

CENTER *for* JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.

Post Office Box 8101
White Plains, New York 10602

Tel. (914)421-1200

E-Mail: mail@judgewatch.org
Website: www.judgewatch.org

July 7, 2025

TO: [U.S. Department of Justice](#)
ATT: Assistant U.S. Attorney Carmen M. Banerjee

FROM: Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

RE: Assisting You, Yet Again – Now by Analysis of the *Amicus Curiae* Briefs Filed in Support of the NPR and PBS Summary Judgment Motions

This follows up my [June 27th letter](#) to you entitled “Assisting, with Evidence, Your Slam-Dunk Defense of President Trump & U.S. Taxpayers in the NPR & PBS Lawsuits – & Your Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment & for Sanctions Pursuant to Rule 11 and FRCP 56(h)”, requesting your response by July 4th and stating that I would “get busy on preparing a supplemental presentation, analyzing the *amicus curiae* briefs filed on June 20th in support of plaintiffs.”

I received no response from you – nor from cc’d Assistant U.S. Attorney Jeremy S.B. Newman as to the Justice Department’s determination of the unconstitutionality of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 by reason of the corruption of CPB’s ‘internal governance and operations’ and the absence of congressional oversight – the subject of my unresponded-to [May 22nd e-mail](#) to him.

To further assist you and Mr. Newman, below is my analysis of the five June 20th *amicus curiae* briefs, reinforcing the correctness of my June 27th letter and May 22nd e-mail.

To enable you to submit these as evidentiary declarations in support of your opposition to plaintiffs’ June 13th summary judgment motions and in support of your own summary judgment cross-motions, due July 11th, I attest to their truth under penalties of perjury.

Should you not submit them, I will attach them to a motion for leave to file an *amicus curiae* brief in support of your opposition/cross-motion. Pursuant to the briefing schedules, [here](#) and [here](#), the motion would need be filed by July 18th.

Finally, in addition to the suggestion in my June 27th letter that you request evidentiary declarations from the [Media Research Center](#) and [Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting and Analysis \(CAMERA\)](#), I suggest you also request evidentiary declarations from [Accuray in Media \(AIM\)](#) and [Professor Robert Lichter/Committee on Media and Public Affairs](#) – and they are herein cc’d.

My signature follows the below analysis.

* * *

**Analysis of the Five June 20th *Amicus Curiae* Briefs
Supporting Plaintiffs' June 13th Summary Judgment Motions**

With the exception of the [American Civil Liberties Union's *amicus* brief](#) (NPR #25, #28; PBS #16, #20)¹, the four other *amicus* briefs make no reference to the mandatory provision of [§396\(g\)\(1\)\(A\) of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967](#) requiring “strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature”. The ACLU’s *amicus* brief refers to it once – toward the end, stowed in a footnote (fn 3), reading:

“...the Act also purports to require CPB’s ‘strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature.’ 47 U.S.C. §396(g)(1)(A). The D.C. Circuit, sitting *en banc*, has already determined that the ‘objectivity and balance’ language ‘is applicable only to the CPB itself, and even there only to a narrower category of programming dealing with controversial issues.’ *Cmtty. Serv. Broad. of Mid-Am., Inc. v. FCC*, 593 F.2d 1102, 1117–18 (D.C. Cir. 1978) (*en banc*). *See also Accuracy in Media, Inc. v. FCC*, 521 F.2d 288 (1975) (upholding FCC’s determination that it lacked authority to enforce the ‘objectivity and balance’ language in part because any other conclusion would raise substantial constitutional questions). If the Act were instead meant to impose this requirement on local broadcasters—or, perhaps worse yet, creators and distributors of broadcast content— ‘then it is clear that we have moved . . . to [the realm] of regulation aimed at suppressing free speech, which may be justified only by reference to the most compelling government interests.’ *Cmtty.-Serv. Broad. of Mid-Am*, 593 F.2d at 1122. Thus, that provision of the Act cannot justify any viewpoint-based discrimination against Plaintiffs here.” (underlining added).

This is false, as there is nothing “purport[ed]” about §396(g)(1)(A)’s requirement of “strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature.” Indeed, the cited-to 1975 D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals’ decision in [Accuracy in Media, Inc. v. FCC and United States](#) states:

“Since the Section is clearly directed to the Corporation and its programming activities, we have no doubt that the Corporation must respect the mandate of the Section. However, we conclude that nothing in the language and legislative history of the Federal Communications Act or the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 authorizes the FCC to enforce that mandate against the CPB.

¹ The separate NPR and PBS *amicus* briefs are identical except for the differing captions and referred-to plaintiffs. Citations herein are to the NPR brief.

...

We leave the interpretation of this hortatory language [‘strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature’] to the Directors of the Corporation and to Congress in its supervisory capacity. We hold today only that the FCC has no function in this scheme of accountability established by §396(g)(1)(A) and the 1967 Act in general other than that assigned to it by the Fairness Doctrine. Therefore, we deny the petition for review and affirm the Commission’s decision rejecting jurisdiction over the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.” (underlining added).

Tellingly, the ACLU brief does not reveal how “the Directors of the Corporation and...Congress in its supervisory capacity” thereafter interpreted the “hortatory language” that is CPB’s statutory “mandate”.

Clear, however, from the legislative history furnished three years later, in 1978, by the quoted-from [*Community Service Broadcasting of Mid-America, Inc. v. FCC*](#), and, most powerfully, by the two dissenting opinions (1135-1150 [Levanthal/Tamm]; 1150- 1154 [MacKinnon/Robb]) to which the ACLU does not quote or cite – and which made the referred-to “*en banc*” a 5-4 split – is that Congress meant what it said, lest “federal funds...create a propaganda machine that could be manipulated by any political party or ideological clique” (at 1137).

In 1992, Congress would statutorily reinforce the “hortatory language” of “strict adherence to objectivity and balance” by the [Public Telecommunications Act of 1992](#), whose Section 19 entitled “Objectivity and Balance Policy, Procedures and Report” reads:

“Pursuant to the existing responsibility of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting under section 396(g)(1)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396(g)(1)(A)) ‘to facilitate the full development of public telecommunications in which programs of high quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, and innovation, which are obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to public telecommunications entities, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature,’ the Board of Directors of the Corporation shall:

(1) review the Corporation’s existing efforts to meet its responsibility under section 396(g)(1)(A);

(2) after soliciting the views of the public, establish a comprehensive policy and set of procedures to

(A) provide reasonable opportunity for the members of the public to present comments to the Board regarding quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, innovation, **objectivity and balance of public broadcasting services, including public broadcasting of a controversial nature**, as well as any needs not met by those services;

(B) review, on a regular basis, national public broadcasting programming for quality, diversity, creativity, excellence, innovation, **objectivity, and balance**, as well as for any needs not met by such programming;

(C) on the basis of information received through such comment and review, take such steps in awarding programming grants ... that it finds necessary to meet **the Corporation's responsibility under section 396(g)(1)(A), including facilitating objectivity and balance in programming of a controversial nature**; and

(D) disseminate among public broadcasting entities information about its efforts to address concerns about **objectivity and balance** relating to programming of a controversial nature so that such entities can utilize the Corporation's experience in addressing such concerns within their own operation; and

(3) starting in 1993, by January 31 of each year, prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a report summarizing its efforts pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2)." (bold added).

This is the law, as exists today, though you would never know it from the *amicus curiae* briefs, which, like the NPR and PBS complaints and summary judgment motions, conceal it and furnish no history of CPB enforcement and congressional oversight with respect thereto. Piecing together such history – obscured as well by the [CPB's website](#) – are decades of nonfeasance, obfuscation, and subversion by CPB and virtually non-existent oversight by Congress. The result, for decades, is that the statutory requirement of "strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature" has been window-dressing, hiding the fact that the very inclusion of that requirement in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 renders the Act unconstitutional, *as written* – at least if the First Amendment arguments of NPR,² PBS, and the *amici* are to be credited, seeming to claim that any enforcement of "objectivity and balance" is unconstitutional.³

² Representing the three Colorado NPR member stations in the NPR lawsuit is Steven D. Zansberg, Esq., who, more than three decades ago, authored "[Objectivity and Balance in Public Broadcasting: Unwise, Unworkable, and Unconstitutional](#)" (Yale Law & Policy Review, Vol. 12:184 (1994)), not cited-to by the NPR summary judgment motion which, like the NPR complaint, simply omits any reference to the statutory requirement of "strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature".

It is because the stated basis of [President Trump's May 1, 2025 Executive Order](#) is “biased and partisan news coverage” – the truth of which is a flagrant violation of §396(g)(1)(A) – that the ACLU brief does not acknowledge the Executive Order’s factual legitimacy in any way⁴, instead distorting and mischaracterizing the situation for purposes of its fraudulent First Amendment argument, as:

p. 1 “he does not like [NPR’s] journalistic and editorial choices...”; “[he] accuses NPR of providing ‘biased and partisan news coverage.’”; p. 2 “[his] disagreement with NPR’s programming”; “[he] disagrees with [NPR’s] views”; p. 5 “NPR’s viewpoint, which President Trump openly despises”; p. 6 “President Trump considers its news coverage to be ‘biased and partisan’”; President Trump’s personal disapproval of NPR’s programming; “accusing NPR of leftwing bias...”;

³ Incomprehensibly, the 5-4 *en banc* D.C. Circuit Court decision in *Community Service Broadcasting of Mid-America, Inc. v. FCC* was not appealed to the Supreme Court. As for the D.C. Circuit Court decision in *Accuracy in Media v. FCC and USA*, the ACLU brief does not reveal that it was appealed to the Supreme Court, which denied *cert*, 425 U.S. 934 (1976). Another notable D.C. Circuit Court case, also denied *cert*, was [The Network Project, et al. v. CPB, PBS...Pat Buchanan](#), 561 F.2d 963 (D.C. Cir. 1977), *cert* denied, 434 U.S. 1068 (1978). All three cases were an opportunity for the Supreme Court to have confronted the constitutional issues here at issue.

⁴ The ACLU’s legal argument sits on its nonsensical rejection of the stated factual basis of the Executive Order:

“President Trump’s viewpoint-based animus against NPR is evident on the Executive Order’s face. Although Section 1 of the Order purports to disavow any interest in ‘[w]hich viewpoints NPR ... promote[s],’ this disclaimer is belied by the rest of the Order. The next sentence states that NPR does not ‘present[] a fair, accurate, or unbiased portrayal of current events,’ and the following sentence directs all ‘agencies to cease Federal funding for NPR[.]’ Exec. Order No. 14290 §1. Section 2 of the Executive Order similarly asserts that NPR’s funding is being cut because President Trump considers its news coverage to be ‘biased and partisan.’ *Id.* §2(a). And the Order itself is titled ‘Ending Taxpayer Subsidization of *Biased Media*’” (pp. 5-6, italics added by ACLU).

This essentially echoes the [PBS’ memorandum in support of summary judgment](#):

“Presumably because the President is aware that viewpoint discrimination is presumptively unconstitutional, the EO contains a disclaimer that ‘[w]hich viewpoints *** PBS promote[s] does not matter.’ EO §1. Such an afterthought cannot save the EO from First Amendment scrutiny. Indeed, it can hardly be taken seriously when considered in the context of (i) the very next sentence, which states that PBS does not ‘present[] a fair, accurate, or unbiased portrayal of current events,’ *id.*; (ii) the rest of the EO, which assails PBS’s purportedly ‘biased and partisan news coverage,’ *id.* §2; and (iii) the accompanying materials, which repeatedly criticize specific PBS content as radical, one-sided, and partisan.” (at pp. 30-31)

p. 8 “punishing NPR for purported bias”; “disfavored expression”; p. 10 “President Trump disapproves of NPR’s programming”; p. 13 “he considers it ‘biased’”.

This is replicated by the [amicus brief of Digital Content Next, The Intercept Media, Pro Publica, and Radio Television Digital News Association](#) (NPR #22-1, #27; PBS #13, #19):

p. 1 “speech the President dislikes”, “disfavored speech”; p. 3 “his dislike of their speech”; p. 5 “disfavored speech”; p. 6 “The President does not want NPR, PBS, and their member stations to broadcast the content of their choosing – he wants them to broadcast content he prefers”; “perceives as ‘Biased Media’”; “claiming falsely that ‘NPR and PBS have fueled partisanship and left-wing propaganda’”; p. 7 “disfavored reporting”; p. 8 “the President’s ‘factual mistake’ of characterizing Plaintiffs as ‘radical, woke propagand[ists],’”; p. 14: “their perceived viewpoints”.

Also, by the [amicus brief of Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press and 29 NPR Member Stations](#) (NPR #26-1, #29):

p. 5 “disagreement with their reporting”; “claiming NPR is ‘biased’ and ‘left-wing propaganda’”; p. 9 “displeasure”; “complained of bias or unfair treatment”; “Accusations of bias”; p. 21 “what the Administration perceives to be NPR’s viewpoint.”; p. 22 “perception that NPR is ‘biased’ and possesses a ‘left-wing’ viewpoint”; p. 24 “reporting and content that the President dislikes”; p. 25 “speech it does not like.”; “stories he does not like”.

This is the same *modus operandi* that is evident in the NPR and PBS complaints and summary judgment memoranda:

[NPR complaint](#): ¶92 “hostility toward the perceived viewpoints expressed by NPR and PBS”; ¶94 “the President’s disapproval of the content of the speech and news reporting by NPR and PBS”; ¶134 “editorial discretion in ways disfavored by the Administration”;

[NPR’s summary judgment memorandum](#): p. 22 “disfavored content”; p. 25 “the President’s dislike of NPR’s journalism and other speech”; “NPR is, in the President’s view, ‘biased.’”; “the President disapproves”; p. 27 “the views expressed by NPR do not align with the President’s”, “what the President views as ‘left-wing propaganda’”; p. 31 “his own editorial judgment – his viewpoints – for NPR’s and the Local Member Stations”;

[PBS complaint](#): ¶1 “disagreements”; ¶3 “perceived political slights in news coverage”; ¶49 “his disagreement with the purported views expressed through its programs and editorial decisions”; ¶102 “the President believes PBS provides ‘biased

and partisan news coverage””; ¶103 “he disagreed with the content and viewpoint of its speech”; ¶134 “based on allegations that PBS provides ‘biased and partisan news coverage’”;

PBS summary judgment memorandum: p. 1: “simply because the President disagrees with the speech”; “the President believes that PBS content is not ‘fair, accurate, unbiased, and nonpartisan’”; “the speech of public media he disfavors”; pp. 2-3: “perceived political slights in news coverage”; p. 15: “his disagreements with the views purportedly expressed through PBS’s programs and editorial decisions”; p. 17: “the President’s view”; p. 18 “accuses PBS”; p. 30 “the President believes”, “he disagrees with PBS’s viewpoint”; p. 33 “programming the President ‘doesn’t like’”.

Simultaneously, the *amicus* briefs – as, likewise the NPR and PBS complaints and summary judgment motions – are packed with hyperbolic rhetoric about the First Amendment, the vital role of the press in our democracy, and unsworn assertions about how NPR and PBS discharge their role by their supposed “quality”, “fact-based”, “truthful reporting on matters of public concern”.⁵

As for the *amicus* brief of America’s Public Television Stations (PBS #18, #21) and the *amicus* brief of the Attorneys General of 23 states (NPR #23, PBS #14), these are not so much briefs as unsworn factual recitations. The AGs’ *amicus* brief mentions the Executive Order once (at p. 2), but not its basis – “biased and partisan news coverage”. The American Public Television Station’s *amicus* brief refers to the Executive Order as “E.O. 14,290”, but not its basis.

The *amicus* brief of the 23 AGs does not get to the subject of “news coverage” until its page 18, at the very bottom, carrying over to page 19:

“Finally, Plaintiffs serve an important role in distributing information regarding state and local politics and voting rights. Broad access to information and diverse opinions is nowhere more critical than in the electoral context....But independent reporting on state and local politics has been on decline for years.^{fn49} Public broadcasting, however, continues to fill this need by showcasing state and local politics in All Amici States. *Id.* This includes some of the only content informing voters on the actions taken by their elected officials. *See id.* at 3. And in 80% of states, NPR provides voter guides to assist voters in understanding the issues they consider in the voting booth. *See id.* at 8...”

⁵ Digital Content Next, The Intercept Media, Pro Publica, and Radio Television Digital News Association *amicus* brief: p. 1 “NPR, PBS, and their member stations play a vital role in the nation’s media landscape...providing fact-based reporting on national news”; p. 2 “the vital role of a free press in our democracy”; p. 5 “fact-based news coverage...truthful reporting on matters of public concern”.

The annotating footnote 49 is:

“Corp. for Pub. Broad. & Edison Research, State Government Coverage in Public Media: Edison Media Research Survey 1 (2021), https://cpb.org/sites/default/files/CPB_SCCS_2021_FINAL.pdf.”

Aside from the fact that the indicated link is incorrect, the referred-to [2021 survey](#) is of public media radio and television stations whose self-reporting about their own state and local journalism, further cloaked by anonymity, is NOT evidence of the true facts. As relates to New York, the true facts, established by [primary source, documentary evidence](#), spanning decades, are of “*knowingly* false, corruption-abetting, election-rigging journalism” by the local New York NPR and PBS member stations, [identical](#) to New York’s other non-profit and its for-profit media, covered up and abetted by the NPR and PBS public editors, presidents/CEOs, boards of directors, counsels, and other management and, thereafter by the CPB inspector general – a situation that Congress has been aware of since [February 18th](#) and CPB’s executive vice-president/general counsel since [May 2nd](#) – which is when I first furnished them with my [February 18th letter](#) “Defunding NPR, PBS – & firing the CPB Inspector General, for starters”.

That New York’s Attorney General Letitia James is one of the [22 AGs on the amicus brief](#), purporting that “Amici States have a strong interest in the safeguarding of constitutional values” is a fraud on both counts, as AG James is, with New York’s judiciary, [the](#) pivotal corrupter of constitutional governance in New York and a top beneficiary of the “*knowingly* false, corruption-abetting, election-rigging journalism” of local New York NPR and PBS member stations and other New York media – so-highlighted by my February 18th letter (at pp. 6-8) as follows:

“...the election of New York Attorney General Letitia James in 2018, her re-election in 2022, and the election in 2021 of Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg, a top deputy to A.G. James’ predecessors, Eric Schneiderman and Barbara Underwood, were achieved by the collusion of New York’s non-profit and for-profit media, in willfully not reporting on the evidence of their corruption, presented by the record of the citizen-taxpayer action, [CJA v. Cuomo, et al.](#), suing the highest constitutional officers of New York’s three branches, the A.G., among them, for corrupting state governance, involving the massive, policy-laden, ‘OFF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RAILS’ state budget, rife with constitutional, statutory, and legislative rule violations and billions of dollars of larcenies of taxpayer monies,^{fn4} including for their own salaries – a lawsuit commenced in September 2016 and which, in the absence of any legitimate defense, the A.G. defended by litigation fraud and was rewarded by fraudulent decisions, ‘throwing’ the case, at every level, up to the New York Court of

^{fn4} “About 40% of the state budget is supported by the federal government”, so-reported by [NY Public Radio’s] February 16, 2025 article ‘[NY comptroller warns of potential federal cuts, questions rebate checks](#)’. An August 2024 article ‘[Which states rely the most on federal aid?](#)’ puts New York second, at \$110.2 billion, after California.”

Appeals which, [exactly five years ago today, February 18, 2020](#), issued the last of its five fraudulent orders, denying review by right and by leave – and which, since June 2022, has been continued by *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.*, and, since March 2023, by *CJA v. Commission on Legislative, and Executive Compensation, et al.*. A.G. James is a named respondent/defendant in both lawsuits, sued for corruption – and she has defended each by litigation fraud, for which she has been rewarded by fraudulent judicial decisions, ‘throwing’ the cases. Both are still LIVE, however, pending before the New York Court of Appeals, on appeals of right ([here](#) and [here](#)), with A.G. James, once again, as in 2019-2020 in *CJA v. Cuomo, et al.* ([here](#)), being unremitting in her litigation fraud, before the state’s highest court.

In that connection, to no avail, in 2021 and 2023, I tried to alert then former President Trump to the situation – constructing for that purpose two webpages on CJA’s website. The first, a ‘[June 4, 2021 Message to Mr. Trump](#)’, pertaining to A.G. James and to then Manhattan D.A. Cyrus Vance, Jr., and the second, an ‘[April 3, 2023 Message to Mr. Trump](#)’ pertaining to successor Manhattan D.A. Bragg.

The framing paragraphs of the June 4, 2021 Message summed up what was going on, none of which had been reported by New York’s press then – or since:

‘DEAR MR. TRUMP:

Your NY Democratic prosecutors – NY Attorney General Letitia James & Manhattan D.A. Cyrus Vance, Jr. – who are pursuing you because ‘*no one is above the law*’, are themselves ‘*above the law*’ – and while you were still president, the FBI & your acting US Attorneys for NY had the OPEN-and-SHUT, *prima facie* EVIDENCE to indict them & scores of other NY public officers for corruption and fraud involving the NY state budget and ‘false instrument’ pay raises they stole for themselves. The highest of these public officers – ALL Democrats – are Governor Andrew Cuomo and the heads of NY’s Legislative and Judicial branches.

...

MR. TRUMP, the reason you know nothing about any of this is because NY’s mostly left-leaning press has, for years, been complicit in the systemic corruption of NY’s governance – involving all three government branches. It has concealed, totally, the EVIDENCE of what has been going on and, by its knowingly false reporting and editorializing, has sped the collapse of constitutional checks and balances, including by its rigging of NY’s elections. Here’s [CJA’s 30-year archive chronicling this](#) – and here’s our two lawsuits aimed at securing media accountability, the first vs [The New York Times](#), and the second vs [Gannett](#) – both ‘thrown’ at trial and appellate levels by fraudulent judicial decisions of NY’s state courts

because there was NO legitimate defense to either lawsuit. Here's also CJA's most recent and IMMEDIATELY relevant chronicling of the 'fake news', corruption-abetting, election-rigging journalism that has deprived the People of the State of New York of what they have needed to know about their public officers and state governance: [last year, before the 2020 elections](#) and, after, in [November](#) and in [December](#), and this year: in [January](#), [February-March](#), [April-May](#), and thus far, in [June](#).

Mr. Trump, from [this website](#), you have the EVIDENCE to PROVE that you are being invidiously and selectively investigated by AG James and DA Vance who have corrupted their offices and are pocketing fraudulent pay raises for their crimes – and that the media has known about this, but reported NOTHING. You have a slam-dunk opportunity to not only help yourself, but, simultaneously, to do a great public good: to 'drain the swamp' that is NY's governance and expose – definitively and beyond all doubt – its 'fake news' press. Go to it!" (italics, capitalization, and hyperlinking in the original).^{fn5}

Notably, among the other non-profit media colluding in the "*knowingly* false, corruption-abetting, election-rigging journalism" that has wiped out constitutional, lawful state governance in New York are the *amici* [Pro Publica](#) and [The Intercept](#). The true facts as to them, putting the lie to the descriptions about themselves at pp. vii-viii of [their amicus brief](#), are established by the [primary source, documentary evidence](#) furnished by my [June 16, 2023 complaint to the Institute for Nonprofit News](#), to which they are members – a complaint summarized by pages 5-6 of my February 18th letter.

As for the 29 NPR member stations which are *amici* on the same [amicus brief as the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press](#) (NPR #26-1, #29), these include five local New York stations whose "*knowingly* false, corruption-abetting, election-rigging journalism" gave rise to my [May 8, 2023 complaint](#) and then my [September 17, 2024 complaint](#) to NPR Public Editor Kelly McBride, featured at page 2 of my February 18th letter. These five are New York Public Radio (WNYC),

^{fn5} The 'swamp' of corruption that is New York's governance is enabled by the corruption of its 'public protection' oversight entities, such as the Commission on Judicial Conduct, the Appellate Division Attorney Grievance Committees, and the Unified Court System's Inspector General, to which Congresswoman Elise Stefanik and others filed complaints on behalf of former President Trump. For more than 30 years, I have furnished the media with the evidence that these entities are corrupt 'window-dressing', as, for instance, the record of [my February 11, 2021 complaint to the Attorney Grievance Committees for AG James' disbarment and referral to criminal authorities](#) – the same as hyperlinked by my [June 4, 2021 webpage 'Message to Mr. Trump'](#) – but they refuse to investigate and report, instead publishing articles as if they are legitimately functioning, as they did pertaining to Rudolph Giuliani's disbarment."

WXXI, WAMC, WLIW (owned by WNET Group), and WSHU. The consequence of what they have been doing, for decades, in tandem with New York's other nonprofit and for-profit media, has now directly resulted in the New York City Democratic mayoral primary win of Zohran Mamdani, whose unfitness as an Assembly candidate and corruption as an Assemblyman is summarized by my [March 14th e-mail](#) to him. This I furnished to WNYC Albany reporters by a [March 18th e-mail](#) entitled "The NYS Budget – & the 6 NYS Legislators Running for NYC Mayor, NYC Public Advocate, Manhattan Borough President, & NYC Council", cc'ing Mamdani and other candidates⁶ – and twice re-sent it to WNYC on March 19th due to a block, [here](#) and [here](#). This followed a [February 22nd](#) election "heads up" to WNYC about the NYC primary races, identifying Mamdani, contained in a second re-sending, due to a block, of my [February 21st e-mail](#) to the 12 member stations comprising the New York Public News Network (NYPNN)⁷ – WNYC, WXXI, WAMC, WLIW, and WSHU, among them – entitled "OVERSIGHT REQUIRED: Corruption-abetting, election-rigging, 'fake news'/fraudulent, agenda-driven journalism by your new Capitol Bureau hire, Jeongyoon Han & her colleagues Jimmy Vielkind & Jon Campbell, enabled by NY Public Radio leadership".⁸

[New Hampshire Public Radio](#) is also an *amicus* on the 29 NPR member station brief – and pages 12-14 spotlight its "ground-breaking and award-winning news investigation... additionally notable because of what occurred after it aired" – with a proclamation at pp. 20-21 that "For NPR Member Stations, the quality and independence of their reporting is central to their credibility", quoting from the NPR Ethics Handbook:

"To secure the public's trust, we must make it clear that our primary allegiance is to the public. ... Under no circumstances do we skew our reports for personal gain, to help NPR's bottom line or to please those who fund us".

This is false – proven not only by my above-recited decades of interaction with New York's NPR member stations, but by my recent interaction with New Hampshire Public Radio (NHPR). The primary source, documentary evidence of this are the series of e-mails to which NHPR was cc'd,

⁶ Mamdani and other candidates were also cc'd on my comparable [March 20th e-mail](#) to "New York City's 'local journalism'" – the [New York Times](#), [New York Post](#), [New York Daily News](#), [New York Law Journal](#), [Wall Street Journal](#) and Associated Press – which, following a bounce-back, I successfully [resent to the AP, with a further message](#).

⁷ NYPNN is identified in the more elaborated description of WAMC that appears in the motion for leave to file an *amicus* brief (NPR #26, at pp. 13-14) – a description stating, *inter alia*, "Headquartered less than a mile from the statehouse in Albany... the station is one of the most prolific producers of local and regional content in the country. Central to the station's mission is coverage of state and local government, and the downstream effects of policy and legislation across the listening region."

⁸ This [February 21st e-mail](#) was the follow-up to my nearly identically-titled [February 11th e-mail](#) to New York Public Radio's Senior Vice President of News/Editor in Chief Audrey Cooper, recited at page 4 of my [February 18th letter](#).

beginning May 26th and culminating in my [June 2nd e-mail to New Hampshire's congressional delegation](#) entitled "Corruption at NPR, PBS, and CPB, mandating congressional investigation & NO funding until 'heads roll' & safeguards are restored – & the left-wing bias & hypocrisy of NHPR journalism", stating:

"...is it not concerning to you that NHPR – a recipient of federal funding – has known of the [\[February 18th\] letter and its 'paper trail' odyssey](#) since [May 25th, when I sent a first e-mail to its Civics 101 podcasting team, its senior political reporter/editor, its news director, and its president/CEO](#), with subsequent e-mails to all of them on [May 26th](#), [May 29th](#), and then again on May 29th by the below, but NHPR has not contacted me for further information or reported anything. How does this accord with NHPR's posted [Code of Ethics](#) about 'fair, independent, accurate, complete and honest' news reporting and its May 2nd message '[The Independence of Public Media Cannot Be Compromised](#)' from its President/CEO Jim Schachter, about reporting 'in the public interest, holding the powerful to account without fear or favor.'

Based thereon and the profusion of assertions by the NHPR Civics 101 podcasters about their integrity and their unbiased, reliable, truth-telling journalism – including at Dartmouth's May 20th forum '[Effective Journalism in a Polarized World](#)' – wouldn't your New Hampshire constituents reasonably expect NHPR to be reporting on [the February 18th letter and its cover-up](#), assisted by experts and scholars, such as from Dartmouth? What an outrage to see what NHPR has chosen instead, such as its misleading, money-focused, left-tilted, and hypocritical May 28th '[Refresher Course: What can be done about corruption in politics?](#)' – part of its 'Every other Tuesday' series when 'the team behind [Civics 101](#) joins NHPR's *All Things Considered* to talk about how our democratic institutions actually work.'

By the way, do you have any content analysis of NHPR journalism, whose left-wing bias is readily discerned – or have you not asked your constituents about this? ..." (hyperlinking in the original).

Identical to the *modus operandi* of New York's NPR member stations, there was no response from New Hampshire's member station, whose [website](#) touts:

"For over 40 years, New Hampshire Public Radio has produced timely, accurate, unbiased, and independent journalism in the public interest. With our media landscape fractured and our democratic governance under stress, we now redouble our commitment to producing trustworthy journalism..."

NHPR is New Hampshire's primary source for accountability reporting on government and private institutions, a forum for the public to question and challenge

elected officials, candidates, and other leaders, and a trusted guide to everyday life in our state. Our national programs, rooted in New Hampshire interests and values, interrogate the most pressing concerns of our time. By producing distinctive, enterprising journalism that our audiences cannot find elsewhere and leveraging NPR's excellence in national and international reporting, NHPR makes itself indispensable."

Nor, of course, was there any disclosure of conflicts of interest, such as of [NHPR President/CEO Schacter](#) who, for seven years until October 2019, was senior vice president for news at WNYC, and, prior thereto, was 17 years at the [New York Times](#), "rising to the masthead position of associate managing editor". He would, thereafter, post a [facebook VIDEO](#) about NHPR's participation in the *amicus* brief, stating it was "because press freedom is on the line".

To complete the picture of the New Hampshire scene – and NHPR President/CEO Schacter would reasonably have been aware of same – I also forwarded my June 2nd e-mail to [New Hampshire PBS](#), whose website identifies its "trusted local and national programs". My transmitting [June 4th e-mail](#) entitled "Defunding NPR & PBS is NOT a partisan issue, it's a corruption issue – & New Hampshire's congressional delegation has the evidence" was addressed to its president, its vice-president/chief content officer, and the host of its "The State We're In" show, who is director of the Granite State News Collaborative. It read:

"Apart from the [PBS News Hour](#), has there been any local journalism by [New Hampshire PBS](#) on the question of defunding NPR and PBS? I assume this would have been by [The State We're In](#), but I have not found any episode on it.

Please advise – and deem my below June 2nd e-mail to New Hampshire's congressional delegation, alerting it, with evidence, that defunding NPR and PBS is NOT a partisan issue, but a corruption issue, a proposal for your investigative journalism. ..." (hyperlinking in the original).

To the [Granite State News Collaborative](#), whose website states that its journalism "holds government accountable to its citizens", I sent a further [June 4th e-mail](#), reading:

"...kindly review and advise, as soon as possible, whether the Granite State News Collaborative will undertake investigative reporting – and, if not, whether you will forward to [ALL the Collaborative's partners – seemingly the entirety of New Hampshire journalism](#) – for their collective and individual consideration.

Please also advise how much New Hampshire 'local journalism' you have been able to find on the NPR/PBS defunding issue – and your assessment of NPR and PBS national reporting on the topic. ..." (hyperlinking in the original).

Thereafter, to assist New Hampshire PBS and the Granite State News Collaborative in assessing the News Hour's reporting on the defunding issue, I cc'd them and PBS' public editor, senior management, and board of directors on three further e-mails:

- my [June 6, 2025 e-mail to PBS News Hour](#) – “FACT-CHECKING THE PBS NEWS HOUR (1) your referred-to ‘independent analyses’ that PBS/ NPR journalism is ‘objective and reliable’ & not ‘leftist news’; (2) the scholars & experts you have interviewed opposing federally-funded public media”
- my [June 12, 2025 e-mail to Professor Victor Pickard/University of Pennsylvania](#) – “Fact-Checking the PBS News Hour – & Your Scholarship”
- my [June 12, 2025 e-mail to Associate Professor Allison Perlman/University of California-Irvine](#) – “Your Co-Update to the ‘official history of public broadcasting... for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting’ – Fact-Checking the PBS News Hour & More”.

No response from anyone.

Parenthetically, there was also no response to my June 2nd e-mail from the New Hampshire Union Leader, whose [website](#) says it “deliver(s) trusted news”, is the “only statewide newspaper[.]...fielding New Hampshire’s largest professional news team”, with “journalists...dedicated [to] keeping a watchful eye on politics and government, and making our Granite State the most well-informed in the nation.” My transmitting [June 4th e-mail](#) to it and the [Nackey S. Loeb School of Communications](#), entitled “How will New Hampshire’s Democratic congressional delegation be voting on whether to defund NPR & PBS – & on what evidence?”, read:

“Using the ‘search’ feature of the Union Leader’s website, I have found negligible reporting on the question of [defunding NPR and PBS](#) – essentially only a single May 30th article from Reuters, ‘[PBS sues Trump to reverse funding cuts](#)’, insufficient to inform New Hampshire citizens or their representatives on the issue.

Please advise — and deem my below June 2nd e-mail to New Hampshire’s Democratic congressional delegation, alerting it, with evidence, that defunding NPR and PBS is NOT a partisan issue, but a corruption issue, a proposal for your investigative journalism.

As the Loeb School is affiliated with [New Hampshire Institute of Politics at Saint Anselm College](#), I am cc’ing its executive director and relevant faculty, with a request for their expert opinion and scholarship. ...”. (hyperlinking in the original).

There was no response, from anyone – further reinforcing, by [a microcosm case study of New Hampshire journalism and academia](#), spanning less than a month and involving the four-member New Hampshire congressional delegation, what is established as to New York, on a macro scale, by my [February 18th letter](#) as to “*knowingly* false, corruption-abetting, election-rigging journalism”, destroying lawful, constitutional governance and our democracy.

* * *

As stated at the end of my June 27th letter, I am available to answer questions – including under oath – and affirm the foregoing to be true, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, under penalties of perjury.

Thank you.

cc: Assistant U.S. Attorney Jeremy Samuel Bloch Newman
Media Research Center – Tim Graham, Director of Media Analysis
Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting and Analysis (CAMERA)
Accuracy in Media (AIM)
Professor Robert Lichter/Founder & President-Center for Media and Public Affairs