

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2025 6:11 PM
To: 'aperlman@uci.edu'
Cc: 'viewermail@newshour.org'; 'GR@heritage.org'; 'info@heritage.org';
'managingeditor@heritage.org'; 'mrc@mediaresearch.org';
'pfrid@nhpbs.org'; 'ddeangelis@nhpbs.org'; 'themailbox@nhpbs.org';
'Melanie.Plenda@collaborativenh.org'; 'publiceditor@pbs.org';
'PBSCorporateSecretary@pbs.org'; 'viewer@pbs.org'; 'mail@itif.org';
'catherine.robb@haynesboone.com'; 'josh7759@colorado.edu';
'victor.pickard@asc.upenn.edu'
Subject: **Your Co-Update to the "official history of public broadcasting...for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting" -- Fact-Checking the PBS News Hour & More**
Attachments: [cja-2-18-25-ltr-to-greene-carr.pdf](#)

TO: [Associate Professor Allison Perlman/University of California-Irvine](#)

In the March 25th PBS News Hour segment "[A look at the history of public media in the U.S. as Republicans target federal funding](#)", you appear in three short clips. Narrator William Brangham does not identify you, but your name is projected in the first clip as "ALLISON PERLMAN, University of California, Irvine". No mention that since 2018 you have been "under contract to co-update the official history of public broadcasting ... for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) and Current".

In the second clip, you refer to "six decades now of threats to public media funding, often for political reasons", implying that the objections to public media funding were not legitimate. You then further diminish their legitimacy in the third clip by stating:

"In the 1990's, what we see are social conservatives who have anxiety about the political direction of some television programming joining forces with economic conservatives who think that the transformations in the media landscape that had taken place from 1967 to the present no longer required federal support. This mix of an economic rationale with a cultural rationale to try to dismantle federal support for public media continues throughout the successive decades." (underlying added).

Did you mean to imply that "social conservatives" had and have only "anxiety", *without* basis in fact? Likewise that "economic conservatives" were and are *without* legitimate, reality-based arguments? How does the "official history of public broadcasting", [first published in 1987 and then updated in 2000](#), address conservative objections and how will your update, scheduled to be published next year, address them? And what about complaints of public

media's leftist bias and false propagandizing from sources other than conservative or Republican ones, as for example, CAMERA (Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting and Analysis)?

Surely integral to any "official history" would be the history of congressional oversight concerning these objections and complaints. In the many decades since Fred Rogers' testimony, featured by the March 25th News Hour segment, how many congressional hearings were held – and were there committee reports based thereon, with deliberations thereafter by the committees, with findings of fact and conclusions of law and appropriate legislation then introduced, deliberated, and enacted – or not? What will your projected 2026 update be adding, in addition to the May 8, 2024 committee hearing "[Examining Accusations of Ideological Bias at NPR, a Taxpayer Funded News Entity](#)" and the March 26, 2025 committee hearing "[Anti-American Airwaves: Holding the Heads of NPR and PBS Accountable](#)". Did you and your co-updater, [University of Colorado-Boulder Associate Professor Josh Shepperd](#), not have any questions for me with respect to those two hearings – and about CPB – based on the [May 5th e-mail I sent you both](#), and then sent again, on [May 14th](#)? What is your answer to the questions those e-mails asked:

"What does the 'official history of public broadcasting' have to say about the establishment and functioning of the NPR and PBS public editors – and about the CPB's Inspector General? Assuredly, such 'update' as you have with respect to these vital safeguards will have to be revised, dramatically..."

So that your "update" can additionally include – *as it must* – what has since unfolded with respect to my above-attached February 18th letter to House DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Green and FCC Chair Brendan Carr, accessible from the Center for Judicial Accountability's menu webpage "[Defunding NPR, PBS – & the CPB's Inspector General, for starters](#)", below is my June 8th e-mail to the PBS News Hour pertaining to its violation of the express requirement of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 ([47 U.S.C. §396\(g\)\(1\)\(A\)](#)) for "strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs or series of programs of a controversial nature", an example of which is its deceptive March 25th segment. Also, here's my fairly comparable [e-mail of today's date to University of Pennsylvania Professor Victor Pickard](#), the second scholar who the New Hour chose to feature in the March 25th segment, notwithstanding his views are ostensibly the same views as yours.

Finally, with respect to the first clip of you, where you state,

"The vision of public broadcasting was that it was a decentralized network of local stations, and local stations themselves should really be at the heart of what public media is about" (underlining added),

the "*knowingly* false, corruption-abetting, election-rigging" conduct of New York's "decentralized network of local stations", spanning decades and ongoing, abetted by the national NPR and PBS public editors, presidents, boards of directors, counsels and, thereafter, by the CPB's Inspector

General, featured by my [February 18th letter](#) and, [since May 2nd](#), by the CPB's vice-president/general counsel, commissioners, and president, is a PERFECT case study of systemic corruption and collapse – now replicated by what the below June 6th e-mail chronicles with respect to the New Hampshire PBS and NPR “local stations”.

Kindly acknowledge your receipt of this e-mail and indicate when I can expect your substantives responses. I am available to answer questions.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Friday, June 6, 2025 3:30 PM
To: 'viewer@mail.newshour.org' <viewer@mail.newshour.org>
Cc: 'GR@heritage.org' <GR@heritage.org>; 'info@heritage.org' <info@heritage.org>; 'managingeditor@heritage.org' <managingeditor@heritage.org>; 'mrc@mediaresearch.org' <mrc@mediaresearch.org>; 'pfrid@nhpbs.org' <pfrid@nhpbs.org>; 'ddeangelis@nhpbs.org' <ddeangelis@nhpbs.org>; 'themailbox@nhpbs.org' <themailbox@nhpbs.org>; 'Melanie.Plenda@collaborativenh.org' <Melanie.Plenda@collaborativenh.org>; 'publiceditor@pbs.org' <publiceditor@pbs.org>; 'PBSCorporateSecretary@pbs.org' <PBSCorporateSecretary@pbs.org>; 'viewer@pbs.org' <viewer@pbs.org>; 'mail@itif.org' <mail@itif.org>; 'catherine.robb@haynesboone.com' <catherine.robb@haynesboone.com>

Subject: FACT-CHECKING THE PBS NEWS HOUR (1) your referred-to "independent analyses" that PBS/ NPR journalism is "objective and reliable" & not "leftist news"; (2) the scholars & experts you have interviewed opposing federally-funded public media

TO: [PBS News Hour](#)

I am director and co-founder of the nonpartisan, nonprofit citizens' organization [Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. \(CJA\)](#) and since February 18th, when I sent the above-attached letter to House DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene and Federal Communications Commission Chair Brendan Carr entitled “Defunding NPR, PBS – & Firing the CPB’s Inspector General, for starters”, have been a behind-the-scenes participant in what has been unfolding.

The [February 18th letter](#) chronicles “knowingly false, corruption-abetting, election-rigging journalism” by NPR and PBS local New York member stations – the subject of fully-documented complaints to the NPR and PBS national entities, ignored, without response, by their public editors, presidents, boards of directors, and counsel and which the Corporation for Public Broadcasting’s Inspector General thereafter also ignored, without response. The letter is explosive for that reason, but also because it identifies that

NPR's and PBS' "knowingly false, corruption-abetting, election-rigging" New York "local journalism" is NOT unique to them, but is how the gamut of New York's "local journalism" operates, from The New York Times on down. This includes – and the letter highlights – rigging the 2018 election and 2022 re-election of Letitia James as New York attorney general and the 2021 election of Alvin Bragg as Manhattan district attorney, so as to enable these two corrupt posturers to invidiously and selectively prosecute Mr. Trump on rhetoric that "no one is above the law". The letter also links to, and quotes from, my outreach to then former President Trump, by a [June 4, 2021 webpage message](#) and an [April 3, 2023 webpage message](#) – including about CJA's lawsuits [suing the New York Times](#) and [suing Gannett](#), aimed at securing media accountability, "'thrown' at trial and appellate levels by fraudulent judicial decisions of NY's state courts because there was NO legitimate defense to either lawsuit."

Prior to the March 26th House DOGE Subcommittee hearing "[Anti-American Airwaves: Holding the Heads of NPR and PBS Accountable](#)", I furnished the February 18th letter to a large swath of press, including the very journalists who would thereafter report on the hearing and conceal it, totally. This has continued to date – and CJA's website, www.judgewatch.org, posts everything, accessible from a menu webpage, [here](#). It starts with the span of my e-mails transmitting the February 18th letter to Subcommittee Chair Greene, c/o the majority office of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to FCC Chair Carr, to DOGE Subcommittee Ranking Member Melanie Stansbury, to Rank-and-File Member Brandon Gill, and to NPR and PBS. After the hearing, it continues with my [March 28th e-mail to Subcommittee Ranking Member Stansbury](#), inquiring about her absence from the March 26th hearing, and my [March 31st e-mail to Congressman Gill](#) entitled "Questions about & for the Record of the March 26th DOGE Subcommittee Hearing..."

On March 25th – the day before the House DOGE Subcommittee hearing -- the News Hour ran a segment entitled "[A look at the history of public media in the U.S. as Republicans target federal funding](#)" which additionally identified itself as "In Context: Public Media". Narrated by William Brangham, it showed a video clip of Senator John Kennedy's February 18th remarks on the Senate floor that "Government doesn't need to subsidize the media anymore because the world's changed. But I still probably wouldn't object that much if the reporting of these entities was fair and was balanced. But it is not." To this, Mr. Brangham responded:

"We should note here, **independent analyses** have found both PBS and NPR to be among the most objective and reliable news sources in America." (at 5 mins. 46 seconds, bold added).

Mr. Brangham did not identify the "independent analyses" to which he was referring. Instead the following appeared on the screen, getting larger as it moved closer to viewers:

"PBS NPR --
Among least biased
Knight Foundation/Gallup (2018)

PBS 3rd most trusted
YouGov (2024)".

I have googled these – and they are, respectively, "[Perceived Accuracy and Bias in the News Media](#)" and "[Trust in Media 2024: Which news sources Americans trust – and which they think lean left or right](#)", both

surveys about perceptions that do not examine whether the perceptions are true. As such, they do not establish that PBS and NPR are “among the most objective and reliable news sources in America”.

The News Hour engaged in similar sleight of hand in its April 16th segment "[A look at the Trump administration's efforts to slash public media funding](#)". Following a video clip of Office of Management and Budget Director Russell Vought stating “You have the \$1 billion for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which is predominantly the NPR and PBS, which is giving us leftist news for decades and cultural indoctrination for the last four or five years”, Mr. Brangham responded:

“We should note, PBS and NPR have consistently been rated some of the most trustworthy and reliable news sources in America. I mean, that is from surveys of public opinion, as well as **independent analyses** of media bias. And also polls have showed that the audience of public media in America does cover the full political spectrum of this country.” (at 4 mins. 55 seconds, bold added)

This time, however, no attributions appeared on the screen.

Please, therefore, furnish the “independent analyses” to which Mr. Brangham twice referred as showing that PBS and NPR are – *in fact, not* perception – “some of the most trustworthy and reliable news sources in America” and not biased toward “leftist news...and cultural indoctrination”. Who are the scholars and experts who produced these “independent analyses”, what specifically were they examining, and with what methodology? Have they been guests on the News Hour – and if so, when?

As for Amna Nawaz’s response in the April 16th segment, immediately after Mr. Brangham’s, that:

“Also worth noting, for example, on this program, we regularly invite and host conservative and Republican voices” (at 5 minutes, 15 seconds),

this is false, insofar as it suggests balance with liberal/progressive/Democratic voices. Indeed reflecting this, dramatically, is the News Hour’s March 26th segment "[NPR and PBS heads face sharp questioning about federal funding during House hearing](#)". Of the four witnesses testifying at the hearing, the News Hour omitted the SOLE witness against federally-funded public media, Heritage Foundation Senior Fellow Michael Gonzalez, whose [written testimony](#) had highlighted the scholarly research of Tim Graham of the Media Research Center, including about the News Hour, as follows:

“...Mr. Graham lifts the veil. He finds, for example, that the ‘PBS News Hour’ routinely books many more liberals than conservatives. Over a four-month period from November 2022 to February 2023, MRC found that liberal-Democratic guests outnumbered conservative-Republican guests 3.7 to 1. When elected officials and political appointees were removed from the guest count, the disparity was even more striking, becoming 5.7-to-1.^{fn14}

Mr. Graham’s MRC analysts examined weeknight editions of the ‘NewsHour’ from January 3 through May 2, 2023, and found that, by a five-to-one margin, NewsHour promoted controversies involving congressional Republicans over those involving Democrats. Congressional Republicans faced 85% negative coverage, compared to 54% positive coverage of congressional Democrats, the analysis showed. NewsHour correspondents branded Republicans as extremists (‘far right,’ ‘hard right,’ etc.) 20 times during this period. How many times were left-wing Democrats so identified?

None.^{fn15} Lastly, NewsHour promoted controversies involving congressional Republicans over those involving Democrats by a five-to-one margin. ..." (at p. 6).

The News Hour then compounded this excision of Mr. Gonzalez from its March 26th segment on the DOGE Subcommittee hearing by what it did the next day in its News Hour "On Democracy" series "where we hear a range of perspectives on how government should function, what led to this moment in American history and where the country goes next". In a segment entitled "[*Angelo Carusone on tracking Project 2025 and right-wing media*](#)", Geoff Bennett concealed that the Project 2025 chapter on federal defunding of public media had been authored by Mr. Gonzalez and, identifying Media Matters for America as "a progressive nonprofit focused on researching and analyzing news media, including disinformation and online ecosystems", interviewed its president. **Why was Mr. Gonzalez not invited to participate – or Mr. Graham from the conservative Media Research Center – in keeping with your "range of perspectives" mantra and Ms. Nawaz's claim 3 weeks later that "we regularly invite and host conservative and Republican voices"? Was there a separate "On Democracy" News Hour segment "on tracking...[left]-wing media? And who were the experts you interviewed for it, if not Messrs. Gonzalez and Graham?**

The Media Research Center critiqued this March 27th News Hour segment by a March 30th podcast/article entitled "[*After Devastating DOGE Hearing, Pathetic PBS Claims the RIGHT Has 'Narrative Dominance'*](#)", which opened:

"If PBS felt any concern about the hit its reputation for balance took at Wednesday's devastating [DOGE hearing](#) on Capitol Hill, Thursday's [PBS News Hour](#) didn't show it.

On the day after its CEO Paula Kerger testified to Congress that they were fair and balanced, PBS turned to the leftist group Media Matters for America. **The *News Hour* has never invited the Media Research Center for an interview about the state of the media since the MRC was founded in 1987.**

How leftist is PBS? In the face of overwhelming evidence of its leftist political agenda, PBS shamelessly turned to another discredited leftist organization as it claims to be unbiased. After Donald Trump won a second term, this show created a series titled 'On Democracy,' as if Trump's election wasn't very democratic. This latest episode suggested the Heritage Foundation's manual recommendations Project 2025 was a threat to democracy. Why? Heritage scholar Mike Gonzalez, who testified in the DOGE hearing, wrote the Project 2025 chapter on why [PBS and NPR should be defunded](#). PBS associates *itself* with democracy." (hyperlinking and italics in the original article, bold added).

Is it true that "The *News Hour* has never invited the Media Research Center for an interview about the state of the media since MRC was founded in 1987"? How do you explain this? Who then are the scholars and experts opposing federally-funded public media that the News Hour has interviewed. Please advise – and also furnish same to Messrs. Graham and Gonzalez, herein cc'd, *via* their respective affiliations, the Media Research Center and Heritage Foundation.

Meantime, below is my June 4th e-mail to New Hampshire PBS entitled "Defunding NPR & PBS is NOT a partisan issue, it's a corruption issue -- & New Hampshire's congressional delegation has the evidence", to which I have received no response. Consistent with your website assertion that "Millions of Americans turn to PBS for the solid, reliable reporting that has made PBS News Hour one of the most

trusted news programs in television”, how about some PBS News Hour reporting on the June 4th e-mail and its transmitted June 2nd e-mail to New Hampshire’s congressional delegation entitled “Corruption at NPR, PBS, and CPB, mandating congressional investigation & NO funding until ‘heads roll’ & safeguards are restored -- & the left-wing bias & hypocrisy of NHPR journalism”? Otherwise, please forward to [PBS’ Frontline](#) so that this explosive story can get the full-scale investigative reporting it deserves.

I look forward to your responses and am available to answer questions.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 4, 2025 8:07 AM
To: 'pfrid@nhpbs.org' <pfrid@nhpbs.org>; 'ddeangelis@nhpbs.org' <ddeangelis@nhpbs.org>;
'themailbox@nhpbs.org' <themailbox@nhpbs.org>; 'Melanie.Plenda@collaborativenh.org'
<Melanie.Plenda@collaborativenh.org>

Subject: Defunding NPR & PBS is NOT a partisan issue, it's a corruption issue -- & New Hampshire's congressional delegation has the evidence

TO: [New Hampshire PBS](#)

President/CEO Peter A. Frid

Vice President/Chief Content Officer Dawn DeAngelis

***The State We're In* Host/Granite State News Collaborative Director Melanie Plenda**

Apart from the [PBS News Hour](#), has there been any local journalism by [New Hampshire PBS](#) on the question of defunding NPR and PBS? I assume this would have been by [The State We're In](#), but I have not found any episode on it.

Please advise – and deem my below June 2nd e-mail to New Hampshire’s congressional delegation, alerting it, with evidence, that defunding NPR and PBS is NOT a partisan issue, but a corruption issue, a proposal for your investigative journalism.

I am available to answer questions.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org

914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 3:06 PM
To: 'riley_burke@shaheen.senate.gov' <riley_burke@shaheen.senate.gov>;
'Tanner_bielefeld_pruitt@hassan.senate.gov' <Tanner_bielefeld_pruitt@hassan.senate.gov>;
'info.pappas@mail.house.gov' <info.pappas@mail.house.gov>; 'dawn.pollinger@mail.house.gov' <dawn.pollinger@mail.house.gov>
Cc: 'civics101@nhpr.org' <civics101@nhpr.org>; 'jrogers@nhpr.org' <jrogers@nhpr.org>;
'dbarrick@nhpr.org' <dbarrick@nhpr.org>; 'President@nhpr.org' <President@nhpr.org>;
'editor@thedartmouth.com' <editor@thedartmouth.com>; 'publisher@thedartmouth.com' <publisher@thedartmouth.com>;
'John.M.Carey@dartmouth.edu' <John.M.Carey@dartmouth.edu>;
'info@brightlinewatch.org' <info@brightlinewatch.org>; 'Sean.J.Westwood@dartmouth.edu' <Sean.J.Westwood@dartmouth.edu>;
'publisher@thedartmouth.com' <publisher@thedartmouth.com>;
'Prescott.J.Herzog.25@dartmouth.edu' <prescott.j.herzog.25@dartmouth.edu>;
'eschickler@berkeley.edu' <eschickler@berkeley.edu>;
'pierson@berkeley.edu' <pierson@berkeley.edu>; 'kriner@cornell.edu' <kriner@cornell.edu>

Subject: Corruption at NPR, PBS, and CPB, mandating congressional investigation & NO funding until "heads roll" & safeguards are restored -- & the left-wing bias & hypocrisy of NHPR journalism

TO: New Hampshire's Congressional Delegation –
[Senator Jeanne Shaheen](#) (D)
[Senator Maggie Hassan, ESQ.](#) (D)
[Representative Chris Pappas](#) (D)
[Representative Maggie Goodlander, ESQ.](#) (D)

I am director and co-founder of the nonpartisan, nonprofit citizen' organization [Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. \(CJA\)](#), seeking to assist New Hampshire Public Radio (NHPR) and Dartmouth College by your answers to two questions germane to a proposal I made to them for investigative reporting and scholarship. This is what I stated in telephoning your offices late in the day on Friday, asking them (1) what your positions are with respect to defunding NPR and PBS; and (2) whether you were aware of my above-attached February 18th letter to House DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene and FCC Chair Brendan Carr entitled "Defunding NPR, PBS -- & Firing the CPB's Inspector General, for starters".

My call to [Senator Shaheen's office](#) was picked up by Special Policy and Projects Assistant Riley Burke, who knew the answer to my first question and gave me a diplomatic response that Senator Shaheen "recognizes the need to continue to provide NPR and PBS with resources". He could not answer my question about the February 18th letter – and declined to provide me with an e-mail address to which I could send it, there being no attachment feature to the electronic message platform on the Senator's website. I obtained his e-mail from one of the district offices, which I called a short time ago.

My call to [Senator Hassan's office](#) was picked-up by Olivia, at the front desk, who stated, after putting me on hold for the answer, that Senator Hassan supports funding – and gave me the e-mail for Legislative

Correspondent/Correspondence Manager Tanner Bielefeld Pruitt, to whom I could send the February 18th letter.

My call to [Representative Pappas' office](#) was picked up by Legislative Correspondent Samantha Golden, who, after putting me on hold for the answer, stated that Representative Pappas had just held a town hall meeting expressing his support for NPR and PBS funding. She instructed me on how to find it, which [I have found](#) (at 8:48 mins) – and furnished me with an e-mail address to send the February 18th letter.

My call to [Representative Goodlander's office](#) was picked up by Constituent Service Director Dawn Pollinger, who stated she would obtain for me the requested information and gave me her e-mail address to send the February 18th letter. Shortly before sending this e-mail, I called the Washington office and Will, an intern, picked up the call and, upon recounting my conversation with Ms. Pollinger, stated he could answer my first question: Representative Goodlander “opposes cuts to NPR and PBS, as she is a frequent listener and understands their vital role”.

Except for front-desk Olivia in Senator Hassan's office, I guided your staff onto CJA's homepage, www.judgewatch.org, whose prominent center link “Defunding NPR, PBS – & Firing the CPB's Inspector General, for starters” enabled them to access a [menu page for the February 18th letter](#) and its “paper trail” of my correspondence to date. I pointed out my [March 25th e-mail to House DOGE Subcommittee Ranking Member Melanie Stansberry](#), a Democrat, like yourselves. It asked:

“Are you aware of my above-attached February 18th letter to DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene entitled ‘Defunding NPR, PBS – & Firing the CPB's Inspector General, for starters’? I sent it three times to the e-mail address of the majority office of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, without response. As I am unable to reach Chair Greene's D.C. or Georgia offices by phone or e-mail, can you confirm that my three e-mails were forwarded to her by the majority office? And was my February 18th letter furnished to you and to the 12 rank-and-file members of the DOGE Subcommittee? How about to the PBS and NPR presidents and public editors and to the CPB Inspector General, for their written responses. Was it forwarded to U.S. Attorney Pam Bondi, as requested? Will the DOGE Subcommittee be questioning the PBS and NPR presidents about the letter at tomorrow's hearing – and will it be included in the written record of the hearing, as requested? Please advise – and, if my February 18th letter was not previously furnished to ALL DOGE Subcommittee members, please now forward it, with this e-mail. Below is the “NEWS TIP – ALERT” I have been sending to the press today, raising the above questions.”

As I explained to them, I received NO response from DOGE Subcommittee Ranking Member Stansbury, who, *without explanation*, was absent from the next day's hearing [“Anti-American Airwaves: Holding the heads of NPR and PBS Accountable”](#), at which NO mention was made of the letter, including by Republican DOGE Subcommittee Member Brandon Gill, to whom I had also furnished it, also by a [March 25th e-mail](#), to further ensure that it was distributed to “all DOGE Subcommittee members”.

In contrast to the acrimonious March 26th hearing, sharply divided along Republican and Democratic party lines, my [February 18th letter](#) has nothing to do with partisanship or ideology. It is about corruption at NPR, PBS, and CPB.

Were you aware of the February 18th letter – and now that you are, what is your view of it? Do you not agree that it mandates congressional investigation, *pronto* – with NO federal funding to NPR, PBS, and CPB until “heads roll” and safeguards are restored? Do you have any doubt that this would be the view of your New Hampshire constituents, *if they knew about the letter*? What steps will you take, consistent therewith?

Also, is it not concerning to you that NHPR – a recipient of federal funding – has known of the [letter and its “paper trail” odyssey](#) since [May 25th, when I sent a first e-mail to its Civics 101 podcasting team, its senior political reporter/editor, its news director, and its president/CEO](#), with subsequent e-mails to all of them on [May 26th](#), [May 29th](#), and then again on May 29th by the below, but NHPR has not contacted me for further information or reported anything. How does this accord with NHPR’s posted [Code of Ethics](#) about “fair, independent, accurate, complete and honest” news reporting and its May 2nd message “[The Independence of Public Media Cannot Be Compromised](#)” from its President/CEO Jim Schachter, about reporting “in the public interest, holding the powerful to account without fear or favor.”

Based thereon and the profusion of assertions by the NHPR Civics 101 podcasters about their integrity and their unbiased, reliable, truth-telling journalism – including at Dartmouth’s May 20th forum “[Effective Journalism in a Polarized World](#)” – wouldn’t your New Hampshire constituents reasonably expect NHPR to be reporting on [the February 18th letter and its cover-up](#), assisted by experts and scholars, such as from Dartmouth? What an outrage to see what NHPR has chosen instead, such as its misleading, money-focused, left-tilted, and hypocritical May 28th “[Refresher Course: What can be done about corruption in politics?](#)” – part of its “*Every other Tuesday*” series when “*the team behind [Civics 101](#) joins NHPR’s All Things Considered to talk about how our democratic institutions actually work.*”

By the way, do you have any content analysis of NHPR journalism, whose left-wing bias is readily discerned – or have you not asked your constituents about this?

I am available to answer questions and look forward to your responses – and to responses from the recipients of my below May 29th e-mail, NHPR and Dartmouth professors among them, herein cc’d.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2025 1:06 PM
To: 'eschickler@berkeley.edu' <eschickler@berkeley.edu>
Cc: 'pierson@berkeley.edu' <pierson@berkeley.edu>; 'kriner@cornell.edu' <kriner@cornell.edu>; 'civics101@nhpr.org' <civics101@nhpr.org>; 'jrogers@nhpr.org' <jrogers@nhpr.org>; 'dbarrick@nhpr.org' <dbarrick@nhpr.org>; 'President@nhpr.org' <President@nhpr.org>;

'editor@thedartmouth.com' <editor@thedartmouth.com>; 'publisher@thedartmouth.com' <publisher@thedartmouth.com>; 'Prescott.J.Herzog.25@dartmouth.edu' <prescott.j.herzog.25@dartmouth.edu>; 'John.M.Carey@dartmouth.edu' <John.M.Carey@dartmouth.edu>; 'info@brightlinewatch.org' <info@brightlinewatch.org>; 'Sean.J.Westwood@dartmouth.edu' <Sean.J.Westwood@dartmouth.edu>

Subject: FOR SCHOLARSHIP: Primary-source, documentary evidence about Congress, polarization, our democracy -- & the role of the press

TO: [University of California/Berkley Political Science Professor & Co-Director of its Institute of Government Studies Eric Schickler](#)

I am director and co-founder of the New York-based nonpartisan, nonprofit citizens' organization [Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. \(CJA\)](#) – and learned of you from the video of [Dartmouth College's May 20th program "Effective Journalism in a Polarized World"](#) wherein, in responding to a question about President Trump's May 1st executive order to CPB to cease federal funding to NPR and PBS, New Hampshire Public Radio Civics 101 podcaster Nick Capodice mentioned the interview you gave for its [May 13th Civics 101 podcast "How can Congress check the president?"](#).

In the podcast, you described the collapse of Congress' checks on presidential power arising from elevation of party loyalties and that the public has a role as a check upon Congress. As you made no mention of the press' role on which our Constitution rests – or perhaps it was edited out, or implied to be consistent with its responsibilities under the Constitution's First Amendment – I wish to bring to your attention the press' deleterious, Constitution-destroying hand in propagating polarizing party narratives, to the exclusion of all else, preventing the public from being able to exert its checking power on elected members of Congress who have betrayed their duties, and not only with respect to the president. Exemplifying this is the press' concealment of ALL report of the corruption of NPR, PBS and the CPB furnished by my above-attached February 18th letter to House DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene and FCC Chair Brendan Carr – corruption which is ideologically-neutral and whose report would unite, not polarize, the public and galvanize it to action – and whose explosive odyssey, to date, accessible from [CJA's menu webpage for the February 18th letter](#), is also unreported, completely.

This primary-source, documentary evidence, germane to your scholarship about Congress, polarization, and democracy, is illustrative of a mountain more, spanning back nearly 34 years to my [November 20, 1991 letter to then Senate Judiciary Committee Chair Joseph Biden](#), posted on CJA's website. Over and again, this evidence chronicles how Democrats and Republicans, in both houses, from the leaders on down, rather than checking each other, colluded in corrupting their offices, aided and abetted by the press, whose reporting and editorializing *knowingly* concealed what was going on, behind-the-scenes, starting with the collusion of members of both parties in corrupting [federal judicial selection](#) and [federal judicial discipline](#), which is Congress' duty to safeguard.

By the way, **apart from [last year's May 8th hearing "Examining Accusations of Ideological Bias at NPR, a Taxpayer Funded News Entity"](#) and [this year's March 26th hearing "Anti-American Airwaves: Holding the Heads of NPR and PBS Accountable"](#)**, are you aware of other congressional oversight hearings of NPR, PBS, and of CPB held over these past many decades? And who are the scholars who have examined such seemingly negligible congressional oversight, including – if any – committee reports with findings of fact and conclusions of law based on evidence from the hearings and record submissions? On that subject, below is my self-explanatory March 31st e-mail pertaining to the March

26th hearing, to which I have received no response, and here's my [April 3rd e-mail](#) about last year's May 8th hearing, to which I have also received no response.

I look forward to discussing this with you – and with the cc's herein, *to wit*, two of your academic collaborators, [Berkeley University Political Science Professor Paul Pierson](#) and [Cornell University Government Professor Douglas Kriner](#), the Civics 101 podcasters, New Hampshire Public Radio, and Dartmouth College, including its [Government Professor John Carey](#), who is also co-director/co-founder of [Bright Line Watch](#), and [Associate Government Professor Sean Westwood](#), who moderated the “*Effective Journalism in a Polarized World*” program.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2025 8:31 AM
To: 'gill@mail.house.gov' <gill@mail.house.gov>

Subject: Questions about & for the Record of the March 26th DOGE Subcommittee Hearing "Anti-American Airwaves: Holding the Heads of NPR and PBS Accountable"

TO: [House DOGE Subcommittee Rank-and-File Member Brandon Gill](#)

At last week's [March 26th DOGE Subcommittee hearing "Anti-American Airwaves: Holding the Heads of NPR and PBS Accountable"](#), Subcommittee Chair Greene did not reveal that Ranking Member Stansbury was absent – and neither you nor anyone else at the hearing made any mention of my above-attached February 18th letter “Defunding NPR, PBS – & Firing the CPB’s Inspector General, for starters”. The letter, which by the below March 25th e-mails I sent first to Ranking Member Stansbury and then to you, requested that each of you ensure that it was furnished to all Subcommittee members – and I followed this with two further e-mails to you confirming my transmittal of the letter to NPR Presidents Maher and Kerger so that they would be ready for questioning about it at the hearing, [here](#) and [here](#).

Please advise:

- whether, as my March 25th e-mail to you requested, you forwarded my [February 18th letter](#) to “all DOGE Subcommittee members”;
- whether the “flash drive containing six feet worth of documents documenting NPR and PBS’ political bias” that, at the hearing, you asked to “submit to the record” “with unanimous consent” and that Chair Greene “without objection, so-ordered” (at 2hrs/25

mins), included my February 18th letter, which I had repeatedly requested be made part of the record;

- whether, in response to Chair Greene's concluding announcement that "all members have five legislative days within which to submit materials and additional written questions for witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses" (at 2 hrs/40 mins), you will be explicitly requesting responses from Presidents Maher and Kerger to my February 18th letter – and submitting the letter for the record, if you have not already done so.

Suffice to add that Presidents Maher and Kerger, both by their oral testimony and written statements, [here](#) and [here](#), made no mention of their respective NPR and PBS public editors, whose importance my February 18th letter highlights – and this is additionally telling as the [written statement](#) that President Maher submitted for last year's [May 8, 2024 hearing "Examining Accusations of Ideological Bias at NPR"](#) of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, at which, in her absence, she sent no one in her stead, such as, most reasonably, the NPR public editor, had stated:

"NPR is one of the only journalistic institutions in the country with a Public Editor. The public editor is a source of independent accountability who serves as an advocate for NPR listeners and readers, with complete autonomy to investigate complaints, address the quality of NPR journalism, and transparently share findings with the public." (at p. 3).

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>

Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 3:35 PM

To: 'gill@mail.house.gov' <gill@mail.house.gov>

Subject: Questions about Tomorrow's DOGE Subcommittee Hearing on NPR & PBS Bias

TO: [House DOGE Subcommittee Rank-and-File Member Brandon Gill](#)

This follow my phone conversation, a short time ago, with your efficient intern Alana, to whom I summarized the below – and who jumped on the "[NEWS TIP – ALERT](#)" webpage to which I directed her.

Below is my e-mail to DOGE Subcommittee Ranking Member Stansbury that I described to her. Kindly forward it to all DOGE Subcommittee members – as, meantime, I will be e-mailing the NPR and PBS presidents, etc. my FULLY-DOCUMENTED and DISPOSITIVE [February 18th letter addressed to DOGE](#)

[Subcommittee Chair Greene](#) so that they can be prepared to answer questions about it at tomorrow's hearing. I will, thereafter, forward you the e-mails.

I am available to answer questions – no matter how late tonight or early tomorrow.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200 cell: 646-220-7987
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2025 2:44 PM
To: 'repstansburypress@mail.house.gov' <repstansburypress@mail.house.gov>

Subject: Questions about Tomorrow's DOGE Subcommittee Hearing on NPR & PBS Bias

TO: [House DOGE Subcommittee Ranking Member Melanie Stansbury](#)

Are you aware of my above-attached February 18th letter to DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene entitled “Defunding NPR, PBS – & Firing the CPB’s Inspector General, for starters”? I sent it three times to the e-mail address of the majority office of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *without response*.

As I am unable to reach [Chair Greene’s D.C. or Georgia offices by phone or e-mail](#), can you confirm that my three e-mails were forwarded to her by the majority office? And was my [February 18th letter](#) furnished to you and to the 12 rank-and-file members of the DOGE Subcommittee? How about to the PBS and NPR presidents and public editors and to the CPB Inspector General, for their written responses. Was it forwarded to U.S. Attorney Pam Bondi, as requested? Will the DOGE Subcommittee be questioning the PBS and NPR presidents about the letter at tomorrow’s hearing – and will it be included in the written record of the hearing, as requested?

Please advise – and, if my February 18th letter was not previously furnished to ALL DOGE Subcommittee members, please now forward it, with this e-mail.

Below is the “NEWS TIP – ALERT” I have been sending to the press today, raising the above questions.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

* * *

NEWS TIP -- ALERT:
Behind-the-Scenes of Tomorrow's House DOGE Subcommittee Hearing on NPR & PBS Bias

Why are the NPR and PBS presidents [the only witnesses scheduled to testify at Wednesday's DOGE Subcommittee hearing on NPR and PBS bias](#)? What about the NPR and PBS public editors, each responsible for complaints, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's Inspector General, also responsible for complaints. And what about complainants who have filed complaints with all of them?

The importance of this was the subject of my above-attached [February 18th letter](#) to DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene and FCC Chair Brendan Carr entitled "Defunding NPR, PBS – & Firing the CPB's Inspector General, for starters". It opened with these two sentences:

"I am director and co-founder of the New York-based non-partisan, non-profit citizens' organization [Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. \(CJA\)](#) and applaud your efforts to expose the truth about NPR and PBS.^{fn1} I suggest you do so by examining how they handle complaints of biased and *knowingly* false journalism – and that you also examine how the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's Inspector General handles complaints about NPR's and PBS' handling of complaints." (italics in the original).

Nine EVIDENCE-FILLED pages later– including as to the collusion of NPR, PBS, and other media in the corruption of New York state governance involving its massive, policy-filled state budget, pay raises, NY Attorney General Letitia James, and NY District Attorney Alvin Bragg – the letter concluded, stating:

"I am available to answer questions – including under oath. I would be honored to testify at such hearings as you will be holding. In any event, I ask that this statement be submitted for the record of the hearings. I affirm it all to be true, under penalties of perjury.

Kindly forward the letter to all who are committed to establishing the truth about NPR, PBS, and their collusion with other media in 'election interference' and other violations of First Amendment responsibilities. There is much defunding, firing, and prosecutions that need to take place.^{fn8}"

Three times I e-mailed the letter to the majority office of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and to FCC Chair Carr – [February 18th](#), [February 28th](#), and [March 19th](#) – *without response*. Why was that? And was the letter forwarded to DOGE Subcommittee Chair Greene and to all the Subcommittee members? Who else? Was it forwarded to U.S. Attorney General Pam Bondi, as requested? How about to the NPR and PBS presidents and public editors and to the CPB Inspector General, for their written responses. Will it be part of the record, as requested? Will it be the subject of questioning, at all, at Wednesday's hearing?

The three transmitting e-mails are also below. CJA's EVIDENTIARY webpage for the letter is [here](#).

I am available to answer your questions, no matter how early or late. Please call.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200 – cell: 646-220-7987
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Friday, March 21, 2025 5:10 PM
To: 'oversight.committee@mail.house.gov' <oversight.committee@mail.house.gov>;
'Brendan.Carr@fcc.gov' <Brendan.Carr@fcc.gov>

Subject: Feb 18, 2025 letter -- "Defunding NPR, PBS - & Firing the CPB's Inspector General, for starters"

TO: [House DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene](#)
(Delivering on Government Efficiency)
[Federal Communications Commission Chair Brendan Carr](#)

I have received no response to my below two e-mails with the above-attached February 18, 2025 letter.

As the [DOGE Subcommittee has now announced the scheduling of its hearing for March 26th](#), I assume there is no objection to my freely circulating the letter, which – to assist you – I have withheld until now.

Kindly confirm that the letter will be included in the printed record.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Friday, February 28, 2025 3:32 PM
To: 'oversight.committee@mail.house.gov' <oversight.committee@mail.house.gov>;
'Brendan.Carr@fcc.gov' <Brendan.Carr@fcc.gov>

Subject: STATUS? Defunding NPR, PBS - & Firing the CPB's Inspector General, for starters

TO: [House DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene](#)
(Delivering on Government Efficiency)
[Federal Communications Commission Chair Brendan Carr](#)

It is now ten days since I sent my below e-mail, with the above-attached letter, and I have received no response.

Kindly advise as to whether you wish me to continue to withhold dissemination of the letter and e-mail, as I have patiently done so as not to jeopardize your strategy decisions – and whether you have forwarded the letter to U.S. Attorney Bondi, as my e-mail requested.

A short time ago, in the hope that I might speak to knowledgeable staff, I called the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee majority office (202-225-5074), but only got a voice mail, on which I left a message. Thereafter, I called the FCC (1-888-225-5322), requesting to speak with Chairman Carr's executive secretary or other executive staff. Lois, from the call center, was not able to route my call, but kindly typed out an extensive message that she stated she would send on my behalf, which I greatly appreciate.

Meantime, NPR and PBS have continued their corruption-abetting, election-rigging journalism, "fake news"/fraudulent journalism – and I have documented this in further devastating correspondence to them, without response.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 18, 2025 4:07 PM
To: 'oversight.committee@mail.house.gov' <oversight.committee@mail.house.gov>;
'Brendan.Carr@fcc.gov' <Brendan.Carr@fcc.gov>

Subject: Defunding NPR, PBS - & Firing the CPB's Inspector General, for starters

TO: [House DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene](#)
(Delivering on Government Efficiency)
[Federal Communications Commission Chair Brendan Carr](#)

Attached is my letter of today's date addressed to you, furnishing a mountain of evidence for defunding NPR and PBS, which their presidents will not be able to defend against at your [upcoming March hearing](#). Likewise, for firing the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's Inspector General and her deputy and counsel, who will not be able to defend against the evidence the letter presents.

To afford you sufficient time to review the letter and make strategic decisions about when to forward it to the NPR and PBS presidents so that they can prepare themselves for questioning about it and, additionally, about requiring the NPR and PBS public editors to also testify at the hearing, with statistics as to the number of complaints they receive of biased, corruption-abetting, election-rigging, fraudulent journalism and how they handle them, indeed, whether you might want to issue subpoenas for their records, I will withhold sending my letter to them, or disseminating and publicizing it until I hear from you.

The final sentence of my letter states “There is much defunding, firing, and prosecutions that need to take place” – with an annotating footnote stating:

“...please forward this letter to U.S. Attorney General Pam Bondi, as it will greatly assist her investigations of A.G. James and D.A. Bragg, reported by [New York Public News Network reporter] Han’s February 6, 2025 article “[U.S. Attorney General vows to investigate two of New York’s top lawyers](#)”, to which I cited and linked by [my February 7, 2025 e-mail](#) to her entitled “A gift to welcome you to your new job, as a Capitol News Bureau reporter for the NY Public News Network – Explosive evidence, complete unreported, about the state budget, A.G. James, & D.A. Bragg”.

I would appreciate if you will do this, as I know it will reach her more directly than my own efforts.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org