NADER AT 11% IN CONNECTICUT

by Pete Karrman

If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, then Al Gore and the Democrats are falling in love with Ralph Nader and the Green Party. In recent days, Gore has switched to a more populist, Green-style rhetoric, attacking corporate power and emphasizing campaign finance reform. However, hard facts, as apart from convention froth, belie Gore's sudden fit of populism. Immediately after delivering his pro-working family acceptance speech, Gore headed to yet another exclusive fundraiser, this one, according to the N.Y. Times, with a $5 million admission sign over the gilded gate. Critics might note that Gore's new stance mirrors the scene in Cashinrana where the police inspectFour professes shock at gambling even as he pocket his winnings. The real behind-the-scenes story of the Democratic convention, like that of the GOP, was that of a crusade of bit-cut access and big money. While delegates on the floor dutifully performed their adoration rituals for empty suit candidates and hot air rhetoric, the real action was in the sky boxes and hospitality suite, where the admission credential was not a more delegate's bote but a hefty checkbook. Apparently, the Democrats are running scared as Nader and the Greens continue to post solid poll numbers across the country. The latest figures have the Green Party candidate at or near 11 percent in Connecticut, New York and California, 5 percent in Pennsylvania and 6 percent in Illinois and Michigan. Nader fares less well in Florida and Texas. An earlier Gallup Poll puts Nader at 8 percent nationally.

The new numbers come from surveys taken by the American Research Group. They are slightly stronger for our region than a truistic poll by Quinnipiac University. The big surprise, especially in Connecticut, was the weakness of the Al Gore campaign, running just slightly ahead of George W. Bush. This, among other events, has rattled the Democrats, according to Nader. He told reporters at a Washington news conference that Vice President Al Gore is a "Mr. Nice Guy." The campaign, however, continues as a serious alternative to the major candidates. Gore and the Democrats have both lost interest in the Green Party candidate, who won the Democratic nomination in a hard-fought primary battle. Nader's campaign has grown in strength as a result.

Green Party Opposes New Mall as Destructive; Corporate Welfare

by Tony Santani

The New Haven County Chapter has chosen to take an active roll in opposing the proposed new mega-mall at Long Wharf. The project, if completed, will be a 1.2 million square foot building plus two large parking garages on a 55-acre toxic waste dump situated at the intersection of I-95 and I-55, not a half a mile from several crowded residential districts. It will cost $500 million to build, $94 million of which will come from the taxpayers of New Haven and Connecticut, and the US Postal Service, which owns part of the site. It will be an "upscale" mall, meaning most people will probably not be able to buy much in it. It is expected to draw between 30,000 and 40,000 more cars to the interchange. The Green Party has chosen to oppose the mall project because it is hindering us from building the just and sustainable society.

You might have heard the phrase "just and sustainable society." This phrase is a common goal of the Green Party. It means that we want a society that is fair and just to all people, that protects the environment, and that is more democratic. This is the kind of society that is possible and necessary for the future.
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Barney is Purple with Rage Against Ralph

By Pete Kairnan

It's a dirty job and no one has to do it, but Barney Frank, the Massachusetts congressman, is giving it his worst shot. Frank has moved into action in recent days at the designated Nader basher for the Democrats.

Barney's been on the media almost as much as his purple nametag. Open the pages of the unfunny Boston Globe or tune in the yucks on "Politically Incorrect" and you get the rep's rip on Ralph.

Frank lambastes Nader for denying the differences between the Democrats and Republicans and downplaying gay rights, among other issues. In other words, in an attack from the left end of a party heading to the right.

Nader, of course, has never denied that Democrats and Republicans clash on so-called social and cultural issues. The point he has reiterated time and again is that corrupt politicians have given the corporate elite the right to set not only America's economic agenda but its social and cultural ones as well.

The facts are, and Barney Frank knows this very well, that issues like abortion, gun violence and gay rights are served up as raw meat to their respective pro and con constituents at election time. The rest of time, they are ignored or fuzzed over by the two parties. Perhaps, Frank forgot that Clinton supported gay rights back in 1992 and then gave the military the irrational cruelty Controverted on fig 4

ALTERNATIVE MEDIA COMING OF AGE

by Cathy Iri

Whether you call it activist journalism, radical media, advocacy media, engaged journalism, it still falls under the larger umbrella of what's better known as "media activism." It's participants come from such diverse groups as students, First Amendment advocates, writers/journalists, grassroots publishers/producers along with public access activists. Their common inter-linking is based on building a democratic "New News" alternative media system in the United States. A news system that informs, encourages and builds participation and strengthens freedom of expression.

In an effort to facilitate building stronger ties between these groups in the hope of strengthening independent media as the best strategy for greater democracy, Project Censored, Fordham Justice Project, Seven Stories Press and the Nation Institute recently presented a two day conference on 'Press Freedom: Investigative Journalism, Media Activism and Democracy'.

Speech Television, one of IMC's links, told the conference that IMC's achieved a counter balance to mainstream media in Seattle by coordinating the linkage of a web site news wire (which fielded 1.5 million hits) with a five part TV series on the cross issue solidarity and activism that shut down the WTO meeting. The series was broadcasted on over 150 television stations and screened to 10,000 houses across the U.S. Galatas said the IMC also used around the clock microradio and print coverage during the WTO protests as well.

While a surrounding media coverage was advertised by conference members from IMC appreciated the applause from the conferences for their accomplishments in Seattle, they were among the first to admit that they came up short when the discussion turned to sustainability and organizing other IMP centers in cities around the country. They had confidence in their plans for organizing IMCs for protests surrounding the presidential conventions in Los Angeles and Philadelphia that could be replicated so even small town activists could mount a "media blitz" on a local issue like ground water quality or on a national issue like universal health care. The discussion was fast and lively, the organizers building on ideas to the point that they got the workshop to take a break so they could continue their discussion.
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MALL CONTINUED
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city" before. Political progressives and environmentalists have been using it for several years now to describe the future we are building. It is our etopoia. It is a nature where where where people are, just like that. There are kind of people you tax money is going to help build a brand new store for. Every one of New Haven's state legislators voted to give $2 million to fund this small store. They say there is no matter what problems the mall may bring to New Haven: traffic, pollution, etc., it will bring jobs and tax revenue to the city. Not one of them wants to ask jobs for whom? The chain stores will be promoting their own personnel to manage these stores. They aren't going to hire a stranger off the streets to run the store for them. When they start building the mall there won't be time to train New Haven's unemployed to employ masons and plumbers and electricians - it takes a long time to train that talent.

The store will be promoting their own personnel to manage these stores. They aren't going to hire a stranger off the street to run the store for them. When they start building the mall there won't be time to train New Haven's unemployed to employ masons and plumbers and electricians - it takes a long time to train that talent.

It is a world of clean air, clear water, and clear soil, a city of gardens and parks and decent homes where you can get the medicine and grass they need. It treats children as precious gifts, and not as a market segment. It ensures all people's basic social and market needs on the playgrounds of the rich are built. It is a world of clear air, clean water, and clean soil, a city of gardens and parks and decent homes, where you can get the medicine and care they need. It treats children as precious gifts, and not as a market segment. It ensures all people's basic social and market needs on the playgrounds of the rich are built.

Sounded pretty nice, didn't it? Well, that's what we're building. Except something is standing in our way. A few things actually, but here I'm going to deal with just one. Money. Not money in general, but specifically the $54 million that we are shipping in for the Long Wharf Galleria. An indoor shopping mall of 450,000 square feet, the just and sustainable society. It is a place where no one lives. It is closed off from the blue sky and filled with artificially conditioned air. It is, in fact, a privately owned commercial automobile for its continued viability. It is filled with chain stores that tax money out of the community and send it back to the home office. It is a place where profit motives rule. It is a place where no one is welcome who does not have money to spend. It is a place of throwaway goods and forgettable meals.

Compulsive shoppers and CEO's dream about malls. Developers long to build them, and malls are constructed to stock them. And the mayor and the governor and the legislature expect us to pay $24 million to help build another mall. Most people don't want money taken out of their pay to subsidize Macy's, or Nordstrom's, or the Gap. If you've been around New Haven for a while, you might remember 8 or 7 years back when there used to be a Macy's on Crown Street, downtown. Macy's threatened to close the store, so the state promised to give them $5 million so it stay open. After Macy's the first installment of $800,000, they went ahead and closed the store anyway. Failed, just like that. There are kind of people your tax money is going to help build a brand new store for. Every one of New Haven's state legislators voted to give $2 million to fund this small store. They say there is no matter what problems the mall may bring to New Haven: traffic, pollution, etc., it will bring jobs and tax revenue to the city. Not one of them wants to ask jobs for whom? The chain stores will be promoting their own personnel to manage these stores. They aren't going to hire a stranger off the streets to run the store for them. When they start building the mall there won't be time to train New Haven's unemployed to employ masons and plumbers and electricians - it takes a long time to train that talent.
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GREENS UNITE BEHIND RALPH NA DER

with a presentation from the credentials committee. This committee admits state Green parties to the ASGP and on Saturday admitted the states of Florida, Delaware and Texas. The new Texas Green Party is off to a sensational organizational start. They collected 74,000 signatures in 75 days to secure ballot access for the Green's in Texas this fall. Following the credentials committee were three hours of debate and approval of the Green Party platform. Our platform, which has evolved over the last four years, is a work in progress. I encourage all to view the ratified document at www.gp.org.

For the rest of the day we were treated to series of speakers beginning with African American Professor of History and Political Science at Columbia University, Manning Marable. Professor Marable, who spoke in Hartford last fall in support of Green Party Hartford City Council candidate Elizabeth Horton-Sharp, spoke passionately about the crisis of the working poor; reminding the audience that "poverty knows no color." He left us with a rarely cited quote from Martin Luther King Jr.: "the moral arch of the universe is long, but it bends toward justice."

Other featured speakers on Saturday included lesbian activist and author Ann Northup, Dr. Sidney M. Wolfe Director of Public Citizen's Health Research Group, Texas activist and author Jim Hightower and several Greens from around the world. The Green Party has affiliates in most countries and is part of the ruling coalition in Germany. Dr. Helen Caldicott, author of many books on the medical hazards of nuclear power and founder of Physicians for Social Responsibility closed the day.

On Sunday morning, Medea Benjamin, Green Party candidate for US Senate in California and founder of Global Exchange, one of the important contributors to last years World Trade Organization (WTO) protests, led off the day. She talked about the growing power of socially responsible advocacy groups and their ability to effect change in the behavior of multinational corporations. She pointed out the particular success of Students Against Sweatshops. Following Medea, several Green candidates and current office holders talked about their ideas, dreams, hopes and victories. The Connecticut delegation was particularly proud when Elizabeth Horton-Sharp, who won election to the Hartford City Council last fall, shared her experiences with citizen's counsel as a way to advance democratic participation.

Other keynote speakers that afternoon included John Anderson, 1980 Independent Presidential candidate and current President of the Center for Voting and Democracy and labor leader Tony Mazzocchi who gave a ringing endorsement for universal single-payer health care. Don Torgerson, press secretary of the American Reform Party, announced their official endorsement of the Green Party Presidential nominee and their intention to campaign with Greens on behalf of Ralph Nader. The afternoon was capped off by the official roll call vote of the state delegates in which Ralph Nader won 296 to 20, and the acceptance speech by Mr. Nader.

Continued from page 2 of "don't ask, don't tell."

Frank is not the only nominally liberal Democrat guarding the left flank of orthodoxy. Also joining the ranks of the defeated business-as-usual crowd in recent days has been Robert F. Kennedy, jr., who has done good work for years in the environmental field.

In a N.Y. Times op-ed, Kennedy warned that Bush would be such a disaster for our land, air and water, that it was vital that Gore win the White House. Nader's campaign, said Kennedy, was, however well intentioned, hurting Gore and helping Bush.

Kennedy's argument was seriously undermined that same week by a highly detailed article in The Atlantic Monthly by Gregg Esherick which found that, in instance after instance, there was little difference on specific environmental concerns between the putative polluters Bush and Gore and the preferred tree hugging Gore.

It's always good to remember when you hear standard politicians like Bush, Gore and Frank arguing issues on their electoral breaks that pretty soon they will be back at their jobs as figurative limousine drivers—taking rich folks wherever they want to go.
Nader at 11%; Master Card Sues for Copyright Infringement

Continued from Page 1

Gore was "directly" involved in efforts to alienate some of Nader's celebrity supporters. Though Nader didn't identify those he said were contacted by Gore, the list of his better-known endorsers includes Paul Newman, Susan Sarandon, Willie Nelson, Bonnie Raitt, Phil Donahue and members of Pearl Jam.

Apparently, the Democrats are running scared as Nader and the Greens continue to post solid poll numbers across the country.

"For months," said Nader, "the Gore campaign would say to representatives among their many newly- won voters, "you have no idea what you have been missing, any sleep, over my campaign. But they are not slumbering on. They are already trying to reach some of our social justice supporters. They are trying to spin off and support them. Some of these calls are being made directly by the vice president. The contacts were confirmed by William M. Daley, Gore's campaign manager, who admitted, according to the N.Y. Times that "Nader worries the Gore camp.""

NEW DEMOCRATIC

Continued from pg 5

ordinance coming out any med- ical waste facility from being sited in Hartford CT. The vote on the council was 9 to 0 in favor. Clearly the election of Elizabeth Horton Sheff and the continued effort by the environmental jus- tice movement had created suc- cess beyond our wildest expecta- tions. Members of the Community Council had also spoken out on this issue and had given consensus to Elizabeth's determination to make the med- ical waste facility an issue.

The Community Council is an ongoing experiment in democracy. It is made up of peo- ple in the community who have shown through their work a commitment to people and change. It is made up of Greens, Democrats, independents, and we are even trying to recruit a Republican or two from our fold. The idea behind the council is to bring activists and others together under the same roof to build consensus, learn from each other, and educate the public about the issues that affect their lives. To this end the Community Council meetings are broadcast on the local cable channel and we have a large audience.

The experience of being a member of the Community Council has been exhilarating and challenging. The Community Council meets once a month in the City Council Chambers and we often interview department heads about the ongoing work of the city. We also review and make recommendations for the ongoing develop- ment of policy for Council mem- bers. Elizabeth Horton Sheff and I do research on issues and openly discuss our differences at our meetings. This openness is in sharp contract to the closed and narrow back room approach exhibited in the Hartford City Council under the direction of the Democratic and Republican parties. Here is just a short sum- mary of some of the other accom- plishments of Elizabeth Horton Sheff's Community Council:

* Though our work and the work of community activists we have expanded the Police Civilian Review Board and obtained funding for a private investigator to investigate alleged acts of police brutality. The Community Council made a recommendation for an ordi- nance requiring video recording of every police car to be used to record the interac- tions between the police and the community. Through commu- nity effort all police officers were informed of the Citron Vs. Vaughn consent degree that for- bids the killing of minors.

* The Community Council lobb- ied and forced the city to hire a community health educator to address environmental issues especially those related to high asthma levels in Hartford and lead poisoning.

* Elizabeth's Council continues to monitor the 700 million dol- lars Adriani's Landing development project. The Council will continue to monitor the commit- ment made by the developers that 90% of workers on the project live in Hartford. The Council also continues to demand an effective Environmental Impact Analysis of this project. The multi-mil- lion dollar 15 year tax abatements given by the legislature and the elected City Council to various parts of the Adriani's Landing project continue to be a major concern. This project is a model of how the city really works. We are trying to keep our community out of the hands of City Councils and our citizens alive and well.

* Pete Karman is a contributing editor to In These Times, a Chicago-based national news magazine.

Wasting Your Vote?

Continued from pg 12

by Peter Karman

It's a funny question. But it comes up constantly. "I like what Ralph Nader stands for," says the citizen. "But why vote for him?"

Americans are used to hav- ing an endless variety of con- sumer choices. We can buy produc- ts that are organically grown, economy food to top of the line, plain or with anything, in cans, bottles or legs, for cash or credit. No one, except perhaps a dubious spouse or parent, is going to tell us that what we buy is a waste.

But when it comes to exer- cising our hard-won democratic right to pick our own leaders, the notion of choice suddenly flies out the window. The message we get from the powers that be is that we can have A or B, meaning Republicans or Democrats, but forget about anything from C to Z. Those interested in having a broad range of politicians and policies are being told they are wasting their vote.

This gives us what business calls 'inside the box thinking.' New ideas for solving old prob- lems are discouraged. Business as usual prevails. Nothing happens and everything gets worse.

Health care

The latest World Health Organization report issued this spring puts the U.S. at a scan- dalous 37th place in keeping its citizens alive and fit. Every other modern country has a national system that covers all of its people and produces better results at lower costs than our patchwork mess of HMO hell-ups and mergers, failing hospitals and harried physicians.

If a company was as badly run as our health system, it would automatically be put out of com- petition to see what they were doing right. But we don't have that option in public policy. The Canadians, Germans, Japanese or Australians may be a lot healthier than us at a lot less cost, but our political narrowness prevents us from learning any- thing from them.

Gore and Bush, apostles of A to B thinking, are not about to suggest that we bring our health standards up from 37th place in some of the most basic of the things that every other modern country does. That would be "extreme." Americans, after all, are not well thought of in the leery Canadian eyes being depicted on TV commer- cials sponsored by pharmaceuti- cal companies selflessly dedicated to the proposition that Americans should pay the
Ralph Nader
Green Candidate for President

For more than three decades, Ralph Nader has fought relentlessly to protect ordinary Americans from powerful corporations and to make government responsive, saving great numbers of lives in the process.

Born in Winsted, CT in 1934, Nader graduated magna cum laude from Princeton in 1955, and from Harvard Law School in 1958. From 1956 to 1959, he lectured on history and government at the University of Hartford. Nader came to the public's attention in 1965 when his best-selling book "Unsafe at Any Speed" exposed unsafe cars such as General Motors' dangerously defective Corvair. When GM went to extraordinary lengths to discredit Nader, Nader sued them for invasion of privacy. GM, having admitted wrongdoing before a Senate Committee, settled the case. With Nader's victory from the settlement and the reputation for standing up to predatory corporations, Ralph Nader launched the modern consumer movement.

Nader has a reputation for never resting and always being on the move. As a lawyer, he took cases against General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and others, most notably the case over the Le Mans-winning "Giant Corporation," and others

Washington, D.C. to work with Ralph Nader. "Nader's Raiders" successfully pushed for numerous laws to protect consumers, workers, taxpayers, and the environment, combating corporate abuse, and increasing citizen access to government. Nader built or stimulated a public interest movement consisting of dozens of organization all over the country with hundreds of citizen leaders working daily for a just society.

On issue after issue, year after year, Ralph Nader has identified and confronted political and corporate abuse. He has fought against insurance companies, global trade arrangements that override American sovereignty, and corporate lobbyists who would block safety standards and deny fair access to the courts for injured parties. He has also authored, co-authored or sponsored many books, including Action for a Change, Corporate Power in America, Taming the Giant Corporation, Verdicts on Lawyers, The Menace of Atomic Energy, Who's Poisoning America, Winning the Insurance Game, and The Frugal Shopper.

His lifelong integrity and tireless commitment to the public interest have made Ralph Nader a mainstay on lists of the most admired and influential Americans. In an era of widespread cynicism, he stands out as a public figure that citizens can trust to hold the office of President.

Books:
Corporate Power in America, 1973
Taming the Giant Corporation, 1976
The Menace of Atomic Energy, 1976
Who's Poisoning America, 1981
The Big Boys, 1986
Winning the Insurance Game, 1990
Collision Course: The Truth About Airline Safety, 1993
No Contest, Corporate Lawyers and the Perversion of Justice in America, 1996

Winona LaDuke
Green Candidate for Vice-President

Candidate Profile:
A 1988 graduate of Harvard, Winona LaDuke currently lives on the White Earth Reservation in Minnesota and works on restoring the local land base and culture. LaDuke also serves as the board co-chair for the Indigenous Women's Network and works in a national capacity as Program Director for Honor the Earth Fund, providing vision and leadership for the organization's Regranting Program and its Strategic Initiatives. In 1994, she was named by Time Magazine as one of America's 50 most promising leaders under 40 years of age. She is author of several books including Last Standing Woman (1997) and All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life (1999).

Opponents:
Nancy Johnson (Republican)
Valenti (Democrat)

E-mail:
cole@discoverzet.net
Phone:
(860) 672-2772

Audrey Cole
Green Candidate for Congress

Candidate Profile:
A Connecticut state certified real estate appraiser and broker and law school graduate, Audrey Cole recently clerked for the Superior Court of Connecticut in New Haven. She has a diverse public service and professional background, working for The Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, The Connecticut Department of Consumer Protection and The Connecticut Citizen Action Group. Audrey also served as staff memoir for former U.S. Senator Lowell P. Weicker in Washington D.C. Audrey is President of the Housatonic Environmental Action League, Cornwall Bridge, CT. and she is a member of the Board of Directors for the Center for Cuban Studies, New York, NY.

Audrey earned a B.S. in Political Science from American University in 1979, an M.A. in American Studies from Trinity College in 1996 and a J.D. from Quinnipiac College School of Law in 1999.
Connecticut State Legislature

Mike DeRosa
State Senate in 1st district
(Hartford & Wethersfield)

Contact Info:
smderosa@erols.com
860-956-8170
www.derosa2000.com

Opponents:
John Ionfara (Democrat)

Candidate Profile:
Mike DeRosa earned a B.A. in History from the University of Connecticut. Mike has worked for the Domestic Peace Corps (VIPSTA) in Camden, NJ and he has 3 years of experience as an elementary school teacher in the New Haven Public Schools. Mike was also hired as a counselor at a job training program as well as a Choir Director in a United Electrical union plant in Wallingford. CT. Currently he is a Computer Network Specialist.

Mike is the host of New Focus, a weekly radio program on two local radio stations. Mike is active in fighting the electric utility restructuring debate and Stop The Stadium. Mike is a member of Hartford City Councilwoman Elisabeth Horton Shelly’s advisory community council and he served as her Campaign Manager in 1996. Mike is a founding member of the Connecticut Green Party. He is also the editor of CT Green Times. He is married to Barbara Barry who is a registered nurse. They reside in Wethersfield, CT. Mike is committed to grassroots citizen participation. The defining theme of Mike’s campaign is “fighting for people and change.”

Tim Bowles
State Senate in 18th district
(Groton & Stonington)

Contact Info:
T2BOWLS2000@aol.com
860-9936

Opponents:
Cathy Cook (Republican)
Don Massel (Democrat)

Candidate Profile:
Timothy Bowles has an M.A. in Child Welfare from Saint Joseph’s College and a B.A. in English from Westham College, Vermont. He has worked as a social worker for the Department of Children and Families and as a planning analyst. He has also worked as a legislative liaison for the Office of Policy and Management in the Energy Division and as a Statewide Regional Planning Coordinator. Currently on leave from the state Tim is an elected full-time officer with AAS Level 4 $200. Tim has been a long-time labor activist and a vice-president with the Connecticut AFL-CIO. Tim served as the Chair for the Connecticut Chapter of the Sierra Club, and is on the Board of Directors for the People’s Action for Clean Energy. He was also appointed to the State Clean Energy Fund in 1999. Tim’s campaign is focusing on sustainable development, including comprehensive land use planning and transportation policies to reduce urban sprawl and preserve open space.

Tom Ethier
State Representative in 65th district (Torrington)

Contact Info:
topher@ecobs.org
860-496-8547
www.ethier2000.org

Opponents:
Pat Dupree (Republican),
John Kowalewski (Democrat)

Candidate Profile:
BBA Hofstra University 1980, co-founder and co-chair of the Connecticut Green Party. Litchfield County Coordinator - Stop the Stadium; Green Party candidate for Torrington. CT Council 1999 - 5 of 5 vote. In 1999 Tom was a County Coordinator for Stop the Stadium, a grassroots organization that helped preserve a billion-dollar taxpayers handout to New England Patriots. In the fall of last year, he was a Green Party candidate for City Council in Torrington where he received 1,200 votes, a strong showing for a political newcomer running as a third party. His written opinions are regularly featured in the Voice News and he has had op-ed published in the Register Citizen and Waterbury Republican. He is currently employed as a training manager in information services. He and his wife Lori Ethier are homeowners and reside in Torrington.

Thomas Sevigny
State Representative in 17th district (Canter & Avon)

Contact Info:
cepconcen@rcn.com
860-692-8544

Opponents:
Jesse Sthrowton (Democrat)

Candidate Profile:
President of Stop the Stadium, co-chair of state Green Party and co-chair of Association of State Green Parties. B.A. in History from Trinity College. Currently enrolled in History Masters program at Trinity. Tom has been active in the Green Party since 1996. He has played a pivotal role in making the Green Party a citizens movement. He has helped Connecticut taxpayers in their fight against corporate welfare, to clean up the “jelly fly” power plants and to clean up PCB contamination in the Housatonic River. Tom’s campaign emphasizes combating urban sprawl, property and income tax relief and ending corporate welfare.

The theme of Tom’s campaigns is Sevigny 2000: A Vision that Puts People First.

Paul Bassler
State Representative in 142nd district (Norwalk Wilton)

Opponents:
Larry Cafero (Republican)

Candidate Profile:
In my campaign I hope to raise the issues of rebuilding democracy, revealing corporate welfare in Connecticut, making education a priority for state funding, arguing for the practical and ethical need for universal health care, constructing a long term government policy for our energy needs one that is ecologically sustainable and exploiting ways to give property tax relief to Norwalk residents.

People need to awaken from our culture of consumption to realize that happiness, good health and democratic government can’t be bought. They just don’t happen. These ideals require initiative. They require action.

Over government is only to encourage and democratic as the degree of participation on the part of the people.

Unless we begin to make structural change in our government so people’s democracy, we will continue to see government that gives away billions in unneeded costs to corporations.

Tony Santini
State Representative in 92nd district (New Haven-West End)

Candidate Profile:
Tony Santini, 35, was born in Bridgeport, CT. He earned a B.S. in Biochemistry and a B.A. to Grogan from Southern Connecticut State University where he was President of the SCSU Environmental Federation. Tony is active on the Town board of First Citizens Community (in Winsted) and is an active member of the Connecticut Green Party. Tony runs his business as a Computer Operator and is a member of the Communications Workers of America.

Tony fell in love with New Haven at a young adult when I came to the city for downtown nightlife, and came to call New Haven home when I moved to Winsted in 1993 while I was attending college.

Opponents:
Pat Dillon (Democrat),
Dino Cortina (Republican)

Contact Info:
tonyantini@hotmail.com
203-935-5240
www.geocities.com/santini492

Congratulations to Senator Mike DeRosa, Representative Tim Bowles, Representative Tom Ethier, and Representative Thomas Sevigny on their re-election. Congratulations to Paul Bassler, Representative in the 142nd district. Congratulations to Tony Santini, State Representative in the 92nd district.
The Politics of Clean Air

by Thomas Ethier

While most of the media is giving "O.J."... the contemporary political process, now dominated by big corporations, the same interaction has produced largely dirty plants, which are the villains of the story. This year's battle against the "Dirty Five" is a test case book of why legislation is made or not made for the benefit of corporate polluters and their pocketbooks and not for the health of Connecticut residents.

The "Dirty Five" is a group of fossil fuel burning power plants located in Middletown, Bridgeport, Norwalk, New Haven, and Middletown. They have been producing levels of sulfur dioxide emissions greater than those allowed by the Federal Clean Air Act for years. Sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides are known asthma triggers that are directly related to abnormally high levels of asthma in the state. The reason these plants are being phased out is that it is cheaper to shut them down than to clean up their emissions. This battle is not just about clean air; it is about democracy and the ability of citizens to hold their elected representatives accountable.

The Clean Air Act was passed 33 years ago, these older plants, including a coal burning plant in Bridgeport were given an exemption from the Clean Air Act by the Connecticut legislature on the questionable assumption that they would soon be phased out. Well, they never were and we've been stuck with these dirty plants that are about 30% as efficient as they should be and account for over half the industrial air pollution in Connecticut. A bill that would have required them to comply with clean air standards passed the Connecticut House by a narrow margin last year but was killed in the State Senate in a procedural move. The 2000 version of the bill, with over 100 sponsors looked like it was sure to pass this time in both legislative bodies. However corporate lobbyists and some compliant legislators who are more concerned with the needs of corporate polluters than with clean air played it.

In April of this year, representatives of the Clean Air Coalition took time off from their jobs and their families to lobby the legislature for passage of the bill. They wanted the legislature to pass a bill that would have required the dirty power plants to comply with the Clean Air Act by 2003. The professional lobbyists for the power plants were pressing legislators for a compliance date of 2005—nearly ten years in the future and half a lifetime from the Clean Air Act of the 70's.

Supporters of clean air were told that their bill would pass in the House but were double-crossed by supposed supporters of the environment Democrat Jesse Stratton of Canton and Moira Lyons of Stamford. They caved to pressure from corporate lobbyists and presented a weakened bill that featured extensions that moved the date of compliance to 2007. The Clean Air Coalition was told to "take it, or go home." The bill passed the State House 137 to 9 in a 2:00 A.M. vote on April 15. Representative Caruso said "this is no victory, it's disgusting to everyone in this." Next the battle moved to the State Senate where it had the support from top leaders like Kevin Sullivan. Here it was hoped they would pass the Senate. The Senate would give a bill closer to the original bill with no pollution trading credits (a permit to pollute) and a compliance date of 2003. Local newspapers supported passage. The Majority of the Senate's intent to pass a tough bill and send it back to the House for another vote. But it was not to be as lobbyists for the corporate polluters carried the day. An amendment sponsored by Dell Feds of Kent that included pollution trading credits passed 16 to 17 and gutted the strong language of the original bill.

The bill coming out of the Senate was so bad that Kevin Sullivan said "it was the worst thing that happened all session." Thomas Kirk, general manager of Winnet, one of the owners of the plants, said he was happy. The legislature passed off the requirements that would have forced the plants to clean up by a certain deadline without being able to trade pollution credits. Rather than present a bill to the Governor that puts the needs of polluters above the health of residents, supporters gave up and decided to fight the battle again next year.

Owners of the power plants, companies like the Milwaukee based Winnet-Connecticut, noted that they will have to invest $50 - $200 million to comply with the legislation. Last year they bought some of these plants from United Illuminating for $270 million. At the same time they made their investment in the plants they must have known that compliance to clean air standards and a corresponding investment in technology is needed on the horizon for them. If they calculated on being able to avoid costs until 2009 and beyond Connecticut residents should not be made to absorb the cost in increased levels of air pollution and asthma.

Proponents for the industry claim that increases in asthma can't be blamed entirely on the pollution caused by these Connecticut plants. Over the last 25 years there have been other sources of air pollution in the state. In addition to the Dirty Five, we can also blame auto- mobiles and pollution from mid-western power plants for our bad air. However this is a problem that we can address right now and our elected representatives have the responsibility to pass legislation in our interests, not the interests of corporations who have been getting a permit to pollute for two decades.

The delay in enacting legislation for clean air in Connecticut only prolongs the time that these ancient plants will continue to pollute. They can be made to comply with national standards at any time; it's just a question of doing it! If we can hold polluters accountable on this issue we can move on to other issues such as the MTA in gasoline and increased protection of our land and waterways. In this fall's election, ask the candidates where they stand on the Dirty Five and tell you want clean air now, not in 10 years.

Thomas Ethier is a Green Party candidate running for State Senate in the 7 district.

New Forum Continued

that when developers do not fulfill their agreements with the city they must be forced to return our tax dollars to the city. The Community Council also feels that this development project should emphasize "welfare development" rather than the creation of minimum wage jobs that have no benefits. We also support a living wage for all workers.

The Council has also discussed specific issues such as dealing with trash disposal problems and traffic problems.

The Community Council supports more city wide recycling and supports a resolution to name Hartford's bus fleet to a clean non-polluting energy forum.

The Community Council has initiated many resolutions that have been later passed by the Hartford City Council in subsequent meetings of that elected body. The most recent resolution was adopted to support the Million Family March to Washington D.C. that was passed by the elected Hartford City Council.

The Community Council is here to stay. As the Green Party begins to win more seats in the Hartford City Council we will see the policies and the ideas of the Community Council begin to take on new significance and power. This is good news for democracy and justice.

MasterCard DENIED: Nader Campaigns Enjoys First Victory in MasterCard Lawsuit

In a victory for political free speech, a Federal District Court in the Southern District of New York denied MasterCard's request to temporarily restrain the Nader2000 campaign from using it of its critically acclaimed political spot, "Priceless Truth." The spot was called the "first truly irreverent candidate commercial of the 2000 election," by Peter Marks in the New York Times. MasterCard tried to impose its own corporate rules on political free speech in court, and was dismissed by Nader's parody of MasterCard's "Priceless" Ad. Nader and his media consultants Bill Hillman's Ad criticized card- register politicians where participation is denied to all but those who can pay the ever-increasing price. The ad urged Nader's inclusion in debates, saying "Without Ralph Nader in the debates, the truth will come in last."

"MasterCard's suit is an attempt to stifle political speech that challenges the contemporary political process, now dominated by big corporations, the same Continued on pg 11
by Mike DeRosa

For many of us, the electric utility "restructuring," law is the greatest example of the "bait and switch" sales pitch ever performed on the electric consumer. As you remember, it was the Democratic Party's legislative leadership along with the Republican Party's Gov. Rowland that pushed through a corporation-friendly "restructuring bill." This bill passed even after the restructuring bill was rejected by large majorities in both the Appropriations and Finance Committees of the CT General Assembly. During that session we were told by our political adversaries that passage of this bill would make our electric bills go down by 10%. We were told by some of our political friends that "the market" would drive our electric bills down. The final verdict is not completely in, but a close analysis of the details shows that had "restructured" costs been eliminated from the "restructuring" legislation, our electric bills would have gone down by 20% or more instead of the 6% we finally got.

At this point, our nuclear power plants in Winsted, CT have just been sold to Dominion Corporation for 1.9 Billion dollars. Dominion is just another corporate owner who will continue to pollute our land and water with nuclear materials. Dominion knows that over one billion dollars in decommissioning money is available to them in a Mellon bank account since they bought the Millstone nuclear complex. Many environmentalists believe that Dominion bought this money rather than the nuclear power plants. If they can run and decommission these plants cheap and dirty (with many spread around of nuclear materials) they can reap big profits. What will consumers, taxpayers, and the citizens of Connecticut reap? According to environmentalists it could be empty pocketbooks and disease caused by pollution.

Since the price of electricity is going up, they will be able to continue to run their nuclear power plants and make a profit on the spot energy market. The legislature and the D.P.U.C. should be phasing nuclear power plants out, not enabling companies like Dominion to continue to externalize their environmental, health, and other costs to the rest of the taxpayers.

Recently we have seen the true face of restructuring in San Diego, CA. The San Diego area is the first area of CA where a true "market" in electricity was allowed. The results have been increases of 400% to 500% in the price of electricity. In New York, price increases have also taken place with threats of black outs and brown outs. Many apologists for restructuring say that once new electric plants are built these increases will disappear. What people need to know is that these new electric generating plants have no obligation to sell electricity in the region in which they reside. Most of these new plants will burn natural gas for fuel. This will create a shortage of natural gas which will further raise the price of electricity. Competition among energy producers in CA is also causing the price to rise. What we are observing is truly a vicious cycle. We have moved out of the era of regulated monopolies into the era of unregulated oligopolies. By definition oligopolies do not compete they collude. Clearly this type of collusion will be a part of electric restructuring wherever it appears. There is no real competitive electric market in the states where restructuring has taken place nor will there be any significant competitive market anytime in the near future. What is happening is that corporations like Northeast Utilities and UI will continue to dominate the retail electric "market" in CT for some time to come and that's just fine to the leaders in the legislature, the D.P.U.C. and the editorial boards of most mass media outlets in CT.

Stranded costs will continue to be a major aspect of restructuring. Stranded costs are the costs that you pay on your electric bill every month under the headings Competitive Transition Assessment and System Benefits Charge. They are supposed to compensate N.U. and U.I. for the loss of their monoply and for the suposed value of their nuclear and non-nuclear power plants which the state required them to sell under the restructuring law.

One thing is for sure, if those of us who fought hard against "stranded cost" had not won the fight, we would have ended up with 12 year bonds ("securitization") that would have paid for "restructuring." This would have doubled or tripled the cost of the biggest bailout in CT history.

The final cost of the "restructuring" experiment may be never known. Who for example can give us a definitive figure on how much the S & L bailout cost the American people? Besides the billions that are being given to N.U. and U.I. , there are many hidden costs they may never be calculated. These include the environmental, health, and other costs of continuing to use nuclear and other fossil fuels to produce our electric. These externalized costs are never paid by corporations. They are externalized to ratepayers and taxpayers and remain invisible to the average person.

We consider the health effects of burning trash to produce electricity in CT. Hartford has the highest childhood asthma levels in the United States. New Haven and Bridgeport are not far behind. Trash incinerators, toxic sludge facilities, and the filthy five still flourish in CT. Nuclear power is still going strong and is still creating environmental destruction. All these costs are externalized to society and we pay for them dearly.

Clearly we need an real energy policy for CT. We need to make a conscious decision to put billions of dollars into conservaion, clean and renewable energy, and to end nuclear energy.

We considered the health effects of the communities in which they reside. This will keep local money local and will allow voters some control over their local environment and their energy producers.

As restructuring continues to increase the cost of electricity and creates blackouts and brownouts, many citizens will begin to look for small victories against the oligopolies that will be running restructuring and the politicians who created it. The Green Party should lead the fight against the energy oligopolies that restructuring will produce and help stop the corporate domination of our energy generation system. The winning of small victories against the energy oligopolies will help us win significant political victories in the future and will help us build the foundation for a sustainable economy.

Mike DeRosa is a member of the CT Green Party and an elected member of the state steering committee. He is running for the State Senate in the 1st district in Hartford. Wethersfield. He can be reached at smderosa@erols.com

NOW IT CAN BE TOLD! CORPORATIONS GET BILLIONS, RATE PAYERS GET BILLS.
by Mike DeRosa

For many of us, the electric utility "restructuring," law is the greatest example of the "bait and switch" sales pitch ever performed on the electric consumer. As you remember, it was the Democratic Party's legislative leadership along with the Republican Party's Gov. Rowland that pushed through a corporation-friendly "restructuring bill." This bill passed even after the restructuring bill was rejected by large majorities in both the Appropriations and Finance Committees of the CT General Assembly. During that session we were told by our political adversaries that passage of this bill would make our electric bills go down by 10%. We were told by some of our political friends that "the market" would drive our electric bills down. The final verdict is not completely in, but a close analysis of the details shows that had "restructured" costs been eliminated from the "restructuring" legislation, our electric bills would have gone down by 20% or more instead of the 6% we finally got.

At this point, our nuclear power plants in Winsted, CT have just been sold to Dominion Corporation for 1.9 Billion dollars. Dominion is just another corporate owner who will continue to pollute our land and water with nuclear materials. Dominion knows that over one billion dollars in decommissioning money is available to them in a Mellon bank account since they bought the Millstone nuclear complex. Many environmentalists believe that Dominion bought this money rather than the nuclear power plants. If they can run and decommission these plants cheap and dirty (with many spread around of nuclear materials) they can reap big profits. What will consumers, taxpayers, and the citizens of Connecticut reap? According to environmentalists it could be empty pocketbooks and disease caused by pollution.

Since the price of electricity is going up, they will be able to continue to run their nuclear power plants and make a profit on the spot energy market. The legislature and the D.P.U.C. should be phasing nuclear power plants out, not enabling companies like Dominion to continue to externalize their environmental, health, and other costs to the rest of the taxpayers.

Recently we have seen the true face of restructuring in San Diego, CA. The San Diego area is the first area of CA where a true "market" in electricity was allowed. The results have been increases of 400% to 500% in the price of electricity. In New York, price increases have also taken place with threats of black outs and brown outs. Many apologists for restructuring say that once new electric plants are built these increases will disappear. What people need to know is that these new electric generating plants have no obligation to sell electricity in the region in which they reside. Most of these new plants will burn natural gas for fuel. This will create a shortage of natural gas which will further raise the price of electricity. Competition among energy producers in CA is also causing the price to rise. What we are observing is truly a vicious cycle.

We have moved out of the era of regulated monopolies into the era of unregulated oligopolies. By definition oligopolies do not compete they collude. Clearly this type of collusion will be a part of electric restructuring wherever it appears. There is no real competitive electric market in the states where restructuring has taken place nor will there be any significant competitive market anytime in the near future. What is happening is that corporations like Northeast Utilities and UI will continue to dominate the retail electric "market" in CT for some time to come and that's just fine to the leaders in the legislature, the D.P.U.C. and the editorial boards of most mass media outlets in CT.

Stranded costs will continue to be a major aspect of restructuring. Stranded costs are the costs that you pay on your electric bill every month under the headings Competitive Transition Assessment and System Benefits Charge. They are supposed to compensate N.U. and U.I. for the loss of their monoply and for the supposed value of their nuclear and non-nuclear power plants which the state required them to sell under the restructuring law.

One thing is for sure, if those of us who fought hard against "stranded cost" had not won the fight, we would have ended up with 12 year bonds ("securitization") that would have paid for "restructuring." This would have doubled or tripled the cost of the biggest bailout in CT history.

The final cost of the "restructuring" experiment may be never known. Who for example can give us a definitive figure on how much the S & L bailout cost the American people? Besides the billions that are being given to N.U. and U.I. , there are many hidden costs they may never be calculated. These include the environmental, health, and other costs of continuing to use nuclear and other fossil fuels to produce our electric. These externalized costs are never paid by corporations. They are externalized to ratepayers and taxpayers and remain invisible to the average person.

We consider the health effects of burning trash to produce electricity in CT. Hartford has the highest childhood asthma levels in the United States. New Haven and Bridgeport are not far behind. Trash incinerators, toxic sludge facilities, and the filthy five still flourish in CT. Nuclear power is still going strong and is still creating environmental destruction. All these costs are externalized to society and we pay for them dearly.

Clearly we need an real energy policy for CT. We need to make a conscious decision to put billions of dollars into conservaion, clean and renewable energy, and to end nuclear energy.

We considered the health effects of the communities in which they reside. This will keep local money local and will allow voters some control over their local environment and their energy producers.

As restructuring continues to increase the cost of electricity and creates blackouts and brownouts, many citizens will begin to look for small victories against the oligopolies that will be running restructuring and the politicians who created it. The Green Party should lead the fight against the energy oligopolies that restructuring will produce and help stop the corporate domination of our energy generation system. The winning of small victories against the energy oligopolies will help us win significant political victories in the future and will help us build the foundation for a sustainable economy.

Mike DeRosa is a member of the CT Green Party and is an elected member of the state steering committee. He is running for the State Senate in the 1st district in Hartford. Wethersfield. He can be reached at smderosa@erols.com

NOW IT CAN BE TOLD! CORPORATIONS GET BILLIONS, RATE PAYERS GET BILLS.
By Kevin Crisp

Last November and this past April, blue-collar workers joined with human rights groups and environmentalists in protests against the economic institutions of the global economy. The mainstream press inaccurately described the recent mobilizations as disparate collections of “protest chic,” “buddies” and “free agents.” These workers were as surprised as many progressives by this renewed activism. The demonstrations against the World Trade Organization in Seattle, WA, and the protests against the International Monetary Fund/World Bank in Washington D.C. would have been hard to imagine 10 (or even 20) years ago. Issues such as logging jobs, development restrictions and environmental pollution have long pitted workers against environmentalists. Today, this blue-green divide has narrowed considerably and unified as a powerful political alliance. To some, this is a mystery. Contrary to the common buzz about the “new economy,” anti-globalization is not a left-of-center movement. Capital mobility, downsizing and the de-industrialization of Western economies have been going on at least since 1980. On the other hand, America’s political landscape has changed a great deal since then. In the 1990s, the two dominant parties have coalesced to defend corporate interests, grassroots activists for labor, the environment and the working poor have come to share a basic understanding of why they are on the same side of the political equation.

The combination of two historical trends, one following the other, distanced labor from the rest of society and severely weakened the political clout of liberals and the left. The first trend was the functional decline of organized labor during the late 1960s and 1970s, or what has been called the “new left.” Democracy activists seized significant victories with the civil rights movement in 1964 and 1965, sought to extend their fight for social and political justice. Anti-war protesters, hippies, hippies, drop-outs, black power activists, feminists, gay and lesbian activists and environmentalists all emerged at political camps. While abstractly multi-class and multi-ethnic, this new left was effectively a middle-class and highly segregated phenomenon. Each of these groups were struggling for their own causes and as the number of issues multiplied each group struggled to maintain distinct identities, though coalitions building difficult and often ruled out seeking support from more traditional interest groups such as labor. As a result, their ancestors participated in the same kind of democratic struggles with public sector and corporate authority several decades earlier.

most working class citizens were, by the mid-1970s, disconnected from the rest of the progressive community. As a result they felt little or no affinity for protesters. Many began to question what they believed to be anti-American sentiments among counter-culture groups. Richard Nixon declared on the campaign trail that there was a split between “middle” America and the street activists, calling on a “silent majority” of working Americans to vote for a return to law and patriotism. The wedge that Nixon drove between the left and the working class would remain intact through the election of 1980. The Nixon and Reagan elections relied heavily on worker support, much of which was based on resentment against the new left and the protest movement. Workers emerged out of it during the previous 15 years.

The second trend was globalization. Not too long ago, workers continued to see globalization as much about nationalis as it was about workers’ rights and decent wages. The “buy American” and “made in the USA” slogans of the 1980s revealed the extent to which labor leadership and many rank-and-file workers understood the economy in terms of the U.S. versus the rest of the world. American management and labor and their American counterparts in Congress had no quarrel with the anti-import campaign, because it benefited them at least as much or more than it benefitted the workers. Yet, it is a mistake to conclude that labor unions and their membership were somehow more protectionist. Layoffs (or the threat of them) at manufacturing plants through outsourcing - particularly in the steel and auto industries - due to increased competition from Japan and other foreign economies reduced the bargaining leverage of labor unions. Worker militancy, necessary as a bargaining option in the face of layoffs, right money Federal Reserve Chairs (Volcker, then Greenspan) and the rise of a new growth industry in the U.S., mergers and acquisitions. Compounding the problem of overseas competition was a growing hostility to unions among conservatives and neoliberal free-traders. Alienated from the rest of the progressive community and weakened by an unregulated global economy, it must have seemed reasonable to management to use workers to fight for their jobs by defending the U.S. companies they worked for.

Empowerment: After several waves of layoffs in the late 70’s and early 80’s, the labor movement, led by the rank and file, their leaders won cooperation - with management and the Democratic Party. The major unions circled the wagons and went on the offensive, putting together plans to prevent plant closings while

they neglected organizing and grassroots mobilization. They based their strategy on exchange for things like contract concessions and tier-wage scales, unions thought they could secure jobs for their members. Instead, they faced the new “political” economy. (a) While the unions were trying to prevent layoffs, Corporate America began to sell a new message of cooperation to workers. Whether in unionized plants, management began to support giving workers more input into the production process. The philosophy was simple: worker participation would lead to productivity gains and job security. Inspired Japanese companies, the team system was gradually accepted by workers but it was not taken seriously by labor. Management had at least not seriously enough to transform shop-floor level participation into top-level decisions making. An aspect of the team-work philosophy was its use as a mechanism for repression of workers organizing and even displacing unions altogether. The message was clear: management wanted to co-opt the empowerment function of unions. Cooperation became the mantra but union avoidance emerged as the primary business goal, spawning its own consulting industry. By 1980, nearly 50% of manufacturing companies with both union and non-union plants made union-avoidance their number one priority. (b) It was no surprise that many of the companies promoting Japanese style cooperation soon turned to downsizing and rapid-style layoffs and mean-spirited threats. To close down more factories, management also eroded union rights. It is, in fact, using local contract negotiations to encourage “whipsawing” - getting union locals within the same companies to sign agreements with one another for jobs, for the worker, this meant more overtime, harder work and less solidarity. Convincing workers that the interests of management and the interests of workers can be equally harmonized has proven harder in practice than theory. While unionization rates declined from about 30% of the prime-product workforce in the 1970s to less than 10% by the late 1990s, “cooperation” with management has done nothing to halt the capital flight, displacing workers to fight for their jobs by defending the U.S. companies they worked for.

The key to this kind of organizing is that it re-introduces the union and workers as a progressive force within the community. Management can out-maneuver the union inside the plant, but they have little ability to respond to a union that takes their cause outside the plant. Examples of coalitions building between unions and their communities have multiplied. In 1989, the Communications Workers of America were on the verge of striking against AT&T for the third time in 10 years. Instead of adding to their narrow focus on the AT&T plan, the CWA planned an organized public boycott, taking their message to the streets, literally. Through the summer of 1989, Communications Workers of America JAM! stickers on payphones throughout the country, (c) Calling for the re-institution of community, church and labor groups, Jobs with

Llabor and student activism is building a blue-green alliance

Jobs with Justice: A new organizing model

Today, unions are confronting corporate power by returning to their old standard - community organizing. But whether the issue is a local contract negotiation or the World Trade Organization, big union leaders from the United Steelworkers, John Hoffa, Jr. are reaching out to progressives on local issues based on a shared commitment to find common ground upon which to build a democracy movement. Writing in Z Magazine in 1992, Jeremy Brecher describes how unions changed tactics to wage a more generalized battle with corporate power

"Local union members participated in new conclude that: public education, lobbying, and direct union unification to push social change ranging from plant-saving legislation to expand medical programs, housing, voter registration, and electoral reform. In New Mexico, for example, a Greenslash Labor Alliance that grew out of a support campaign for firing light work- ers, proved for renewed construction from 1992 to the city, the case of the upcoming elections in South Africa, and development of a local street level program was key to the election of Mary Haly and state coalitions throughout the country to back for legislation regarding plant closing. (d)"
Justice, reached out to other progressives to enlist their support.

The Jobi with Justice strategy isn’t to simply PR unions into their past strengths, it is a grassroots outreach to unite broad-based civic institutions. Mobilizing citizens with over 80 national and community action groups across the country, activists for [WJ] means more than contract negotiating. It is organizing around fighting for issues that affect everyone, including living wage ordinances, health care reform and elimination of the cruel welfare reforms signed into law by President Clinton. [WJ] infuses their action with a philosophy that states every member must pledge to fight for other members’ rights, making solidarity into rallying cry for broader political action. As one [WJ] activist, Libby Poole Pershing, has put it on the [WJ] website:

"Jobs with justice exemplifies solidarity. If a single union demonstrates the power of group action, then a coalition like Jobs with Justice multiplication that joins us I feel a personal responsibility to return to the old idea by helping out when I can." (4)

Organizations such as the UE (The United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America) and the Naugatuck Valley Project in Connecticut, are also from the same community-building model. The UE has always been engaged in supporting democracy in ways that are on the periphery of the union movement, like their recent call for an end to the violent U.S. "War on Drugs" in Columbia. In Connecticut, the NVP have discovered the community-building aspects of the re-union union activism: preserving unionism only if they build new democratic spaces, giving them leverage against corporate power. Transformation can come from bargaining agents into central players in the progressive community.

"The UE, an organization composed of more than 40 local unions, church groups, and community groups, helped another big local plant, forced alteration to the change of local contracts, started an employee-owned home improvement store, and organized tenants to create permanently affordable housing." (5)

Monitoring together in Seattle and Washington D.C. has been a new experience for workers and environmentalists but it is built upon a common history and a common cause. A student activist who participated in the Seattle protests succinctly described the importance of the recent protests. The true of the global economy helps bring us together. If it’s not just about rights or the environment, it’s not meeting separately. But here we are achieving the big picture.

Workers’ rights, decent standards of living, a sustainable environment and the right to democratic self-determination how these goals are achieved. Yet, The Big Picture. Perhaps there is no better social glue. Workers and greens are going to the polls this November. Finally, they are going together.

Sources:
(2) Broder, Jeremy. New Tactics for Labor Politics. 2 Magazine May 1996
(4) Participating in Management: Labor Representation Theory and Practice. Midwest Center for Labor Research, Chicago, 1989
(5) Jobs Justi ce website http://www.zej.org
(6) Hanson, Don. What's Different in a Generation Maker, Abell Site 2000
(7) Jeffrey, Mike. The New Student Movement, The Nation, May 15, 1992
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Continued from pg 8 of kind of ceremony among the corporate parties want to impose on the presidential debate," said Nader. 2000 campaign manager Thomas Amato. "We will continue to play this ad on our website during the course of the debate."

"Ralph Nader’s Presidential campaign is premised on a fundamental concern with corporate domination of the political process and the need for Americans to break free from a process where participation is practised for the benefit of the ordinary citizens," Amato said.

The Nader 2000 Campaign is represented pro bono by Fohn and Richardson, one of the premier intellectual property firms, Mark S. Lesley briefed the case. Anthony Fletcher and Lawrence Koledny argued the case for Nader 2000. 
Say Yes! to Ralph Nader and Winona LaDuke in 2000! Help us regain control over the democratic process in this country by participating as a grassroots activist or both!

Dear Citizen,

On February 24 Ralph Nader announced his intention to seek the Green Party nomination for President. With Mr. Nader in the race voters now have a clear alternative to the one-party rule of Democrats and Republicans. No more Tweedleisms and Tweedleisms politics! No more voting for the lesser of two evils! As political. No more voting for the issues of too evils! As someone who is deeply concerned about progressive issues, I'm sure Mr. Nader needs little introduction to you. He is one of the foremost advocates for consumer and worker safety and health rights in U.S. history. He has been an eloquent critic of the increasing concentration of wealth and power and the adverse effects of corporatization on U.S. society. You and I know who he is and what he's done but we need your help to get the message out.

Connecticut Green 2000 is the political action committee formed to raise money, increase awareness and organize support for Mr. Nader's candidacy in Connecticut. In 1996 a little over $5,000 was raised in Connecticut in support of Mr. Nader's "walking" into own words candidacy. This time when he is actively running we have set a goal of $125,000. We will be using the money for buttons, bumper stickers, lawn signs and other advertisements. With enough money we can open a physical office and staff it with volunteers to do phone banking and create a presence that the media will be unable to ignore. It is estimated that only 7% of the people knew that Ralph Nader was on the ballot in 1996 - in 2000 we can bring that figure to 100%! In 1996 Nader received about $25,000 votes in Connecticut. If everyone who voted for Ralph Nader in 1996 gave just $10 we would double our goal so if you aren't able to afford a $50 or $100 donation please send in a $10 check. It will all help.

As an incentive for donations, we are offering Norman Solomon's book "The Trouble with Dilbert: How Corporate Culture Get the Last Laugh" for all that donate more than $50. In "The Trouble with Dilbert," Solomon takes on the myths that the cartoon character, so familiar to corporate cubicle dwellers, is actually on the side of the workers. In addition to his syndicated column, Media Beat, Norman Solomon is co-author of the widely acclaimed book Through the Media Looking Glass. He has written op-ed articles for many newspapers including the Boston Globe, Los Angeles Times, Newsday, New York Times and Chicago Tribune.

In election 2000 we have an opportunity to make a bold progressive statement. Too many people realize that issues such as corporate welfare and bailouts, economic globalization that puts profits ahead of workers and the environment, defense spending, growing income disparity and real health care reform, that there is no difference between Al Gore and George W. Bush.

In the words of Eugene Delis, "It is better to vote for what you want and not get it than to vote for what you don't want and get it." This November we can make a difference! Please be as generous as possible.

Winona LaDuke - Green VP Candidate
Ralph Nader - Green Presidential Candidate

This advertisement was paid for by CT Green 2000.A unincorporated association, and was not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.