

P.T.T

9/29/85

Who was unethical?

THERE IS no adequate word to describe our reaction to your editorial of Sept. 16 on the East Palo Alto election fraud suit. "Fatuous" comes to mind, or perhaps "profound nonsense."

Pray, on what basis do you suggest reconciliation take place? We will not fool the people into believing our finances can meet their needs. There is a wide gap in what we believe the issues and solutions are. We have no trust in a group that means to rule — or ruin this community. What you mean by reconciliation is capitulation and surrender. We reject your advice. You throw us a sweetmeat by conceding we are "sincere and heart-felt." We deeply resent the condescension implied in that remark.

We categorically deny that any of our actions were ever unethical. We reject the criticism of the judge in your editorial. Anyone who states we harassed or used seniors or others is an unmitigated liar, and that includes the judge. The judge did not approve our investigation? We did so only because we were stonewalled by all county officials. The proof is that the District Attorney even acted as part of the defense in court. Why? Instructions of the Board of Supervisors.

It was EPACCI who took advantage of and used the elderly, the unsophisticated and young children. It is they who dragged seniors and children to meetings of the Local Agency Formation Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and even to the appellate court in San Francisco to be used as pressure groups. It is they who voted for the seniors under the guise of assisting them. It is they who illegally brought ballots back to EPACCI campaign headquarters and made lists or copies before bringing them to Redwood City. State Law prohibits third parties handling ballots. But the judge overlooked all this and much, much more.

Judge Cruikshank denigrated our witnesses. He insulted them by saying they were too ignorant and too unsophisticated

to know what they were doing — blithely dismissing their testimony. He dismissed the testimony of those whose lifestyle he disapproved. Not even Pete McCloskey was immune from his rudeness. Even at the last the judge interrupted McCloskey before he had completed his summation and announced "I believe the election was legal." Ethics in the court room? The judge acted as lawyer for the defense, but with increased power to intimidate and bully.

Most of us have never attended a court room trial. We expected dignity, impartiality and a decision based on law rather than emotional outbursts. The decision came as an anticlimax. Many walked out of the court saying, "There is no justice; we will never vote again." The trial "increased the bad feelings" and divided us more than ever before.

We will do all we can to inform, to organize and protect our community.

Eulesy Reese
Gertrude Wilks
Julia Harvey

EAST PALO ALTO