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Lawsuit
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A Los Angeles-based consumer activist group, the Coalition For Economic Survival (CES) has joined with the Department of Agriculture and the Justice Department in a lawsuit seeking to overturn a recent court decision that allowed Justice to stand, could cost consumers millions in overcharges for short-weighted food products. The suit, filed by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals in a case brought by Ruth Daronio of California, contends that packaged food products may weigh less than what they say on their labels, falling within "reasonable variations" only. Government inspectors can no longer remove items from sale without showing "clear and convincing" evidence they are underweight. In order to remove short-weighted items, each packs must be sampled and have to be examined and returned, all at one time. CES spokesman Joseph Donnelly said the court's actions as a violation of the "common interpretation of a product's label as a reliable, truthful representation of the amount inside the package." In announcing the suit, he said, It is being appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. CES noted that according to a 1973 report of the Department of Agriculture estimate Californians were overcharged $25 million per year for short-weighted meat products alone. A 1974 survey of flock-labeled products by the department "found an average of 50% short, and as many as 20% of the products were underweight. CES officials said this latest court decision is overruled such findings may now be called "reasonable".

Nowell sign of the times

As the crow flies, the distance between the Los Angeles City Hall and the Hearings Room in the California State Capitol Administration Building is about three blocks. For a commuter on foot, it takes about a year and costs a third of a million dollars. For Nevada, the trek did not even begin.

Nowell had himself the generality of the Pacific Outdoor Advertising Company and Foster and Kleiser for a short sojourn by the shores of the blue Pacific at Puerto Vallarta. It was suggested that Nowell's vote on December 27, 1973, on billboards and advertising signs may have been affected by his partaking of the good life. Nowell was incensed at that suggestion.

For his other members of the Council who voted against the proposal, the City Planning Commission to control billboards and advertising signs, a few hours later, was both Pacific Outdoor Advertising and Foster and Kleiser.

For example, to help him in his incertitude, Art Snyder has been given $5,000 by the two companies. John Ferraro is in for $400,000; Gilbert Lindsay for $500, Peggy Stevenson received $125; Zev Yaroslavsky got $500, and David Cunningham received $50 from Foster and Kleiser.

By John Knopf

Coming to terms with sexism

By Sharon Milan

Sticks and Stones may break my bones but words will never hurt me.

At a tender age, I was taught that certain words were taboo; among them strong slang expressions for races and ethnic groups. The reason was clear and uncontestable: just people are individuals, not predetermined to an identity by place of birth, race or skin color. Nevertheless, I heard them while growing up, and I learned that some words have the power to hurt.

Unlike broken bones which mend and are then forgotten, words don’t go away. They attached themselves to people, situations, and things. Sometimes they merely managed to create an independent existence — a status quietly acknowledged by Lewis Carroll and some relativists. I was not then aware of another insidious use of language, one that covertly convinced us that women are fundamentally inferior to men.

I call it idiocy because it is not simply a question of expression, but rather, it is built into the very fibre of the language. To talk about all of us, we said "mankind" or "men." Or, to talk general about all of us, we said "he." To talk about our ancestors, we said "the forefathers." References to women were shown to us as helpless "the damsels in distress." (the weaker sex), undesirable ("pushy broad"). A reasonable (eternally im
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Evacuating Los Angeles

Pentagon plans for nuclear war

Dave Lindoff

It is nuclear war, the unthinkable nightmare, that is being seriously considered by the Pentagon. But the nuclear war planning efforts in this "war game" is not the United States, it's the American people.

The program is called Crisis Relocation Planning (DCPA), an office of the U.S. Army in a crisis. The DCPA, as the crisis response planning office, has been second-guessing the Pentagon's plans for the area of the nation. Five to ten targets are located in the Los Angeles area, and the closest one to Los Angeles is the March Air Force Base near Riverside. This means that we could be in the crosshairs of a nuclear attack.

As Al Villere of the Los Angeles Times reports, the state's emergency response planning has been a failure. Villere's article highlights the lack of preparedness and the need for better planning.

The DCPA answer is that nuclear war might not be "all out." The DCPA plan involves the evacuation of people from the Los Angeles area. However, the DCPA plan has been widely criticized, and the Pentagon has been accused of planning for an "all-out" nuclear war.

The article concludes with a call to action for the people of Los Angeles to demand better planning and preparedness for a nuclear attack.

City government goes underground
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Dave Lindoff

At the same time that the Pentagon is pushing the idea of mass evacuations of cities during international crises, the Los Angeles City Council is also pulling out its funding for emergency preparedness for natural disasters.

Earlier this year, the federal Office of Emergency Management (OEM) announced that it was cutting its funding for emergency preparedness for natural disasters. The Los Angeles City Council followed suit, cutting its funding for the Office of Emergency Management.

The Los Angeles City Council's decision was based on a report from the Office of Emergency Management that the city was not in immediate danger of a nuclear attack. However, the decision has been criticized by some who argue that the city should be better prepared for any type of disaster.