Green Presidential Candidates

There are five Green presidential candidates: Howie Hawkins of New York, Dario Hunter of Ohio, Dennis Lambert also of Ohio, Sedamn Mozawatū-Curry of California, and David Rolde of Massachusetts. Among this group, Hawkins is the clear standout in experience, endorsements and fundraising possibilities. First of all, since 2000 Hawkins has offered himself as a candidate for office at least seven times in New York. He can for the U.S. House of Representatives four times, for governor three times, as well as for the U.S. Senate, mayor of Syracuse and lesser offices. Secondly, he has already been endorsed by the Socialist Party U.S.A. and Solidarity. His other endorsements include two former Green Vice Presidential nominees, Ajamu Baraka and Cheri Honkala. Former San Francisco Board of Supervisors head and 2008 Vice Presidential candidate (with Ralph Nader) Matt Gonzalez as well as Pulitzer Prize winning journalist Chris Hedges have also endorsed Hawkins. None of the other candidates have run for office as many times or received comparable endorsements. Finally, Hawkins is the one candidate with the background and reputation to achieve even minimal fundraising goals. As of the time of this writing, he is the only candidate to raise over $25,000 for the 2020 campaign.

Democrats and Republicans

In current American politics, following the facts and the why of campaign funding for the presidential candidates of the two mainstream parties along with related media coverage are the twin keys to deeper understanding. As usual, the very rich have an outsized influence. Two of the leading candidates are virtual personifications of capital. Billionaire Republican President Donald Trump represents the most right-wing, reactionary, racist and gangster like elements of the United States capitalist class. Even some Reagan Republicans label him an “ignorant demagogue”—an incompetent, lying and ego-driven lunatic who is destroying our nation and threatens to destroy others. Sad and alarming to say, Trump is popular in many Midwestern and Southern states, and overall gains about 40 percent vote. It is in such a misleading landscape that few of sources, prominent among them the role of the Fox Television network, which has propagandized for Trump for decades.

Democrat Michael Bloomberg (who won twice as a Republican candidate for Mayor of New York City and once more as an Independent) is much richer than Trump. At well over $50 billion (more than $50,000 million) in assets, Bloomberg is likely by far the wealthiest candidate. He has run for office as a Democrat, a Republican and a Libertarian. His other endorsements include the Working Families Party and the Convention of States. He has also pledged to cut climate change spending by $500 billion and to increase military spending by $600 billion.

Register Green by Earth Day, April 22

If you are not already a registered Green, or if perchance you changed Party preference to vote in the primary, please be sure to register Green! To remind yourself of this, resolve that you’ll register Green no later than by Earth Day (April 22). It’s important to let the corrupt “Corporate Parties” know that you don’t approve of their many policy failures and the unaccountable actions that they’ve taken, both recently as well as over the past decades. (Please also see the article, “The Business Party Syndicate,” which begins on this page.)

In addition, please remember that all future elections until the Spring of 2024 will not be affected by your party registration status—all voters will receive the exact same ballots. (For example, as a registered Green, you can vote for any candidate this November, 2020, as well as in all of the 2022 elections.) So for almost four full years, you can officially be counted as valuing the corporate-free politics of peace, justice and ecology. And by registering Green, you will also help us maintain our status as a “bail-out-qualified” political party.

Postage-paid voter registration cards are available for free at most libraries and post offices. Or you can register online at: https://registervotetov.ca.gov/. Please remember to register Green as soon as you can, or at least by Earth Day!

The Business Party Syndicate

Each year leftist Democrats, Socialists and Radicals are asked to hold their noses and vote for the lesser-of-two-evils. This is a false choice because we live in a rigged One-Party state—a plutocracy run by the Business Party, a Syndicate with Democratic and Republican wings. “Syndi cate” is the proper word for our corrupt One-Party system because there is no real choice—only the appearance of choice. We are onlookers cheering for the villain or the babyface in a pro-wrestling spectacle we call elections orchestrated by a complicit mass media. We must open our eyes to this facade for the “first revolutionary act is to call things by their true name.” (Rosa Luxemburg)

At both the state and national levels, the candidates offered up by the Syndicate are corporate-funded purveyors of empire whose primary loyalty is to the investor class that funds them. In fact, the only requirement the Syndicate makes on their candidates is that they are capable of raising massive amounts of money from corporations, or the corporate rich, to ensure they have the blessing of the investor class. There are no requirements on morality, voting record, or policy positions within the Business Party Syndicate. Mark Twain was correct when he wrote: “It could probably be shown by facts and figures that there is no distinctly native American party.” This corruption is as true today as it was 150 years ago. And the higher that one is elevated in the party wings of the Syndicate, the more fundraising dominates their time and focus. It is this process that transforms politicians (who initially believe they can honestly represent the public) into marketers whose role is to convince the public that there is no alternative to the capitalist system or the policies written by corporate-funded think tanks. “Corruption is not an anomaly but an essential element in the functioning of managed democracy.” (Sheldon Wolin)

In addition to fundraising, the Business Party Power Structure requires adherence to the status quo ideology of the Washington Consensus. To obtain backing in the Syn dicate, candidates must first profess a belief in American mythology: that the U.S. is the “indispensable country”—a benevolent force where Americans are innocent in our hos tilities, that capitalism is the only method for organizing an
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The “GPAC” is one of the few County Councils that produce a Voter Guide for each election. We mail about 6,000 to Green households, and distribute another 10,000 through cafes, BART stations, libraries, and other locations. Please read yours and pass it along to other interested voters. Feel free to copy our “Voter Card” to distribute as is. We are working on a number of November candidate and ballot measure contests. For more information, please contact: acgreens1992@gmail.com or: (510) 644-2293

Albany and Berkeley Greens: We are working on a number of November candidate and ballot measure contests. For more information, please contact: acgreens1992@gmail.com or: (510) 644-2293

Oakland-Emergyville-Piedmont Green Mountain are actively running local candidates in the November election. Please join us as soon as you possibly can. For additional info, see our website, http://oaklandgreens.org or telephone us: (510) 436-3721

East and South County Greens: We are looking for east and south county candidates, volunteers interested in helping re-activate an East County and a South County Local. If interested, please text or phone Mandep Gill at: 506-204-1069.

Credits: Our voter guide team includes: Peter Allen, Bill Balderston, Dale Baum, Paul Burton (page layout), Mandep Gill, Greg Jan, Don Macly, James McFadden, Debbie Nordin, Paul Rea, Justin Richardson, Michael Rubin, John Salabaky, Larry Shoup, Phoebe Sorgen, Kent Sparling, Joan Strasser, and Laura Wells.

Our endorsement process

For many of the candidates’ races, we created questionnaires for the candidates and solicited their responses. For others we conducted over-the-phone or in-person interviews. We also gathered information from Greens and others working on issues in their communities and from the public record. For local measures we gathered information as comprehensively as possible. The Green Party of Alameda County held endorsement meetings to consider all the information and make decisions. Our endorsements are as follows:

When we list “No endorsement,” either we had unresolved differences that prevented us from agreeing on a position, or no position was warranted. We only endorse bond measures for essential public purposes that are unlikely to be funded otherwise. Our endorsement “Yes, with bond reservations” reflects our position that funding through bonds is more costly and therefore less fiscally responsible than a tax.

Our endorsement process is open and transparent. We solicited candidates’ responses, and have a process for challenging endorsements. The process itself is subject to a review by the Green Party’s By-law committee.

Taxes and Bonds: TAX THE RICH not just the rest of us

In this Green Guide Voter Guide some measures are endorsed as “Yes, with reservations.” Often it’s a good cause with bad funding such as bonds, parcel taxes, sales taxes, and other regressive taxes that tax the rich at lower rates than the rest of us. The good news is that voters will have a chance in the November 2020 election to make taxes more fair.

Prop 13 flattened property taxes in 1978 and started the “tax revolt” that swept the country and primarily benefited the super-rich. Prop 13 reform will be on the November ballot and Big Money will use misrepresentations, distortions, and outright lies to persuade people to vote against the interests of current and future generations. It is very important now to start telling everyone you know in California, north and south, that it will not affect residential property at all, not homeowners, renters, second homes, not even luxury complexes owned by huge corporations, and it will help small businesses. The reform bill will remove corporate tax loopholes and start making big corporations pay their fair share for the first time in 40 years. In 1992, fourteen years after Prop 13 passed, the Green Party achieved ballot status in California and we’ve been fighting for a fairer tax system ever since. Unfortunately, neither supermajority Democrats nor minority Republicans have used their power to promote real solutions. For more information on local property taxes, please see http://evolve.ca.org or http://schoolsandcommunitiesfirst.org

Regressive methods of funding public services include the following:

BONDS have been sold to voters as “no new taxes” but should be called “spend now and make kids pay later, with interest.” Super-rich individuals and corporations, instead of paying taxes, lend money to the government in the form of bonds, and get even richer with interest. Good news this past year is that Sacramento passed a bill to allow publicly owned banks, which will enable California to use its own capital to fund public projects, and then invest the interest back into the state and localities.

PROPERTY TAXES, before Prop 13 in 1978, came primarily from commercial properties, but now primarily from homes, currently 28 percent commercial and 72 percent residential. Homes are reassessed upon sale, whereas tax loopholes enable corporations to escape reassessment. November’s Prop 13 reform will close the loopholes.

PARCEL TAXES are basically applied per property regardless of value, with small exemptions that are not nearly enough. Some residents of smaller properties now pay more in parcel taxes than they pay in basic property taxes.

SALES TAXES are another example of regressive taxes, and they incentivize governmental decisions in favor of shopping malls rather than needed affordable housing and open space.

With “reservations” we endorse funding when needed for vital services. This year, with Prop 13 reform on the ballot in November 2020, we can all educate and organize for fairer ways of raising revenue in the future.

Support Your Green Party!

The Green Party cannot exist without your help. Unlike some political parties, we do not receive funding from giant, multinational polluting corporations. Instead we rely on donations from generous people just like you.

In addition, our mailing and printing costs have significantly increased over the past few years. Please send in the coupon to the left with your donation today!

Please clip the form to the left and mail it today to help your Green Party grow.
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He already has raised enough money to qualify for matching funds for New York and California. For more info, you can view the candidate websites by clicking on their respective names, as displayed on the national Green Party website, at: https://www.gp.org/2020?page=2

Green Policies

Our world is increasingly on the verge of planetary catastrophe at the hands of a world capitalist class willing to snuff out millions of human lives to protect their profits and the planet’s livability. After all, what are our own lives, the answer that without an ambitious GND we will likely lose Sanders GND program and over ten times larger than War website (under “The Ecosocialist Green New Deal Budget”) If implemented, Hawkin’s program can save the people need to transition out of the fossil fuel economy.

Peace conversion, and electrified transportation. The plan manufacturing, regenerative agriculture, green buildings, renewable energy system by 2030. Key aspects include the Green Economy Reconstruction Program. The goal is to zero our greenhouse gas emissions and a 100 percent clean renewable energy system by 2030. Key aspects include social ownership of key sectors of the economy to be able to democratically plan the reconstruction of all sectors of the economy, including electric power production, zero waste management, and green transport. The second is the Green Economy Reconstruction Program. The goal is to create 30 million good jobs and make this transition for those who will lose their jobs due to the need for the economic transformation.

If implemented, Hawkin’s program can save the people and the planet. It is available in full at Howie Hawkins’ website (under “The Ecosocialist Green New Deal Budget”) and projects spending about $42 trillion over ten years, paid for with taxes on large corporations and the rich, revenues from publicly produced goods and services, a 75 percent cut in military spending and more. The billions in savings will be paid by the wealthy and the large corporators. Howie’s plan is almost three times larger than Sanders’ and he’s backed by the left wing Greens, the labor movement, the Greens’ program specifies spending $16.3 trillion over 10 years for everything related to transforming the U.S. economy into a sustainable one that will reverse the destruction path that the current focus on endless capital accumulation has put us on. The second biggest GND plan among the leading Democrats is Warren’s at about $4 trillion over 10 years. war budgets, acceptance of corporate money, and lack of endorsement and support for important bills, initiatives, and movements. Every member of Congress needs maximum pressure to do everything they can to stop the foreign interventions and to start providing public services and a real democracy that inspires and empowers people to take part in our government. None of these is a reasonable goal for most members of Congress. This is a call for change. In advance of the November 2020 election, Californians are organizing strong for a ballot initiative to reform Prop 13 and turn around years of corporate tax loopholes, without affecting residential property taxes. The only U.S. Reps that are early endorsers of the effort are Rob Khanna and Karen Bass from California. Where are the others?

Over the years Lee has accepted money from corpora- tions and PACs such as PG&E, Bayer, Lockheed Martin, General Motors, Google, JStreet-PAC, and Microsoft.

Unlike the majority of her constituents in 2016, Lee did not support Bernie Sanders’ no-corporate-money run for president, and her endorsed candidate for 2020 was Kamala Harris, not one of the more progressive candidates.

If you’re not a member of the Greens, you can still contribute to support the Greens by calling someone who is telling or leaking the truths that we need to know, and who is organizing for a better world. The Greens’ endorsement and support for important bills, initiatives, and movements. Every member of Congress needs maximum pressure to do everything they can to stop the foreign interventions and to start providing public services and a real democracy that inspires and empowers people to take part in our government. None of these is a reasonable goal for most members of Congress. This is a call for change. In advance of the November 2020 election, Californians are organizing strong for a ballot initiative to reform Prop 13 and turn around years of corporate tax loopholes, without affecting residential property taxes. The only U.S. Reps that are early endorsers of the effort are Rob Khanna and Karen Bass from California. Where are the others?
The last candidate is quite curious. Her name is Sara Brink. She identifies as a filmmaker, which relates to her entrance in the race. She is running not only to champion a broader radical agenda, but also as someone moving up a film about people working a full-time job, while running for office. In short, her campaign is a project in participatory art. She sees herself as a new generation of constituency.

Sara responded to our questionnaire, unlike the other candidates. She is outraged by the inequality in society, as reflected in corporate domination of politics, as evidenced in Wall Street’s donations and money campaign. She sees virtually all basic necessities, such as housing, transportation, and food, are human rights, and should “not be tied to employment status.” This includes health care and she strongly supports single payer, and is for legalizing virtually all drugs. Brink also believes housing should be free.

On the environmental front, she advocates for abolishing the six industrious companies linked to Native American rights and the restoration of their tribal lands. Likewise, she sees democratic/civil rights interwoven with all the other issues mentioned. Thus, she sees police reform/defunding as linked into her campaign. She is for delinking public education from a corporate agenda and favors a public bank.

Sara notes that she may not be seen as “serious” because she does not have specifics on implementation, but she is motivated by “dignity and urgency.” She generally advocates for left/independent politics (she is listed as No Party Preference on the Assembly candidate registration form). She voted 100 percent for the Green New Deal, linking climate change policy with public housing, affordable housing and universal health care/single payer.

All this said, Bonta is still joined at the hip to the Democratic Party establishment. While we can agree and give (often critical) support to some important legislation he proposes, we must not see him as an advocate for, or leading, a needed insurgency in the Democratic Party, nor even of the Bernie Sanders variety. For this reason, it is impossible to endorse Bonta, or his GOP opponent.

### State Assembly, District 18

#### No Endorsement

Assembly District 18 covers all of Alameda, and most of Oakland and San Leandro. Incumbent Rob Bonta was first elected in 2012. It is hard to resist to this as a contest, since Bonta has won over by 85 percent in his last three election cycles. His opponent is Stephen Slauson, who also ran in 2018; should Slauson reach the 20 percent level, he must face a runoff against notable community activist Jovanka Beckles in 2018 for Assembly was most telling. She ran in 2018 for Assembly as a large field, due to her left, having a runoff against notable community activist Jovanka Beckles on the Richmond city council and a member of the Richmond Progressive Alliance and DSA. Often using smear tactics and outspending Beckles 4 to 1 with a $1.5 million war chest, only 10 percent of which came from district residents and over three quarters of her contributions of $5000 or above, including from Trump/DeVos supporters and from the California Charter School Association, Wicks won 56 percent to 44 percent. Her time in Sacramento reflects a current “mainstream” Democratic agenda.

Her three priorities are housing (especially related to transit), public education (including charters) and universal/single payer health care. She has co-sponsored many bills relating to community colleges, Native American rights and other issues of concern to people of color, reproductive rights, etc. She did vote for AB 5 and the public banks bill. She has a 100 percent rating from the Sierra Club for environmental issues, and she has a fairly strong civil rights record, for the 2018 election, we focused on his role as strong second.

### State Assembly, District 15

Sara Brink, with qualifications

The race for Assembly District 15, covering Berkeley, Albany, part of Oakland (20 percent) and portions of Contra Costa County and Alameda County, is one of three races, all three female, representing three distinct perspectives.

To begin with the easiest to summarize, there is the Republican candidate, Jeanne Solonard. She, along with her husband, are real estate brokers/business owners. Her views represent the usual GOP line in California. She opposes any alteration in 1978’s Prop 13, including the current Schools and Communities Initiative. She calls for a moratorium on any tax increase to protect the rich from any other property tax progression proposals. She views her home ownership as an investment (generally at market rate); while advocating a 10 percent pay increase in all teachers’ salaries (though they are uneven at best statewide), she calls for expansion of charters schools as a key proposal. Enough said.

The incumbent is Buffy Wicks, first elected in 2018. Though born in California, she only returned to the state in 2016, after a long absence for college and working in D.C. Although she had some progressive background including anti-war and labor organizing, and is very supportive of LGBTQ issues, she is the most conventional of California Democratic candidates. She is a key organizer in the Hillary Clinton campaign in 2016. Wicks’s campaign in 2018 for Assembly was most telling. She ran in 2018 for Assembly as a large field, due to her left, having a runoff against notable community activist Jovanka Beckles on the Richmond city council and a member of the Richmond Progressive Alliance and DSA. Often using smear tactics and outspending Beckles 4 to 1 with a $1.5 million war chest, only 10 percent of which came from district residents and over three quarters of her contributions of $5000 or above, including from Trump/DeVos supporters and from the California Charter School Association, Wicks won 56 percent to 44 percent. Her time in Sacramento reflects a current “mainstream” Democratic agenda.

Her three priorities are housing (especially related to transit), public education (including charters) and universal/single payer health care. She has co-sponsored many bills relating to community colleges, Native American rights and other issues of concern to people of color, reproductive rights, etc. She did vote for AB 5 and the public banks bill. She has a 100 percent rating from the Sierra Club for environmental issues, and she has a fairly strong civil rights record, for the 2018 election, we focused on his role as strong second.

### Superlative Court

#### Judge, Office #2

Elena Condes

Mark Fickes, with reservations

There are three candidates running for the Alameda County Superior Court seat currently held by Carol Broshnan, a long-serving and highly respected judge. The three candidates are Elena Condes, Mark Fickes and Lilla Szelenyi. All three have a long and impressive record of diverse legal experience, and any of the three would contribute to diversity on the bench, with one being a Latina lesbian (Condes), one a gay Jewish man (Fickes) and one an immigrant (Szelenyi). All three responded to the Green Party questionnaire. Based on their answers to the questionnaire and information on their campaign websites, we give an edge to Condes, with Fickes a strong second.

Elena Condes has 25 years of experience as a criminal defense attorney, and has been an active participant in the community, particularly on education issues. Condes also has an impressively long list of endorsements, including that of Judge Brosnahan. While Condes does not have much diversity of legal expertise, her criminal law background means that she has spent a significant amount of time in court, and criminal cases are a major and important part of a judge’s workload. Condes provided detailed and thoughtful answers to our questionnaire. There is no question that she is qualified to be a judge, she has a strong progressive background, and the endorsement of Judge Brosnahan is a plus.

Mark Fickes has a broad diversity of legal experience, including criminal prosecution and defense, private practice and working for the Securities and Exchange Commission. He has been an attorney for over 20 years, and his list of endorsements is also impressive and almost as long as that of Condes. While his background appears to be less consistently progressive than that of Condes, he also has significant court experience, and his breadth of experience is potentially valuable, as judges hear more than just criminal cases. Fickes provided detailed and thoughtful answers to our questionnaire. Again, there is no question that Fickes is qualified to be a judge.

Lilla Szelenyi has been a practicing attorney since 1990, and has been an Administrative Law Judge since 2005, so she also has significant legal experience. Unfortunately, all of her experience is in the area of workers’ compensation. She appears to have little or no experience in criminal or civil litigation of the sort she would be presiding over in Superior Court, and from the information she has provided it is not clear if she has attended law school (if she has, it was not recently). She has a very short list of endorsements, and her answers to the questionnaire were brief and oddly vague. Based on the information available to us, we can不予推荐 Szelenyi.
Provision 13 - NO Bonds for Education Facilities

The opposition to this measure is not simply our general reservations about such pro-banking, regressive means of raising funds; we have given critical support to such measures if the funds were spent for important social needs, with no identified hidden agenda involved. However, in this case such a not-so-subtle poison pill is present. This initiative is the offspring of Prop. 51, passed in 2016. We opposed that proposition which was also for building/repairing of education facilities, even though it focused on K-12 districts of highest need as well as community colleges and career technical schools.

The key problem with 51 and now with 13 is the restriction on any fees being placed on developers for all the infrastructure which accompany these facility projects, benefitting real estate interests (and their profits), at no costs to them. It is not an accident that the measure was largely instigated and funded by real estate and construction firms.

Massive funds are involved: $9 billion for K-12, $4 billion for universities, and $2 billion for community colleges. Another negative is that this proposition, like Prop. 51, provides substantial funds for charter schools ($500 million).

Critically the measure is backed by Governor Newsom and much of the Democratic Party centrist establishment.

The two main teacher unions, CTA and CFT, are largely sitting this out, their main efforts being focused on the Schools and Communities initiative (to reform 1978’s Prop 13), scheduled for this November’s ballot.

County Measure C

Health and Child Care Sales Tax
No endorsement

There is a child care and early education crisis in Alameda County that deserves our attention, however, we strongly would prefer if this measure did not have funding in the form of a regressive sales tax, as well as convoluted management.

The crisis is twofold. Early educators’ (including staff) pay has not kept up with the rising cost of living and affordable childcare is out of reach for working and middle-class families.

However, the sales tax approach to this important issue disproportionately taxes the very people the measure intends to help and who need this assistance the most. Communities in need will be paying a larger percentage of their income in sales taxes than higher-income groups.

A second concern is the two-step management with First Five as a controller and a civilian oversight commit- tee. What we really need is oversight of the entire Alameda County budget in a global and organized manner. The single fund oversight committees have not been effective and are normally bogged down with busywork. Having fund specific management adds to confusion. Funds should be allocated to the departments who already have the child welfare job, avoiding the duplication of management and the whole of each department should have effective audit and oversight.

Back in 2018 the Green Party of Alameda County reached out to County Supervisors to express our concerns about the regressive sales tax on the first version of this measure before the wording was finalized, but we received no response. Although we definitely want children to have access to high quality services they desperately need in the early stages of life, it is also simply unjust to fund these services via a regressive sales tax. Therefore, we are not making an endorsement on this measure.

Albany Measure B

School Parcel Tax
Yes, with reservations

Albany’s Measure B is an extension of Measure LL, approved by Albany voters in 2014, and which expires on June 30, 2021. The measure imposes an education parcel tax for six years beginning on July 1, 2021, at the rate of $448 per parcel of each taxable parcel of real property within the District, and will raise $2.2 million per year. The measure includes provisions for exemptions and rebates for seniors and those on fixed incomes. The measure has clear language about the uses of funds raised, and good accountability and accounting provisions.

The Green Party position is generally that flat parcel taxes are regressive, in that they impose the same tax on each parcel regardless of the difference in parcel values, and are therefore unfair to people with lesser-valued properties, who are taxed at the same rate as those with higher-value properties. However, it can be broadly argued that all property owners in Albany benefit from the value that the Albany Unified School District creates; the quality of education in Albany makes the community desirable for families with children in the public school system, thereby increasing property values of all homes in Albany.

There is no question that the loss of funds, should the existing Measure B not be extended, would be detrimental to the District, its employees and its students. Teacher and administrative positions would be lost, and programs and classes would have to be cut. This diminishes the community.

It’s our view that this parcel tax is an equitable solution to continuing to fund valuable education services within Albany, and that the oversight and exemption provisions make it a fair measure. Since the State of California seems unable to properly fund education, it does fall upon local communities to do what they can to keep their programs and staff active and thriving, and there is little question that Albany should continue to support a strong School District. We therefore recommend a YES vote for Measure B.

Emeryville Measure F

Services Sales Tax
YES, with Reservations

The Emeryville City Council has put Measure F on the ballot, which if approved by 66.7 percent of voters, would levy a quarter cent sales tax on sales in Emeryville, raising approximately $1.5 million annually. The tax will be used for hiring police, maintaining police, fire and emergency services and funding the Emeryville Child Development Center. All funds will stay in Emeryville, and food and medicine are exempt from the tax. Emeryville has the most progressive city council ever elected in the city, and we want to support their request. We have three reservations. Although this is a small tax, all sales taxes are regressive, thus the Green Party does not approve sales taxes without reservations. This tax has no sunset, and another measure will have to be approved by the voters in order for the ordi- nance to expire. The measure does not specify percentages of the tax to be allocated to each purpose proposed. We would like to see a large portion of the money allocated to the Emeryville Child Development Center, but suspect that only much pressure from the electorate would influence the City Council to spend a significant portion of the money raised on the EDCD.

Emeryville Measure K

Education Parcel Tax
YES, with Reservations

This parcel tax of 12 cents per square foot would take effect July, 2020. Residents of Emeryville are expected to con- tribute 1$1,800,000 annually for the Emeryville Uni- fied School District. A parcel tax of 15 cents per square foot, passed by a measure in 2014, has almost identical wording to the present Measure K, and will continue in effect until June 30, 2037. Parcel taxes do not take into account the value of a property. Therefore, we do not recommend “Yes” on a parcel tax without reservations. In addition, these measures have stated in very general wording that parcel tax money will be spent on teacher recruitment and retention, enrichment of curriculum, after school programs and teacher pay for after school programs.

The Emeryville Unified School District (EUSD) has not been stable during the past decade. There have been several turnovers in superintendents, principals, high turn- over in teachers, and a variety of people have served on the school board. In addition, the Oversight Committee, which is specified in these measures as responsible for overseeing that monies are spent as specified by the measures, has an advisory, but not a decision making role. Money can be, and may have been misspent, used to fix budget deficits and to hire expensive consultants. More information regarding these allegations may be found on the EUSD website ( http:// acgreens.org ) as we receive additional information.

Although the measures have consistently stated that ad- ministrators could not be paid from these funds, additional administrators have been hired without guidelines, who might not have been hired had money collected from the parcel tax not been available for other purposes. The problems of the past has not been sufficiently resolved.

berkeley measure e

Teacher Salaries Parcel Tax
YES, with reservations

berkeley measure g

School Facilities Bond
YES, with bond reservations

berkeley measure h

Maintenance and Classified Staff Parcel Tax
YES, with reservations

On the face of it, putting three measures on the ballot by BUSD seems excessive. However, because of chronic historical and CURRENT state funding for education, the apparent overreach is justified.

Berkeley, like many Bay Area communities, faces a dire situation with attracting and keeping teachers. Housing costs are through the roof (ha, ha) and the cost of living is high. Classified staff face additional financial burdens...though pay has not kept up with the rising cost of living and affordable housing.

Although the measures have consistently stated that ad- ministrators could not be paid from these funds, additional administrators have been hired without guidelines, who might not have been hired had money collected from the parcel tax not been available for other purposes. The problems of the past has not been sufficiently resolved.

berkeley measure e

 Parcel tax money will be spent on teacher recruitment and retention, enrichment of curriculum, after school programs and teacher pay for after school programs.

The Emeryville Unified School District (EUSD) has not been stable during the past decade. There have been several turnovers in superintendents, principals, high turn- over in teachers, and a variety of people have served on the school board. In addition, the Oversight Committee, which is specified in these measures as responsible for overseeing that monies are spent as specified by the measures, has an advisory, but not a decision making role. Money can be, and may have been misspent, used to fix budget deficits and to hire expensive consultants. More information regarding these allegations may be found on the EUSD website ( http:// acgreens.org ) as we receive additional information.

Although the measures have consistently stated that ad- ministrators could not be paid from these funds, additional administrators have been hired without guidelines, who might not have been hired had money collected from the parcel tax not been available for other purposes. The problems of the past has not been sufficiently resolved.

berkeley measure g

Parcel tax money will be spent on teacher recruitment and retention, enrichment of curriculum, after school programs and teacher pay for after school programs.

berkeley measure h

Parcel tax money will be spent on teacher recruitment and retention, enrichment of curriculum, after school programs and teacher pay for after school programs.

The Green Party position is generally that flat parcel taxes are regressive, in that they impose the same tax on each parcel regardless of the difference in parcel values, and are therefore unfair to people with lesser-valued properties, who are taxed at the same rate as those with higher-value properties. However, it can be broadly argued that all property owners in Albany benefit from the value that the Albany Unified School District creates; the quality of education in Albany makes the community desirable for families with children in the public school system, thereby increasing property values of all homes in Albany.

There is no question that the loss of funds, should the existing Measure B not be extended, would be detrimental to the District, its employees and its students. Teacher and administrative positions would be lost, and programs and classes would have to be cut. This diminishes the community.

It’s our view that this parcel tax is an equitable solution to continuing to fund valuable education services within Albany, and that the oversight and exemption provisions make it a fair measure. Since the State of California seems unable to properly fund education, it does fall upon local communities to do what they can to keep their programs and staff active and thriving, and there is little question that Albany should continue to support a strong School District. We therefore recommend a YES vote for Measure B.
Oakland Measure Q
Parcel Tax for Park Maintenance and Homeless Services
YES, with Reservations

Great cause, bad funding. Please vote YES on this parks measure, AND work to make taxes more fair in the future. This “future focus” will help undo 40 years of regressive taxation, which means rich individuals and corporations are taxed at lower rates than the rest of us. Regressive taxes include parcel taxes such as this measure, and sales taxes, as well as increased fees for college tuition, traffic fines, parking, and parks. We can organize now to pass tax reform in November 2020. See the article on page two of this publication, “Taxes and Bonds: TAX THE RICH not just the rest of us.”

Measure Q will help unhoused individuals find shelters and housing, and help to ensure that all Oakland parks, waterfronts, and recreation centers are clean, safe, and equitably well-maintained. Oakland’s parks and recreation centers host after-school programs, arts instruction, community meetings, senior events, and a variety of sports and other activities. Use of the park services has grown tremendously, and it is time to provide funds to keep these areas clean and to protect our water supply has not increased. The funds from Measure Q will be allocated roughly 2/3 to parks and 1/3 to the homelessness crisis.

This parcel tax is $148 per year per single-family parcel, and $101.08 for multiple-residential units. Commercial property is based on calculating how many single-family residential unit equivalents the property represents based on size. There are exemptions built into the bill for low-income and for seniors. A parcel tax measure requires a 2/3 majority.

In summary, we endorse voting YES on Oakland’s Measure Q in March, and we endorse spreading the word that November’s Prop 13 reform will not affect residential property at all, but will close corporate tax loopholes. This process will help us get good parks now, and good tax reform in the future.

Oakland Measure R - YES
Official Newspaper(s)

The City of Oakland relies on newspapers to publish legal and other notices of important public matters. The City Charter contains outdated language requiring a designated newspaper to be printed and published within the city and to have a daily circulation of 25,000. Since 2016, this situation no longer exists. Because the city charter contains income and for seniors. A parcel tax measure requires a 2/3 majority.

In summary, we endorse voting YES on Oakland’s Measure Q in March, and we endorse spreading the word that November’s Prop 13 reform will not affect residential property at all, but will close corporate tax loopholes. This process will help us get good parks now, and good tax reform in the future.

Oakland Greens
The Oakland Greens are a local subgroup of the Green Party of Alameda County committed to a just and sustainable Oakland.

We emphasize the need for a new system of preventing and addressing crime, with a focus on increasing opportunities for education and employment so that residents are not driven to crime out of desperation.

We run candidates in local elections as we also advocate that our local voting process must also be extensively reformed so that the voices of all residents are heard.

Join us at a monthly meeting and/or our monthly dinner and movie night

Contact@oaklandgreens.org (510) 436-3722

Green Sundays
Green Sunday forums are usually held on the second Sunday of every month. Join other Greens to discuss important and sometimes controversial topics, hear guest speakers, and participate in planning a Green future.

When: Second Sunday of the month, 5:00-6:30 pm
Where: Niebyl-Proctor Library, 6501 Telegraph Avenue, Oakland (between Alcatraz Ave. and 65th St.)
Wheelchair accessible.
Join Action 2020
and
Fight for Oakland Schools

In November of 2020
four of the seven school board seats in Oakland
will be up for a vote.

Action 2020 is a group of parents, teachers and
residents who want an Oakland School Board
majority that is in favor or public, community schools,
and wants to keep our neighborhood schools open.

We want responsible, audited budgeting done in public.
We also want an end to the charter movement
running the public schools.

The members are from different political affiliations,
united around these goals and building up support
for candidates who share these same values and commitments.

https://www.action2020oakland.org/  510 402-5021
oaklandpublicschoolaction2020@gmail.com

Read the CANDIDATES’ QUESTIONNAIRES Online

Most of the candidates returned our questionnaires, for most of the local races. You’ll find lots
of additional info in the candidates’ completed questionnaires, so we strongly encourage you to
read them on our website: http://acgreens.wordpress.com/candidate-questionnaires/. (Or, you
can simply go to: http://acgreens.org, and then click on the “Candidate Questionnaires” tab
near the top of the page).
County Offices

Alameda County Supervisor

continued from page 1

appoint themselves to as many as a dozen other regional agencies, such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Very few know what happens at those agencies or who is responsible for decisions made by them. The agency administrative heads deflect inquiries with explanations such as, “Transfer all board member inquiries to the county offices or other subcommittees.”

As a group, the supervisors have a record of always voting for regressive sales (sales/property), while rarely refusing anything thatSherrif Greg Ahern wants. The press has been receptive to the funding the operations of his deputies and for those in charge of the troubled Santa Rita Jail.

The dedicated citizens who keep a watchful eye on each county agency, provide agenda/information links, a brief paragraph synopsis of certain important issues, and tally the votes on a website dedicated to “our” government. The press has not done it and will not do it. The folding of the Tribune into the other Bay Area News Group papers makes an already bad situation even worse. At least the East Bay Express recently reminded its readers that this March ballot is not easy, bring about accepted endorsements from the Alameda County Sheriff’s Department. Sheriff Ahern’s biggest supporters on the board have been Nate Miley and Scott Haggerty. Thus, the race are arguably in District 1 and 4: With Haggerty’s declaration to seek re-election in District 1, the wide-open race includes Fremont Councilmember Vinnie Bacon, District 1 State Senator Bob Wieckowski, District 4 State Senator Scott Haggerty, Alameda City Council Vice Mayor Melissa Hernandez. In District 4 Miley faces Esther Goolsby, a community activist with the East Bay Alliance for a Sustainable Economy (EBASE) and Com- munity for a Better Environment (CBE) East Oakland of District 5 Supervisor Keith Carson, whose district includes Berkeley and North Oakland, is facing a challenge to his re-election from Albany Councilmember Nick Pitch.

District 1: Vinnie Bacon

Along with knowing their histories, after reading through the questionnaires we received back from two of the candidates running, Vinnie Bacon and Bob Wieckowski, our initial impression is that they are both strong and pro-gressive public advocates. Bacon and Wieckowski cover much of the same ground in caring about climate change, affordable housing, better transit options, and addressing houselessness in their responses.

The key difference is that Bacon has never taken any concrete steps to implement the concept of a public bank, yet he has himself to become a proactive leader, which we so sorely need.”

The bottom-line is that the argument for Esther Goolsby goes beyond the fact that her election would guarantee a change in the dynamics of the BOS and shift it to the progressive side of the board. Miley would continue to be an entrenched standpadder, she will be an agent for change. Goolsby understands that the climate crisis and environmental injustice demand building the resilience of frontline communities for a just and revolutionary transi- tion away from nineteenth century industries and towards a regenerative Green New Deal economy complete with a public bank to give back to and for their own money. Electing Goolsby will make the switch a reality.

Employed for the past three years with Communities for a Better Environment as the East Oakland staff organizer, Miley has lived in the East Bay for forty years, and for the past decade as a self-described “Activist, Advocate, and Freedom Fighter.” Over the years, she has volunteered countless hours working on public organizations and community initiatives, and has worked with the HOPE (Health for Oakland People and Environment) collaborative, the Acta Non Verba Youth Urban Farm Project board, and currently with the REAL Peoples Fund. She is also one of the Anchor Owners of People Power Solar Cooperative, one of the first-ever residential-owned solar cooperatives in the United States. Her website is http://www.Goolsby4District4.net

Vote for Esther Goolsby for District 4 County Supervisor.

District 5: No Endorsement

Incumbent supervisor Caron has kept the seat since 1992 and for the first time in over two decades is facing a contested race. Challenger Nick Pitch currently sits on the Board of Education and the Contra Costa County Supervi- sor represents the most consistently radical part of Alameda County, including Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Piedmont, and West Oakland.

Our local elected officials need to be pushing for the major changes we need to move society in a more progressive and positive direction. Both candidates have made the best effort to do a probably good job performing the duties of the office and are able to recognize areas where change is most needed in county government programs and policies. Still, judging from their answers to our question- naire both have a tendency to hedge their bets rather than lead the way on many key issues.

Both candidates listed housing and houselessness among the most critical problems facing Alameda County. We asked if they would advocate for providing either af- fordable housing units or tiny homes for every homeless person in Alameda County. Carlson observes, there is “not a one-size-fits-all approach to housing” and he has been working to make funds available through existing County and State programs while “prioritizing prevention and anti-displacement efforts.” Pitch is still gathering ideas on the topic, watching to see what successful, and wants to “monitor the costs and outcomes” of various models. Hopefully both candidates can swiftly move beyond the status quo and creative long-term strategies that match the urgency of this increasingly dire crisis in our communities.

Regarding the state-mandated (but administered and funded by Alameda County) General Assistance program, both men acknowledge current funding levels are too low but failed to articulate a vision for how we might increase funding. Following the 2008 recession Carlson had sought ways to “maximize the programming” of the program “if it is viable” by helping people make use of other benefits such as SSI, SNAP, MediCal, CalWORKs and housing pro- grams. Pitch indicated it would be important to work with state legislators to both “stop any decreases in funding and to increase funding.”

Creating a Public Bank of the East Bay would be one way to generate and reinvest local funds that are otherwise paid to Wall Street banks in the form of fees and charges. The foundation for doing so was recently established by the State legislature through AB 857. Both candidates expressed sup- port for the concept of a public bank, yet, neither candidate stated a willingness at this time to introduce or co-sponsor legislation to make Alameda County a founding member, participating in and part owner of the Public Bank of the East Bay. Carlson let us know he previously provided a letter of support to the Public Bank East Bay Interim Board. Pitch stated he would cautiously and seriously consider the idea “of a county public bank.”

For the reasons cited above, we are not able to give either Carlson or Pitch our endorsement, and we will be watching to see if the winner of the contest can transform himself to become a proactive leader, which we so sorely need in these increasingly difficult times. See candidates’ completed questionnaires for additional information.

County Board of Education

continued from page 1
taxation, providing billions for education and other public services. She has been endorsed by the Oakland Education Association, the Alameda Education Association, and Rob and Mal and the Coliseum area in the south, and the communi- ties of Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherrylund, El Portal Ridge, Fairmount Terrace, Fairview, Hillcrest Knolls and Pleas- ant Hill. His time in office since 2000, and he is now up for re-election for his 6th term. Although he has done good things in areas of health, education, and welfare for the county, he has become far too comfortable with the status quo. He has alienated progressives with his disapproval of efforts to adopt ranked-choice voting for the county, obstruction of the movement to audit Sheriff Ahern’s department to create greater transparency on how the money is being spent, and one failure after another to be successful, to the Stop Urban Shield coalition. Although the state legislature through AB 857 created a firm foundation for establishing public banks, Miley was not ready to make Alameda County a founding member, participate in, and part owner of the Public Bank of the East Bay. Many progressive groups fear, that when Miley suggests a project, such as in this case, “is worth exploring,” it means that he will need to consult with his large corporate donors to learn what position to take, complete with talking points why such action poses so many risks and problems. The greatest disappointment with Miley has arisen in East Oakland where the particu- laters in the air—from the A.B.I. & foundry combined with the smoke from the local crematorium, plus the exhaust from trucks cause—caused a dozen years less than a white child in the more affluent hills. Miley often mentions that not a single polluting occurre- nce listed above is against the law. His remedy, again in this case, is to tout his “Illegal Dumping Pilot” to beautify the area by collaborating with “Trees for Oakland” and “a robust network of local businesses and community groups,” to plant trees along Railroad Avenue. When the “local businesses” happen to include three polluters (Aeron Metals, Argent Materials, and A.B.I.), the reaction of his constituents has been more cynical than appreciative.

The key difference is that Bacon has never taken any concrete steps to implement the concept of a public bank, yet he has himself to become a proactive leader, which we so sorely need.”

The bottom-line is that the argument for Esther Goolsby goes beyond the fact that her election would guarantee a change in the dynamics of the BOS and shift it to the progressive side of the board. Miley would continue to be an entrenched standpadder, she will be an agent for change. Goolsby understands that the climate crisis and environmental injustice demand building the resilience of frontline communities for a just and revolutionary transi- tion away from nineteenth century industries and towards a regenerative Green New Deal economy complete with a public bank to give back to and for their own money. Electing Goolsby will make the switch a reality.

Employed for the past three years with Communities for a Better Environment as the East Oakland staff organizer, Miley has lived in the East Bay for forty years, and for the past decade as a self-described “Activist, Advocate, and Freedom Fighter.” Over the years, she has volunteered countless hours working on public organizations and community initiatives, and has worked with the HOPE (Health for Oakland People and Environment) collaborative, the Acta Non Verba Youth Urban Farm Project board, and currently with the REAL Peoples Fund. She is also one of the Anchor Owners of People Power Solar Cooperative, one of the

Area 5 - No Endorsement

Area 5 of the Alameda County Board of Education is the only district being contested this year with Ken Berwick (Area 3) and Eileen McDonald (Area 6) running unopposed (thus, neither Berwick nor McDonald will appear on the ballot). The current Area 5 trustee, Fred Fontenot, is retiring, and three candidates are seeking to replace him.

The district is centered in Hayward and two candidates have ties to the Hayward School Board, Lisa Bruoner, who lost her seat, and Linu Reynoso, who, at present, on that...
The Business Party Syndicate
continued from page 1

economy, that free markets and free trade function without government and beneficence alike, that inequality is natural and a mertocracy, and that growth is necessary. One must also show fealty to the Pentagon and arms industry, to the financial interests of Wall Street, and to multinational corporations and commodity prices, and against an entire country that fails to embrace neoliberal ideology. This fealty also translates to lower wages, increased health care costs, poorer schools, soaring housing costs, growing homelessness, and mass incarceration—none of which works to the benefit of the Syndicate the candidate chooses to join, they must embrace the core mythology designed to maximize corporate profits. And “if voting made any difference, they’d make it illegal.” (Emma Goldman)

The continued lesser-of-two-evils voting by the Left has facilitated 30 years of neoliberal policies that have created the highest level of wealth inequality that the U.S. has ever seen, and a series of endless wars instigated and perpetuated by both wings of the Syndicate. Einstein stated, “Insanity: doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.” So the United States, and its Leftists, choose to behave in this manner? Have we forgotten that “he who chooses for the lesser evil all too readily forgets having chosen evil.” (Hume) We continue to vote for false candidates that move us further and further into a hegemonic empire of bases occupying the world? To answer this question, and envision a path forward, we must first understand the behavior and corruption which has led to the endgame of the system and then ask what can be done differently.

We begin by acknowledging that U.S. representative government was designed by the founding fathers to ensure that the wealthy, slave-owning men controlled the State. James Madison wrote “Landholders ought to have a share in the government, to support these invaluable interests, and to balance and check each other. Other representatives ought to be so constituted as to protect the majority of the opulent against the majority. The senate, therefore, ought to be this body; and to answer these purposes, they ought to have permanence and stability.” Representative government was never designed to be democratic—it was purposely designed to be anti-democratic in order to partner with property owners and assist their crimes of asset theft—primarily through slavery and land stolen from indigenous nations.

Early on, the mythology of white supremacy and patriarchy were intertwined with our other mythologies of capitalism, meritocracy and national individualism. Many were too(#) to hide this immoral theft—this piracy. Together these myths act as a social glue that justifies the inequalities apparent throughout society. This mythology still blinds most Whites to see the historical and racialized mass incarceration and objectification of women being the most obvious. “Understanding the foundation of capital-ism requires a consideration of ‘the hidden abode of race’. The ontological distinction between superior and inferior humans—codified as race—that was necessary for slavery, colonialism, the theft of lands in the Americas, and genocide.” (Michael C. Dawson). Racism, misogyny, and impoverishment are the nature of our capitalist system. Neoliberal mythology developed over the last 50 years is just the latest form of propaganda used to justify a system that uses sexist and racist oppression to control and rob us of our labor, our assets, and our dignity.

But this early system of government designed to partner with slavery and enchattlement of women has evolved into a system of “Inverted Totalitarianism.” This is not classical totalitarianism where a strong leader seizes power. Paraphrasing Wolin: Today our leaders are products of a system—a system gradually created that re-creates old myths. It values corporate power at the center of its system, the good, the economy dominates the political, and it uses economic instability to generate passivity in a demobilized society. The system is designed to seize the assets of the poor and funnel them to the rich, and then criminalize the poor to cover up the theft. We citizens are complicit in this process by accepting a passive spectator role. We are no longer involved in setting policy or choosing potential leaders, and a captured intelligentsia offers a false utopian vision while the ruling elite “manage democracy.” We are apolitical subjects not citizens, fixed irrevocably in childhood hopes that the leader-messiah will bring us to salvation.

However there are moments when the public recognizes that they have been deceived, that the system is broken and corrupt. At these times our political leaders offer a salve of technical fixes using the obfuscate language of economics to obscure both the reality of the problems and the cause. And when all else fails, they blame the bureaucrats of government rather than the beneficiaries of government corruption and largess. In this system of managed democracy, the two “major parties are very protective of their monopoly over US politics. Should any third party begin to gain a significant following that could compete with either party in the polls, they will make common cause in attacking and bringing about the dismantlement of the third party.” (Steve, March 2014)

Inter-party reform of the Business Party Syndicate, or either wing of that Syndicate, is prevented by the structure that governs promotion within each wing—a structure that is based upon fundraising from powerful corporations. Should any leftist candidate manage to bypass the corporate-controlled gates via small-donation fundraising, they are either destroyed by redistricting or from direct personal at-tacks by corporate-funded think tanks and corporate-owned mass media. Examples of the former are 2008 Green Party Presidential candidate Rep. Cynthia McKinney and anti-war Rep. Dennis Kucinich, while examples of the latter are too numerous to list. Examples of the latter include those on Rep. Tulsi Gabbard for her anti-war position, Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez for her Green New Deal, Rep. Ilhan Omar for criticizing Israel, and Jill Stein for challenging the Syndicate by running as a Green.

When you examine the arc of history since WWII, there is a consistency between the two wings of the Syndicate on both foreign and domestic policy. It is clear that our One-Party criminal system is designed to fund the military industrial complex, to support Big Oil so as to maintain the U.S. petro-dollar as the world’s reserve currency, and to destroy any liberation movements that threaten corporate profits and U.S. hegemony. Manifestations of this Syndicate include the endless wars for control of oil, coups carried out by the CIA to eliminate socialist programs, embargoes imposed on any countries that do not submit to neoliberal monetary policies, and the creation of a surveillance and police state to crush any dissent at home. Members of both wings of the Syndicate have julieously carried out these actions. Tens of millions of people have been sacrificed by the Syndicate over the past decades in order to maintain U.S. hegemony, and we, a docile public are complicit in these acts. We need to understand that this ruthless clinging to power at all costs is no different than what is seen in other criminal syndicates. There appear to be no moral limits to the Syndicate’s piracy, including accelerating the global climate crisis to maintain power. This latter policy of the Syndicate is apparent in both wings, with Obama’s “all-of-the-above” energy policy and Trump’s climate change denials. U.S. hegemony and corporate profits depend on controlling the global demand for oil, and the Syndicate cannot allow any policy that is a threat to this power—including the Green New Deal. Most environmentalists will do not understand this and assume they can work within the system. They have been fooled. Media manipulation has produced an expectation that the Democratic wing of the Syndicate will adopt environmental policies to avoid this disaster. Unfortunately, “It’s easier to fool people than to convince them that they have been fooled.” (Mark Twain)

Manipulation of Americans, by limiting the dialogue allowed around political problems and by only giving voice to a narrow range of solutions acceptable to the Syndicate, is a key element in maintaining “manufactured democracy.” This control is accomplished with commercial and social media organized by a handful of corporations that use “di- vide and conquer” propaganda techniques, honed over the last century, to sow fear, racism, xenophobia and misogyny.

The Business Party Syndicate controls the electoral process by accepting a passive spectator role. We are no longer involved in setting policy or choosing potential leaders, and a captured intelligentsia offers a false utopian vision while the ruling elite “manage democracy.” We are apolitical subjects not citizens, fixed irrevocably in childhood hopes that the leader-messiah will bring us to salvation.

Ten Key Values of a Green Party

Economic wisdom
Nonviolence
Social Justice
Grassroots Democracy
Decentralization
Community-based Economics
Feminism
Respect for Diversity
Personal and Global Responsibility
Sustainability

Also please see: https://www.cagreens.org/ten-key-values
corporate-funded think tanks whose mission is to maintain US hegemony, protect global capital, and defend neoliberal social policies of austerity.

Within this system of propaganda, political campaigns would be the easiest means to build a Movement. As we have seen, the benefits of such an effort are many: benefits to the donors, to the leaders and to the voters. This image is then marketed to us. Noam Chomsky writes: “It is important to bear in mind that political campaigns are designed by the same people who sell toothpaste and cars.” Voters are bombarde with messages both from the not-so-independent corporate media and by political campaigns who now tailor their individualized messaging based on your Facebook and Google profiles. In this sea of propaganda, the voter is left to choose between Coke and Pepsi—or during the 2016 presidential campaign between Caligula and Nero. And by voting for members of the Syndicate, we give tacit approval to a corrupt system that robs us of our power, our assets, our labor and our freedoms.

What does it mean to choose between candidates that are incapable of addressing the primary existential threats to humanity—namely climate change and war? What does it mean to choose between candidates who are guaranteed to favor Wall Street over Main Street? What does it mean to choose between candidates that will continue to pursue policies designed by corporations that remove the last safety nets we have for health, education, food security, housing and retirement? By choosing between the Syndicate candidates, are we collaborating with a system that perpetuates economic and social inequality controlled by an ever-growing military and police-surveillance state? Can lesser-of-two-evils voting work in such a system? Do such participation indicate consent in a system of injustice? Is there a way to break the cycle?

All attempts to reform the One-Party system over the past few decades have proved futile due to their stated reasons described above. In fact, corporate control of the Syndicate has strengthened. Any efforts to work within the corrupted structure, and that deviate from the Syndicate’s Washington Consensus, are crushed. Attempts thus far to run a non-Syndicate candidate in a winner-take-all election system have been futile both due to lesser-of-two-evils voting which causes small Party candidates to be ignored or, on the rare occasion when an outsider wins, because individual representatives within that system have no power. What is especially needed now is an effort to build something outside of the control of corporate money. Let’s call this something “The Movement” just to give it a name.

The Movement must be broad-based and inclusive to face off against the Syndicate, therefore it must combine all the issues that the Left struggle against. No one issue can dominate. This uniting is possible because all the political struggles that make up the fight against the Syndicate—which is too powerful for any subset of organizations to challenge. In addition, all the various political objectives of the Left can be united under one umbrella, ending oppression and racism, promoting democratic participation, ending corporate control, preventing environmental degration, dismantling capitalism, providing affordable health care and education, and ending poverty—are all intertwined with the power structure of the Syndicate. And because the Syndicate controls the current power structure, it will not allow any challenges to its power within that structure. The Movement must be built outside that system and in such a manner that the Syndicate is unable to control or destroy it.

So what form can The Movement take and what role can it play? We need progressive and leftist organizations having nothing to do with the Washington Consensus. First, the Left must acknowledge that all political organizations that currently exist will be unsuccessful in achieving their objectives if they require defeating the core objectives of the Syndicate. For this, any organizations attempting to impact policy as regards global climate change will fail because Syndicate power relies on maintaining an oil-based economy, and control of oil that maintains petrodollar hegemony. It doesn’t matter that this Syndicate control will result in the deaths of billions of people because the Syndicate’s corporate-machine structure will eliminate any member whose primary concern is not maintaining Syndicate power.

Alternatively, any attempts to reduce global poverty and inequality will fail because Syndicate profits depend on that exploitation. And any attempts to move away from endless war will fail because the Syndicate’s control and profits depend on the maintaining a growing military industrial complex. Any targeted efforts at change will never be powerful enough. Only a combined effort that involves all Leftist interests with massive participation can be successful. And any organizations who choose to focus on a narrow set of goals, rather than topple the Syndicate, will fail over time and slowly become more concerned with maintaining their operations rather than reaching their goal—which will eliminate their reason for existence. In fact, such an organization can now be found in many “leftist” or “progressive” organizations, with many environmental organizations fully captured and beholden to corporate funding.

So what can organizations do to build The Movement? First, they must be willing to sacrifice their narrow political interests to the larger goals of The Movement. This should be declared openly and their education programs must address the interconnectedness of all our political problems. They must also identify the primary driver of these problems—namely the Business Party Syndicate with its Democratic and Republican wings. Organizations must focus on constructing the building of democratic structures outside the Syndicate’s control.

Organizations should spend little time on election-related issues except as outreach to educate and draw in others to The Movement, and should instead focus on building coalitions with other groups. Organizations must emphasize bottom-up democratic operations that build solidarity and democracy in competing political organizations. The Movement will need to develop its own internal super-structure that is independent of the old systems of power, with safeguards to prevent power consolidation and disruption by the Syndicate. And The Movement must wait till it reaches a critical mass of people capable of challenging the Business Party Syndicate before it wields its political power.

So what can be done by individuals now while the path to building The Movement is unclear? A first step is to do anything one can to disempower the Syndicate. One way is to demonstrate that your loyalty is not to the Business Party by registering to vote with a non-corporate Party. No Party Preference fails to do this since this does not demonstrate interest in building an alternative to the Syndicate. Second, vote for candidates who are not members of the Syndicate and who are not from corporate-funded Parties. Third, form local groups to discuss the history and structure of the Syndicate so we understand what we are up against. Fourth, join leftist organizations and begin a dialogue about the interconnected nature of all our social problems and the need to unite against a common enemy—namely the Syndicate. Fifth, in building The Movement we need the ideology and vision that will unite us and not on candidate or leader personalities. Sixth, building The Movement means doing the hard work of community outreach and education, and in particular getting outside into a more comfortable zone. This will include defending those who are attacked by the Syndicate and providing the needed economic and educational support to those communities who join The Movement. Seventh, dialogue is critical, so all members of The Movement must work to develop critical thinking and listening skills. Training must include recognition of the various propaganda techniques that the Syndicate will attempt to use to divide us.

We live in capitalism, its power seems inescapable. So did the divine right of kings. Any human power can be resisted and changed by human beings.” (Ursula Le Guin)

Therefore start doing the work to build The Movement today so we can do away with the corrupt Business Party Syndicate which is now the greatest existential threat humanity has ever experienced. Don’t be fooled into thinking that participation in elections means that we really have a choice or that this is democracy. Your choices are extremely limited and will not change the system nor will they help avert disaster. This can only be done by building The Movement and taking back our power from corporations. “[They] who passively accept evil are as much involved in it as [they] who help to perpetrate it. [They] who accept evil without protesting against it are really cooperating with it.” (Martin Luther King Jr., updated for gender inclusivity.)

**GO PAPERLESS**

The PDF version of this Voter Guide is available on our website at http://acgreens.wordpress.com/voter-guides. Would you like to save some trees and printing/postage costs? PLEASE LET US KNOW at paperless@greengovernmental dispatch.com or acgreens1992@gmail.com

Printed copies (for your use, and to distribute) will always be available at our Green Party headquarters at 2202 Blake Street, Berkeley, CA 94704; (510) 644-2293. Donations of any amount are encouraged (but not required). Thanks everyone!
Vo...
Green Voter Card

Federal Offices
- President
- Five Greens and 20 Democrats will be on the ballot; please see article

State Offices
- State Senate, District 9
  - Write In someone, please see article
- State Assembly, District 15
  - Sara Brink, with qualifications
- State Assembly, District 18
  - No endorsement, please see article

Superior Court Judge
- Office #2
  - Elena Condes; Mark Fickes, with reservations

County Supervisor
- District 1
  - Vinnie Bacon
- District 4
  - Esther Goolsby
- District 5
  - No endorsement, please see write-up

County School Board
- Area 2
  - Angela Normand
- Area 5
  - No endorsement, please see write-up

Local Measures
- Proposition 13 - Education Facilities Bond - No
- LocalMeasures B - Albany School parcel tax - Yes, with reservations
- C - Alameda County Health & Child Care sales tax - No endorsement, please see write-up
- E - Berkeley Teacher Salaries parcel tax - Yes, with reservations
- F - Emeryville Services sales tax - Yes, with reservations
- G - Berkeley School Facilities Bond -- Yes, with bond reservations
- H - Berkeley School Maintenance and Classified Staff parcel tax - Yes, with reservations
- K - Emeryville Education parcel tax - Yes, with reservations
- Q - Oakland Park Maintenance and Homeless Services parcel tax - Yes, with reservations
- R - Oakland Official Newspapers - Yes
- S - Oakland Increase Appropriations Limit - Yes

Green Party County Council
- Please see write-up
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