

Subject: "Verified Facts to Hold the Powerful Accountable" -- Including in Journalism

Date: 7/6/2006, 2:05 PM

From: Elena Ruth Sassower <judgewatchers@aol.com>

To: Ellen Hume <ellen.hume@umb.edu>

Organization: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc.

Dear Professor Hume:

I am at a loss to understand your e-mail response.

What I am "trying to accomplish" is to promote "necessary scholarship and reporting on the role of the press in our democracy" -- an objective which I clearly stated in my five-sentence memo of today's date, transmitting to you and other indicated recipients my yesterday's letter to Tom Rosenstiel.

Do you deny or dispute "The Far-Reaching Evidentiary Significance of CJA's Public Interest Lawsuit vs. The New York Times -- including as a Case Study for Establishing News Councils"? The relevant facts are summarized by my straightforward 2-1/2 page letter to Mr. Rosenstiel, which is a perfectly understandable letter, not at all "a legal brief". Likewise the accompanying enclosures: the two press releases about the lawsuit and my e-mail correspondence to Jay Rosen and Jeff Jarvis. What about these short, separate documents do you not understand?

You are an intelligent, educated person -- a journalist and academic -- who holds and has held important, leadership positions in journalism. Do you really not know what my "beef" is? -- a word choice suggesting that you read The Times column which is the basis for the lawsuit's libel and libel *per se* causes of action. And do you really not know what "[I] think anyone should do"? Isn't what I think journalists and scholars should do explicit from what you concede are "meticulously presented material" -- and isn't what I think should be done not only reasonable, but professionally and ethically-mandated?

Finally, on what basis do you "take issue with how [I] characterized [your] participation in the Media Giraffe conference"? My footnote reference to your participation (at p. 3 of my letter to Mr. Rosenstiel) does not interpret what you said during the June 28th panel discussion -- just the fact that you said it or some paraphrase of it, which you do not deny or dispute.

I await your response to the foregoing -- first and foremost to whether you deny or dispute "The Far-Reaching Evidentiary Significance of CJA's Public Interest Lawsuit vs The New York Times". Is it your contention that the lawsuit does not present -- by *readily-verifiable* primary source documents (accessible *via* CJA's website) -- "verified facts to hold the powerful accountable?", and was this not your emphatic definition of what journalism must be about?

It is ironic that among the important questions you put forward in your June 28th presentation -- after "who will pay for investigative journalism? and "who will hold government accountable?" -- was "if someone does hold journalism accountable with real journalism, how will we know to believe it?"

Let us work together to find this "real journalism" to hold "journalism accountable" -- as we have laid before you overwhelming evidentiary proof of journalistic betrayal, imperiling our democracy.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower
