

[ORAL ARGUMENT NOT YET SCHEDULED]

Nos. 26-5113, 26-5253

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY, et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, et al.,

Defendants-Appellants.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Columbia
Nos. 25-cv-4218 & 26-cv-1690

**BRIEF OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AND
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-
APPELLEE AND AFFIRMANCE**

Brian Hauss
Esha Bhandari
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004

Scott Michelman
Arthur B. Spitzer
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA
529 14th Street NW, Suite 420
Washington, DC 20045
(202) 457-0800
smichelman@acludc.org

September 11, 2026

Counsel for Amici Curiae

CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS, AND RELATED CASES AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1(a) and D.C. Circuit Rule 28(a)(1), undersigned counsel certifies as follows:

A. Parties and Amici

To the best of counsel's knowledge, all parties, intervenors, and amici appearing before the district court and in this Court are listed in the Briefs for Appellants in these two cases.

B. Corporate Disclosure Statement

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 26.1 and Circuit Rule 26.1, *amici* certify that they are non-profit corporations that defend civil rights and civil liberties in the United States, defend the freedoms of speech and the press, and provide legal assistance to individuals whose constitutional rights have been threatened or violated. *Amici* further certify that they have no parent corporations and that, as they issue no stock, no publicly held corporation owns 10 percent or more of any stock in *amici*.

C. Rulings Under Review

References to the rulings at issue in these two cases appear in the Briefs for Appellants.

D. Related Cases

These cases have not previously been before this Court or any court other than the district court. Undersigned counsel are aware of no related cases within

the meaning of D.C. Circuit Rule 28(a)(1)(C), except that the two cases in which this brief is being filed are related to each other.

/s/ Scott Michelman
Scott Michelman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATES AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
GLOSSARY	xiv
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
ARGUMENT.....	4
I. American History Teaches the Value of Vigilance Against All Intrusions on Free Expression	4
A. Early American History	4
B. World War I and the Postwar Years.....	7
C. The Second Red Scare	10
II. Press Freedom in the United States Is Being Tested Again Today.	12
A. Speech by Current and Former Employees.....	13
B. Retaliation Against Speakers Expressing Disfavored Viewpoints.....	14
C. Attorney Speech.....	15
D. Higher Education.....	16
E. Viewpoint-Based Funding Decisions.....	16
F. Direct Suppression of Disfavored Speech.....	17
G. Attacks on the Media.....	18
III. Other Countries’ Experiences Caution That Intrusions on Free Expression, If Allowed To Persist, Often Lead to Democratic Backsliding.	20
A. The Philippines	21
B. Hungary	23
C. Turkey and Russia	26
CONCLUSION	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Accountability NOW USA v. Griess</i> , 2026 WL 1870626 (D.D.C. June 29, 2026)	1, 17
<i>Adler v. Bd. of Educ.</i> , 342 U.S. 485 (1952).....	10, 11
<i>Am. Ass’n of Univ. Professors v. Rubio</i> , 802 F. Supp. 3d 120 (D. Mass. 2025).....	15
<i>Associated Press v. Budowich</i> , 780 F. Supp. 3d 32 (D.D.C. 2025)	18
<i>Boos v. Barry</i> , 485 U.S. 312 (1988)	1
<i>Brandenburg v. Ohio</i> , 395 U.S. 444 (1969).....	9
<i>Bridges v. Wixon</i> , 326 U.S. 135 (1945).....	15
<i>Communist Party of the United States v. Subversive Activities Control Bd.</i> , 367 U.S. 1 (1961).....	11
<i>Christian Knights of the Ku Klux Klan Invisible Empire, Inc. v. District of Columbia</i> , 972 F.2d 365 (D.C. Cir. 1992)	1
<i>Debs v. United States</i> , 249 U.S. 211 (1919).....	8
<i>Dennis v. United States</i> , 341 U.S. 494 (1951).....	10, 11
<i>Endocrine Soc’y v. Fed. Trade Comm’n</i> , 832 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2026)	14

<i>Frohwerk v. United States</i> , 249 U.S. 204 (1919).....	8
<i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i> , 372 U.S. 335 (1963).....	15
<i>Gilbert v. Minnesota</i> , 254 U.S. 325 (1920).....	8
<i>Gitlow v. New York</i> , 268 U.S. 652 (1925).....	8, 9
<i>Hartman v. Moore</i> , 547 U.S. 250 (2006).....	14
<i>Iancu v. Brunetti</i> , 588 U.S. 388 (2019).....	20
<i>Jenner & Block LLP v. U.S. Dep’t of Just.</i> , 784 F. Supp. 3d 76 (D.D.C. 2025).....	16
<i>Kelly v. Hegseth</i> , 820 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. Feb. 12, 2026).....	13
<i>Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of State of N.Y.</i> , 385 U.S. 589 (1967).....	12, 16
<i>L.A. Press Club v. Noem</i> , 171 F.4th 1179 (9th Cir. 2026).....	18
<i>Legal Servs. Corp. v. Velasquez</i> , 531 U.S. 533 (2001).....	15
<i>Mahoney v. Babbitt</i> , 105 F.3d 1452 (D.C. Cir. 1997)	1
<i>McGonigle v. Curran</i> , No. 1:26-cv-349 (D. Me. filed July 7, 2026)	14
<i>Media Matters for Am. v. Fed. Trade Comm’n</i> , 805 F. Supp. 3d 105 (D.D.C. 2025).....	14

<i>Media Matters for Am. v. Fed. Trade Comm’n</i> , 2026 WL 1354245 (D.C. Cir. May 4, 2026)	14
<i>Mills v. Alabama</i> , 384 U.S. 214 (1966).....	4
<i>Moody v. NetChoice, LLC</i> , 603 U.S. 707 (2024).....	19
<i>Nat’l Endowment for the Arts v. Finley</i> , 524 U.S. 569 (1998).....	16
<i>Nat’l Pub. Radio, Inc. v. Trump</i> , 827 F. Supp. 3d 48, 60 (D.D.C. 2026)	17
<i>Nat’l Rifle Ass’n v. Vullo</i> , 602 U.S. 175 (2024).....	1, 19
<i>N.Y. Times Co. v. Sullivan</i> , 376 U.S. 254 (1964).....	6, 7
<i>Perkins Coie LLP v. U.S. Dep’t of Just.</i> , 783 F. Supp. 3d 105 (D.D.C. 2025).....	16
<i>President & Fellows of Harvard Coll. v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Hum. Servs.</i> , 798 F. Supp. 3d 77 (D. Mass. 2025)	16
<i>Rankin v. McPherson</i> , 483 U.S. 378 (1987).....	13
<i>Regents of Univ. of Mich. v. Ewing</i> , 474 U.S. 214 (1985).....	16
<i>Reno v. ACLU</i> , 521 U.S. 844 (1997)	1
<i>R.I. Latino Arts v. Nat’l Endowment for the Arts</i> , 800 F. Supp. 3d 351 (D.R.I. 2025)	16, 17
<i>Rossignol v. Voorhaar</i> , 316 F.3d 516 (4th Cir. 2003).....	20

<i>Roth v. United States</i> , 354 U.S. 476 (1957).....	4
<i>Schenck v. United States</i> , 249 U.S. 47 (1919).....	8
<i>Susman Godfrey LLP v. Exec. Off. of President</i> , 789 F. Supp. 3d 15 (D.D.C. 2025)	15, 16
<i>Trump v. Dow Jones & Co., Inc.</i> , No. 25-cv-23229 (S.D. Fla. filed July 18, 2025)	18
<i>Trump v. N.Y. Times Company</i> , No. 25-cv-2487 (M.D. Fla. filed Sept. 15, 2025)	18
<i>United States v. Helstoski</i> , 442 U.S. 477 (1979).....	5
<i>United States v. Robel</i> , 389 U.S. 258 (1967).....	12
<i>W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette</i> , 319 U.S. 624 (1943).....	20
<i>Whitney v. California</i> , 274 U.S. 357 (1927).....	8, 9
<i>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP v. Exec. Off. of the President</i> , 784 F. Supp. 3d 127 (D.D.C. 2025).....	16
<i>Yates v. United States</i> , 354 U.S. 298 (1957).....	11, 12
<i>Zaid v. Exec. Off. of President</i> , 815 F. Supp. 3d 113 (D.D.C. 2025).....	15

Scholarly Authorities

Adam Shinar, <i>Democratic Backsliding, Subsidized Speech, and the New Majoritarian Entrenchment</i> , 69 Am. J. Comp. L. 335 (2021)	23, 24
---	--------

Adrienne Koch & Harry Ammon, <i>The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions: An Episode in Jefferson's and Madison's Defense of Civil Liberties</i> , 5 Wm. & Mary Q. 145 (1948)	6
Floyd Abrams et al., <i>The Press Clause: The Forgotten First Amendment</i> , 5 J. Free Speech L. 561 (2024)	4
Jack M. Balkin, <i>Nine Perspectives on Living Originalism</i> , 2012 U. Ill. L. Rev. 815 (2012)	6
Kriszta Kovács & Gábor Attila Tóth, <i>Hungary's Constitutional Transformation</i> , 7 Eur. Const. L. Rev. 183 (2011)	23
Laura M. Weinrib, <i>Freedom of Conscience in War Time: World War I and the Limits of Civil Liberties</i> , 65 Emory L.J. 1051 (2016)	7
Louis Fisher, <i>Correcting Judicial Errors: Lessons from History</i> , 72 Me. L. Rev. 1 (2020)	6
Maria J. Stephan & Erica Chenoweth, <i>Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict</i> , 33 Int'l Sec. 7 (2008)	22
Martha Minow, <i>Storytelling and Political Resistance: Remembering Derrick Bell (with a Story About Dalton Trumbo)</i> , 28 Harv. J. Racial & Ethnic Just. 1 (2012)	10
Nancy Murray & Sarah Wunsch, <i>Civil Liberties in Times of Crisis: Lessons from History</i> , 87 Mass L. Rev. 72 (2002)	5, 6, 7
Richard A. Primus, <i>Canon, Anti-Canon, and Judicial Dissent</i> , 48 Duke L.J. 243 (1998)	8, 9
Samantha Barbas, <i>New York Times v. Sullivan: A Civil Rights Story</i> , 12 Tex. A&M L. Rev. 1 (2024)	10
<i>Virginia Resolutions of 1798</i> , in 4 <i>The Debates in the Several Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution</i> (Jonathan Elliot ed., 1891)	6

William M. Wiecek, *The Legal Foundations of Domestic Anticommunism: The Background of Dennis v. United States*, 2001 Sup. Ct. Rev. 375 (2001).....10

Zechariah Chafee, Jr., *Freedom of Speech in War Time*, 32 Harv. L. Rev. 932 (1919)7, 8, 9

Other Authorities

1 Annals of Cong. 434 (1789) (Joseph Gales ed., 1834).....5

Alan Feuer, *Trump Threatens Suit Over Report He Doesn't Like, Aiming to Intimidate a Critic*, N.Y. Times (Aug. 21, 2026), <https://perma.cc/7VRR-SS8L>.....14

Article 19, *Hungarian Media Laws Q&A* (2011)24

Attila Mong, *Hungarian Journalists Fear Orbán Will Use Election Win to Tighten Grip on Independent Media*, Comm. to Protect Journalists (Apr. 5, 2022), <https://tinyurl.com/mry7vrsz>25

Catherine Belton, *Russia closes window for dissent as Ukraine's attacks stir public dismay*, Wash. Post (July 28, 2026), <https://perma.cc/K96H-CZVU>28, 29

Charlie Savage, *Trump Baselessly Claims He 'Took the Freedom of Speech Away' From Flag Burners*, N.Y. Times (Oct. 9, 2025), <https://perma.cc/CW6B-ZABT>17, 18

Chris Hacker, Elahe Izadi & Emily Yahr, *Trump tried to silence late-night hosts. They're mocking him even more*, Wash. Post (May 21, 2026, at 05:00 ET), <https://perma.cc/JQ7Q-J2H5>.....19

Collin Binkley & Aamer Madhani, *Trump Asks 9 Colleges to Commit to His Political Agenda and Get Favorable Access to Federal Money*, Assoc. Press (Oct. 2, 2025), <https://tinyurl.com/4d7j6vu4>16

CPJ Staff, *Turkey's Press Freedom Crisis: The Dark Days of Jailing Journalists and Criminalizing Dissent* 6, Comm. to Protect Journalists (October 2012), <https://tinyurl.com/2u8sy2um>27

CPI Staff, <i>Hungary’s initial media reforms are promising but lasting safeguards still needed</i> , Comm. to Protect Journalists (July 22, 2026, at 05:36 ET), https://tinyurl.com/yc3kxsah	26
Erica Frantz et al., <i>The Origins of Elected Strongmen</i> (2024)	23
Francesca Regalado, <i>Philippine Senate Shelves Impeachment of Vice President Sara Duterte</i> , N.Y. Times (Aug. 7, 2025), https://tinyurl.com/bde9xu6b	22
Gen. George Washington, Address to Officers of the Army (Mar. 15, 1783), <i>reprinted by Nat’l Archives: Founders Online</i> , https://tinyurl.com/5n6j5wus (last visited Sept. 1, 2026).....	5
Gene Maddaus, <i>FCC Chairman Threatens ABC Over Jimmy Kimmel’s Remarks About Charlie Kirk’s Killer</i> , Variety (Sept. 17, 2025, at 16:56 ET), https://tinyurl.com/ytd3amd4	19
Geoffrey R. Stone, <i>Perilous Times: Free Speech in Wartime</i> (2004)	7, 9, 10
<i>Hungarian Media Law Further Endangers Media Freedom, Says OSCE Media Freedom Representative</i> , Org. for Sec. & Coop. in Eur. (Dec. 21, 2010), https://tinyurl.com/3mc6dztX	24
<i>Hungary: Freedom in the World 2024 Country Report</i> , Freedom House, https://tinyurl.com/2s43t9vb (last visited Sept. 1, 2026).....	25, 26
<i>Hungary’s Media Control Unprecedented in EU, Joint Mission Finds</i> , Comm. to Protect Journalists (Dec. 3, 2019), https://tinyurl.com/4s6w259w	24
Int’l Press Inst., <i>Conclusions of the Joint International Press Freedom Mission to Hungary</i> (Dec. 3, 2019), https://tinyurl.com/3vnm733f	25
James FitzGerald, <i>US Disaster Agency Suspends Workers Who Criticised Trump Cuts, Reports Say</i> , BBC (Aug. 27, 2025), https://tinyurl.com/yfzfbnrk	13
Joe Heim & Liam Bowman, <i>Park Service removes statue of Trump and Epstein from National Mall</i> , Wash. Post (Sept. 24, 2025), https://perma.cc/YC4K-2PM7	14, 15

Julia Gabriel, V-Dem Inst., <i>Hungary: A Country Report Based on Data 1918-2012</i> , (V-Dem Country Rep. Series No. 12, 2016), https://tinyurl.com/2z9s5f7a	23
Kaela Malig, <i>How Russia's Press Freedom has Deteriorated Over the Decades Since Putin Came to Power</i> , PBS (Sept. 26, 2023), https://tinyurl.com/4krjkh76	28
Kate Musgrave, <i>Tipping Point: Democratic Erosion and the Assault on Press Freedom</i> , Ctr. for Int'l Media Assistance (Oct. 27, 2021), https://tinyurl.com/4sykpxst	28
Letter from Thomas Jefferson to James Currie (Jan. 28, 1786), <i>reprinted by Nat'l Archives: Founders Online</i> , https://tinyurl.com/33mzybyr (last visited Sept. 1, 2026)	29
Maria Meco, <i>Hungary's Assault on Academic Freedom</i> , Democratic Erosion Consortium (May 2, 2024), https://tinyurl.com/5af4eu8p	25
Marissa J. Lang, <i>The White House Peace Vigil, after standing for decades, is dismantled</i> , Wash. Post (Sept. 19, 2025), https://perma.cc/554D-2ZD2	14
Matt Grossman, <i>Fired BLS Chief Breaks Silence, Calls Her Dismissal a 'Dangerous Step'</i> , Wall St. J. (Sept. 16, 2025, at 23:28 ET), https://tinyurl.com/65e7xy9j	13
Michael M. Grynbaum, <i>Times Journalists Subpoenaed as Trump Escalates Pressure on Media</i> , N.Y. Times (July 11, 2026), https://perma.cc/TL8N-H9KK?type=standard	18
Nate Schenckan, <i>The End of Competitive Authoritarianism in Turkey</i> , Freedom House (Mar. 26, 2025), https://tinyurl.com/5cjyw9m9	27
Nick Thorpe, <i>Hungary Broke EU Law by Forcing out University, Says European Court</i> , BBC (Oct. 6, 2020), https://tinyurl.com/2mc28hn9	25
Press Release, <i>FCC Approves Skydance's Acquisition of Paramount CBS</i> , Off. of Chairman Brendan Carr (July 24, 2025), https://tinyurl.com/3w9zy2hf	19

<i>RSF Condemns the Latest Murder of a Radio Journalist in the Philippines</i> , RSF (July 21, 2025), https://tinyurl.com/mub8b7pk	23
<i>Russia</i> , RSF, https://tinyurl.com/574z6dmh (last visited Sept. 1, 2026)	28
Scott Nover, <i>Trump says ABC, NBC licenses should be revoked over refusal to air speech on election integrity</i> , Wash. Post (July 16, 2026), https://perma.cc/GCK2-EKBT	19
Stephen Lee, <i>EPA Suspends Dozens of Employees Who Signed Letter of Dissent</i> , Bloomberg Law (Sept. 5, 2025, at 15:42 ET), https://tinyurl.com/486fe9r2	13
Steven Levitsky & Daniel Ziblatt, <i>How Democracies Die</i> (2018)	3, 5, 21
Tom Ginsburg & Aziz Z. Huq, <i>How to Save a Constitutional Democracy</i> (2018)	21
Tony Romm, <i>White House Seeks to Impose Political Test on Billions in Federal Grants</i> , N.Y. Times (June 2, 2026) https://perma.cc/4MBY-SYJW	17
<i>Türkiye</i> , RSF, https://tinyurl.com/bdzkcj7m (last visited Sept. 1, 2026)	27
<i>The United States Supports Press Freedom Worldwide</i> , U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab. (May 5, 2008), https://tinyurl.com/2n2wua3y	21
U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., <i>Hungary 2016 Human Rights Report</i> (2017), https://tinyurl.com/4duf29k8	24, 25
U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., <i>Hungary 2023 Human Rights Report</i> (last visited Sept. 1, 2026), https://tinyurl.com/4jwar53k	26
U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., <i>Philippines 2020 Human Rights Report</i> (2021), https://tinyurl.com/3jjcsujj	22
U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., <i>Philippines 2023 Human Rights Report</i> (2024), https://tinyurl.com/ym7bjy6d	23

U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., <i>Russia 2024 Human Rights Report</i> (2025), https://tinyurl.com/3xfvm63s	28
U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., <i>Turkey (Türkiye) 2023 Human Rights Report</i> (2024), https://tinyurl.com/jpax758m	27
Valerie Hopkins, <i>Whatever You Do in Russia, Don’t Talk About the War</i> , N.Y. Times (June 26, 2026), https://perma.cc/U7QP-VQEH	29

GLOSSARY

ACLU	American Civil Liberties Union
ACLU-DC	American Civil Liberties Union of the District of Columbia
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
CPJ	Committee to Protect Journalists
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
RSF	Reporters sans frontières (Reporters Without Borders)

INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*¹

The American Civil Liberties Union (“ACLU”) is a nationwide, nonprofit organization that since 1920 has sought to protect the civil liberties and civil rights of all Americans. The ACLU of the District of Columbia (“ACLU-DC”) is the ACLU’s Washington, D.C. affiliate. The ACLU and ACLU-DC have frequently appeared in this Court, as counsel to parties or as *amici curiae*, in cases about the meaning of the Constitution and its application.

The ACLU and its affiliates have also participated as counsel or *amici curiae* in many consequential First Amendment cases, including those involving suppression of disfavored views. *See, e.g., Nat’l Rifle Ass’n v. Vullo*, 602 U.S. 175 (2024) (counsel); *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844 (1997) (counsel); *Boos v. Barry*, 485 U.S. 312 (1988) (amicus); *Mahoney v. Babbitt*, 105 F.3d 1452, 1453 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (amicus); *Christian Knights of the Ku Klux Klan Invisible Empire, Inc. v. District of Columbia*, 972 F.2d 365 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (counsel); *Accountability NOW USA v. Griess*, 2026 WL 1870626 (D.D.C. June 29, 2026) (counsel).

¹ Counsel for all parties have consented to the filing of this brief. No counsel for any party authored this brief in whole or in part and no entity or person, aside from *amici curiae*, their members, or their counsel, made any monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Once again, the Trump Administration is attempting to exert unconstitutional control over the content of expression—this time, by affording executive officials unbridled discretion to revoke Pentagon correspondents’ press access for receiving, soliciting, or reporting “unauthorized” information (and then retaliating against the press for a successful challenge to that policy by restricting press access in other ways).

The Administration’s multipronged attack on the free press calls upon this Court to remind the Administration that governmental attempts to control what journalists report is anathema to the First Amendment.

Amici curiae American Civil Liberties Union and American Civil Liberties Union of the District of Columbia—organizations devoted to free expression—submit that our Nation’s history and other countries’ modern trajectories demonstrate the importance of upholding First Amendment protections here. When officials are allowed to demand that press outlets toe the government’s line, repression and democratic backsliding often follow.

I. American history shows that scrupulous protection of the press’s right to disseminate information, without fear or favor to those in power, is essential to our democracy. Dark chapters in our Nation’s past—from early American history, to

World War I, to the Second Red Scare—illustrate what happens when we stray from our commitment to First Amendment freedoms.

II. The Pentagon’s assertion of the power to banish journalists for disfavored coverage is an alarming part of a broader assault on free expression. The Administration has attempted to muzzle institutions like the bar, the academy, and the media that are at the heart of civil society and has retaliated against speakers of all kinds for espousing views the Administration dislikes. Constant vigilance for our liberties is as critical as ever.

III. Developments in other democracies and former democracies demonstrate the dangers of allowing the government to infringe on speech and press freedoms. Across the world—including in the Philippines, Hungary, Turkey, and Russia—democracies have backslid into repressive regimes with few freedoms after their institutions failed to hold the line on free expression. Backsliding does not happen in leaps but “takes place piecemeal.” Steven Levitsky & Daniel Ziblatt, *How Democracies Die* 77 (2018). It often begins with a crackdown on speech and the press.

To uphold the challenged policies would not only fly in the face of First Amendment jurisprudence, as Plaintiffs demonstrate; it would also ignore the warnings from our Nation’s history and from recent history around the world: that incursions on free expression, left unchecked, lead to increasing repression.

ARGUMENT

I. American History Teaches the Value of Vigilance Against All Intrusions on Free Expression.

Even among democracies, the United States is exceptional in its robust protections for free speech and the free press. *See* Floyd Abrams et al., *The Press Clause: The Forgotten First Amendment*, 5 J. Free Speech L. 561, 563 (2024). Our country holds fast to the belief that, without the “unfettered interchange of ideas,” a democracy cannot “brin[g] about . . . political and social changes desired by the people.” *Roth v. United States*, 354 U.S. 476, 484 (1957). And in disseminating information about the government’s actions, and ideas about how to respond to them, the press “serve[s] as a powerful antidote to any abuses of power by governmental officials.” *Mills v. Alabama*, 384 U.S. 214, 219 (1966).

But America’s embrace of free expression has not always been steady, as three chapters in our history illustrate: the “Quasi-War” with France in the 1790s, World War I, and the Second Red Scare following World War II. Each time, our Nation came to regret its faithlessness to the First Amendment. This Court should heed that lesson today and prohibit the Administration from leveraging Pentagon access to control press coverage and public debate.

A. Early American History

Since the Founding, the freedoms of speech and of the press were understood as fundamental guardrails of our democracy. In a 1783 speech, George Washington

told Continental Army officers that without “the freedom of Speech,” “dumb & silent we may be led, like sheep, to the Slaughter.” Gen. George Washington, Address to Officers of the Army (Mar. 15, 1783), *reprinted by Nat’l Archives: Founders Online*, <https://tinyurl.com/5n6j5wus> (last visited Sept. 1, 2026). And when proposing the First Amendment in Congress, James Madison proclaimed the people’s “right to speak, to write, or to publish their sentiments” together with “the freedom of the press” to be among “the great bulwarks of liberty.” 1 Annals of Cong. 451 (1789) (Joseph Gales ed., 1834).

Even so, the founding generation faltered in its commitment to protecting free expression. The distrust between the two first political parties—the Federalists and the Jeffersonians—was so severe that they equated dissent with disloyalty. *See* Levitsky & Ziblatt, *supra*, at 103. So, Federalists sought “to destroy [their] political opponents.” *United States v. Helstoski*, 442 U.S. 477, 493 (1979). In the midst of the Quasi-War with France, Federalists enacted the Alien and Sedition Acts to empower the president to deport the suspicious without notice or a trial and to criminalize criticism. *See* Nancy Murray & Sarah Wunsch, *Civil Liberties in Times of Crisis: Lessons from History*, 87 Mass L. Rev. 72, 73 (2002). Anti-Federalist papers were put out of business; dozens were arrested. *See id.*

In response, the Virginia and Kentucky legislatures adopted resolutions, anonymously penned by Madison and Jefferson, respectively, that became the

banner for the opposition. See Adrienne Koch & Harry Ammon, *The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions: An Episode in Jefferson's and Madison's Defense of Civil Liberties*, 5 Wm. & Mary Q. 145, 147 (1948). “[The Sedition Act] exercises . . . a power not delegated by the Constitution,” the Virginia Resolution read, “but, on the contrary, is expressly and positively forbidden by [the First Amendment].” *Virginia Resolutions of 1798*, in 4 *The Debates in the Several Conventions on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution* 528, 528-29 (Jonathan Elliot ed., 1891). The power to silence critics “more than any other, ought to produce universal alarm, because it is levelled against that right of freely examining public characters and measures, and of free communication among the people thereon, which has ever been justly deemed the only effectual guardian of every other right.” *Id.*

This “great controversy . . . first crystallized a national awareness of the central meaning of the First Amendment.” *N.Y. Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 273 (1964); see also Jack M. Balkin, *Nine Perspectives on Living Originalism*, 2012 U. Ill. L. Rev. 815, 837 (2012) (noting that the Jeffersonians’ electoral victory in 1800 “led to new constructions of the First Amendment that were confirmed by executive and legislative practices”). After assuming the presidency in 1800, Jefferson called the Sedition Act unconstitutional and pardoned all those convicted under it. See Louis Fisher, *Correcting Judicial Errors: Lessons from History*, 72 Me. L. Rev. 1, 8 (2020); Murray & Wunsch, *supra*, at 74. “Although the Sedition Act

was never tested in [the Supreme Court], the attack upon its validity has carried the day in the court of history.” *N.Y. Times*, 376 U.S. at 276.

B. World War I and the Postwar Years

Throughout World War I, as “public hysteria and intolerance” of dissent gripped the Nation, our fidelity to free expression faltered again. Geoffrey R. Stone, *Perilous Times: Free Speech in Wartime* 533 (2004). Congress passed the Espionage Act in April 1917 to stymie interference with military recruitment. Soon after, Congress amended the law through the Sedition Act of 1918 to silence criticism of the government and the war effort. *See Murray & Wunsch, supra*, at 76. A wave of prosecutions followed. *See* Laura M. Weinrib, *Freedom of Conscience in War Time: World War I and the Limits of Civil Liberties*, 65 Emory L.J. 1051, 1052 (2016); Stone, *supra*, at 12. Activist Rose Pastor Stokes was sentenced to ten years in prison for writing to a newspaper: “I am for the people and the Government is for the profiteers.” Zechariah Chafee, Jr., *Freedom of Speech in War Time*, 32 Harv. L. Rev. 932, 972 (1919). Eugene Debs—who had received almost a million votes in the 1912 presidential election—was sentenced to ten years in prison for denouncing the war and conscription. *See* Stone, *supra*, at 196-97. “[A]ny genuine debate about the merits of the war was effectively squelched.” *Id.* at 12.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court yielded to the anxieties of the time in a series of decisions allowing the government wide latitude to suppress speech. In

Schenck v. United States, the Court upheld convictions for conspiring and attempting to cause “insubordination,” and to “obstruct” enlistment, based on pamphlets criticizing the draft as “monstrous” and urging readers to seek its end. *See* 249 U.S. 47, 49-51 (1919). A week later, the Court upheld convictions for attempted “disloyalty” and “mutiny” based on newspaper articles “declaring it a monumental and inexcusable mistake to send our soldiers to France” and extoling Germany. *Frohwerk v. United States*, 249 U.S. 204, 207 (1919). And the same day, it affirmed Eugene Debs’s conviction for causing “insubordination, disloyalty, [and] mutiny” based on a public speech opposing the war and praising others convicted for resisting the draft. *Debs v. United States*, 249 U.S. 211, 212-13 (1919).

This criminalization of war criticism persisted. In *Gilbert v. Minnesota*, over the dissent of Justice Brandeis, the Court upheld a conviction of a speaker who denounced enlistment in the war. 254 U.S. 325, 333 (1920). *Gitlow v. New York* upheld, over the dissent of Justice Holmes, a conviction for publishing a left-wing manifesto that was found to have advocated the overthrow of government. *See* 268 U.S. 652, 661 (1925). And *Whitney v. California* upheld a conviction based on membership in a group that taught the propriety of violence as a means of accomplishing political change. *See* 274 U.S. 357, 371 (1927).

These efforts to stamp out dissent did not go unchallenged. Zechariah Chafee—“possibly the most important First Amendment scholar of the first half of

the twentieth century,” Richard A. Primus, *Canon, Anti-Canon, and Judicial Dissent*, 48 Duke L.J. 243, 293-94 (1998)—argued in 1919 that the Espionage Act “ha[d] been interpreted in such a way as to violate the free speech clause,” Chafee, *supra*, at 968.

Justices Holmes—whose “views of the First Amendment” had “shift[ed]” since 1919, Stone, *supra*, at 208—and Brandeis also gave voice to a competing vision that embraced disagreement not as disloyalty, but as contributing to the marketplace of ideas. *See, e.g., Gitlow*, 268 U.S. at 672-73 (Holmes, J., dissenting) (“Every idea is an incitement. It offers itself for belief and if believed it is acted on unless some other belief outweighs it or some failure of energy stifles the movement at its birth.”); *Whitney*, 274 U.S. at 372-80 (Brandeis, J., concurring) (“Fear of serious injury cannot alone justify suppression of free speech and assembly. Men feared witches and burnt women. It is the function of speech to free men from the bondage of irrational fears.”).

The civil libertarian views of Justices Holmes and Brandeis ultimately “w[on] the day,” as both the American public and the Supreme Court came to repudiate the “dismal precedents” of the World War I era. Stone, *supra*, at 138, 211; *see, e.g., Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444, 447 (1969) (per curiam) (“*Whitney* has been thoroughly discredited by later decisions.”).

C. The Second Red Scare

During the Cold War, an “antiradical crusade . . . demonized Communists,” conceiving of them as having “extraordinary powers and malignity, making them both covert and ubiquitous.” William M. Wiecek, *The Legal Foundations of Domestic Anticommunism: The Background of Dennis v. United States*, 2001 Sup. Ct. Rev. 375, 428 (2001). “In an aggressive effort to uncover subversion, the federal government initiated abusive loyalty programs, legislative investigations, and criminal prosecutions of the leaders and members of the Community Party of the United States.” Stone, *supra*, at 12-13. The House Un-American Activities Committee, and a Senate investigative subcommittee headed by Senator Joseph McCarthy, targeted even those with tenuous—or no—connections to the Communist Party and blacklisted members of the film industry. *See, e.g., Martha Minow, Storytelling and Political Resistance: Remembering Derrick Bell (with a Story About Dalton Trumbo)*, 28 Harv. J. Racial & Ethnic Just. 1, 3-4 (2012).

The Court “rubber-stamped” many of these legal efforts. Samantha Barbas, *New York Times v. Sullivan: A Civil Rights Story*, 12 Tex. A&M L. Rev. 1, 27 (2024). For example, *Dennis v. United States* upheld convictions under the Smith Act for conspiring to overthrow the government based on no specific plans but only the general philosophy espoused in communist pamphlets and books. *See* 341 U.S. 494, 497-98, 510-11 (1951). In *Adler v. Board of Education*, the Court upheld

screening public school teachers for “loyalty” and ties to communism. 342 U.S. 485, 492-93 (1952). And *Communist Party of the United States v. Subversive Activities Control Board* upheld compulsory registration requirements for Communist Party members, officers, and funds. *See* 367 U.S. 1, 88-105 (1961).

Justice Black predicted that respect for the First Amendment would return. “Public opinion being what it now is, few will protest the conviction of these Communist petitioners,” he stated in his *Dennis* dissent. 341 U.S. at 581 (Black, J., dissenting). “There is hope, however, that in calmer times, when present pressures, passions and fears subside, this or some later Court will restore the First Amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society.” *Id.*; *see also Adler*, 342 U.S. at 496-97 (Black, J., dissenting) (“This is another of those rapidly multiplying legislative enactments which make it dangerous . . . to think or say anything except what a transient majority happen to approve at the moment.”); *Subversive Activities Control Bd.*, 367 U.S. at 148 (Black, J., dissenting) (“The same arguments that are used to justify the outlawry of Communist ideas here could be used to justify an outlawry of the ideas of democracy in other countries.”).

As Justice Black predicted, “calmer times” returned. The Court turned the page on speech-restrictive decisions: it rejected precedents that paid short shrift to free expression rights, and it recognized important First Amendment protections that still govern today. *See, e.g., Yates v. United States*, 354 U.S. 298, 318-19 (1957)

(“The distinction between advocacy of abstract doctrine and advocacy directed at promoting unlawful action is one that has been consistently recognized [W]e should not assume that Congress chose to disregard a constitutional danger zone so clearly marked”); *Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of State of N.Y.*, 385 U.S. 589, 595 (1967) (“[T]o the extent that *Adler* sustained . . . membership in an organization advocating forceful overthrow of government [as] a ground for disqualification, pertinent constitutional doctrines have since rejected the premises upon which that conclusion rested.”); *United States v. Robel*, 389 U.S. 258, 263 (1967) (“[T]he operative fact upon which the job disability depends is the exercise of an individual’s right of association, which is protected by the provisions of the First Amendment.”).

These chapters in American history show a pattern: the courts and the Nation ultimately repudiate government action and judicial decisions curtailing the freedoms of speech and of the press. Surely it would have been better had the courts resisted those curtailments at the time.

II. Press Freedom in the United States Is Being Tested Again Today.

Unfortunately, the lessons of our history have been lost on the current Administration. In relatively short order, it has undertaken a series of retaliatory attacks on individuals and institutions—including federal employees, immigrants,

attorneys, universities, artists, protesters, and media companies, as well as journalists—who refuse to toe the Administration’s ideological line.

A. Speech by Current and Former Employees. “[P]ublic employers [may] not use authority over employees to silence discourse . . . simply because superiors disagree with the content of employees’ speech.” *Rankin v. McPherson*, 483 U.S. 378, 384 (1987). Yet the Administration has moved quickly to quell non-conformity in the federal government, suspending or firing employees who voiced concerns about the direction of their respective agencies or published politically inconvenient information. See Stephen Lee, *EPA Suspends Dozens of Employees Who Signed Letter of Dissent*, Bloomberg Law (Sept. 5, 2025, at 15:42 ET), <https://tinyurl.com/486fe9r2>; James FitzGerald, *US Disaster Agency Suspends Workers Who Criticised Trump Cuts, Reports Say*, BBC (Aug. 27, 2025), <https://tinyurl.com/yfzfbnrk>; Matt Grossman, *Fired BLS Chief Breaks Silence, Calls Her Dismissal a ‘Dangerous Step’*, Wall St. J. (Sept. 16, 2025, at 23:28 ET), <https://tinyurl.com/65e7xy9j>.

The Administration has also moved to punish a Navy veteran and sitting United States Senator—Sen. Mark Kelly—for discussing servicemembers’ obligations regarding illegal orders. See *Kelly v. Hegseth*, 820 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2026), *appeal pending*.

B. Retaliation Against Speakers Expressing Disfavored Viewpoints.

“[T]he First Amendment prohibits government officials from subjecting an individual to retaliatory actions . . . for speaking out.” *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250, 256 (2006). That principle has not deterred this Administration from initiating pretextual antitrust investigations of media outlets whose reporting it dislikes, *see Media Matters for Am. v. Fed. Trade Comm’n*, 805 F. Supp. 3d 105 (D.D.C. 2025), *appeal dismissed*, 2026 WL 1354245 (D.C. Cir. May 4, 2026), and of medical societies whose positions on health issues it opposes, *see, e.g., Endocrine Soc’y v. Fed. Trade Comm’n*, 832 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2026). The Vice President has excluded a prominent social media critic from public, taxpayer-funded events. Compl., *McGonigle v. Curran*, No. 1:26-cv-349 (D. Me. filed July 7, 2026), at 1-2, 6. The President has threatened to sue a think tank for \$5 billion for publishing a report finding that his National Guard deployment did little to reduce violent crime. Alan Feuer, *Trump Threatens Suit Over Report He Doesn’t Like, Aiming to Intimidate a Critic*, N.Y. Times (Aug. 21, 2026), <https://perma.cc/7VRR-SS8L>. And during the past eight months, Park Police officers have dismantled peaceful demonstrations and summarily revoked demonstration permits for speech critical of the President and his administration. *See* Marissa J. Lang, *The White House Peace Vigil, after standing for decades, is dismantled*, Wash. Post (Sept. 19, 2025), <https://perma.cc/554D-2ZD2>; Joe Heim & Liam Bowman, *Park Service removes*

statue of Trump and Epstein from National Mall, Wash. Post (Sept. 24, 2025), <https://perma.cc/YC4K-2PM7>.

The First Amendment’s protection from retaliation extends to resident noncitizens. *See Bridges v. Wixon*, 326 U.S. 135, 147-48 (1945). Nonetheless, the Administration has taken aim at lawfully admitted immigrants who express opinions the Administration disfavors. For example, top Administration officials have “misuse[d] the sweeping powers of their respective offices to target non-citizen pro-Palestinians for deportation primarily on account of their First Amendment protected political speech,” all for the purpose of “striking fear into similarly situated non-citizen pro-Palestinian individuals, pro-actively (and effectively) curbing lawful pro-Palestinian speech and intentionally denying such individuals . . . the freedom of speech that is their right.” *Am. Ass’n of Univ. Professors v. Rubio*, 802 F. Supp. 3d 120, 194 (D. Mass. 2025), *appeal pending*.

C. Attorney Speech. Attorneys’ advocacy to courts on clients’ behalf is protected expression, *see Legal Servs. Corp. v. Velasquez*, 531 U.S. 533, 542-43 (2001), and is essential to securing all our liberties, *see, e.g., Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335, 343-45 (1963). But the President has issued a series of executive orders against law firms and lawyers for their representation of disfavored clients and causes. *See Zaid v. Exec. Off. of President*, 815 F. Supp. 3d 113, 120 (D.D.C. 2025), *appeal pending*; *Susman Godfrey LLP v. Exec. Off. of President*, 789 F. Supp.

3d 15, 28 (D.D.C. 2025), *appeal pending*; *Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP v. Exec. Off. of President*, 784 F. Supp. 3d 127, 150-51 (D.D.C. 2025), *appeal pending*; *Jenner & Block LLP v. U.S. Dep’t of Just.*, 784 F. Supp. 3d 76, 88 (D.D.C. 2025), *appeal pending*; *Perkins Coie LLP v. U.S. Dep’t of Just.*, 783 F. Supp. 3d 105, 120-21 (D.D.C. 2025), *appeal pending*.

D. Higher Education. Academic freedom is “a special concern of the First Amendment,” *Keyishian*, 385 U.S. at 603, and “thrives not only on the independent and uninhibited exchange of ideas among teachers and students but also . . . on autonomous decisionmaking by the academy itself,” *Regents of Univ. of Mich. v. Ewing*, 474 U.S. 214, 226 n.12 (1985) (citations omitted). The Administration has undermined that freedom, conditioning or canceling funding based on curricula, hiring, and research choices. *See, e.g., President & Fellows of Harvard Coll. v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 798 F. Supp. 3d 77, 124-25 (D. Mass. 2025), *appeal pending*; Collin Binkley & Aamer Madhani, *Trump Asks 9 Colleges to Commit to His Political Agenda and Get Favorable Access to Federal Money*, Assoc. Press (Oct. 2, 2025), <https://tinyurl.com/4d7j6vu4>.

E. Viewpoint-Based Funding Decisions. The government may not discriminate against disfavored ideas or views “even in the provision of subsidies.” *Nat’l Endowment for the Arts v. Finley*, 524 U.S. 569, 587 (1998). The President has sought to do just that, issuing an Executive Order directing the National Endowment

for the Arts to disfavor applications that “promote gender ideology.” *R.I. Latino Arts v. Nat’l Endowment for the Arts*, 800 F. Supp. 3d 351, 357 (D.R.I. 2025), *appeal pending*. The Administration has likewise stripped funding from National Public Radio “because the President disapproves of their ‘left-wing’ coverage of the news.” *Nat’l Pub. Radio, Inc. v. Trump*, 827 F. Supp. 3d 48, 60 (D.D.C. 2026). And the Administration has proposed imposing an ideological purity test on all federal grantmaking. *See* Tony Romm, *White House Seeks to Impose Political Test on Billions in Federal Grants*, N.Y. Times (June 2, 2026), <https://perma.cc/4MBY-SYJW> (“If finalized, it would require all federal grants to be approved by the president’s political appointees, who must ensure that the money would ‘demonstrably advance the president’s policy priorities.’”).

F. Direct Suppression of Disfavored Speech. Sometimes, this Administration simply attempts (or purports) to shut down speech directly. For instance, the Administration ordered a political protest group, on pain of losing its demonstration permit, to take down an “8647” flag calling for the impeachment and removal of President Trump and two signs about child sexual-abuse allegations made against President Trump—even though “both sets of materials represent core protected speech.” *Accountability Now USA v. Griess*, 2026 WL 1870626, at *2 (D.D.C. June 29, 2026), *appeal pending*. And last October, President Trump announced that he “took the freedom of speech away” regarding flag burning. *See*

Charlie Savage, *Trump Baselessly Claims He ‘Took the Freedom of Speech Away’ From Flag Burners*, N.Y. Times (Oct. 9, 2025), <https://perma.cc/CW6B-ZABT>.

G. Attacks on the Media. Finally, the Pentagon press policies at issue here are part of a broader assault on the press generally. Department of Homeland Security agents have repeatedly used force, including pepper balls, rubber bullets, and tear gas, to retaliate against journalists and legal observers documenting protests against Immigration and Customs Enforcement raids, even when the journalists and observers “stood far from any protesters or bad actors.” *L.A. Press Club v. Noem*, 171 F.4th 1179, 1189 (9th Cir. 2026). The White House has barred the Associated Press from press pool events for refusing to parrot the administration’s preferred name for the Gulf of Mexico. *Associated Press v. Budowich*, 780 F. Supp. 3d 32, 38 (D.D.C. 2025), *appeal pending*. President Trump has personally filed extortionate defamation lawsuits against the New York Times seeking \$15 billion and against the Wall Street Journal seeking \$10 billion. *See Trump v. N.Y. Times Company*, No. 25-cv-2487 (M.D. Fla. filed Sept. 15, 2025); *Trump v. Dow Jones & Co., Inc.*, No. 25-cv-23229 (S.D. Fla. filed July 18, 2025). And the Trump Administration issued subpoenas to New York Times journalists following a report on security concerns regarding the new Air Force One donated by Qatar. *See Michael M. Grynbaum, Times Journalists Subpoenaed as Trump Escalates Pressure on Media*, N.Y. Times (July 11, 2026), <https://perma.cc/TL8N-H9KK?type=standard>.

“[I]t is no job for government to decide what counts as the right balance of private expression—to ‘un-bias’ what it thinks biased,” *Moody v. NetChoice, LLC*, 603 U.S. 707, 719 (2024), nor may it “coerce a private party to punish or suppress disfavored speech on [its] behalf,” *Nat’l Rifle Ass’n v. Vullo*, 602 U.S. 175, 190 (2024). The FCC has done both. It demanded that Skydance change CBS’s programming to reflect “a diversity of [political] viewpoints” and hire an ombudsman to evaluate journalistic “bias” before approving its acquisition. Press Release, *FCC Approves Skydance’s Acquisition of Paramount CBS*, Off. of Chairman Brendan Carr (July 24, 2025), <https://tinyurl.com/3w9zy2hf>. And the FCC threatened companies that broadcast late-night shows expressing criticism of the President or his political allies. See Gene Maddaus, *FCC Chairman Threatens ABC Over Jimmy Kimmel’s Remarks About Charlie Kirk’s Killer*, *Variety* (Sept. 17, 2025, at 16:56 ET), <https://tinyurl.com/ytd3amd4>; Chris Hacker, Elahe Izadi & Emily Yahr, *Trump tried to silence late-night hosts. They’re mocking him even more*, *Wash. Post* (May 21, 2026, at 05:00 ET), <https://perma.cc/JQ7Q-J2H5>. President Trump himself has threatened to strip broadcast licenses from networks that did not air a speech he gave. See Scott Nover, *Trump says ABC, NBC licenses should be revoked over refusal to air speech on election integrity*, *Wash. Post* (July 16, 2026), <https://perma.cc/GCK2-EKBT>.

* * *

The Pentagon policies at issue here are of a piece with this Administration's relentless pursuit of ideological conformity. If courts allow the government to chip away at free expression, the political repression that occurred during the dark chapters in our country's history may yet return.

“[T]he First Amendment to our Constitution was designed to avoid these ends by avoiding these beginnings.” *W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 641 (1943).

III. Other Countries' Experiences Caution That Intrusions on Free Expression, If Allowed To Persist, Often Lead to Democratic Backsliding.

Courts routinely remind us that America's commitments to free speech and the free press separate us from other countries. The suppression of free expression is thought to happen elsewhere, not here. As Justice Alito has observed, “Viewpoint discrimination is poison to a free society. But in many countries with constitutions or legal traditions that claim to protect freedom of speech, serious viewpoint discrimination is now tolerated.” *Iancu v. Brunetti*, 588 U.S. 388, 399 (2019) (Alito, J., concurring); *see also Rossignol v. Voorhaar*, 316 F.3d 516, 527-28 (4th Cir. 2003) (Wilkinson, J.) (suppression of political criticism “belongs to a society much different and more oppressive than our own”). This distinction we proudly draw will hold only for as long as our institutions and our courts actively enforce the First Amendment; absent that vigilance, we might find ourselves following other countries down an authoritarian path.

Experiences beyond our borders underscore that violations of the freedom of the press frequently precede wider repression of civil society. *See The United States Supports Press Freedom Worldwide*, U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab. (May 5, 2008), <https://tinyurl.com/2n2wua3y> (“In countries where independent journalists and media are at risk, the fundamental freedoms of all citizens are at stake.”).

Democratic backsliding is “a process of incremental, but ultimately still substantial decay in the three basic predicates of democracy—competitive elections, liberal rights to speech and association, and the rule of law.” Tom Ginsburg & Aziz Z. Huq, *How to Save a Constitutional Democracy* 43 (2018). The word “process” is critical. Some democracies have died suddenly, but in the twenty-first century, gradual erosion of democracy is more common. That process plays out “often in baby steps”—and so slowly that it hardly “set[s] off alarm bells.” Levitsky & Ziblatt, *supra*, at 6, 77; *see also* Ginsburg & Huq, *supra*, at 35-39.

The experiences in countries like the Philippines, Hungary, Turkey, and Russia show that when resolve for free expression and a free press weakens, democratic backsliding follows. The road back is steep at best.

A. The Philippines

Democracy came to the Philippines in 1986, when a pro-democracy movement successfully ousted Ferdinand Marcos and initiated democratic reform.

See Maria J. Stephan & Erica Chenoweth, *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*, 33 Int'l Sec. 7, 32-35 (2008). But democracy regressed with President Rodrigo Duterte's election in 2016. Duterte is estimated to have ordered extrajudicial killings of many thousands of people. See Francesca Regalado, *Philippine Senate Shelves Impeachment of Vice President Sara Duterte*, N.Y. Times (Aug. 7, 2025), <https://tinyurl.com/bde9xu6b>.

Suppression of the press was part of Duterte's playbook. In January 2018, the Philippines' Securities and Exchange Commission ordered *Rappler*, an independent news website known for criticizing the president, to shut down for allegedly violating foreign-ownership rules. See U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., *Philippines 2020 Human Rights Report* 20-21 (2021), <https://tinyurl.com/3jjcsujj>. *Rappler*'s president was arrested on related charges, as well as for libel. See *id.* Duterte accused the broadcaster ABS-CBN of various crimes, including failure to air his political advertisements, and the government ordered ABS-CBN to cease broadcasting after the legislature refused to renew its license for supposed bias. See *id.* Journalists also "face[d] harassment and threats of violence, including from politicians and government authorities critical of their reporting." *Id.* at 21.

Despite the decrease in abuses under current President Ferdinand Marcos, Jr., "[s]ignificant human rights issues" persist, including continued extrajudicial

killings, forced disappearances, and torture or cruel punishment by and on behalf of the government. U.S. Dep't of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., *Philippines 2023 Human Rights Report* 1 (2024), <https://tinyurl.com/ymuhkc8u>. Five journalists have been murdered since Marcos, Jr., took office. *See RSF Condemns the Latest Murder of a Radio Journalist in the Philippines*, Reporters sans frontières (RSF) (July 21, 2025), <https://tinyurl.com/mub8b7pk>.

B. Hungary

When the Iron Curtain fell, Hungary transitioned to a multiparty democratic system. *See* Julia Gabriel, V-Dem Inst., *Hungary: A Country Report Based on Data 1918-2012*, at 6 (V-Dem Country Rep. Series No. 12, 2016), <https://tinyurl.com/2z9s5f7a>; Kriszta Kovács & Gábor Attila Tóth, *Hungary's Constitutional Transformation*, 7 Eur. Const. L. Rev. 183, 184 (2011). By 2004, Hungary had joined the European Union and was widely considered a stable democracy. *See* Erica Frantz et al., *The Origins of Elected Strongmen* 104 (2024); Gabriel, *supra*, at 6. But then Hungary underwent “the sharpest transition from liberal constitutionalism” to an illiberal regime in modern history. Adam Shinar, *Democratic Backsliding, Subsidized Speech, and the New Majoritarian Entrenchment*, 69 Am. J. Comp. L. 335, 347 (2021). To reach that end, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and his Fidesz party, who ruled Hungary from 2010 until earlier this year, paved their path with attacks on free speech and the free press.

Orbán and Fidesz capitalized on their electoral victories in 2010 to rewrite the constitution “through a highly defective process surrounded by secrecy and the nonparticipation of broader society and scholars.” *Id.* at 348. The government enacted vague bans on any speech that did not respect “the constitutional order,” or offended “human dignity” and “private life,” or discriminated against “any majority” or “church or religious group.” Article 19, *Hungarian Media Laws Q&A* 4 (2011) (citations omitted), <https://tinyurl.com/mr2f7h6y>. It required all media—whether broadcast, print, or online—to register with a governmental authority, and threatened high fines for “unbalanced coverage” and ill-defined legal violations. *Hungarian Media Law Further Endangers Media Freedom, Says OSCE Media Freedom Representative*, Org. for Sec. & Coop. in Eur. (Dec. 21, 2010), <https://tinyurl.com/3mc6dztx>.

Orbán and Fidesz “systematically dismantled media independence and used verbal attacks, lawsuits and other means to harass critical journalists in Hungary.” *Hungary’s Media Control Unprecedented in EU, Joint Mission Finds*, Comm. to Protect Journalists (Dec. 3, 2019), <https://tinyurl.com/4s6w259w>. Hungary’s parliamentary speaker indefinitely barred three publications from the building for “their questions about possible corruption.” U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., *Hungary 2016 Human Rights Report* 19 (2017), <https://tinyurl.com/4duf29k8>. The government forcibly closed the largest

independent daily newspaper and blocked the license of a prominent radio station. *See id.*; Attila Mong, *Hungarian Journalists Fear Orbán Will Use Election Win to Tighten Grip on Independent Media*, Comm. to Protect Journalists (Apr. 5, 2022), <https://tinyurl.com/mry7vrsz>. And it further “silence[d] the critical press” by “engineering” the “takeover of once-independent media.” Int’l Press Inst., *Conclusions of the Joint International Press Freedom Mission to Hungary* 1-2 (Dec. 3, 2019), <https://tinyurl.com/3vnm733f>.

The Hungarian government also launched “a targeted assault on academic freedom.” Maria Meco, *Hungary’s Assault on Academic Freedom*, Democratic Erosion Consortium (May 2, 2024), <https://tinyurl.com/5af4eu8p>. A higher-education law, which the European Union’s highest court subsequently deemed illegal, pushed the Central European University out of Hungary. *See* Nick Thorpe, *Hungary Broke EU Law by Forcing out University, Says European Court*, BBC (Oct. 6, 2020), <https://tinyurl.com/2mc28hn9>. The government privatized thirteen state universities and put them in the hands of loyalists. *See id.* “Authorities have increasingly threatened the academic autonomy of well-established institutions, pulling support, interfering in their affairs, and landing progovernment supporters in leading positions.” *Hungary: Freedom in the World 2024 Country Report*, Freedom House, <https://tinyurl.com/2s43t9vb> (last visited Sept. 1, 2026). In October 2023, a

professor at Corvinus University was dismissed after criticizing Fidesz-linked university leadership. *See id.*

The recently elected government in Hungary has taken promising first steps to address the “[s]ignificant” human rights challenges there, including serious press, expression, and association restrictions, and violence or threats of violence against marginalized groups. U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. and Lab., *Hungary 2023 Human Rights Report* 1-2 (last visited Sept. 1, 2026), <https://tinyurl.com/4jwar53k>. The new government has “eased restrictions on journalists’ access to the parliament building,” “dissolved the centralized former structure of state media,” and abolished the Sovereignty Protection Office, “which had been used to harass and delegitimize independent media by labeling them threats to national sovereignty.” CPJ Staff, *Hungary’s initial media reforms are promising but lasting safeguards still needed*, Comm. to Protect Journalists (July 22, 2026, at 05:36 ET), <https://tinyurl.com/yc3kxsah>. “[T]hese changes show the breadth and speed of the new government’s intervention,” but “[f]urther reforms will be needed to create a public service media that can function fairly even when those in power dislike the journalism produced.” *Id.*

C. Turkey and Russia

Some regimes that have backslid from democracy in the last quarter century have gone much further, starting with suppression and ending with full-blown

authoritarianism. Although repression of dissent in these regimes today ranges far beyond anything we see now in the United States, widespread curtailment of democratic freedoms in these other nations began with smaller, methodical steps to undermine free expression.

1. In Turkey, President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan “has waged one of the world’s biggest crackdowns on press freedom in recent history.” CPJ Staff, *Turkey’s Press Freedom Crisis: The Dark Days of Jailing Journalists and Criminalizing Dissent* 6, Comm. to Protect Journalists (October 2012), <https://tinyurl.com/2u8sy2um>. Thousands of journalists have faced criminal charges. *See id.* Judges under the government’s thumb censor online articles on corruption or other sensitive topics. *See id.* And 90% of the media is under state control. *See Türkiye*, RSF, <https://tinyurl.com/bdzkcj7m> (last visited Sept. 1, 2026). With the arrest of Erdoğan’s most popular political rival in 2025, “Turkey is on the cusp of a transition to a consolidated dictatorship.” Nate Schenkkan, *The End of Competitive Authoritarianism in Turkey*, Freedom House (Mar. 26, 2025), <https://tinyurl.com/5cjyw9m9>. The U.S. Department of State has considered Turkey’s “serious restrictions on freedom of expression and media freedom” to be “[s]ignificant human rights issues.” *E.g.*, U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., *Turkey (Türkiye) 2023 Human Rights Report* 1-2 (2024), <https://tinyurl.com/jpax758m>.

2. Although Russia was a burgeoning democracy after the Soviet bloc broke up, “the government [has] increasingly restricted” the freedoms of speech and of the press since then. U.S. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Democracy, H.R. & Lab., *Russia 2024 Human Rights Report* 8 (2025), <https://tinyurl.com/3xfvm63s>.

Within a year of President Vladimir Putin coming to power at the end of 1999, “all three federal [TV] networks were under state control.” Kate Musgrave, *Tipping Point: Democratic Erosion and the Assault on Press Freedom*, Ctr. for Int’l Media Assistance (Oct. 27, 2021), <https://tinyurl.com/4sykpxst>. “All privately owned independent TV channels are banned from the air, except for cable entertainment,” and many Western outlets are inaccessible. *Russia*, RSF, <https://tinyurl.com/574z6dmh> (last visited Sept. 1, 2026). Russia’s media regulator has censored the most popular independent news sources. *See id.* “No journalists, even those in exile, are safe from the threat of serious charges based on vaguely worded draconian laws” *Id.* Hundreds of journalists have been arrested since Putin’s rise, and forty-three have been killed—including at least twenty-five in retaliation for their reporting. *See* Kaela Malig, *How Russia’s Press Freedom has Deteriorated Over the Decades Since Putin Came to Power*, PBS (Sept. 26, 2023), <https://tinyurl.com/4krjkh76>. During the Russian war on Ukraine, even muted criticism of the war has been suppressed. *See, e.g.,* Catherine Belton, *Russia closes window for dissent as Ukraine’s attacks stir public dismay*, Wash. Post (July 28,

2026), <https://perma.cc/K96H-CZVU>; Valerie Hopkins, *Whatever You Do in Russia, Don't Talk About the War*, N.Y. Times (June 26, 2026), <https://perma.cc/U7QP-VQEH>.

* * *

Obviously, the United States is not Russia, nor any of these other countries. At least not yet. *Amici* catalogue these examples from recent world history to underscore the stakes of permitting the government to disadvantage media outlets whose reporting this Administration finds inconvenient. As Jefferson said, “[o]ur liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost.” Letter from Thomas Jefferson to James Currie (Jan. 28, 1786), *reprinted by Nat’l Archives: Founders Online*, <https://tinyurl.com/33mzybyr> (last visited Sept. 1, 2026).

CONCLUSION

The Court should affirm the orders in favor of plaintiffs.

September 11, 2026

Brian Hauss
Esha Bhandari
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Scott Michelman

Scott Michelman
Arthur B. Spitzer
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA
529 14th Street NW, Suite 420
Washington, DC 20045
(202) 457-0800
smichelman@acludc.org

Counsel for Amici Curiae²

² Counsel wish to acknowledge the assistance of paralegal Ameerah Adetoro in the preparation of this brief.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that my word processing program, Microsoft Word, counted 6,440 words of the foregoing brief, excluding the items exempted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(f) and that this complies with the word limit set forth in Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29(a)(5).

/s/ Scott Michelman
Scott Michelman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 11, 2026, I electronically filed the foregoing brief in support of Plaintiffs-Appellees with the Clerk of the Court of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit by using the Appellate CM/ECF system, which will send notice to all counsel who are registered CM/ECF users.

/s/ Scott Michelman
Scott Michelman