A month before the Bailey Recall election, the issue has finally become openly what it always was behind the scenes: one more in a series of efforts by conservatives to destroy the Left in Berkeley. The withdrawal of Ann Fagan Ginger Wood from the race has left voters with a single choice: do they want D’Army Bailey removed from office and replaced by a conservative?

Ms. Wood’s withdrawal, after a week in the race, leaves only BART Security Chief Byron Rumford Jr. and former poverty director (and now a law student) Allen Wilson as ballot choices, in case the recall effort is successful.

Citing confusion as to her stand on the recall as the reason for her withdrawal, Ms. Wood asked her supporters to work hard against the recall, and to vote against it on August 21.

Ms. Wood is nationally known as a civil rights attorney, author and teacher; she is chairperson of the Berkeley-Albany ACLU and has been active in the National Lawyers’ Guild, Union Women’s Alliance to Gain Equality, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, and the Berkeley PTA. Her withdrawal from the race leaves liberals with no philosophically acceptable alternative to Bailey.

“Since my position against the recall is said to be unclear because of my placing my name on a different part of the ballot, I am withdrawing my name and I urge other candidates to do the same, so the recall can be called off.”

“And I urge everyone to vote against this divisive, racist recall,” Ms. Wood said.

The August Recall ballot has two parts: 1) should D’Army Bailey be recalled (yes or no); 2) if D’Army Bailey IS recalled by over 50% of this vote, who.

Although she had urged supporters to vote AGAINST the Bailey Recall (part 1 of the ballot), Ms. Wood said in her withdrawal statement, “the recall of Councilman Bailey should be defeated. He was elected as a progressive black candidate and he has played that role. The recall is an effort to cost him because of what he is, what he has done, and his style of politics. The recallers are trying to turn Berkeley into a one-kind-of-people town, with one kind of representation.”

RUNNING TO OPPOSE RUMFORD
Ms. Wood said that she had initially decided to run to oppose Rumford on part 2 of the ballot, “on the theory that it was silly to waste the bottom of the ballot. Some people called it an insurance policy,” she explained, “so that in case Bailey were recalled, there would be a candidate who represented some of the things he represented.” Both Rumford and Allen Wilson, the remaining recall candidates, are conservative candidates.

She had been asked to run, Ms. Wood said, “by people who are against the Bailey Recall. Black and white people with whom I had worked for a long time felt it was necessary to defeat Rumford, and to bring out ‘no’ voters on the Recall.” Rumford, a conservative Black who is one of the primary organizers of the Recall Campaign, Ms. Wood said, “was opposed to the things the people of Berkeley have already voted for, such as rent control and an effective police force. He would pull the Council away from a fairly adequate representation of the various groups in
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City cable TV potential lost

Perhaps the best way to approach cable television and its potential is to think of it as an open market for information and services. The tremendous technological capacity of cable is usually described in terms of services we have available from older technologies. This frequently causes confusion since the cost, scale, and delivery of services via cable may be radically different from what we’ve seen in the past. When we say that cable has the ability to offer the public forty or more television channels, data transmission services, telephone-television or phone-a-vision, home purchasing and burglary alarm systems, individually requested information education for any subject - what are we really saying is that cable can provide individualized services, that is, information, education or entertainment available to the individual in the time and place of his or her convenience for a reasonable fee.

**OPEN MARKETPLACE.** To provide the individual with such services requires the development of new industries — information industries — with new definitions of jobs, “markets” for services, and cost systems. The open market concept comes into play with cable because it is a technology of abundance whereas almost unlimited services are possible and many sources of service are needed to realize the full potential of cable.

Think for a moment about all of your own interests and informational needs - i.e.: hobbies, work, consumer services, environmental, health, political interests, and educational needs.

Suppose you could get any information about any of these things when you wanted it for between $25 and $1. How much time and effort would you save? Would it ease your problems of transportation or baby sitting or reduce your costs otherwise? It probably would.

**LOWER COSTS**

An interesting by-product of such an open market would be the reduction of costs to the consumer of goods and services as well as greater variety.

Presently, 40% to 80% of the consumer dollar pays for mass corporate advertising and marketing. Advertising is a service which justifies itself as being a means of informing the public about new products or educating them about the benefits of known products. If advertising were to be made available to us when we needed information about products or services, we would be able to analyze, compare and choose from all of the sources available to us and not have to pay for mass advertising campaigns delivering information when we don't want it. Our dollars would easily go twice as far.

**GOVERNMENT USES**

Access to information is especially important to us in order to participate in decisions affecting our lives, our community and our future. With cable, information on legal rights, live coverage of government planning and decision making, and electronic community voting continued on p. 4.
LETTERS TO THE COLLECTIVE.

To Grassroots Collective:
Great pressure was put on Ann Ginger Wood to withdraw as a candidate against D'Arny Bailey. As this is written, we do not know if she is staying in the race.

If she runs, she will be the principle candidate of the Kallgren Klatsch, but the Klatsch is against Bailey, because she can split the liberals and can split whites from blacks.

If she runs, she will have the support of any liberal organization. The Berkeley Coalition, the Black Caucus, the Peace & Freedom Party, and the Neighborhood political organizations — none of them will support her.

She says she opposes the recall. But she can be elected only if Bailey is recalled. Which is her main interest: to get elected, or to defeat the recall? She can win only if the entire liberal-progressive-radical community is defeated.

She is running against a militant and effective Black council member who has a very good working record. All her sophistry cannot erase that fact.

Her candidacy has aroused fury in the Black community, justified fury. She has strengthened the argument of those Blacks who say that Whites always betray Blacks. She has already done great damage to Black-White unity.

The discussions now going on at the community level are a result of the Coalition decisions before entering the recall race. It can be shown that it was a futile effort, in any case, since, if conservatives had the strength to recall Bailey, they would have elected nonetheless who they chose.

A number of Coalition supporters also saw Ms. Wood's candidacy as a threat to the Coalition, since it had taken a position against the recall and against Bailey's candidacy. Although Ms. Wood was never put forth as a Coalition candidate, she had many supporters from the Coalition. Among these was Louise Stoll, Dorothy Hill, Elza Harris, Lawrence Duga, Helen Mekjian, Charles Schwartz, Elzaree Salkind, Margo Peters, Phoebe Watts, Dr. Ephraim Kahn and others. Ms. Wood said that she had not been aware of the Coalition decisions before entering the race. It was also charged that Ms. Wood had not been chosen to run by an open process, but had instead been selected by a few persons just before the close of the filing period.

The election of the SUDS slate is important because it is a result of the community's attitude towards the public's right to know. This denial of such a right is increasing Đồng thời, the Berkeley Five, the people of Berkeley, are the Richmond-based Gazette (a publication so lacking in values). The Berkeley Five, people of Berkeley, are the Richmond-based Gazette (a publication so lacking in values). The Berkeley Five, people of Berkeley, are the Richmond-based Gazette (a publication so lacking in values). The Berkeley Five, people of Berkeley, are the Richmond-based Gazette (a publication so lacking in values). The Berkeley Five, people of Berkeley, are the Richmond-based Gazette (a publication so lacking in values).
At 2:30 in the afternoon on Sunday, July 22, the S.U.D.S. community group (members of 50 Beale Street, University Avenue, Dwight Way, and San Pablo Avenue) will celebrate a partial victory. By forming a community-designed totlot on Acton Street between Bancroft Way and Allston Way, this group will occupy a part of a larger part for which we are still struggling.

Two years ago, almost to the day, the residents of S.U.D.S. area started fighting against a long standing, little publicized municipal evil—the giveaway of over an acre of scarce city-owned park land to a small, exclusive, virtually all-white private club devoted to an esoteric sport. Today that Club still has possession of our land.

PRIVATE CLUB

In July of 1971 we were astounded to learn that the only grassy open park space in our otherwise green and leafy neighborhood was not only city-owned but also tax-maintained at a yearly cost of over $16,000 out of the Recreation and Parks Department budget. What many of us had assumed was a privately owned property restricted to the members of the eastern gray, perfectly manicured, level area set in a gracious landscape of shrubs and redwoods—was simply surrounded by padlocked gates and a high barbed wire fence—turned out to be land quietly reserved by City officials for the exclusive use of the Berkeley Lawn Bowling Club. The Club is a private association of the property consisting of two greens somehow assured them continued public use of any of the land. Club members referred to "unwritten" agreement with the previous owners and claimed that their leasing of a neighborhood multi-use mini-park.

Our park was short-lived. Before it could be unlocked, the Lawn Bowling Club went to Court, arguing that compromise was intolerable and seeking an injunction against the City to prevent public use of any of the land. Club members referred to "unwritten" agreement with the previous owners and claimed that their leasing of a neighborhood multi-use mini-park.

The Board already had allocated $11 million to the Club and the key force in the San Diego city council for stock manipulation and fraud. He has been charged with his own Health Dept.), that they can limit the county's ability to collect their property taxes for both city and county facilities. Berkeley residents pay through their property taxes for both city and county facilities.

And so the private sanctuary of a handful of Berkeley supporters is reduced to the City Council's total control of the facility. The City itself often justified its "liberal" city officials continued to do this on the side of the City and a participant in the rathervague injunction are; once the Court decision in the lawn bowling case, the Judge was willing to order, and later the Club chose not to deal with many of them—in particular those raised by our lawyers. (The Neighborhood Committee for a Public Park was an intervenor in the case on the side of the City and a participant in the hearing.)

JUDGEx RULES

The Judge eventually ruled that the Club did have a right to both use of the greens as an "implied" part of their Clubhouse lease and he issued an injunction against the City to prevent implementation of the City Council compromise.

In retrospect, the Court decision in the Berkeley case is less surprising than it was at the time, for it can be viewed as one of a series of recent Alameda County trial court decisions in which judges have frustrated Berkeley's democratically elected and electoral majorities. In the lawn bowling case, the Judge was willing to overturn a legislative act on the basis of a public use of public land in order to enforce an alleged unwritten agreement which our neighborhood lawyers maintain would be illegal if it were actually written down.

BERKELEY'S OWN CITY BUDGET

Berkeley's own city budget is just a drop in the bucket compared to Alameda County's annual budget. At $305 million it is roughly ten times the size of Berkeley's, yet, probably because the operations of the county are not as well understood, it receives very little attention in Berkeley. The county funds the welfare system, the county health department, social programs such as child care, and the court and detention system.

This year the county received a two percent increase of federal revenue-sharing funds ($24 million) which more than equaled a three million dollar loss in state and federal grant monies. This incredibly good opportunity to fund the many hundreds of social programs that are begging for money was practically lost because the Republican Conservative majority of the Board of Supervisors voted to spend these funds largely on existing non-social programs. After they had whipped away the funds, only $3.3 million was left for new programs. This compares with $9 million proposed by Oakland supervisor Tom Bates, the most liberal of the supervisors.

Following is a summary of chairman Joe Bort's plan and Bates' plan for the revenue sharing fund:

According to Bates, "Bort sold us out" by using the money to fund programs that were simply funded in the county's regular budget. The capital improvements funds alone are for a five year $58 million program to build administrative and court buildings throughout the county (including a $3.3 million expansion of the court facilities in Berkeley's civic center). The Board already had allocated $11 million to the CIP fund in the regular county budget, meaning that the $14 million in Bort's proposal was a waste of needed public funds. Perhaps if the Board and Bort had chosen to fund social programs with this money they would not have needed such a costly building program for the courts and jails.

Bates proposed to use the major surplus of the funds to meet the more pressing unfunded needs made by various public and private agencies in the county including health clinics and child care. Few people realize in Berkeley (which is one of the few cities in the state with its own Health Dept.), that they can use the county's health and welfare facilities. Berkeley residents pay through their property taxes for both city and county facilities.

Berkeley's own city budget is just a drop in the bucket compared to Alameda County's annual budget. At $305 million it is roughly ten times the size of Berkeley's, yet, probably because the operations of the county are not as well understood, it receives very little attention in Berkeley. The county funds the welfare system, the county health department, social programs such as child care, and the court and detention system.

This year the county received a two percent increase of federal revenue-sharing funds ($24 million) which more than equaled a three million dollar loss in state and federal grant monies. This incredibly good opportunity to fund the many hundreds of social programs that are begging for money was practically lost because the Republican Conservative majority of the Board of Supervisors voted to spend these funds largely on existing non-social programs. After they had whipped away the funds, only $3.3 million was left for new programs. This compares with $9 million proposed by Oakland supervisor Tom Bates, the most liberal of the supervisors.

Following is a summary of chairman Joe Bort's plan and Bates' plan for the revenue sharing fund:

Bort's plan (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>5 year capital improvement program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing program funding</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fund</td>
<td>6.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds required to balance the budget (included in Bort's plan under the above programs)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reserve fund is being held subject to the impact of S.B. 90 which would limit the county's ability to collect revenues.
Cable in Berkeley

Cable operators are conservative businessmen. They want to make a profit as quickly as possible for as little effort as possible. City governments, the licensing or franchising authorities that permit cable companies to operate in their communities, are generally ignorant about how the cable business operates and are more interested in the size of their annual franchising fee than in safeguarding the public. As a result, they have the fullest cable services available to them now and in the future.

BayCablevision, which had been building a two-way system capable of all the services described above, re-arranged their cable lines at the City Council's request leaving the residents with an obsolete cable system. In 1972, the Federal Communications Commission required that by 1977 all cable systems have channels available for use as public access. BayCablevision is reluctant to activate the channel to comply with the local government for any modification. In 1977, Berkeley will have a totally obsolete system unless the City Council overrules the earlier decision of the old City Council and orders BayCablevision to comply with the Federal Rules by the 1977 deadline.

City Channel

In 1968, the BayCablevision franchise specified that the City have one channel available for government use. The channel hadn't been used by the City because BayCablevision interprets the franchise to mean that the city must pay for the equipment to put city programming on the cable. (We are not talking about production equipment which the city has available, we're referring to the modulator and line to bring the program to BayCablevision - origination source - the head-end). This would cost the city approximately $3000.

BayCablevision has another advantage in not opening the government channel. It can make the City Council meetings and other city functions available on its own commercial channel and receive advertising revenues from the commercial sponsors. Since the City Council meetings frequently become the best show in town, the advertising revenues could be substantial in the long run. If, however, the government channel is activated, the city could receive funds from "sponsors" as direct income to the city (and a tax benefit to the sponsors) to defray the cost of making Council meetings and other city functions available to the public. The cost of cable communications between the government and the public could be financed without any additional tax burden on the residents.

There are still other reasons for a cable company to be reluctant about activating local access channels. It is in the interest of any money-minded cable operator to encourage competition with the local government. Programming provided by the government, educators or as public access programming in direct competition with private enterprise will hurt the public access programs on the commercial channel.

Yet, as part of the 1972 cable rules from the Federal Communications Commission, each cable system is required to have a government, educational and public access channel available by 1977. The public access channel must have equipment and facilities available as well on a first come, first served, non-discriminatory basis.

If you prefer old fashioned building materials, such as wood and glass, to the systems look of modern plastics, you may get a safer place to live. Some of those "fire-proof" plastics aren't so "flammable," according to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

The FTC has charged 26 major chemical companies with knowing about, but failing to disclose, the fire hazards created by two plastic materials used in construction and furniture. These plastics are cellular polyurethane and all forms of polystyrene. Between them, these two companies? are cellular polyurethane and all forms of debated action against the chemical industry's total annual production.

These plastics are all around you in insulation, upholstery, wall panels, furniture, plumbing and lighting fixtures, flooring, etc. In 1972, 1.5 billion board feet of rigid foam urethane was produced for use as insulation in commercial and institutional buildings. This constituted 10% of the total production of all types of building insulation materials.

News people find out that these materials spread flame rapidly and increase the likelihood of "flashover" in a fire; generate extreme heat; produce vast amounts of dense smoke from their fire-resistant additives; and release toxic or flammable materials that burn. The FTC says that the plastic manufacturers have misinformed these plastics as "non-burning" and "self-extinguishing," although they have known at least since 1947 that they presented a serious fire hazard. How many hospitals have this "safe" insulation by now?

The FTC first became aware of the potential danger of polyurethane and polystyrene.
CLOCKWORK ORANGE RETURNS: PSYCHOSURGERY, CASTRATION DRUGS TO CONTROL BEHAVIOR

A potentially explosive project to study violent behavior is being quietly implemented by state and university officials in Los Angeles, despite mounting opposition in the community. The Center for the Study and Reduction of Violence, as its most recent title has it, is being funded through federal and state money, and set up at the University of California, Los Angeles, in conjunction with the Neuropsychiatric Institute there. It is requesting $1 million for its first year and an additional million each year. The Center proposes to do research on identification, prevention, control and treatment of individual violence, using schools, hospitals and prisons as its laboratories. Among the specific projects are experiments with brain waves, castration, aggression in children, violence in women during menstruation, males with XYY chromosome groups, identified as "violent subcultures" such as ethnic communities, and developing "correlates" to violent individuals such as age, race and biological makeup.

The Center for the Study and Reduction of Violence (CSRV) hopes to receive $1 million this year, of which 75% is to come from the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) to be channelled through the California Council on Criminal Justice (CCC). The remainder will be state money. However, the CSRV expects to obtain half of its annual million from the state by the third year, with the federal government's share decreasing.

The focus at the CSRV will be on IDENTIFICATION, DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF VIOLENT INDIVIDUALS, through a combination of biological and psychiatric techniques. The project does NOT deal with legal or institutional violence (e.g., war, police brutality) or with the social and economic underpinnings of violence such as poverty and racism. Not only will the project be invading the physical and mental privacy of individuals who have been labeled as "violent" by the state, but the focus of the research and its practical applications points mainly at Third World and poor people and at political dissenters. The CSRV plans close contact with state mental hospitals and prisons, all of which hold a disproportionate number of these groups, who will be used for experiments.

The specifics of the various research projects have only recently been made public, due to the determined efforts of individuals to obtain information. One project, "A Survey of Violence in California," will investigate "various violent phenomena" in the state; the nature of the study is made explicit in the statement that "the major known correlates of violence are sex (male), age (youthful), ethnicity (black), and URBANITY (emphasis added), which leaves little doubt as to what kind of communities will be studied. A related task force on "Determinants of Violence" will attempt to predict what kinds of persons are "violence prone," with emphasis on "age, sex, ethnic background and urbanity" along with "mental and physical status." The data used will be from the police, courts and prisons, although no control is planned for the well-documented bias of these agencies due to institutional racism. Another study on "Violence in Schools" will look at two schools only: one in a Chicano area and one in a Black area.

Research on "Biological Aspects of Violence in Females" will observe violence in women during their menstrual periods, and the findings will be used in possible drug treatment of incarcerated women and women in general. Previous studies have come out with such recommendations as female prisoners with "violent" tendencies should be isolated and given sedative drugs during menstruation. Another biological study will compare hormone levels in aggressive and nonaggressive boys to discover "constitutional predisposition to violence." There will be a study of men with the XYY chromosome and its relation to violence, although previous studies have come out with questionable results. In yet another project, sex offenders will be given the drug cypionate, which effectively castrates by stopping the secretion of androgens. Dr. Richard Green, director of this study, has written works on "curing" effeminacy in boys, homosexuality as mental illness, and the effects of cypionate on castrated rats.

Possibly due to intense public opposition, several of the projects in the original proposal have been shelved, at least temporarily. One of these was a study of violence in hyperkinetic (overactive) children to use the drug methylphenidate on them. It was estimated that 10% of all children suffered from "minimal brain dysfunction" (MBD) and that this might be a "precursor of alcoholism and sociopathy." Another discarded proposal was using animal violence as a model for human violence, to test reactions to morphine and its antagonist, naloxone, to discover which drugs enhance and reduce violent behavior.

But perhaps the most frightening project of all, and the one that has stirred the most controversy, is the one dealing with violence and brain waves. The CSRV plans to do "Studies of abnormal electrical activities within the brain, involving various forms of brain disease and brain lesions, which will be carried out in the neurological and physiological laboratories to clarify their relationship to various types of behavior," including as subjects hyperkinetic children and individuals who have committed "aggressive or violent sex crimes." The CSRV will work with UCLA's Brain Information Service. Patients' brain waves can be monitored and altered electrically and surgically. "The terminal man," a fictitious patient with wires in his brain, is actually based on a patient of Dr. Frank Ervin, who is now at UCLA. Many professional and community people concerned about the impending Center for the Study and Reduction of Violence are speaking out against what appears to be a "Clockwork Orange" in California.

At a State Senate hearing held on the proposal last month in Sacramento at public demand, sponsors of the Center were evasive about their plans to do psychosurgery, which is brain surgery that alters behavior by removing or controlling parts of the brain. Psychosurgery was performed last year on three prisoners at Vassal Medical Facility in California, before public outcry caused what may be only a temporary halt to the program. More recently, court action halted a proposed implantation of electrodes on a Michigan State Hospital patient who had been locked up for 18 years as a sex psychopath and consented to surgery as a condition of freedom. Although the CSRV admittedly will be researching electric activity in the brain, diseases and lesions, Dr. Louis ("Jolly") West, director of the Neuropsychiatric Institute and an expert on drugs and conditioning, denied that psychosurgery would be performed. He admitted, however, that it might depend on how you defined "psychosurgery," and said that there might be operations on "diseased" brains. He noted earlier that individuals have been...
MANY YOUNG WOMEN HAVE BEEN OPERATED ON...DOCTORS

continued from p. 5

"cured" of aggression by removal of "the focus of abnormal brain wave activity." Dr. J.M. Stubbilbine, State Director of Health and another enthusiastic propo­
sate of the CSRV, stressed that "we
should not deny the benefits of medical
science to those who need treatment," even if treatment meant psychosurgery.

Psychosurgery has a frightening
history of abuse. The practice of
lobotomy, or severing the frontal lobes of
the brain (which control human emotion,
creativity and abstract thinking), began in
the 1930's and was used on patients
diagnosed as "chronic" mental cases. The
point was to eliminate anxiety, but it was
discovered that lobotomy also relieved
the patient permanently of his sensitivity,
judgement, self awareness, independence
and feeling. Nevertheless, Dr. Walter
Freeman ("Father of the Lobotomy" in
the United States) performed some 4000
operations personally before he was asked
to leave the hospital, and at least 50,000
other operations were done in this
country. The pace of lobotomies was
dowed in 1950's after the discovery
of psychotropic (behavior altering) drugs
and electroshock therapy. These tech­
niques were used to make patients
MANAGEABLE and were only secondari­
ly considered as therapy. The second
wave of psychosurgery began in the late
1960's, a period of social upheaval, and
 technological advances have made possible a host of methods far more sophistica­tioned than lobotomy. These include
amygdalotomy, the operation used at
Vacaville by Dr. George Bach-Y-Rita and by his Boston colleague
Dr. Frank Ervin (the same man now at
UCLA), which removes an almond-shaped
area deep in the brain thought to be the
center of "violent" fits. Another technique
has been the injection of olive
oil into the brain to destroy selected
tissue, practiced on hyperactive children
in India. In Boston, Dr. Jose Delgado has
pioneered the technique of "electrical
stimulation of the brain" (ESB) which
involves implantation of electrodes and
remote control for diagnostic and
treatment purposes.

Who are the victims of psychosurgery?
One target has been women. Dr. Freeman
advocates operating on women because
lobotomy seemed to make housewives
more content, and he continued against
operating on men, because many had
great difficulties concentrating on their
jobs after the surgery. Dr. Lindstrom, a
California neurosurgeon, estimated in
1964 that 72-80% of the patients being
operated on were women. Santa Monica's
Dr. Hunter Brown, "Father of the
Cingulotomy" (which electrically de­
stroys nerves in the limbic, or "feeling," part of the brain, supposedly to cure
depression), an operation used in
Philadelphia on drug addicts and
alcoholics, did 71% of his operations in
1968 on women. Dr. Freeman describes
one patient as a 63 year old woman who
was a "master at bitching and really led
her husband a dog's life." She was
somewhat calmer after surgery, but still
"shrewish." Many young women have
been operated on by Drs. Frank Ervin
and Vernon Mark in Boston, who
received almost $1 million from the
National Institute of Mental Health
(NIMH) and the LEAA (which is funding
the new Center) for studies on violence
and the brain before a congressional
investigation cut off the grant. One
"depressed" woman submitted to an
operation under pressure from the
doctors and her husband; when it failed, a
second was done. Becoming angry, she
refused a third operation, which was
taken as a "paranoid rage" by the doctors
(and a hopeful sign of "good spirits").
Allowed to leave the hospital to shop, she
committed suicide, but the doctors
consider her a success, since the suicide
represented a "recovery" from depres­
sion.

Another group of frequent victims is
children. In Japan lobotomies were done
on children suffering from "unsteadiness,
hyperactive behavior disorders and poor
concentration." At the University of
Mississippi, Neurosurgery Director O.J.
Andy had destroyed the thalamus (a
center of judgement) of children as young
as nine, many of whom are black.

Blacks and other members of minority
ethnic groups are being increasingly seen
as targets for psychosurgical experimenta­tion, especially by researchers focusing on
the lucrative issue of violence. Doctors
such as Ervin explain aggressive behavior
as the result of BRAIN DYSFUNCTION
rather than social inequities. Ervin, Mark
and Dr. William Sweet, doing government
sponsored work on violence and brain
dysfunction, wrote in 1967, "The proponents
of urban disorders seem to be the people
who are most likely to suffer from
organic brain diseases," in the wake of
Black uprisings across the country. Dr.
Andy agreed, "I think that those who are
involved in any uprising such as Watts or
Detroit could have abnormal brains.
Those people should undergo tests with
whatever capacity we now have." In their
book Violence and the Brain, Drs. Mark
and Ervin urge that "violence prone"
individuals be studied for PREDICTION
and TREATMENT, emphasizing the
"failure" of environmental attempts to
TORS CONSIDER SUICIDE A ‘RECOVERY’ FROM DEPRESSION

...The Focus Of The Research And Its Practical Applications Points At Third World, Poor People And Political Dissenters.

control crime and defending the validity of medical approaches. They specify physical examinations, electroencephalographs (EEGs), IQ tests, chromosome checks, social histories, psychiatric evaluations ... in short, a proposal remarkably similar to that of the Center for the Study and Reduction of Violence at UCLA, Ervin’s new home.

Dr. Alvin Poussaint, a Black professor of psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, warns of the dangers of these studies of violence. They don’t consider that something’s wrong with THEIR brains.” (emphasis original)

Prisoners are particularly vulnerable to the threat of psychosurgery, as last year’s amygdalotomies at Vacaville attest to. The program was stopped only after it accidentally leaked out and became a public issue. This year, however, new plans are being quietly formulated by the California Department of Corrections for a neuropsychiatric program at the California Men’s Colony at San Luis Obispo, to include surgery on “violent” prisoners with epilepsy. The endangered convicts are often the political dissenters and others who refuse to “go quietly.” These kinds of prisoners were forced to participate in the 1968 Vacaville experiment in which the drug acepromazine was injected to paralyze the lungs (causing a sensation of drowning, suffocation and death) and the inmate was told that the next time he engaged in “violent” behavior, he would recall that sensation. Dr. Poussaint remarks, “What parole board wouldn’t listen if an amnesic doctor says that a prisoner has a lesion ‘associated’ with violence? If a convict submits to an operation in order to gain his freedom, he has to pay for it with a piece of his brain. If he REFUSES to submit, he has to risk having more time tacked on his sentence.” (emphasis original) This is the choice being offered to many California prisoners. Furthermore, many doctors insist that the usual standard of “informed consent” for such operations is irrelevant when dealing with a brain diseased person, for he is unqualified to decide, and a professional medical expert must decide for him.

The new technological advances are having widespread repercussions not only on prisoners, but in the control of people on parole and probation. In the future, electric monitoring and surveillance of a very intimate nature may be done on anyone perceived as a POTENTIAL lawbreaker. Drs. Ralph and Robert Schwitzgebel are developing and advocating the use of brain implants and radio telemetry to trace a person’s whereabouts, activities and emotions, which they see as replacing the old need to institutionalize offenders. Computers monitoring these individuals would translate brain wave patterns and feed back signals through the implanted electrodes to avert certain actions. Dr. Jose Delgado, responsible for electronic stimulation of the brain, has used electrodes to block thought, speech and movement, to evoke pleasure, talk, sexual desire, hostility, rage, fear, memory and hallucinations in the human brain. This is, as Dr. Peter Breggin, a prominent critic of psychosurgery, has said, “the ultimate lobotomy.” Dr. Delgado writes, “Leaving wires inside a thinking brain may appear unpleasant or dangerous, but actually the many patients who have undergone this experience have not been concerned about the fact of being wired, nor have they felt any discomfort due to the presence of conductors in their heads. Some women have shown their feminine adaptability to circumstances by wearing attractive hats or wigs to conceal their electrical headgear, and many people have been able to enjoy a normal life as outpatients, returning to the clinic periodically for examination and stimulation. In a few cases in which contacts were located in pleasurable areas, patients have had the opportunity to stimulate their own brains . . .

The larger implications of all this is one of the issues that has raised concerns among psychiatrists, lawyers, social scientists and prisoners about just exactly what the Center for the Study and Reduction of Violence will be doing. Deeply implicated is the question of violations of privacy, liberty and human integrity. What ethical standards will be enforced for the research, particularly when it involves prisoners and mental patients in total institutions? Is “treatment” sometimes a guise for punishment and repression of behavior threatening to the State? Why, when the world is obviously beset by institutionalized violence conducted by government...
Continued from p. 7

officials, is the focus on individual violence among the poorest class of people? And in this study of individual violence, why are psychobiological factors being studied rather than socio-economic ones? Questioned about this, Dr. West said, "We understand that most of the violence in the world is NOT caused by sick people, but often by respectable institutions and their leaders. Much group violence stems from the social oppression of racism and neglect. But we are primarily concerned with individual violence." (emphasis added) And Dr. Shubblebine defended the medical approach by saying that crime might have many causes, but they are "all mediated through the individual and our task is to look at this individual.

It is growing apparent to many people that the country is in the middle of a period of repressive law enforcement that relies on technological and medical weapons, such as electronic surveillance, monitoring and utilization of "predelinquent" children, mass computerized information, sophisticated anti-potter technology (often straight from Vietnam), drugs to keep people manageable, group therapy techniques of behavior modification (now being used in prisons everywhere), and government-run control programs such as Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) that reaches into people's everyday lives by distributing methadone daily. Law enforcement agencies are concerned with PREDICTING, CONTROLLING and TREATING violent behavior. The Center for the Study and Reduction of Violence seen in this context fills the government's need to scientifically" research and apply programs that have political aims: maintaining law and order, controlling racial minorities and political rebels who challenge social institutions, expanding a repressive government machinery. It is easier and cheaper to put people out of action with drugs, psychiatry and behavior therapy than to imprison them, and these new techniques can be "scientifically" legitimated.

With this understanding of what the Center for the Study and Reduction of Violence means, people in the community are working to stop it from being implemented. The next California Council on Criminal Justice public hearing on the Center is scheduled on July 23 in the East Bay. An East Bay group, "The Committee Opposing Psychiatric Abuse of Prisoners (COPAP), has worked extensively to publicize the film series - the most important that everyone understand and take action against what's going on, FOR THESE DEVELOPMENTS THREATEN ALL OF US, DEPRIVING US OF ESSENTIAL FREEDOMS."

For further information, please contact COPAP, 5406 Claremont Ave., Oakland, 655-8971.

Dorje Klein for the Union of Radical Criminalologists

With most East Bay theaters now charging $2.50 and some $3.00, now seems like a good time to review those bargain rates:

one dollar per film or $1.50 for two films

Museum and is located on Durant
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The article on NAM in the last issue of GRASSROOTS outlined our general perspective. This article will discuss our work and experiences on several immediate questions.

Prior to the last eight or nine months, the main emphasis of the Berkeley NAM chapter was on internal political development. We tried to develop an understanding of our political perspective and to define what that perspective meant for work in both internal and external relations which we experience in most of our daily lives. We have not yet started to replace the hierarchical, authoritarian structures which are concerned with community issues, particularly around social services. We think it is possible and very important for such organizations to become explicitly socialist, to put forward a sustained working presence in the city. So far our work has concentrated on helping to build and support student, and electoral organizations. Some women in the chapter have participated in other women's activities -- locally. Because of our limited numbers (about 20 people) and a desire to unite with other activists in the city, we have not yet started projects in our own name. We have decided to affiliate with larger organizations which are concerned with community issues, particularly around social services. We think it is possible and very important for such organizations to become explicitly socialist, to put forward a sustained working presence in the city.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZING

Our work involves not only the small groups in Berkeley, but the larger institutions, which are concerned with community issues, particularly around social services. We think it is possible and very important for such institutions to become explicitly socialist, to put forward a sustained working presence in the city.

The article on NAM in the last issue of GRASSROOTS outlined our general perspective. This article will discuss our work and experiences on several immediate questions.

Prior to the last eight or nine months, the main emphasis of the Berkeley NAM chapter was on internal political development. We tried to develop an understanding of our political perspective and to define what that perspective meant for work in both internal and external relations which we experience in most of our daily lives. We have not yet started projects in our own name. We have decided to affiliate with larger organizations which are concerned with community issues, particularly around social services. We think it is possible and very important for such organizations to become explicitly socialist, to put forward a sustained working presence in the city.
am confident that my particular amendment will not pass the Committee mark-up session, we will be presenting the amendment when it comes to the floor sometime this month.

From the information and contacts we have been developing, it seems that this year will be the first time in which the House will probably take some action to redress the inequalities in our military based on gender. These commitments hopefully will be the first step in really driving the unique position that the Pentagon has held with the Armed Services Committee.

In testimony presented in the Manpower subcommittee I asserted that "We must be aware that manpower levels at the Pentagon are decided by the Political Division of the Department of Defense and not by the Congress. Indeed I believe that the Congress in its role as a co-equal branch of the governmental structure and as the representative of the American people, has an inherent ability to make decisions that will have a greater impact on its own survival than the executive branch.

I believe it is fair to surmise that the committee which has approved, without question, the attempt to recall Congressman D'Army Bailey.

In 1964 many of the same people who are now attempting to recall Mr. Bailey were involved in another recall movement. At that time the recall was against school board members who were trying to develop and implement integration in our schools. Fortunately the people of our community recognized that important and rejected that attempt. Again in the spring of 1972 there was much talk by these same people of taking action against our congressman, Ron Dellums. They did not feel that he was the right person but the job was unsatisfactory and they just wanted to do something. Again there was obviously much cutting across this community and that attempt was dropped. Shortly afterwards a move was made by the same people to recall Hancock, Bailey, Simmons and Widener. Each step of the way they were met with opposition. Finally they settled on the recall of D'Army Bailey.

THE CONGRESS OPPOSES RECALL

The Council of Neighborhood Organizations (CNO) urges that people all over Berkeley strongly oppose the attempt to recall Congressman D'Army Bailey.

"We must be aware that manpower levels at the Pentagon are decided by the Political Division of the Department of Defense and not by the Congress. Indeed I believe that the Congress in its role as a co-equal branch of the governmental structure and as the representative of the American people, has an inherent ability to make decisions that will have a greater impact on its own survival than the executive branch."

I believe it is fair to surmise that the committee which has approved, without question, the attempt to recall Congressman D'Army Bailey.

In 1964 many of the same people who are now attempting to recall Mr. Bailey were involved in another recall movement. At that time the recall was against school board members who were trying to develop and implement integration in our schools. Fortunately the people of our community recognized that important and rejected that attempt. Again in the spring of 1972 there was much talk by these same people of taking action against our congressman, Ron Dellums. They did not feel that he was the right person but the job was unsatisfactory and they just wanted to do something. Again there was obviously much cutting across this community and that attempt was dropped. Shortly afterwards a move was made by the same people to recall Hancock, Bailey, Simmons and Widener. Each step of the way they were met with opposition. Finally they settled on the recall of D'Army Bailey.
Grassroots

A Political Hermaphrodite.

Some people get to be friends of famous people. Others do it for a living. Mark Trautwein, City Council reporter for the Berkeley Daily Gazette, is on friendly terms with people as different as Tom McLean and Lori Hancock.

However, not even these people necessarily like Trautwein's news stories concerning the City Council. Many people believe Gazette news coverage, including Trautwein's, reflects a radical concern concerning the City Council. Many necessarily like Trautwein's news stories friendly tert11s with people as different as that on a given Wednesday you could possibly read Trautwein's front page story and know who the Gazette supports on the Council without turning the page. The Gazette's distortions have led Councilwoman Ying Kelley to file suit for possibly read Trautwein's front page stories.

And a couple of paragraphs that are about my stories and I feel good about the paragraphs the last reporter usually wrote? In other words, why don't the paragraphs the last reporter usually wrote?

The documentation of their distortions is a story in itself. And though understanding the bias of a newspaper and how it's expressed on the front page is important, it doesn't explain why a particular reporter writes a story in a particular way. For while newspapers are often viewed as institutions, they are made up of men, usually white men with women as their secretaries, who are responsible for the distortions we have come to expect from newspapers. Now what makes a reporter, especially a young reporter, write news stories you already expect to read, with the age-old platitudes and write the most biased stories, never noticing the inconsistencies. In viewing himself as a "political hermaphrodite" (does that make him a "politico"?), as someone with no political peers, Trautwein has set himself up to be an excellent Gazette reporter. In the Gazette, in the person of Mike Culbert, has not only political peers, but an array of vested interests to advance and protect that run from the advertisers in his paper to the Bailey recall campaign. Now what happens when a man who can go either way (or both ways at once) works for a man who's consistently liberal? Trautwein has been working for the Gazette for two years, ever since he graduated UC at a journalism major. His assignments concern City Hall and related stories.

Having only been out of school for two years, Trautwein has already developed what he calls "professional instinct." Or, of course, usually refers to something innate, which "professional instinct" is not. "Professional instinct," according to Trautwein, means a reporter doesn't have to sit down and think about his biases when he writes a story, he just sits down and writes. Trautwein says: "My effort is to be fair, to give everyone his due." He says he can be "fair" because: "I don't have a political line. . . . I try to check my preconceptions with others and I go on my own best judgment."

In deciding what to write Trautwein has certain criteria he follows. Top news priorities to Trautwein are: "anything the Council takes action; concentrating on anything concerning a large amount of money; and issues of general concern and interest." He says he tries to "minimize reporting of resolutions, such as Wounded Knee or Farmworkers.

Trautwein describes himself as "a political hermaphrodite," identifying with no group and feeling solidarity with no one, except a constituency which comes from both (the political) left and right about my stories and I feel good about that," he says.

From Trautwein's comments it is at first not necessarily evident that he is a Gazette reporter or that his stories contain the biases you would expect from the Gazette. But a moment's reflection will reveal how Trautwein, and thousands of reporters like him, can say they're "fair," speak in the most pleasing conservative? He develops "professional instincts"; he just incorporates what he knows to be acceptable to his boss into his own vision and sees everything within that spectrum.

So when Trautwein says "fair," it's just hot air. His "professional instinct" would no more allow him to report that supposedly anti-war Councilmembers Howe, Waldner, and Rosenberg invested Berkeley tax money in war industries than it would allow him to call Helena Dorsey (a black woman who protested when passed over for advancement by the City) heroic, rather than a "harasser" or "broadside.

When discussing news coverage and priorities Trautwein's bias becomes even clearer. For he says: "I don't believe in the concept of objectivity — the reporter as a cold uninvolved conduit of (could you imagine the ulcers he'd have?), it is plausible that his biases surface as his "professional instinct" and "criteria for newsworthy." Those are the rationalizations he has concocted for his conservative bias, a bias he is as comfortable with as his boss is, as long as he doesn't think about it as such.

What Trautwein has done, and as reporters all over the country who may have at one time known better do, is to impose self-censorship. They know what is expected and accepted and they try not to exceed the limits. When they do, they are corrected and must avoid making the mistake again.

Les Hoffman

\[\frac{\text{Grassroots}}{\text{A Political Hermaphrodite.}}\]
A new game has emerged in the weekly spectacle of the Berkeley City Council, as the Berkeley 5 continue to develop their style of "getting it done." The new game is called "Procedural Hassle." In the name of efficiency, organization, or determination, or whatever, the City Council has probably spent more time debating procedure in the manner of the new council, than in the whole previous year. One reason this game can be so successful with the arrival of the new council is that there are two people now who love to play—Councilmen Ramsey and Bailey. Council watchers arelearning a lot about Robert's Rules of Order as a result, and Councilmembers are seen with increasing regularity be carrying their own copies. The Council reached what was hopefully the height of absurdity in the "Procedural Hassle" game at the meeting of June 19, when they held a 45-minute procedural debate over whether to allow the attorney for Helena Dorsey to speak for 5 minutes. Ms. Dorsey is a black female city employee who claims she has been discriminated against for promotion. Concerning another gross case of incompetence, the city is now being asked to pick up the tab for fixing the leaky roof on the new parking structure built by F.P. Lathrop and Co. between Channing and Dana (near Telegraph). If Councilwomen Hancock and Kelley have written a decent contract to begin with, the contractor could have been held liable for negligence. Instead, most of the city-run space in that structure is still untended.

Mayor Widener's peculiar behavior as City Council chairman, in the last couple of weeks of the old council, has been inconsistent, to say the least. Though some meetings are still occasionally lasting to the wee hours of the mornings, there are now as many other times when the quorum gradually slips away, just as it always did. The Council seems to have a particular problem keeping its members present at the time when the rent control legislation is coming up on the agenda. Several meetings have ended without finishing the agenda without a quorum being called. Who would have thought it? Let the record show, also, that when the Council does not finish an agenda because it is not able to get a true quorum, the members of the Berkeley 5 leaving that stop the meeting, not the radicals. Councilwomen Kelley and Bailey left a Council meeting yesterday and then refused to participate in a couple of meetings—which is another interesting matter.

WOMEN PICKET

The meeting of June 19 was disrupted by women picketing the Council regarding the matter of Helena Dorsey. For the second time in just a few weeks, the Berkeley 5 adjourned to the offices of the City Manager behind the Council Chambers. The 4 radicals refused to change some of this.

However, the City Manager behind the Council Chambers does not have any way of pointing out what was going on. It was comforting to know that in most cases, win or lose the vote, at least those of the Berkeley 5 can't go without big words and pious arguments which totally misrepresent the people organizing neighborhoods.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A couple quick quotes of little importance from recent public hearings: "On the issue of the break down of employees at his motel on the Berkeley Marina. Councilwoman Kelley asked him how many secretaries were employed at his establishment, and of those, how many were minority. "Elven secretaries," he said, "with two of them being minority." "And what minorities are the two?" asked Ying. "One is a Chinese, and one is a Hungarian immigrant," was the reply. It is also of interest to note that one of the secretaries held the opinion that the Marriott Inn is "executive housekeeping.""

Mayor Widener's peculiar behavior as City Council chairman in the last couple of weeks of the old council, has been inconsistent, to say the least. Though some meetings are still occasionally lasting to the wee hours of the mornings, there are now as many other times when the quorum gradually slips away, just as it always did. The Council seems to have a particular problem keeping its members present at the time when the rent control legislation is coming up on the agenda. Several meetings have ended without finishing the agenda without a quorum being called. Who would have thought it? Let the record show, also, that when the Council does not finish an agenda because it is not able to get a true quorum, the members of the Berkeley 5 leaving that stop the meeting, not the radicals. Councilwomen Kelley and Bailey left a Council meeting yesterday and then refused to participate in a couple of meetings—which is another interesting matter.

The first steps will be taken only by working with one another. A meeting was held with people from the Planning Department to get an understanding from them about how they saw things developing. People from CONO presented them ideas that many different neighborhoods have.

Non-profit Corporation

In the area of housing, people with CONO have begun the process of setting up a non-profit housing corporation that would be controlled by the different neighborhood organizations. Its purpose would be to attempt to obtain funds for high quality low and moderate income housing. People from all parts of the city have recognized the need for this kind of housing to maintain the diversity of the city.

Many residents of Berkeley are seeing the distance that exists between the majority of the city council and themselves. This is magnified in terms of those who are employed by the city and do not even have enough concern to live here and face the problems that exist here, or more importantly share and understand the benefits of the city in the city. Berkeley. The Council of Neighborhood Organizations is in a position to begin to change some of the attitudes of council members.

OPEN MEETINGS

People from all over the city should begin to meet with their neighbors and develop ideas and activities to make the city what they want it to be. There are open meetings of the Council of Neighborhood Organizations the first and third Thursday of each month, at 8:15, at 2022 Blake St.

GRASSROOTS, is a community-oriented newspaper, relies on subscriptions, on the participation and contributions of the community, and not on street sales, vendors or advertising. Please help. Send us your subscription today. $5.00 per year.

I know GRASSROOTS needs help, so I want to...