

Subj: **Following Up on Structural Mechanisms & The NYT**
Date: 1/26/00 11:07:38 AM Eastern Standard Time
From: Judgewatch
To: JNaureckas@FAIR.org

Dear Mr. Naurekas:

Thank you for your January 24th e-mail response. However, CJA's July 8, 1998 story proposal to *Brill's Content* was NOT itself 16 pages, but 6. This is identified at the outset of the second paragraph of my e-mail which, together with the following two paragraphs, provides a brief synopsis of WHY the proposal should interest "watchdog" media journals – and fascinate their subscribers.

Unfortunately, you have chosen *not* to address the particulars set forth in those three paragraphs, preferring to end any discussion by continuing to maintain that the proposal is "not interesting". This goes beyond *Content's* position in its January 18th rejection letter that it was "indeed interested", but had "written about the role of ombudsmen and the *New York Times* lack of one" – for which it conspicuously provided no specificity.

I will not burden you with my further correspondence to *Brill's Content* since it appears that your *own* personal opposition to news ombudsmen prevents you from being open-minded enough to explore the possibility that *Extra!* subscribers might be keenly interested in structural mechanisms for enhancing media accountability and their use or non-use by the various media. Surely, subscribers would never tolerate – as you seem to – the *Times'* alternative: that legitimate complaints bearing upon the integrity of *Times* news coverage and editorial positions should be simply IGNORED and that a complainant who thereafter embodies seven years worth of unresponded-to legitimate complaints in a submission to Project Censored should be subjected to depraved, *ad hominem* abuse by a *Times* editor – and that Mr. Sulzberger would put his imprimatur to this.

As to this story being "hot", I don't think that Ben Bagdikian would have the slightest difficulty in recognizing that fact – particularly after reviewing the breath-taking "paper trail" of documentation that supports CJA's July 8, 1998 proposal, including 4 comprehensive complaints provided to Mr. Sulzberger himself. Here, too, however, you have chosen *not* to address the concrete suggestion in the final paragraph of my e-mail that "at very least" the July 8, 1998 proposal should be seen by Ben Bagdikian.

Since Mr. Bagdikian not only serves on *Extra!'s* advisory board, but has been a Project Censored Judge since its founding in 1976, I would expect him to be keenly interested in CJA's July 8, 1998 proposal – and in examining the Project Censored submission that elicited such a rabid response from the *Times*, as approved by Mr. Sulzberger. Perhaps, too, Mr. Bagdikian will have suggestions as to the "elsewhere" that will publish this dynamite story – since you have supplied none. I would appreciate your providing me with Mr. Bagdikian's phone number and address for such purpose.

Thank you.

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
914-421-1200