

Letters

Activists, judges

I am the subject of “*The Scourge of Her Conviction*” by Kristen Lombardi [February 2–8], purporting to be about my arrest, conviction, and six-month incarceration on a “disruption of Congress” charge. Such a story shamelessly covers up the corruption of federal judicial selection involving a Who’s Who of the high and mighty in New York and Washington. It hardly befits a newspaper that holds itself out as maintaining a tradition of “no-holds-barred reporting and criticism.”

Among the high and mighty who get off “scot-free” or virtually so: senators Schumer and Clinton. Your story makes it appear that they—and likewise the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee—could freely ignore documentary evidence of corruption by New York Court of Appeals judge Richard Wesley, which I presented to them weeks before the committee’s May 22, 2003, hearing to confirm his nomination to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. Indeed, you nowhere identify that senators Schumer and Clinton were duty bound to examine that evidence and had the power to

prevent the nomination from proceeding to a hearing. Nor do you mention that the nomination was the product of a political “agreement,” announced by Senator Schumer in a press release—let alone explore Governor Pataki’s role in that “agreement.” Omitted is that Judge Wesley was a pal of the governor from their days in the New York legislature and the governor’s first appointee to the New York Court of Appeals. Also omitted is the Center for Judicial Accountability’s evidence-based assertion that the nomination was a “payback” to Judge Wesley for having protected Governor Pataki in a politically explosive public interest lawsuit directly implicating him in the corruption of the State Commission on Judicial Conduct and “merit selection” to the New York Court of Appeals.

As to the documentary evidence of Judge Wesley’s corruption in that lawsuit, you make no qualitative assessment—and garble what Judge Wesley did and what the lawsuit was about. Indeed, you so completely protect the guilty that you do not call the commission by its name, but euphemistically refer to it as “the state’s judicial-review board.”

Senator Schumer is a Harvard Law School graduate, Senator Clinton a graduate of Yale Law School. What were their findings of fact and conclusions of law with respect to what you describe as the “27-page memorandum that outlined, in meticulous detail, the center’s opposition”? And why has the *Voice*, which has a copy of that March 26, 2003, memorandum and the pertinent substantiating evidence of Judge Wesley’s misconduct in the commission case and in an earlier case challenging the constitutionality of billions of dollars of New York bonds, not itself come forward with findings of fact and conclusions of law?

That you smear me as a “pest” and otherwise besmirch my proper and professional advocacy only further underscores your betrayal of fundamental standards of journalism. *Voice* readers can judge this for themselves by examining the paper trail of documents pertaining to the “disruption of Congress” case, posted on the center’s website, judgewatch.org.

Elena Ruth Sassower
Coordinator, Center for
Judicial Accountability Inc.
White Plains, New York