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In “How the Press Should Cover Trump,” by Nic Dawes, the main argument is that journalists are not asking specific enough questions. Dawes goes on to say that journalists must start asking more specific questions in order to get the truth about information from Trump and the people who work for him.

Dawes writes, “If journalists insist on appearing neutral, they will avoid asking hard-edged questions or calling a lie a lie.” This shows that journalists are not asking specific enough questions that will force Trump and his people to answer directly. Instead, journalists are asking questions that have a broad range of answers. One problem with our president today is when he gets asked hard questions, instead of answering them, he goes into a speech.

The second piece of evidence from the article that supports the argument is when President Trump called *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* “fake news” after articles were published about Gen. Michael Flynn, the national security advisor. This equates to to the main argument of the article because even though they reported the facts, President Trump immediately tried to say what was published wasn’t true.

This raises a question: Should journalists continue to report the truth about the government when one of the consequences is President Trump calling the news fake? According to this article, the answer is yes; journalists should continue to report the truth about the government. As Dawes raises the argument that journalists must change the way they get information to report, it is just as much the journalist’s responsibility to ask the more specific questions as much as it is the president’s responsibility to answer these questions without being vague and going into a speech.

The third piece of evidence from the article that supports the main theme is when reporters for *Time* and the Associated Press decided to not attend Sean Spicer’s briefing when he said “friendlies-only” were invited and rival news outlets were excluded from the invitation. Dawes writes, “Journalistic access can be very useful, but only if journalists and their bosses make sure that ‘access’ does not mean the tacit or explicit trading of your independence for information.” The First Amendment gives journalists the access to government. In this example, reporters who were excluded from the briefing decided not to attend as a protest were trading their independence for information that they could have gotten at the meeting.

Overall, Dawes makes the argument that journalists were not acting the way they should at the time the article was written and argued that it was time for this to change. Based on the evidence, Dawes was right.