NEW HAVEN DROPS LONG WHARF MALL.

by Tony Santini

A sad and potentially disastrous chapter has been closed in the checkered history of urban development in New Haven. On December 19th, 2000, the city government pulled out of the proposed Long Wharf Mall deal, effectively killing the project. Lawsuits by competitors and a grassroots organization of downtown merchants, plus protest rallies by the New Haven County Green Party Chapter helped convince Nordstrom’s, one of the four chain anchors, to reconsider its role in the mall. This led Democratic mayor John DeStefano to ask New England Development, one of the project’s corporate welfare recipients, to formulate a strategy by which the city could pull out.

In return for dropping its lawsuits against the city and developers, Westfield Corporation, the multinational owner of other malls in the area, will purchase the old Armstrong/Pirelli building on Sargent Drive for $14 million. Furthermore, Westfield agreed not to put any retail development on the site at the interchange of I-91, I-95, and Route 34.

The project would have cost an estimated total $150 to $500 million to complete. It would have attracted as many as 40,000 vehicle trips per day to an already overcrowded section of the highway. Studies commissioned and ignored by the State of Connecticut showed that the mall would have stolen up to 28 percent of the business of downtown merchants, who would have been forced to subsidize their own demise. The mall would have been built on a former toxic waste dump next to New Haven Harbor not far from the City Point neighborhood, whose residents worried for their health if ground was broken on the project.

The unalloyed death of the Mall project has saved the taxpay- ers of New Haven, Connecticut, and the United States approximately $94 million in corporate welfare from city, state, and federal sources. New England Development and its executives and architects donated over $40,000 to Governor Rowland’s last re-election campaign. Fusco Corporation, the minor partner

Greens Move Towards National Party

Now that the Green Party is in the national spotlight, the existence of two separate or- ganizations has led to embarrassing and harmful confusion. For example, although both groups backed Nader for president, the two groups had their own separate platforms. Nader ran only on the A.S.G.P. plat- form, and as a result, many people were confused. The media used this confusion to misrepresent Nader’s positions on a variety of issues and continues to use the factional split as an example of the Green Party’s inability to become a legitimate political party.

Recognizing the problems with two active green groups, members of A.S.G.P. and G.P.U.S.A. met in Boston in early October and developed a document to combine the two groups. A.S.G.P. will become the electoral green party which

民主ism is Cure for U. S. Elections

by Pete Karman

One of Ronald Reagan’s favorite jokes was about a little kid madly digging through a pile of manure because “there must be a pony down here somewhere.” The pony, if there is to be one, from our reeking presidenti- nal election is a renewed populist fight for democracy sparked by the fraud in Florida and given impetus by the gulliel campaign of Ralph Nader and Winona LaDuke and the Green party.

Let’s start out with the obvi- ous. The whole world knows that that election was stolen.

The American voter was robbed of any serious considera- tion of real issues or honest al- ternatives to know-nothing Bush or know-it-all Gore and their overarching corporate patrons.

The American voter was robbed of any serious considera- tion of real issues or honest al- ternatives to know-nothing Bush or know-it-all Gore and their overarching corporate patrons.
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by Pete Karman

Will war be the Bush administration’s cure for the US economic downturn? It’s looking more that way every day.

The Pentagon is in the midst of a multi-billion dollar buildup in the Middle east, pouring weapons and advisors into Columbia and spending $564 million just to improve one air base in Ecuador. Can more billions and body bags be far behind?

Why war? The story of the secret cocaine trade. But it’s thin cover at best. The real enemy, according to surprisingly frank statements by Trent Lott and other G.O.P. leaders, is Hugo Chavez, the democratically-elected populist president of oil-rich Venezuela, Columbia’s neighbor. In years past, he would have been labeled anti-American or communist. Nowadays, the charge against him is being anti-globalist. A tough former paratrooper, Chavez is off the reservation as far as Washington is concerned. Elected two years ago with a powerful mandate for change from the poor who form the great majority in Venezuela, his regime has been busy reforming the country’s corrupt political structure and reallocating its economic and foreign policies for the benefit of Venezuelans rather than multinational business.

His other offenses include urging O.P.E.C. to raise oil prices, opposing the brutal trade embargoes against Cuba and Iraq, and maintaining good relations with the far bigger, South American’s worst nightmare and quite possibly a catalyst of Indochina proportions.

But hardliners can be expected to argue that Venezuela, one of the world’s biggest oil-producers, is far more difficult for us to solidify our “Castro-narco terrorists” attacking our troops. For icing on the cake, the media could do nothing to cover these stories about Chavez eating babies, a la the horror tales spun about Noreiga.

Sane heads in the Pentagon and the Bush Administration should appreciate that any major U.S. military involvement south of the Rio Grande would set off the America’s worst nightmare. But Washington is looking quite literally safe for our corporatist empire. The Pentagon is in the midst of a multi-billion dollar buildup in the Middle east, pouring weapons and advisors into Columbia and spending $564 million just to improve one air base in Ecuador. Can more billions and body bags be far behind?

Dear Editor:

I received my copy of the Times the other day, and was enjoying the intelligent articles and messages conveyed through the text of lofty ideals, of justice and fairness for the general populace and the environment. I had reached an agreeable state of friendly compatriotry with the paper and the party, when I was rudely jolted from this comfortable position by what I saw on page three. There was an ad for Barney Ltd. Booters. A shoe store, selling leather. I called them to confirm this and they indeed bragged that there were no man-made products in their store. All items were leather. Leather which comes from and strongly supports the beef industry. An industry based on such cruelty to animals as could only be devised in hell. An industry which sustains world hunger because every pound of meat sold takes fifteen pounds of grain away from hungry people. An industry which dumps thousands of pounds of excrement, much of which finds its way into our waterways and ground water.

Hartford Green Party Office: A Natural Progression

by Pete Magistri

The Mike DeRosa for State Senator campaign office is now the official office of the Hartford Chapter of the Connecticut Green Party. The office is located at 47BA New Britain Ave, next to Roma Bakery in a neighborhood reflecting the ethnic diversity of the city. The location is considered to be one of its greatest benefits since our party is structured to be all-inclusive.

As we worked our way through the “how to best use this space learning curve” for Mike’s campaign, so too are we faced with a similar task for the new designation.
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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

An industry which destroys whole forests to create grazing land. And with these forests go priceless animals, plants and herbs, destroyed with their home, some never to be seen again. The leather industry may be one step removed, but it is still a byproduct of and inexorably linked to the beef industry. Buying leather is buying beef with all the pain which companies in it. This message was so contrary to the spirit of the Green Party, it was like seeing Mike’s name in a vegetarian magazine. Now I’m suggesting that one small ad is going to exert any influence over any party actions, but I am suggesting that when you shake hands with contributors such as this, you send the message that the Green Partycondones and approves of pain and pollution-based businesses, if it means dollars in their pocket. I wonder, would you call it to a fur company if they offered money for ads or anything else?

Very Sincerely Yours,
Barbara N. Service
Storrs, CT

What If They Gave A War?

by Pete Karman

In other words, it may take U.S. troops to save vital Venezuela from its own citizens and make it safe for our corporations again...

Petey Magistri is coordinator for the Hartford Area Green Chapter.

Dear Editor:

I have replaced the main sign with a temporary generic one, but the rest of the frontage still reflects this year’s elections. Its use will be broadened in the coming months to include committee meetings, a staging area for local actions, outreach activities now being developed and campaign office for future elections to name a few.

Chapter meetings will continue to be held at the University of Hartford at least until we improve the seating capacity of the office. Appointments to the office can sit comfortably, expandable to around 20.

Public reaction to the office has been positive with the occasional drop-in. This is expected to increase as we develop a system of coverage. For now, the “closed” sign hangs most often. Of course, the weather, holiday season and campaign fatigue all tend to delay the regrouping that is imminent.

Pete Magistri is coordinator for the Hartford Area Green Chapter.

The CT Green Times is published 4 times a year. 20,000 copies of this issue were published.
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The entire CT Green Times, “the Bush administration,” would obvi- ously be far more difficult for it to mount an anti-Chavez grab for power from within its ranks than it was in Chile, where the civilian Allende and his followers had no base.

In other words, it may take U.S. troops to save vital Venezuela from its own citizens and make it safe for our corporations again just as in Panama, not only far bigger. The most likely scenario is increasing U.S. military involvement in Columbia, accompanied by charges that Chavez “betrayed” his people and is siding with the “Castro-narco terrorists” attacking our troops. For icing on the cake, the media could do nothing to cover these stories about Chavez eating babies, a la the horror tales spun about Noreiga.

Sane heads in the Pentagon and the Bush Administration should appreciate that any major U.S. military involvement south of the Rio Grande would set off America’s worst nightmare and quite possibly a catalyst of Indochina proportions.

But hardliners can be expected to argue that Venezuela, one of the world’s greatest oil-producers, is far more difficult for us to solidify our “Castro-narco terrorists” attacking our troops. For icing on the cake, the media could do nothing to cover these stories about Chavez eating babies, a la the horror tales spun about Noreiga.

Sane heads in the Pentagon and the Bush Administration should appreciate that any major U.S. military involvement south of the Rio Grande would set off America’s worst nightmare and quite possibly a catalyst of Indochina proportions.

But hardliners can be expected to argue that Venezuela, one of the world’s greatest oil-producers, is far more difficult for us to solidify our “Castro-narco terrorists” attacking our troops. For icing on the cake, the media could do nothing to cover these stories about Chavez eating babies, a la the horror tales spun about Noreiga.

Sane heads in the Pentagon and the Bush Administration should appreciate that any major U.S. military involvement south of the Rio Grande would set off America’s worst nightmare and quite possibly a catalyst of Indochina proportions.

But hardliners can be expected to argue that Venezuela, one of the world’s greatest oil-producers, is far more difficult for us to solidify our “Castro-narco terrorists” attacking our troops. For icing on the cake, the media could do nothing to cover these stories about Chavez eating babies, a la the horror tales spun about Noreiga.

Sane heads in the Pentagon and the Bush Administration should appreciate that any major U.S. military involvement south of the Rio Grande would set off America’s worst nightmare and quite possibly a catalyst of Indochina proportions.
Democracy Is Cure For U. S. Elections, Continued

Continued from page 1

Instead, they were served up three billion dollars worth of mindless blather barely disguised as democratic discourse. Rarely, if ever, had more been spent for less. Depending upon the strategic value of their states, voters either had to suffer countless instantly forgettable campaign commercials or wonder if the nation was a national election happening at all.

Those who dared consider anything more substantial, like Nader-LaDuke and the Greens, were branded spoilers and troublemakers. The election became the equivalent of building a giant supermarket just to sell two pre-packaged turkeys, one without a head and the other missing his giblets.

Then, in Florida on election night, that supermarket was hit by a hurricane. All the displays and decorations blew away, leaving the two turkeys and those who trusted and dressed them naked amid the wreckage. Americans learned that, hey, their votes really didn't count for very much, that the electoral system was decapitated when it wasn't corrupted, and that the real decisions about who ran the country didn't come from public ballots but rather from private deals.

Caught in the open with their chicanery hanging out, the media and the politicos made the best of their embarrassment. Defensively, they favorably compared America's system to those of tinpot regimes where the votes were transported by tanks rather than Ryder rental trucks. Understandably, they avoided any such comparison to democratic first-world countries.

Consider our next door neighbors. Canada called a national election right in the middle of our endless campaign. Canadians had a choice of five major parties and several smaller ones from left to right. They got to vote in lively televised debates that included all comers. The parties did their politicking and the citizens voted with no further ado. The ballots were counted on election night and everyone went to sleep. They woke to find the incumbent party still in charge and that the big loser was a rightwing party that shot itself in the foot by merely hinting that it might weaken or, God forbid, try to Americanize Canada's beloved single payer health care system (the other parties were busy promising to grant it much needed budget increases). The whole process from start to finish took 35 days and cost less than Al Gore's wardrobe advisor or George Bush's tab for take out. How dare they?

Of course, Americans would never stand for that kind of wild-eyed extremism. Thirty-five days, indeed. The 2004 U.S. presidential election started even before the 2000 one was over. Let's figure $10 billion this time around. Our elections have become permanent because they are good business, you know.

Or maybe you don't. What the mainstream media carefully omitted from the mind-numbing coverage of the mess in Florida was that billions of bucks in corporate welfare were riding on whether Bush or Gore gained the oval office.

The fat cats that poured all that money into the campaign did it not only to improve their already happy lot generally, but to gain specific favors and deals from their candidate of choice. Bush, who won with the fewest votes, is tied to Southwest financial interests and big oil, while Gore, who lost with the most votes, was the favorite of the Wall Street bond traders and California computer titans. Who do you think paid for all those million dollar-an-hour lawyers arrayed from Tallahassee to Capital Hill?

It's true that, amid all this electoral extravaganza of empty excess, the Green Party and the Nader-LaDuke candidacy here in Connecticut and nationwide did not fare quite as well as they had hoped when it came to sheer numbers. Just under three million Americans voted Green, 64,000 of them here in the Nutmeg state, for 2.7 percent of the total vote and 4.6 percent of the vote in Connecticut. Not bad at all for a bottoms-up political movement that offers its constituency not tax breaks or star wars, but only the satisfaction that comes from making a full-hearted effort at civic virtue.

Still, it could have been better. By any reckoning, the Green vote should have been twice the size it was. The powerful, fear-inducing anti-Nader propaganda effort by nominally liberal Democrats had its effect. Voters were scared off from the Greens even in states where Democrats were expected to–and did–coat-to overwhelming victories.

Nevertheless, with its grassroots organization and bottoms-up approach to democracy, the Green Party is uniquely able to provide a home not just for those who voted for Nader-LaDuke, but also for those who meant to but decided instead to vote strategically. Citizens riled by the electoral sham, as well as those concerned with basic Green issues like the environment and health care, will be looking for clean alternatives. It's up to the Green Party to supply them.

A likely starting point should be a major effort to push I.R.V., or Instant Runoff Voting. The measure would ensure that any candidate running for state office would win by a simple majority by allowing voters to rank their preferences for all the candidates for a given office. Candidates with the fewest votes would be automatically eliminated and their totals transferred to the voters’ next choices.

If such a system had been in place on November 7, additional millions of citizens could have voted for Ralph Nader or other third party candidates without the fear that they were “wasting their vote” or helping the candidate they least preferred.

Pete Karman is a contributing editor to In These Times, a Chicago-based national news magazine.
Clean Elections = Campaign Finance Reform

by Karen Hobert Flynn

The 2000 elections have demonstrated clearly that our democracy falls short of its promise to live up to the principle of one person, one vote. Thousands of votes were invalid in the presidential election because many of our states’ voting systems are outdated, inconsistent, and inaccurate. Even worse, voting irregularities occurred more frequently in poor and minority districts, leading to the disproportionate disfranchisement of black voters.

Our representative system of government is further undermined by the special interest domination of our electoral and legislative processes.

The new President and the new Congress will be coming into office on heels of a record $5 billion on federal campaigns during this election. The political parties collected and distributed some $520 million of unregulated soft money from corporations and wealthy individuals. These large donors and their lobbyists are already lining up to cash in their chips for access and favors from those they elected.

Despite the bleak news about voting irregularities and the dominance of special interests in Washington and many state Capitols, there is one hopeful development of the 2000 election season. In Maine, Vermont and Arizona, candidates able to run for office without being beholden to special interests.

Each of these three states passed a Clean Election law, which reduces the influence of special interest money and provides a level playing field for offering qualified candidates a limited and equal amount of public funds for the 2000 election.

In Maine, 16 out of 35 general election candidates opted into the Clean Election program. Sixty-three percent of the participating candidates were Democrats and 34 percent were Republicans. Thirty-two percent were incumbents and almost one-half of the races had at least one candidate running “clean.”

Maine saw a 40 percent increase in the number of contested primaries and an overall increase in the number of women running for office this year. Many candidates cite the reform as a key factor in their decision to run.

Clean Election reform not only enhanced participation and competition in Maine races, but it also liberated many candidates from special interest funding. One-third of Maine’s legislators were elected without ties to special interest money.

In the Senate, 17 of 35 members won their seats without private funding. In the House, 45 out of 151 winners participated as Clean Money candidates.

In Maine races where a Clean Election candidate ran against a privately-funded opponent, Clean Election candidates won 53 percent of the time.

In Maine, Arizona and Vermont, we are beginning to see the benefits of a bold new experiment in campaign finance reform that could help restore the principle of one person, one vote. We hope to replicate that kind of program here in Connecticut.

Connecticut has made significant progress on moving a clean-election style bill through the legislative process. Last year, a coalition of more than 40 organizations, including Common Cause/CT and the Green Party, pushed a public financing bill through the state House and Senate.

Unfortunately, Governor Rowland vetoed the strong campaign finance measure. Those who founded our country had a vision of government of, by, and for the people. As long as candidates must rely on raising private money to get elected to public office, candidates and our legislators will be the captive of special interests.

A Clean Elections system will allow candidates to compete by showing broad support from voters instead of narrow support from wealthy interests.

We will continue to fight for election reform that ensures that every citizen’s vote counts. And we must not rest until we open up our election system for any candidate who wants to run for office—fromany party.

Karen Hobert Flynn is a Consultant and a former Executive Director of Common Cause/CT

Green Party Works For Connecticut

Universal Health Care Legislation

by John R. Battista, M.D.

Green Party members throughout the state are lobbying local legislators and members of the Public Health Committee to support the Connecticut Health Care Security Act which would:

- Provide comprehensive health care insurance for all Connecticut residents.
- Cover all inpatient, outpatient, and long-term health care, all diagnostic tests, all medications, and all medical equipment recommended by a licensed health care giver.
- Provide free choice of any licensed health care provider.
- End managed care pre-approval requirements.

The Connecticut Health Care Security Act would accomplish these goals by:

- Decreasing administrative expenses by at least one-half.
- Decreasing costs of medications and durable medical equipment by 30-50 percent through bulk purchasing.
- Emphasizing preventive health care.
- Negotiating fees with all health care providers.
- Establishing global budgets for all Connecticut hospitals and health care organizations.
- Coordinating medical services through out the state.

The health care insurance would be paid for by:

- Pooling existing state and federal health care dollars used for Connecticut residents.
- Eliminating state and federal government pay for all residents eligible for existing health care programs.
- Health care payroll premiums paid by all employers of Connecticut residents.
- Family health care premiums collected through the state income tax system.
- Excise taxes on activities detrimental to health, such as tobacco products.

There would be no cost for families up to 185 percent of the federal poverty guidelines. Four of five Connecticut residents are expected to save money on health care under the proposed legislation. Overall, Connecticut health care costs are expected to decrease by up to 10 percent.

The health insurance program would be administered by a health care trust under the control of health care advocates and health care providers responsible to state government.

The Connecticut Health Care Security Act would improve quality of care by:

- Eliminating the poorer quality of care associated with for-profit, managed health care insurance.
- Providing higher quality health care to the poor and uninsured.
- Educating health care givers to the latest research on the treatment of all medical conditions.
- Ending disruption of the continuity of care associated with managed care programs.
- Returning decision making back to health care givers.
- Ending disruptions of patient confidentiality associated with managed care.

The Connecticut Health Care Security Act is consistent with the Green Party’s reform calling for single-payer, universal health care throughout the United States. This type of health insurance program exists in all other industrialized countries in the world. It is associated with better overall health care statistics, equal quality of care for acute illnesses, and costs on average less than one-half of what the United States currently spent on health care.

Two years ago this legislation passed out of committee but was never raised for vote. This year the bill never made it out of committee! Call your legislators and demand that the Connecticut Health Care Security Act get a fair hearing in the health committee and on the floor of both houses of the Connecticut General Assembly.

To help the cause and obtain more information contact the Connecticut Coalition For Universal Health Care web site at http://thehealthserver101.com, call Dr. Battista at 860-354-1822, or contact your local Connecticut Green Party chapter.
in the project, is one of Mayor DeStefano’s biggest contributors. The Mall project was probably the most divisive issue in New Haven politics in recent memory. Lawsuits and bad publicity had delayed groundbreaking for over a year. The sheer size of the project’s corporate welfare price tag caused the state government to hold up money for more worthy projects around the city. Even city democrats were beginning to question the wisdom of putting all the city’s development eggs in one basket.

The proposed 1.5 million square foot retail project was the biggest part in the democrat administration’s continuing efforts to gentrify and suburbanize the city. The city is considering the so-called Buckley Plan to replace stores and buildings that cater to New Haven’s poor and minority shoppers and develop downtown into a pricey retail district aimed at attracting out-of-towners. There is a noticeable dearth of commerce on Dixwell Avenue and in the Hill District, two of the city’s largest African-American neighborhoods. The thrift and dime stores, and the merchants who market to African-American New Haveners, are often the only place many city people can shop without leaving town to go to the extensive strip malls in Orange and Hamden. Even now, the city government is planning to buy downtown properties that do not have businesses that are up-market enough for the city’s Planning Department.

In sharp contrast, the New Haven County Green Party Chapter leans toward development that does not push out the poor or smack of the racism inherent in catering to suburbanites. The Local Issues Committee of the New Haven County Green Party Chapter will be tackling downtown development later this winter. By summer the Chapter will have an alternative downtown development plan for New Haven.

Tony Santini ran for State Representative in the 92nd district (New Haven-West End) will be known as The Green Party of the United States. G.P.U.S.A. will serve as a grass roots advocacy group within the Green Party of the United States.

The A.S.G.P. coordinating committee endorsed the Boston agreement in its biennial meeting in Georgia in December. G.P.U.S.A. will consider the agreement in its next annual meeting in May. A.S.G.P. also moved toward applying for national party recognition. Each state is collecting data to support the application, which will be made after the G.P.U.S.A. meeting in May. Legal advisors believe that the application will be successful.

In accord with the development of a national party presence, A.S.G.P. will begin to raise money to establish a national green party office in Washington, D.C. This office will function as an information communication center for Green Party activities in the United States. In addition, the office will assist in forming Green parties in those areas of the country where none currently exist. The hope is to have functioning Green parties in every state by the year 2002. Currently there are about 40 active state Green parties and over 900 Green Party groups on college and university campuses.

John Battista M. D. & Tom Sevigny are CT Green Party Representatives to A.S.G.P.

Mall Project Terminated

continued from page 1

I.M.S. Capital has been in business since 1984 helping people with mortgage financing. Our policy is to assist our potential clients with a FREE personal consultation, a FREE Financial analysis Report and a FREE Credit Report. With over 300 mortgage programs available, I.M.S. capital’s goal is to find affordable solutions to real estate financing circumstances. Our rates and point quotes are extremely competitive. Try us.

103% Financing Any Credit-OK

SPECIAL OFFER WITH THIS AD
$300 Cash Back Toward Closing
(Present this ad for credit toward closing costs at loan funding)

483D Monroe Turnpike (RT. 111) - Monroe, CT 06468 - Phone: 203.452.0077 - Fax: 203.459.2835
CALL TOLL FREE: 877.452.0077

I.M.S. CAPITAL CT, L.L.C.
MORTGAGE LENDER
GREEN PARTY MEMBER OWNER
We come to you - Mortgage funding anywhere in the U.S.A.

No Income/No Asset Verification Loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase</th>
<th>F.H.A.</th>
<th>1-4 Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refinance</td>
<td>Jumbo</td>
<td>Condos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Coops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Consolidation</td>
<td>Cash-Out</td>
<td>Home Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unified Green Party

Continued from page 1 will be known as The Green Party of the United States. G.P.U.S.A. will serve as a grass roots advocacy group within the Green Party of the United States.

The A.S.G.P. coordinating committee endorsed the Boston agreement in its biennial meeting in Georgia in December. G.P.U.S.A. will consider the agreement in its next annual meeting in May. A.S.G.P. also moved toward applying for national party recognition. Each state is collecting data to support the application, which will be made after the G.P.U.S.A. meeting in May. Legal advisors believe that the application will be successful.

In accord with the development of a national party presence, A.S.G.P. will begin to raise money to establish a national green party office in Washington, D.C. This office will function as an information communication center for Green Party activities in the United States. In addition, the office will assist in forming Green parties in those areas of the country where none currently exist. The hope is to have functioning Green parties in every state by the year 2002. Currently there are about 40 active state Green parties and over 900 Green Party groups on college and university campuses.

John Battista M. D. & Tom Sevigny are CT Green Party Representatives to A.S.G.P.
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Electric deregulation is in the news again as the state of California experiences a so-called “energy crisis.” The California Public Utilities Commission (P.U.C.) and Governor will go into full effect on January 1, 2004. In both California and in Connecticut, consumers were saddled with paying off “stranded costs.” Stranded costs are the money that utilities say is owed for the cost of their power plant investment when deregulation took away their electric market monopoly. In California the bail out of stranded costs will cost $20 billion, and in Connecticut the cost will be over $2 billion. Stranded costs are paid by you on your electric bill each month, and are a subsidy to an incumbent electric utility. This same incumbent utility may also own local generating facilities which also sells you electricity. In this way the incumbent utility’s parent company can really never lose.

California was also the first state to actually implement this new electric deregulation and create a “free market” where “competition” among generators would set the price and government regulation would be eliminated. Then the “free market” experiment are now routinely referred to in the press as a “debacle.” California is now in the process of spending billions of dollars more on further bailouts and subsidies for utilities and Connecticut may do the same in the future.

ENERGY CRISIS

California is having an “energy crisis” according to recent news reports. We are told that the Golden State does not have enough power plants and that is why California is having a shortage of electricity.

In California really having an “energy crisis”? Many experts and consumer groups are pointing to the fact that California has a large winter reserve of electric power and has had that reserve for many years. According to the California Energy Commission (C.E.C.), generating plants within California have the capacity to produce about 52,500 megawatts of electricity. Yet huge price increases and blackouts recently occurred when the demand was less than 34,000 megawatts.

Dividing unused capacity by demand shows that California actually has an electric reserve of more than 24 percent during the winter months. Energy experts say that a margin of 14 percent is considered more than adequate.

According to the consumer group The Citizens’ Rights Forum, Inc. (C.R.F.) a major price increase recently occurred when the demand was less than 24 percent during the winter months. Energy experts say that a margin of 14 percent is considered more than adequate.
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Continued from Page 6
“dereregulated” electric market. This is parvene economics. Competition is supposed to be the driving force behind price reductions not the current model. If we have to artificially raise rates to encourage market entry, then you don’t have a market, at least not one that should be left unregulated. What is the point of competition if the result isn’t price reductions? Better customers know that it is in their best interest to vote with their dollars to support candidates who push for an electric industry that is free of government interference and that works on the premise of supply and demand in electricity use and will keep our hard earned money and energy in Connecticut. We need an elected D.P.U.C., which will answer to us and will re-regulate the electric industry. We need a Citizens’ Utility Board, which will research and represent consumers before the legislature and other government agencies. We also need Municipal Utility Districts, which will produce clean and affordable energy and will be locally controlled. If we do not move in this direction we will find ourselves spending tens of billions of dollars on more bailouts and subsidies that will go in the pockets of greedy corporations. In just a few years we may one day wake up to a spoiled environment and a nation without liberties.

Mike DeRosa runs for State Senator in the 2nd District and hosts the radio show New Focus (wwhu 91.7) by Tom Ethier

One of the key issues for the Connecticut Green Party in 2001 and indeed one that we discussed during the past election is corporate welfare. Corporate welfare—loosely defined as public subsidies such as low interest loans, loan guarantees, grants, corporate tax breaks and other tax giveaways and incentives has risen dramatically over the last twenty years. As a category, Federal spending on corporate subsidies exceeds government spending on housing and education combined. Though the features and effects of corporate welfare—or corporate subsidies if you prefer, are rarely discussed in most political debates and campaigns, it does make its way into the public discourse once in a while.

In 1999 the state of Connecticut gave to the New England Patriots football team a striking example of corporate welfare and one that was able to grab and hold the attention of the public primarily because it was so brazen and done in such an undemocratic fashion. When moves such as these occur they tend to arouse the public for the moment but are then often forgotten while other giveaways continue uneexamined.

Public assistance to corpora-
tions is not always bad for citizens and taxpayers or at least it doesn’t have to be. Most calls for these forms of aid and support are couched in the language of increasing jobs and sometimes they even do produce these benefits. That they are used at all should at least make people realize that we don’t actually live in a free-market economy despite the usual rhetoric from many politicians, intellectuals and business leaders. Given all this and despite some limited successes, the record of public giveaways in achieving their purported goals in Connecticut is generally poor.

From 1992-1998, there were 441 corporations in Connecticut that received more than $250,000 in state aid. Half of these companies either eliminated jobs or created no new jobs. During this time, the corporate beneficiaries were also pretty bad at projecting the number of jobs that they did create. While they claimed they would create over 24,000 jobs, more than two-thirds of the companies fell below their projections in job creation.

Another measure of the value of corporate subsidies is cost per job created; this is also weak. The Federal government specifies $255,000 or below in subsidies per job created as an adequate benchmark for corporate subsidy programs. (Just as a comparison, the Patriots Stadium deal was literally “out of the ballpark” in this category, with some estimates as high as $250,000 per job created.) In Connecticut since 1992, the average subsidy per job clocked in at nearly $355,000—more than 55 percent above the Federal government’s limit. In the end, only about one-fifth of the companies receiving assistance were able to meet their job gain projections and keep the cost at less than $355,000.

Given the history of these corporate welfare programs, it is in the interest of citizens and taxpayers to see that these programs are effective and accountable. One way to address this concern is through legislation. Moderate legislation to hold corporations accountable for the tax dollars they receive was introduced in the State Senate last year. In the 2000 session it failed to pass by a narrow margin—it tied 18 to 18. There is a real opportunity for it to pass in 2001 if ordinary citizens contact their legislators and let them know that it is important.

This legislation is of concern to both labor organizations and to business groups such as the C.B.I.A. Labor and unions like the idea, while business groups oppose it. It can bring some accountability to the recipients of these programs while specifying the parameters that these companies can operate to be considered a “good” corporate citizen.

The legislation applies to companies that receive over $500,000 in state aid and commits these companies to certain standards. They need to create or maintain full-time jobs in Connecticut—they don’t even have to promise to create new jobs—just not eliminate old ones. Any company that moves more than 95 percent of their workforce out of state within five years of receiving the assistance must repay what they received to the state. It further specifies that the corporate recipients of taxpayer-funded job subsidies must pay at least industry standard wages to their employees. Lastly, they must comply with state and federal labor and environmental laws. If a company is out of compliance with any of the provisions they will be given 180 days to resolve the problem. All violations and responses will be reported in the Connecticut General assembly.

The Connecticut Green Party, along with the U.A.W. and Citizens for Economic Opportunity and other labor organizations, will be lobbying legislators and educating citizens on this legislation. Citizens for Economic Opportunity is a statewide coalition of community, labor and religious organizations that has been leading the charge on this issue for years. I encourage voters to contact their legislators and ask them where they stand on this issue. Tell them that you want to see your tax dollars used fairly, wisely and in a way that makes corporations accountable for the assistance they receive.

If you would like more information on challenging corporate welfare and holding the recipients of taxpayer subsidies accountable, watch for educational sessions to be held on the topic throughout Connecticut. These sessions will be reported in the Connecticut General assembly.
by Tom Sevigny

If we have learned one thing from this year’s presidential election it is this: Our Democracy is failing. The belief that our vote will be counted, the fundamental tenet of any democracy, has been called into question by events in Florida and has forced us to ask if similar voting discrepancies are occurring elsewhere in other states. It has also become quite obvious that a systematic attempt to disenfranchise minority voters was also undertaken in Florida as evidenced by reports of intimidation and obstruction by white crowds and officials, lack of ballots and working voting machines in majority black precincts, refusal of assistance and foreign language translation to voters, and failure to process registrations.

In addition, the American people learned that our current winner-take-all voting system enables candidates with less than a majority of the vote to win election, relegates third party candidates to the role of spoiler, and keeps the United States at the bottom of the list when it comes to voter participation. The warning signs of our Democracy are indeed weakening.

All of these problems, including the Florida debacle, could have been avoided if the United States enacted Instant Runoff Voting, Instant Runoff Voting (I.R.V.) is an election reform that is rapidly gaining attention throughout the United States. Major efforts to replace existing plurality election laws with this more democratic alternative are underway in Alaska, New Mexico, Vermont, Washington, California, and elsewhere. Instant Runoff Voting allows for better voter choice and participation by accommodating multiple candidates in single seat races, while assuring that a “spoil-er”-effect will not result in undemocratic outcomes. Instant runoff voting allows all voters to vote for their favorite candidate without fear of helping elect their least favorite candidate, and it ensures that the winner enjoys true support from a majority of the voters. Plurality voting, used in most American elections, does not meet these basic requirements for a fair election system that promotes wide participation.

Instant Runoff Voting is a winner-take-all system that ensures that a winning candidate will receive a majority of votes rather than a simple plurality. In plurality voting—as used in most U.S. elections—candidates can win with less than a majority of the vote when there are more than two candidates running for the office. John Rowland’s victory in 1992 is an excellent example of this. In that election John Rowland received only 36 percent of the vote while the remaining 64 percent of the vote was split among three candidates. In other words, the majority of the people did not want John Rowland to be governor, yet that is exactly what happened. In contrast, I.R.V. elects a majority candidate while still allowing voters to support a candidate who is not a front-runner. I.R.V. is a sensible method in single winner elections.

I.R.V. allows voters to rank candidates as their first choice, second choice, third, fourth and so on. If a candidate does not receive a clear majority of votes on the first count, a series of ballots are counted using each voter’s top choices indicated on the ballot. The candidate who received the fewest first place ballots is eliminated. The ballots are then rebalanced, with each counting as a vote for the top-ranked candidate listed on the ballot that is still in contention. Voters who chose the now-eliminated candidate have their vote transferred to their second choice candidate—just as if they were voting in a traditional two-round runoff election. This process continues until a candidate achieves more than fifty percent of the vote. Therefore, Instant Runoff Voting:

• Ensures majority rule, in contrast to plurality voting.
• Increases voter turnout by giving voters better choices.
• Experience around the world shows that voter turnout goes up when voters have a wider range of choices.
• Promotes positive, issue-based campaigns because candidates will seek 2nd and 3rd choice votes.
• Creates a clearer mandate for winning a candidate’s agenda, giving better direction for policy-making.
• Solves the problem of groupings of voters splitting their votes among similar candidates, which allows a candidate to win with only minority support.

In other words, to the fullest extent possible, this will contribute to electing a candidate that you like. Sounds like Democracy at its best to me.

An Estimate of Global Petroleum Reserves

by Tony Santini

Recently, as a small research project of my own, I have tried to find out how much petroleum there is left in the world. The first thing I found out is that there are a lot of different opinions on the matter. They range from ignoring the matter to as much as 150 years of remaining supply. I decided to do the calculations myself. I went out on the World Wide Web and did some of the research it is supposed to be useful for.

I should mention that this little project only produced an estimate of when we might run out of petroleum. It is impossible to exactly know several of the quantities I used to calculate the final estimate. The first quantity I found was the amount of petroleum left outside the U.S. In a U.S. Geological Survey press release issued earlier this year, Thomas Ahlbrandt, U.S.G.S. World Petroleum Assessment project chief, said: “There is still an abundance of oil and gas in the world. Since oil became a major energy source about 100 years ago, about 570 billion barrels of oil have been produced outside of the U.S. We now estimate the total amount of future technically recoverable oil, outside the U.S., to be about 2120 billion barrels.” (http://energy.cr.usgs.gov/energy/WorldEnergy/WFPNews_Release3.03.htm) So I started my estimate with this figure of 2120 billion barrels of oil outside the U.S. This, strangely enough, includes known reserves as well as undiscovered reserves. How one goes about estimating an undiscovered quantity, I know not, but I will trust that the experts have a way to do just that.

But, of course, the U.S. also has a large amount of petroleum. The most recent figure I could find on the Internet was a U.S.G.S. assessment from 1995 (http://energy.cr.usgs.gov/energy/stats_ctry/Stat1.html#Reserves). In 1995, the U.S.G.S. estimated that there were 110.5 billion barrels of petroleum, both known and undiscovered (there it is again). I decided that this figure would be the best I could do. I decided to say, for the sake of this estimate, that the total amount of U.S. petroleum in reserve remained constant from 1995 to 2000, i.e. just as much new supply was found as was used.

So we started off in the year 2000 with a total of 2230.5 billion barrels of petroleum spread throughout the insides of Mother Earth. Considering that some of that petroleum remains as yet undiscovered, this seems like as good an estimate as any. There could very well be no

Continued on page 11

Abbreviated chart, please see article to inquire about getting statistics year to year.
NEW HAVEN COUNTY CHAPTER OPPOSES BURNING OF OIL AT ENGLISH STATION

by Tony Santini

In the wake of electric deregulation, the New Haven area is faced with gaining a sibling to its filthy five plant. Quinnipiac Energy plans to reopen English Station on Grand Avenue in Fair Haven. English Station is an ancient power generating facility built on an island in the Mill River over a century ago. The United Illuminating Company expanded the generating facility throughout the last century until it presented a Dickensian façade dominating New Haven’s inner harbor. U.I. closed the plant in 1992 because it was too antiquated to continue operating. When the company considered decommissioning the plant, they found out it would cost over $6 million, which it would have to pass on to its stockholders. Instead, it found an easy way to weasel out of it. Quinnipiac Energy, a new partnership formed specifically to operate English Station, agreed to take over the plant if U.I. would give it $4.5 million. This way, U.I. could pass the cost on to its ratepayers in the form of stranded costs (euphemistically listed as “lost assets” on customers’ bills).

Quinnipiac Energy will reconstruct English Station in two phases. First, Q.E. plans on burning oil in the old building 22 days a year for two years. In the meanwhile, Q.E. will construct four new gas turbine generators to replace the oil burners. A byproduct of the gas generators will be steam and hot water, which the company would like to sell to nearby factories to replace their own oil-burning generators. This sounds good in theory. The New Haven County Green Party Chapter and other environmental and environmental justice groups in the area have several problems with the plan. First, by Q.E.’s own estimate, burning oil will increase local air pollution by 2 percent to 5 percent, and it will happen in an area of the city that already has air quality reminiscent of a drive along the highway through Newark, New Jersey, and a childhood asthma rate that is already shameful. A recent study for the Health Effects Institute was conducted by Dr. John Samet, professor of epidemiology at Johns Hopkins School of Public Health. Dr. Samet found that a 0.5 percent increase in particulate matter emissions, a type of pollution typical of oil-burning facilities, will result in a 1 percent increase in mortality rates and 2 percent to 4 percent increase in hospital admissions of senior citizens. Particulate matter is a type of pollutant emitted by oil-burning power plants. The study is available online at http://www.healthyeffects.org/Pubs/Samet.pdf.

Second, there is nothing in Q.E.’s permit from D.E.P. that would limit them to burning oil for only two years. Q.E. will be selling electricity at peak times and, calculating with recent peak electric prices, the company stands to make anywhere from several million to a hundred million dollars a year in an increasingly tight energy market. Q.E. claims that the gas-fired phase, if successful, will decrease local pollution greatly, and no one doubts this. But the key words here are “if successful”. There is also a question of whether the Southern Connecticut Gas Company will be able to pipe enough natural gas to English Station and how this will affect homeowners’ rates. Also, many people in the coalition working on the issue simply do not trust Q.E. to follow through on its plan to phase out oil burning. Even if one does not believe Q.E.’s priorities to be heartfelt, greedy people, the sheer amount of money that could be made from selling oil-generated electricity may be blinding them to the bad that they could do. In all fairness to Q.E. and its main partner Mark Minnenberg, it has been more responsive to the concerns of the community than would be expected from a company that stands to make as much money as it does. Mr. Minnenberg, although he lives in Killington now, is originally from Fair Haven, which is now a mainly Latino neighborhood. His mother still lives nearby and his family roots in Fair Haven go back several generations. Mr. Minnenberg has been willing to give tours of the plant to anyone who wishes to see it, including those opposed to its reopening, and has talked with several activists about using a large, empty building on the property to develop renewable energy sources. There is also the question of money. A functioning, profitable English Station may contribute an estimated $3 million in local property taxes to cash-strapped New Haven, and could contribute many tens of millions of dollars to the local economy in the form of construction and permanent jobs.

Still overall, the Green Party chapter has decided to oppose the oil-burning phase. A press release written by the Local Issues committee was recently used for an article in Tiempo, a Spanish-language weekly. And we continue to work in coalition with other like-minded groups in New Haven.

Thanks to Laura Smith and Tom Amatruda for research

EFFICACY

The tide is turning in the War on Drugs

With public sentiment rising for sensible drug policy, a youth movement demanding an end to the insanity and prominent politicians decrying the U.S.’s failed approach, the time has come!

The time has come!

The Drug War has caused a massive prison surplus with over 2 million people now incarcerated in the U.S.

It’s time to end the war on drugs!

The Drug War is not working. Use and abuse levels have risen over the thirty years of the Drug War.

European nations are successfully implementing programs based on alternatives to the War on Drugs. In South America, the President of Uruguay recently declared the Drug War a failure and voiced support for legalization of drugs.

Legitimate capital investment can never be more profitable than prohibition-induced drug trafficking or cultivation.

Alternatives to the Drug War have to be as far-reaching and pervasive as the problem itself.

Want more information? Want to help?
Contact Efficacy, PO Box 1234, Hartford, CT 06143  860-285-8831
The FTAA: The Silent Killer

by Kitty Giannini

The Free Trade Area of the Americas (F.T.A.A.) could be the most important trade agreement in modern history, but you are certainly not going to hear about it on your local news stations. The F.T.A.A., often called “N.A.F.T.A. on steroids,” is an expansion of the N.A.F.T.A. (North American Free Trade Agreement) to the entire Western Hemisphere, excluding Cuba. The F.T.A.A. was first discussed during the Summit of the Americas in Miami in December 1994, after the successful passing of the N.A.F.T.A. earlier that year. This new agreement, which will affect the lives of over 800 million people, is set to go into effect by the year 2005. It is difficult to predict the ultimate effects that the F.T.A.A. will have because the entire process of its formation is being done behind closed doors, and negotiators refuse to make the documents accessible to the public or even to members of Congress, who will eventually have to make a decision on whether or not to pass this agreement. It is predicted that the Bush administration will attempt to get fast-track legislation within the first 100 days of his presidency. Fast-track empowers the executive branch by barring Congress from changing a bill that involves other countries, allowing Congress to vote only yes or no. Fast track is what the Clinton administration used in 1993 to pass the N.A.F.T.A. unchanged and with very little public support. During that session Congress had a maximum of 20 hours of floor debate and was allotted 60 legislative days to decide on a document containing over 600 pages. It is obvious why the Bush administration wants fast-tracking back under their belt as the U.S. now seriously delves into the F.T.A.A. negotiations.

Because all talks are being done in secret, we can only look at what we know, the N.A.F.T.A. and the W.T.O., as examples of what the F.T.A.A. will look like. Negotiators have already made it very clear that the F.T.A.A. will be modeled after the N.A.F.T.A. and will be “W.T.O. compatible.” Taking a look at the N.A.F.T.A.’s track record, applying this failed model to 31 more countries is most definitely a recipe for disaster. According to the consumer advocacy group Public Citizen, since the N.A.F.T.A., over one million U.S. jobs have been lost due to companies relocating to Mexico for cheaper labor, the U.S. trade surplus with Mexico has now become a $18.6 billion deficit, eight million Mexicans have fallen from middle class to below the poverty line, and about 44 tons of toxic waste are disposed of improperly every day along the U.S. Mexican border, creating enormous environmental and health problems to U.S. and Mexican citizens alike. It is clear that the promise of more jobs, less poverty and a healthier environment through the N.A.F.T.A. have all been broken. Why then would the U.S. be pushing so hard to write a similar trade agreement for the entire Western Hemisphere? The answer is fairly simple; the U.S. always protects its corporate interests and the almighty dollar above all else. Trade agreements like the N.A.F.T.A. liberalize borders, make it possible for corporations to sue governments directly and undermine basic environmental, labor and safety standards. The N.A.F.T.A. has its own separate court system, which can rule on cases between corporations to sue governments and corporations. In a case between a U.S.-based corporation and the Canadian government, Ethyl Corporation forced Canada to pay $15 million in reparations and drop the ban on MMT, a gas additive that attacks the human nervous system, claiming that the ban was an unfair “trade barrier” and had caused a significant loss in potential profits.

There are steps that we can take as U.S. citizens to make our voices heard in opposition to the F.T.A.A. The next Summit of the Americas in which 34 heads of state and corporate representatives will be meeting on the F.T.A.A. is this coming April 18-22 in Quebec City, Canada. People all over the hemisphere are currently planning a mass mobilization to protest the F.T.A.A. in Quebec.

On April 11th from 4-8PM at the Hartford Public Library Auditorium C.G.A.N. is hosting a teach-in/direct action training given by “A Call to Action Caravan” that are experienced activists from all over the U.S. This event is open to the public. The event will focus on local issues and link in globalization and the F.T.A.A. to local struggles and local action planning. If you would like to become active with this campaign please contact Kitty at 860.768.6380 or smashthestate@riseup.net! Kitty Giannini is a member of C.G.A.N.
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Petroleum Supplies, Continued
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undiscovered petroleum, but if U.S.G.S. set that one expert’s estimate it might cause an international panic, don’t you think?

Next thing was to find out how much petroleum Homo sapiens (which may be a tachonomic misnomer) use. That’s where our second branch of the federal government comes in. In 1996, the Department of Energy spent your tax dollars to find out that the developed countries of the world were using petroleum at a rate of 41 million barrels per day in 1993. Furthermore, that rate was rising by 0.9 percent every year and would reach just under 50 million barrels per day by 2015. Less developed countries were using 26 million barrels per day, and that figure would rise by 3 percent per year and would pass the quantity used by developed countries sometime around 2015. (http://pubs.usgs.gov/openfile/ofa0696/oa.pdf).

These figures are per day, so if you add them together and multiply by 365, you get a Gaia-wide total of 57,605,358,734,960 barrels of oil used in the year 2000. D.O.E. didn’t seem to want to commit to predicting petroleum usage after 2015, but I decided to keep the annual increases the same. After all, I haven’t heard anyone saying daily commutes are getting any shorter, have you?

There. We have a baseline to start with. With the magic of computers by my side, I started plugging my figures in to Microsoft Excel. With no help from that little animated paperclip Bill Gates provides you for assistance, I created my petroleum spreadsheet.

According to my calculations based on U.S. government figures and a little fudging, there is approximately 50 years of petroleum left. That’s it. By 2051 it should be all gone. Of course, it really isn’t that simple. As I said before, how can U.S.G.S. know much of an undiscovered thing exists? And D.O.E. doesn’t trust itself to predict more than 19 years into the future (if only I could find a tarot reader with that kind of clutzpah!) I guess the only point to this exercise is to show that petroleum really is a non-renewable resource like we’ve been saying all along.

Corporate Subsidies, Continued

Continued from Page 7

provide citizens with information on how these subsidies work and how they compare with other forms of public spending. Please watch for these meetings. You can also get more information at United for a Fair Economy Web site at www.ufenet.org and Citizens for Economic Opportunity at www.ceo-ct.org. U.F.E. is a Boston based non-profit studying economic justice issues.

Tom Ether
Torrington, CT
NW Chapter
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Newtown’s Legislative Council Assailed By Greens

On Clean Up Of Environmental Time Bomb.

by Barry Besan

A massive environmental remedia
tion (clean up) question is the issue being fought over by Green Party activists David Eliscu and myself with Newtown’s First selectman and its Legislative Council. The former State men
tal institution, Fairfield Hills, which is located in the middle of the Town of Newtown is an idyllic country setting of rolling green hills and 1950’s era rustic campus style buildings which is, in reality, an environmental time bomb that is projected by experts to cost over $25 million to clean up.

At the New town Legislative Council meeting held on December 13, 2000, I made a 30 minute presentation with associate Erwin Potter of the Newtown Property Owners Association, which warned the council of the dangers of buying the Fairfield Hills facility without doing a complete Phase I environ
tmental survey to identify the location of all of the contamination problems and the amount of pollution present at the site.

State studies showed massive amounts of As
bестos, Lead and P.C.B.s in the

1.2 Million square feet of build

ing space, as well as high levels of Arsenic, Lead, Chromium and Nickel in the grounds surrounding some of 17 buildings on the 185-acre site. Soil and water testing also showed alarmingly high levels of Chlor dane, Aldrin and Dieldrin. The acceptable level of Dieldrin is 36 ppb, while the soil tests showed levels of Dieldrin at the dangerous level for Dieldrin of 1900 ppb.

With Newtown’s First Selectman pushing for the pur
chase of Fairfield Hills without conducting a complete Phase II survey, my argument is that Newtown is playing Russian Roulette with the town’s finances.

There is no way to quantify the amount of contaminated materi
al that needs to be removed during the eventual remediation process without a Phase II and subsequent cost estimates.

How can the First Selectman make the state an offer when he doesn’t know what the clean-up will cost? What if the remediation jumps up to $45 million from his current $10 million estimate? If Newtown buys the property, it will be too late to go back and renegotiate a lower cost.

The Fairfield Hills complex was built in the 1930’s at a time when the use of Asbestos and Lead were considered acceptable. There are many similar struc
tures and complexes located throughout Connecticut with all of the same built-in environ
ment)

mental problems.

State Public Works person
nel have stated that although the State allocates funds each year for environmental clean-up, the money is committed in a matter of days and only a small fraction of the problems are really addressed. Cleaning up just the buildings owned by the State of Connecticut may take over twenty years at current State allocation levels.

Eliscu made the point that as the Fairfield Hills property is located directly on top of the Pootatuck Aquifer, the sole source aquifer for most of Newtown’s drinking water, a complete environmental clean up MUST be done, regardless of whether Newtown or someone else buys the property. If we allowed the Pootatuck Aquifer to be contaminated by pollution, its loss as a fresh water source for the town would be catastrophic.

In the meeting I stated that, “There are additional major pol
lution sites in Fairfield Hills located on property still owned by the State and ignoring massive amounts of pollutants just across the street is totally unacceptable.”

This is a national problem with all older buildings. With heating and air conditioning systems coming under suspicion for bad air inside office build


ings, cleaning up environmental problems in work related areas should be a much higher priori
ty than it is currently. While our national and state governments are running huge fiscal surpluses some of this extra money should be put to use by cleaning up the work environment in older functioning buildings.

For those buildings that will be sold by government depart

ments, title should not transfer unless they are cleaned up in ad

vance. Especially Fairfield Hills.
Join Us in Our Ongoing Quest for Social Justice and Ecological Wisdom

Dear Friend,

Now that the elections are over, we at the Connecticut Green Party have turned our attentions to building a strong progressive political party and effecting meaningful social change—locally and globally. We are ordinary citizens who have said “enough is enough” to the corporate-controlled Democratic and Republican parties.

The Green Party has accomplished a great deal by electing Green Party member and representative Elizabeth Horton Sheff to the Hartford City Council:

- We stopped the citing of a medical waste facility in Hartford.
- We continue to fight against the pollution that is causing an asthma epidemic in Hartford (Hartford has the highest documented childhood asthma levels—41 percent).
- With a coalition organized by Democracy works we’ve continued to pressure the legislature to pass a campaign finance bill.

But the quest has just begun. These are the pieces of legislation we are currently working on:

- Opposing Connecticut’s “Filthy Five” Polluters.
- Universal Health Care for all Connecticut residents.
- Death Penalty Moratorium in Connecticut.
- Living Wage/Corporate Welfare Bill.
- Instant Runoff Voting.

Additionally, members are working in coalition with other groups on issues like opposing imperialistic globalization measures like the F.T.A.A. and Plan Columbia. Members are also working on National and local policy initiatives such as drug policy reform, opposition to the prison industrial complex, supporting local workers’ attempts to obtain living wages and decent benefits, and continuing our fight against the “Filthy Five” Hartford polluters. We will also begin the process of running candidates in upcoming elections.

In order to continue this work we need your help and involvement!

Our address is:
CT Green 2001
PO Box 231214
Hartford, CT 06123-1214

Please fill out and clip this form to mail in with your donation of time or money.

In CT state law requires political committees to report the name, mailing address, occupation & name of employer for each individual whose contributions aggregate to exceed $100 in a calendar year.

Green Ten Key Values

1. Grassroots Democracy
2. Social justice
3. Ecological Wisdom
4. Nonviolence
5. Decentralization
6. Economic justice
7. Gender Equity and Cooperation
8. Respect for Diversity
9. Personal and Global Responsibility
10. Future Focus

It is up to each one of us to create a better future and a “deep democracy”.
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