(no subject)

Reinhold Niebuhr <reinholdniebuhr7@gmail.com> 11/1/16

to me

When I read the times coverage involving Mike S, I am left with the sense that they don't understand the significance of my having spoke about the case in July. It changes the entire analysis. Perhaps you can make him smarter.

Let's imagine the Times had a policy against writing new articles close to elections if the articles might influence the election. Consistent with that policy they would avoid writing this week if sources told them that the FBI was looking at Huma Abedin's emails.

But let's imagine that they wrote a very high profile piece in July that sources lead them to now conclude was materially inaccurate. Would they correct it or stay silent because they have a policy to avoid action near elections?

I suspect they would quickly conclude that either course is an "action" and the choices are either reporting or concealing but there is no longer a "neutral" option because of the reporting in July. I also suspect they would resolve very quickly to choose the action of disclosing because to remain silent is to actively mislead, which has a wide range of very bad consequences.

Why is this so hard for them to grasp? All the stuff about how we were allegedly careful not to take actions on cases involving other allegations about which we have never spoken is irrelevant. I love our practice of being inactive near elections. But inactivity was not an option here. The choices were act to reveal or act to conceal.

Daniel Charles Richman <dcr2132@columbia.edu> 11/2/16

to Reinhold

This is precisely the case I made to them and thought they understood. I was quite wrong. Indeed I went further and said mindless allegiance to the policy (and recognition that more evidence could come in) would have counseled silence in july to let hrc twist in the wind

Daniel Richman
Paul J. Kellner Professor of Law
Columbia Law School
Office: [redacted]
Cell: [redacted]

Daniel Charles Richman <dcr2132@columbia.edu> 11/2/16

to Reinhold

Just got the point home to mike. Probably was rougher than u would have been

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT 6 1:25-CR-272-MSN