

**Subject: Re: Have you decided NOT to write about "...what else has the Times lied about?" -- & if so, WHY?**

**Date:** 8/23/2006, 10:06 AM

**From:** Captain Ed <captain@captainsquartersblog.com>

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

No -- I lost your e-mail in my laptop meltdown! (I have notoriously bad luck with e-mail ... ) Thanks for the follow-up. Can we do something tomorrow evening?  
Cheers!

Edward Morrissey  
Captain's Quarters

*Thus every blogger, in his kind,  
Is bit by him who comes behind ...*

Ctr for Judicial Accountability wrote:

**TO:** Edward Morrissey -- Captain's Quarters *"Thus every blogger, in his kind, is bit by him who comes behind..."*

As your August 15th e-mail to me said that you would be calling "later today" because you would "love to interview [me]", I was disappointed not to have heard from you further.

Have you decided NOT to write about "...what else has the Times lied about?" -- and if so, WHY?

Your today's blog, Wanted: Conservative Blogger Liaison, states "Bloggers have to write quickly and effectively about breaking news stories". Enclosed is a copy of what is now being sent out to bloggers and journalists as an "empirical test".

\* \* \* \* \*

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 in November.

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.judgewatch.org, accessible via the sidebar panel "Suing The New York Times".

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

TESTING,  
TESTING,  
ONE:

---