## Framework

### My value is morality for two reasons

1. The resolution’s use of the word “ought” implies a moral obligation
2. Morality allows us to perceive what is inherently good or bad. It’s the value upon which we can conceptualize all other values, thus it must be prioritized.

### My criterion is increasing maximum expected wellbeing

#### Util considers the entire community affected including individuals harmed-It’s not just aggregate good

**Deni Elliott, 2007[Ethicist and Ethics Scholar], "Getting Mill Right," [**Department of Journalism and Media Studies University of South Florida St. Petersburg]**Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 22(2&3), 100–112,** [**https://pages.uoregon.edu/tbivins/stratcomweb/readings/Getting\_Mill\_Right\_(Elliott)%20copy.pdf**](https://pages.uoregon.edu/tbivins/stratcomweb/readings/Getting_Mill_Right_(Elliott)%20copy.pdf) **MS**

Many people think that the bumper sticker for John Stuart Mill’s utilitarianism reads, ‘‘Do the greatest good for the greatest number.’’ However, they would be wrong. Utilitarianism, at least as espoused by this 19th century British philosopher and his acknowledged, but rarely recognized collaborator, Harriet Taylor-Mill, does not teach us to add up the people potentially helped by an action and subtract from that number the people potentially harmed, with the presumably ‘‘ethical’’ choice of having the majority win. Rather, **Mill’s utilitarianism requires the far more difficult analysis of determining which action is most likely to produce the aggregate good**—**the overall good for the community as a whole, or for all of the people who can be identified as being affected by a particular action**. In addition, through an application of the principles of justice, required prior to the use of any utilitarian calculus, Mill employs special protection for individuals who might otherwise be sacrificed for the good of the whole. In contrast to the simplistic reasoning sometimes offered—it is okay if an individual is hurt by the publication of a story or picture, as the journalist can argue that many more citizens might benefit from having the knowledge or seeing the picture—**Mill requires calculating what is truly good for the whole community**. If causing harm is justified at all, it is justified on the basis that causing harm in those particular types of cases is good for the community, **including the individual harmed**. Sometimes it is better for individuals to be harmed, sometimes not. **But the ability to distinguish between those instances involves more than mere computation.** It requires the agent doing the analysis—even if that agent is the person potentially harmed—to make the determination with dispassionate objectivity. The decision maker must be truly impartial with regard to his or her own interests and the interests of all others involved.

### Contention 1- Misinformation

#### **Mistrust in Mainstream Media is at an all-time high, citizens want objectivity**

Sands 20 [Sands, John. "Americans Are Losing Faith In An Objective Media. A New Gallup/Knight Study Explores Why.". Knight Foundation, 2022, https://knightfoundation.org/articles/americans-are-losing-faith-in-an-objective-media-a-new-gallup-knight-study-explores-why/. Accessed 20 Mar 2022.]  **Americans see increasing bias in the news media**: One of the primary reasons Americans don’t think the media works for them is because of the bias they perceive in coverage. Many feel the media’s traditional roles, such as holding leaders accountable, is compromised by bias, with nearly 7 in 10 Americans (68%) who say they see too much bias in the reporting of news that is supposed to be objective as “a major problem,” up from 65% in the 2017 Knight/Gallup study. They see it in their own news sources (57%), and more than 6 in 10 are concerned about bias in the news other people are getting, the survey finds. Some 7 in 10 Americans worry that owners of media companies are influencing coverage. 2) Americans think the media is pushing an agenda. Eight in 10 Americans say that when they suspect an inaccuracy in a story, they worry it was intentional —because the reporter was misrepresenting the facts (52%) or making them up (28%). Only 18% say they think the inaccuracies were innocent mistakes. And when it comes to news sources they distrust, nearly three-quarters of Americans (or 74%) say those outlets are trying to persuade people to adopt a certain opinion. 3) Distrust in the media cuts along partisan lines: Views on the media vary widely by party, though overall, Americans view the media more negatively than positively. The breakdown: Nearly 7 in 10 Republicans (67%) have a very or somewhat unfavorable opinion of the news media, versus 1 in 5 Democrats (20%) and about half of independents (48%). 4) A majority of Americans say the media are under political attack – but are divided by party on whether it’s warranted: While people from all political persuasions agree that the media is being politically attacked, 66% of Democrats say those attacks are not justified, while 58% of Republicans say they are. 5) Opinions on the media also vary widely by age. Young Americans, for example, tend to have more negative views on the media. One in 5 American adults under 30 (20%) say they have a “very” or “somewhat” favorable opinion of the news media, versus almost half of those aged 65 and older (43%). 6) Americans blame the media for political divisions, but they also see the potential for the media to heal these divides. Forty-seven percent of Americans say the media bears “a great deal” of blame for political division in this country, and 36% say they bear “a moderate amount.” At the same time, 8 in 10 Americans believe the media can bring people together and heal the nation’s political divides

#### Mistrust in Media leads to an increase in consumption of Alternative news

Kim Andersen, 11-10-2021, "Alternative News Orientation and Trust in Mainstream Media: A Longitudinal Audience Perspective," Taylor & Francis, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412

The emergence of online alternative news sites has enabled people to easily access viewpoints corresponding to their social and political identities and challenging mainstream media coverage. Taking an audience perspective and relying on a large four-wave panel survey from Sweden, this study examines orientation towards alternative news, paying specific attention to the potential reinforcing relationship with trust in mainstream media. Results show that increasing orientation towards alternative news is related to decreasing trust in mainstream media, and vice versa. In addition, the study highlights how alternative news orientation supplements rather than replaces consumption of traditional news. These findings provide valuable insights on the alternative news users and the dynamics of their media consumption, informing the debate on the role played by alternative news media in society. In recent years, a growing number of alternative news sites have emerged online, positioning themselves as correctives to mainstream media (Holt, Figenschou, and Frischlich [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Figenschou and Ihlebaek [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). Based on strong ideological profiles representing anti-system and anti-elite attitudes, some alternative news media provide content that stands in opposition to the content found in mainstream news media (Holt [2018](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)), often with an aim of social or political reform (Downing [2001](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). Prominent examples include Breitbart in the United States and The Canary in the United Kingdom, but many more alternative news outlets exist around the world. The societal and democratic implications of this development are profound. On the one hand, alternative news sites present a potential challenge to society, as information found here may be biased or even false. As a consequence, alternative news media may exacerbate political polarization, but also foster misinformation and conspiracy theories (Mourão and Robertson [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). On the other hand, alternative news media also create a more diverse media environment, where dominant narratives can be critically challenged and thoroughly deliberated. As such, these information sources enable people to nurse special interests and connect with like-minded people—something highlighted as important by, for example, the pluralism theory of democracy (Baker [2002](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). To better understand the role played by alternative news media in society, however, we lack knowledge about the underlying mechanisms influencing the usage of these information sources. With notable exceptions (Leung and Lee [2014](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Thorbjørnsrud and Figenschou [2020](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)), the users of alternative news media have not received much attention in the literature. This is a seemingly paradox, as these media users are likely to be some of the most active and engaged audiences (Downing 2003). Therefore, this study takes an audience perspective and examines orientation towards alternative news media, paying specific attention to the potential reinforcing relationship with distrust in mainstream news media. As media distrust is likely to be both a key reason for using alternative news but also a potential outcome of such consumption, we assume that the relationship indeed is reinforcing over time. Media trust has recently declined in many countries (Hanitzsch, van Dalen, and Steindl [2018](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). With the emergence of many new alternative news sites online, people with low trust in mainstream media have more opportunities than previously for finding information that gives a different picture of reality and fits their worldview and social identity better than the one found in mainstream media. In addition, a central part of alternative news media is their criticism of mainstream media for deficient news coverage (Cushion 2021; Cushion, McDowell-Naylor, and Thomas 2021; Figenschou and Ihlebaek [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Holt, Figenschou, and Frischlich [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Ladd [2012](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)), which may further fuel mistrust in mainstream media among alternative news users. Previous studies have confirmed the relationship between distrust in mainstream media and the use of alternative news (Fletcher and Park [2017](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Tsfati [2010](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Tsfati and Cappella [2003](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Tsfati and Peri [2006](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). These studies have been limited by cross-sectional data, however, making it difficult to draw firm causal conclusions and examine the potential of an over-time reinforcement. To examine the underlying reasons for alternative news consumption, this study, therefore, examines the relationship between people’s orientation towards alternative news and their trust in mainstream media over time, enabling us to examine their dynamic development longitudinally. In addition, the study examines how consumption of traditional news are linked to alternative news orientation. Empirically, the study is based on a four-wave panel survey with a large sample of the Swedish population conducted in 2018–2020 enabling longitudinal analysis. With an increasing number of online alternative news sites and polarizing attitudes on media trust, Sweden provides a good case for testing the dynamics at stake. Over the past decades, the media environment has transformed from a low-choice to a high-choice media environment, as the amount of available information has accelerated (Van Aelst et al. [2017](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). Lately, this development has been driven in particular by digital inventions like personal computers, the Internet, smartphones, and social media. As media choice has expanded, people’s preferences have come to play an increasingly important role in their media consumption (Napoli [2011](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Prior [2007](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). As a consequence, media use has become more individualized and fragmented (Van Aelst et al. [2017](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). One example illustrating this development is that people’s political interest has become an increasingly important driver for their news consumption (Strömbäck, Djerf-Pierre, and Shehata [2013](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). While people with a high interest in politics can seek out news constantly, people with a low interest likewise have ample opportunities for finding other content and avoiding news (Skovsgaard and Andersen [2020](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). For those still consuming news, selective exposure to politically like-minded content has likewise become easier (Iyengar and Hahn [2009](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Stroud [2008](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). As part of this high-choice media environment, an increasing number of alternative news sites have emerged online. Such alternative news sites usually have strong ideological profiles, representing anti-system and anti-elite attitudes (Holt [2018](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)), and provide coverage that stands in opposition to that of mainstream media, providing a platform for viewpoints usually ignored (Atton [2007](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Haas [2004](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). Especially right-wing alternative news media have been very prominent. Alternative news media thereby illustrate how the boundaries of journalism are fading, challenging journalists’ monopoly as a trustworthy source of information (Lewis [2012](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). As part of their profile, alternative media also attack mainstream media for being untrustworthy (Cushion [2021](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Cushion, McDowell-Naylor, and Thomas [2021](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Figenschou and Ihlebaek [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Holt, Figenschou, and Frischlich [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Ladd [2012](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)), criticizing them for being biased, being distanced from the people, excluding important voices, and instead acting as an uncritical platform for those in power (Figenschou and Ihlebaek [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). From a historical perspective, alternative news media have been closely linked to social movements. Thus, alternative news media often thrive well in times of social and political turmoil (Downing [2001](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). Alternative media can therefore, in a broad sense, be defined as “media devoted to providing representations of issues and events which oppose those offered in mainstream media and to advocate social and political reform” (Haas [2004](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412), 115). As such, alternative news media is nothing new, and they have existed for a long time (Downing [2001](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). But with the technological developments described above they have expanded in numbers, as it has become easier for producers to establish and run alternative news media, also for non-journalists, and easier for the audience to access them. This development is further supported by social media, where alternative news media can easily distribute their content. Previous studies have also highlighted that alternative news media take up a large proportion of shared news on social media (Sandberg and Ihlebaek [2019](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412); Thorbjørnsrud and Figenschou [2020](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)). With algorithms catering for people’s preferences (Thorson et al. [2021](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1986412)), social media platforms further stress the importance of understanding the underlying drivers of people’s alternative news consumption.

#### Alternative news replicates and disseminates misinformation

Michael Hameleers, Anna Brosius, Claes H De Vreeseuniversity Of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlandscorresponding Author, 2-11-2022, "Whom to trust? Media exposure patterns of citizens with perceptions of misinformation and disinformation related to the news media," SAGE Journals, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667

When citizens distrust the mainstream media, they have a tendency to withdraw from it and turn towards alternative sources (e.g. Müller and Schulz, 2021; [Tsfati and Cappella, 2003](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667)). One reason to distrust the news media, and to increasingly use alternative outlets, could be an impression that the information reported in the mainstream media is false or even intentionally misleading. However, not all false information is the same; extant literature distinguishes between inadvertent misinformation and deliberate disinformation ([Jack, 2017](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667); [Karlova and Fisher, 2013](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667); [Wardle, 2017](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667)). This is not purely a scholarly distinction; citizens may also, to an extent, distinguish between the two (Hameleers et al., [2021](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667)). The present study focuses on how perceptions of misinformation and disinformation applied to general news media coverage relate to media trust as well as the use of mainstream and alternative news sources, which we consider as a broad category of online non-journalistic news coverage, such as Tweets, blogs, or alternative online news sources reflecting (hyper) partisan views. The key aim is to comprehensively map the news diets of people who are concerned about misinformation and disinformation in the news media. In tandem with populist discourse, traditional news media are increasingly scapegoated for misleading the people – which is exemplified by the salience of the ‘Fake News’ label used to delegitimize traditional news media ([Egelhofer and Lecheler, 2019](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667)). Citizens might respond to this by seeking out information from other platforms, specifically more alternative news sources online (Müller and Schulz, 2021). At the same time, this online news environment is also argued to be particularly conducive to the spread of misinformation and disinformation ([Bennett and Livingston, 2018](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667); [Tambuscio et al., 2015](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667); [Van Aelst et al., 2017](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667)). Thus, susceptibility to misinformation and disinformation and perceptions of communicative untruthfulness may be reinforced in a spiral of distrust: The more citizens perceive the (mainstream) media as dishonest and inaccurate, the more likely they are to select media content from sources that adhere less to the standards of verified, objective journalism (i.e. news shared on social media), which could in turn intensify perceptions of misinformation and disinformation. In addition to that, [Zimmermann and Kohring (2020)](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667) show that those who trust the media less are also more likely to believe online disinformation. Other research has indicated that citizens in countries with low levels of polarization, populist communication, and high levels of media trust are most resilient to false information ([Humprecht et al., 2020](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/02673231211072667)). Trust may thus be a crucial factor related to people's susceptibility to disinformed worldviews.

#### Misinformation is an existential impact

**Lin, 19**—senior research scholar for cyber policy and security at the Center for International Security and Cooperation and Hank J. Holland Fellow in Cyber Policy and Security at the Hoover Institution, both at Stanford University (Herbert, “The existential threat from cyber-enabled information warfare,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 75:4, 187-196, dml)

Corruption of the information ecosystem is not just a multiplier of two long-acknowledged existential threats to the future of humanity – climate change and nuclear weapons. Cyberenabled information warfare has also become an existential threat in its own right, its increased use posing the possibility of a global information dystopia, in which the pillars of modern democratic self-government – logic, truth, and reality – are shattered, and anti-Enlightenment values undermine civilization as we know it around the world. The misuse of social media in the information ecosystem has also made rational responses to the threat of climate change more difficult for national governments to reach, as companies and groups with financial and ideological interest in creating the appearance of doubt sow misinformation about consensus scientific view. That is, cyber-enabled information warfare is a threat multiplier in the climate change arena, just as it is in the nuclear policy area. Founded in 1945, the Bulletin first focused on the existential threat from nuclear war. The atomic scientists of the Manhattan Project did not believe that the miniature suns let loose on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in themselves posed an existential threat to human existence. (In the project’s early days, some of its physicists raised the possibility that the detonation of an atomic bomb might indeed incinerate the earth’s atmosphere. This concern was taken seriously only in the sense that they performed a variety of calculations that indicated such an outcome was impossible for all practical purposes. See Horgan 2015 for an authoritative account in an interview with Hans Bethe.) However, most of the Manhattan Project’s scientists recognized that atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were omens of a future in which nuclear weapons, used on a large scale, could indeed threaten human existence, and even used on a smaller scale could threaten modern human civilization. After sporadically reporting on climate change for decades, in 2007 the Bulletin formally expanded its concept of existential threat to include climate change and nuclear war. (Ironically, the possibility of significant global cooling as the result of nuclear war was first raised in the scientific literature in the early 1980’s. See, for example, NRC (1985)) Where large-scale nuclear war threatens to snuff out hundreds of millions of lives in a matter of hours, climate change threatens to alter the planetary ecosystem. Here the effects are more subtle and less easily noticed because they are cumulative over decades. There is no single cataclysmic event in the offing, and yet myriad smaller regional disasters will result in more intense and more frequent forest fires, heat waves, and storms; vastly increased coastal flooding and rising sea levels; loss of arable land; severe shortages of food and water; and mass migrations and relocations. Nuclear war and climate change threaten the physical infrastructure of human civilization as well as the underlying geochemical processes and the ecology of the planet. Because most people depend on both physical infrastructure and our global ecology for food, energy, and other necessities of existence, nuclear war and climate change put the lives of the great mass of humanity at risk. Because nuclear war and climate change threaten massive changes in cultural identity and the loss of historical resources, our civilization and our legacy are at stake, too. In those ways, both nuclear war and climate change pose existential threats to humanity. But these are not the only such threats to civilization as we know it. The infrastructure for human civilization is undeniably tangible (that is, physical, chemical, and biological), but it is increasingly virtual as well, and the virtual aspects of that infrastructure – the information ecosystem (or, equivalently, environment) – in many ways has become central and often critical to the way people now live all over the world. As Balkin (2012) describes, “it is not an exaggeration to say that modern states are informational states: states that recognize and solve problems of governance by collecting, analyzing, and distributing information.” Consider that nations require good information to allocate benefits and social services to the populace; to administer mechanisms for public safety (e.g. law enforcement, court systems, fire-fighting); to provide for national security; to gather revenue to support national expenditures; and to engage with other nations in ways that support national interests. 3 Cyber-enabled information warfare is distinct from cyber warfare; the former targets human minds, whereas the latter targets computer and communications systems 188 H. LIN . Businesses and nonprofit entities in turn are also highly dependent on information. They use it to develop products and services for customers and clients; to understand markets and audiences for their products and services; to inform customers and clients about their products and services; to comply with laws and regulations applicable to their products and services; and to maintain their accounting and finances. Construction and manufacturing projects entail the coordination of dozens, hundreds, or thousands of parties – all of whom must have a justifiable confidence in the information they are sharing and relying upon. Contextualized, reliable, trustworthy information is as important to the thinking of human beings as clean air is to human breathing. Human beings depend on good information for making informed decisions about political candidates standing in elections; to know as consumers which specific products and services will best serve their needs; for managing their finances; in making health-related decisions about themselves and their loved ones; in learning to perform their jobs more effectively or efficiently; and in truly countless other ways. Nations also engage extensively in information production. They provide education for young people; support scientific research that undergirds economic growth and prosperity; and collect, curate, and disseminate largescale statistical data that influence decisions at every level of society. Imagine what life would be like if citizens could not count on the validity and trustworthiness of the information underlying any of these activities. In some cases, the result would be no more than minor annoyance. In others, however, the result could be life-threatening. Nations could be crippled, as they could and likely would make bad or at least sub-optimal decisions about war and peace, the economy, law enforcement, housing, food production, energy, and the many other important matters for which governments have some responsibility

#### Thus the plan: Journalists ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy by doing the following:

1.Never adding anything which isn’t relevant or true

2.Never deceiving the audience.

3.Being transparent about their methods and motives.

4.Relying on their own original reporting.

#### Definitionally objective news rejects fake news

Kovach and Rosenstiel 01 (Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel., Bill Kovach, a 1989 Nieman Fellow, was curator of the Nieman Foundation from 1989 to 2000. He is the co-author of “The Elements of Journalism.”, Tom Rosenstiel is executive director of the American Press Institute and co-author of “The Elements of Journalism.”, 6-15-2001, accessed on 2-19-2022, Nieman Reports, "The Essence of Journalism Is a Discipline of Verification | Nieman Reports", https://niemanreports.org/articles/the-essence-of-journalism-is-a-discipline-of-verification/)

“In the end, the discipline of verification is what separates journalism from entertainment, propaganda, fiction, or art…. Journalism alone is focused first on getting what happened down right…. Perhaps because the discipline of verification is so personal and so haphazardly communicated, it is also part of one of the great confusions of journalism— the concept of objectivity. The original meaning of this idea is now thoroughly misunderstood, and by and large lost. When the concept originally evolved, it was not meant to imply that journalists were free of bias. Quite the contrary…. Objectivity called for journalists to develop a consistent method of testing information—a transparent approach to evidence—precisely so that personal and cultural biases would not undermine the accuracy of their work…. In the original concept, in other words, the method is objective, not the journalist. The key was in the discipline of the craft, not the aim. The point has some important implications. One is that the impartial voice employed by many news organizations, that familiar, supposedly neutral style of newswriting, is not a fundamental principle of journalism. Rather, it is an often helpful device news organizations use to highlight that they are trying to produce something obtained by objective methods. The second implication is that this neutral voice, without a discipline of verification, creates a veneer covering something hollow. Journalists who select sources to express what is really their own point of view, and then use the neutral voice to make it seem objective, are engaged in a form of deception. This damages the credibility of the whole profession by making it seem unprincipled, dishonest, and biased. This is an important caution in an age when the standards of the press are so in doubt…. A more conscious discipline of verification is the best antidote to the old journalism of verification being overrun by a new journalism of assertion, and it would provide citizens with a basis for relying on journalistic accounts. 1.Never add anything that was not there. 2.Never deceive the audience. 3.Be transparent about your methods and motives. 4.Rely on your own original reporting. 5.Exercise humility. …we began to see a core set of concepts that form the foundation of the discipline of verification…. The willingness of the journalist to be transparent about what he or she has done is at the heart of establishing that the journalist is concerned with the truth…. Too much journalism fails to say anything about methods, motives, and sources.”