, and every other newsroom watching learns the lesson: write what pleases, or lose your seat.

The law has recognized this. In *Sherrill v. Knight* (1977), a federal appeals court considered a case in which a reporter challenged the denial of a White House press pass. The court accepted that the public has no general right to enter the White House. But it held that once the government opens press facilities to journalists, it may not deny a bona fide reporter access arbitrarily or for less than compelling reasons, and that a denial requires notice, a chance to respond, and a written decision.

That distinction matters. The press has no automatic right to enter every government room, attend every closed meeting, or ride on every official aircraft. Governments may set neutral rules for space, safety, and order. But where an established process for press access exists, officials may not bend it to reward favorable coverage and punish unfavorable coverage. The question is not whether a door must open to everyone. It is whether a door already open to the press may be closed on one reporter because of what that reporter wrote.

A government that can choose which reporters are allowed to see it can choose what the public is allowed to know about it. That is the precedent, and it is a dangerous one. Once established against one outlet, it is available against every outlet, under every future administration, including those whose politics the current administration opposes. Power used against an unpopular press today is inherited tomorrow by whoever holds office next.

V. The Fourth Estate Belongs to the Public

The press is called the Fourth Estate because it stands outside the formal branches of government and watches all of them. It has no army, no treasury, and no vote. Its only power is the power to make things known.

That power is not the press’s own. It is borrowed from the public. Ordinary citizens cannot attend every hearing, read every contract, question every official, or walk into every room where decisions are made about their lives. The reporter goes on their behalf. When a journalist is shut out, it is the public that is shut out. When a story is suppressed, it is the public that is kept

ignorant.

James Madison understood this. In 1822 he wrote that a popular government without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both. A people who cannot learn what their government is doing cannot govern themselves. They can only be governed.

VI. Anticipating the Objections

Serious people raise serious concerns, and they deserve answers.

Some reporting is genuinely false and harmful. True, and false reporting can carry real consequences: correction, rebuttal, loss of credibility, and where the law's standards are met, liability decided by a court on evidence. What official displeasure alone can never justify is a unilateral decision that the story may not be told or the reporter may not return.

National security requires secrecy. Sometimes it does. But the Pentagon Papers case established that any prior restraint arrives bearing a heavy presumption against its validity, and that the government carries a heavy burden to justify it. Embarrassment, political damage, and inconvenience do not meet that burden. The claim of security must be proven, not merely asserted.

Access is a privilege, not a right. Governments may set neutral rules for space, safety, and order. What they may not do is apply those rules selectively to reward favorable coverage and punish critical coverage. The test is simple: would this outlet still be excluded if it had written something flattering?

The press is biased. Perhaps some of it is. Bias is answered by competition, criticism, and more reporting. It is never answered by giving the government the power to decide which bias is acceptable, because the government will always choose its own.

VII. Conclusion

The right to question authority is not a courtesy authority extends. It is a limit authority must accept. A government that cannot tolerate being questioned has already told the public everything it needs to know.

No newspaper should ever need permission to report. No official should ever have the power to punish a story for being unwelcome. And no free people should ever accept that the truth is whatever those in power find comfortable to read.

The record is the resistance.

A free press is how the record gets made.

Selected References

Brandeis, Louis D. Concurring opinion, *Whitney v. California*, 274 U.S. 357 (1927).

Madison, James. Letter to W. T. Barry, August 4, 1822.

Near v. Minnesota ex rel. Olson, 283 U.S. 697 (1931).

New York Times Co. v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254 (1964).

New York Times Co. v. United States, 403 U.S. 713 (1971), including the concurring opinion of Justice Hugo L. Black.

Sherrill v. Knight, 569 F.2d 124 (D.C. Cir. 1977).

The Trial of John Peter Zenger, Supreme Court of Judicature, Province of New York (1735).

U.S. Constitution, Amendment I (1791).

Free Press. Free Speech. Free to Create.

First Amendment Television LLC · Chicago, Illinois
Because history deserves more than memory. It deserves a record.

© 2026 First Amendment Television LLC. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed without written permission of First Amendment Television LLC, except for brief quotation with attribution.

CV-009 · © 2026 First Amendment Television LLC · Page