

Friday, September 15, 2006

Mr. Newmark,

I am not satisfied with this ruling and request a hearing before the Election Appeals Master. The basis of the appeal is that in your decision you use only examples that support your decision and give no merit to the examples that do not support your decision. It is said that a picture is worth a thousand words. I cannot believe that any fair and unbiased person could look at the picture of ANY candidate on the Leedham slate in the Teamster magazine and honestly say that the picture is not uncomplimentary.

If you read the rule (6) it states "unless all candidates for the same position are given equal treatment, equal space and equal prominence." The definition of equal does not allow your interpretation of "fairly approximates the political demographic". Fairly approximates and equal are not the same. No where in the rules does it mention the number of votes that a candidate received! It does not state the candidate that gets a higher percentage of delegate votes, gets better treatment, more space, and more prominence! The definition of equal is "1. Having the same quantity, measure, or value as another. 2. *Mathematics* Being the same or identical to in value" That does not mean 10% of the photographs equals 90% of the photographs.

Also your assumption that just because Mr. Leedham's hand's are not showing does not constitute "uncomplimentary pictures" is very misleading. I just meant to illustrate the bias that no Leedham candidate was seen in a picture making any type of hand gestures? What does constitute an uncomplimentary picture by your definition? You can honestly look at all those pictures say none of them are uncomplimentary of the Leedham candidates. Be honest with yourself!

You never addressed why all the proposed amendments to the constitution were not reported. Were they not newsworthy? The key to this appeal is "equal treatment, equal space, and equal prominence". Even if I were to agree with all of your other points, the language is very clear and not open for interpretation.

Also your statement that Hoffa had a larger role does not matter either. Both Hoffa and Leedham are candidates for the same position, period. Again read the rule "(6) carry a substantial number of articles and /or multiple pictures featuring a particular candidate, unless all candidates for the same position are given equal treatment, equal space, and equal prominence. I am not a lawyer, but I see no where in that part of the rules that states the person with a larger role should receive a larger number of articles, a larger number of photographs, or larger prominence. No matter how you try to twist it equal is equal. You don't need to be a lawyer to know that 4 pictures does not equal 1 picture.

Please forward this to the proper parties. Thank You.

Joseph Wright
Teamsters Local 82