

**Subject: When will CJRD be reporting the very FACT of CJA's public interest lawsuit vs The NYT for journalistic fraud, charging it with election-rigging for Spitzer & Clinton**

Date: 9/21/2006, 10:27 AM

From: Ctr for Judicial Accountability <judgewatchers@aol.com>

To: Mark Mitchell <m.mitchell@cirdaily.org>

Organization: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc.

Dear Mr. Mitchell:

This belatedly responds to your September 5th e-mail to me -- requesting A SECOND TIME -- that I provide a summary of the evidence as to The New York Times' cover-up of Attorney General Eliot Spitzer's corruption in office -- and adding, for the first time, a similar request as to Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton.

As to Spitzer, my August 22nd e-mail to you stated in pertinent part:

"...although The New York Times long ago recognized that the primary job of the Attorney General is to defend the state when sued, it has wilfully refused to report on Attorney General Spitzer's defense of lawsuits. Likewise, it has wilfully refused to report on Mr. Spitzer's 'public integrity unit', which he had promised voters he would establish to root out governmental corruption when he ran for Attorney General in 1998 -- an election he won by a squeaker. This refusal by The Times is with knowledge that reporting ON THE EVIDENCE would end Mr. Spitzer's political career, indeed result in criminal and disciplinary investigations and prosecutions against him for corruption.

For immediate purposes, attached is CJA's January 18, 2006 letter to Kenneth Langone, conveniently enclosing our October 8, 2002 2-page covermemo to The New York Times Editorial Board, our four-page proposal for coverage "The Real Eliot Spitzer - NOT the P.R. Version", and other substantiating documents. This letter to Mr. Langone is the first posted under the heading "Searching for Champions" on our "Elections 2006: Informing the Voters" page. By the way, our DECISIVE October 8, 2002 memo is referred-to by the verified complaint of our lawsuit against The Times (at paras. 51 and 111)."

Did you read the October 8, 2002 2-page covermemo to The Times Editorial Board with its attached four-page story proposal "The Real Eliot Spitzer - NOT the P.R. Version"? And did you look at the sidebar panel "Press Protectionism" to which my August 22nd e-mail ALSO referred you, with its "Special Topic"

**"2. SKEWING & SUBVERTING THE ELECTORAL PROCESS:  
PRESS PROTECTIONISM OF -- NYS ATTORNEY GENERAL ELIOT SPITZER",**

which provides a succession of cites to and postings of our correspondence with The Times pertaining to Spitzer's readily-verifiable corruption that The Times has wilfully and deliberately suppressed from coverage, with knowledge of its electoral consequences.

As to Clinton, the SAME sidebar panel "Press Suppression" -- and the SAME "Special Topic": **"2. SKEWING & SUBVERTING THE ELECTORAL PROCESS:"**

has --as its FIRST entry --

**"PRESS PROTECTIONISM OF -- U.S. SENATORS CHARLES SCHUMER & HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON"**

which, likewise, provides a succession of our correspondence to The Times pertaining to Clinton's readily-verifiable corruption in office, which The Times has wilfully and deliberately suppressed from coverage, with knowledge of its electoral consequences. It also provides a link to our public interest lawsuit vs The Times whose verified complaint (para.16 onward) summarizes this correspondence

A summary of Senator Clinton's corruption in office -- as well as its tie-in to Attorney General Spitzer's corruption in office -- is provided by CJA's August 25, 2006 memo to New York Media -- including The New York Times -- posted, since that date, at the top of our website's "Elections 2006: Informing the Voters" webpage -- to which my August 22nd e-mail ALSO referred you. Did you read this 2-page August 25th memo? For your convenience, a copy is attached. It states, in two concise paragraphs, what our mountain of correspondence with The Times particularizes:

"With respect to Attorney General Spitzer, elected in 1998 on a pledge that he was going to clean up government and establish a 'public integrity unit', our correspondence summarizes that his 'public integrity unit' was a hoax -- and that Mr. Spitzer refused to investigate and root out systemic governmental corruption involving a pattern and practice of litigation fraud engaged in by his predecessor Attorneys General in defending state judges and the Commission on Judicial Conduct, sued for corruption -- for which they were rewarded with fraudulent judicial decisions. Instead, he engaged in the same litigation fraud to defend the Commission when we sued it for corruption -- for which state judges, at every level, rewarded him with fraudulent judicial decisions. In so doing, Attorney General Spitzer not only perpetuated a documentably corrupted Commission on Judicial Conduct, leaving the People of the State of New York defenseless against the most flagrant lawlessness by state judges -- including those who 'threw' the lawsuit -- but perpetuated the corruption of the state judicial appointments process, including 'merit selection' to the New York Court of Appeals, which the lawsuit encompassed.

With respect to Senator Clinton, she not only covered up – and thereby perpetuated – the systemic governmental corruption challenged and chronicled by the documentary record of our lawsuit against the Commission, but, additionally, the corruption of federal judicial selection and discipline. To accomplish this and effectuate a behind-the-scenes political deal seating a corrupt New York Court of Appeals judge on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, she maliciously set in motion and complicity acquiesced in my wrongful arrest, prosecution, conviction, and six-month incarceration on a bogus 'disruption of Congress' charge. My 'crime'? At the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee's public hearing to confirm the judge, I respectfully requested to testify in opposition based on his on-the-bench corruption, as established by the record of our lawsuit against the Commission – a record Senator Clinton was duty-bound to have examined, making findings of fact and conclusions of law."

**ALL OF THIS IS – AS YOU KNOW – WHOLLY BESIDE THE POINT.** My August 22nd e-mail to you entitled "Empirical Test: The 'Gatekeepers' -- Alive & Well, Protecting The New York Times" – which initiated our exchange – did NOT request anything more than that Columbia Journalism Review Daily (CJRD) report the VERY FACT – *immediately verifiable* from the "Suing The New York Times" page of our website – that The New York Times is being sued in a "first ever public interest lawsuit...for journalistic fraud", which "chronicles The Times' election-rigging for Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton & NY Attorney General Eliot Spitzer, engineering their anticipated landslide victories."

WHAT MORE IS REQUIRED FOR CJRD – which purports to be a "real-time daily critique of journalism", with a focus, as well on "political journalism" – TO SIMPLY REPORT THE FACT OF THIS LAWSUIT vs THE TIMES & ITS ALLEGATIONS – of which it first had notice by a March 22, 2006 press release, sent on that day and the next – thereafter reiterated by our two subsequent press releases – on June 9, 2006 and August 22, 2006 – additionally alerting CJRD to the EXTRAORDINARY POSTURE OF THE CASE, likewise *immediately verifiable* from our "Suing The New York Times" webpage and worthy of report.

As we are now only a month and a half way from the November elections, please advise without further delay.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director  
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)  
Tel: 914-421-1200  
E-Mail: [judgewatchers@aol.com](mailto:judgewatchers@aol.com)

 [8-25-06-ny-media.pdf \(173KB\)](#)

\*\*\*\*\*  
Mark Mitchell wrote on 9/5/2006, 11:00 AM:

Dear Ms. Sassower,

I have taken a closer look at your Web site. There is a lot of information there, and thus it is a bit difficult to absorb without taking a few days to study it. I'm wondering whether you might be willing to summarize, in 2-3 paragraphs, your evidence that Clinton and Spitzer are corrupt, and that the NYT has deliberately engaged in a cover-up. Please keep in mind that I know nothing about this, so it is necessary to start from square one.

Thank you.,

Mark Mitchell  
CJR

On Aug 31, 2006, at 1:07 PM, Ctr for Judicial Accountability wrote:

Dear Mr. Mitchell,

TO: COLUMBIA JOURNALISM REVIEW DAILY  
Mark Mitchell, Assistant Managing Editor

It's now 9 days since our e-mail exchange. What has been the outcome of your "closer look"?

Meantime – and to further assist you in assigning journalism students to report on this fully-documented time-sensitive story, heretofore suppressed by The New York Times and other media – attached is CJA's August 25th memo to New York media, also posted on our webpage "Elections 2006: Informing the Voters".  
<8-25-06-ny-media.pdf>

Please advise so that I may know how to proceed.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director  
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)  
Tel: 914-421-1200

\*\*\*\*\*  
Mark Mitchell wrote on 8/22/2006, 1:00 PM:

Thanks. I'll take a closer look.

On Aug 22, 2006, at 12:22 PM, Ctr for Judicial Accountability wrote:

Dear Mr. Mitchell,

Thank you for your prompt response. Are you sure you looked at our website, [www.judgewatch.org](http://www.judgewatch.org)?

Aside from the sidebar panel, "Suing The New York Times" -- which brings up a page containing, directly under the lawsuit caption, a link to "15-Year Background History -- Paper Trail of Suppression, Protectionism, & Blackballing by THE NEW YORK TIMES", please see the following:

(1) The sidebar panel "Press Protectionism" -- which contains a list of "Special Topics" including

**"2. SKEWING & SUBVERTING THE ELECTORAL PROCESS:  
PRESS PROTECTIONISM OF -- NYS ATTORNEY GENERAL ELIOT SPITZER"**

(2) The sidebar panel "Elections 2006: Informing the Voters"

**"Would-Be Governor: Attorney General Eliot Spitzer  
SEE: Press Protectionism of A.G. Spitzer  
Paper Trail of A.G. Spitzer's Corruption in Office"**

The short answer to your question is that although The New York Times long ago recognized that the primary job of the Attorney General is to defend the state when sued, it has wilfully refused to report on Attorney General Spitzer's defense of lawsuits. Likewise, it has wilfully refused to report on Mr. Spitzer's "public integrity unit", which he had promised voters he would establish to root out governmental corruption when he ran for Attorney General in 1998 -- an election he won by a squeaker. This refusal by The Times is with knowledge that reporting ON THE EVIDENCE would end Mr. Spitzer's political career, indeed result in criminal and disciplinary investigations and prosecutions against him for corruption.

For immediate purposes, attached is CJA's January 18, 2006 letter to Kenneth Langone, conveniently enclosing our October 8, 2002 2-page covermemo to The New York Times Editorial Board, our four-page proposal for coverage "The Real Eliot Spitzer - NOT the P.R. Version", and other substantiating documents. This letter to Mr. Langone is the first posted under the heading "Searching for Champions" on our "Elections 2006: Informing the Voters" page. By the way, our DECISIVE October 8, 2002 memo is referred-to by the verified complaint of our lawsuit against The Times (at paras. 51 and 111).

Please don't hesitate to call. I would be pleased to assist you -- including with "hard copies" of all posted documents.

<1-18-06-langone-with-encl.pdf>

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

\*\*\*\*\*  
Mark Mitchell wrote on 8/22/2006, 10:21 AM:

Dear Ms. Sassower,

While I would certainly be interested in seeing any evidence that the New York Times has fraudulently covered up the misdeeds of Elliot Spitzer, I am not finding it in your press release or on your Web site. To be perfectly honest, after reading your press release, I cannot quite tell what it is you are alleging. Perhaps you could summarize your allegations and evidence in a few short lines.

Thanks very much.

Mark Mitchell  
Asst. Managing Editor  
CJR Daily

On Aug 22, 2006, at 9:32 AM, Ctr for Judicial Accountability wrote:

TO: COLUMBIA JOURNALISM REVIEW DAILY  
COLUMBIA JOURNALISM REVIEW  
"America's Premier Media Monitor"

IF the "gatekeepers" are gone, why has there been NO report of this first ever public interest lawsuit against The New York Times for journalistic fraud?

This is an election year and the lawsuit chronicles The Times' election-rigging for Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton & NY Attorney General Eliot Spitzer, engineering their anticipated landslide victories.

Attached is the Center for Judicial Accountability's third press release about the lawsuit – as well as the two that preceded it – also posted on our website, [www.judgwatch.org](http://www.judgwatch.org), accessible via the sidebar panel "Suing The New York Times".

Are the "gatekeepers" gone? Let this be an empirical test:

TESTING,  
TESTING,  
ONE  
<press-release-3.pdf>

TWO  
<press-release-1.pdf>

THREE:  
<press-release-2.pdf>

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

## CENTER for JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC. \*

Post Office Box 8220  
White Plains, New York 10602

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

E-Mail: [judgewatch@aol.com](mailto:judgewatch@aol.com)  
Website: [www.judgewatch.org](http://www.judgewatch.org)

DATE: August 25, 2006

TO: NEW YORK MEDIA: EDITORIAL BOARDS & NEWS DEPARTMENTS

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

RE: **YOUR UPCOMING EDITORIAL ENDORSEMENTS AND ONGOING ELECTION COVERAGE:** The Races for New York Governor, U.S. Senator from New York, and New York Attorney General

This is to bring to your attention – to aid you in both your upcoming editorial endorsements and ongoing election reporting – primary source documentary evidence establishing the unfitness of the Democratic and Republican candidates for Governor, Senator, and Attorney General. Such evidence is posted on the Center for Judicial Accountability's website, [www.judgewatch.org](http://www.judgewatch.org), accessible via the sidebar panel "Elections 2006: Informing the Voters".

Scroll down the "Elections 2006" webpage to the section entitled "Searching for Champions", posting our correspondence to all Democratic and Republican candidates for Governor: Tom Suozzi and John Faso, for U.S. Senate: Jonathan Tasini, John Spencer, and Kathleen Troia McFarland, and for Attorney General: Andrew Cuomo, Mark Green, Charlie King, Sean Patrick Murphy, and Jeanine Pirro – except for Attorney General Eliot Spitzer and Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, whose corruption in office the correspondence summarizes.

With respect to Attorney General Spitzer, elected in 1998 on a pledge that he was going to clean up government and establish a "public integrity unit", our correspondence summarizes that his "public integrity unit" was a hoax – and that Mr. Spitzer refused to investigate and root out systemic governmental corruption involving a pattern and practice of litigation fraud engaged in by his predecessor Attorneys General in defending state judges and the Commission on Judicial Conduct, sued for corruption – for which they were rewarded with fraudulent judicial decisions. Instead, he engaged in the same litigation fraud to defend the Commission when we sued it for corruption – for which state judges, at every level, rewarded him with fraudulent judicial decisions. In so doing, Attorney General Spitzer not only perpetuated a documentably corrupted Commission on Judicial Conduct, leaving the People of the State of New York defenseless against the most flagrant lawlessness by state judges – including those who "threw" the lawsuit – but perpetuated the corruption of the state judicial appointments process, including "merit selection" to the New York Court of Appeals, which the lawsuit encompassed.

---

\* The Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) is a national, non-partisan, non-profit citizens' organization, based in New York, working, since 1989, to ensure that the processes of judicial selection and discipline are effective and meaningful.

With respect to Senator Clinton, she not only covered up – and thereby perpetuated – the systemic governmental corruption challenged and chronicled by the documentary record of our lawsuit against the Commission, but, additionally, the corruption of federal judicial selection and discipline. To accomplish this and effectuate a behind-the-scenes political deal seating a corrupt New York Court of Appeals judge on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, she maliciously set in motion and complicitly acquiesced in my wrongful arrest, prosecution, conviction, and six-month incarceration on a bogus “disruption of Congress” charge. My “crime”? At the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee’s public hearing to confirm the judge, I respectfully requested to testify in opposition based on his on-the-bench corruption, as established by the record of our lawsuit against the Commission – a record Senator Clinton was duty-bound to have examined, making findings of fact and conclusions of law.

All the summaries presented by our posted correspondence identify the substantiating primary source documentary evidence – and where it is posted on our website. You can thereby *readily verify* its serious and substantial nature, warranting criminal investigation and prosecution of Attorney General Spitzer and Senator Clinton for corruption.

In presenting this to the other Democratic and Republican candidates, as would-be champions of the public, we requested that they use the opportunity of their candidacy to expose the corruption of these incumbents for the benefit of all New Yorkers. That they did not do so – indeed, that they did not even favor our request for a meeting so that we could answer their questions and provide them with hard copies of the website-posted evidence – preferring instead to mount candidacies made futile by the landslide leads enjoyed by Attorney General Spitzer and Senator Clinton and, in the case of the candidates endeavoring to succeed Mr. Spitzer as Attorney General, extolling him and seeking the mantle of his “greatness” – can only be explained one way. Notwithstanding their posturing and rhetoric about being reformers who are going to “fix Albany” and make government work, they will NOT touch the vested political interests and their friends and patrons involved in the systemic governmental corruption that reaches into and pollutes the judiciary. Such will remain unchanged upon their election – subjecting countless innocent New Yorkers and our state at large to continuing injustice and irreparable injury.

Only the media can make the difference.

We offer you our fullest assistance so that you can discharge your First Amendment responsibilities to the voters by reporting on this powerful election-altering evidence – rather than on polls, financial war chests, political endorsements, and handicapping that have become the standard fare of political reporting, contributing to the demise of competitive elections.

Elena Ruiz  
Xavier