

CENTER for JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.

P.O. Box 69, Gedney Station
White Plains, New York 10605-0069

Tel. (914) 421-1200
Fax (914) 428-4994

E-Mail: judgewatch@aol.com
Web site: www.judgewatch.org

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator

BY FAX: 202-994-9811 (3 pages)
BY E-MAIL: turley@law.gwu.edu

June 6, 2005

Professor Jonathan Turley
J.B. and Maurice Shapiro Professor of Public Interest Law
George Washington University Law School
2000 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20052

RE: Adding substance to your quoted comments in the article, "*The Scourge of Her Conviction*" (*Village Voice*, Feb. 2-8, 2005), by your *amicus curiae* and other assistance in the appeal of the "disruption of Congress" case, *Elena Ruth Sassower v. United States of America*

Dear Professor Turley,

I thank you for your comments to *Village Voice* reporter Kristen Lombardi, quoted in her article, "*The Scourge of Her Conviction*" (Feb. 2-8, 2005), that the "disruption of Congress" case against me is "extraordinary" and sets a "worrisome precedent".

These comments resemble my own description of the case throughout the past two years as I repeatedly sought the assistance of supposedly "non-partisan, good-government" organizations, as well as organizations on the left and right which purportedly concern themselves with federal judicial selection, the rule of law, and/or enhancing citizen participation in our democracy and governmental accountability. Although the organizations did not deny or dispute the accuracy of my description – because it was *readily-verifiable* as true from the "paper trail" of primary source documents posted on CJA's website, www.judgewatch.org¹, to which I referred them -- they refused to help me in any way. Indeed, virtually all of them refused to even speak with me.

I have already e-mailed you my May 27, 2005 memo to these organizations and my June 1, 2005 memo to the ACLU, summarizing their past conduct, including the refusal of three of them, when contacted by Ms. Lombardi, to publicly comment about the case, with one of them defending its inaction by *ad hominem* disparagement of me, for which it insisted on anonymity – because its disparagement was utterly false. More importantly, these memos reiterated my

¹ The "paper trail" was then posted on CJA's homepage. It has since been moved to the "*Disruption of Congress*" page of the website, where it has been retitled "*Paper Trail to Jail*".

requests to them of nearly a year ago for their *amicus* and other assistance on the appeal, in which I am *pro se* and single-handedly championing the public interest.

As yet, I have heard back from only two organizations -- both on the right. In a May 27, 2005 e-mail, Free Congress Foundation instructed: "You are again directed to forthwith delete my e-mail address" -- essentially reiterating its last year's response². Washington Legal Foundation tersely stated, also in a May 27, 2005 e-mail, "Due to limited resources and commitments in other cases, unable to provide *amicus* support".

If the past is any indicator, I will not be hearing from the other organizations to which my May 27, 2005 memo is addressed. Nor will I be hearing from Ralph Nader, the memo's first addressee -- much as he had been the first addressee of my June 16, 2003 memo, in which I had first requested legal and other assistance in the case, then in its inception, and of my June 8, 2004 memo, in which I had first requested *amicus* and other assistance on the appeal.

These predecessor June 16, 2003 and June 8, 2004 memos -- which I provided to ALL the organizations -- identified that because the "paper trail" underlying the "disruption of Congress" case evidentially establishes the corruption of federal judicial selection/confirmation, the case is a powerful catalyst to advance long-ago made, but *unimplemented*, recommendations for non-partisan, good-government reform of federal judicial confirmation for the benefit of ALL this nation's citizens, regardless of ideology. My June 8, 2004 memo additionally summarized that when the case hit the D.C. Superior Court -- a court directly funded by Congress -- the rule of law effectively vanished as the "merit selected" trial judge unabashedly "protected" the government and denied me fundamental due process.

So that I will not be left unaided on this important appeal, I take this opportunity -- encouraged by your quoted comments in the *Voice* and the fact that you bear the title J.B. and Maurice Shapiro Professor of Public Interest Law at George Washington University Law School³ -- to respectfully request your *amicus curiae* support and other assistance in championing the public interest in this "extraordinary" case so that it can meet its history and law-making potential and its "worrisome precedent" can be overturned.

The far-reaching, public interest issues presented by the appeal are summarized by my already e-mailed May 27 and June 1, 2005 memos -- with their potential to make law demonstrated by my draft appellate brief, consisting of "Issues Presented for Review", a "Statement of the Case/Facts", and "Argument", which accompanied the memos. To avoid needless duplication,

² Its previous June 16, 2004 letter to me is posted on CJA's website under "*Correspondence: Organizations-Free Congress Foundation*".

³ Also encouraging me is the recollection of your inspiring presentation at the February 1998 Yale Law School Conference on "Rebellious Lawyering" -- at which we met. In the event you have not preserved my follow-up June 28, 1998 e-mail to you, it is conveniently posted on CJA's website under "*Correspondence: Academia*".

I refer you to them. Although posted on the "*disruption of Congress*" page of CJA's website, I am again e-mailing them to you with this letter, for your convenience. Additionally, I am e-mailing you my predecessor June 16, 2003 and June 8, 2004 memos because of their significance.

Pursuant to Rule 29 of the D.C. Court of Appeals, the due date for filing an *amicus curiae* brief is one week after the filing of my appellate brief. Appropriate to this case about patriotism, the rule of law, and fundamental citizen rights, that date is the day after the Fourth of July, *to wit*, Tuesday, July 5, 2005. I expect the U.S. Attorney would consent to such filing, thereby obviating the need for a motion.

Should you be unable to contribute an *amicus* brief, I would be grateful for your assistance in crafting my appellate brief – and for your recommendations of other law professors, attorneys, and organizations which might be favorably disposed to filing an *amicus* brief and otherwise assisting on the appeal.

In any event, because you are an influential academic and frequent media commentator, you are well positioned to alert your academic colleagues and media contacts to this "extraordinary", politically-explosive case – and I respectfully request that you do so.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Yours for a quality judiciary,



ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Coordinator
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

Enclosures

cc: Ralph Nader & Other Addressees of the May 27 and June 1, 2005 memos
Kristen Lombardi, *The Village Voice*