

April 19, 1971

# WHAT'S GOING ON?

This Newsletter has been issued for 11 years because the newspapers in Imperial and Coachella Valleys, Calif., South of Palm Springs, have NOT PRINTED THE TRUTH OF WHAT IS GOING ON HERE. There are 2 main offenders-SCHURZ'S PROSTITUTED PRESS with daily newspapers in Indio, Brawley, and El Centro and the San Diego Union which is distributed here in great numbers.

The San Diego Union has a very poor reputation in the newspaper world as one can see if he went to the library and read the article in the January 5, 1970 issue of NEWSWEEK. To illustrate, there was a race riot in San Diego but the San Diego Union would not report it ALTHOUGH OUT OF TOWN NEWSPAPERS REPORTED IT. The San Diego Union is in collusion with the BIG RANCHERS of Imperial and Coachella Valleys and will not report what the opposition to the BIG RANCHERS is doing or saying or news adverse to the public image of the big farm interests.

SCHURZ'S PROSTITUTED PRESS does not report the news adverse to the big ranchers like the IRVINE CO., United Fruit Co., Dow Chemical Co., Tenneco, and many others WHO ARE ABSENTEE LANDOWNERS who own 70% of the farmland in these 2 valleys. SCHURZ'S PROSTITUTED PRESS gets its "payoffs" in the form of advertisements from this power structure of BIG RANCHERS AND THEIR ALLIES. The Imperial and Coachella Valleys have a combined agricultural production of 350 Millions which give a yearly profit of \$75 millions. That is why these billion dollars companies like the Irvine Co., United Fruit Co., Dow Chemical Co. etc. are operating in these valleys.

Recently, there has been great activity in lawsuits which were started so that absentee corporations doing farming in these valleys would be forced out. Both the San Diego Union and Schurz's newspapers have not explained what has happened. IF THE PEOPLE KNEW WHAT'S GOING ON, the people would demonstrate in great numbers in front of the main IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT OFFICES in El Centro and in front of THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT WHERE JUDGE TORRENTINE IS, to express their displeasure because their "right for due process of the law" has illegally been taken away from them.

Governments all over the world tell their people not to make violent demonstrations but to take the matter to court. In practice, "the due process of law" in Court is often not permitted. What "due process of law" means can best be understood by giving an actual example.

There is the famous EL PASO NATURAL GAS CO. LAWSUIT. This company had supplied gas wholesale to the people of California for many years. It was a monopoly. (Read NEWSWEEK of June 30, 1969 for full details.) William Bennett on the Calif. Public Service Commission, had fought this monopoly so that by 1963, the people of California had been saved a total of \$158 millions in gas bill charges.

William Bennett while on the Public Utilities Commission had prodded the Anti-Trust Division of the U.S. Dept. of Justice to start a lawsuit for El Paso Natural Gas to divest itself of ownership of the Pacific Northwest Pipeline which was the cause of the monopoly. It was to be sold to another company but the result would be another monopoly squeezing the people of California. The Calif. Public Utilities Commission had entered this lawsuit on the side of the U.S. Dept. of Justice.

By 1968, Governor Reagan would not reappoint William Bennett to the Commission. The Commission announced that it would not appeal the decision of the sale to the new company although Mr. Bennett said a new monopoly was being formed. Erwin Griswold, the Solicitor General of the Department of Justice announced he would not appeal.

So William Bennett did something that had never been done in the history of U.S. jurisprudence. As a private citizen, he went before the U.S. Supreme Court and made an appeal that he was the "advocate of the consumer" and should be heard. The U.S. Supreme Court not only granted the right to appeal but after hearing his argument agreed that a new monopoly was being formed.

This set a new precedent that when crooks like the Calif. Public Utilities Commission and Solicitor General Erwin Griswold steal the people's right to "have due process of the law" by not appealing, that private citizens can appeal when the corrupt officials do not.

Here, for 4 years the big farm interests with their political influence were able to stall hearings on the lawsuit *United States v. Imperial Irrigation District* which was a lawsuit to prevent anyone receiving water to farm more than 160 acres pursuant to the U.S. Reclamation Law of 1902. I put out a Newsletter entitled *OPEN LETTER TO JUDGE TURRENTINE* and was successful in having this lawsuit scheduled for trial in December 1970 at the U.S. District Court in San Diego, Calif.

Judge Turrentine and all lawyers involved in this lawsuit prior to the trial said that if they lost, they would appeal. The lawsuit was heard and Judge Turrentine made a decision that the 160 acres limitation SHOULD NOT BE ENFORCED BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT HAD NOT ENFORCED IT FOR A LONG TIME. Because Judges do not make decisions "because a law was not enforced a long time" a Nader Raider investigated Judge Turrentine and found that he was a land speculator in this area and has a probable "conflict of interest".

Immediately, various politicians like Congressman Victor Veysey made speeches that they were going to use their influence to prevent an appeal. The Dept. of Justice lawyers stalled in announcing the appeal of the lawsuit. So I notified Attorney General Mitchell of the probable "conflict of interest" of Judge Turrentine, urging immediate appeal. Finally, it leaked out in the newspapers that Solicitor General Erwin Griswold of the U.S. Dept. of Justice was going to make the decision as to the appeal. This is the same crook who attempted to steal "due process of the law" from the people in the El Paso Natural Gas lawsuit.

As the end of the time to make the appeal was drawing close, Arthur Brunwasser, my lawyer in San Francisco, and I decided that the Government officials under the political pressure of the politicians (we little people have no political pressure because we have not the big money to contribute to campaign funds for election of the politicians like Congressman Victor Veysey or Senator John Tunney) would not appeal.

SO ON MARCH 29, 1971, ARTHUR BRUNWASSER ASKED TO ENTER THIS LAWSUIT ON BEHALF OF MYSELF AND 123 OTHER RESIDENTS HERE USING THE PRECEDENT SET BY WILLIAM BENNETT IN THE EL PASO NATURAL GAS CASE. JUDGE TURRENTINE REFUSED TO FOLLOW THE PRECEDENT SET BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT.

I then made up the Newsletter *THE CROOKS' DILEMMA* telling how "due process of the law" was being prevented and mailed it to news media, President Nixon, many U.S. Senators and Congressmen, officials in the U.S. Dept. of Justice and Interior Dept. etc. On April 10, 1971, Erwin Griswold, Solicitor General of the U.S. Dept. of Justice announced that no appeal was to be made because the Interior Dept. did not want it. But the corrupt Interior Dept. was the cause of all the trouble because it has not enforced the law here against the big farm interests for 35 years. So Arthur Brunwasser appealed Judge Turrentine's decision to the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco so that the people will not have "due process of the law" stolen from them. So the fight still continues on the 160 acres limitation.

But it is important to point out I and the 123 other residents are the complainants in a lawsuit against the Secretary of Interior to enforce another provision of the U.S. Reclamation Law which forbids outsiders to farm here. This lawsuit is much more important than the 160 acres limitation. Judge William Murray of Montana heard this lawsuit about March 23, 1971 but has not given his decision as yet. NO NEWSPAPER REPORTED THIS TRIAL. It is time for the Judiciary Committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives to investigate Erwin Griswold for his attempts to stop "due process of law" in the Courts.