## Independent candidate charges unfair treatment in the media

## To the Patch editors in Fort Hunt, Mount Vernon, Hybla Valley, Kingstowne, and Belle Haven: <br> I am writing to express concerns that my campaign is being "blackballed" and deliberately marginalized by the local media outlets.

On Wed., Oct. 19, 2011, The Mount Vernon Voice published an article reporting on the candidate forum that was held before the Mount Vernon-Lee Chamber of Commerce the previous week. In reporting on the presentations of the three District 44 candidates, the article limited its coverage of my campaign to only 82 words (reducing my message to a series of incomplete thoughts and sentences), while affording 230 words to the Democrat incumbent and an additional 225 words to the Republican challenger.

On Thurs., Oct. 20, 2011, The Mount Vernon Gazette published an article reporting on the same forum before the chamber. In this article it was explicitly stated that I am in favor of implementing a tax system "that would put a heavier burden on taxes charged to retail sales on items such as milk, bread, and beer." I can assure you that these are not my words. And the deduction made by the Gazette is patently false. I view this as a blatant attempt to purposely misrepresent my campaign before the voters.

On Sat., Oct. 22, 2011, The Washington Post published an article endorsing the Democrat incumbent. The article identifies me simply as "an obscure independent candidate" (without even mentioning me by name), and claims that my campaign has failed to offer a strong argument for ejecting Delegate Surovell from his political seat on election day. However, by insinuating that the wholesale abandonment of our "inalienable," God-given rights can somehow be offset or justified by the fact that Surovell is a politically astute lawyer, the Post offers us a glimpse behind the mask of its own political leanings, which obviously favor an elitist worldview.

Also at issue is the question over why the Republican's candidacy should be considered substantive and significant, while my candidacy is to be passed off as "obscure." As it stands, neither he nor I have held public office. Nor has any poll of qualified voters been conducted, so as to attempt to gauge the true public significance of our campaigns. And yet The Post asserts (in defiance of reason) that my candidacy is "obscure" and that somehow his is not.

The fact of the matter is that my candidacy has garnered three national endorsements (including one from Black America's Political Action Committee, the nation's largest minority PAC), and one statewide endorsement. It's expected that we will pick up additional support going forward, in these final critical weeks before the election. In stark contrast, the Republican candidate has only been "pseudo-endorsed" by the party bosses, the establishmentarians, and the big money people.

In its refusal to acknowledge the veracity of my campaign, The Washington Post has essentially tipped its hat in favor of party elitism, while it continues to scoff at the involvement and participation of ordinary citizens such as me.

In the old days, decisions to "blackball" a candidate were sometimes related to the complexion of that person's skin. I suspect, however, that in this case the decision may have had more to do with our local media's general disdain for conservative principles.

I share these observations with you in hopes of obtaining some relief in the press. In contrast to our traditional media outlets, the Northern Virginia Patch seems to represent a true, independent voice. And as the deliberate misrepresentation of my campaign has apparently become a daily occurrence, I pray that your news organization can muster the courage to bring this story of media bias to the voters.

I am attaching copies of the letters I have sent to the editors of The Mount Vernon Gazette and The Washington Post, which more clearly articulate the basis for my grievance.

I ask that you consider the possibility of publishing this letter, along with digital copies of the letters I have attached, so that your readers will have a clear understanding of this matter - and of the real facts - as we approach election day.


## Enclosures:

(1) Letter to the Editor: The Mount Vernon Gazette
(2) Letter to the Editor: The Washington Post

Joseph A. Glean
8610 Washington Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22309
(703) 780-3094

October 21, 2011
Mount Vernon Gazette
1606 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

## Letter to the Editor

## To the Editor:

In this past week's edition of the Gazette, in the front page article entitled, "Double Challenge," (concerning Del. Scott Surovell and the upcoming election), it was incorrectly stated that I am in favor of implementing a tax system "that would put a heavier burden on taxes charged to retail sales on items such as milk, bread, and beer."

This is not true. What I actually said was: "We need to abolish the state income tax and replace it with a fair tax system - one that restores the understanding that the money we earn through employment is truly ours. By empowering the people of Virginia, and giving them more control over their own money, it would produce good economy - on an individual level - and I believe this would translate into good economy for local businesses."

To be clear, the sort of tax I am referring to is one that would be assessed at the point of sale, allowing individuals to regulate their own level of participation based on their personal spending habits. Under such a tax system, certain commodities such as food and clothing would actually be exempt from the tax. In other words, there would be tax relief measures put in place- not for extravagant purchases, but for those who are truly and simply trying to make ends meet.

During my presentation before the chamber, I made absolutely no mention of "milk," "bread," or "beer," as the article seems to suggest. What I did say, however, is that: "We must support free access to wholesome / non-pasteurized / non-modified foods and dairy, and support sustainable agriculture and bio-dynamic farming."

I believe the lost rights of dairy farmers who wish to produce "raw" milk (as it is called) ought to be restored, along with the lost rights of consumers who wish to purchase such commodities. We must return to the type of self-determination and self-governance that was instituted by our founding generation, coupled with the true and simple understanding that good government begins at home.

In my opinion, there are additional errors contained in the article, including the false assertion that John Barsa is a "conservative." But I'm afraid I must allow them to pass for the sake brevity.


Joseph A. Glean<br>8610 Washington Avenue<br>Alexandria, VA 22309<br>(703) 780-3094

October 22, 2011
The Washington Post
$115015^{\text {th }}$ Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

## Letter to the Editor

## To the Editor:

On Saturday, October 22, 2011, The Post published the second part of its political endorsements for the Virginia House of Delegates. It certainly does not surprise me that your newspaper favors the Democrat incumbent in District 44. What I find rather inconceivable, however, is your reasoning.

The statement released in conjunction with your endorsement of Scott Surovell claims that my campaign has not "offered a strong argument for throwing out the Democratic [sic] incumbent."

In point of fact, my arguments have all centered heavily upon Surovell's neglect of our basic human rights (as demonstrated by his refusal to acknowledge the rights of our posterity in the womb), his neglect of our religious freedom (as demonstrated by his advocacy of neosecularism), and his moral contempt for the maintenance and restoration of the human family (as demonstrated by his advocacy of gay marriage). Speaking out against Scott Surovell's direct involvement in the promotion of such ruthless political atrocities has been the very centerpiece of my campaign.

And yet you suggest that none of these offenses offer a good enough reason to eject someone like Scott Surovell from his seat of power? You claim that all of these deplorable characteristics are offset by the fact that he's a politically astute lawyer. I am at a loss to name the precise form of oppressive government you mean to advocate by this endorsement, but it is certainly not one that is "of, by, and for" the people.

I'm also a bit mystified as to why my candidacy is completely glossed over in your piece. You identify me simply as "an obscure independent candidate," without even mentioning me by name. And yet the fact of the matter is that my candidacy has garnered three national endorsements (including one from Black America's Political Action Committee, the nation's largest minority PAC), and one statewide endorsement. It's expected that we will pick up additional support going forward, in these final critical weeks before the election. In stark contrast, the Republican candidate has only been pseudo-endorsed by the party bosses, the establishmentarians, and the big money people.

As it stands, neither he nor I have held public office. Nor has any poll of qualified voters been conducted, so as to attempt to measure the significance of our campaigns. And yet you assert to your readers that my candidacy is to be considered "obscure" and that somehow his is not? I'm sorry, but this conclusion defies common sense!

Again, I don't know exactly what sort of angle you're playing at, but I stand by our founding fathers in rejecting the type of government that is alluded to by your endorsement of Scott Surovell, and further exemplified by your refusal to acknowledge the veracity of my campaign. Your vision for America, which clearly scoffs at the involvement and participation of ordinary citizens (such as me), is not at all consistent with the doctrine of independence that was envisioned and set in place by our founding generation.

In this day and age, I can only hope and pray that your decision to effectively "blackball" my campaign has less to do with the complexion of my skin, and more to do with your newspaper's careless disdain for conservative principles.


