

## Let "the people" decide Elections!!!!

The news media and polls are no way to determine "Elections" - this "right" is given to every "citizen" and granted by the US CONSTITUTION.

1. There is a PUBLIC INTEREST involved with elections, and therefore, they are different than a private entity (think Apple computer or Ford Motor) making up what rules, regulations, and bylaws that private entity abides by. In an election the people and only the people determine who is elected - not the media, not reporters, not corporations, not lobbyists, or special interest groups - "the people"!!!! By not letting the people see and hear ALL candidates available for them to choose from, these private entities that are hosting the debates are determining who gets elected. This is wrong!! It is not up to them. My argument is sound, fact based, logical, fair, just, and impartial. One must ask simply why? Why won't they let me debate? **Let me debate!!!!**

2. The polls. The polls that are being conducted are completely without merit, inaccurate, and unscientific! No scientist or engineer would ever give credence to such a ridiculous poll of only naming the D, R, (and in the case of CO GOV another R). Fully 45% of Coloradans are unaffiliated! That means that 45% have already chosen not to be a D, R, L, or any other party. This is by far the largest voting bloc in Colorado. Yet, their lead candidate, Jason R. Clark, can't debate? **Let me debate!!!!**

3. Because of the erroneous nature of polling (many times polls are flat out wrong not only in politics but sports and the stock market) we should not let polling alone decide who gets to debate. Imagine in the NFL if the polls of the so called analysts determined who made the playoffs or who would be in the Super Bowl - ridiculous right!! How about using some good old common sense here? There is a clear and distinct difference between myself and other candidates on the ballot - just read my web site, my resume, background, accomplishments, experience, media coverage, and the fact that, yes, I have money. Clearly, based on the aforementioned, I am in 4<sup>th</sup> place right now. Why not let me debate and let the people decide if I am 1,2,3,4 or worse? **Let me debate!!!!**

4. Tom Tancredo set a precedence for this. The American Constitution Party is a private entity so they can make up their own rules (same as the private entities that are hosting the debates). However, the judge ruled even though the law is clear as a stand alone interpretation it would not serve the public interest, be too difficult and costly to reprint the ballots, the voters voice deserves to be heard and recognized, and lastly all of this would be too confusing and difficult to inform the public of at such a late date, and therefore, Tom Tancredo should remain on the ballot. This is analogous to why your rules about the polling to get in the debates should not be the only qualification. As the judge just ruled in a similar situation we must consider the will of the people, the voice of the people, let the people determine the outcome of elections!!!! Sound familiar???? Just let my voice be heard - **Let me debate!!!!**

5. Again, what other considerations might we use to break the gridlock of disagreement? How about the fact that I am the only candidate who has put forth a

significant amount of my own money! \$250,000!!!! Many applauded Andrew Romanoff for selling his house and pouring his heart and soul into his primary race. Afford me the same dignity and **Let me debate!!!!**

6. Whose purpose does it serve to not let me debate? Limits competition, and discourages young people like myself (the next generation of leaders) from participating in the political process. Is this what you want? Is this the outcome you are looking for? Does this serve the best interest of the public? The best interest of America? The best interest of Colorado? **Let me debate!!!!**

7. The Independent movement/unaffiliated movement has surged over the past few years. Reference a recent USA Today article that talks about the dissatisfaction of the people with the two party system. Colorado is #9 in the union with 45%+ choosing not to be part of a political party system ([http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/2010-04-20-independents\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/2010-04-20-independents_N.htm)). Yet, the media and debate organizers are still stuck in the D, R (in the gov's race R squared) mode. Another example of voter dissatisfaction has come forth since the last Presidential election among the "youth" vote. Read the NYT article written how college students are more and more disenfranchised with the two party system (<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/03/us/politics/03students.html>). See a pattern developing here? **Let me debate!!!!**

8. Up until 2006 there had never been an unaffiliated candidate for governor. Paul Fiorino was the first in 2006 to be on the ballot as (UAF) for Governor of this great state. I don't agree with or support Paul's platform, but I sure do admire his patriotism, hard work (he has always obtained his own signatures), and his beliefs in the arts. The Y2006 was only 4 years ago v. 234 years of American politics - virtually all of which have been between some form of D, R. That is a pretty daunting bridge to cross. Why make it even harder, even more unfair, even more impartial by not allowing (UAF) candidates to debate? I am only asking for a level playing field! Nothing less! Nothing more! **Let me debate!!!!**

9. I must commend Dan Maes as the only candidate with the understanding and love of our state, our country, our flag, and our constitution who has said publicly on numerous occasions to let Jason Clark debate! What are Tom Tancredo and John Hickenlooper scared of? My voice? "Be wary of the man who is scared to compete." Jason R. Clark (I/UAF) for Colorado Governor. **Let me debate!!!!**

10. **Why not? Let me debate!!!!**

Thank You Colorado!!!!

Jason R. Clark (I/UAF) candidate for Governor of Colorado  
[www.jasonclarkforgovernor.com](http://www.jasonclarkforgovernor.com)