



apply three separate law review articles that powerfully advance media reform in the public interest in support of the First Amendment and the public's right to know. What can we do?"

Lemann: Anybody familiar with this case?

Fancher: I get e-mails about it. I guess, what, what, when we think about, when we think about this whole notion of media reform and fighting against the consolidation of ownership, one of the things that gets said is – no matter what your cause is, this should be your second cause because this is about your ability to get your story told. And so, when you think about, whether you're on the, whether you're the National Rifle Association, or you're Christian conservatives, or you're the Hollywood creative community, or you're at war with The New York Times over journalism fraud, being able to find access, to get your story told is what this is all about. So, you know, I think you just have to keep up your battle.

Lemann: You asked your question, we've got to have more questions, okay.

Sassower: The question is the viability of this cause of action, as well as others proposed by law review articles.

Lemann: Yeah, okay. I think... ma'am.

Sassower: We can't get discussion by the scholars, by the research institutions, including this one which gets money from The New York Times, from the Sulzberger family, and does not respect fundamental conflict of interest rules, as likewise the other institutions that are connected to the industry. My question is –

Shafer: Will you send me, will you send me the lawsuit?

Lemann: Yes, thank you.

Sassower: It was already sent to you, sir.

Shafer: No it wasn't.

Lemann: Yeah.

*Sassower goes up to the podium and hands Shafer three previous e-mails, enclosing three press releases about the lawsuit*

Shafer: Thanks.

Lemann: Okay, so Jack will look into it and write a column about it.

Shafer: I'm served, I'm served. Have couple of lawyers here who can defend me?

Sassower: Thank you.

Shafer: Thank you.