

James J. Sosnoski
Department of Communication
University of Illinois at Chicago

A Configural Discourse Analysis of New York Newspaper Accounts of a Day in the Isiah Thomas – Anucha Browne Sanders Sexual Harassment Trial

Four Discourses about One Situation.

In September of 2007, the prosecution lawyers for Anucha Browne Sanders began their sexual harassment case against Isiah Thomas and the Madison Square Garden (MSG) before a Federal Grand Jury. Thomas was at that time the coach and general manager of the NY Knicks basketball team and Dolan was the chairman of MSG. On September 17th, taped depositions from two MSG officers—James Dolan and Rusty McCormack—was shown. Two witnesses also testified on that day of the trial—Sanders’ sister and Jeff Nix, a former MSG employee. Four major NY area newspapers reported the event. A summary of the five key events of the trial day follows:

1. James Dolan’s deposition was shown in part by the prosecution.
 - a. Dolan said that it was his decision to fire Anucha Browne Sanders without consulting attorneys or reviewing the report of her charges. He said that she presented a danger to MSG by interfering with the sexual harassment investigation. He claimed that Rusty McCormack had informed him of her actions
 - b. Dolan denied that he fired her in retaliation for suing MSG
2. Rusty McCormack’s deposition was shown in part by the prosecution
 - a. McCormack testified that he had never spoken to Dolan about Browne Sanders’ interference with the sexual harassment investigation.
 - b. He admitted that the report of the investigation, which he signed, was drafted by an MSG lawyer who feared a lawsuit from Browne Sanders.
 - c. In addition he said that the report and a memorandum of his recommendation that Browne Sanders be “separated” from MSG were not necessarily intended to be read by anyone.
3. Jeff Nix’s testimony as a prosecution witness
 - a. Nix testified that he saw Browne Sanders “pull away” from Thomas and walk away looking upset. When he asked her what happened, she said that Thomas told her he loved her.
 - b. Nix said that he advised her to tell Mills, the President of MSG Sports who was Browne Sanders’ boss and who oversees Thomas. Mills did not respond to her complaint.
 - c. He also said he learned that Mills had allegedly told Browne Sanders that Thomas would float rumors that she and Nix were having an affair if she pursued sexual-harassment charges against the Garden.
4. Ruth Browne Sanders’ testimony as a prosecution witness
 - a. Anucha’s sister testified that her younger sister was very upset at being harassed by Thomas.
5. John Blasig’s testimony as a prosecution witness
 - a. Her mentor and supervisor at a previous job at I.B.M. testified to Browne Sanders’ competence while working for him. [The defense suggested that she was incompetent.]

The trial provides an instance of a “news frame” (Dolan fired MSG exec for interfering) and a competing “counter-frame” (Dolan fired Browne Sanders in retaliation for her complaint of sexual harassment) in a trial during which the outcome depended upon which frame would prevail. These newspaper reports provide a set of discourses about the same event and will serve as an example of configural discourse analysis (CDA)¹ as a method in communication and media studies.

5. Comparable Components of the Trial Day Configurations²

One of the methodological requirements of configural discourse analysis (CDA) is that it be comparative. A minimum of two comparable documents (texts) need to be identified. For the analysis under discussion, documents were deemed comparable because they were accounts of the same situation. The reason for this requirement is that the comparison of texts produces textual evidence. In analyzing a single text, the claim that something that should have been included has been omitted is the result of the analyst’s interpretation. On the other hand, omissions and inclusions revealed by comparing texts gain the status of facts. When two texts include an event but a third omits it, the result is a more reliable claim about textual omissions. In addition, several texts about one situation help the analyst to determine the chronological order of events. In turn, knowing about the chronology—even in part— can reveal the events that are reported out of their chronological order which often reflects the emphasis placed upon them. In addition, the descriptors used by different writers to delineate an event, when compared, often reflect the authors’ attitude toward the persons involved.

Once I identified comparable texts about the Isiah Thomas sexual harassment trial, I chose *The New York Times* article as the standard (protolog) against which the others would be compared. In identifying a protolog from the four NY newspaper articles, I choose the one that I regarded as a reliable source. In other analyses, different criteria might apply: the earliest account of a situation, a second article about a situation written by an author being analyzed, or one that has recognizable qualities pertinent to the analysis (metaphoric discourse, logical discourse, etc.) In many respects, the choice is arbitrary, but designating one of the discourses as the norm against which the others will be compared facilitates the analysis because it identifies a specific quality as normative—in this case “detachment”—marked by a stylistic protocol that avoids evaluative terms. (I avoid norms such as “non-biased” or “objective” because these traits are very difficult to identify by linguistic markers.) This is not to say that *the NY Times* author, Richard Sandomir, does not evaluate Dolan. It is only to say that *the NY Times* editorial policy is to *avoid* personal opinions about the situation rather than to publish them.

Comparing discourses requires a complex pattern of match-ups. If we were to take the sequence of sentences as they appear in the texts, the points of comparison would make any chart of them a jumble of lines connecting the comparable contents. So the first mode of comparison takes the various topic/comment units in the discourses and juxtaposes them with respect to their content, which moves them out of their original order.³ Then, a second comparison is made with the points in their original order to

assess the framing (configuring) processes. Finally the resulting configurations are compared.

On September 19, 2007 four NY newspapers gave accounts of the events that took place at the Isiah Thomas / Anucha Browne Sanders sexual harassment trial on the preceding day—Richard Sandomir for the NY Times, Anthony M. Destefano for Newsday.com, Jim Baumbach also for Newsday.com, and Thomas Zambito for the NY Daily News.

[Note: In the following tables showing their points of comparison, the protolog is shaded and appears first. Expressions of the author’s evaluation of the situation are italicized.]

Headline:

SANDOMIR	MSG Chairman Says Decision to Fire Knicks V.P. Was His Alone
Destefano	Dolan: I canned MSG exec for interfering*
Baumbach	Dolan's taped deposition <i>raises behavior questions</i>
Zambito	James Dolan fired Browne Sanders for interfering with probe

Whereas Sandomir emphasizes Dolan’s self characterization as a decision maker, two of the analogs put the Dolan “defense frame”—interfering—in their titles. Baumbach emphasizes his evaluation of the situation. Though one might expect *The Times* to frame an account of a trial with the prosecution or defense claim, Sandomir singles out Dolan’s insistence on his power. *”Canned” is Dolan’s expression, not Destefano’s.

Prosecution charge

SANDOMIR	(06) Browne Sanders is suing Thomas, the Knicks’ coach and president of basketball operations, for verbally abusing and sexually harassing her , and the Garden for firing her in retaliation for making her claims.
Destefano	(13) Browne Sanders testified earlier that Thomas spewed a host of obscenities at her, also calling her a "ho" when she wanted to talk business. (14) She also testified that Thomas made unwanted sexual advances towards her. (15) Thomas has denied acting inappropriately.
Baumbach	(07) There's no telling whether Anucha Browne Sanders' attorneys will successfully convince the jury of seven that Isiah Thomas is guilty of sexual harassment. (08) But after listening to Dolan's deposition, and that of senior vice president of human resources Rusty McCormack, <i>it's become clear he wrongfully fired Browne Sanders.</i>
Zambito	(02) A federal jury yesterday heard the sports-media mogul say he canned her after she lobbed sex-harassment allegations at coach Isiah Thomas and star guard Stephon Marbury. (16-20) {implies the retaliation charge}

Sandomir mentions the prosecution’s second claim, “retaliation.” Zambito describes Browne-Sanders’ lawyer asking Dolan “if he understood what the term "retaliation" meant,” but does not identify it as one of the prosecution charges, using the dialogue to characterize Dolan. The emphasis in the analogs is largely on sexual harassment. The retaliation claim is given more prominence in *The Times*, which supplies more details about Dolan’s ignorance of the in-house investigation, allowing readers to infer that Dolan was unconcerned about its accuracy because McCormack testified that he never talked to Dolan about the investigation and did not know who might have told him about it. (See “report of investigation” below.)

“Defense” Claim—interference with the investigation of her charge

SANDOMIR	(08) [Dolan] said he learned about Browne Sanders’s SUSPECTED tampering with the investigation from Rusty McCormack, the Garden’s senior vice president for human resources.
Destefano	(title) Dolan: I <i>canned</i> MSG exec for interfering (01) A female Madison Square Garden executive was fired because she willfully interfered in a company probe of her sexual harassment allegations against Knicks coach Isiah Thomas, MSG chairman James Dolan said in videotaped testimony played Tuesday in federal court in Manhattan.
Baumbach	(12) Dolan said he fired her almost immediately after McCormack told him over the telephone that Brown Sanders was impeding his investigation into her sexual harassment complaint. (13) <i>Never mind that McCormack all but admitted in his videotaped testimony that the investigation basically was a crock.</i> (14) What <i>infuriated</i> Dolan was McCormack's claim that she was coercing "her direct reports into collaborating her complaints." (15) <i>But Dolan didn't think to bring this accusation to Browne Sanders, as any sane boss would do.</i>
Zambito	(title) James Dolan fired Browne Sanders for interfering with probe (05) Dolan said he didn't <i>bother</i> to consult his lawyers before firing Browne Sanders in December 2005 because he <i>felt</i> she was interfering with a Garden investigation of the claims.

Sandomir describes Browne Sanders’ interference with the investigation as “suspected.” Destefano reports her “willful” interference as an established fact. Baumbach and Zambito are both contemptuous of Dolan’s claim.

Dolan ID (initial mention):

SANDOMIR	(01) James L. Dolan
Destefano	(01) MSG chairman James Dolan
Baumbach	(01) James Dolan
Zambito	(01) Madison Square Garden <i>boss</i> James Dolan

Sandomir names Dolan. Two analogs identify him as the head of MSG in contrasting ways: chairman vs. boss. The word “boss” (“a person who exercises control and makes decisions” WorldNet⁴) underscores Dolan’s ability to control MSG whereas the word “chairman” (the officer who presides at the meetings of an organization, WorldNet) by comparison de-emphasizes control.

Browne Sanders ID (initial mention):

SANDOMIR	(01) Anucha Browne Sanders
Destefano	(01) A female Madison Square Garden executive (02) ...executive Anucha Browne Sanders.
Baumbach	(07) Anucha Browne Sanders
Zambito	(01) Firing ex-Knicks executive Anucha Browne Sanders

Sandomir initially identifies Browne Sanders by her full name as he does Dolan, both in the first sentence. Destefano identifies her as a “female” MSG executive, mentioning “her sexual harassment allegations against Knicks coach Isiah Thomas” before he gives her name. Since “Anucha” would not be readily identified as a woman’s name, making this obvious underscores the sexual harassment aspect of the case. Following with a description of Dolan as “unapologetic” in the second sentence links Dolan’s attitude to

Browne Sanders’ allegation. Saying in the previous sentence that she “willfully interfered” in a probe of her allegation would call for an apology if the accusation was true but that Dolan did not give one. That Dolan was unapologetic could also suggest that the circumstance of Thomas harassing Browne Sanders did not affect him. Readers who took Dolan’s side would be likely to construe Destefano’s description of him in the first sense, readers who took Browne Sanders’ side would be likely to construe it in the second sense. Baumbach does not mention Browne Sanders until the seventh sentence. In five of his previous sentences Dolan is described in unflattering terms—“large ... head,” “arrogant,” “cracked a bad joke,” “sighed at a question,” and “slouched so far down in his chair at one point that it made you feel as if he was sitting courtside in the fourth quarter of a game the Knicks trailed by 40.”

Browne Sanders position in the MSG corporation

SANDOMIR	(01) Dolan said he fired her (05) At the time, she was the Knicks’ senior vice president for marketing and business operations. (20) ... Steve Mills, the president of MSG Sports, who was Browne Sanders’s boss
Destefano	Dolan “fired” her (01 & 07). (12) marketing head at MSG
Baumbach	(08) he <i>wrongfully fired</i> Browne Sanders (15) <i>But Dolan didn’t think to bring this accusation to Browne Sanders, as any sane boss would do.</i>
Zambito	(title) James Dolan fired Browne Sanders Also (01)

Only Sandomir provides information about Browne Sanders’ position in the chain of command. Dolan is known as the owner of the Knicks and Mills is identified as her “boss.” She is identified as a “Senior Vice President.” Destefano identifies her as marketing head but leaves out her title, “senior vice president.” Baumbach and Zambito identify her only as Dolan’s employee.

Institutional Relationship of Thomas to Browne Sanders

SANDOMIR	(05) At the time, she was the Knicks’ senior vice president for marketing and business operations. (06) ... Thomas, the Knicks’ coach and president of basketball operations (20) ... Steve Mills, the president of MSG Sports, who was Browne Sanders’s <i>boss</i> and oversees Thomas.
Destefano	(01) ... Knicks coach Isiah Thomas
Baumbach	
Zambito	(01) ... coach Isiah Thomas

Sandomir notes that Steve Mills supervised both Browne Sanders and Thomas. Since he identifies Browne Sanders as Vice President of Marketing and Thomas as the Knicks coach and president of basketball operations, their positions in the MSG corporation are not described as power relations—Thomas is not Browne Sander’s “boss.” Again, only Sandomir provides information about the relative corporate positions the principals hold.

Description of deposition

SANDOMIR	(01) a video deposition shown yesterday (02) ... [Dolan’s] image projected on a large screen inside the federal courthouse in Lower Manhattan.
Destefano	(01) ... [Dolan’s] videotaped testimony played Tuesday in federal court in Manhattan. (05) ... the 10-minute excerpt of the deposition played in court,

Baumbach	(01) When James Dolan's video deposition appeared in court yesterday afternoon on the oversized television , you couldn't help but take note of how large his head appeared on screen. (03) ... an 11-minute taped segment in which he was asked pointed questions by lawyers.
Zambito	(08) Dolan, ..., appeared on a big-screen TV

While the descriptions of the deposition are relatively minor elements in three accounts of the trial, it is interesting to note how Baumbach uses the fact of a large screen to describe Dolan's head as "big." Of course, the expression "he had a big head" implies that the person being described has an inflated view of his importance. (Big-Head. To have a big head – to be conceited; bumptious. Also applied to men or youths who are 'cocksure' of everything," *Slang and Its Analogues Past and Present*.)

Description of Dolan's appearance

SANDOMIR	
Destefano	(02) Dolan, wearing what appeared to be a dark turtleneck sweater ..., <i>appeared unapologetic</i> as he was questioned. (05) Poker-faced throughout most of the 10-minute excerpt of the deposition played in court, <i>Dolan cracked a smile only when asked to recall if he consulted anyone</i> before deciding to fire Browne Sanders in early 2006.
Baumbach	(02) the <i>arrogant</i> way he conducted himself on tape (03) In the span of an 11-minute taped segment in which he was asked pointed questions by lawyers, Dolan ran the full gamut of emotions. (04) He laughed out loud, even <i>cracked a bad joke</i> . (05) He <i>sighed at a question</i> . (06) <i>He even slouched so far down in his chair at one point that it made you feel as if he was sitting courtside in the fourth quarter of a game the Knicks trailed by 40</i> . (14) What infuriated Dolan ...
Zambito	(01) <i>a slam dunk decision</i> for Madison Square Garden boss James Dolan. Dolan, ... dressed casually in a black sweater <i>rolled up at the sleeves</i> .

Whereas Sandomir does not describe Dolan's appearance, the three analogs do in some detail and in mostly unflattering terms. The fact that these unflattering descriptions occur early in the analog accounts positions them as framing tools. For example, it would be hard for Baumbach's readers to find Dolan credible later in his account. His description of Dolan is far more volatile than Destefano's. Zambito's description is not as volatile as Baumbach's but more damaging than Destefano's

Description of Browne Sanders' appearance

SANDOMIR	
Destefano	(12) Browne Sanders, 44
Baumbach	
Zambito	(04) Browne Sanders, 44

By contrast to the numerous descriptors applied to Dolan's appearance, the only one applied to Browne-Sanders is her age. Destefano and Zambito regarded the fact that Browne Sanders was 44 years old important enough to mention. At the time, Isiah Thomas was 46 but his age is not mentioned.

Description of the sexual harassment

SANDOMIR	(29) Nix, whose contract with the Knicks ended last month, testified that after the team beat Minnesota in December 2004, he saw Browne Sanders in the hallway outside the locker room pulling away from Thomas's embrace.
----------	--

	<p>(30) She walked away toward Nix, but passed him.</p> <p>(31) "She looked upset," he testified.</p> <p>(32) He added that when he caught up to her, she told him: "You won't believe what he just said.</p> <p>(33) He said, 'I'm in love with you.'</p> <p>(36) ... Thomas's hugging and trying to kiss her.</p>
Destefano	<p>(13) Browne Sanders testified earlier that Thomas spewed a host of obscenities at her, also calling her a "ho" when she wanted to talk business.</p> <p>(14) She also testified that Thomas made unwanted sexual advances towards her</p> <p>(16) Tuesday attorneys for Browne Sanders brought in a number of witnesses who testified that she had complained to them about Thomas' behavior and the obscenities he heaped on her.</p> <p>(17) Faye Brown, a former administrative assistant at MSG, said Browne Sanders had complained to her about Thomas using the words "bitch" and "ho."</p>
Baumbach	
Zambito	<p>(22) Nix, who worked for the team for 15 years until he was fired last month, testified Browne Sanders told him Thomas called her a "bitch" and a "ho."</p> <p>(23) He said Browne Sanders told him about a 2004 meeting in which she quoted Thomas telling her: "Don't forget, you f---ing bitch, I'm the president of this f---ing team."</p> <p>(24) Nix, ..., said he witnessed an incident that same year in which Thomas allegedly hugged Browne Sanders and professed his love for her.</p> <p>(25) He said Browne Sanders pulled away from Thomas at "the end of a hug" that occurred in a hall off the Garden floor.</p> <p>(26) "I saw Anucha pushing away from Isiah," Nix testified.</p> <p>(27) He said he caught up to her a few minutes later, when he says Browne Sanders told him: "You're not going to believe what [Thomas] just said. ... He said, 'I'm in love with you. It's like "Love and Basketball.'"</p>

Sandomir and Zambito's account of the sexual harassment is similar. Destefano focuses on the obscenities and omits the corridor scene Nix recounts. He omits Nix's testimony and only implies abusive language in his account of Dolan's response to Browne Sander's lawyer's question about the appropriateness of using it. This allows him to mention that after the exchange, "(37) A mixture of laughter and gasps came from the small crowd in the back of the room. (38) If we only knew what Dolan's Garden attorneys were thinking."

The act of firing

SANDOMIR	<p>(01) James L. Dolan said in a video deposition shown yesterday at the sexual harassment trial at which he and Isiah Thomas are defendants that he fired Anucha Browne Sanders without consulting corporate counsel, talking to her supervisor or reading the report of an investigation into her claims. ...</p> <p>(07) Dolan said he made his decision to fire her without knowing the status of the Garden's investigation or reading anything more than newspaper accounts detailing Browne Sanders's accusations.</p>
Destefano	<p>(01) A female Madison Square Garden executive was fired because she willfully interfered in a company probe of her sexual harassment allegations against Knicks coach Isiah Thomas, MSG chairman James Dolan said in videotaped testimony played Tuesday in federal court in Manhattan.</p>
Baumbach	<p>(09) Of course Dolan took credit for the firing, seemingly even puffing his chest as he did so.</p> <p>(12) Dolan said he fired her almost immediately after McCormack told him over the telephone that Brown Sanders was impeding his investigation into her sexual harassment complaint.</p> <p>(14) What infuriated Dolan was McCormack's claim that she was coercing "her direct reports into collaborating her complaints."</p>

	(15) But Dolan didn't think to bring this accusation to Browne Sanders, as any sane boss would do.
Zambito	(01) Firing ex-Knicks executive Anucha Browne Sanders was a slam dunk decision for Madison Square Garden boss James Dolan.

Sandomir contextualizes the act of firing Browne Sanders in Dolan's making the decision without counsel, talking to her supervisor, reading the investigation report, without knowing the status or it, and with no more information than newspaper accounts. Destefano, by comparison, puts the firing in the context of Browne Sanders' "willfully" interfering with the investigation of her charges. Baumbach places the firing in the context of Dolan's taking credit for it, and then indicts him as an incompetent CEO. Zambito's metaphor for firing—a slam dunk—suggests a display of power (see below).

Accounts of Dolan's reasons for firing Browne Sanders

SANDOMIR	(04) Dolan said that the danger Browne Sanders posed when she was said to have coerced employees into "corroborating her complaint" — which he said impeded the Garden's investigation — outweighed a potential legal opinion about "why we would have Ms. Sanders stay in the job." (08) He said he learned about Browne Sanders's suspected tampering with the investigation from Rusty McCormack, ...
Destefano	(03)With all due respect, Mr. Dolan, you said that she willfully violated company policies and undermined [the company] investigation of her charges, " said attorney Anne Vladeck., (04) "That's right ... by bringing in people who were ... attempting to influence the process, " responded Dolan.
Baumbach	(12) Dolan said he fired her <i>almost immediately</i> after McCormack told him over the telephone that Brown Sanders was impeding his investigation into her sexual harassment complaint.
Zambito	(05) Dolan said he didn't <i>bother</i> to consult his lawyers before firing Browne Sanders in December 2005 because he <i>felt she was interfering with a Garden investigation of the claims.</i>

Sandomir articulates Dolan's reason for firing Browne Sanders as "she was said to have coerced employees into 'corroborating her complaint.'" His use of "she was said to have..." and "suspected tampering" are appropriate qualifications at this point in the trial. Destefano has Dolan saying that Browne Sanders was "bringing in people who were ... attempting to influence the process." Baumbach has him fire her "almost immediately" on the word of McCormack. Zambito undercuts Dolan's claim with the word "felt" and by preceding it with the admission that "he didn't bother to consult his lawyers before firing Browne Sanders." Destefano reports that Dolan said Browne Sanders brought people in which seems to contradict Sandomir's report of Dolan saying that she coerced employees. [However Dolan made both remarks, pausing after "bringing people in" and continuing with the phrase "to influence the proceedings." (NY Times video of the disposition)]

Timing of the firing

SANDOMIR	(19) McCormack said the memorandum [advising "(13) that Browne Sanders had to be "separated"] was written by Marc Schoenfeld, the Garden's senior vice president for legal affairs, in anticipation of a lawsuit, and he made a few edits before signing it.
Destefano	
Baumbach	(12) Dolan said he fired her almost immediately after McCormack told him over the telephone that Brown Sanders was impeding his investigation into her sexual harassment complaint.

	(24) As for Cablevision's supposed investigation into Browne Sanders' sexual harassment complaints against Thomas, McCormack said it was not concluded until after she was fired, making it convenient for him to come to the conclusion she should be "separated" from the organization. (25) But when pressed on the videotape, he said he drew up a memo concluding the investigation only because the Garden's lawyers feared a lawsuit from her. (26) They needed this paper "on record," he said.
Zambito	(01) Firing ex-Knicks executive Anucha Browne Sanders was a slam dunk decision for Madison Square Garden boss James Dolan. (02) A federal jury yesterday heard the sports-media mogul say he canned her after she lobbed sex-harassment allegations at coach Isiah Thomas and star guard Stephon Marbury.

One of the prosecution charges was that the Garden fired her “in retaliation for making her claims” of sexual harassment against Thomas. Sandomir notes that the Garden’s senior vice president for legal affairs advised firing “in anticipation of a lawsuit.” Baumbach notes that Dolan fired her “almost immediately” after a conversation with McCormack, who he later notes sent a memo over his signature “(25) ... only because the Garden's lawyers feared a lawsuit from her. (26) They needed this paper "on record," he said.” However, the memo was allegedly based on the investigation which McCormack said “(24) ... was not concluded until after she was fired.” Zambito writes that “(02) ... he canned her after she lobbed sex-harassment allegations at coach Isiah Thomas.” (Though Dolan said that McCormack told him about the memo, McCormack denied it, saying that he didn’t know who told Dolan about it.)

Decision Quote

SANDOMIR	(02) “All decisions at the Garden I make on my own,” said Dolan, the chairman of Madison Square Garden, whose image projected on a large screen inside the federal courthouse in Lower Manhattan.
Destefano	(06) “Well, all decisions at the Garden I make on my own,” Dolan said with a big grin.
Baumbach	(10) Of course Dolan took credit for the firing, seemingly even puffing his chest as he did so. “All decisions at the Garden, I make on my own,” Dolan said. Words that surely make Knicks fans shake their heads and think about what's become of their storied franchise.
Zambito	(03) “All decisions at the Garden I make on my own,” Dolan said in a pretrial deposition played for jurors at the scandalous trial that has rocked the NBA.

All four newspapers reported Dolan’s remark but they contextualize it differently. Sandomir places it second as it fits with his title and invites us to image Dolan saying it on “a large screen.” Destefano invites us to imagine Dolan “with a big grin.” Unlike the other three reporters, he prefixes the remark with “Well, ...” This utterance does not contribute to the meaning of his answer to the lawyers question. It relates to the social aspect of their interaction. Destefano’s previous sentence, “(05) Poker-faced throughout most of the 10-minute excerpt of the deposition played in court, Dolan cracked a smile only when asked to recall if he consulted anyone before deciding to fire Browne Sanders in early 2006,” frames Dolan’s use of “Well, ...” (See the analysis of Destefano’s discourse in the 7th section, “Configuring the Discursive World of the Dolan Deposition.”) Baumbach frames Dolan’s answer with “(09) Of course Dolan took credit for the firing, seemingly even puffing his chest as he did so.” The “well” indicates the position he is taking in the turn-taking of the attorney/witness dialogue—as an authority on the matter in question. Zambito contextualizes Dolan’s remark by placing it “the scandalous trial that has rocked the NBA.

Health of the Garden Quote

SANDOMIR	(03) "I specifically did not consult with counsel," he said, adding that the "overall health of the Garden was at jeopardy."
Destefano	(07) Dolan said he didn't consult with MSG lawyers about his decision and would have overridden the advice of lawyers if they told him not to fire her. (08) "Because I felt that the overall health of the Garden was at jeopardy here, and that that would override any opinion Counsel might have otherwise, that we should have Ms. Sanders stay in the job," Dolan said.
Baumbach	(16) And he refused to ask the Cablevision lawyers if firing her was appropriate after she had formally complained of sexual harassment by Dolan's top employees. (17) No, this decision was bigger than his lawyers. (18) "I specifically did not consult with counsel," Dolan said. (19) "I felt that the overall health of the Garden was in jeopardy here and that would overrule any opinion of counsel." (20) Imagine that, Dolan worrying about the "overall health of the Garden." (21) Look what's become of the place now and what's on display each day in room 23A of the Daniel Patrick Moynihan federal courthouse in Manhattan.
Zambito	(05) Dolan said he didn't bother to consult his lawyers before firing Browne Sanders in December 2005 because he felt she was interfering with a Garden investigation of the claims. (06) "I felt that the overall health of the Garden was at jeopardy here and that that would override any opinion on counsel," Dolan said at the grilling taped last year. (07) Browne Sanders is hoping the admission helps prove she was illegally fired.

Whereas Sandomir simply reports Dolan's reason for not consulting with lawyers, Destefano, Baumbach, and Zambito emphasize the fact that Dolan didn't consult with lawyers. Destefano notes that Dolan would have "overridden" the lawyers opinions because MSG was in jeopardy. Baumbach ridicules Dolan's reasoning. Zambito points to the way Dolan's remark could be evidence for the prosecution case.

Dolan's firing was unilateral--no "counsel" with anyone at MSG

SANDOMIR	(01) James L. Dolan said ... that he fired Anucha Browne without consulting corporate counsel, talking to her supervisor or reading the report of an investigation into her claims. (03) "I specifically did not consult with counsel," he said, (07) Dolan said he made his decision to fire her without knowing the status of the Garden's investigation or reading <i>anything more than</i> newspaper accounts detailing Browne Sanders's accusations.
Destefano	(07) Dolan said he didn't consult with MSG lawyers about his decision and would have overridden the advice of lawyers if they told him not to fire her.
Baumbach	(16) he <i>refused</i> to ask the Cablevision lawyers if firing her was appropriate (18) "I specifically did not consult with counsel," Dolan said. "
Zambito	Dolan said he didn't bother to consult his lawyers before firing Browne Sanders

Sandomir reports that Dolan claimed to have discussed Browne Sanders case with McCormack but that on the witness stand McCormack denied ever having discussed it with Dolan. Destefano, Baumbach, and Zambito did not report McCormack's denial.

The report of the investigation

SANDOMIR	(20) He [McCormack] added that the report was "not necessarily" intended to be read by Dolan or Steve Mills, the president of MSG Sports, who was Browne Sanders's boss and oversees Thomas. (23) He also said he never read Browne Sanders's performance evaluations — which were uniformly excellent — before signing the report . (24) The report also recommended sensitivity training for Thomas, which, McCormack
----------	--

	testified, he did not receive. (25) "When the lawsuit came, that was about as much sensitivity training as he'd ever want," he said.
Destefano	
Baumbach	(13) <i>Never mind that McCormack all but admitted</i> in his videotaped testimony that the investigation <i>basically was a crock.</i> (22) <i>Imagine the embarrassment Cablevision as a company feels today</i> after McCormack, its senior vice president of human resources, admitted in his deposition that he is not trained in equal opportunity employee laws. (23) <i>This guy</i> even suggested that calling another employee a derogatory name is OK, as long as it's not to their face. (24) As for Cablevision's supposed investigation into Browne Sanders' sexual harassment complaints against Thomas, McCormack said it was not concluded until after she was fired, <i>making it convenient for him to come to the conclusion she should be "separated" from the organization.</i>
Zambito	

Sandomir implicitly calls the report of the investigation into question— evidently it was not intended to be read by anyone other than McCormack who then would make a recommendation though it is not clear to whom. He also points out that Browne Sanders' evaluations were not considered and that McCormack did not act on the recommendation that Thomas undergo sensitivity training. Baumbach, aside from dismissing the report as a "crock," points out that it was not concluded until after Browne Sanders was fired. Destefano and Zambito omit this testimony.

The memorandum

SANDOMIR	(13) He testified that he did not know who told Dolan the conclusion in his memorandum on the in-house investigation that Browne Sanders had to be "separated." (19) McCormack said the memorandum was written by Marc Schoenfeld, the Garden's senior vice president for legal affairs, in anticipation of a lawsuit, and he made a few edits before signing it.
Destefano	
Baumbach	(25) But when pressed on the videotape, he said he drew up a memo concluding the investigation only because the Garden's lawyers feared a lawsuit from her. (26) They needed this paper "on record," he said. (27) <i>And it only gets worse.</i> (28) In the memo , McCormack wrote that Thomas should undergo sensitivity training and Garden president Steve Mills should meet with human resources officials about the experience. (29) But neither person followed through with the suggestions. (30) "When the lawsuit came about, that's about as much sensitivity training [Thomas] could want," McCormack said. (31) Besides, McCormack later admitted he didn't write the memo , even though it's in his name. (32) Marc Schoenfeld, senior vice president of legal affairs, drafted it.
Zambito	

Sandomir makes it clear that Marc Schoenfeld wrote a memo, in anticipation of a lawsuit, advising that Browne Sanders be "separated" from MSG which McCormack slightly revised and signed. Baumbach's account is rather caustic. Neither Destefano nor Zambito mention the memo.

Evaluation of Browne Sanders' work

SANDOMIR	(23) He also said he never read Browne Sanders's performance evaluations — which were
----------	---

	uniformly excellent — before signing the report .
Destefano	
Baumbach	
Zambito	(13) ... Ruth Browne, who recalled near-daily conversations with her younger sister about the harassment she endured during a five-year stint at the Garden in which she rose to become one of the NBA's top-ranking female executives.

Presumably, Sandomir's parenthetical "which were uniformly excellent" comment on Browne Sanders' evaluations at MSG was verified. In addition, he mentions (28) John Blasig, who was her mentor and supervisor at a previous job at I.B.M. The comment that Browne Sanders "rose to become one of the NBA's top-ranking female executives" would be difficult to verify and not "admissible evidence" if it was her sister's.

Appropriateness of Thomas' alleged remark

SANDOMIR	(37) Dolan was asked in his deposition about the appropriateness of using "bitch," a word Browne Sanders said Thomas called her, in a workplace. (38) "No, it's not appropriate," he said. (39) "It is also not appropriate to murder anyone." (40) I don't think that that has happened either."
Destefano	(09) Asked if the use of the word "bitch" was appropriate, Dolan said it wasn't. (10) Browne Sanders has testified that Thomas routinely addressed her with that word. (11) "No, it is not appropriate, it is also not appropriate to murder some one," he said, without further explaining the analogy.
Baumbach	(33) When Dolan was asked if he thought that it was appropriate for an employee to refer to a colleague as a "bitch," he leaned back in his chair. (34) "It's not appropriate," he said. (35) "It's also not appropriate to murder anyone." (36) I don't know if that's happened here." (37) A mixture of laughter and gasps came from the small crowd in the back of the room.
Zambito	(09) As quickly as he explained her firing, Dolan brushed off claims that Thomas and Marbury used the B-word to refer to Browne Sanders, implying that his coach and star point guard never used the word. (10) The Cablevision chairman told Browne Sanders' lawyer it's "not appropriate" for Garden employees to refer to fellow employees as "bitch" or "black bitch." (11) Then, Dolan added: "It is also not appropriate to murder anyone." (12) I don't know that that has happened, either."

The Times juxtaposes this dialogue with Nix's testimony that such incidents happened (though he does say he knew of the obscenities from Browne Sanders). Destefano adds "without further explaining the analogy," calling our attention to the relationship in Dolan's response between using abusive language and murder, implying that neither occurred at MSG. No one else suggests that Dolan's point seems to hinge on whether or not inappropriate behavior "happened." Baumbach's account of this segment of the trial differs significantly from the others because he added (37) A mixture of laughter and gasps came from the small crowd in the back of the room. Zambito frames Dolan's remark by his previous sentence "Dolan brushed off claims that Thomas and Marbury used the B-word to refer to Browne Sanders."

Retaliation dialogue

SANDOMIR	
Destefano	
Baumbach	

Zambito	(16) Dolan was asked during the deposition if he understood what the term "retaliation" meant. (17) "I think I understand the concept," he said, sounding annoyed. (18) "Essentially, it is an action taken against a person in response to their making an allegation, a formal allegation," he said. (19) "Do you believe that Ms. Browne Sanders made a formal allegation?" her lawyer Anne Vladeck asked. (20) "Yes, I think she did," Dolan said.
---------	--

It is not difficult to understand why the other accounts left this out. The question is why did Zambito include it?

Persons mentioned in the four accounts

Note: the number of sentences in which the person is mentioned are in parentheses. A check mark indicates a mere mention of their presence.)

Person mentioned	Sentences	Sandomir	Destefano	Baumbach	Zambito
Rusty McCormack MSG human resources senior vp	(32)	(18) 08-26	(2) 23-24	(12) 08, 13, 22-32	(0)
Jeff Nix a former Knicks assistant general manager and scouting director	(17)	(6) 29-34			(11) 21-31
Kevin Mintzer a lawyer for Browne Sanders	(6)	(6) 14-18, 21-22			
Faye Brown a former administrative assistant at MSG	(6)		(6) 17-22		
Steve Mills President of MSG Sports, Browne Sanders's boss and oversees Thomas	(5)	(4) 20, 34-36		(1) 28	√ 15
Anne Vladeck a lawyer for Browne Sanders	(5)		(1) 03		(4) 16-19
Hank Ratner the Garden's vice chairman	(4)	(4) 10-11, 17-18			
Marc Schoenfeld the Garden's senior vice president for legal affairs	(2)	(1) 19		(1) 32	
Ruth Browne Browne Sanders's oldest sister in whom she confided	(1)	√ 28			(1) 13
Stephon Marbury The Knicks star point guard	(1)				(1) 02
John Blasig her mentor and supervisor at IBM.		√ 28			

The number of sentences devoted to witnesses and lawyers raises several questions:

Why did Sandomir include Mintzer's two questions?

Why did Sandomir include Hank Ratner?

Why did Destefano choose to include Vladeck's question, "(03) "With all due respect, Mr. Dolan, you said that she willfully violated company policies and undermined [the company] investigation of her charges,"?

Why did Destefano include Faye Brown's testimony?

Why Do Destefano and Baumbach omit Nix's testimony?

Why does Zambito omit McCormack’s testimony?
 Why was Zambito the only one to identify Marbury as a defendant?
 Why did Zambito include Vladeck’s questions about Dolan’s understanding of the term “retaliation”?
 Why did Zambito include Nix’s remarks about Mills?

In each case omissions are interpreted as events that do not contribute to the author’s thesis and inclusions are interpreted as events that to.

Words devoted to:⁵

reporter	words	Prosecution charges	“Defense” claims	Dolan’s description	Personal opinion	misc
SANDOMIR	797	694	44	0	1	58
Destefano	585	408	114	42	0	21
Baumbach	721	295	35	121	270	16
Zambito	703	432	38	56	31	146

What the comparisons reveal

Sandomir

The NY Times reporter focuses almost entirely on the prosecution’s case—only mentioning Dolan’s (the Defense’s) claim of interference. Such a focus is appropriate since the witnesses were called for the prosecution. His title, “MSG Chairman Says Decision to Fire Knicks V.P. Was His Alone,” however, focuses upon Dolan’s decision. As the next section reveals this contrast is an aspect of Sandomir’s framing of the situation to reflect the way the prosecution built up its case.

Sandomir’s account is implicitly rehearses the argument that Dolan’s act of firing Browne Sanders without “due process.” Mintzer’s interrogation established that Dolan’s testimony that he learned of Browne Sanders’ interference from McCormack was false.

Destefano

Destefano’s account of the trial day, like Sandomir’s focuses on the prosecution charge. He gives the most space to Dolan’s claim. His account is the most favorable to Dolan. He begins by asserting the Dolan fired Browne Sanders “because she willfully interfered.” His account offers the most support for Dolan’s claims. He is the only reporter to include Faye Brown’s testimony (The NY Times lists three witnesses. Brown is not among them. If Destefano inserted her testimony):

(17) Faye Brown, a former administrative assistant at MSG, said Browne Sanders had complained to her about Thomas using the words "bitch" and "ho."

(18) Brown, who worked for Browne Sanders for about four years, was so embarrassed to use obscenities in court that she sometimes spelled them out instead.

(19) "She was in disbelief.

- (20) At times she would cry," said Brown, who isn't related to the plaintiff.
(21) But Brown could turn out to be useful for both sides.
(22) While each witness told the jury that Browne Sanders complained to them about Thomas' behavior and obscenities, they also said during cross-examination that they never heard Thomas use foul language or talk in disparaging terms about her.

This opens the door for the possibility that Thomas did not use abusive language toward Browne Sanders. He omits Nix's testimony which is the most damaging to the defense. He does not discuss Dolan's knowledge of the report of the investigation or of the memo. His only comment about McCormack's testimony is his statement that "employees were obligated to report harassment under company policy." He notes that Thomas denied Browne Sanders' charges. His description of Dolan's demeanor during his deposition is not disparaging—"(02) wearing what appeared to be a dark turtleneck sweater for the December 2006 deposition," (05) Poker-faced throughout most of the 10-minute excerpt of the deposition played in court, Dolan cracked a smile only ...," "(06) with a big grin." These descriptions contrast sharply with Baumbach's and to a lesser extent with Zambito's. (See "description of Dolan's appearance above.")

Baumbach

Whereas Sandomir and Destefano do not make their views of the situation explicit, Baumbach is clearly the most opinionated reporter. His opinions take up as much space in his article as his description of the event. He also spends more time than any other reporter describing Dolan's behavior and appearance, most often in unflattering terms and in some instances ridiculing him.

It is surprising that Baumbach does not include Nix's testimony which is quite damaging. Given that Nix's testimony focuses on the charge against Isiah Thomas, Baumbach's article clearly focuses on his portrait of Dolan as an arrogant and thoughtless tyrant. Unlike Sandomir's use of McCormack's testimony which posits evidence for the retaliation claim, Baumbach's uses it as a context for Dolan's behavior. He pokes fun at Cablevision, Dolan's company, for employing McCormack as a senior vice president of human resources who "admitted in his deposition that he is not trained in equal opportunity employee laws." Generally, Baumbach portrays McCormack as confused and incompetent and as an index of Dolan's mismanagement of MSG.

Zambito

In contrast to Baumbach's overt hostility to Dolan and company, Zambito is critical but much more restrained. His inclusions and omissions contrast to the other reporters.

Unlike Destefano, he is critical of Dolan, e.g., (02) "A federal jury yesterday heard *the sports-media mogul say he canned her after she lobbed sex-harassment allegations at coach Isiah Thomas and star guard Stephon,*" (03) "*the scandalous trial that has rocked the NBA,*" (05) "*Dolan said he didn't bother to consult his lawyers,*" (09) "*Dolan brushed off claims that Thomas and Marbury used the B-word to refer to Browne Sanders,*" (17) "he said, sounding annoyed." He does include Nix's damaging testimony against Isiah

Thomas. As far as I know, Zambito was mistaken in identifying Marbury as a defendant. However, Marbury’s deposition, which was not shown on this day of the trial, leaves a distinct impression that he was complicit in the harassment of women at MSG.

Like Destefano, Zambito omits McCormack’s testimony. He includes Vladeck’s questions about Dolan’s understanding of the term “retaliation,” which addresses the second half of the prosecution charge. (Sambito used McCormack’s testimony to “argue” that Dolan did not follow due process which indirectly supports the charge that he “retaliated.) Retaliate suggests “strike back” (“make a counterattack and return like for like,” WordNet). Zambito implies that Dolan retaliated when he wrote (02) that Dolan “*canned her after she lobbed sex-harassment,*” noting that (05) “*he didn't bother to consult his lawyers,*” preceded by (03) “*the scandalous trial that has rocked the NBA.*”

Zambito also included Nix’s remarks about Steve Mills, the MSG official to whom he advised Browne Sanders to notify of her complaints, which Browne Sanders testified that she had done.

(28) Nix testified he was drawn into the feud at one point.

(29) In November 2005, he said he learned that Mills had allegedly told Browne Sanders that Thomas would float rumors that she and Nix were having an affair if she pursued sexual-harassment charges against the Garden.

(30) "I was angry," Nix told jurors.

(31) "I said Steve Mills is a f---ing liar."

Zambito, by contrast to the other reporters, portrays the situation as collusion among Dolan, McCormack, Mills, and Marbury.

In this section, I have compared and contrasted the four accounts of the trial day. To do so, I have taken the sentences out of their original order in the articles. I now turn to the implications of the order of the sentences.

6. Frame or Framing?

Rather than search for news frames, a CDA examines how readers are instructed by the text to construct a mental representation of the situation under discussion. The textual instructions hinge on “the world-building (deictic) information which, together with associated knowledge-frames, defines the parameters of the world in question” (Werth, 1999, 194). In other words, we are instructed to position figures in various social and cultural relationships in the space and time of a text world where they act and interact. I will take Thomas Zambito’s article as my example.

KEY

Spatial and temporal parameters	bold face
Figures that populate the text world	CAPS
Actions & interactions	<i>italics</i>
Social and cultural relationships	<u>double underline</u>

James Dolan fired Browne Sanders for interfering with probe

BY THOMAS ZAMBITO
DAILY NEWS STAFF WRITER

Wednesday, September 19th 2007, 9:29 AM

- (1.) Firing ex-Knicks executive ANUCHA BROWNE SANDERS was a *slam dunk decision* for **Madison Square Garden boss** JAMES DOLAN.
- (2.) A **FEDERAL JURY yesterday** heard THE SPORTS-MEDIA MOGUL say HE canned HER *after SHE lobbed sex-harassment allegations at coach* ISIAH THOMAS and star guard STEPHON MARBURY.
- (3.) "All decisions at the Garden I make on my own," DOLAN said in a *pretrial deposition* played for JURORS at the scandalous trial that has rocked the NBA.
- (4.) BROWNE SANDERS, 44, a former college basketball star, is *suing for \$10 million* in **Manhattan Federal Court**.
- (5.) DOLAN said HE *didn't bother to consult his LAWYERS before firing* BROWNE SANDERS in **December 2005** because HE felt SHE was interfering with a **Garden investigation** of the claims.
- (6.) "I felt that the overall health of the **Garden** was at jeopardy here and that that would override any opinion on COUNSEL," DOLAN said at the grilling taped *last year*.
- (7.) BROWNE SANDERS is *hoping the admission helps prove* SHE was illegally fired.
- (8.) DOLAN, whose FAMILY empire is worth billions with assets that include **Cablevision, the Garden, the Knicks, the Rangers and Radio City Music Hall**, appeared on a big-screen TV dressed casually in a black sweater rolled up at the sleeves.
- (9.) As *quickly* as HE explained her firing, DOLAN brushed off claims that THOMAS and MARBURY used the B-word to refer to BROWNE SANDERS, implying that HIS COACH and star POINT GUARD *never used the word*.
- (10.) The Cablevision CHAIRMAN told BROWNE SANDERS' LAWYER it's "not appropriate" for **Garden EMPLOYEES** to refer to FELLOW EMPLOYEES as "bitch" or "black bitch."
- (11.) Then, DOLAN added: "*It is also not appropriate to murder anyone. I don't know that that has happened, either.*"
- (12.) BROWNE SANDERS' LEGAL TEAM wrapped up its case *yesterday* by calling HER SISTER RUTH BROWNE, who recalled *near-daily* conversations with HER younger sister about the harassment SHE endured *during a five-year stint at the Garden* in which SHE rose to become one of the NBA's top-ranking FEMALE EXECUTIVES.
- (13.) DOLAN could appear in person *as soon as today* when **Garden LAWYERS begin their attack** on BROWNE SANDERS' allegations by calling their first WITNESSES. Also *expected to testify* is Garden President and Chief Operating Officer STEVE MILLS.
- (14.) DOLAN was asked **during** the deposition if he understood what the term "retaliation" meant.
- (15.) "I think I understand the concept," HE said, *sounding annoyed*.
"Essentially, it is an action taken against a person in response to their making an allegation, a formal allegation," HE said.
- (16.) "Do you believe that MS. BROWNE SANDERS made a formal allegation?" her LAWYER ANNE VLADECK asked.
- (17.) "Yes, I think SHE did," DOLAN said.
- (18.) **Earlier**, former Knicks assistant coach JEFF NIX *took the witness stand* and backed up many of BROWNE SANDERS' claims involving THOMAS.
- (19.) NIX, who worked for the team for 15 years until he was fired last month, testified BROWNE SANDERS told him THOMAS called HER a "bitch" and a "ho."
- (20.) HE said BROWNE SANDERS told HIM about a **2004 meeting** in which SHE quoted THOMAS telling HER: "*Don't forget, you f---ing BITCH, I'M the president of this f---ing TEAM.*"
- (21.) NIX, who served under eight Knicks COACHES including THOMAS, said HE witnessed an incident *that same year* in which THOMAS allegedly hugged BROWNE SANDERS and professed HIS love for

HER.

(22.) HE *said* BROWNE SANDERS pulled away from THOMAS at "*the end of a hug*" that occurred in a **hall off the Garden floor.**

(23.) "I saw ANUCHA pushing away from ISIAH," NIX *testified.*

(24.) HE *said* HE *caught up to* HER **a few minutes later, when** HE *says* BROWNE SANDERS *told* HIM: "YOU'RE *not going to believe* what [THOMAS] just *said.* ... HE *said,* 'I'm in love with YOU. It's like 'Love and Basketball.'"

(25.) NIX *testified* HE *was drawn into* the feud *at one point.*

(26.) **In November 2005,** HE *said* HE learned that MILLS *had* allegedly *told* BROWNE SANDERS that THOMAS would float rumors that SHE and NIX were having an affair if SHE pursued sexual-harassment charges against the Garden.

(27.) "I *was* angry," NIX *told* JURORS. "I *said* STEVE MILLS is a f---ing liar."

Zambito's article provides numerous instructions about how to construct the court room scenario. With the trial day as an anchor (9/19/2007) we can construct a time line of events that took place prior to that day going back as far as 15 years and 8 Knick's coaches. Again with the trial as an anchor, we "hear" much of what was said in a Manhattan Federal Court before a Federal Jury. We perceive that Anucha Browne Sanders was represented by a legal team, one of whom was Anne Vladeck and that Ruth Browne and Jeff Nix testified in person. We perceive that many of the events discussed in the court room took place earlier at Madison Square Garden prior to James Dolan's video deposition. We also "see" Thomas in a hall of MSG hugging Anucha Browne Sanders who pushed away from him.

We are told enough about the intertwined scenarios to construct Zambito's version of what had happened both in court and at MSG. There is little room to doubt that Zambito's article favors Browne-Sanders and, to some extent, caricatures James Dolan. In this version, Thomas harassed Browne-Sanders and Dolan fired her illegally. Zambito does not argue the issues in a detached manner. He presents Nix's testimony as what happened and implies that not only was Browne Sanders fired because of her accusations but that Nix was also fired because he believed her and was prepared to testify that he personally witnessed the harassment.

We have parts of the hierarchy of command at MSG from this account: Dolan was the CEO with complete authority, Steve Mills was the MSG President and Chief Operating Officer. Isiah Thomas was the coach of the Knicks and Marbury was his point guard. Zambito leaves us with the impression that the four were in collusion.

It is clear from the outset how we are being instructed to comprehend the situation.

Firing ex-Knicks executive Anucha Browne Sanders was a slam dunk decision for Madison Square Garden boss James Dolan. A federal jury yesterday heard the sports-media mogul say he canned her after she lobbed sex-harassment allegations at coach Isiah Thomas and star guard Stephon Marbury. "All decisions at the garden I make on my own," Dolan said in a pretrial deposition played for jurors at the scandalous trial that has rocked the NBA.

As we move through the statements, we are instructed to construct the situation frame by frame:

Key: JD = James Dolan; ABS = Anucha Browne Sanders

1a. Firing ex-Knicks executive Anucha Browne Sanders	First act: the firing
1b. was a slam dunk decision	Characterized as “something that is a sure to occur; a foregone conclusion; "predicting his success was a slam dunk ” WordNet
1c. for Madison Square Garden boss James Dolan	by her boss (“a person who exercises control and makes decisions” Wordnet) NOTE: ABS = “executive,” JD = “boss”
2a. A federal jury yesterday heard	A federal jury (one set aside as the seat of the national government, Wordnet) hear
2b. the sports-media mogul say	The mogul (a very wealthy or powerful businessman; "an oil baron" [a dislogistic phrase] Wordnet) say
2c. he canned her	He canned (fire, give notice, dismiss, give the axe, send away, sack, force out, terminate [a dislogistic phrase] Wordnet)
2d. after she lobbed sex-harassment allegations at coach Isiah Thomas and star guard Stephon Marbury	After she lobbed (propel in a high arc; "lob the tennis ball") [“After” could imply a conditional relationship to the firing. The image of a tennis ball propelled at Dolan would dispose a reader to believe he returned the lob which, metaphorically, implies he “retaliated.”—struck back.]
3a. All decisions at the garden I make on my own," Dolan said	on my own = deciding is his prerogative-- (belonging to or on behalf of a specified person especially yourself)
3b. in a pretrial deposition played for jurors	pretrial deposition played (clarification of the scene)
3c. at the scandalous trial	scandalous trial (giving offense to moral sensibilities and injurious to reputation; "scandalous behavior" Wordnet)
3d. that has rocked the NBA	Rocked (sway, shake, Wordnet)

Invoking the pun, we can say that Zambito “framed” Dolan. Framing is accomplished by sequencing frames so that a specific “picture” emerges.

7. Configuring the Discursive World of the Dolan Deposition

Configuring a text involves processing a sequence of conceptual events. Even when the concepts are abstract representations, configuring entails narrating though it may be as minimal as an abstract structure of movements in space and time. Leaving aside the issue

of configuring abstract concepts, it is obvious that news reports generally refer to experiences and can easily be construed as narratives. In our example, the news reports are narratives of the events on the day of James Dolan’s deposition in the Isiah Thomas sexual harassment trial. Each report builds a different mental representation of the events on that day largely by telling them out of their chronological order⁶ and by characterizing the participants and evaluating their actions. Having set the stage for an analysis of the configural structure of the reports by comparing their points of comparison, we are now ready to examine the way each report frames the events.

Note: I will leave out the descriptions of the settings since they are easy to follow.
 Key: The following abbreviations are used: blended = “<+>,” resulting blend = “-->,” inference drawn from implications of the text world on basis of past experience of similar events = “{text},” Shifts in perspective or focus = CAPS. Persons mentioned in the first column are identified by their initials in the second column

RICHARD SANDOMIR

Sandomir, NY Times	Configuring Sandomir’s “text world” ⁷
MSG Chairman Says Decision to Fire Knicks V.P. Was His Alone	JD firing is blended with (<+>) the expression “his alone” Result (-->) JD {insists} on his position as chairman of MSG ⁸
(01) James L. Dolan said in a video deposition shown yesterday at the sexual harassment trial at which he and Isiah Thomas are defendants that he fired Anucha Browne Sanders without consulting corporate counsel, talking to her supervisor or reading the report of an investigation into her claims.	INITIAL PERSPECTIVE = JD’S The act of unilateral firing <+> not consulting, talking, reading. --> fired without studying situation. Inference: {illegal firing [without due process]}
(02) “All decisions at the Garden I make on my own,” said Dolan, the chairman of Madison Square Garden, whose image projected on a large screen inside the federal courthouse in Lower Manhattan.	{[Without due process]} <+> making decision on his own {emphasizes his complete control}. --> legally problematic decision for chief executive {as exercise of control or display of power}
(03) “I specifically did not consult with counsel,” he said, adding that the “overall health of the Garden was at jeopardy.”	{Exercise of control} <+> MSG at jeopardy --> {had to act quickly}
(04) Dolan said that the danger Browne Sanders posed when she was said to have coerced employees into “corroborating her complaint” — which he said impeded the Garden’s investigation — outweighed a potential legal opinion about “why we would have Ms. Sanders stay in the job.”	Had to {quickly} control situation <+> ABS coercing employees to corroborate her complaint. --> JD’s reason insufficient as explanation of not consulting MSG lawyers. {ABS’s “suspected tampering” calls for consulting lawyers as the danger is <i>not immediate</i> .}
(05) At the time, she was the Knicks’ senior vice president for marketing and business operations.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE to ABS’ ACTIONS
(06) Browne Sanders is suing Thomas, the Knicks’ coach and president of basketball operations, for verbally abusing and sexually harassing her, and the Garden for firing her in retaliation for making her claims.	SHIFT OF FOCUS TO LAWSUIT ABS complaint <+> her MSG position <+> JD exercising control unilaterally --> {quickly} exercising control <+> charge of “retaliation.” {That JD retaliated is likely.}
(07) Dolan said he made his decision to fire her	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE back to JD & FOCUS

without knowing the status of the Garden's investigation or reading anything more than newspaper accounts detailing Browne Sanders's accusations.	BACK TO DECISION preceding portrait of JD exercising control unilaterally <+> ignorance of investigation & absence of documented reports --> confirms & reinforces existing portrait of JD
(08) He said he learned about Browne Sanders's suspected tampering with the investigation from Rusty McCormack, the Garden's senior vice president for human resources.	SHIFT OF FOCUS TO SOURCE OF INFO Existing portrait <+> JD learning of ABS' tampering from RM. --> {this connection has potential to revise preceding portrait of JD as an illegal firing}
(09) Dolan said he discussed the Browne Sanders case with McCormack on a helicopter flight to Manhattan from Cablevision headquarters on Long Island.	Learning <+> helicopter ride with RM --> focus is on the setting of JD's learning about ABS' interference
(10) Hank Ratner, the Garden's vice chairman, was with them, he said.	<+> with presence of HR --> focus continues on learning setting
(11) Dolan testified that he told McCormack and Ratner, "They needed to let her go."	SHIFT OF FOCUS TO DECISION (02) "decision on my own" <+> JD telling RM & HR to let ABS go --> learning from RM <+> JD's exercise of control {JD emphasizing that he, not RM or HR made the decision.}
(12) But in excerpts from McCormack's video deposition, which was shown after Dolan's, McCormack denied that he told Dolan anything about the investigation.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE to RM (01-11) JD's story <+> RM's deposition denying he told JD of ABS' tampering. "But" links the two and implies an alternative. --> {one story contradicts the other—which to believe?}
(13) He testified that he did not know who told Dolan the conclusion in his memorandum on the in-house investigation that Browne Sanders had to be "separated."	(01-11) JD's story <+> RM's memo --> {foregrounds "communication gap" in the two stories.}
(14) Kevin Mintzer, a lawyer for Browne Sanders, asked, "Did you have any conversations with James Dolan about separating Ms. Browne Sanders from M.S.G.?"	Communication gap <+> (08-11) JD & RM conversations <+> mention of ABS' lawyer KM. --> Sandomir's quotation from KM <+> a testimony under oath --> {implies a fact} If (08-11) JD's statements about RM, --> {why ask given 12? Reinforces 12}
(15) "No, I did not," McCormack said.	(13) Testimony under oath <+> RM's answer: "no" --> {RM probably did not lie, so JD probably did.}
(16) "And did you have any conversations with Hank Ratner about separating Ms. Browne Sanders from M.S.G.?" Mintzer asked.	(13) Communication gap <+> (08-11) conversations between JD & RM which <+> (14) mention of KM. <+> (13) {JD probably lied.} --> {KM prob eliminates HR as source of info}
(17) "No, I did not," McCormack said.	{Testimony under oath} <+> RM's answer: "no" --> {RM probably did not lie & HR probably did not tell JD about ABS}
(18) McCormack said the memorandum was written by Marc Schoenfeld, the Garden's senior vice president for legal affairs, in anticipation of a lawsuit, and he made a few edits before signing it.	SHIFT OF FOCUS TO MEMO (13) Testimony under oath <+> MS as legal expert -> RM discloses author of memo <+> "in anticipation of a lawsuit <+> (01) investigation <+> legal expert <+> RM ok'd it --> Legal expert wrote memo anticipating that ABS would sue {Does this imply that the legal expert believed ABS had a substantial case?}

<p>(19) He added that the report was “not necessarily” intended to be read by Dolan or Steve Mills, the president of MSG Sports, who was Browne Sanders’s boss and oversees Thomas.</p>	<p>SHIFT OF FOCUS TO REPORT Report {of investigation} <+> not necessarily to be read <+> ABS’s boss <+> also oversees IT --> {Steve Mills is a person who SHOULD have read this report.}</p>
<p>(20) “And the statements you made concerning Ms. Browne Sanders,” Mintzer said. “Did you intend them to be read by anyone?”</p>	<p>SHIFT OF FOCUS BACK TO MEMO (18) “statements” <+> (13) “the conclusion in his memorandum on the in-house investigation that ABS had to be “separated.” <+> (19) MS wrote memo --> What RM earlier identified as his “conclusion” was MS’ {RM may have agreed with it}</p>
<p>(21) “Not necessarily,” McCormack said.</p>	<p>(13) Memo <+> (13) conclusion <+> (18) legal judgment <+> not to be read by anyone (19) --> {[not a credible business procedure]}⁹</p>
<p>(22) He also said he never read Browne Sanders’s performance evaluations — which were uniformly excellent — before signing the report.</p>	<p>SHIFT OF FOCUS TO EVALUATIONS (21) Not reading <+> ABS’ evaluations --> {RM should have read them} Evaluations <+> uniformly excellent --> {that they were “uniformly excellent” but unread makes firing ABS suspicious} Not reading ABS excellent evaluations <+> signing report <+> signing memo <+> conclusion --> {RM’s behavior parallels JD’s in (01, 07)}</p>
<p>(23) The report also recommended sensitivity training for Thomas, which, McCormack testified, he did not receive.</p>	<p>SHIFT OF FOCUS BACK TO REPORT Report <+> sensitivity training <+> (01) sexual harassment <+> IT --> {report indicated IT did to some degree sexually harass ABS} report <+> not acted upon --> {RM & JD favored keeping IT & thus had to “separate” ABS}</p>
<p>(24) “When the lawsuit came, that was about as much sensitivity training as he’d ever want,” he said.</p>	<p>SHIFT OF FOCUS TO LAWSUIT (23) report <+> WHEN lawsuit came <+> reason for not following sensitivity training recommendation --> {Legal expert correctly anticipated—& IT was given sensitivity training as a result—suggests that ABS’ charge against IT was justified.}</p>
<p>(25) The Dolan and McCormack videos highlighted the final day of the case presented by Browne Sanders’s legal team.</p>	<p>END OF ACCOUNTS of DEPOSITIONS</p>
<p>(26) The defense will begin presenting their case today.</p>	<p>COMMENT</p>
<p>(27) Three witnesses testified on Browne Sanders’s behalf yesterday: Ruth Browne, her oldest sister; Jeff Nix, a former Knicks assistant general manager and scouting director; and John Blasig, her mentor and supervisor at a previous job at I.B.M.</p>	<p>SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE to witnesses for ABS (01, 12) “videos” blended with “witnesses” --> {JD, RM, IT not at the trial} Witnesses <+> oldest sister --> sister would defend ABS Witnesses <+> assistant general manage of MSG, --> former MSG officer may have pertinent info, Witnesses <+> IBM supervisor --> {Because of IBM status, supervisor can significantly evaluate ABS’ work}</p>
<p>(28) Nix, whose contract with the Knicks ended last</p>	<p>JN <+> testimony <+> image of ABS “pulling</p>

month, testified that after the team beat Minnesota in December 2004, he saw Browne Sanders in the hallway outside the locker room pulling away from Thomas's embrace.	away" from IT's embrace. SHIFT OF FOCUS TO THOMAS --> Nix was eye witness of sexual harassment by IT
(29) She walked away toward Nix, but passed him.	ABS walks toward JN <+> but passed him --> {ABS did not plan to tell Nix what happened}
(30) "She looked upset," he testified.	ABS <+> looked upset <+> (28) pulled away from IT's embrace --> {ABS did not want IT to embrace her.}
(31) He added that when he caught up to her, she told him: "You won't believe what he just said.	JN <+> caught up to ABS --> {JN was concerned about ABS} Caught up to ABS <+> you won't believe ... --> {ABS sensed JN was sympathetic and this indicated that she could tell him what happened.}
(32) He said, 'I'm in love with you.'	Preceding (31) <+> IT <+> "I'm in love with you" <+> (28) pulling away from embrace --> {IT was forcing his attention on ABS}
(33) "Nix said he advised her to tell Mills.	JN <+> advice to tell Mills <+> (20) "Browne Sanders's boss and oversees Thomas." --> {sensible advice}
(34) Browne Sanders has testified that she regularly informed Mills of her encounters with Thomas, but that he did nothing to change the situation.	Advice <+> ABS following it <+> nothing done --> {why not?}
(35) In snippets of his video deposition shown yesterday, Mills said he did not respond to her e-mail message complaining of Thomas's hugging and trying to kiss her.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO THE DAY BEFORE & MILL'S DEPOSITION (OUT OF CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER) SM <+> did not respond --> {confirms ABS's statement but does not explain why SM did not respond}
(36) Dolan was asked in his deposition about the appropriateness of using "bitch," a word Browne Sanders said Thomas called her, in a workplace.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE BACK TO DOLAN DEPOSITION (OUT OF CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER) JD <+> appropriateness <+> abusive language <+> ABS' charge vs IT --> {ABS's lawyer wants it on record that such abusive language is not appropriate at MSG}
(37) "No, it's not appropriate," he said.	JD <+> admission --> {ABS has right to charge IT}
(38) "It is also not appropriate to murder anyone.	Not appropriate <+> murder --> {odd parallel, why bring it up?}
(39) I don't think that that has happened either."	Murder <+> did not happen at MSG --> {JD is claiming that the verbal abuse did not happen but in a confusing way.}

The focus of Sandomir's account is upon the consistency of the depositions and witnesses. He implies weaknesses in Dolan's reason for not consulting or studying the case by juxtaposing Dolan's claim that Browne Sanders posed a "danger" to MSG with her charges. They are incommensurate. Sandomir's emphasizes the fact that Dolan did not take the time to study the situation. Then, in his account of McCormack's deposition, Sandomir emphasizes that Dolan did not consult McCormack or Ratner. The portrait of Dolan as CEO that emerges is of a person who exercises his power without studying the situation. Having painted a portrait of Dolan, he turns to McCormack in the second part of his article who is portrayed as similar to Dolan in his efforts to keep Thomas and remove

Browne Sanders. Even with the same goals in mind, McCormak contradicts Dolan. Then, Sandomir focuses on Nix’s testimony to paint a portrait of Thomas sexually harassing Browne Sanders. The three portraits combined “argue” for the prosecution. Sandomir’s article could be construed as an accurate description of the evidence *as it was put forth by Browne Sanders’ lawyers.*

Sandomir Configuration: Effective prosecution attorneys portraying the defendants to be “guilty as charged.”

DESTEFANO

Anthony M. Destefano, Newsday.com	Configuring Destefano’s text world
Dolan: I canned MSG exec for interfering	JD <+> “canned” --> dislogistic ¹⁰ MSG exec <+> interfering --> JD forcefully dismissed MSG exec
(01) A female Madison Square Garden executive was fired because she willfully interfered in a company probe of her sexual harassment allegations against Knicks coach Isiah Thomas, MSG chairman James Dolan said in videotaped testimony played Tuesday in federal court in Manhattan.	INITIAL PERSPECTIVE = JD’S MSG exec <+> female <+> willfully interfered <+> company probe --> justified action Sexual harassment allegations <+> IT --> {[IT <+> former NBA star <+> groupies, etc.]} ¹¹
(02) Dolan, wearing what appeared to be a dark turtleneck sweater for the December 2006 deposition, appeared unapologetic as he was questioned by attorneys representing fired executive Anucha Browne Sanders.	JD <+> unapologetic --> {JD = unwilling to make an apology, but why?} (01) female exec <+> ABS --> ABS identified as the female exec.
(03) "With all due respect, Mr. Dolan, you said that she willfully violated company policies and undermined [the company] investigation of her charges," said attorney Anne Vladeck, who represents Browne Sanders in her lawsuit against Dolan, Thomas and MSG.	“With all due respect” <+> (02) unapologetic <+> AV’s question <+> AV = ABS’ lawyer --> {“with all due respect” suggests that JD has not disclosed something that he should have.}
(04) "That's right by bringing in people who were attempting to influence the process," responded Dolan.	{Undisclosed} <+> bringing in people to influence process --> {JD had not indicated why ABS had actually done to “interfere”}
(05) Poker-faced throughout most of the 10-minute excerpt of the deposition played in court, Dolan cracked a smile only when asked to recall if he consulted anyone before deciding to fire Browne Sanders in early 2006.	JD <+> poker faced --> not showing emotions Preceding <+> cracked a smile --> {showed emotion} Cracked a smile <+> question --> {why smile?}
(06) "Well, all decisions at the Garden I make on my own," Dolan said with a big grin.	Smile <+> “Well, “ --> {[confident of his answer]} JD <+> decide on my own

	--> {does not have to confer with anyone else; has complete control} Remark <+> big grin {JD pleased with his power}
(07) Dolan said he didn't consult with MSG lawyers about his decision and would have overridden the advice of lawyers if they told him not to fire her.	JD <+> didn't consul MSG lawyers --> {JD had complete power so didn't have to} JD overridden <+> advice not to fire ABS --> {why?}
(08) "Because I felt that the overall health of the Garden was at jeopardy here, and that that would override any opinion Counsel might have otherwise, that we should have Ms. Sanders stay in the job," Dolan said.	{why?} <+> MSG in jeopardy --> {sound reason but what jeopardy?}
(09) Asked if the use of the word "bitch" was appropriate, Dolan said it wasn't.	SHIFT OF FOCUS {no answer to jeopardy} "bitch" <+> appropriate <+> not --> {JD recognizes it is not appropriate}
(10) Browne Sanders has testified that Thomas routinely addressed her with that word.	ABS <+> IT's use of bitch --> {ABS testified to IT's use of abusive language, likely true if 01 background knowledge}
(11) "No, it is not appropriate, it is also not appropriate to murder some one," he said, without further explaining the analogy.	Repeats (09) Murder <+> not appropriate --> true Murder <+> did not occur at MSG --> {so, abusive language didn't*} Remark <+> no explanation for analogy --> {Destefano wasn't sure what JD meant by it? [*inference is clear]}
(12) Dolan's deposition came during a day in which attorneys for Browne Sanders, 44, the former marketing head at MSG, rested their case in the \$10 million harassment and retaliatory dismissal lawsuit.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO LAWSUIT & ABS Lawsuit <+> a) harassment, b) retaliation --> prosecutions charges
(13) Browne Sanders testified earlier that Thomas spewed a host of obscenities at her, also calling her a "ho" when she wanted to talk business.	ABS' testimony about abusive language <+> time to conduct business --> {not only are the words abusive but also the occasion inappropriate.}
(14) She also testified that Thomas made unwanted sexual advances towards her	ABS testimony <+> unwanted sexual advances --> {(12) first prosecution charge}
(15) Thomas has denied acting inappropriately.	IT <+> denied charges --> {whom to believe?}

(16) Tuesday attorneys for Browne Sanders brought in a number of witnesses who testified that she had complained to them about Thomas' behavior and the obscenities he heaped on her.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO WITNESSES Witnesses testified <+> IT abusive --> {left out retaliation charge}
(17) Faye Brown, a former administrative assistant at MSG, said Browne Sanders had complained to her about Thomas using the words "bitch" and "ho."	SHIFT OF FOCUS TO BROWN Brown said <+> IT abusive --> {ABS told FB about IT but FB not an eye witness }
(18) Brown, who worked for Browne Sanders for about four years, was so embarrassed to use obscenities in court that she sometimes spelled them out instead.	FB <+> worked for ABS 4yrs. --> {probably favorable to ABS} FB <+> embarrassed to use words --> {offended by foul language}
(19) "She was in disbelief.	ABS? <+> disbelief --> {presumably ABS was in disbelief & told FB}
(20) At times she would cry," said Brown, who isn't related to the plaintiff.	FB said <+> ABS cried FB <+> not related to ABS --> {eye witness to ABS crying}
(21) But Brown could turn out to be useful for both sides.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO DESTEFANO FB <+> useful to both sides --> {how?}
(22) While each witness told the jury that Browne Sanders complained to them about Thomas' behavior and obscenities, they also said during cross-examination that they never heard Thomas use foul language or talk in disparaging terms about her.	SHIFT BACK TO WITNESSES Each witness <+> was told of abuse by ABS <+> no eye-witnesses --> {ABS could have lied to them}
(23) Another taped deposition played yesterday was that of Rusty McCormack, a senior vice president for human resources at MSG.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO RM RM <+> a senior vice president for human resources at MSG --> {RM's position involves protecting employees from harassment}
(24) He said that employees were obligated to report harassment under company policy and that calling someone a "black bitch" -- as Browne Sanders says happened -- had overtones of racial and gender bias.	RM <+> said employees were obliged to report harassment --> {ABS was within her rights} RM <+> ids "black bitch" as racial and gender bias --> {agrees that <i>If</i> IT called ABS by that phrase, it would be harassment}
(25) The defense is expected to begin its case Wednesday.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO NEXT DAY

Destefano focuses almost exclusively on Browne Sanders' charge of abusive language against Thomas. Dolan said it did not happen and Thomas denied Browne Sanders'

charges. Whereas Destefano is specific about the abusive language used, he is not about the charge of unwelcome sexual advances. He represents the situation as one in which it remains to be decided who is lying about sexual harassment—Thomas or Browne Sanders. There is no evidence either way. As for the charge of abusive language, none of the witnesses for Browne Sanders observed Thomas behaving inappropriately. Their only source of information about events was Browne Sanders.

Destefano Configuration: Ineffective prosecution attorneys failing to prove their case.

BAUMBACH

Jim Baumbach, Newsday.com	Configuring Baumbach's text world
Dolan's taped deposition raises behavior questions	JD deposition <+> raises <+> behavior questions --> {Some behaviors questionable. Whose?}
(01) When James Dolan's video deposition appeared in court yesterday afternoon on the oversized television, you couldn't help but take note of how large his head appeared on screen.	[first phrase describes the setting INITIAL PERSPECTIVE = JD'S] you <+> noted <+> large head --> {JD's "big head" [=conceited]}
(02) Based on the arrogant way he conducted himself on tape, that's how he likes it.	Arrogant conduct <+> JD enjoyed --> {JD is arrogant}
(03) In the span of an 11-minute taped segment in which he was asked pointed questions by lawyers, Dolan ran the full gamut of emotions.	Pointed questions <+> gamut of emotions --> {questions affected JD}
(04) He laughed out loud, even cracked a bad joke.	JD <+> laughed out loud JD <+> cracked bad joke --> {inappropriate for court room}
(05) He sighed at a question.	JD <+> sighed at a question --> {JD bothered question was asked}
(06) He even slouched so far down in his chair at one point that it made you feel as if he was sitting courtside in the fourth quarter of a game the Knicks trailed by 40.	JD <+> slouched --> {drooping posture ["usually used in negative constructions" WordNet]} slouch <+> parallels his posture watching Knicks lose --> {JD looks like he is going to lose the court case?}
(07) There's no telling whether Anucha Browne Sanders' attorneys will successfully convince the jury of seven that Isiah Thomas is guilty of sexual harassment.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO ABS No telling of <+> prosecution success --> {verdict is not clear yet} Prosecution <+> convince <+> jury <+> IT <+> sexual harassment --> {not yet clear that IT is guilty}
(08) But after listening to Dolan's deposition, and that of senior vice president of human	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO BAUMBACH <+> listening <+> JD +

resources Rusty McCormack, it's become clear he wrongfully fired Browne Sanders.	RM deposition --> {"But" signals contrast to 07} It's clear <+> JD wrongfully fired ABS --> {Baumbach believes JD is guilty (confirms 06 inference)}
(09) Of course Dolan took credit for the firing, seemingly even puffing his chest as he did so.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD JD <+> took credit JD <+> puffing his chest --> {recalls JD's arrogance 02}
(10) "All decisions at the Garden, I make on my own," Dolan said.	JD <+> makes all decision on own --> {recalls 09 "took credit" & 02 "arrogant"}
(11) Words that surely make Knicks fans shake their heads and think about what's become of their storied franchise.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO BAUMBACH Knicks fans <+> shake their heads <+> about what's happened to their team --> {fans don't understand JD's decisions [that brought about several disastrous losing seasons]}
(12) Dolan said he fired her almost immediately after McCormack told him over the telephone that Brown Sanders was impeding his investigation into her sexual harassment complaint.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD JD <+> fired ABS <+> almost immediately --> {firing was quick} After <+> RM told him of ABS's impeding his investigation --> {JD's reason for firing was RM's saying ABS interfered with investigation}
(13) Never mind that McCormack all but admitted in his videotaped testimony that the investigation basically was a crock.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO BAUMBACH RM implied <+> investigation = crock --> {RM's accusation that ABS interfered is suspect, [crock = nonsense; foolish talk, WordNet]}
(14) What infuriated Dolan was McCormack's claim that she was coercing "her direct reports into collaborating [sic] her complaints."	RM's claim <+> infuriated JD --> {JD furious at [insubordination]} SHIFT OF FOCUS TO RM ABS <+> making her reports reinforce her complaints --> {[ABS was insistent about IT's sexual harassment so JD fired her for insubordination]}
(15) But Dolan didn't think to bring this accusation to Browne Sanders, as any sane boss would do.	SHIFT OF FOCUS TO BAUMBACH JD <+> didn't think <+> talk to ABS --> {[normally the accused has right to know of accusation]}

	Sane boss <+> would talk to accused --> {"sane" <+> JD acted irrationally}
(16) And he refused to ask the Cablevision lawyers if firing her was appropriate after she had formally complained of sexual harassment by Dolan's top employees.	JD <+> refused to consult lawyers <+> after ABS complaint --> {recalls 12 thus focuses on timing of firing [ABS did not receive "due process"] & recalls arrogance 02} Sexual harassment <+> top employees --> {[treatment of top employees not standard]}
(17) No, this decision was bigger than his lawyers.	Decision <+> bigger than lawyers --> {bigger = more important, why? Arrogance again [wanted to display power]}
(18) "I specifically did not consult with counsel," Dolan said.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD Preceding <+> specifically didn't consult counsel --> {"specifically" = especially not counsel [lawyers were not relevant]}
(19) "I felt that the overall health of the Garden was in jeopardy here and that would overrule any opinion of counsel."	Health of MSG <+> jeopardy --> {"health" not financially but environmentally [group "chemistry"]} Jeopardy <+> overrule counsel opinion --> {recalls 18—counsel irrelevant; their opinion—not to fire implied—JD would overrule because of danger—ABS presented}
(20) Imagine that, Dolan worrying about the "overall health of the Garden."	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO BAUMBACH Imagine <+> JD worrying about health of MSG --> {such an event is laughable}
(21) Look what's become of the place now and what's on display each day in room 23A of the Daniel Patrick Moynihan federal courthouse in Manhattan.	Look at <+> MSG now --> {[organization had been criticized by NBA commissioner for ineptitude]} Look at <+> courtroom display --> {= embarrassing to be sued for sexual harassment in your company}
(22) Imagine the embarrassment Cablevision as a company feels today after McCormack, its senior vice president of human resources, admitted in his deposition that he is not trained in equal opportunity employee laws.	Imagine <+> Cablevision as company whose senior VP of human resources, RM, admits not trained in equal opportunity laws --> {[VP of HR should be trained] thus the company should be embarrassed at the trial's exposures}
(23) This guy even suggested that calling	This "guy" <+> even

<p>another employee a derogatory name is OK, as long as it's not to their face.</p>	<p>--> {[informal ref] beyond the norm = derogatory and accusatory} RM <+> ok with calling employees derogatory names if not to their faces --> {VP of HR holds a position that contradicts his role in the company}</p>
<p>(24) As for Cablevision's supposed investigation into Browne Sanders' sexual harassment complaints against Thomas, McCormack said it was not concluded until after she was fired, making it convenient for him to come to the conclusion she should be "separated" from the organization.</p>	<p>Investigation <+> "supposed" --> {investigation not an investigation} SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO RM RM <+> said investigation not concluded until after ABS was fired --> {firing ABS was illegal} This circumstance <+> convenient for RM to conclude ABS should be fired. --> {the investigation confirmed firing ABS after the fact, so = invalid action}</p>
<p>(25) But when pressed on the videotape, he said he drew up a memo concluding the investigation only because the Garden's lawyers feared a lawsuit from her.</p>	<p>When pressed <+> on the videotape --> {ABS's lawyers got him to admit} RM composed memo <+> because MSG lawyers feared a lawsuit --> the investigation confirmed firing ABS after the fact fearing a lawsuit, {so = invalid}</p>
<p>(26) They needed this paper "on record," he said.</p>	<p>MSG lawyers <+> needed the recommendation to fire "on record" --> confirms 24 {RM faked document lawyers needed in case of lawsuit}</p>
<p>(27) And it only gets worse.</p>	<p>It <+> gets worse --> {it refers to questionable behavior & recalls title of article}</p>
<p>(28) In the memo, McCormack wrote that Thomas should undergo sensitivity training and Garden president Steve Mills should meet with human resources officials about the experience.</p>	<p>RM <+> wrote IT should undergo sensitivity training --> {if IT needed sensitivity training isn't this tantamount to admitting he was guilty of sexual harassment?} RM <+> wrote that SM should meet with "human resource officials" --> {Why would they need to do so if there was no sexual harassment?}</p>
<p>(29) But neither person followed through with the suggestions.</p>	<p>RM's recommendations <+> not followed --> {throws additional suspicion on docs coming out of investigation.}</p>
<p>(30) "When the lawsuit came about, that's about as much sensitivity training [Thomas] could want," McCormack said.</p>	<p>RM <+> lawsuit = only sensitivity training IT could want --> {remark implicitly indicts IT}</p>

	[expression suggests that the consequences of IT's actions resulted in punishment enough.]}
(31) Besides, McCormack later admitted he didn't write the memo, even though it's in his name.	RM <+> did not write memo but signed it --> {the recommendations were not RM's but he agreed with them}
(32) Marc Schoenfeld, senior vice president of legal affairs, drafted it.	MS <+> senior VP legal affairs --> {if an MSG legal officer wrote the memo is it related to the fear of a lawsuit? If so, memo is the "needed paper" 26}
(33) When Dolan was asked if he thought that it was appropriate for an employee to refer to a colleague as a "bitch," he leaned back in his chair.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD JD <+> asked if calling colleague a "bitch" was appropriate --> {ABS lawyers want JD to admit abusive language (07 prosecution charge) was inappropriate} JD <+> leaned back in his chair --> {[leaning back in a chair suggests a gesture of confidence] which would be arrogant in context.} ¹²
(34) "It's not appropriate," he said.	JD <+> calling colleague a "bitch" not appropriate --> {lawyers got JD to admit charge would be justified}
(35) "It's also not appropriate to murder anyone.	JD <+> murder = inappropriate --> {[“out of right field”]}
(36) I don't know if that's happened here."	It (murder) <+> did not happen at MSG --> {implies IT calling ABS a bitch did not happen either}
(37) A mixture of laughter and gasps came from the small crowd in the back of the room.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO CROWD IN COURTROOM Previous response <+> laughter & gasps --> {laughter suggests JD's remark was incongruous to some in the courtroom; gasps suggest that it was shockingly incongruous to others [audience responses imply JD's parallel was unintelligible to them]}
(38) If we only knew what Dolan's Garden attorneys were thinking.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO BAUMBACH If only <+> we knew --> {[if we could be “flies on the

	wall”}] MSG attorneys <+> were thinking --> {[implies attorneys were thinking that JD’s remark was not helpful to their case]}
--	--

Baumbach first paints a portrait of Dolan as an arrogant and incompetent MSG CEO. When he turns to McCormack’s deposition (22), he ridicules him briefly (23-24), then analyzes his testimony, pointing out that McCormack concluded his investigation after Browne Sanders was fired and signed the recommendation that the MSG VP for legal affairs drafted since MSG lawyers needed it on record because they feared a lawsuit. The investigation is described as a pretense and a hoax since its other recommendations — concerning Thomas and Mills were not followed. He also implies that McCormack’s remarks about Thomas imply that he was guilty of sexual harassment. Baumbach ends his article with Dolan’s admission that abusive language was inappropriate at MSG. When Dolan tries to imply that such language did not occur with his odd parallel to murder, Baumbach underscores the incongruity of the parallel by describing the courtroom crowd’s reaction to it—laughter and gasps.

Baumbach Configuration: Caricature of arrogant CEOs of large wealthy corporations who do not believe they can lose a lawsuit against a mere employee.

ZAMBITO

Thomas Zambito, Daily News Staff Writer	Configuring Zambito’s text world
James Dolan fired Browne Sanders for interfering with probe	JD <+> fired <+> ABS <+> interfering --> statement of fact
(01) Firing ex-Knicks executive Anucha Browne Sanders was a slam dunk decision for Madison Square Garden boss James Dolan.	INITIAL PERSPECTIVE = Zambito’s headline <+> JD <+> slam dunk --> JD fired ABS without hesitation {[slam dunk = dislogistic metaphor]}
(02) A federal jury yesterday heard the sports-media mogul say he canned her after she lobbed sex-harassment allegations at coach Isiah Thomas and star guard Stephon Marbury.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JURY federal <+> jury --> important trial prev <+> media mogul <+> canned --> {[dislogistic description of JD]} prev <+> after charge --> {suspicious} charge of sex har <+> IT & SM --> {[NBA sex scandal again]}
(03) "All decisions at the Garden I make on my own," Dolan said in a pretrial deposition played for jurors at the scandalous trial that has rocked the NBA.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD quote <+> JD --> {JD = arrogant} prev <+> scandalous --> confirms 02 prev<+> rocked NBA --> suggests accusation thought true by NBA

	personnel}
(04) Browne Sanders, 44, a former college basketball star, is suing for \$10 million in Manhattan Federal Court.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Sambito statement of facts about trial
(05) Dolan said he didn't bother to consult his lawyers before firing Browne Sanders in December 2005 because he felt she was interfering with a Garden investigation of the claims.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD JD <+> bother <+> consult --> {inappropriate behavior for exec.} JD <+> felt --> {didn't know for a fact}
(06) "I felt that the overall health of the Garden was at jeopardy here and that that would override any opinion on counsel," Dolan said at the grilling taped last year.	JD <+> overall health of MSG <+> jeopardy --> {strange metaphor} prev <+> override counsel --> {[sounds "fishy"]}
(07) Browne Sanders is hoping the admission helps prove she was illegally fired.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO
(08) Dolan, whose family empire is worth billions with assets that include Cablevision, the Garden, the Knicks, the Rangers and Radio City Music Hall, appeared on a big-screen TV dressed casually in a black sweater rolled up at the sleeves.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Zambito statements of facts about Cablevision JD <+> deposed (03) <+> "dressed casually in a black sweater rolled up at the sleeves" --> {inappropriate behavior at a deposition for a federal court case}
(09) As quickly as he explained her firing, Dolan brushed off claims that Thomas and Marbury used the B-word to refer to Browne Sanders, implying that his coach and star point guard never used the word.	"As quickly as" <+> explained <+> firing --> {fits with "dressed casually" [given situation = arrogance]} prev <+> "brushed off" <+> prosecution claim --> {same as above} JD <+> implied never used the B-word --> {Is Zambito saying JD lied?}
(10) The Cablevision chairman told Browne Sanders' lawyer it's "not appropriate" for Garden employees to refer to fellow employees as "bitch" or "black bitch."	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD JD <+> ABS lawyer <+> not appropriate --> {lawyers get JD to admit inpropriety}
(11) Then, Dolan added: "It is also not appropriate to murder anyone. I don't know that that has happened, either."	JD <+> not appropriate <+> murder --> {very odd analogy} prev <+> at MSG --> {implies no one called ABS by B-word}
(12) Browne Sanders' legal team wrapped up its case yesterday by calling her sister Ruth Browne, who recalled near-daily conversations with her younger sister about the harassment she endured during a five-year stint at the Garden in which she rose to become one of the NBA's top-ranking female executives.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Zambito statements of fact about the witnesses SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO RBS RBS <+> witness to ABS's 5 yr suffering --> {5 year harassment = too much} RBS <+> ABS rose to top NBA exec --> {impressive but it's her sister's evaluation}
(13) Dolan could appear in person as soon as today when Garden lawyers begin their	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Zambito statements of fact about defense actions

attack on Browne Sanders' allegations by calling their first witnesses. Also expected to testify is Garden President and Chief Operating Officer Steve Mills.	defense <+> attack <+> ABS allegations --> {[attack ABS's claims suggests attacking her credibility]}
(14) Dolan was asked during the deposition if he understood what the term "retaliation" meant.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD JD asked <+> what retaliation meant --> {ABS lawyers setting the stage}
(15) "I think I understand the concept," he said, sounding annoyed.	JD <+> annoyed --> {didn't like the question}
(16) "Essentially, it is an action taken against a person in response to their making an allegation, a formal allegation," he said.	JD <+> quote --> {"formal" suggests filing the complaint}
"Do you believe that Ms. Browne Sanders made a formal allegation?" her lawyer Anne Vladeck asked.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Vladeck quote <+> formal --> {lawyer getting JD to acknowledge prosecution charge}
(17) "Yes, I think she did," Dolan said.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO JD prev <+> yes --> {JD acknowledges it}
(18) Earlier, former Knicks assistant coach Jeff Nix took the witness stand and backed up many of Browne Sanders' claims involving Thomas.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Nix Nix <+> witness <+> backed ABS's complaints --> {contradicts JD's deposition}
(19) Nix, who worked for the team for 15 years until he was fired last month, testified Browne Sanders told him Thomas called her a "bitch" and a "ho."	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Zambito Nix <+> fired last month --> {implies retaliation against Nix} SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Nix Nix <+> witnesses abusive language from IT --> {Nix = eyewitness}
(20) He said Browne Sanders told him about a 2004 meeting in which she quoted Thomas telling her: "Don't forget, you f---ing bitch, I'm the president of this f---ing team."	Nix <+> from ABS <+> past abusive language --> {contradicts JD's deposition statements (09)}
(21) Nix, who served under eight Knicks coaches including Thomas, said he witnessed an incident that same year in which Thomas allegedly hugged Browne Sanders and professed his love for her.	SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Zambito Nix <+> served under 8 Knicks' coaches --> {why was he fired last month? (19)} SHIFT OF PERSPECTIVE TO Nix Nix <+> saw IT hug ABS --> eyewitness
(22) He said Browne Sanders pulled away from Thomas at "the end of a hug" that occurred in a hall off the Garden floor.	ABS <+> pulled away after hug --> {ABS did not want to be hugged}
(23) "I saw Anucha pushing away from Isiah," Nix testified.	Nix <+> quote --> reinforces (22)
(24) He said he caught up to her a few minutes later, when he says Browne Sanders told him: "You're not going to believe what [Thomas] just said. ... He said, 'I'm in love with you. It's like "Love and Basketball.'""	Nix <+> caught up to <+> ABS --> {Nix concerned about what he saw} ABS <+> IT said I'm in love --> {[suspicious given NBA climate]} ABS <+> love & basketball -->

	{[reference to NBA players' sexual escapades?]}
(25) Nix testified he was drawn into the feud at one point.	Nix <+> drawn into feud --> {ABS vs IT had "feud" [WordNet: a bitter quarrel between two parties]}
(26) In November 2005, he said he learned that Mills had allegedly told Browne Sanders that Thomas would float rumors that she and Nix were having an affair if she pursued sexual-harassment charges against the Garden.	Nix <+> Mills told ABS IT would float rumors re: affair between ABS & Nix --> {Mills in on retaliation against ABS prev <+> if ABS pursued charges {supports ABS's claim of retaliation}}
(27) "I was angry," Nix told jurors. "I said Steve Mills is a f---ing liar."	Nix <+> angry with Mills --> {a likely reaction to Mills threat} Nix <+> Mills = liar --> {likely true}

Zambito Configuration: reporter at the trial exposing the ways in which the defendants colluded outside of the courtroom against the plaintiff.

8. Configurations.

The Sandomir Configuration: Effective prosecution attorneys portraying the defendants to be "guilty as charged." The narrative structure underlying this configuration (framing story) is:

1. initial state of affairs: figure A accuses figure B.
2. key interaction: A (or representative) contests B's claims and bring in witnesses to testify against B.
3. final state of affairs: A wins contest with B.

This narrative structure is readily available in our culture, for example, numerous TV programs such as *Law & Order*.

The Destefano Configuration: Ineffective prosecution attorney's failing to prove their case. The narrative structure underlying this configuration (framing story) is:

1. initial state of affairs: figure A accuses figure B.
2. key interaction: A (or representative) contest B's claims and bring in witnesses to testify against B.
3. final state of affairs: A (or representative) loses contest with B.

This narrative structure is the reverse of the first. It too is readily available in our culture but not as an exact fit to the figure of Dolan (figure B in the narrative structure). Basically, the structure presents a figure who is falsely accused but the evidence against the person is insufficient. Given Destefano's somewhat unflattering description of Dolan (he "canned" MSG exec, "unapologetic," "Poker-faced," "with a big grin"), it is difficult to make him into a sympathetic person who has been falsely accused. The cultural motif that comes to mind is lawyers getting wealthy client acquitted but, given Destefano's implicit indictment of Browne-Sanders, this is not a good fit either. Destefano's configuration is not resonant for me.

The Baumbach Configuration: Caricature of arrogant CEOs of large wealthy corporations. The narrative structure underlying this configuration (framing story) is:

1. initial state of affairs: figure A clashes with figure B with respect to values
2. key interaction: B (or representative) uses unethical tactics to defeat A
3. final state of affairs: A exposes B's (or representative's) unethical behavior to the public & defeats B

This narrative structure is a common plot in contemporary films where the villain is a corporation personified by a key figure, for example, Steven Seagal's anti-environmental villains in his popular action films—*On Deadly Ground*, *Fire Down Under*.

Zambito Configuration: reporter at the trial exposing the ways in which the defendants colluded outside of the courtroom against the plaintiff.¹³

1. initial state of affairs: figure A accuses figure B
2. key interaction: Associates who represent B produce apparent evidence in B's favor by collusion with B; but A's representative exposes it as false.
3. final state of affairs: A wins out over B

This narrative structure is a common plot in contemporary films where the villain is a corporation or a government personified by a key figure, for example, Grisham novels (e.g., *Rainmaker*), but also Watergate.

Of the four accounts of the trial day, Sandomir's article in the New York Times paints a picture of an effective prosecution of the three charges—against Isiah Thomas as a person who is accused of using abusive language and making unwelcome sexual advances as well as against James Dolan for retaliatory firing. This is accomplished by drawing three portraits as they unfolded in the testimony that the prosecution attorneys brought together into a description of MSG as an environment hostile to women.

Destefano's article represents the prosecution as ineffective in proving the charges against Dolan and Thomas. His unflattering portrait of Dolan during his deposition makes his description of the trial day somewhat ambiguous. He is less ambiguous about Anucha Browne Sanders—"A female Madison Square Garden executive was fired because she willfully interfered in a company probe of her sexual harassment allegations against Knicks coach Isiah Thomas, MSG chairman James Dolan said in videotaped testimony played Tuesday in federal court in Manhattan." The emphasis in this sentence is on the first phrase "executive was fired because she willfully interfered" and the last "videotaped testimony played Tuesday in federal court in Manhattan." That Dolan said this is the least emphatic part of the sentence. The expression, "was fired because," is a statement of fact, uttered by Dolan. That it was spoken as "testimony" in "federal court" also suggests that it was a "true" statement. Nothing in the rest of the article is offered to challenge this statement. That Dolan was "unapologetic" and "poker-faced" or that he "cracked smile" do not imply that he was lying. The circumstance that the witnesses called in support of Browne Sanders heard of Thomas' behavior only from her is not solid evidence for the prosecution. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Destefano's discourse is the inclusion of Faye Brown's testimony, noting that it "could be useful for either side," but pointing out that no one testified that Thomas had behaved inappropriately except Browne-Sanders. Sandomir says that "three" witnesses testified

for Browne-Sanders and did not mention Faye Brown. He also remarked that “While each witness told the jury that Browne Sanders complained to them about Thomas' behavior and obscenities, they also said during cross-examination that they never heard Thomas use foul language or talk in disparaging terms about her.” Not having mentioned that Thomas attempted to kiss her and that he told her he loved her, the evidence for the charge that he had used inappropriate language was witnessed only by Browne-Sanders.

Baumbach's article is an outright condemnation of Dolan and his legal team. It is by far the most searing description of Dolan and the most opinionated account of the trial day. It would have “resonance” for persons who agree with Baumbach, especially Knicks' fans who were upset at his & Thomas' management of the team. For them the caricature of Dolan as an incompetent but arrogant rich owner who is self serving and destructive because he insists on making the decisions would confirm their own beliefs. Persons who were not predisposed to dislike Dolan would probably find the article too opinionated to be credible as an accurate account of the trial day.

The conspiracy theory aspect of Zambito's article would have resonance for readers who believe that wealthy persons have numerous experts in their employ who work collusively to cover up any indiscretions that their employers commit. Though much less opinionated and caustic than Baumbach, but unlike Destefano, Zambito decisively indicts Dolan's organization. After portraying Dolan as a “knee jerk” administrator, Zambito writes: “Dolan could appear in person as soon as today when Garden lawyers begin their attack on Browne Sanders' allegations by calling their first witnesses. Also expected to testify is Garden President and Chief Operating Officer Steve Mills.” The notion that a team of MSG lawyers would begin their “attack” on Browne Sanders's “allegations” suggests that Dolan's defense team was out to destroy her credibility. From this point on, he uses Jeff Nix's testimony to describe how Mills operated behind the scenes to keep Browne Sanders from suing the Garden with the threat that they would start rumors about her having an affair with Nix. Pointing out earlier that Mills was going to be one of the legal team's witnesses hints at collusion in a strategy of attacking Browne Sanders' credibility. Zambito's account foregrounds collusion (“agreement on a secret plot,” WordNet).

10. Conclusion

A comparative CDA reveals the “pro-Dolan” slant of Destafano's discourse. The comparisons identify the inclusions (Faye Brown testimony) and omissions (Nix's testimony) that structure the text world of the discourse. Without this evidence, his discourse, especially if considered by itself, would be understood as neutral. In addition, a CDA of Destafano's discourse reveals its pro-Dolan representation of the trial to the extent that it implies that the evidence presented by the prosecution attorneys is insufficient to prove their charges. By contrast, the other three discourses represent the trial as pointing toward the guilt of Thomas and Dolan.

Baumbach's discourse is clearly the most opinionated. At the same time, it includes a strong argument:

(24) As for Cablevision's supposed investigation into Browne Sanders' sexual harassment complaints against Thomas, McCormack said it was not concluded until after she was fired, making it convenient for him to come to the conclusion she should be "separated" from the organization. (25) But when pressed on the videotape, he said he drew up a memo concluding the investigation only because the Garden's lawyers feared a lawsuit from her. (26) They needed this paper "on record," he said.

Given that Browne-Sanders was fired before the investigation of sexual harassment was concluded, and given that McCormack wrote a memo concluding it only because MSG's lawyers feared a lawsuit and need it "on record," it follows that her case was not treated with "due process." Sandomir reports the fear of a lawsuit but does not indicate that Browne-Sanders was fired before the investigation was concluded.

Without tracking the text world (configuration) that Sambito asks his readers to build, the conspiracy aspect of the case would not be revealed. In his discourse Nix's testimony plays a major part and he adds information no other reporter does about "floating rumors" if Browne-Sanders filed a lawsuit.

Though Sandomir's discourse would probably be seen as "detached" or "objective," a CDA reveals that his discourse, whether consciously or unconsciously, presents the prosecution's perspective on the situation.

The configurations of the trial day presented by the four reporters bring into focus the various ways they have framed the events.

¹ The abbreviation "CDA" usually stands for "Critical Discourse Analysis." Since discourse analyses based on Cognitive Linguistics are done in this tradition (*Cognitive Linguistics in Critical Discourse Analysis*), I use the abbreviation but allow "C" to stand for "Configural" for reasons I explain later.

² Before I encountered Werth's work, I had made a very similar argument using a different term, configuration. Using this term, I argued that a configuration exists only when audiences configure a narrative text. Under the long standing influence of Kenneth Burke, I understand a configuration to be a representative symbolic action. I believe this is consistent with Werth, Hart, and Lukeš work. In this paper, I refer to the act of turning a text into a discourse by building a virtual world in a reader's mind as "configuring," and the result as a "configuration." Configure ("set up for a particular purpose," Wordnet) suggests drawing or sketching the relations among various figures to show their positions spatially. A configuration ("an arrangement of parts or elements; any spatial attributes, especially as defined by outline," Wordnet) suggests a structure in which the figures interact or in Kenneth Burke's phrase, a "symbolic [inter]action" that is dramatic. The terms used in concert emphasize the action of constructing a mental representation of experience. A configuration is the result of configuring. In the subsequent sections of this paper, I will use the term, "configure," to refer to the process of constructing a text world into a discourse and "configuration" to refer to the result of the process in order to be consistent with earlier publications.

³ Though I referred to the points of comparison as topics or linguistic units, a more detailed list would include under topics:

- the events narrated about the situation
- the figures described
 - actions & interactions

-
- settings
 - the remarks quoted
 - the remarks summarized

The points of comparison among linguistic units would include:

- titles
- questions
- narratives (anecdotes, stories)
- problem/solution pairings
- instructions

Both of these lists can be extended to include other marked elements of discourses. However the points of comparison might be enumerated, the order in which they occur in the discourses compared is highly likely to differ.

⁴ “WordNet® is a large lexical database of English, developed under the direction of George A. Miller. Nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs are grouped into sets of cognitive synonyms (synsets), each expressing a distinct concept. Synsets are interlinked by means of conceptual-semantic and lexical relations” <http://wordnet.princeton.edu/>. WordNet provides both a sense of the connotations a specific word as by its relations to other synonyms and often provides a description of the experience to which a word or phrase refers. Hence it is a valuable tool in CDA.

⁵ The word counts are rough estimates. Some of the sentences counted in a particular category contain words or phrases that could be considered for an unmentioned category. For example, (03) “All decisions at the Garden I make on my own,” Dolan said in a pretrial deposition played for jurors.” The entire sentence was placed in the category “prosecution charge” because it contains the incriminating phrase: “I make on my own” since the previous sentences note that he made the decision hurriedly after her charges, etc. The second part of the sentence could have been placed in a category such as “description of the setting.” But the trial is the context for observing that he did not consult counsel, etc.

⁶ From the four accounts of the trial we learn that the actual sequence of events was probably as follows—“Three witnesses testified on Browne Sanders’s behalf yesterday: Ruth Browne, her oldest sister; Jeff Nix, a former Knicks assistant general manager and scouting director; and John Blasig, her mentor and supervisor at a previous job at I.B.M. (Sandomir 28)

1. Dolan’s deposition
2. McCormack’s deposition
3. Ruth Browne’s testimony
4. Jeff Nix’s testimony
5. John Blasig’s testimony

It is not clear if Fay Brown testified on that day. Changing the actual chronological order would indicate foregrounding.

⁷ The conceptual blending involved in processing these texts belongs to me and depends upon my past experience. Regardless of the ways in which other readers configured Sandomir’s text, the analysis at this juncture is a “description” of the text world Sandomir constructed and not a description of my reading the text. The difference lies in the deliberate way in which I conduct the analysis over against the “intuitive” way I first read the text. The blending identified in the analysis is partial because the process is overwhelmingly complex. The analysis only sketches it.

⁸ James L Dolan’s official title is “Chairman, Madison Square Garden.” The MSG website describes his role in the following terms: “In his leadership role at MSG, Mr. Dolan is responsible for the company’s overall growth strategy and oversees all of its operations.” <http://www.thegarden.com/corporate/james-dolan.html>

⁹ {} indicates an item of “background knowledge.” In this case it would be odd for a business to conduct an investigation and not intend the report of it to be read only by the person who ordered the investigation. One would expect the companies lawyers to review it.

¹⁰ WordNet offers the following synonyms: “fire, give notice, dismiss, give the axe, send away, sack, force out, give the sack, terminate.” Though they range in degree, all these expressions have negative connotations.

¹¹ Given background knowledge about groupies and NBA stars together with background knowledge of Isiah Thomas's reputation, it seems likely that he would be promiscuous. Readers without this background knowledge would not be predisposed to judge Thomas as a likely candidate for a sexual harassment suit.

¹² "leaning back" also can suggest "time needed to think of a response." I choose to interpret as "a gesture of confidence" which would be somewhat inappropriate in a courtroom and thus fit Baumbach's portrait of Dolan as "arrogant."

¹³ Ironically, on the day I wrote this sentence, the following remark was made on ESPN.com: "When the Securities and Exchange Commission charged him with \$750,000 worth of insider trading last November, Mark Cuban did what a billionaire can do. He hired eight top lawyers -- including a Washington attorney who has published seven books on insider trading -- and he rounded up an additional five law professors from Harvard, Yale and other elite schools. Working long and hard to prepare his defense, his lawyers and professors are telling a federal judge in Dallas that although Cuban's use of inside information might look bad, there is absolutely nothing wrong with it." "Cuban's defense faces tough sell," by Lester Munson, June 1, 2009, ESPN.com