



Bruce Ruff Commentary Is Now Published Locally, Nationally and Internationally

The Selection

***I want to address here why I opted to not participate
in the Board of Supervisors' selection process.***

The Board of Supervisors knew there was a real possibility, through a strong and persistent rumor, for over 5-years, that said Bill Kolender intended to step down, just past mid-term of his present term, and recommend his personal friend (Bill Gore) be given his job.

Honorable and professional, elected representatives of any public region, especially when they know they will be tasked, by law, with appointing a replacement for another elected position if that position should become vacant, they have a moral and ethical obligation to remain silent about their preferences toward such replacement prior to the event that would cause such action.

The Board of Supervisors knew they had no specific experience, criteria, rules of specific parameters, or measurable requirements within which their selection process would need to be done. Because of no precedent establishing rules or actions this Board was free to make up whatever criteria, rules and parameters they deem appropriate for making their selection – and this is now the precedent for the future. If the next elected sheriff should decide to step down and give the job to his friend the precedent is now set for that to happen. **(in future decisions)**

So **(since)** the Board members having previously exposed their bias, made their preferences for their selection known and very public – and I remind you it was still without unanimity – it says their preference(s) are based on no personal knowledge of the skills sets, or performances histories, or any other credible criteria that could be equally judged and held sustainable toward/for all the candidates. This said, it was inevitable that the selection process would simply be a pretence – and the majority, who had already made public their preference, would simply prevail.

So the process could not be fair, and what was expected, by all who understood the above, was that Bill Gore, already supported by the majority of the 5-supervisors would prevail.

Bruce Ruff for Sheriff 2010, Law enforcement committed to excellence!

I encourage you to view the video the supervisors are having re-run showing their interview process and you can see for yourself what a pathetic demonstration it was.

The questions were set to benefit those who are currently in positions to have data the others could not realistically have known – so the bias of the process in that light alone demonstrated the fallacy of an assumption the process was fair.

Once the supervisors had made public statements about their endorsements, and clearly tainted the selection processes possibility for fairness, the only honorable way to resolve the issue would be through other means. The complete failure to demonstrate professional discipline and keep one's opinion secret (to at least purport to be being fair) would have been to recuse/exclude the board members from the selection process. And this would allow them to only participate to the extent they must - which was making an appointment but not conducting the interviews and reviews.

This could have been done by deferring to the most recent, past, election cycle.

The voters were asked in 2006 to vote for whom they wanted to have as their sheriff.

The voters were told, by Bill Kolender, in various ways that he would stay the full term if they voted for him. The Union Tribune even did an article about the rumor and through their story they and Bill Kolender assured the voters Bill Kolender would stay full term if re-elected. This turned out to be absolutely untrue.

The 2006 election was open and gave opportunity for all who sought to be considered to become the sheriff, and who possessed the legal credentials to run for the office, to have run for the position.

The competition was resolved – but now we know it was conducted with untrue assertions by Bill Kolender - and this his voter base was ultimately going to come to discover he lied to them.

In Communist societies they have politburos – they decide who can be selected and then tell the voters, if they get to vote at all, who it is they need to select – write me and explain to me the difference between politburo in Communist society and what just happened here.

In order to prevent politburo style politics here in San Diego the Board of Supervisors were advised, in a letter from me to Supervisor Jacob that they

Bruce Ruff for Sheriff 2010, Law enforcement committed to excellence!

should defer to 2006 election results. To allow the sheriff to pick his successor and the board thus becoming complicit through the appointment of the friend and handpicked successor through an exclusive process - would be against the will of the electorate and a betrayal of the voter's voices from 2006.

If the board had simply been courageous enough to select the second highest vote receiver from the 2006 election it would have sent some very clear messages to all:

- 1.) If one wished to be considered for an elected position should the elected party be unable or unwilling to complete their elected term - then one must run for that position.
- 2.) The selection process would stop politburo behaviors and clearly demonstrate a commitment to the voters to recognize their choices in order of vote numbers.

Since this was not done, I believed the outcome of the alleged "fair interview and application process" could not be different than the predictable outcome prior to the pretence there was a fair process going to be conducted.

So, you decide:

Are you comfortable with what has transpired?
Do you believe the process was fair in the least?
Doesn't it appear, if you've seen the broadcast, that those who worked for, or with, the Board of Supervisors had clear advantage for having some inside information that would make them appear more enlightened?

It was impossible to remove the taint the Board of Supervisors seemingly placed on the selection process by their exuberance to tell the public their preferences very early.

I ask that you do your homework, look at the facts and send a message in 2010 that you disapprove of what was happened.

What was done was done – but what was done should not have been done!

You have the power to change this in 2010 – help me send that message!

###

"Get Ruff on Crime"