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PANTHERS RUN IN OAKLAND

By Art Goldberg

By now, most people know that Black Panther Party chairman Bobby Seale is running for Mayor of Oakland in next April's municipal election, and that Panther central committee member Elaine Brown is a candidate for one of three City Council seats that will be contested then.

The question many people on the white left are asking is, "Is it really going to be a serious campaign, or will it be a token candidacy, as were the Newton-Seale efforts in 1968?"

A talk with Bobby Seale will convince you that he is deadly serious about winning. "Don't you realize," he begins, "that the city of Oakland voted two to one against the death penalty in the last election? He goes on to cite other figures showing Oak­

land's population to be close to fifty percent Black.

The Panthers have already set up a main campaign headquarters in their central office, and have already opened three section campaign offices, with plans to open more. The city has been divided up into nine sections, with campaign field coordinators and assist­

ants assigned to each section.

During the first week in December, the Panthers received the endorsement of the Black Student Alliance at Merritt, Laney, Grove Street, and sever­

eral other junior colleges. From these will come the 500 precinct captains, and some of the 3,000 precinct workers the Panthers plan to use to blanket most of Oakland's 450 precincts.

According to Seale, no precinct will have less than five workers, and some may have as many as ten. He cites two

Continued on page 9

WOMEN'S CONFERENCE MOVES 'BEYOND ANGER'

Over 350 women of all ages came together on December 2nd for a conference of Berkeley Women. Many of those attending the conference have been involved with the Berkeley community over the years. But quite a num­

ber of the women there were at this gathering as a first involvement with women as a movement. The lack of third world women was striking, reminding us again that much of women's liberation seems irrelevant to women who are heads-of-household, or who are still angry, or who have their own preferred ways of dealing with racist and sexist oppression. Ages varied from teens through 70s. Politics, though never specified, were very diverse.

It was a full day—keynote speech, workshops, large group meetings, small group meetings. The aim was to be programmatic, for women to speak specifically of the changes they want to see in their situations here in Berkeley, and to try to form an organization that would be an instrument for connecting women and giving voice to their needs.

One criticism of the organizers of the conference (primarily the No Name Women's Radical Caucus) was that we were not up front about our own expectations and areas of interest. Electoral politics kept welling up mysteriously throughout the day. Implicated in the miseducation program, the purpose of the conference was to work toward forming an organization which would be chiefly concerned with the political effectiveness of women in Berkeley. The organizers of the

Continued on page 4

berkeley's progressive movement and the city govt

At its regular meeting on December 3, the Coalition decided by consensus not to invite D'Army Bailey and Ira Simmons to take part in the December 16 meeting called to plan procedures for the drafting of a platform and the selection of candidates to run in next April's municipal election.

news analysis

This important decision—making public what up to now had been but a widely understood split in the successful 1971 electoral coalition—followed weeks of discussion among Coalition members and with allied forces in the Black community. The opinions of the Black groups led the Coalition to resolve internal differences in favor of the decision not to invite on behalf of a yet non-existent coalition. He accused the organizers of assuming which people of the black community were qualified spokesmen. Davis said that the Black Caucus had made no secret of its disagreement with some of the things Bailey and Simmons have said and done. Lee Halterman, a Dellums staffer who said he was speaking on behalf of the Congressman, said that since Bailey and Simmons have not shown any willingness to cooperate with anyone outside of their immediate interest and to function in a coalition format, their role should be reevaluated. Art Goldberg and Dan Siegel explained that the white coalition that organized the meeting had been divided down the middle on the Bailey and Simmons question. It was then decided, they said, to ask for the advice of black and other third world groups, many of whom supported the exclusion of Bailey and Simmons. Siegel then spoke on behalf of class politics versus narrow interest group politics.

Later on, Davis questioned the racism of a group that identifies itself with a "liberal democrat," Ron Dellums, and called for a review of the records of Dellums and Lonnie Hancock as well as those of Bailey and Simmons.

Finally a resolution was passed, as offered by Lenny Goldberg and amplified by Dan Siegel, Frank Yoon, Barbara Dudley, and several others. It stated that: (1) The planning process
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Editorial

GRASSROOTS supports the call by the Dec. 16 community meeting at Longfellow School for an open Convention to write a platform and select candidates for the 1973 municipal elections. (See front page article.)

We applaud the spirit of that meeting, when it was decided to form a coalition and to state on a platform of principles of unity. We support the decision that from the start representatives from diverse ethnic groups, of whom at least 50% must be women, come together to draft that statement.

Our support is based on the following four points:

1. It is the first time that Asians, blacks and whites agreed from the beginning on a collective process toward victory in April.
2. This process is important because it affirms the development of a common approach against those who control the wealth and power in this city.
3. A unified approach means a protection for the poor from the rapacious and a unified platform and ticket. A unified approach also gives assurance that the platform and candidates coming out of the Convention will be representative.
4. It will be a complete Convention. All the participants will have agreed on a substantially simplified platform.

Therefore no compromises with outside forces, upon whom the Convention will have no control, will be made.

Some people were pessimistic about the process. They did not believe their needs would be represented by members of the Third World. We believe they are mistaken and we urge them to give their support to a struggle in which we all have a stake.

The process has already started to work satisfactorily. The white community, sufficiently represented at the meeting, chose six people, who, together with other ethnic groups, will draft the principles of unity. We believe that those six people are representatives of the white radical left in Berkeley. They are: Frank Brown (a trade unionist), Lenny Goldberg (an economist and a student); Louise Gross (a community worker and a teacher); Florence McDonald (former trade unionist and Grassroots staff member); Evie Wozniack (a student and a community worker); Anne Marie Hogan (a feminist).

Of the five ethnic groups to be included in the platform, and to create an ongoing organization (Asians, blacks, whites, chicanos, and native Americans) three have already chosen their coordinators. They are Frank Yoon (asian); Don Davis (black); Louise Gross (white).

People with suggestions for the statement of unity submit them to Louise Gross, ph. 845-6186.

In preparation to the Rent Control board hearing in the Berkeley Tenants Organizing Committee (B.T.O.C.) is circulating a questionnaire, the main purpose of which is to facilitate an roll out back to its August 1971 level. People are being asked how much rent they were paying in August 1971, even if they do not live any longer in the Berkeley

People interested in circulating these questionnaires in their neighborhood will be responsible for its publication and that “as such it will be political and serve the Berkeley left as in agreement with the change, and as a means of communication and information sharing between ourselves.” We want a community paper to “give background and analysis not available through other sources” and we want to work collectively to achieve this.

Have we accomplished these objectives? The answer to this question is the assessment of our progress and a view of our future plans might interest our readers. We have run in this issue articles and comprehensive supplements on Berkeley issues not considered in the past. The existence of the activities of our school system or of neighborhood affairs. We are working on changing this. Our layout has been somewhat haphazard. More effort is

Progressive Movement
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Some of the black sanitation workers denounced Bailey’s “attempt to split black and white workers,” as eventually accepted the higher offer and remained in the strike.

Many of the disputes have involved the workers’ movement, which Bailey and Simmons refuse to acknowledge as a legitimate struggle of people seeking to end their oppression and exploitation. Only months of argument persuaded them to include white heads of households of classifications in the city’s categorical Action Hiring Proposal.

Recently, Bailey told the proponents of the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance that he would support the proposal only if it excluded black developers from all its requirements. He thus put the interests of a few black capitalists in making money above the interests of all the people of Berkeley—black and white—in controlling over building and demolition in their neighborhoods.

When Loni Hancock proposed at a recent city council meeting to send $1,000 to aid the students at Southern University, Simmons denounced her for “meddling in affairs she knows nothing about.”

The dispute with Bailey and Simmons is not over aggressive exploitation of black interests, but rather over their refusal to work together with other progressive forces when the issue affects more than just the black community.

Such a narrow concern with interest group politics does not advance radical change and ultimately strengthens the status quo. When various exploited and oppressed groups seek merely to gain a share of city resources and services, the usual response of those in power has been to make a little room for the newcomers. Years ago organized labor was treated this way. Today, blacks are in a similar situation. As a result of cooperation, progressive forces wind up competing among themselves for the crumbs provided. The unity that is necessary to force radical changes is sacrificed, and those in power remain untouched.

Real liberals, progressives and radicals will continue to use the power of unity and despite all split efforts by the several groups of Big Business stooges.

Lee Cox, Chairman
Alameda County Central Committee
Peace & Freedom Party

Grassroots cherishes letters from the readers. Letters should be typewritten and run on letterhead. Address them to: P.O. Box 274, Berkeley 94701.

To the collective:

The Nov. 15 issue had a lot of good material in it, but I have the feeling each story is so far apart physically by its location on various pages or places on the page that one almost gives up the search. If you are trying to put a message across, why not make it as simple as possible for the reader? Or is it supposed to be frightening? Look at page 13, for example: I think four of the five items are continued from other pages, but only one of the others is on page origin. The initial part of the article often gives no clues as to how the continuation will be handled. I for one, try to keep track of the item until it is reprinted, sometimes in a different print size. Why? Because I am still interested in the item and will want to continue to read it in the next issue. If you are trying to sell, why not make it as simple as possible for the reader.

Yours,
Jean Deblinger

Grassroots has fallen into the trap of narrow interest group politics, and not to the progressive majority of Berkeley people. They have also alienated a good part of the black community, who now claim to represent. Unless they change their positions and seek to advance progressive coalition politics, there seems to be little prospect for their being able to work together.

Bailey and Simmons, however, have not been solely responsible for the lack of unity within the Left in Berkeley. The white Left has also failed in many ways. It has failed to understand the historical and political conflict in the city and to create an open organization. It has failed to define its politics, and to create an organized strategy to change the system and to help create accountable and responsible leadership. After the April 1971 elections it failed to strongly support its elected representatives.

One of the many consequences of the lack of defined politics has been the failure to fully understand the apparent differences between white left politics and black left politics, and other Third World groups. Are there real conflicts of interests between the two groups, or if so, why? Where? How can the white Left hope for real coalition politics if it does not understand?

The failure to respond to these questions has brought the white Left to the point where minority interests have much too often been championed by minority people only. Also, in some instances, the white Left has followed an interest group perspective. The original formulation of the Neighborhood Preservation ordinance, for example, represented the interests of white conservatives, and not those of black people in maintaining the attractiveness of much existing housing, but spoke very little to the needs of black people in maintaining substandard housing with decent, low cost housing. During the city workers strike at the University, the progressive whites did not support the workers because their demands for pay increases conflicted with residents’ needs for services.
R E N T C O N T R O L S L A T E D R I V E  O N

On November 11 and 12, the Community Rent Control Convention met at Longfellow School to ratify a platform and nominate a slate of five candidates for the Rent Control Board election to be held in Berkeley on January 23, 1973. The Convention was called by the Berkeley Tenants Organizing Committee and was sponsored by the Berkeley Black Caucus, Black Panthers Party, Ocean Series Committee, Radical Student Union, New American Movement, the April Coalition, and many other community groups.

On Saturday, November 11, the platform was considered by the convention as a whole, amendments were proposed and each plank was voted upon separately. The primary amendments were (1) that the Rent Control Board shall encourage the formation of tenants unions to negotiate leases and rents in collective bargaining with landlords; and (2) that rent adjustments should eliminate excessive and exorbitant profits for landlords. Rent adjustments would be determined by considering mortgages and loans paid by landlord, property taxes assessed against the landlord, income tax benefits to the landlord, and the total land holdings of the landlord. The income of tenants as well as the size, age, and quality of the housing unit will also be taken into account.

Other platform planks adopted by the convention included “Landlord Tenancy Obligations,” which provided that tenants have a right to continued occupancy of their units. Evictions must be granted, as provided in the Rent Control Charter Amendment, only for just cause, after review by the Board of Hearings. A hearing of the landlord and tenant, if a tenant is evicted for repairs or remodeling, shall be given first priority to return when the unit is rented again. The platform also includes a statement of support for the neighborhood preservation ordinance (in its amended form) including the encouragement of construction of low income dwellings and the prevention of high density, high income structures. There is a strong plank against intimidation in housing minorities, Third World people, women, homosexuals, and the handicapped. The platform adopted a statement expressing the limitations of rent control in providing a real solution to the lack of good low income housing, and in moving toward cooperative ownership of housing. These problems on the platform states, will only be solved through a broader movement to change property relationships.

SLATE

On Sunday, November 12, the convention reconvened to select a slate of candidates. By the time of the first ballot the convention was attended by some 250 people from the community. Many of those were representatives of groups or organizations interested in housing in Berkeley. About 30% were Black, and perhaps 20% were students. Ten people were nominated, gave short presentations of their perspectives on rent control, and answered questions. After the first ballot, seven candidates were elected from the majority of the people attending the convention. The top three were accepted as candidates (Karen Stevenson, Barbara Dudley, and Ella Walker), a run-off was held among the other four. After four more ballots, with dose counts and some moments of tension, Marty Schiffenthaler and Bill Walker were added to the slate.

The candidates represent a broad spectrum of interests and constituencies. Karen Stevenson was nominated by the Black Panther Party, although she is not a tenant and has been working for several years with the Panther Survival Programs in the Berkeley area. She is 26 years old and works at the University Co-op snack bar. Most important, she is a tenant and a mother who knows the problems of tenants in the West Berkeley area, and is strongly committed to solving those problems through community organizing.

Ella Walker, a 36 year old fashion designer, has been working in housing and tenants’ problems for four years. She was active in the Fair Rent Committee which put the rent control amendment on the ballot and has been in the Berkeley Tenants Organizing Committee since its inception. She also serves on the Charter Review Committee. Ella is also a tenant in the West Berkeley area and stated at the convention that she represents in particular the interests of Black women, heads of households, who face especially severe housing problems in Berkeley, as well as defending the interests of all tenants and small homemakers in Berkeley.

Barbara Dudley is a 26 year old attorney who has been working with the Tenants Action Project in Berkeley, defending tenants’ rights and attempting to enforce the rent freeze which was a part of the Rent Control Charter Amendment. She is one of the lawyers representing various tenant’s groups and other community organizations and individuals who intervened in the lawsuit filed by the landlords against the city of Berkeley. This suit is aimed at calling off the elections for the Rent Control Board and nullifying the Charter Amendment. In the “Candidates Profile Sheet” distributed at the convention, Barbara stated that the Rent Control Board should minimize profits for landlords, banks, and speculators and encourage organization among tenants.

Martin Schiffenthaler is a 34 year old writer with a PhD in Economics who has been active in both the Fair Rent Committee and the Berkeley Tenants Organizing Committee from the beginning. He coordinated the petition drive to put the Charter Amendment on the ballot and campaigned for its passage. He has also been very active in BRTT (Refiners of Illegal and Oppressive Taxes) and the American Reparations Committee. Marty was...
Continued from page 4

PAYROLL  GOVERNMENT  DEFENSE

Your tax dollars at work
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AMERICA'S ASIAN AUSCHWITZ

Reports of mass arrests in Vietnam, torture of political prisoners and persistent rumors of wholesale liquidation of opponents of the Thieu regime emphasize the failure of the current peace talks to end the suffering in Vietnam.

How many prisoners is unknown. The Government of South Vietnam admits to 30,000 prisoners. The Department of Defense gives the figure of 400,000, prisoners of them political prisoners.

The Saigon Committee for the Reform of Prisons reports nearly two percent of the population of South Vietnam is political prisoners.

The San Francisco Chronicle of August 5, 1972, reported arrests approaching 14,000 civilians per month

something over 2,000,000 political prisoners. Don Luce, a journalist with twelve years' experience in Vietnam, gave in Congressional testimony the figure of 400,000, prisoners, of them political prisoners.

The Saigon Committee for the Reform of Prisons reports nearly two percent of the population of South Vietnam is political prisoners.

The San Francisco Chronicle of August 5, 1972, reported arrests approaching 14,000 civilians per month.

Continued on page 8
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conference bit off more for one day than 250 unorganized people can chew the first time together. The last part of the program concerning forming a women's organization never happened as a whole group.

Many women were also critical of the keynote speech which they felt was alienating and based on assumptions questioned by the conference.

EXCELLENT WORKSHOPS

The workshops which followed the keynote speech were excellent, largely because they each had a knowledgeable, competent convenor. Many of the workshops were action oriented and have made plans to continue to meet together.

A few of the areas of special interest were: child care, health, radical psychiatry, lesbians, rape, older women, legal center, high school women, anti-war, education, women and the church, working women, welfare and housing.

After the very satisfying morning workshops the conference reconvened in the large hall for lunch, poetry, music and conversation. In the afternoon the conference heard from women who are active in making changes in different areas of concern to women. Becky Mills, formerly an employee of the University in the Affirmative Action Program, called that program a shock set up to operate in such a way as to split minorities and women.

Anita Friedman of Radical Psychiatry spoke of the need for women to learn how to be psychiatrists for each other. Loni Hancock urged women to get involved in politics.

After these talks women organized themselves into small random cluster groups. Some of these cluster groups discussed starting a women's center and a large umbrella organization. Some used the time to explore their feelings of anger and paranoia at the conference. Some groups did both.

SUPPORT RENT CONTROL

Then back again to the large hall where the intended program was abandoned. The group was asked to endorse the Berkeley Community Rent Control Committee's slate of candidates for the Rent Control Board. Barbara Dudley, Karen Stevenson and Ella Walker, the three women candidates on the slate spoke and answered questions. The group, as a conference, voted overwhelmingly to endorse the slate after Ms. Walker assured the group that the men on the slate were sensitive to women's issues involved in Rent Control. The conference was clear that the endorsement was of a slate committed to a platform sensitive to women's needs.

In the midst of the general afternoon session, several women angrily complained about the many pictures being taken and the possible adverse job and legal consequences for some of the women present in the room. Somewhat surprised by the intensity of the outburst, the video taping camera was stopped immediately. Then five or six women accused the conference organizers of having a hidden agenda; since April of this year, Sydney Schanberg in the New York Times, August 13, 1972, wrote that prisoners were routinely tortured at detention centers before being sent to Con Son. Some said water had been forced down their mouths until they nearly drowned, while others told of electric prods used on sensitive parts of the body, of fingernails pulled out and fingers smashed.

Who are the prisoners? They are religious leaders, both Catholic and Buddhists; known pacifists; students, poets, lawyers, intellectuals and political activists. Anyone suspected of having a neutralist position is arrested and so is anyone who is a relative of anyone suspected of having a neutralist position. Persons on the Phoenix program "blacklist" are in greatest danger. This is a list of persons suspected, but never proven to be sympathetic to the opposition.

Why are they prisoners? These political arrests are being made to eliminate all and any opposition to the Thieu regime. Since May 9, 1972 Thieu has assumed emergency power to rule by decree. Article 19 of Decree Law 004/66 states: "These persons considered dangerous to the national defense and the public security may be interned in a prison or a designated area or banished from designated areas for a maximum of two years which is renewable."

This decree is interpreted by the arresting official and there is no possibility of trial or appeal.

President Thieu stated on November 4, 1972 that those persons who supported a coalition government were "pro-communist neutralists" and would not be allowed more than five minutes. (S.F. Chronicle, Nov. 4, 1972 AP)

Continued on page 8

CANDIDATES
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strongly supported by students and has a broad constituency in the South Campus area.

Bill Walker is the Chairman of the Oceanview Committee, and a member of the Berkeley Black Caucus. He is 43 years old and the only homeowner on the slate. He has supported rent control and the charter amendment consistently and worked in the campaign for rent control last spring. Though the Oceanview Committee, Bill helped organize a successful campaign to prevent destruction of about 60 low-income housing units, and will press for the development of more decent low-income housing in Berkeley as a member of the Rent Control Board.

The slate is pledged to support the platform adopted by the convention, and they are the only candidates for "rent control in the interest of tenants."

The election is on January 23, 1973. Copies of the entire platform and other information can be obtained from the Berkeley Tenants Organizing Committee, 2700 Bancroft Way (643-6601).

Women's Media West
ARC FOR THE FLOOD: VIETNAM REPARATIONS

By Ying Kelley

The American Reparations Committee went into being after Nixon announced the blockade of Haiphong and the resumption of the bombing of the DRV. Before that, ARC was thought of as the Berkeley Reparations Committee. Thought of, because it had existed primarily on paper. Sometime in February of 1972, members of the Coalition and Women for Peace were searching for some means to draw attention to a war made increasingly more distant to the American people by the Nixon military policy. We knew that most people in Berkeley were against the war and wanted to translate that feeling into action. We remembered that the year before thousands of signatures had been collected by people who wished to separate Southern Vietnam. These are repositories for political prisoners and we had evidence that prisoners were being systematically tortured. The group prepared support documents for the main points in the ordinance and lobbied the individual council members and organizations around Berkeley to put pressure on the council. The Mayor promised time and time again to place it on the Council agenda. Councilwoman Hancock promised to present the ordinance as a motion and did so three times at three council meetings. No one on the Council would second her motion.

That is where the Peace resolution was on the dark Monday when Nixon announced the Haiphong Blockade. The people of Berkeley gathered to urge the Council to do something to show Nixon, the people in the United States, and the people in Southeast Asia of our anger. Momentum gathered. By Tuesday at 7:30 thousands had gathered in front of City Hall. Eager to get in and hear what the Council would do. It was obvious that Council chambers would be too small and arrangements were made, to use the Berkeley High School auditorium. An hour and a half later, the crowd had grown to about 5,000 and was either silently waiting or singing "Vietnam for the Vietnamese, Power to the People's Army..."

The Council convened and all nine members were seated. There were some preliminary remarks and the Mayor suggested that the coming Friday afternoon be set aside as a day of mourning. The Council accepted that and Lonid made a motion to pass the BRC Peace Ordinance. The ordinance was read and there were some remarks on the genocidal nature of the war in Vietnam and the atrocities committed by the U.S. in Asia. The audience was filled, downstairs and up, and even in the aisles. The audience accepted the BRC ordinance as something reasonable and possible to do. The Council discussed it for about five minutes: Hancock, Widener, Bailey and Simmons for; Sweeney, McLaren, Prise, Kalgren and Hone against. The audience arose as a body, frustrated and angry. The five council persons who had voted against the resolution immediately left behind the stage background. And so the BRC ordinance failed.

We had thought the ordinance might pass, although Hancock and Widener were the only sure votes, but we had considered the possibility of failure. The "American Reparations Committee" was created when the Berkeley Reparations Committee ordinance lost. In spite of disappointment with the Council the reparations work proceeded. That very evening, two neighborhood groups called to give their support to the ARC. Within the next two weeks, when energy was at its height, ARC collected over six thousand dollars. This money represented a wide variety of sources; groups like the Potter's Studio which sold their work that Saturday and raised over $700; individual contributions from dimes to $50, donations from businesses like Northside Theatre and the Cheshire Cat, Books Unlimited and other businesses in Berkeley.

The coming of summer and the presidential elections some of us put out time into that effort to end the war. Now we are back with the ARC. Have you the energy to join us? We have sent $6,000 to the DRV through Medical Aid for Indochina. This money has been used to buy oxygenators and tanks of oxygen (for shock and trauma victims) which is most needed. Will you help us do more?

YOUR TAX DOLLARS AT WORK

Let's not mince words. Bombing schools and hospitals, dropping anti-personnel bombs on civilian centers which are exquisitely designed only to shred human flesh, destroying fields and farms that feed civilian populations,mitting harbors from the air - these are WAR CRIMES. We must do everything we can to make reparation to the victims of these crimes, to help them rebuild their country. Not "when the war is over" - for we, the people, are not at war with Vietnam - but NOW!

---

Send your contribution to: AMERICAN REPARATIONS COMMITTEE
1708 Grove Street, Berkeley, CA
94709. To request speakers or volunteers your time and talents call the office or call 848-4084.

---

VIETNAM RECONSTRUCTION CERTIFICATE

This certificate represents a donation of $ in the name of toward the reconstruction of the nation of Vietnam.

By purchasing this certificate, Americans are demonstrating their understanding that the war in Vietnam has been more than a military and police struggle; it has been a struggle between opposing models of social and economic development. On the one hand, the United States government has fought to impose an economic system on the Vietnamese which integrates them into the world capitalist system, dominated by U.S. corporations. On the other hand, the liberation forces of Vietnam have fought for an alternative: an independent country controlled by Vietnamese, not foreigners.

For the Vietnamese, this alternative constitutes the building of an economy and society along socialist lines. This means a nationally planned program of industrial development, from which the profits of production are not retained by the accounts in New York, Paris, or Geneva but are reinvested in the Vietnamese economy. It means a society which uses its resources for the education, medical care, and housing of all the people, not just for the luxuries of the few. It means an agricultural system which fosters cooperation and peasant control, not domination by landlords.

It will take the Vietnamese a long time before socialism can be fully achieved, in liberated areas, land reform and improved medical and educational efforts are underway. But the war has seriously disrupted the economy and society. Only when peace has been established can the program of reconstruction and socialist development really get implemented.

This certificate represents a small but significant contribution to that reconstruction process. It is significant because it concretely expresses the support of Americans for the Vietnamese effort to reconstruct their country as they determine it. These small contributions are not meant to take the place of large-scale postwar reparations by the U.S. government, which bears primary responsibility for the massive destruction inflicted upon the land and people of Vietnam.
War is a bad thing
Stop it before it is too late.
Why do you die for someone’s lie?
Why do you kill when it’s not your will?
Why do you have to fight when you can’t see the light?
Why do you have to die when you don’t know why?

Merrell 6th grade

We got to have peace on the earth.
We got to bring them back.
Some of them die upon the earth.
Some of them going in the electric chair.
We got to help them come back.
We got to bring them back home.

Dwayne 4th grade

P. is for our brothers, fathers, uncles
and sons who have gone to the war. Some
have lost and some have won to bring peace
to our land before it is all gone.

E. is for easy going love that one day
this world will bring to all mankind and
other offspring.

A. is for Art which almost every man needs
to give him entertainment while he’s down
in his greed.

C. is for couples whose marriages will be
broken because of the war which everyman
has spoken.

E. is our elders who are sick and well.
We should do something before hell.

Terri 6th grade

The peace of the pitter patter of the rain
just a colliding noise from the little rain
may bring your great dane
to your side.

Steen 6th grade
will towards all people.

One friend of mine went to the village
to get rice for his mother and father to eat.
He crossed the field to the hill
and the airplanes saw him
and shot him
and killed him
so that you couldn't even see his body
it was scattered all over the field.

12 year old Laotian refugee

I think president Nixon
Should stop the war and
bring home the army people.
it may bring peace in the world.

Anthony 4th grade

The way we have peace on earth is:
1. Send letters to the brotherhood companies
2. Get together and get out on the streets, like a parade
3. The Walkathon is helping a little bit
4. We can also write letters.

Deneshia 4th grade

We can have some peace by stopping them from fighting
and breaking out windows, stealing stuff out of people's
houses, stop hitting people, starting fights and fussing.
stop stealing out of the stores. Stop jerking people's
nurses. Stop crashing planes.

Izola 4th grade

If we were to stop the war we might get some kind
of peace, but I don't know just how long it would
last.

Denise 4th grade

Maybe we can have peace if people would stop
hating one another. If the war was to stop
that would not help if we still hate people
in our hearts.

Lovenia 4th grade

Peace is sitting under a tree quietly
watching the birds by yourself.

Maia 2nd grade
activist lawyer denied practice

By Dan Siegel

After a while waiting to begin the trial, I realized that I had failed to get on my nerves. It’s now been exactly two years since I learned that I have passed the California Bar Examination in August 1970, and I still don’t know whether I will ever be allowed to practice law.

The case is now before the California Supreme Court. The last briefs were filed on October 24, but the Court has still not let us know whether we will even consider my appeal from the Committee of Bar Examiners’ decision that I am not morally fit to join. Joe Alioto, Evelle Younger, and Richard Nixon are on an officer of the court.

The reasons given by the Committee of Bar Examiners for excluding me were flimsy, and my lawyers — Mal Burnstein, Marshall Krause, Barry Winograd and Frank McTernan — think we will win at the State Supreme Court. But the Bar Examiners have already won.

For the past two years my life has been dominated by the uncertainty of this situation. This has made all planning impossible as well as resulting in some subtle and probably not so subtle changes in my personality, relationships with other people, and world outlook.

COMMUNITY FELLOWSHIP

When I graduated from Boalt Hall Law School at UC in June 1970, I had been awarded a Reginald Heber Smith Community Fellowship, which resulted in my working in the Legal Aid Society and the Alameda County in East Oakland. As a “Reggie,” I was placed in a local OED program but was to some extent independent of it since I was working for the people in Oakland who awarded the fellowships. This arrangement is designed to allow lawyers more freedom and creativity in legal aid work.

For my entire 13 months as a Reggie, I was never a member of the bar, but rather a somewhat experienced, well-trained, and respected law clerk. Although the people who ran the program — both locally and in Washington — were very supportive and even extended my contract for a second year, I was frustrated by not being able to bring and fight lawsuits in court and I quit one month into the second year. Although I learned a lot from the job — about how poor people live and think, as well as about the law — the experience was largely wasted and remains a personal disappointment.

BEFORE THE BAR

The hearings before the Committee of Bar Examiners and its hearing subcommittee began in May 1971. A decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1930’s upheld the exclusion from the California Bar of a man who refused to answer questions about his Communist Party membership and activity; so, we felt that I would be able to answer all questions put to me by the Committee and its “examiners.”

Many of the subjects were predictable; they wanted to know all about my arrests and trials for political activity as well as several instances of university discipline. They also had a very thick file of newspaper clippings and reprints of public speeches and insisted that I justify every one. Worse still, the examiner wanted to know about my relationships with women as well as whether I agreed with him that my anti-war activities were “traitorous.” (They had followed my attendance at international conferences with Vietnamese and Cambodian representatives.)

We also had to go through the charade of “proving” affirmatively that I was a person of good moral character — the State Bar Rules put this obligation on every applicant, although only when questions are raised must a person actually do anything about it. In my case, we brought in everything from my Boy Scout record and high school honor society membership to letters from Alan Cranston (who spelled my name wrong, much to the relief of the examiner) and Ron Dellums.

But after all the hearings, the Committee decided to ignore both my good character and the most ludicrous of the charges against me and found only that I had advocated illegal violence on three occasions in 1969 and 1970 and that I had lied to the Committee in denying these charges. According to these findings, I advocated illegal violence: (1) May 15, 1969, when I spoke at Sproul Plaza before the march to People’s Park which ended with the Alameda County Sheriffs’ murdering James Rector, blinding Alan Blanchard, and wounding 60 others; (2) March 6, 1970, when at a Provo Park rally I spoke euphemistically about the burning of the Bank of America at Santa Barbara but urged people to begin organizing for the 1971 city council elections here; and (3) April 15, 1970, when, again at Sproul I spoke against the war and the University’s ROTC program.

CATCH 22?

If I had admitted advocating illegal violence, I could have been excluded on that basis. If I denied it, as I did, I am excluded for untruthfulness. The Committee refused to notice that for both the People’s Park and anti-ROTC speeches I was arrested and charged with inciting to riot. The first charge ended when a Berkeley jury found me not guilty after a three-week trial and the second after the judge threw it out before trial. The Provo Park speech resulted in no arrest — but the chairman of the Committee of Bar Examiners is a partner in the big San Francisco firm which represents the B of A!

By the time the hearings were over I had begun to have some very weird feelings about the whole thing. Some part of me accepted Alioto’s legitimacy and wasn’t convinced that I was good enough to be a lawyer. When I was on trial in the Berkeley Municipal Court, the support of the people who came each day reinforced my conviction that the whole thing was a political frame-up, that we were right, the University and the police wrong. But all alone with the Committee — in an examination that was just as deep and personal as a criticism and self-criticism session with comrades — I felt myself playing their game, following their rules, and accepting some of their judgment.

And at the same time, I worried — and still worry — about raising new issues for the Bar. An arrest, or even a public statement, could easily lead to new hearings and, at best, set the procedure back another year. So I fight — with my friends and with myself — about taking the risks involved in doing what I believe. And I don’t like myself when I decide not to speak or not to take part in a demonstration because of what the Bar might do.

But even that isn’t simply personal. Many friends, including the lawyers I have no money to pay, have put a lot into this case. So my actions affect them as well, and if I screw things up, their time and effort will have been wasted as well as mine.

Obviously I don’t feel good about this mess. But the sense of being part of a world-wide movement of people fighting to have their basic needs fulfilled, to live in just societies, and to fulfill their potential as human beings, prevents me from feeling too sorry for myself. I like to think that what got me into trouble with the Bar was of some small help to the millions of Vietnamese who have been raped, maimed and made homeless by the U.S. government and to people like George Jackson and Angela Davis who have been forced to make far greater sacrifices for their beliefs. Venceremos!

GRASSROOTS

GRASSROOTS

COMMUNITY FELLOWSHIP

Continued from page 4

Who is responsible? Project Phoenix, devised by the U.S. to neutralize by any means whatever opponents or suspected opponents to the existing regime, continues in operation. Ambassador Colby, Deputy of the OED program, testified before Congress in 1971 that over 20,000 persons had been assassinated under the Phoenix program. These assassinations have now accelerated. The Phoenix program has been funded by the U.S. at a cost of $372 million for the period 1969 to May 1971.

Since 1967, funding of South Vietnam’s prisons and police systems has come from the USAID and the U.S. Department of Defense, Projected Aid funds for these prisons in 1973 are $2 million more than 1972. Two U.S.

One hundred fifty-six advisors are scheduled for the National Police of South Vietnam. Of the 300,000 men “maintaining order” in Vietnam, only 122,000 are accounted for in the South Vietnamese budget. The U.S. has provided 533,000 police for the additional security police. (This sum is six times the Vietnamese national budget for education). Additional secret agents in unknown numbers are paid out of CIA funds which are incorporated, undisclosed and unaudited. Police are trained in 142 centers provided in the U.S. for foreign personnel under the Military Assistance Program.

What is the American responsibility? The text of the peace agreement holds that “The United States is not committed to any political tendency or any personality in South Vietnam and it does not seek to impose a pro-American regime in Saigon.” If this is indeed our intent we must re-examine the continuing U.S. involvement in the prison and police system of South Vietnam. It is imperative that an immediate inquiry be made to determine the extent of the current torture and the rumored assassinations and to prevent further acts of repression which will jeopardize a peace with justice for Vietnam.

GOR’S STEREO

An Alternative Non-Profit Community Store

A division of the

Sales + Service

2518 A Durant

Berkeley

Uptowners in the Abbey Mall

848-7201
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Cooperation Politics

The basis of BTOC's decision to refrain from taking sides organizationally is its commitment to what has become known here in Berkeley as "co-affiliation politics." The practice of cooperation is an attempt to equitably distribute political power among the city's various "communities," including those of cultural, sexual, or occupational. It is a commitment to a political form and process, not to a well defined content for that form.

It might be argued that the misgivings regarding politics that faced the convention were debated in the platform workshops. Indeed, very important debates took place over the rents housing and the housing crisis plan. But in the absence of a shared political perspective, decisions over candidates were in fact, most important of the different candidates could choose to represent the platform in different ways. No organization bound them to its platform. In such a case the platform of a tenant organization is as good as the candidates behind it. And in the absence of open political debate about the candidates most people at the convention had little idea of just where the candidates stood. Candidates were selected too much by virtue of what "community" they represented and too little by what political perspective they advocated.

This is not a desirable situation. It is not, however, due to a failure of the political process. To work. To our way of thinking it is a built-in feature of coalitions politics as we know it. But the lessons that we in BTOC learned from the Rent Control Convention ought to be heeded as the Berkeley left regroups and looks toward April and beyond.

The principles around which the coalition was allegedly built were integrated into the platform accepted by the convention. But because the convention was not an ongoing organization, the platform lost a good deal of its meaning when everyone went home. The only organization that is continuing to work toward rent control in a massive way and to which the candidates could conceivably be responsible is BTOC. But the candidates are not BTOC candidates. They are coalition candidates and are thus free from the organizational restraint of BTOC.

Fortunately the slate that was chosen is not a very strong, attractive, or principled one. It deserves our full support. The potential dangers of "co-affiliation politics" is fundamental to racism, and it may well jeopardize fair trials for every Asian American in California.

Asian Americans will no longer remain silent when their constitutional rights are threatened. Commonwealth leaders will speak out against this latest incident in a long history of racism in the legal institutions of California.

Supporters of these actions include:
East Bay Asian Legal Services
Asian Community Center
Chinatown Neighborhood Legal Assistance
Congressman Ronald V. Dellums
Paul Takagi, Professor of Criminology, University of California in Berkeley
Patrick Hayashi, Asian Studies, University of California in Berkeley
Ling-Chi Wang, Coordinator, Chinese for Affirmative Action
Colin Watanabe, Coordinator of Asian Studies, University of California in Berkeley
Assemblemany Ken Meade
Assemblemany John Burton
Dale Minami, Attorney at Law, Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund
Reubner Greenberg, Undersheriff, City and County of San Francisco
Berkeley City Councilwoman Iona Hancock
Mary Son, Youth Service Center
BRA has been restrained by the courts mate over Savo within Model Cities local developers in years past. A stalemate between South Berkeley residents and Island is not a new one, and was the focus of community protests all over town in the "anti-redevelopment" proposals (headed off by neighbors). The Council chance to make good since its control of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allowed the Berkeley Redevelopment Agency (BRA) its first chance to make good since its contentious attempts to bulldoze Ocean View and other "mutil-redevelopment" proposals (headed off by neighbors).

The idea of Redevelopment for Savo Island is not a new one, and was the subject of Model Cities struggles between South Berkeley residents and local developers in years past. A stalemate over South Berkeley's housing has kept all plans on ice. Since the BRA has been restrained by the courts from continued development, the so-called West Berkeley Industrial Park in Ocean electioneerers

The City of Berkeley is conducting a Special Municipal Election for Rent Control and Local Commissions on January 23, 1973 and precinct workers for that day are urgently needed. If you are a registered voter in the City of Berkeley and are interested in serving as a precinct worker on January 23rd, please contact the office of the City Clerk (City Hall, Berkeley 94704; telephone 527-6165).

Precinct workers serve from 6:45 AM on January 23rd until the polls close at 8:00 PM. Compensation for position is $18.00 for clerk or $21 for city inspector.

To qualify for Federal funds, the City of Berkeley is conducting a special election, to be held on Tuesday, March 14, 1973. The election will determine the value of PG&E's property here are the "worst possible from the City's standpoint," and that other methods of evaluation which are more favorable to the City would be considered in court, but not by the PUC. Another objection raised by RIOT is the study's failure to investigate the impact of city electrical power, including membership in the 11-city California Power Authority. In fact, it looks like City hall has no plans to make any decisions about the proposed facility. The project was not necessary to be and would be detrimental to the economic situation of the area because it would compete with the already established stores and gas station in the immediate area. Quik Stop is just a convenience store for people living outside the neighborhood. Quik Stop's products are for the PAC. This decision and others will be tackled in the near future at meetings held weekly on Wednesdays at the Berkeley Adult School, 1930 Carleton St., 7:30 PM. Call the Berkeley Redevelopment Agency, 527-6165.
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Precinct workers serve from 6:45 AM on January 23rd until the polls close at 8:00 PM. Compensation for position is $18.00 for clerk or $21 for city inspector.

To qualify for Federal funds, the City of Berkeley is conducting a special election, to be held on Tuesday, March 14, 1973. The election will determine the value of PG&E's property here are the "worst possible from the City's standpoint," and that other methods of evaluation which are more favorable to the City would be considered in court, but not by the PUC. Another objection raised by RIOT is the study's failure to investigate the impact of city electrical power, including membership in the 11-city California Power Authority. In fact, it looks like City hall has no plans to make any decisions about the proposed facility. The project was not necessary to be and would be detrimental to the economic situation of the area because it would compete with the already established stores and gas station in the immediate area. Quik Stop is just a convenience store for people living outside the neighborhood. Quik Stop's products are for the PAC. This decision and others will be tackled in the near future at meetings held weekly on Wednesdays at the Berkeley Adult School, 1930 Carleton St., 7:30 PM. Call the Berkeley Redevelopment Agency, 527-6165.
The full committee of Charter Review is now discussing decentralization and neighborhood government. This discussion will probably continue on into January. The main issues to be discussed are how neighborhood areas should be defined, how neighborhood councils should be formed, and what their powers should be. The Committee is now hearing reports from various committee members on a range of subjects having to do with decentralization. For example: a history of neighborhood organizations in Berkeley, a summary of Community Corporations in Columbus, Ohio, and reports on decentralization in New York, China, Winnipeg, and Dayton, Ohio.

The real substance of our discussions will come when we talk to neighborhood organizations and community people about what they want in the way of decentralization. Most members of CRC agree that this is essential. It is the responsibility of those of us on the left to press for the wide participation of community people in this process. This will probably be done through a series of public forums, as yet to be organized. In the meantime, we urge anyone interested in decentralization in New York, China, Winnipeg, and Dayton, Ohio.

COMMITTEE REPORT

On December 4th the Finance Sub-Committee met. The main discussion centered around the responsibility given to the sub-committee to work on a CRC budget (July 73 - June 74) which must be presented to the city manager by January 15, 1973. A proposal was then made that the entire CRC meet as a workshop on December 18th to develop this budget. The Elections Sub-Committee at their December 4th meeting had a discussion with four invited guests, Harry Stoops, Albert Rayburn, Calder Hayes and Karl Mac, on how the present system of elections works at a practical level.

The Social Services Sub-Committee has recently initiated a series of neighborhood meetings. One meeting has been held on Eisdell Avenue; more are planned for West Berkeley, Fulton and Ashby, and North Berkeley BART Station. The sub-committee is continuing its efforts to learn about Berkeley's social services, how city departments operate, and how they might be reorganized under a new charter.

HOUSING & LAND-USE

The Housing and Land-Use Subcommittee has begun talking to neighborhood groups about the changes they want to see in Berkeley city government in the areas of traffic, zoning, housing and recreation. The last meeting was with members of SUDS and of Claremont-Lincoln N. A. Some interesting ideas that emerged were: That Berkeley should have a transportation planning process whose orientation is towards public transportation (as opposed to the present system run by traffic engineers who think only of moving cars). That user-developed parks be encouraged. As SUDS discovered in putting together their tot-lot near the Bowling Greens, there are great obstacles put in the way of user-developed parks by the present system of government. SUDS pointed out that user-developed parks draw on the enthusiasm of neighborhoods and free manpower to create small parks inexpensively without bureaucratic delay.

The next Subcommittee meeting will be a discussion with members of San Pablo Neighborhood Ass., Oceanview Committee, San Isidro Neighborhoods, and W. Berkeley Neighborhood Ass. It will be at San Pablo Recreation Center on Monday, Dec. 18 at 8:00 PM. Interested community people are urged to attend.

Unfortunately the schedule for January has not been made in time for GRASSROOTS publication. For information about subcommittee meetings call the following people:

Social Services

Joel Rubenzahl
848-1681

Finance

Clara Camarda
841-0747

Housing & Land Use

Foster Forman
843-4703

Elections

David Mundstock
849-4610

Full Committee

any of the above

PAINTING-REMODELLING

interior-exterior

expert work references

free estimates 527-4176

HANDY MAN

fix sash cords, lights

minor plumbing, rewire

lamps, etc. 845-0775

THE POLICE ISSUE GROUP

The Police Issue Group is now circulating initiative petitions to place four police control measures on next April's municipal election ballot. Each petition must be signed by 2434 qualified Berkeley voters by late January, when the City Council will choose between passing the proposed ordinances as submitted or placing them on the ballot.

Final drafting of the four proposals early this month ended a two-month process involving discussions with people representing radical political groups throughout the city. The Police Issue Group itself includes members of the Berkeley Black Caucus, Black Panther Party, the Coalition, International Solidarity Committee to Combat Fascism, and the Citizens Committee for Community Control, which backed the unsuccessful attempt to pass a police control charter amendment in 1971.

The amended proposal to establish a Police Review Commission calls for a body of nine members, one appointed by each member of the Berkeley City Council. PIG determined, after discussion with many groups, to propose an appointed rather than elected commission because of objections to calling another special election for a city commission and because of possible legal problems involved in proposing new city elected positions through a city ordinance.

The Commission will be empowered to review and make recommendations to the public, City Council, and City Manager concerning all police policies and procedures, especially those relating to: Treatment of Rape Victims; Police relationships with minority communities; Weapons and equipment; Hiring and training; Priorities for police planning; and, Budget Development. The Commission will also investigate all complaints against the police and can compel police cooperation in its investigations.

WEAPONS LIMITATION

The proposal to demilitarize the Berkeley Police Department has been amended to eliminate the provisions calling for abolition of military style and uniforms because many people thought these proposals were frivolous and would create the illusion rather than the reality of change. This proposal limits police firearms to the standard .38 caliber revolver and removes shotguns from police cars. It also forbids the police from using or possessing submachine guns, CS gas, Mace, rifles, weighted batons, and all privately-owned weapons. The proposal also requires the City Council approval after a public hearing before the police can acquire any new riot-control or other weapons not specifically allowed by the ordinance and establishes regular public reporting of all weapons possessed by the police.

The ordinance establishes residency requirement which states that all presently employed sworn personnel must move into the city within one year and all new personnel must move into Berkeley within 90 days of beginning work. Exceptions to these requirements, designed to make the police more responsive to the community they are hired to serve, will be made only when “extreme hardship” is proven to the City Council.

No changes were made in the proposal to invalidate all agreements between the Berkeley Police Department and other law enforcement agencies unless approved by the Berkeley City Council. This ordinance requires the police to secure approval from the Council following a public hearing before entering into agreements with any public agencies. All existing agreements—including the Joint BPD-UCPD foot patrol—will be canceled if not approved by the Council within 90 days of the passage of the ordinance.

COMMUNITY CONTROL

The Police Review Group sees these four proposals as steps toward the goal of community control of police. Passage of the ordinances will involve the people of the city in police matters and help educate the public about the real potential force of police power. PIG plans to take the charter review process so that the people of Berkeley will soon have the chance to cast a police control proposal which will place total power over the police in the hands of the people in whose communities the police work.

Meanwhile, those who are willing to circulate the initiative petitions to take part in the campaign to pass the ordinances should contact Dan Siegel at 635-1124, Paul Forman at 843-4703, or the ISCC at 525-4375.
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Bay Area Women Against Rape (BAWAR) is collecting reports of misrepresentations of rape victims by police. If you have had such an experience, send the info to:

Edith(Rape Against Rape)
805 Women's Refuge
YWCA, 2134 Allston Way
Berkeley, Calif.
Include your name, address, phone number, and dates of experience with police. ONLY members of BAWAR will see it, unless you specify otherwise. NO NAMES OR PERSONAL INFO WILL BE RELEASED WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT. Reports against Berkeley “peace” officers are especially important, as they may be used as testimony by Police Issue Group to demonstrate the necessity of a police review board.

Comes in and sees for yourself.

Christopher's Amoebic

2576 Opalite Ave., Berkeley
Hours: Mon-Fri 11am-6pm, Sat 11am-6pm
849-0178

There's a good chance!
Reliable sources report that Roy Nakadegawa was given a cool reception by the board of trustees of the AC Transit District when he sat in on a meeting following his election. Although they couldn't pronounce Roy's name correctly, we can be sure that the other trustees will learn how to pronounce it after he is installed next month.

The Berkeley Citizens United Bulletin (ultra-conservative) bemoaned the elections of the new SFAC candidates "bearded radical Roy Nakadegawa" and Riles supporter Mary Lee Jeffers.

After extensive quoting from an election article in Grassroots, the Bulletin concluded that "the Left is rapidly closing ranks on moderates, living here may soon be untenable." Well, well ... perhaps after April this sort of council testimony on the complex issue of the Bay Area.

The Berkeley Citizens United Bulletin published council voting records in September on 10 critical votes in 1972 and in November on 7 more council votes. Using these votes as a guide, Fly calculated the council's MQ's which are given below.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councilor</th>
<th>Critical Issues</th>
<th>7% Control Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallgren</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeney</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(abstentions are considered as no votes)

Following what seems to be an increasingly clear trend, this month the Berkeley City Council forged ahead in its efforts to conduct city business with a dazzling display of referrals, postenrollments, and "approvals in principle."

Nov. 15 Meeting

On Nov. 15 the council heard over 3 hours of public testimony regarding a Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance, a proposal originated by the People's Housing Conference which would require neighborhood input and approval from the Board of Adjustments for demolitions and all new construction in Berkeley for 2 years pending re-examination of the Master Plan by the Planning Commission and interested community groups. Organizers of the ordinance claim discontentment with the pattern of building in the city where old housing is torn down and replaced by modern high rent "ticky tacky" apartments. None of the long list of speakers spoke against the proposal. Councilman Bailey objected because he said he feared it would hinder the development of low cost housing if the neighborhood didn't approve of it. He said down zoning was designed to decrease the number of minority people in town. Councilwoman Hancock countered that the only low cost housing in the city were the old houses currently being destroyed to build apartments and the ordinance would prohibit the destruction of these homes. Bailey said he would support the proposal if it: 1) Had a clause that a building be exempted from the ordinance if the developer promised to order any low cost units he tore down with at least an equal number of low cost units in his development, 2) exempted all low cost housing and 3) exempted anything built by a company that was 51% minority owned.

Hancock made a motion to adopt the ordinance. It died for lack of a second. Kallgren then moved to adopt it "in principle" and send it to Model Cities, the Berkeley Community Development Council, the City Manager's office, and City Attorney's office for public input and readadable discussion for the meeting of December 12. Bailey made a substitute motion of the same thing without adopting it in principle. His motion failed 4-5 (Bailey, Simmons, Sweeney and Widener voting yes). Kallgren's motion then passed with Bailey, Simmons and Widener voting no.

Nov. 28 Meeting

At the meeting of November 28, the Council had a public hearing on an Architectural Heritage Ordinance presented by Urban Care. The ordinance would establish an appointed Landmarks Preservation Committee with the power to declare any structure or group of structures within the city an architectural landmark. Demolition or significant change of the property would then be subject to the committee which also would be empowered to declare a one year moratorium on the proposed changes to the landmark. During the time concerned citizens would have an opportunity to find ways of purchasing the building or otherwise preserving it.

The motion to adopt the ordinance failed 3-3 with Hood, Hancock, and Kallgren voting yes, Price, Widener and Sweeney voting no and Bailey, Simmons, and Kallgren absent. The council then expressed "enthusiastic support for the goals and objectives" of the ordinance and sent it to the City Attorney for his report.

At the meeting of December 6, the Council heard over 3 hours of public testimony on the complex issue of the $1,500,000 second Marina loan. (See GRASSROOTS issues for Sept. & Oct. for details). The loan binds the city to the construction of 580 berths at the Marina and a parking lot and other amenities for boaters. Opponents of the loan argue that it was contracted without proper public hearing and that acceptance of the loan should be suspended and no funds disbursed until the following conditions are met: 1) A financial audit of the Marina occur, 2) Berth rates be raised from $85 cents and $99.50, 3) renegotiate the loan to eliminate rate spikes for boat owners, 4) renegotiate the loan so that surplus funds above those needed to meet loan repayment are available to the community for other waterfront uses and 5) form one commission with responsibility for the entire waterfront.

The council voted to suspend the loan until the auditors produce a financial report on the Marina and they scheduled a council discussion of the issue again for Jan. 9.

Other Decisions

In other meetings sweeping inediction this month: at the meeting of Nov. 21 the council discussed Environment Commission's affirmative action program. They also "expressed interest" in a City Manager's one year moratorium on the proposed construction of a new jail. The council voted to postpone action on an emergency proposal by Ms Hancock to grant $700 to the Women's Resource Center for December 5 when it was finally granted after 3 weeks on the agenda.

Ms. Hancock introduced a proposal by the People's Free Bicycle Repair and Give Away Program to give 50 bicycles from the city's annual auction to the group to give away for Christmas. The 50 bikes were withheld temporarily from the auction and the proposal was referred to the Recreation Commission.

At the meeting of December 5, the Council discussed a request by Southern Pacific for relocation of a spur track. The discussion turned around the affirmative action programs of Southern Pacific (which has 50 separate programs) and Cutter Labs. Several motions were made ranging from the granting of the request to requiring both companies to follow the city's affirmative action program. All motions failed and the matter was to be rescheduled with additional information.

The council did make some definite, positive decisions this month of a routine nature. They include such things as: affording the Berkeley High School football team, changing the location of the December 5th meeting from the City Council chambers, canceling the meeting scheduled for December 26, and agreeing to move the meeting from Hillside School to West Campus auditorium.