

Subj: **RE: Structural Mechanisms for Media Accountability**
Date: 1/24/00 11:05:05 AM Eastern Standard Time
From: JNaureckas@FAIR.org (Jim Naureckas)
To: Judgewatch@aol.com (Judgewatch@aol.com)

I did not read your entire 16-page fax, and I think you'll find that most editors will not read a 16-page query. Under only the rarest of circumstances would a story of a rejected story proposal be newsworthy, because the vast majority of story proposals are rejected. Proving that a given story was rejected because it was "too hot" rather than "not interesting" is virtually impossible.

I wish you the best of luck in getting your story published elsewhere.

Jim Naureckas

> _____
> From: Judgewatch@aol.com[SMTP:Judgewatch@aol.com]
> Sent: Friday, January 21, 2000 8:18 PM
> To: JNaureckas@fair.org
> Subject: Structural Mechanisms for Media Accountability
>
> Dear Mr. Naureckas:
>
> Thank you for your response. However, you must be both a very fast reader
>
> and typer if, by 4:56 p.m., you were able to already e-mail your response
> to
> a 16-page fax, which had only arrived 10 minutes earlier. Indeed, the fax
>
> itself took 8 minutes to send: from 4:38 to 4:56 p.m.
>
> With all respect, I think you have been a bit hasty – and did not fully
> read
> the six-page July 8, 1998 proposal. Do you really not find it surprising
> –
> indeed inexplicable– that Brill's Content should not be eager to examine
> the
> efficacy of structural mechanisms which are supposed to achieve
> journalistic
> accountability, such as news ombudsmen, news councils, etc., that it
> should
> not present any story about how they have evolved and been adapted by the
> various media across the country and, perhaps, around the world, and not
> want
> to explore whether The New York Times own practices have detrimentally
> influenced the use of such mechanisms? Certainly, if you, as editor of
> Extra
> I, believe that news ombudsmen "are more a problem than a solution" –
> that
> is an important point of view, which should be aired – including in
> Brill's
> Content – along with the alternative that you not only see as superior,
> but
> can prove to be so.
>
> If you have read the July 8, 1998 story proposal, you know that The NY