Don't Watch What We Say... Mendelsohn sings a new tune

Environmentalists like greenery as a rule, and San Francisco County Supervisor Robert Mendelsohn is no exception.

Mendelsohn, a favorite of many environmentalists, sometimes genuinely and sometimes because he is the lesser of evils on the State Coastal Commission, apparently is his greenery recently when the commission voted on proposed sites for state acquisition along the California coastline.

The commission voted to accept almost every one of 200 sites which were endorsed by their respective Regional Commissions. The sole exception was a 140-acre wetlands tract in Marin County owned by Howard Hughes Summa Corp.

When the Hughes property, recommended for state acquisition by the South Coast Regional Commission, came up for consideration by the Coastal Commission, Mendelsohn, who lives hundreds of miles away, objected.

Although it was known that Archisystems, a division of the Hughes Summa Corp., has plans to develop a 600-acre marina in the area, including the wetlands tract, Mendelsohn argued that controls on development would be sufficient to protect this last restorable wetlands area along the Santa Monica Bay shore. A similar argument might have been made against acquisition of any of the other 200 sites. None was. Still, Mendelsohn "conceded" a slim majority on the commission.

South Coast Regional Commission member Normon Fay said angrily after the commission deleted the wetlands from the acquisition list, "It is an act of betrayal of what we're here to achieve." Fay refused to speculate on Mendelsohn's motives, but Katy Butler of the San Francisco Bay Guardian, said she was not surprised by the Supervisor's position.

"He still has a $200,000 campaign debt left over from his unsuccessful race for state controller," she said.

We'll be watching to see who fills the kitty after that decision.

Dave Lindoff

If readers have any tips, we invite you to send them in for the "Don't Watch What We Say" column.
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Dear Editor-

Vanguard readers interested in easing repressive for Argentinians are asked to sign this letter and send it to the Solidarity Committee with the Argentine People: 715 S. Park View, Los Angeles 00097

Dear Congressmen,

We are writing to you this day to tell you that Argentine is suffering under the brutal military junta led by General Jorge Videla which has been in control for the last 10 years. The very existence of the Argentinian people is in danger today, and the United States government has not done anything to help.

We ask you to tell the United States government that we support the Argentine people and that we want them to be free.

Respectfully,

Richard Kagan

Asian History Department
Hamline University
St. Paul, Minn.
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The Nuclear Initiative

The passage of Proposition 15 will cost Californians $40 billion in the next 20 years. That’s the view of UCSF Energy Research and Development director Paul W. Leventhal, who calls it “both a law and personal passion.” To push nuclear energy, a group of high stakes involved in the bitter battle Proposition 15—the Nuclear Safeguards Initiative—upon which voters will decide June 8. It points to the kind of emotional claims that will cloud the vital issues.

The last few years soaring utility prices have driven the cost of the energy crisis. The need for dwindling resources has led to increased pressure on utilities while the energy crisis is still engulfed with record costs. But the carefully orchestrated crisis has left to no profound need for the need for Americans to support the reliability of the energy grid. Assumptions now taken for granted have now become cloudy issues.

Clear fusion power is one of the essential elements in the mix designed by those who believe in virtually unchecked power. Scientists, too, who speak of nuclear fusion as an ideal source have now come to turn their promise: Industry spokesmen, who claimed that the need would no longer make sense, are now reorganizing their calculations. And able is finally involved in the battle.

June 8th initiative sounds those concerns but centers on the question of safety safeguards. Proposition 15 for a public review of the utility’s systems, demonstrated by the state legislature in the face of the state legislature's emergency emergency. The November 1970 measures, and that nuclear wastes be stored safely, and full attention to the public in the face of a reactor accident.

Proposition 15, sponsored by the Kern County Safe, believes that these fundamental requirements should not be the nuclear industry, too, to the regulatory agencies and public elected representatives. The public initiative demands. The Kern voters declare that nuclear plants must meet safety to the satisfaction of two-thirds of the legislature. Failure to those tests would lead to shutting down and even the banning nuclear power generating.

Voters declare the initiative in practice would end nuclear power as a power source in forms—a view rejected by 35,500 voters. The organization represents not only the large industry and utilities but leading political figures in the region, including former Governor Brown and former L.A. County Supervisor. Kern voters leader, and John T. St. John. Voters leader.”

Nuclear power is hazardous to your health.

Your government wants you to be aware of the dangers of nuclear energy.

Your government does not want you to be aware of the dangers of nuclear energy.

Nuclear energy is not hazardous to your health.

There are 56 nuclear power plants licensed to operate in the United States today. Together they provide only about 3% of the total electric capacity. Three plants are operating in our state: Humboldt Bay, Rancho Seco near Sacramento, and San Onofre near San Clemente, but many more are in various stages of planning and construction. By the year 2000 there could be as many as 50, so it is urgent now to assess the safety and reliability of nuclear plants before our safety needs are in place, and unless Ralph Nader calls “unsound, unnecessary, and unreliable.”

The $40 billion argument the Energy and Research Development Agency official used represents the threat that the nuclear industry hopes will help them to victory, but it is based on distortions of the real costs involved, outdated projections of electric demand, and inflated prices for alternative sources.

Never before has so much money been devoted to the development of a technology, and yet enormous gaps still exist in the safety of nuclear power. The current estimates have become dimmer, rising construction and finance costs, and increased public opposition. Taken together, they reveal a crisis of faith in the part
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