State Ballot Issues

A BIRD'S EYE VIEW

This November California voters must consider a stunning array of State propositions. Although several of these measures appear harmless enough, past experience has shown they deserve careful study. For example, Proposition 8 appears as an innocuous "ecology" measure that might help curb pollution. Yet if this issue is approved, it will provide huge tax write-offs for industry which, by encouraging industrial growth, actually increases pollution.

Grassroots discusses the propositions and makes recommendations. We have included a summary of our recommendations for your convenience.

Proposition 1

Proposition 1, if passed, will provide $160 million for major construction, acquisition of equipment, and purchase of sites for community colleges. Junior college systems are governed locally and tend to be more responsive to community pressure than the two state-wide university systems. Locally controlled colleges need encouragement. Yet Berkeley and Northwest Oakland have been "rippled-off" by the Peralta Junior College District. No Berkeley campus has been built as promised and Grove St. is being phased out. Peralta administrators would use the revenue from this bond to construct a "multipurpose facility" on the Feather River College campus in Plumas Co. and a gym at Alameda College. Athletic equipment would also be purchased. The old Grove St. campus (formerly Merritt) would not receive a dime. Until the Peralta board is returned to the people, WE URGE A NO VOTE ON BOND ISSUES FOR THIS DISTRICT.

Proposition 2

The University's Health Science Facilities Bond (Proposition 2) issue appears routinely on every ballot (look for it on the Rent Control Board Ballot!). This bond would provide the kind of facilities that every medico and every potential medico (and other assorted pretenders) assumes to be its inalienable right. Our medical system stinks and providing these chumps with more labs and classrooms just helps perpetuate their smelly system. Right on! VOTE NO ON THE DEATH PENALTY!

Proposition 3

Proposition 3 allows the legislature to issue revenue bonds for the purchase, construction, and installation of pollution control facilities. These facilities would then be leased, at low interest (of course), to private companies. The cost of controlling pollution should be borne directly by the company. But companies pass those costs on to the consumer. Saturday consumer consciousness will discourage the production of unnecessary items. Until then VOTE NO ON 3.

Proposition 4

The Legislative Reorganization measure (Prop. 4) calls for a two-year session and several procedural reforms. Proponents argue that this issue will streamline operations of the legislature and provide more responsiveness to the public. This remains to be seen! But, because of the two-year session, special interests will have a more difficult time defeating key legislation. This may be the case since the principal opponents are organized interests. WE RECOMMEND YES ON 4.

Proposition 5

Proposition 5 authorizes school boards to initiate and carry on any programs or activities which do not conflict with state law. The original legislation on this measure was passed by the legislature but vetoed by Reagan. It allows for more community control of the school system and opponents argue that the State Department of Education will lose "effective control over irresponsible programs." Right on! VOTE YES.

Proposition 6

This measure (Prop. 6) would modernize the State Constitution in line with recommendations of the Constitution Revision Commission. It involves the setting of state boundaries, and concerns suits against the state, and salaries and term of office of state officials. If this issue passes it should be easier to change the term of office of appointed officials, i.e., Board of Regents. VOTE YES.

Proposition 7

Proposition 7 changes the minimum age for voting, incorporates the requirement for open presidential primaries, and removes the details regarding literacy and residency. This is a change in the constitution. Opponents argue that the residence requirement of 30 days would let transients (meaning students) control cities and counties, making it harder for the Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Realtors to control development projects, zoning laws, etc. VOTE YES.
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DELLUMS & McGOVERN How To Help
By Fras, Jenimato

As the Dullums representative in the Berkeley McGovern United Campaign Office, I am mainly concerned with organizing door-to-door precinct work in all non-student areas of Berkeley. On this I'm working with Dolores Taller and Genta Barlow (from the McGovern campaign). Please Budlall and Jeff Rudolph are doing the same in the campus areas.

We are doing this on the basis of having people work their own precincts. At the moment (October 7) we have about 50 percent of non-student Berkeley covered by people in their home precincts. Some of this will come unstuck, of course. But on, the basis of previous campaigns this represents a very successful beginning.

If you want to do your own precinct (or part of it) call me on Dolores or Genta at the office (841-9322) or me at home after 7 pm (654-5082).

We need more workers. If we can get all or almost all of Berkeley covered by people who make a long term commitment to work in their own precincts, then we will be able to send the people who can only volunteer a week-end or a few hours into other areas (Richmond, Alhambra, and Oakland, for example) where there is a shortage of local volunteers.

The immediate goal of all this effort, naturally, is to get as many votes as possible for McGovern, Dellums, Meade, Miller, No N. M., No on Proposition 17, etc. But there's a long term goal. And that is to develop an experienced network of precinct workers who will work in the city council elections next spring.

Selection work is not over on election day. Paul Grabowski (call on 2 and 10 PM at 841-9322) is in charge of the Get-Out-The-Vote Drive. If you can only work one day, work election day.

Keep Grassroots Growing
Grassroots, as a community-oriented newspaper, relies on subscriptions, on the participation and contributions of the community, and not on street sales, vendors, or advertisers.

Please help. Send us your subscription today (and tell us about others who may be interested. We'll send them sample copies for 3 months free).
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ROY WHO?

by Gilbert Bendix

Elected governments come and go, but bureaucracies go on forever. How can we stop the Left from leaving the frustration of getting our candidate elected to an office like AC Transit Director only to see progressive programs stalled in a bureaucratic traffic jam? The answer is simple: we can elect a candidate who is not only knowledgeable in transit and engineering as an AC Transit bureaucrat and is dedicated to social justice and service to the people-ROY NAKADEGAWA.

An Insider With A Difference
Roy, who is a Senior Civil Engineer for the City of Richmond, knows first-hand about both the technology of transit and the workings of bureaucracy, yet he is a dedicated activist for the people. He was a charter member of the April Coalition, the Berkeley Coalition, and the Community for New Politics. His salary and bank account have been repeatedly attached because of his refusal to pay war taxes.

Fighting Land Rip-Off
Roy Nakadegawa has donated his professional know-how to numerous neighborhood groups, including Westbrae Neighborhood Association and North Berkeley Neighborhood Association, in the fight against large, profit-oriented developments trying to rip off the people. The Hearst Strip, Albany Hill, Berkeley Marina, Mountain Village. Even establishment groups have availed themselves of his expertise; he has served

on Richmond's Model Cities Transit and Environment Committee, Berkeley's Local Transit Study Committee, and Vice-Chairperson of Urban Care.

From Physics to Dog Food
Roy Nakadegawa was born in Los Angeles in 1923. In 1941, upon graduation from high school, he was honored with the Travis Memorial Award as outstanding physical science student. Two years later he was again honored, this time by internment as a "dangerous" Japanese-American, in the Poston, Arizona relocation camp.

Roy was released from Poston upon admission to Illinois Tech, where he supported himself by analyzing the urine of prisoners and by holding down a job as houseboy to a dog food manufacturer-experiences of indubitable value to an AC Transit candidate.

Now, the best candidate cannot get elected without help. Ward 1, which Roy hopes to represent, contains all of Berkeley east of Sacramento Street, and to the east of Sacramento Street, and to the west and south of Berkeley. It requires dollars and doorbell pushers, dialers and other volunteers to put Roy in the driver's seat. Make sure you carry Roy's literature when you do your McGovern and Dullums precinct work. Roy asks for your support.

To help, contact the Roy Nakadegawa for AC Transit Campaign Committee at 741 The Alameda, Berkeley 94707, or phone 526-5904.

Keep Grassroots Growing
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UNIFIED CAMPAIGN OPPOSES M

by Paul Foreman

On September 13, the Berkeley McGovern United Campaign voted to oppose Proposition M, the election rigging amendment, and to include opposition to M on all slate literature. The steering committee meeting was well attended, and there were many emotional presentations. U.C. students, led by Peter Budall from the Campus United Campaign, argued that students could not participate in a slate effort, unless opposition to M was included. Representatives from the Meade and Dellums precinct committee urged opposition to M as a means of preserving unity and preventing needless duplications of efforts.

Zack Brown, a proposition M supporter, advocated a position of neutrality on M for the McGovern United Campaign. His position was supported by councilwoman Sue Hone.

After a long debate, the vote was overwhelmingly to come out against M. Since that action, other conservative supporters of M have written letters of protest to McGovern, and other Democratic Party leaders. Zack Brown has withdrawn his financial support of the Berkeley McGovern United Campaign.

One noteworthy development in the M campaign was that the supposedly "nonpartisan" League of Women Voters in Berkeley took a partisan stance in favor of Proposition M. This is surprising since the League took neutral positions in previous elections with regards to the Community Control of Police Initiative a year and a half ago. Perhaps Grassroots' readers will be less surprised when they recall that Sue Hone was the recent president of the League of Women Voters.
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How To Help
Now, the best candidate cannot get elected without help. Ward 1, which Roy hopes to represent, contains all of Berkeley east of Sacramento Street, and to the west and south of Berkeley. It requires dollars and doorbell pushers, dialers and other volunteers to put Roy in the driver's seat. Make sure you carry Roy's literature when you do your McGovern and Dellums precinct work. Roy asks for your support.

To help, contact the Roy Nakadegawa for AC Transit Campaign Committee at 741 The Alameda, Berkeley 94707, or phone 526-5904.

Gil Bendix has been working as a precinct worker in left wing campaigns, and as a trade unionist, for over 20 years.
utility districts

ELECTION OFFERS CHANCE FOR CHANGE

By Selina Bendix

Local voters usually ignore the uncontested elections for the Boards of Directors of EBMUD, AC Transit, and the Regional Park District. Not realizing that these Boards have substantial impact on their lives, most voters study neither the candidates nor the issues in these races and no political group has encouraged candidates to run for such offices.

This year, attention has been focused on this part of the November ballot by PACE, the Political Action Coalition for the Environment. PACE is a politically heterogeneous liberal group united by interest in environmental issues. But with the exception of Coalition stalwart Roy Nakadegawa, candidate for AC Transit Director, PACE candidates and members are conservative enough to fear that endorsement by Ron Dellums, or espousement of the right of public employees to organize and to strike, would kill their campaigns, particularly in areas outside of Berkeley.

The present directors of these three districts represent local business interests in maintaining low business tax rates and transportation, and power generation or transmission services, as well as solid waste disposal.

One way of improving the Board would be to change the way Directors are elected. Although they must run from the ward in which they reside, Directors are presently voted on district-wide. If they were actually elected by ward, they could represent a specific group of constituents.

The present Board of Directors, a Chamber of Commerce types, is shown in the accompanying picture. At the left is El Sobrante Director Charles J. Wright, a 1972 appointee, who is on the Richmond Draft Board. Wright represents Ward 1, which includes North Berkeley, Albany, Richmond, and Pinole. He is being opposed by conservationist/jean Sin. No challenger has beaten an incumbent EBMUD Director since 1958. No woman has ever served as Director. Jean has been active in the Sierra Club, the Contra Costa Shoreline Parks Committee, the Baywatchers of Contra Costa County, and the Stop Smog Committee, and he served on the EBMUD Land Use Committee and as advisor to People for Open Space.

P.A.C.E. Candidates

Jean Sirf
Mary Lee Jefferds

East Bay Regional Park District

The present Park District Board consists of four businessmen, a lawyer and two teachers (one of them a biologist). The Board decides how much open space there is going to be in the East Bay, what kind of access will be provided to this open space, and which developments will be placed on it. Decisions are often made without consideration of plans for the development of the 27,000 acres of EBMUD lands which equal the Park District acreage. Since 1969, all activities have been based on a priorities list which has never been related to a general policy statement by Board or staff. There has been a 50 percent turnover in the top 25 staff positions in the District in the last three years, a rate indicative of bad working conditions.

Only a fraction of the potential of the Parks is being exploited. People drive to Sonoma County for recreation facilities that are available in the local Park District. Have you been fishing at Lake Chabot, swimming at Contra Loma, hiking on the wilderness trails in Briones or Sunol? How much of the Park system are you familiar with?

Mary Lee Jefferds, Berkeley's first vocal spokesperson for environmental education, is running against reactionary businessman Paul Harberts for Director from Ward 1. Harberts fought the CORE program to encourage minority hiring by Berkeley merchants and was one of the leaders in the recall effort against the Berkeley School Board members who first proposed integration of the Berkeley schools.

Mary Jefferds managed the Audubon Conservation Center in Berkeley for 15 years, and has been active in statewide environmental activities of the American Association of University Women, Nature Conservancy, and other organizations. She has been involved in the formation of a Center for Renewed Education for Women at UC and is a consultant to the Berkeley School District.

Alameda Contra Costa Transit District

The current businessman Board of Directors of AC Transit is locked into a relatively rigid pattern of concern with keeping taxes down in the face of rising operating and maintenance costs. The members have not faced the implications of the fact that patronage has been dropping continuously since 1968.

The resounding defeat of the Southern California Transit Agency in the last election is evidence that people would really like to give public transit a chance, but it didn't stimulate the Transit District to explore new ideas meaningfully. The District hasn't supported legislation to promote public transit or pushed for review powers over new developments, with their attendant transit problems. The Board meetings are held at 4 p.m. in downtown Oakland instead of in the areas whose transit problems are on the agenda. Result: no one goes to the meetings.

Ideally, BART and AC Transit should become a single, coordinated metropolitan transit agency; this will be difficult to accomplish because of the differences in district boundaries and enabling legislation. BART may not use tax monies for operation or maintenance costs while AC can, using tax money to subsidize fares lower than those of BART.

Much of Berkeley is in AC Transit Ward 1, currently represented by ex-Berkeley Real Estate Board President Claude Daughtry, who, as a Berkeley Planning Commissioner, supported the auto-oriented Berkeley Marina Development.

Ron Dellums, John J. Miller, Ken Meade, Ecology Action, PACE, and many other individuals and organizations have endorsed Roy Nakadegawa for the Ward 3 Directorship this November. Roy is a civil engineer who has advised many community groups on transit problems.

Berkeley west of Sacramento Street is in Ward 2, where the incumbent, William Berk, a plumbing contractor, is opposed by George Dalney Jr., who has been endorsed by Ron Dellums, the Berkeley Black Caucus, and the Richmond Black Caucus. Selina Bendix is a molecular biologist now working as an environmental writer.

Drink One For Dellums

Saturday, October 28
4 - 7 p.m.

Cocktail Party to meet Congressman Ronald V. Dellums and Alex Haley

at the home of
John McElroy
3076 Buena Vista Way
Berkeley

To benefit: Committee to Re-Elect
Ron Dellums
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A specter is haunting white male America. The specter is the threat of affirmative action. As is well known, the softest and best paid jobs in the US are almost exclusively held by white men from certain class backgrounds.

Among blue collar workers, the best paid and secure employment is also almost exclusively that which white men have and which is often controlled through certain trade crafts.

Now the biggest industry in Berkeley—education industry in the person of the University of California—is facing the "threat" of Affirmative Action. This means that the university will have to define a plan to rectify its past sexually and racially discriminatory practices and policies.

For example, although there are whole parts of the world which are known for their female system of farming, there are no gardeners who are females in the university. The maids have jobs and responsibilities similar to those of porters but similar does not mean equal when it comes to wages, security, and benefits. A female secretary with a BA is a secret.

In the best paying and protected job category, not a budding administrative person as male holders of a BA, who usually begin in an entirely different job category.

HEW Complaint

Grassroots obtained an interview with Prof. Harriet Amster, one of the founders of the League of Academic Women (LAW) and a principal author of the original complaint to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare charging discrimination against women at the University.

She clarified for us this maze of discriminatory procedures and executive orders, plans and charts. (Incidentally, Prof. Amster, although employed by the University, was recently denied tenure. The ostensible grounds for this decision was that her research lacks "significant impact". She is taking up an appeal.)

Professor Amster tells how LHW filed the original complaint, waited a year while HEW dragged its heels, and finally sued the University on grounds of sexual discrimination. The original complaint to HEW was based on a federal requirement forbidding sexual and racial discrimination wherever Federal money is granted.

LAW, professors state that a person who has been employed for 8 years should have some security of employment. This is not tenure, but it does offer some job protection.

White men hold 1500 academic jobs at UC, 1300 of which are tenured or in tenure ranks, and only 200 lecturers, women hold a total of 166 academic jobs—less than one in six—of which 90 are lecturers, 47 in tenure ranks, 29 tenured.

LAW Proposals

LAW will continue to demand the right of the above.

Revision of the security of employment situation that presently exists; lecturers not to be released unless caused.

Requirements that researchers, research assistants and others in similar positions be reviewed for other positions when they open up.

An appropriate enforcement mechanism for the above.

A grievance procedure for women—that is, by their peers. (Academic and non-academic employees)

Suitable child care arrangements.

Possibility of part time employment with security provisions (both academic and non-academic).

Part-Time Jobs

Amster sees that part-time jobs can be a two edged sword. She believes that it is very important that women be given the right to the other part of a part-time job.

Part-time employees put in more work and also proportionately more time than full time employees, yet are often abused in matters of medical benefits, vacations, and other basic workers needs. Unless adequate protection can be worked out, part-time work can end up as another female ghetto.

So far, there has been no demand for splitting up of jobs to share employment in a time of heavy employment. In fact, only recently has the University established a single half-time tenure position. To do this, the University "fractionated its "fractionation rule", which were formerly prohibited part-time professional work on the campus.

In any case, part-time work is not a panacea; it can be subject to abuse unless it comes about in conjunction with full benefits and other policy changes beginning with wage increases.

The case at the University of California may well set the pattern for universities and colleges throughout the United States. So, it comes as no surprise that the concept of Affirmative Action has occasioned discussion in the national media. Such national media as Commentary and such widely distributed local media as New York's Village Voice have dealt with some concepts of Affirmative Action. Much of the tone of these articles could have been favorable to the idea of Affirmative Action. The term "quota" is often used, possibly to dredge up old fears. Now it looks as if the mentality that once dreamed up quotas to exclude racial and ethnic minorities calls Affirmative Action "exclusory" for demanding that women and ethnic minorities be brought into interesting, well-paying and secure jobs in proportion to their numbers—in short for seeking an end to the exclusion of women and ethnic minorities.

Affirmative Action is exclusionary in that it tries to exclude those persons who up to this point have been overrepresented in certain job categories relative to their proportion either in the population or in the qualified labor force. For example, white males are about 35% of the US population (men if only men were considered). Yet they are overrepresented in the best paying and protected job categories.

To Him Who Has

Another point Prof. Amster made was that the rates gained in the strike settlement at the University will be brought up in an increased disparity between the wages of men and women. The majority of those who received the pay increases above the standard 6 percent were men. Nearly, all of the relatively few women who received a 6% or 11% increase did so because they worked in jobs which are "male-typed." Members of AFSCME 1695 and other UC, non-academic employees are filing a mass grievance about the recent pay adjustments, calling them a clear example of discrimination.

Current Action

This coming year, Prof. Amster suggested that more part-time jobs can be considered as an apprentice position which is a prerequisite for a job.

Prof. Amster summarized the interview by stating that it will take the organized efforts of women to be powerful enough to make needed change. They will have to end the buddy system that prevails in the various hierarchal know as departments, and to end the type of sexual caste wage system that prevails in the non-academic jobs.

Nixon to the Rescue

The gender and color sorting system of jobs in the US is in danger of being drastically revised. However, those persons who fear strong measures have a supporter in President Nixon.

In a speech given in September, Nixon announced that he plans to amend the Executive Orders on Equal Employment Opportunity that make him the right to make the changes.
The University of California, acting with characteristic dishonesty, and displaying no unusual arrogance towards the community so it blatantly rips off each year, has heard last week that it intended to build high-density housing for married students on People's Park.

Both these projects were announced at the September 21-22 Regents meeting, and both were decided upon with no participation from the community these buildings are to be located in. The gym project, which will be paid for mainly with money collected from recent university student fees, has overcome that bring back memories of the two-month strike which closed down Columbia University in 1968, the focal point of which was the construction of a gym in an oppressed community.

The plan to build housing on the park however, is of more immediate concern, because the Regents have just allocated $235,000 to be spent in fiscal year '72-'73 for plans and working drawings, and Chancellor Albert Bowker has indicated that construction could start in fiscal '73-'74.

University Double Talk

It had been widely believed that the University had no money to build anything at People's Park, and University planners had stated that there was nothing in the University's general budget to indicate that there would be any construction on the site for another four to five years at least, not did building plans of the state's entire higher education system reveal any plans for the People's Park.

Chancellor Bowker's decision to push for construction beginning next year then, and the Regents' decision to float a special bond issue in order to finance it, indicates that the move was a purely political one, to disprove the city and the community of use of the land.

About a week after the fence came down the day of the Council's City-City subcommittee was arranged for in Chancellor Bowker's office. Professor Louis Lapides was the only council person to attend that meeting, also attended by ASUC president Larry Seidman, two representatives from the Park, several members of the Hancock staff, and Berkeley Parks Department head Walker.

At that initial meeting, attended by Bowker, his deputy, Vice-Chancellor Robert Cury and Vice-Chancellor Glenn Grant, University officials indicated that they were really not interested in keeping the Park, were quite clear that it would be a good thing if the city took it off their hands.

Bowker stated that the "rules" he had promulgated were published mainly to appease unnamed forces in Sacramento, and indicated that if things in the Park remained generally "cool" there would be no problems.

Councilwoman Hancock, ASUC president Seidman, representatives from the Park, and Hancock staff members all stressed their desire to have the city gain control of the land. Mr. Toney stated that admission of the University "is a whole different ballgame" for his department, but said he foresee no real problems with it.

"The Regents Are Businessmen"

The university officials said that the best way for this to happen was for the city to present them with a lease, that included an option to buy. There was talk about getting an appraisal of the land for the purpose of assessing its real value. Both Bowker and Cury and explained that in their opinion the Regents would not go for it at a straight lease, because "they are businessmen and essentially see the land as an asset, which they would not want to let go for nothing."

It was agreed at that first meeting that Mr. Toney who has a background in real estate, would draw up a draft lease and present it to the University as soon as possible. Vice-Chancellor Cury and all present that the University would try to keep police harassment to a minimum in the near future, and ordered one of his Council subcommittee to set up several days later. This time Mayor Taney's draft lease, which was presented for consideration, was graduated to ten years, and with interest, you get more interest.

Widener and Simmons not abstained there would have been five votes to pass the lease. Bailey was absent from the meeting.

In trying to figure out the strange turn of events, people close to the Park situation recalled that Bowker reportedly had made during a reception for fellowship students in late June. The enabling legislation, introduced by them Assemblymen Runflood and Mulford in 1965, was never passed.

According to City Fire Chief Robert Kearney, the University, according to the formula worked out in 1958, would have paid the city $1,122,000 in fiscal 70-71, if the legislature had passed the bills introduced in 1965. Multiply $122,000 by ten years, and with interest, you get more than the $1,3 million the University is asking for the Park. It does not even take into account the years of fire service provided by the city before 1965, or before 1958 for that matter.

The Decision Remains

In the final analysis however, it does the University have the right to acquire land in the city of Berkeley, and then construct what it pleases on it, despite the fact that such construction may be in direct violation of the city's zoning regulations, and against the wishes of most of the community.

The University is operating on the assumption that it, as University, has the right to do this. The legality of this is contestable in the opinion of several experts. The question is, will the Council have the guts to legal action, or will it have to be taken by a group of "taxpayers."

The Council also has several other legal ways of its disposal to curb the excesses of the university if it wishes to use the service provided by the city before 1965, or before 1958 for that matter.

U.C.'s Berkeley's Biggest Rip-off

The ultimate question however, does the University have the right to make decisions of the University for many years. In 1958, the University of California for many years. In 1958, the University and the City reached an agreement on how to assess the University on the cost of such service, but the enabling legislation, introduced by then Assemblymen Runflood and Mulford in 1965, was never passed.
FORCED WORK: The New Slavery

by Marilyn McGregor

In the past few months there have been a lot of headlines about "forced work" welfare provisions applicable to Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients. Recently, Dave Chavkin of Berkeley Neighborhood Legal Service (BNLS) explained the situation in some detail.

Two-Gun Attack

These forced work provisions are aimed only at families with children. There are two variations of the forced work provisions, one federal and one state.

The first is the Talmadge amendment to the Social Security Act. An AFDC parent with children 6 or older must register for forced work. This federal amendment was originally part of the Nixon plan for an annual guaranteed income of $2400 for a family of four. The Nixon plan was never enacted, and the Talmadge amendments were instead tacked onto the Social Security Act.

The California State forced work program is called Community Work Experience Program (CEWEP); it is the California forerunner to the Talmadge amendments. CEWEP applies to AFDC recipients whose children are 7 or older. As in the federal program, the parent must sign a "forced work agreement" and "work" without receiving a paycheck. No matter what the job or its prevailing pay scale, the "forced" worker gets only the usual inadequate welfare check. The logical outcome of this plan would be for government agencies like highway maintenance or buildings and grounds to fire regular employees, trim their budgets, and use welfare workers at no cost to the agency. CEWEP, created before the Talmadge amendments, was not scheduled to come to Alameda County for several months. California Welfare Rights has sued the Department of Social Welfare for several months. California government agencies like highway maintenance or buildings and grounds to fire regular employees, trim their budgets, and use welfare workers at no cost to the agency. CEWEP, created before the Talmadge amendments, was at best a partial success.

or certain trade schools theoretically to keep a portion of their earnings in the State of California on the grounds that the parent is a "forced worker." As far as school or trade training is concerned, presumed earnings are unlimited and "forced work" expenses are not paid. The directives require that the job be "valuable" without defining a valuable job. If you are either mentally or physically incapacitated and can prove it, you need not work.

There are many unanswered questions. What job can be assigned? Is "work" in the trade school context to be defined as an education or training activity? How many hours can a "forced worker" work each week? Are there limits on the type of training? These rules imply that a parent does not have to accept forced work unless there are adequate child care arrangements. Who decides whether a child care arrangement is adequate?

Unclear Directives

Chavkin believes that so far the state CEWEP directives leave a lot of loopholes for recipients. The directives do not spell out which forced work expenses will be paid. The directives require that the job be "valuable" without defining a valuable job. If you are either mentally or physically incapacitated and can prove it, you need not work.

There are many unanswered questions. What kind of work will be assigned to a parent with children over 7? Will it be the "best" job available? Will there be a "forced worker" program for the very young? The rules imply that a parent does not have to accept forced work unless there are adequate child care arrangements. Who decides whether adequate child care arrangements are in place?

Fair Hearing

Chavkin emphasized the importance of knowing one's rights, particularly the right to a "Fair Hearing." Whenever a recipient questions a welfare department's action, he or she should request a Fair Hearing through the welfare worker or through the California State Department of Social Welfare. Sacramento, CA, Fair Hearing Division. The law requires that payments to the recipient continue unchanged until a decision is reached after the hearing. It is important that the request be made within 15 working days after the particular action.

Berkeley Neighborhood Legal Services (BNLS) assists people with their Fair Hearings. Statewide, about 40% of the Fair Hearings are won on behalf of the welfare recipient. BNLS wins about 58% of the cases that it takes to Fair Hearings.

Welfare Workers

BNLS relations with welfare workers are varied. BNLS often advises workers of coming directives that would be of help to recipients. (There is never any fear about implementation of regulations that are harmful to welfare recipients. They are issued and acted upon almost immediately.)

BNLS gets most of its referrals from welfare workers who advise the recipient to go to Legal Services. Welfare workers often realize that what they are doing or are ordered to do is unjust if not illegal.

BNLS recently won a precedent-setting case against an individual worker in Alameda County Welfare Department. Chavkin expects that there will be similar suits in the future. These suits may force punitive workers to perform on a more humane level, and reduce the constant problem of helpful workers quitting in despair.

BNLS Services

Chavkin sees the function of legal services as threefold.

1. Community education and prevention of a law. BNLS gives legal advice and tries to anticipate changes in the law.

2. Handling service cases. BNLS handles cases such as Fair Hearings, Landlord-Tenant, loan contracts, and other aspects of law including domestic relations.

BNLS works closely with Berkeley Welfare Rights. At present Welfare Rights operates out of 2325 6th Street, the home of Gladys Jenkins. BNLS and BCDC both help Welfare Rights produce their newsletter, "The Welfare Fighter." Welfare Rights has a proposal pending before BCDC for funding to operate an office and expand its services. Welfare Rights also plans to maintain a continuous presence in the local welfare department beginning this fall.

Action Needed

On a city level a number of actions should be taken to help welfare recipients. The City Council should be urged to refuse to sign a User Agency Agreement with HRD, as it could set a precedent for the rest of the county. The City and school district (should) provide for more child care, so that parents could obtain paying jobs instead of working for a welfare check. The City Council should supply money for emergency food projects and other emergency services.

BNLS's proposal to the City Council for a much-needed grant of $25,000 for an attorney and supportive staff was denied. Some cities are already supporting the wages of an attorney in the Legal Services of their areas. Berkeley should have been in the forefront in subsidizing people's legal services. Get behind these demands!
running the maze for childcare

by Mary Millman

(This article is based in part on an exclusive interview with Dorothy Snyder, Bureau of Preschool, State Department of Education.)

The "Moretti-Lewis-Brown-Rodda (!) Child Development Act" (aka AB 99, signed into law in July) consolidates all child care services into a "child development program" under the aegis of the State Department of Social Welfare (SDSW) of their responsibilities for the provision of child care. AB 99 also establishes an Office of Educational Liaison (Reagan appoints the director) in the state Health and Welfare Agency (HWA), and appropriates $3 million for the child development program. Since its passage, AB 99, an "urgency statute", has generated statewide confusion, the main questions focusing on administration and access to state and federal child care monies.

Ab, Wilderness!

The general outline of AB 99's administrative structure has been common knowledge in Sacramento since July: centered in the Bureau of Preschool (SDE), the system will probably employ field agents to execute contracts between Sacramento and local groups (the latter to encompass school districts, county welfare agencies, community organizations, and even proprietary child care enterprises).

There are two further complications in the administration of AB 99 which ought to make veteran observers of the child care scene queezy. In the first place, although the statute designates SDE as the "single state agency responsible for the promotion, development and provision of care of children in the absence of their parents," SDSW is presently the only state agency capable of receiving Title IV (federal) child care funds. AB 99 directs the Superintendent of Public Instruction to request a transfer of the capacity to receive federal monies from SDE to SDSW. The success of this maneuver really depends on whether the federal government will grant the appropriate waiver to the state, which has not occurred to date. Some observers fear that the waiver will be undermined in the fight over HR1, Nixon's "forced-work" welfare reform measure. In this event, SDE would have to contract with SDSW for federal child care funds.

In the second place, the $3 million of state child care funds appropriated by AB 99 were placed, not in SDE's budget, but rather in the budget of HWA. In effect, then, SDE acquired all the administrative responsibility for day care but no money for expansion of services. SDSW is required by the statute to contract with HWA for the state monies. The new Reagan-appointee-riddled Office of Educational Liaison (in HWA) will, of course, oversee the process. We need only remember that it took two years to get the essential contract between SDE and SDSW enabling federal money to flow into the Children's Center Program to conjure up an image of what a quagmire AB 99's contractual complexities could create.

Before this scheme can be rendered operative, however, SDSW must report to the legislature on both the current situation of on-going day care services in the state and on the SDE "program" for implementation of AB 99. Fact-finding tours in the counties are now in progress, but the final implementation of AB 99 is some months away. To insure continuity in the provision of services, in late August Wilson Riles directed SDSW and the counties to continue their day care functions until AB 99 was fully implemented.

You Can Fool Some Of The People

The more pressing problem ensuing from AB 99's passage is access by local providers of services to federal and state child care funds. The $3 million granted by the statute will not be spent until there is a structure through which it can flow. Pursuant to Riles' directive, SDSW and the counties retain in present function as the conduit for state and federal funds; but in fact, the counties have embraced the confusion created by AB 99 as an excuse for virtually halting their day care activities. Alameda County has funded no new programs since June.

Perhaps the most disheartening consequence of this situation is that SB 796 funds have been lost in the shuffle. SB 796 appropriated (for FY 71-72) state money for day care, $160,000 of which became available to Alameda County in late June. County Human Resources Agency personnel now emphatically state that "SB 796 money is not going to come through." Yet HWA has publicly assured SDSW that SB 796 funds are available to the counties. (It is an interesting sidelight that SDSW refuses to divulge to SDE a financial report on the status of SB 796 funds.)

AB 99 was hailed as a rational approach to the fragmented complex of child care services in the state, but it has to date mostly compounded a situation already ridiculously complex. On the state level, those who have an interest in preventing the expansion of state and federally-supported child care now possess a perfect excuse for doing nothing. No one has taken initiative to clarify the situation, nor has there been organized pressure to get new services functioning. From the local perspective, the avenues to state and federal money for child care will remain effectively blocked in the interim until AB 99 is operative as long as people accept the county welfare agency's shuck and jive.

There is one final underlying irony. AB 99, both in its administrative and fiscal aspects, is predicated on Title IV funds: that is, state child care money can only be used to capture matching federal funds which exclusively subsidize child care for families who fall within certain welfare categories. Federal money for child care services for this narrow segment of the population have at least hitherto been limitless, but there is every indication that Nixon will soon place a lid on Title IV, restricting it essentially to the level of services it now supports. AB 99, though its implementation will consume much energy, may well result in little, if any, expansion of services for children.

white men?

From page 4...

And that means Affirmative Action will have little force behind it. It means that institutions can say, "Well, we tried and perhaps we have our one black, our one Asian, our one Chicano, our one woman and we just could not find any more." It means that specific time tables, proportions and goals would no longer apply.

Moreover, the long delay on the Letter of Findings to the University and the scheduling of the injunction some 40 days after its delivery may indeed be related to the national elections. How then can people respond when modest attempts at social justice through bureaucratic procedures are preempted by presidential action. More self hate? More self destruction? Or anger turning outward?

The rage of women is deep if somewhat veiled. Alta, a poet of the Bay Area, expresses many women's feelings.

most women are shorter than most men it's easy to over look us unless we stick our fingers into your eyes and say look at me, baby, or you won't be able to see at all.

-Marilyn McGregor-

M. McGregor is one of the many unemployed women in the Bay Area. She will accept money in lieu of work.

GRASSROOTS
Anti-war activities: a part of our struggle

Car Tune Up
Oct. 21 & 22
Benefit For Oct. 14 Committee
Sierra Designs Par. Lot
4th & Addison
$10 and parts
no checks please

BOND, CLARK, DELINGER TO SPEAK

The anti-war movement will move back into the representative of the Union of Vietnamese in the U.S. streets October 14 with massive marches and rallies. The San Francisco action is being organized by the Coalition to raise the Indochna War as the primary October 14th Coalition, composed of more than 20 political issue facing the American People as they third world and white groups doing ongoing work in approach the November elections. The themes of the Bay Area. The Coalition has conducted a national comparisons - "Denounce Nixon" and "Support the Seven outreach campaign to make October 14th a day of Point Peace Plan" - will be used to focus attention on national opposition to the Nixon administration and its Nixon's policy of talking peace while making war and war policies and support for the Vietnamese Seven on the fair peace terms put forward by the Vietnamese Point Peace Plan.

The Bay Area demonstration will take place in San Francisco on Saturday, October 14. The march will begin at 10 AM in Mission Dolores Park. We must arm the Nixon administration that there will be continued and heightened opposition to his war policies, no matter who wins in November. At the same time we inform the American people of Nixon's position of unimportance.

Community Anti-War Action Needed

by Dan Siegel

The re-election of Richard Nixon means the potential destruction of Indochina. Four more years of the Nixon peace policy: talking a good line while escalating the campaign of terror in a war of the potential destruction of Indochina.

After November 7, all the restraints will be off. In his acceptance speech in Miami, Nixon spelled out the three "nevers" that define his war policy. Never, he said, will he (1) Stop supporting the Thieu regime; (2) Stop the bombing before all U.S. prisoners are released; and (3) "Stain the honor" of the United States.

And with his second and last term in office, as well as his place in history, secure, Richard Nixon will exercise uninhibited discretion in the use of anti-personnel bombs, defoliants, chemical and biological warfare agents, and all of the other fiendish devices of a war that is uninhibited in its use of our bored and unimportant.

As long as American society is allowed to function smoothly and peacefully, the government can and will do what it likes to combat the liberation movements in Indochina.

Vietnamese Look To Us

The Vietnamese understand this well. Recently a long time Berkeley activist spent several weeks in South Vietnam talking with anti-Thieu and anti-war forces. She was continuously asked why the American anti-war movement had died after what the Vietnamese considered our greatest success, forcing Nixon to abandon his Cambodia invasion. Perhaps, in 1970 as today, too many Americans put all of their peace eggs in the basket of the Democratic Party.

Vietnamese citizens, people in America; that those who get rich from the war do not want funds spent to provide health or child care or to clean up the environment; that implicit in the sexist, racist and anti-war policies and support for the Vietnamese Seven is the oppression of third world people in America. Those who get rich from the war do not want funds spent to provide health or child care or to clean up the environment. That implicit in the sexist nature of American society is the inhumanity which blinds Americans to the suffering of the Indochinese people.

Therefore, it should not be necessary to set up a separate anti-war apparatus in any area or around any issue. We have reached the level where people understand the connections that bind particular issues together: that the racism which tolerates genocide against the people of Indochina allows the oppression of third world people in America. Those who get rich from the war do not want funds spent to provide health or child care or to clean up the environment. That implicit in the sexist, racist and anti-war policies and support for the Vietnamese Seven is the oppression of third world people in America. Those who get rich from the war do not want funds spent to provide health or child care or to clean up the environment.

Community Anti-War action is being organized by the Coalition, composed of more than 20 third world and white groups doing ongoing work in the Bay Area. The Coalition has conducted a national outreach campaign to make October 14th a day of Point Peace Plan. The Coalition believes that the weeks before the elections are crucial for independent anti-war activity. Anti-war headquarters should be established in each city, and in sub-areas of the larger cities. Each headquarters should serve as the center for groups doing work in neighborhoods and workplaces, as well as for groups providing community services or organizing around local issues.

Contacts should be made with all of the groups in each city doing organizing in any area. We must reach the level where people understand the connections that bind particular issues together: that the sexism which tolerates genocide against the people of Indochina allows the oppression of third world people in America. Those who get rich from the war do not want funds spent to provide health or child care or to clean up the environment; that implicit in the sexist, racist and anti-war policies and support for the Vietnamese Seven is the oppression of third world people in America. Those who get rich from the war do not want funds spent to provide health or child care or to clean up the environment.

Dan Siegel returned to Berkeley in August after a year spent doing legal work for U.S. servicemen in Asia. He is now on the Steering Committee of the October 14 Coalition, and on the staff of Grassroots.
our daily lives

DENOUNCE NIXON

Remember Nixon's secret plan to end the war? His demand that he be given a chance to make peace after four years of Democratic failure? The Nixon peace record: six million people killed, wounded, or made homeless since he took office. U.S. Government statistics show 4.5 million Indochinese civilians killed, wounded, or made homeless. These figures do not include deaths and injuries inflicted by U.S. bombing in Laos, Cambodia, or North Vietnam. Military deaths and injuries number 1.5 million, not including "unofficial" casualties in Laos and Cambodia.

Hiroshima Every Week

Nixon has become history's leading bomber, having ordered U.S. forces to drop 3.7 million tons of bombs in Indochina since he took office. This figure represents almost twice the total tonnage dropped by the U.S. in World War II four times the amount used to level every building in North Korea during the war there. Nixon's tonnage is the equivalent of one Hiroshima every week.

Operation Phoenix, the CIA-directed program to eliminate civilian "subversives" through assassination, has resulted in 39,000 murders since Nixon took office. Even LBJ could eliminate only 2,000 people under the Phoenix program.

Ecological damage under Nixon includes 13 million bomb craters, 1.7 billion cubic yards of earth displaced, 750,000 acres bulldozed.

Since Nixon took office, the war has cost the American people $59 billion, 20,000 dead, 110,000 wounded, and 500 captured or missing in action. Current costs are 10 casualties and $20 million daily.

The world air attack now being waged against Vietnam involves 1,400 fixed-wing aircraft, 700 helicopters, 50 warships in the Gulf of Tonkin, 35,000 U.S. troops in South Vietnam, and 200,000 airmen and sailors waging war from outside Indochina. In June the last month for which figures are available, this armada dropped two tons of bombs every 60 seconds on the people of Indochina. Daily Pentagon reports indicate an ever-increasing attack.

Recently the editor of Finance Magazine announced that he had recruited 28 heads of state and raised $20,000 in an effort to win the Nobel Peace Prize for Nixon in 1973. What next?

(Figures compiled by Project Air War from official U.S. government sources.)

Support the 7 Points

The Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam presented the Seven Point Peace Plan at the Paris talks on July 1, 1971. Because the plan is not just a bargaining position, but rather a fair and just proposal to provide for the future of Vietnam, the proposal has been endorsed by many communist and non-communist nations throughout the world.

Many Americans, including Democratic presidential candidate George McGovern, have endorsed the principles of the plan.

Main Provisions

The Seven Point Peace Plan consists of two main provisions: First, the U.S. must set the date for the total withdrawal of all its own and allied troops and materials from South Vietnam. Second, the U.S. must end its support for the corrupt, tottering regime of President Nguyen Van Thieu so that the Vietnamese people can determine their own destiny.

Once the U.S. sets the date for troop withdrawal, the North Vietnamese will begin to release the American POW's it holds. The last POW will be released at the same time as the last U.S. serviceman is withdrawn.

A ceasefire and cessation of all military activities by all parties will begin as soon as the date for U.S. troop withdrawal is set.

Thieu the Stumbling Block

The major dispute blocking U.S. acceptance of the plan is the question of the Thieu government. Nixon promised at the Republican convention that he would "never" withdraw support from Thieu, despite the fact that doing so would simply mean recognizing that the Vietnamese people have the right to self-determination. If Thieu were the choice of any large number of Vietnamese, he would be able to survive the withdrawal of U.S. backing.

The plan calls for the replacement of the Thieu regime with an administration aspiring to peace and national unity formed by democratic and peace forces and even elements of the Thieu administration. The PRG will join with this group to form a government of national concord that will organize and hold elections, protect all persons from acts of terror or reprisal, reestablish all refugees, and free all political prisoners from jails and concentration camps.

The reunification of North and South Vietnam will be achieved in a gradual and peaceful manner in accordance with the wishes of the people in both zones. Both North and South will maintain positions of neutrality pending reunification.

Nixon's Bogus Plan

Nixon has attempted to divert attention from the Seven Point Plan by offering his own bogus peace proposal, which is simply a call for Vietnamese surrender. The Nixon plan demands that all POW's be returned and a ceasefire begin four months before the U.S. withdrawal. The ceasefire proposal mentions nothing of U.S. bombing or actions by the South Vietnamese military. To say that this offer, "the Vietnamese, who have been continually double-crossed by the U.S., since Eisenhower called off the national elections and reunification scheduled for 1956, would have to trust Nixon to actually withdraw the troops. Returning the POW's before the cessation of hostilities, as Nixon demands, would mean the surrender of one of the Vietnamese's few bargaining points and an act unprecedented in the history of war.

Nixon also refuses to end U.S. intervention in South Vietnamese politics. His plan calls for new elections to be run by the present Saigon government, although Thieu himself would resign two months before the actual balloting. Nothing in the plan insures against a repeat of last October's rigged elections or of the campaign of terror, torture, and arrests waged against political opponents of the Thieu regime.

Surrender or Else

The Nixon proposal came at the height of this spring's Vietnamese offensive, at a time when his Vietnamization policy was being proven unsuccessful, and unprecedented U.S. bombing support was needed to prevent the total destruction of South Vietnam's puppet army. It cannot be viewed as a serious peace offer, but only as a signal that the U.S. seeks only a Vietnamese surrender.

Nixon is attempting to fool the American people into thinking that the Vietnamese are the ones who stubbornly refuse to make peace, we will not object to his attempts to bomb them into submission. We must resist this attempt and work to expose the Nixon policies for what they are, a genocidal attempt to what we are, a genocidal attempt to maintain Indochina in its subservient and neo-colonial status.

The Vietnamese have shown that they will never give up their courageous struggle for liberty, democracy, and independence. But although they will ultimately prevail, in the meantime they are suffering tremendously under the genocidal bombing attacks of the madmen in Washington. It is the job of the American people to stop the slaughter.
Tax Reform: The Sad Story

by Lenny Goldberg

The Berkeley City Council has come up with a new catchphrase in order to turn down programs which serve the needs of the poor: "wait until new sources of revenue have been explored." The "moderate" councilmembers no longer claim to oppose a city income tax; medical care, drug rehabilitation, new parks, and other social programs. They merely claim that the city has no way of raising the money for such programs, despite the millions spent on police and city administration.

They are correct about a fiscal crisis in Berkeley - the property tax rate is one of the highest, if not the highest, in the state. But much of this crisis is due to the actions and inactions of the council. For despite the incantation of "new sources of revenue," the council has done next to nothing to seek these sources.

Council Inaction

Their inaction is not due to lack of possibilities. While Berkeley homeowners and tenants continue to shoulder the heavy property tax burden, proposals for city-wide income taxes have been floating around since the last campaign. Most of these proposals have not been concretely formulated and put before the council; rather, they are just more examples of lip service to the idea of "new revenue sources." However, one - a concrete, workable proposal for a city income tax - has been designed by Lon Hancock. Moted at a council meeting by Ms. Hancock, it died for lack of a second. Loni had hoped for a relatively quick passage of her income tax. Even if passed, such a tax faces a long court test, since it is not clear that a city income tax is legal under the California constitution. But we will not find out unless the council - or a different council after the April elections - takes some action.

BACKGROUND

Before assessing the impact of an income tax, we should look briefly at some of the background of the tax situation. The Berkeley property tax is presently set at a rate of $15 per hundred of assessed valuation (check figure), where assessed valuation is one quarter of the market value of the house. Thus, assessed value of a $20,000 house is $50,000, of which 15% or $1280 per year, is paid in property tax. (This is the same as saying that the tax rate is 4% of total market value - it just happens to be calculated in above manner). Of this $15 per hundred, the largest part - about $7,650 - goes to the school district. About $27.32 goes to the county, and $379 to BART, $2 to the Pen出土 Junior College District, and the rest to myriad state aid items. (see chart). That changes in city revenue collection can affect the property tax rate, but for meaningful tax relief, new modes of revenue collection should affect the school system as well.

Poor Pay More

What's wrong with property tax? Why should there be property tax relief? Basically, the property tax tends to be regressive: that is, poor people pay a higher percentage of their income in property taxes than rich people. This is true because poor people generally spend more of their income on housing, and pay the same property tax rate as the affluent. This situation holds for both relatively low income homeowners (of which there are many in Berkeley) and for renters in Berkeley's tight housing market. Landlords can consider the property tax as just another cost, and pass it on to the renter so that they can make their usual profit.

People on fixed incomes, especially old people, are heavily hit by the property tax. An elderly couple living on social security may have paid off the mortgage on their house long ago, but still may have to pay $100 per month in property tax alone to remain there. Many black people in Berkeley with relatively low incomes are homeowners, but the combination of high unemployment rates and rising property tax rates is enough to drive some of them out of their homes. And prior to rent control, landlords used any property tax increase as an excuse for exorbitant rent increases.

Tax on Business

Since the new council has taken office, there has been one serious effort to raise new revenues, with the impetus coming from councilmen Bailey and Simons. They were hoping to get needed revenues from the business community, in the form of a tax on the gross receipts (as distinct from net receipts, or profits) of businesses. The business community, of course, was not enthusiastic, opposed, and even favoring the tax felt that it was more complicated and less equitable than a city income tax. The result was a compromise which doubled the business license tax, revised it to make it more equitable (it previously had been extremely regressive and the Chamber of Commerce wanted to keep it that way), and added a gross receipts tax on professionals.

The State Tax Mess

Complicating the attempt to reform local taxes is the confused state tax picture. The California State Supreme Court has ruled that the present system of financing education from local property taxes discriminates against low income communities. If this ruling stands, the whole state and local tax system will have to be overhauled, most likely in the direction of increased state taxes and subsidies. Also, alternatives to property taxes, such as income taxes, will be more widely considered as general revenue sources for cities. In the face of all this possible change, the gross receipts tax was shelved.

Youth Alternatives Seeks Foster Homes

Berkeley Youth Alternatives (BYA) has worked constructively with nearly 1,000 young people who for one reason or another found themselves alienated from their families and themselves and at a dead end in terms of their own resources. During the past 3 years of history BYA has provided, developed, and expanded the following services:

- A Foster Home Placement Program which provides long term and short term living alternatives to young people.
- A Counseling Center which provides individual, family, group counseling services on a crisis intervention level as well as on a continuing basis.
- A Juvenile Court Advocacy Program which provides housing and referral services to young people who are interested in experimenting with other families or in a supervised exchange.
- A School Pre-Runaway Counseling Program which is a preventive program developed in the school setting to work with young people who are having family and/or peer-school problems.
- A Volunteer Training program which provides training and guidance for the volunteer staff who work throughout the program.
- An Under 18 Youth Hostel which provides housing and referral services to delinquent youth during the school year.
- A Community Education Program which serves as a liaison between our available services and the family and community at large.
- A Foster Home Service which was developed out of a need to provide the community with the information about Bay Area and national resources.
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RAPE OF THE MARINA

PART II

by Evie Wozniak

On November 2, 1971, the Berkeley City Council voted to amend the 1965 $1,800,000 State Marina loan contract to secure an additional loan for $1,500,000. This second loan like the first would be for the benefit of a few Bay Area boatowners. It would be used to tear down the 2,300 old berths in the south and west walls of the harbor, replace them and add 350 more berths, bringing the harbor’s total to over 1,000. The loan would provide the following services to boaters: harbor improvements, provision of locked security, sewerage dumping stations, telephone ducts and electrical supplies on berths, toilet facilities and an additional parking lot. Both loans would be paid off from berth rentals and concession profits.

However, the additional loan extends the length of Berkeley’s indebtedness to the State past the year 2,000, thereby postponing to the next century any financial return to the community. The second loan does not provide for low cost boating opportunities or other public Marina uses, it locks off piers in the old section of the harbor from public purseview, it requires that additional scarce Marina land be used for boater parking and continues to limit Marina development for the benefit of a few relatively wealthy people. The only imaginable benefit to the public as presently planned would be the $15,000 or 1% of loan money scheduled to be used for shoreline landscaping.

 Silence – Then Misinformation

Until recently, heads of the Department of Recreation and Parks and of Planning maintained that Berkeley was obligated by the first loan contract to apply for the second. However, they were wrong. The first loan only obligated Berkeley to rehabilitate the old berths and specifically provided for funds to make this rehabilitation possible through the mechanism of a reserve fund financed from project area gross receipts. Monies were to be placed to the Reserve Fund beginning financial situation clearly was shaky as indicated by the fact that concessions and berthing brought in several hundreds of thousands of dollars less than anticipated. Today however City bureaucrats explain the failure to maintain a Reserve Fund not as a function of financial inadequacies but rather due to admittedly illegal City in 1968 and terminating in 1974 in the following amounts: year 1968/$44,000; 1969/$41,000; 1970/$61,000; 1971/$52,000; 1972/$72,000; 1973/$53,000; 1974/$35,000. The total rehabilitation obligation was only $340,000 with a required completion date of 1975.

Loan – A Cover Up?

By early July 1970, only $1,732 of the required $147,000 had been placed in the Reserve Fund by city officials. At that time the State "informed" agreed to drop the Reserve Fund requirement if Berkeley took a second loan to meet its rehabilitation obligations. On July 16, 1970, the City Council appeared before the "old" City Council requesting permission to make application for this second loan. He then admitted the failure to maintain a Reserve Fund and attributed it to "unforeseen delays in completing the查封 program and securing commercial tenants." He said that immediate Council action was necessary to meet the State’s budget review cycle so that funds would be available for the 1971-1972 Fiscal year. However, the Council was told that since its binding decision would not occur until 1971, there would be time for a review of the entire Marina financial situation. The bureaucratic juggling of project area gross receipts.

Loan – Secret From Community

When the "new" City Council voted unanimously in favor of the second loan in November 1971, it was a result of both community ignorance and misinformation fed to the Council by City bureaucrats. Community ignorance is generally uninformed. Furthermore, the Marina is hazy. Four citizen commissions and committees (Planning and Recreation Commissions and Marin Design Review and Waterfront Advisory Committees) deal with the Marina but the general public is only promised to withhold processing of the loan temporarily (the loan has not yet been drawn against), the bureaucrats have not been cooperative. Critical financial information essential to evaluate the loans has been promised but not provided to the community. Yet City bureaucrats are the only people who know about the financial situation because they made the in-house feasibility study for the State on the basis of which the State was willing to grant the second loan.

The all-white subcommittee is hung up financially and politically. So far the financial situation is totally unclear. Politically views vary between those persons who feel private boating should be subsidized and that everyone should be encouraged to buy 50 foot yachts to those who feel the second loan should be cancelled to those who feel the second loan should be renegotiated to benefit the public. The latter position is the following. If the financial projections are approximately accurate, and if berthing fees are maximized (i.e., $1.50 per linear foot as opposed to 85 cents), the second loan could bring in enough money to pay off both loans in 8 years, at which time all profits could be available for public use. Or the loan could be renegotiated to allow public use of surplus funds now.

Other items being discussed in the subcommittee include renegotiation of the loan to eliminate more parking, cutting down on berthing, enlarging the project area, allowing for public access to the piers, providing for low cost restaurants and boat rentals, more adequate development of Shorebird Park and the creation of a single commission to deal with Marina and other waterfront planning. The subcommittee will present its final report to the Planning Commission of Wednesday, October 18. From there the issue will go to City Council.

BERKELEY'S OFFICIAL MARINA MAP

WHEN THE MARINA AS IT EXISTS NOW – i.e., following the first loan and before the second. (Inaccuracies are inevitable. Facilities which actually exist are underlined, the others do not exist.)

1. Richfield Fuel Dock
2. Covered Dry Boat Storage
3. Boat Repair
4. Charley's (Marina Inn)
5. Cafe (Marina Inn)
6. Boat Sales (Marina Inn)
7. Marina Inn
8. Restaurant (Marina Inn)
9. Public Sailing Facility
10. Sightseeing Cruise Boat
11. Three Bridges Restaurant
12. Berkeley Marina Sports Center
13. Berkeley Marina Sports Center
14. Alcatraz Office Building
15. Inland Yacht Restaurant
16. Berkeley Yacht Club
17. Boat House
18. Small Boat Basin
19. Should provide
20. Fishing Pier
21. Covered Boat Berths
22. Marine Administration Bld
23. Feature Area
24. Boat Ramp
25. Marina Entrance
26. Parking Lot
27. Parking
28. Cafe
29. Service Area
30. View Point
31. Boat Storage
32. Park
33. Park
34. Auto and Trailer Parking
35. Small Boat Dock and Hotel
36. Movie Docks Sandwich & Tackle Shop (Not Listed)
37. Golf Course
38. Cove
39. Marine生物
40. Berthing Bays
41. Baseball Field
42. Ice Cream Counter
43. Boat Yard
44. Yacht Club
45. Public Kayak Area
46. Jockey Point Building
47. Police
48. U.S. Coast Guard
49. U.S. Coast Guard
50. U.S. Coast Guard

GRASSROOTS
By Julius Cornell

On June of this year, the people of Berkeley decided that they had control over the rent increases imposed on them by big time realtors and developers. With 11,000 signatures needed to place the issue of rent control on the ballot in June, the City Council was asked to vote on it, and it had a convincing victory. In spite of the massively financed campaign by the Board of Realtors, the charter amendment was placed on the June ballot passed by a margin of over 2400 votes.

When the Secretary of State signed the Berkeley rent control law on August 2, 1972, he supposedly started a freeze on all rent increases that would last until 1979, after which a board is elected to administer the city's rents.

Purpose and Power

However, since that time several real estate companies have gone up on their rents, having no regard whatsoever for the new City rules. Donald McCullum, who has been receiving anywhere from thirty to forty calls daily, refused to make any attempt to enforce the law in behalf of the people, who in this case are the claimants. Even though the city attorney directs him to enforce the law and prosecute those who blatantly discard the people's efforts, he refuses even to register tenants' complaints and pursue landlords who violate the amendment.

As a result of this some groups have formed a coalition organization known as the Berkeley Tenants Organizing Committee. This organization consists of several groups: the Black Panther Party, Tenants Action Project, Fair Rent Committee (who were responsible for getting the amendment in motion last winter) and numerous other groups in the community. The purpose being, 1. to try and organize the people around an issue that represents their interest, rent increase, 2. hold meetings and conduct workshops about rent increases and what should be done about them, 3. to try and select a representative slate to run for the Rent Control Board.

The Black Panther Party is once again asking the people to come out in support of the enforcement of the rent control freeze, as well as a rent control board that will fairly and swiftly answer the plea of the Berkeley community.

Let us as a collective gain control of the destiny of our community as well as the rent control board.

Let there be no mistake, this shall be the test of the masses, and if we are successful we will set a most dynamic example that will be world-wide and will set precedence for all oppressed communities in this North Amerikkkan empire.

ALL POWER TO THE PEOPLE.

FREE DAVID HILLIARD, CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE BPP

Julius Cornell is a member of the Black Panther Party.

ARLENE SLAUGHTER

Central Realty Service

Specializing in the Unusual

6436 Telegraph, Oakland

Office 658-2177

Eve. 649-2976
Racism in the Berkeley Police Department is a problem for the whole community. The City Council, the City Manager, the Personnel Department, and particularly the Police Department are unable and/or do not wish to deal with the problem. When BART can hire up to 16 percent of its security force from the black community with requirements as high as the BPD and Baker's police department still has less than 3 percent black police, something is wrong.

If Bruce Baker is serious about changing the racial composition of his police department, then let him stop opposing the rehiring of Johnnie Porter. Johnnie Porter had to organize the support of the department, then let him stop opposing the racial composition of his police department, then let him stop opposing the equitable employment opportunities Commission made. He said that he would stand behind whatever determination the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission made. He concluded the meeting by saying he had spent many sleepless nights over Johnnie Porter's case, and that he would like to see Johnnie "back on the force and working in the community."

Enough of the BPD

The Berkeley community has had enough of the BPD's shilly-shallying. The police are public servants; what they have to do is to say who the city hires or rehires. If Bruce Baker has intimidated City Manager Williamson on the Johnnie Porter case, it is time for Williamson to say so and ask the City Council to remove Baker from his job.

The BPD will never have more than a token two or three percent of Blacks on the force as long as Baker and certain captains and sergeants under him exhibit the racism that seems habitual to them. The EEOC met with the department and requested the records on Johnnie Porter; the Police refused, and the EEOC had to get a subpoena for the records. When they make their determination, undoubtedly on the side of Johnnie Porter, Johnnie will get his job back, and hopefully a footbait in the Black community, where he can best serve.

The whole Berkeley community should acquaint itself with the facts in Johnnie Porter's case. Petitions for community support are now being circulated. For information call or write the Berkeley Black Caucus, 3200 Adeline, phone 655-5756. The Berkeley community has had enough of this police intimidation of its city officials. It's time to FIRE chief Bruce Baker and REHIRE Johnnie Porter.

Paul Foreman is a local writer, poet and printer.

Weak Citizen Voice

A contract for a Neighborhood Traffic Study was approved by the City Council on September 12. The vote was 8-1 with only Hancock opposed. The bulk of this direction, a $142,000 contract will go to the consulting firm of DelEau, Cather, and Co., an accounting corporation with offices in San Francisco.

Discussion on the study centered around community participation. The contract calls vaguely for consultation with citizens but effective involvement is not insured. With this in mind, Hancock moved that (1) a community participation mechanism be formally and explicitly included in the contract, and (2) that the recommendations of the consulting firms not be passed on to the council unless approved in each case by the neighborhoods affected. This motion lost 2-7 with Hancock and Price voting yes. An earlier motion by Hancock to reduce the cost died for lack of a second.

Moderates were satisfied that citizen opinions would be considered; they disapproved of strong, formal community involvement and supported the study's direction by professionals. Hancock pointed out that citizen control is not an unusual practice in city planning and development. Hancock pointed out that the Berkeley Black Caucus, 3200 Adeline, phone 655-5756. The Berkeley community has had enough of this police intimidation of its city officials. It's time to FIRE chief Bruce Baker and REHIRE Johnnie Porter.

Paul Foreman is a local writer, poet and printer.
NIXON'S POLICE STATE
THE FIRST FOUR YEARS?
Anne & Ken Mazlen

In his first term, Nixon has succeeded in controlling the Judiciary and in intimidating Congress. Where judicial rulings and/or laws have been unfavorable or lacking, the Executive have repeatedly acted as judiciary and legislature unto itself. We are, in fact, witnessing the assumption by the Executive of powers which are the very hallmarks of a police state.

LOOK AT THE FACTS:
1. The Executive Branch
In his November, 1969 Des Moines speech, Agnew initiated an all out attack upon freedom of the press by threatening to revoke the licenses of television networks critical of the President. Nixon himself later called a closed meeting of radio and television station owners which resulted in the complete reorganization of more than one station to silence anti-Nixon criticism. In March, 1971, Nixon appointees to the FCC handed down a ruling requiring censorship of certain radio broadcasts. At about the same time, a Justice Department Grand Jury subpoenaed a newsman to supply information gathered in his interviews with a Black Panther. The newsman fought the subpoena because it threatened to undermine the relationship of newsmen to their dissident groups.

In addition, in its brief against the N.Y. Times and Washington Post, the Justice Department sought a decision which would in effect legitimate government censorship of the press, virtually destroying the 1st Amendment right. Also, in the trial of Ellsburg about the release of the Pentagon Papers, the Justice Department is seeking an interpretation of the Official Secrets Act which goes far beyond the control that the military is exercising about the war in Vietnam.

Whereas the Congress has steadfastly refused to give subpoena power to the FBI, which would in effect create a national police force, the Justice Department has placed the Grand Jury system's power of subpoena at the disposal of the FBI. It is clear from the more than thirteen Grand Jury convictions in the last twenty-four months that the Grand Jury is being used to obtain information for the FBI to intimidate dissenters, their families, and their friends. (On the other hand, the Justice Department has refused to convene a Grand Jury, as it would have been traditionally used, to investigate the Kent State killings.) Witnesses before a secret Grand Jury do not have the right to know why they are being questioned, nor the right to counsel, and face imprisonment for the duration of the Grand Jury if they invoke the 5th Amendment! (Thus, witnesses do not have the rights that McCarthy's victims had.)

The Justice Department has flagrantly ignored repeated judicial rulings seeking to strictly limit the use of wiretapping upon the basis of 4th Amendment protections. (Instead, the government has massively increased financial support for wiretapping at all levels of law enforcement.) The Justice Department has also flagrantly ignored judicial and legislative mandates to enforce the newer civil rights protections, especially voter registration.

2. The Legislative Branch
Aside the hysteria which Nixon fostered around the crime and law & order issues, Congress passed two major "anti-crime" bills both of which contain provisions familiar to a police state.

3. The Judicial Branch
Nixon's control of the Supreme Court is the key to his attack upon the system of checks and balances. Thus far, Nixon has appointed four of the nine Justices and will probably have two additional appointments if he is re-elected. The present Supreme Court has given Nixon a majority on fundamental decisions undermining 5th Amendment protections, the fairness of state jury trials, defendants' rights, and renews against Army Surveillance of civilian political activity.

The Supreme Court decision regarding the use of the 5th Amendment before Grand Juries fundamentally undermines 5th Amendment protections. If a witness before a Grand Jury, pleads the 5th Amendment, he is subject to jailing for the duration of the Grand Jury. If a witness does not plead the 5th Amendment (and face imprisonment), he may be granted "use" immunity which pervertedly protects him from conviction based upon his own testimony. The decision, however, leaves the decision to the prosecution to show "affirmative evidence" that the conviction was obtained independently.
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There is an alternative
COME HEAR
George McGovern
A MAJOR POLICY ADDRESS FRIDAY, OCTOBER 13, 7:15 P.M.
SAN FRANCISCO OWSWALD PALACE

OCR-Cleveland Plain Dealer
"REVOLUTION IS THE MAIN TREND IN THE WORLD TODAY."

Yenan Books

2506 Haste St. Berkeley, Ca. 94704

PUBLIC MEETINGS for
CHARTER ISSUES

MONDAY 7:30 PM
10/16/72
WEDNESDAY 9:30 am
10/18/72
THIRD WORLD JOURNAL is a new
publication being put out by a group of
brothers and sisters at Grove Street
College. It will be devoted to helping
develop a writer’s voice and participation
in the struggle for the preservation of
human rights everywhere, and will
provide an outlet for all types of writing
and art. Anyone interested in
contributing: art, photos, essays, short
stories, poems, cartoons, plays, etc., can
submit them to: Grove Street College,
5714 Grove Street, Oakland, Calif. 94609
c/o Rudy Espinosa.

PUBLIC FORUM ON
PROPOSITION M

WEST-CAMPUS
AUDITORIUM
Former CRC Office
2105 Grove

Haste
st.

Berkeley,
rea.
94704

PUBLIC FORUM ON
PROPOSITION M

Social Services
Subcommittee

Physical Environ-
ment Subcommittee

Monday** 8:00 pm
10/30/72

Employees Lunchroom
(enter North Door)

Employees Lunchroom

Charter Review
Committee

PUBLIC MEETINGS for
CHARTER ISSUES

MONDAY 7:30 PM
10/16/72
WEDNESDAY 9:30 am
10/18/72

PUBLIC MEETINGS for
CHARTER ISSUES

MONDAY 7:30 PM
10/16/72
WEDNESDAY 9:30 am
10/18/72

SCHOLARLY BOOKS & JOURNALS
Bought & Sold
Book Finding Service—no charge

CONTACT LENSES
Complete Services, Far-Out Metal Frames
Dr. Philip Schletter, O.D.
3031 Telegraph
849-2202

WHAT A LOVELY VIEW—
PROPERTY—FOR SALE,
FOR RENT, FOR PROFIT!

NOT A RENT STRIKE
WITH ASSESSLANDLORDS
RENT
BERKELEY TENANTS
ORGANIZED FOR RENT CONTROL

ANOTHER DAY, AND RISING IN THE EAST,
OVER THE HILLS OF BERKELEY...

THE GREAT AMERICAN GENIE:
PAPA BUCK!

RENT STRIKE
WITH ASSESSLANDLORDS
RENT
BERKELEY TENANTS
ORGANIZED FOR RENT CONTROL

THE TENANTS ARE GETTING RESTLESS.
FORGET IT! RENT IN OR OUT AND
RAISE THE RENT!

AT THE POLLS, THE PEOPLE
VOTED FOR RENT CONTROL.

THE CITIZENS BROUGHT THE ISSUE
OF ENFORCING THE RENT FREEZE
BEFORE THE COUNCIL... THEY
WERE KEPT WAITING—

SUDDENLY, MOST OF THE
COUNCIL HAD URGENT
BUSINESS ELSEWHERE...
WE RECOMMEND:

President McGovern
Congress Delums
Assembly Meade
Dundie
Mendel
Miller
East Bay MUD Sirs
Park District Sirt
AC Transit District Jerfils
Proposition M Nadeau
(Election Rigging Amendment) Proposition

From page 1...

Proposition 8 is the final word in pollution. Proposition 8 has received a lot of publicity as the "industrial pollution tax break measure." Instead of industry meeting pollution regulation requirements as a cost of doing business, these bastards are going to get a break on the taxes they pay. The measure is so loosely worded that carpets and air conditioners can be considered as pollution control devices. VOTE NO.

Proposition 9 sets up a mechanism whereby school bond issues for the purpose of repairing, reconstructing, or replacing school buildings determined unsafe can be approved by a simple majority vote (a 2/3 vote is required now). We can expect a lot of condemnation proceedings if this measure passes. BUT VOTE ANYWAY.

This issue calls for a property tax exemption increase on homes owned by blind veterans from $5,000 to $10,000. How about the nonveteran blind? VOTE YES, WE GUESS.

The passage of Proposition 11 would provide a lot of work for constitutional law experts and might even add to people's rights. It would amend the State Constitution to add "privacy" to our inalienable rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The ACLU believes that this change would provide a basis for challenges to wire-tapping and other forms of surveillance as well as the secret intelligence dossiers compiled on all of us by police agencies and credit bureaus. VOTE YES.

Proposition 12 is another veterans' benefit measure. BUT VOTE YES ANYWAY.

Proposition 13 The 'Worker's Compensation' measure (Prop. 13) would permit payment of additional injury claims to employees by the employer's insurance rather than by the State Compensation Fund. It is an attempt to improve the rights of employees under "Worker's Compensation." VOTE YES.

If passed, the "Water Initiative" (Prop. 14) may eventually be classed as a natural disaster. It appeared on the ballot in 1968 in a more abbreviated form. Although this measure has been broadened, it basically substitutes the sales tax for the property tax. Sales taxes, generally speaking, are even more regressive than property taxes (i.e., essentials like clothing get taxed). Property taxes compose about 40 percent of taxes on business. A switch to the sales tax (even with increased rates) would provide a real bonanza for commercial interests (the initiative calls directly for a redistribution in the banking tax).

A political view is that this constitutional amendment would cause so much chaos that an equitable tax system would have to be developed. This argument is similar to the one used to justify radicals voting (or merely hoping for the election) for Reagan and Nixon. Changes will come with this initiative is passed but probably will not be the ones we want. Radicals are not in a position at this time to guide the changes. Instead, the Legislature will cook up some smooth, liberal measures and we will get a lot of pressure from wire-tapping and other forms of surveillance as well as the secret intelligence dossiers compiled on all of us by police agencies and credit bureaus. VOTE YES.

Proposition 15

This measure (Prop. 15) would require that the salaries of State employees be set at the average of private and public salary scales for comparable duties and responsibilities. The Governor would not have the power to change or void legislative actions on this issue. This measure would establish collective bargaining in non-economic employer-employee relations (i.e., agency shop and some fringe benefits). Although this proposition is mild, it would end some of the selective exploitation practices by the State Personnel Board and prevent one man (Reagan) from setting salary levels with the veto. VOTE YES.

Proposition 16 calls for setting the salary of Highway Patrolmen to at least the maximum of each comparable class of policemen in each city and county in the State. Salaries of Highway Patrolmen are included in Proposition 15. In this initiative the measurers of the ultra-conservatives. It is unnecessary and WE URGE A NO VOTE.

The death penalty initiative — Proposition 17— is frightening, both in its immediate effect and in its implications for the police state of the future. This measure would overturn the California Supreme Court's holding last February in People v. Anderson and that capital punishment violates the state constitution's provision against cruel and unusual punishment. It does so by amending the constitution to provide that all capital punishment laws on the books as the Anderson decision "are in full force and effect."

The provision would restore only those laws which call for a mandatory death penalty (assault by a life term inmate, train-wrecking, treason against the state, and bribery in a capital case resulting in the execution of an innocent person) since laws providing for a discretionary death penalty were struck down in June by the U.S. Supreme Court in Farber v. California (state legislatures cannot reverse a U.S. Supreme Court decision based upon federal grounds.)

Proposition 17 also prohibits judicial review of capital punishment statutes on state constitutional grounds. The effect of the initiative would therefore be that the legislature could lawfully enact a statute providing for a mandatory death penalty for any crime — advocating the violent overthrow of the government, for example. Anyone convicted of this crime would have to be sentenced to death. Proposition 17 might go so far as to argue to an appellate court that the sentence violated his rights under the state constitution.

Just as threatening as its provisions is the way in which Prop. 17 qualified for the ballot. Turning the police apparatus of the state into an explicitly political organization, Attorney General Evelle Younger drafted the initiative petition and led a campaign involving the district attorneys, sheriffs, and municipal police chiefs in each of the state's 58 counties to get it on the ballot.

According to San Francisco Police Inspector Ken Samuels, Younger began the campaign by calling regional meetings with law enforcement officials and assigning county quotas to each. As a memorandum filed from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department shows, law enforcement agencies were turned into a political bureau, with officers commanding the men under them and their wives in the signature gathering effort. Newspapers throughout the state proclaimed that the petition stations and municipal buildings in California cases uniformed police and California Highway Patrolmen stopped motorists and then let them go without citations after they had signed the initiative.

The initiative campaign involved innumerable violations of constitutional and statutory prohibitions against political activities by the Attorney General, other state and local officials, and uniformed police; the use of state funds and public facilities for political activities; and solicitation for political services of public employees by their superiors.

If Proposition 17 is successful, we may see a series of police-inspired initiatives to overturn liberal court decisions and recalls of "permissive" judges, as well as new repressive measures to be used against radicals and third world, poor, and working people in this state. IN ADDITION TO VOTING AGAINST PROPOSITION 17, WE URGE YOU TO WORK AGAINST IT.

Proposition 18

Pornography will have no place in the society of the future. The priority of eliminating sexist role definitions will supersede the free speech value of permitting the sellers of sex to pollute and warp our consciousness. But in the world of today, those who attempt to define and prohibit the "obscene" would go far beyond sexist pornography to include legitimate art and sex in the future — unpopular political documentaries as well. Proposition 18 is full of exciting definitions of sadomasochism, arousal, and sexual organs; attempts to amend court decisions dealing with obscenity; and sets up all kinds of local and statewide bureaucracies to snoop into people's reading and viewing habits. After a careful reading of this document (we had to?), WE RECOMMEND VOTING NO.

Proposition 19

And while talking about smut we might as well talk about dope. (This state ballot has something for everyone.) However, it seems unnecessary to go through all the arguments justifying an end to criminal penalties for the possession and use of marijuana (Proposition 19). WE URGE A YES ON PROP. 19.

Proposition 20

The "Coastline Initiative" (Prop. 20) is aimed at protecting California's remaining coastal areas. This measure creates a Statewide commission and six regional commissions. The commissions are to prepare a comprehensive plan which is to be adopted by the State commission by December 1, 1973. Interim controls on building are included in the initiative. Opponents view the state-issued permits as a hardship for property developers. Our eyes are swelling with tears. If anything, this measure is not tough enough, at least it should slow down the destruction of the coast. VOTE YES AND PRAY.

Proposition 21

Proposition 21 oulaws the assignment of school children on the basis of race and repeals statutes which establish policies against racial segregation in the schools. It is thus far beyond the position of those who oppose busing for the purpose of racial integration. This measure, if passed, could force Berkeley to resegregate its schools. Proposition 21 would eliminate the right of local school districts to choose integration (which both blacks and whites wanted in Berkeley) and for this reason VOTE NO.

Proposition 22

The very model of anti-labor legislation, Proposition 22 would outlaw the farmworkers secondary boycott, severely limit their right to strike, and destroy collective bargaining. Furthermore, it would hopefully complicate union election procedures, effectively eliminate the union shop and allow the Governor to appoint the board that administers the measure.

Call the Agricultural Labor Relations Initiative, it was set into motion by the Farm Board and corporate agriculture. Petition circulators used fraudulent means to gather signatures and the California Secretary of State reported that perhaps as many as 1,000 students were manipulated into signing petitions under the pretense that the measure would help farmworkers. NEEDLESS TO SAY, WE URGE A NO VOTE.

GRASSROOTS

Page 16