

CENTER *for* JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.

Post Office Box 8220
White Plains, New York 10602

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

E-Mail: cja@judgewatch.org
Web site: www.judgewatch.org

Elena Ruth Sassower, Director

BY E-MAIL: reblawdirectors@mailman.yale.edu

DATE: December 27, 2007

TO: Yale Law School Student Co-Directors
14th Annual Rebellious Lawyering Conference: February 22-24, 2008

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

RE: *“No More ‘High-Tech Lynchings:’ Reforming the Judicial Appointment Process”*

Thank you for organizing Yale Law School’s upcoming 14th annual, student-run, Rebellious Lawyering Conference.

I write concerning the planned panel discussion *“No More ‘High-Tech Lynchings:’ Reforming the Judicial Appointment Process”*, as to which your website states:

“Panelists will critically assess the current judicial confirmation process and envision a confirmation process that better suits the needs of the American political system. In particular, panelists will discuss the extent to which the system conveys useful information to the American public and their representatives about the judges who they are approving or rejecting; provides a forum for an honest and informative discussion of the pressing political and juridical issues of the day; and acts as a relevant broker in balancing the interests and powers of the different branches of government.”

As your website does not yet list who the panelists will be – and the purpose of the conference is to:

“bring[] together practitioners, law students, and community activists / advocates from around the country to discuss innovative, progressive approaches to law and social change” –

I take this opportunity to request that I be considered for inclusion as a panelist.

I am the director and co-founder of the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA), a New York-based national, non-partisan, non-profit citizens' organization, dedicated to ensuring that the processes of judicial selection and discipline are effective and meaningful – and welcome, rather than spurn, the contributions that citizens and members of the public have to offer.

For more than 15 years, CJA has interacted with the essentially closed-door process of federal judicial selection – and, by such direct, first-hand experience, has documented its corruption *at every level*. By this we mean, the refusal of those involved in the process to confront evidence of nominee unfitness, having nothing to do with ideology, but, rather, integrity and honesty. The primary source, documentary proof of this corruption, organized as case-studies, is posted on our website, www.judgewatch.org – conveniently accessible *via* the sidebar panel “Judicial Selection-Federal”. Our most spectacular case study is additionally accessible *via* the sidebar panel “*Disruption of Congress*”, chronicling what is perhaps the only case in U.S. history where a citizen's respectful request to testify in opposition to a federal judicial nominee at a U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee public confirmation hearing resulted in her arrest, prosecution, conviction, and six-month incarceration for ‘disruption of Congress’. I was that citizen and – following my release from jail – appealed the case up to the U.S. Supreme Court, whose lawlessness with respect thereto is chronicled by my petition for rehearing, posted on the website, which the Court denied last month.

Despite the meticulous, independently-verifiable nature of CJA's work and our herculean attempts to secure scholarship and media report of the documentary evidence of the corruption of federal judicial selection, including *via* Ralph Nader and the supposed non-partisan, good-government organizations, in addition to the partisan, ideologically-driven organizations “on the left” and “on the right”, there has been no scholarship nor media examination. Rather, scholars, the media, and the organizations have engaged in suppression and disinformation, knowingly perpetuating “politics as usual” and thwarting the far-reaching reforms the public would have demanded had the scandalous facts of what has been going on not been withheld from it. This is also chronicled by our website.

From the sidebar panel “*Searching for Champions (Correspondence)-Academia*”, I draw your attention to:

- the link to Syracuse University's Institute for the Study of the Judiciary, Politics, and the Media” – which posts our November 17, 2006 letter to its director, documentarily demonstrating the materially false and misleading presentations of panelists at the Institute's October 16, 2006 symposium “*The Last Umpires? The News Media, the ABA and Other Independent Voices in the Federal Judicial Confirmation Process*”; and
- the link to the scholars contributing to the University of Pittsburgh Law School's April 15, 2004 Jurist Online Symposium “*The Judicial Confirmations Process: Selecting Federal Judges in the Twenty-First Century*”, to whom we presented a May 4, 2004 proposal for scholarship entitled “*Beyond Statistics to Documentary Evidence: The*

Corruption of Federal Judicial Selection/Confirmation, as Readily-Verifiable from Case Studies of So-Called 'Mainstream', 'Consensus' Nominations...".

From the sidebar panel "*Disruption of Congress-The Appeals*", I draw your attention to CJA's correspondence with Ralph Nader & the organizations – all "missing in action" on the appeals of the case, as they were when the case was in the trial-level D.C. Superior Court.

From the sidebar panel "*Press Suppression*", I draw your attention to:

- The "Special Topic" entitled: "*Suppressing, Falsifying & Obscuring the 'Disruption of Congress' Case – & its Meaning for Reform*"; and
- The "Special Topic" entitled "*Championing the First Amendment: Suing The New York Times for Libel and Journalistic Fraud*" – also accessible via the separate sidebar panel "*Suing The New York Times*"—posting CJA's landmark public interest lawsuit against The Times, triggered by what it did in the "disruption of Congress" case and its "protectionism" of the public officers involved therein, for whom it has been election-rigging. Among these: New York Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, a Yale Law School alumna.

Based on CJA's nearly two decades of in-the-trenches activism and advocacy, I will offer a powerful, positive message to law students inclined to "radical layering". Our democracy needs them. They can readily make law and history for the benefit of all our nation's citizens simply by following the evidence to careers in academia, journalism – and such public interest litigation, as is now unfolding against The New York Times, in vindication of the First Amendment and an informed electorate.

I would be pleased to speak with you directly about my request to be a panelist – and would appreciate your advising as to whether such evidence-based perspective and message as I have to offer is represented by any of the panelists you have already invited to discuss "*Reforming the Judicial Appointment Process*".

Thank you.



Elena R. R. Passow