



Raven for Mayor 2027

**An Independent Citizens' Campaign for Mayor of the City of Elmira —
Where Frustration Becomes Action, Action Becomes Renewal,
and Renewal Becomes Hope.**

**RE: Formal Demand for Retraction, Correction, Public Apology, and Preservation
of Evidence Concerning June 4, 2026 WSKG Article**

To:

Natasha Thompson, President & CEO
WSKG Public Telecommunications Council, Inc., Christine Dempsey, Chief Content
Officer, Phoebe Taylor-Vuolo, Managing Editor, Natalie Abruzzo, Reporter, WSKG
Public Telecommunications Council, Inc.

CC: Congressman Nick Langworthy

Dear Ms. Thompson, Ms. Dempsey, Ms. Taylor-Vuolo, and Ms. Abruzzo:

I write concerning WSKG's June 4, 2026 publication entitled:

"No likelihood of success on the merits. Judge dismisses lawsuit challenging drag
performances at Elmira Pride Festival."

This letter serves as formal notice that the article contains a materially false statement attributed to me, Julian Marcus Raven, concerning my legal position in the June 2, 2026 proceeding before New York State Supreme Court Justice Christopher P. Baker in Chemung County.

The article states:

"He said allowing a drag show during the festival breaks city zoning laws pertaining to 'adult-use or sexually-oriented business and public decency' in public parks or where minors are present."

I never made that statement.

The statement is not presented as a quotation but is expressly attributed to me through the words "He said." WSKG therefore represented to the public that I made or asserted that claim.

The official transcript demonstrates otherwise. (See attached.)

During the hearing, my argument was repeatedly framed as a question of review, process, disclosure, and whether the City of Elmira had fulfilled its obligations to determine whether its own ordinances, including Elmira Code §457, were implicated by the proposed event.

The transcript reflects that I expressly stated:

- That review could conclude the event was entirely lawful.
- That I was not arguing that Park Church constituted a sexually oriented business.
- That I was not seeking cancellation of the event.
- That my request concerned meaningful governmental review.

Those statements were central to my legal position. Yet none of those explanations appeared in WSKG's article. Instead, the article attributed to me a materially different legal position and then proceeded to construct a narrative around that false attribution.

The article devoted substantial space to individuals and organizations supporting the event, including Southern Finger Lakes Pride, Hannah Jones, Susan Wilks, Park Church, and Brent Stermer. The article further included allegations that my lawsuit constituted an "act of hate."

The article repeatedly emphasized themes of inclusion, support, dignity, compassion, community, and acceptance while simultaneously portraying my lawsuit through a false characterization of my position.

The article quoted approximately thirty words directly attributable to me concerning the substance of the controversy, while devoting several hundred words to opposing viewpoints and supportive commentary concerning the event. And virtually no substantive legal analysis, opinion or accurate transcript citations.

The result was not balanced reporting on a public controversy.

The result was a publication that accurately reported portions of the hearing adverse to me, including the Court's ruling, while omitting the central elements of my legal argument and attributing to me a statement I never made.

Most troubling is that this was not a situation where the reporter lacked access to the facts. Ms. Abruzzo attended the hearing. Ms. Abruzzo took notes during the hearing. Ms. Abruzzo interviewed me following the hearing. The official transcript was available and accurately reflects the arguments presented.

Nevertheless, WSKG published a statement that materially altered my position and conveyed a false impression concerning both myself and my lawsuit.

As a publicly funded media organization that professes adherence to journalistic standards of fairness, accuracy, objectivity, and public trust, WSKG bears a heightened responsibility to accurately represent the positions of individuals it covers, particularly in matters of public controversy.

Adding further concern to the appearance of partiality is the fact that WSKG itself maintained a visible presence at the Pride Festival that was the subject of its reporting. Photographs from the event show a WSKG booth operating among festival participants and attendees. Standing alone, attendance at a public event does not prove bias. Journalists routinely cover events and engage with the communities they serve. However, when a news organization publishes an article that materially mischaracterizes one side of a public controversy, devotes overwhelmingly greater space to advocates of the opposing position, includes inflammatory accusations that the lawsuit constituted an "act of hate," omits the plaintiff's central legal arguments, and then is shown to have participated in the very event it was covering, a reasonable reader may legitimately begin to question the organization's professed objectivity.

The issue is not whether WSKG supported the Pride Festival. The issue is whether WSKG fulfilled its obligation to accurately and fairly report the controversy surrounding it. Public trust in journalism depends not merely upon claims of neutrality, but upon conduct that demonstrates neutrality. When a publication appears aligned with one side of a dispute and simultaneously publishes reporting that minimizes, mischaracterizes, or omits the arguments of the other side, confidence in the independence of that reporting is inevitably diminished. The photograph of the WSKG booth does not by itself establish bias, but when viewed alongside the content, framing, omissions, and selective

quotations contained in the article, it raises legitimate questions concerning whether advocacy and journalism became blurred in a manner inconsistent with the standards of fairness, balance, and objectivity that news organizations publicly profess.



Please further take notice that copies of this correspondence, together with supporting exhibits, the official court transcript, the challenged publication, and related evidentiary materials, may be provided to appropriate governmental oversight bodies, elected representatives, journalism accountability organizations, and public officials with oversight responsibilities relating to publicly funded media organizations. Such recipients may include members of Congress, including Congressman Nick Langworthy, whose office has jurisdictional interests in matters involving federal funding, public accountability, and the stewardship of taxpayer-supported institutions.

The purpose of such distribution is not to interfere with editorial independence, but rather to ensure that legitimate concerns regarding accuracy, fairness, objectivity, public trust, and adherence to professed journalistic standards receive appropriate review. When a publicly funded news organization publishes reporting that is alleged to contain a materially false attribution, omits central facts contained in the official record, and presents a substantially imbalanced account of a public controversy, those concerns extend beyond a private dispute between a reporter and a citizen. They implicate broader questions concerning public confidence in journalism, institutional accountability, and the faithful discharge of the responsibilities entrusted to organizations that operate, in part, with public support and under the mantle of public trust.

Accordingly, absent a timely and satisfactory correction of the record, Plaintiff reserves the right to submit this matter, together with all supporting documentation and evidence, to appropriate oversight authorities, congressional offices, public broadcasting stakeholders, journalism ethics organizations, and other interested parties for review and consideration.

Accordingly, I demand the following:

1. Immediate correction of the article.
2. Publication of a retraction of the false attribution stating that I did not say: "allowing a drag show during the festival breaks city zoning laws..."
3. Publication of a clarification accurately describing my actual position as reflected in the official transcript.
4. Publication of a public apology acknowledging that the article materially mischaracterized my position.
5. Correction of all digital versions of the article.
6. Preservation of all evidence relating to the article, including but not limited to:
 - reporter notes;
 - recordings;
 - interview recordings;
 - emails;
 - text messages;
 - editorial drafts;
 - internal communications;
 - metadata;
 - publication records.

This letter constitutes a litigation-hold notice.

If WSKG contends that the challenged statement accurately reflects something I said, I request identification of the exact source, recording, transcript citation, note, or other record supporting that assertion.

If WSKG fails to correct the record within seven (7) days of receipt of this notice, I will evaluate all available legal remedies under New York law, including claims arising from false attribution, libel, defamatory implication, and related causes of action.

Nothing in this correspondence shall be construed as a waiver of any right, remedy, or claim.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Julian Marcus Raven". The signature is stylized with a large, looping initial "J" and a long, sweeping underline.

Julian Marcus Raven
714 Baldwin Street
Elmira, New York 14904
RavenForMayor.com
June 22, 2026