

Parents Continue Struggle for Decent Daycare

March 10 at 2pm a group of parents from the UCSD Day Care Center met with Chancellor William McElroy at his office to discuss day care and to explain opposition to his plans to contract an outside agency to operate UCSD day care, announced in a memo that morning. The meeting was interrupted at about 2:30 pm when McElroy walked out.

McElroy later told the San Diego Union that he "didn't have to listen to a shouting match." However, the parents all agreed that no shouting had occurred and that the Chancellor's departure took place after one parent suggested that his support of day care was "hypocritical." At that point, we were told, McElroy "lurched forward, put out his cigarette and said, 'I don't have to listen to this crap,'" and stalked out.

Before the blow-up, McElroy had agreed to investigate administrative funding for the Center's director, which would absorb the deficit, and to have the

continued on page 3



Sundesert Proposal Alive—Citizens Protest

On March 7 over a hundred demonstrators sang, shared dinner and listened to representatives from community organizations berate SDG & E's attempt to bury nuclear safeguard laws. SDG & E's proposed Sundesert plant cannot meet California's minimum safety standards. The utility has begun paying jr. high and high school students to circulate petitions in favor of the unsafe facility. The students are recruited through official school channels and must dress conservatively, not wear sunglasses and in order to hide their ignorance of the issue they are to refuse to answer any questions.

new indicator

Volume 3 Number 12

UC San Diego

March 21-April 3, 1978

Commentary

Behind the Daycare Crisis

Establishing Day Care at UCSD has been a long struggle. The most recent ground surfaced two years ago when crowded, unsafe conditions drew attention from the state inspector and local TV stations. The parents organized, the Chancellor promised a permanent center with 60 slots (32 now) and upgraded the site. Then, as soon as the 75-76 school year ended, he transferred Day Care from Student Affairs to Business Office control.

Last year the parents adopted a wait-and-see attitude. The Business office convinced the parents not to apply for State Dept. of Education funding and the deficit rose. Parents familiar with the Center's history feel that last year was a cooling-off period preparatory to finding the Center "financially unfeasible." The suspicion was not allayed this year: when, several months ago, a source inside the Business Office confided to one parent that powerful administration interests were determined to close the Center irregardless.

The Committee Report

The Chancellor commissioned an Ad Hoc Committee on Day Care Options, composed of Day Care staff, undergraduate and graduate student reps, administrative reps, parent reps, and an outside child care expert, to study the situation. The committee investigated finances, outside centers, and system-wide UC day care. They found UCSD's Center to be among the highest in quality and one of the cheapest to operate of the UC centers.

The committee also found that most outside agencies were uninterested in operating the UC center. One agency which expressed interest was Palo Alto, a national chain. It operates cheaper than UC centers because: 1) poor teacher-child ratio (12 to 1, counting director); 2) no infant care (eliminating many UCSD children); 3) regimented programming (less attention to children); 4) extremely low wages (\$2.50-2.70/hr.).

Quality Control

In addition, committee members found that private profit centers—like their convalescent home counterparts—have a strong lobby which recently blocked state legislation which would have imposed quality control on their operations. (The Chancellor's claim to meet "the community standard" with an outside agency must be considered in

this light.)

The Chancellor says he is committed to day care but the parents see an outside agency as destruction of day care, for several reasons. First, the lack of infant care. Agencies like Palo Alto will not take infants, and the committee found that infant care is practically unobtainable in this area. McElroy has information to this effect from San Diego community child care agencies. Yet he claims he will be providing day care. Another problem is regimentation: if children cannot sit still for long periods of time, Palo Alto-type agencies will not take them.

Combine these factors with substandard wages which produce under-qualified staff and high turnover and an unstable environment for children and you have effectively eliminated day care for a substantial number of those who need it and greatly lowered its quality for the rest.

The Recommendation

Thus, when the committee made its recommendation to the Chancellor, I recommended the present Center and development of permanent funding sources, while I voted for babysitting and I for closing down or contracting with an outside agency.

Both the *Triton Times* and the *San Diego Union* have printed without criticism McElroy's claim that contracting with an outside agency was one of the options the committee recommended, yet only 1 person out of 13 so recommended.

Funding Priorities

The Chancellor says the Center costs \$88,000 to operate, and is quite frank in seeing lower wages as the cure. But after the parents' monthly fees (\$150) and State Department of Education funds are obtained, the deficit is about \$10 to 20 thousand for the present Center. Not much, seemingly, when compared to the \$4 million per year the Reg Fee Committee handles. Or to the several thousand dollars Vice Chancellor unilaterally appropriated for Mission Bay yachting facilities and an intercollegiate sports staff spot, or Hunt's \$25,000 slush fund, or the \$30,000-60,000 appropriation just to maintain McElroy's rent-free mansion. As a parent put it, the funding should be studied in perspective.

The Graduate Student Union report

of two years ago noted that UCSD has by far the most top-heavy administration in the UC system, \$170 per student more than the average UC campus. "Let's not fall for the scarcity plea," says one Day Care supporter. "If Day Care funds are to be scrutinized, let's look at them along with all UCSD funds and compare value received. Let's open the books."

The parents have a point in asserting that decent day care serves us all, that it reflects the kind of community we are and aspire to. It literally enriches the social environment and allows university access to a significant segment of the population who would otherwise be shut out.

Wage Standards

It is appalling that the administration would farm out UCSD jobs at minimum wage. A great university, as this purports to be, should set standards, not lower them to the level of the profiteers. UCSD workers should consider this a precedent. If McElroy can farm out Day Care jobs, why not hire secretaries through an outside agency (like Kelly Girls), or custodians, or gardeners, or security guards, etc. None of these operations breaks even and a lot of money could be saved here. If McElroy gets his way, work-study students will earn more than the "teachers" at a profit-oriented day care center.

continued on page 3

Taft-Hartley: Involuntary Servitude

Anyone who has been following the progress of the current coal strikes has been reading a lot about Taft Hartley.

They say that somewhere in Southern California there is a courtroom with an inscription over the door reading: "This is a court of Law not Justice." This important distinction should be made. A law is merely a rule or a regulation imposed by the state. It need not necessarily be just or even consistent with other rules the state imposes. It need only reflect the interest of those who control the state. Ours is a capitalist state. Its laws serve the capitalist class.

A case in point is the Labor Management Relations act of 1947, better known as Taft-Hartley. The law is written in complex legalese but in people's language it means among other things that is a strike threatens to disrupt the nation's capitalist economy, thus qualifying as a National Emergency Strike, the President may obtain an injunction to force workers back to work



WHY GRAD STUDENT REG FEE REP QUIT— PAGE 3

Judge Sez Cop Lied

Kozden Acquitted

OB activist Tom Kozden has been acquitted by Judge Ronald Mayo of all three counts of inciting to riot, disturbing the peace and resisting arrest stemming from his arrest during last summer's OB policesweeps.

In acquitting Kozden, Judge Mayo noted that SDPD officer Larry Wright, who has a long record of past complaints against him for the use of excessive force, "did more to incite the crowd than Mr. Kozden."

Four witnesses were presented by the defense team who had been involved in past complaints of officer Wright's alleged police brutality. Meanwhile Wright, known to many as Batman, boasted of 150-180 arrests during the controversial police sweeps of Ocean Beach. In dismissing the charge of resisting arrest, Judge Mayo stated, "It's a question of credibility. I simply do not believe the police officer."

for up to 80 days under the conditions of their last contract. Obviously this is a good way to break a strike. It is also unconstitutional

Article XIII section 1 of the U.S. Constitution reads; "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for a crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

In other words forcing people to work when they don't want to even if they're paid, is unconstitutional. But that doesn't stop presidents from invoking Taft-Hartley back-to-work injunction. They have returned to work under a second Taft-Hartley option, seizure. This allows the President to temporarily nationalize an industry and bring strikers back to work under new conditions. Union people prefer this option as they can usually get a better contract under it. But nationalization is all too temporary and coal operators are

continued on page 3

LETTERS

Reader Urges No Kentucky Fried Kids

Dear New Indicator

As a former employee of the Palo Alto system and a current volunteer at the UCSD Day Care Center, I am shocked that UCSD is considering allowing Palo Alto to take over our day care facility.

I worked at a Palo Alto preschool several years ago as a teacher. In the mornings, there were two teachers and 40 to 50 children. We had no aides. In the afternoons, one teacher went out on the playground while the other stayed inside and fixed lunch. These ratios of 1 to 20(30) and 1 to 40(50) hardly compare with UCSD's ratio of 1 teacher per 7 children (1 to 6 when work study students are counted).

Working conditions were less than ideal. Theoretically, we were entitled to two breaks and one lunch hour, but we could not take breaks and had to eat lunch with the children.

Staff turnover was quite rapid, due to the more qualified teachers leaving for better paying jobs. We teachers were paid \$3.50 an hour then, although I understand it is \$2.70 an hour now. All UCSD's current teaching staff members have at least a B.A. or B.S. in child development, and most teachers here have higher degrees. But Palo Alto only requires current enrollment in two semester units yearly of child development. No background education or experience is required for teachers.

Admittance requirements for children were that they be 3 years old and toilet trained. What about younger children and infants? No luck, they aren't eligible. At UCSD's Day Care Center, infants and un-potty trained children comprise one-third of the enrollment.

Palo Alto has a rigidly structured classroom situation, all time blocks neatly planned each day. UCSD has a highly creative, open structure that makes learning a good experience for all the children. We spent most of our time just keeping order at Palo Alto. Palo Alto has children listen rather than participate.

Speaking of creativity, innovative staff are not encouraged by Palo Alto. My own director was a highly motivated,



Member of The Committee For Decent Day Care finds Chancellor's chair to his liking.

talented person who chafed so miserably under the tight strictures that she was forced to resign in less than six months. The central office telephoned long distance every day to make sure we were keeping to the mimeographed plans in the plastic notebooks. All curriculum is predetermined, already printed. There is no input from parents or teachers. Palo Alto's central office alone controls all Palo Alto preschools—their main concern was to prevent deviation from "the rules." What will happen to parent and administrative control at UCSD?

Let me end by saying I worked for Palo Alto Preschool for four months—then I left (at the same time as two other teachers) for a job at a more flexible, open structured preschool that cared little for rules but very much for children. If anyone out there cares, please speak up for the current UCSD Day Care Center. Come by and sign the parents' petition.

Name Withheld

Look Out Kids Yer Gonna Get Hit

Observations Of A College Graduate

Dear New Indicator

We have all been fed the bull about how college will enable us to get a better paying job and improve our chances of entering the field of our choice. In the vast majority of cases this is another example of the "big lie" and empty promises the ruling class uses to pacify the people. Those of you about to graduate will see what I mean all too soon.

Recently I was compelled to take a demeaning, deadening, factory job to support myself. This job is an invaluable first hand education in the alienation

and exploitation of the workers that Marx wrote about. It also proves that a college degree in 1978 is worth less than the paper it is written on.

The first thing I noticed was how the greedy capitalists who own the factory try to get the most out of their workers while paying them the least amount possible. Our duties have increased significantly since I started working there, while our wages have been frozen at the same low amount. I can barely support myself for the less than \$100 a week take home pay, and my heart goes out to those who must support a family for that same amount. Our hourly labors result in huge profit for the fat cat bosses, yet we get a small fraction of the fruits of our labor in return.

All around the place are warnings from the management listing grounds for dismissal. This harassment and use of scare tactics to keep workers in their place never stops. The high unemployment rate which "officially" is about 10% in San Diego and easily double that amount for third world workers tends to have a chilling effect on dissent. If no jobs are available, worker discontent is effectively crushed.

In many ways the factory is run like a prison. If we leave the building even once for some fresh air, we are subject to dismissal. If we question absurd orders, we are fired on the spot. Even if we do our best, something is always brought up and blamed on the workers. If the machines, for instance, are not working properly and turning out a larger than usual amount of defective merchandise, the workers are taken over the coals for finding too many rejects.

Freedom of speech is unheard of and the employees tend to censor themselves for fear of reprisal. Every copy of the *New Indicator* that I have left for the workers to read has been confiscated by the management. This is a sad commentary on freedom in America, but a tribute to NI's effectiveness.

The primary result of this worker exploitation has been to cause fighting among the workers, and anger which is mis-directed. Instead of aiming our outrage at the capitalist system and fat

cat owners, we fight among ourselves.

The primary hope for a more even distribution of the wealth is mass education as to where power really lies in America and who really controls our lives. If the humiliation which I and my co-workers face every day can be focused and directed at the capitalist beast, only then is there hope for a more human and tolerable society. Worker's revolutionary awareness must be increased, and vital communication links such as the *New Indicator* can be quite effective in dissemination the truth about the workings and deadliness of our present economic system.

I urge all workers to share their own stories of abuse and exploitation on the job, for this coming together will tend to destroy the "divide and conquer" tactics by which the rich and powerful keep us apart.

Guy L. Fletcher

Weird Budget Practices

To: Chancellor McElroy
From: The Organizing Support Group
Re: ASUCSD Funding Practices

After seven months, Jon Bekken, of the Organizing Support Group, received a response from the Advisory Committee on Student Fee Programs Co-Chairs regarding the AS budget procedures. We have also tracked down some memos referred to in Reg. Fee minutes which were attached to the response. We have learned that Acting Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Howard Hunt never formally approved of the AS Fall '77 and yearly budget allocations, as required by University regulations. In addition, the Reg. Fee committee did not meet to consider grievances regarding these allocations. Instead, Richard Whitehill, Reg. Fee Co-Chair, conferred with eight committee members, each individually, in order to get their approval of AS allocations. This effectively prevented the possibility of conducting hearings on the budgets, and rendered inoperable the established appeals process undertaken by groups that had been discriminated against by the AS. The Organizing Support Group, in accordance with these procedures, conferred with Howard Hunt regarding AS discrimination against us.

Also we have learned that Scott Spicer, Student Organizations Advisor, froze the allocation to the Groucho Marxist Caucus without referring to any established guidelines or procedures.

In view of the fact that budgetary guidelines have been ignored and/or violated, and that there are no clear budget appeals procedures, the Organizing Support Group requests that you prevent any further AS allocations and expenditures, until an investigation into AS funding practices has been made, and such needed changes implemented.

Thank you.

the print co-op is a student-run printshop offering quality offset printing at low prices.

Located in the south wing of the Student Center.

Open Monday through Friday 10 am to 3 pm.



ANNOUNCEMENTS

Miguel Mesa, a representative of the Spanish Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo (CNT), will speak at a press conference **April 3, 2 pm** at the Center for Iberian and Latin Studies (CILAS), 1260 H—L, and at a talk **April 3, 8 pm** in the Humanities Auditorium. The CNT is a syndicalist industrial union. An articulate speaker in English and Spanish, Mesa will talk and answer questions on the CNT, workers self-management, and the Spanish labor movement. Sponsored by CNT Support Committee

Nude Beaches Committee needs volunteers to circulate initiative petitions which are available at Nude Beaches Committee office, 3950 5th Avenue, evenings, or by mail, 291-7212. Petition circulators meeting every Wed. evening, 8 pm at above address.

A Study Group/Research Project on the UC-CIA documents is being planned for the Spring term. It will be sponsored by the Organizing Support Group of the Student Cooperative Union. The topics of emphasis, the option of academic credit for those students desiring it, and other preliminary questions are presently being worked out. The study group will be aimed at bringing about maximum exposure of concrete details and implications of UC-CIA ties, particularly UCSD's. Anyone interested in helping with the preliminary work should contact the group at 276-6142.

Grad Student Reg Fee Rep Tells Why He Quit

Graduate Student Council:

After serious and careful consideration of the recent abuses of the procedures of the Advisory Committee on Student Fee Programs by the office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, I have determined that my continued participation in the committee could do no more than legitimate a bankrupt process.

The Vice Chancellor's office, with the Chancellor's full cooperation, has by its openly despotic actions made alarmingly clear its contempt for the Committee structure. This office has deliberately avoided seeking student opinion on major policy issues and has disregarded that opinion when it was expressed.

Along with the Chancellor's charge letter (the first communication I received after being appointed to the ACSFP by the Graduate Student Council) I was given the Systemwide Guidelines for the Administration of Registration Fee Budgets (10/15/76) which contained the following rather interesting provision: "Student views shall be actively solicited prior to decisions affecting University Registration Fee budgets and/or the level of the fee."

Yet it was at the first meeting of the Committee in September that I was advised that a telephone poll conducted by Assistant Vice Chancellor Rick Whitehill had approved the \$159,000 annual AS budget without any formal Committee consideration. Ostensibly the approval was contingent upon the determination of the office of the VCSA that the budgets were "reasonable and proper" and had been "arrived (at) in a procedurally correct fashion." (Memo 9/14/77: Whitehill to Acting Vice Chancellor Howard Hunt).

Nonetheless, when documented allegations of procedural violations were presented to the Committee by a number of individuals, the matter was neither investigated nor even debated (despite my strong objections).

This manipulation of the Committee by the VCSA's office might have been ascribed to the lack of experience of the Committee (five of the seven student representatives had no previous ACSFP experience) were it not for subsequent events.

The Revelle College representative, Bert Lee, revealed that \$107,000 had been improperly allocated by the VCSA's office during the summer months. The Committee voted to hear testimony from former ACSFP members as well as the VCSA's office. The former Committee members were unanimous in their condemnation of the "betrayal of trust" and the "railroading" of the Committee by the office of the VCSA. These were veteran members of the Committee who had served in some cases several years on the ACSFP. The problem was clearly not the Committee's lack of experience, but rather the VCSA's office's lack

of good faith.

The VCSA's office justified the improper allocations on the grounds that prior contractual agreements which the office was unaware of before the summer, had to be honored. The remaining allocations, they argued, had been made after careful study by the VCSA's office.

In short, the Committee was asked to trust in the VCSA's office's judgement while at the same time having to believe that contracts were suddenly materializing out of thin air. One could choose between questioning either the integrity or the competence of the VCSA's office.

That student advice had not been solicited on several allocations, and that the expressed ACSFP position was ignored in other cases, was deemed a matter of small concern.

It was at this point that the student members of the ACSFP met and determined that substantive changes in the Committee structure were indispensable if future abuses of a similar nature were to be safeguarded against. It was also agreed to demand that the Chancellor replace in the Student Affairs reserve the \$107,000 which had been improperly allocated. The student ACSFP members withdrew from the Committee process to await an administrative response.

The response of the Chancellor was a direct affront to the Committee: "Acting Vice Chancellor Hunt and I concurred (that these allocations) were proper and appropriate." (Memo 11/11/77: McElroy to ACSFP Student Members)

The VCSA's office's proposed reform of the Committee process consisted of incorporating "prior consultation" into the Chancellor's charge letter to ACSFP members. (Memo 11/10/77: Hunt to McElroy) In other words, our struggle had secured a year-old provision of the Systemwide Guidelines (10/15/76). We had the VCSA's office's implied affirmation that in future the consultation would be in good faith. But we also had the bitter experience of the "betrayal of trust" and "railroading" of the ACSFP by the office of the VCSA. We had a precedent for arbitrary and unchecked power—plays by the VCSA's office. But we had no check against such abuses in the future. The VCSA's office's proposal was simply too little, too late.

Some student ACAFP members, uncomfortable with the adversary role they had been forced to assume by the administration's overtly autocratic actions, clung to this straw as to a rare jewel. They expressed the naive belief that "incremental reform" was the answer. As the administration bulldozer backed off the demolished Committee structure, these students spoke of adding a new wing, instead of constructing defenses against future bulldozers.

Some colleagues have suggested that, by resigning from the Committee, protesting students have left an open field to the VCSA's office's railroaders. They argue that much good can still be done within the Committee structure by people who refuse to be coopted by bureaucracy.

I have considered this proposition very carefully and have decided that the possible advantages to be gained by participation (and these are dubious at best) are greatly outweighed by the acceptance of the Committee structure as it now exists. What the events of the past summer indicate is that, given this structure, no degree of student participation can prevent abuses by the office of the VCSA. In fact, it is now clear that even if students are joined by administrative ACSFP members in opposing a VCSA's office policy (as they were in opposing the allocation of the \$107,000), they are still powerless to head off the arbitrary and autocratic actions of that office.

The only structural change which could prevent abuses of the kind we witnessed last summer is to replace "prior consultation" with **concurrence** of the ACSFP and the VCSA's office on all budgetary matters. We did not advocate a change in the constitution of the Committee. We were willing to work with the illusory one-vote majority allowed student representatives. We did not want to seize ultimate control over the budget (indeed we bound ourselves to being able to implement no policy without the VCSA's office's approval). We merely wanted a guarantee from the office of the VCSA that no future allocations, like those of last summer, could ever be made again without Committee participation in the process. Concurrence means a mutual working relationship to respond to the needs of the campus community. And well we may wonder why the VCSA's office is so fearful of having to work with students in this manner.

The Chancellor has made clear he has no intention of making reparations for the improper allocation of \$107,000. Student fees were increased this year, and unless we act, they will continue to increase while the last remnants of student power are effectively usurped by an incompetent autocracy.

My continued participation on the Committee would only disguise the power grab that last summer's events signal is now under way, and would thereby deprive students of the critical opportunity to mobilize in our own defense.

If my resignation sparks such a mobilization the results will be far more significant than anything I might have done individually as an appendage to this farcical institution. But even if it does not do this, it will at least serve notice on the administrative autocrats that a reckoning awaits those who believe they can "fool all the people, all the time."

KEVIN J. O'CONNOR

Parents...

Continued from page 1

Business Office apply for State Dept of Education funding. However, he refused to halt plans to contract with an outside agency while the state funding was pursued.

According to the parents, McElroy adopted an insulting, cantankerous posture from the start, saying that he already knew what they were going to say and that he didn't want to waste his time or theirs.

The parents had collected 1200 signatures in less than two days on a petition backing the present Center and opposing outside contracting.

After McElroy left, the parents held a news conference and waited "for the Chancellor to return." About 7pm they moved to his house with a demand for a moratorium on outside contracting.

The parents said that franchising would effectively eliminate day care, especially since infant care would not be available. (Commentary in this issue outlines the main objections to franchising.)

Parents said the Business Office was behind the franchising move and that the Chancellor did not seem very familiar with the report filed by his Ad Hoc Committee on Day Care Options, which had recommended continuing the present Center by an 11 to 2 margin, with only one member supporting the franchise option. Having to depend on the Business Office to pursue state funding, they said, created a need for a moratorium on the franchising option, to assure proper attention to state funds.

The parents noted that day care is an

affirmative action issue, that it allows older students and single parents to study here. The required subsidy is proportionally small, they said, noting that as parents they are precluded from enjoying most of the things their reg fees support.

The present Center, they said, is a community model, studied by other schools and agencies. It provides early language experience, sequential mathematics development and sensory motor perspectives. Such a program is incompatible with a profit operation, they asserted, because of the low wages, poor ratio and high turnover.

The parents and their supporters cleaned McElroy's office before leaving. Triton Times reporter and Business Office employee Andy Schneider took a turn trying out the Chancellor's desk chair.

The parents continue to meet and organize resistance to the outside agency and support for "decent" day care. They will be conducting an educational campaign to familiarize the UCSD community with the issues involved and gathering support for the present Center.

Daycare Crisis...

Continued from page 1

Organization Continues

It is now clear to us and to the Chancellor that a hornets' nest has been stirred with Day Care. The parents are determined to maintain and upgrade the Center. They collected 1200 signatures of support in less than two days. Decent day care should be available to all. The present Center should be expanded to the 60 slots McElroy promised, not farmed out.



the new indicator is officially recognized as a campus newspaper by the Student Communications Board of UCSD. The views expressed do not necessarily represent those of the CommBoard, the Chancellor or the Regents.

the new indicator subscribes to Liberation News Service (LNS) and is a member of the Alternative Press Syndicate (APS).

Articles and letters are welcomed. Please type them, double-spaced, on 55-space lines and send to:

new indicator collective student organizations center
UCSD, b-023
La Jolla, CA 92093
(714) 452-2016

collective contributors & workers: brian, chris, martin, dave, sam & dave, ron, don, jon, john, sheri, tracy, charlie, andy, andrea, steve, gene, jori, yvette, debbie, robin, elyn, catherine, patrick, vic, rick and trix.

thanx.

Long Stories In Short

College Degree Worthless

from LA TIMES

GENEVA—A university degree is a ticket to nowhere as a result of the unemployment problems in Western industrialized and developing countries, according to the International Labor Organization.

A study released Wednesday said university graduates increasingly are finding their training useless and being forced to take jobs below their qualifications.

This sets off a chain reaction throughout the employment market, forcing other workers into lower categories.



Ford Knowingly Produced Defective Gas Tanks

from Mother Jones

Last fall **Mother Jones** broke the story of fire hazards associated with the Ford Pinto ("Pinto Madness," **MJ**, Sept./Oct. 77). In a low-speed rear-end collision, the Pinto gas tank can break open, creating a fire hazard. The story showed that Ford put the Pinto into production in 1970, knowing that the gas tank defect could be corrected for less than \$10 a car.

In 1973, 13-year-old Richard Grimshaw was riding in a Pinto. It was rear-ended at 35 mph. Grimshaw would probably not have been injured in the accident had the gas tank not ruptured, filling the passenger compartment with flames. Ninety-five percent of his body was badly burned.

On February 6, a jury awarded Richard Grimshaw \$2.8 million in compensatory damages and \$125 million in punitive damages. This is the largest single personal-injury judgement in history.

In another case in Arlington, Virginia, six-year old Jeremy Norton, badly burned and scarred, won a judgement of \$657,000 against Ford. The jury agreed that the Pinto's fuel system was defective. Ford attempted a statistical defense to prove the safety of the car.

In another development, the Illinois Supreme Court ruled December 12 that Ford was at fault in designing a gasoline tank that burst into flames. This time the model was the 1966 Fairlane 500. The tank design was the object of a Department of Transportation investigation which closed mysteriously during the Nixon Administration. The Court severely criticized Ford for withholding crash-test reports showing that the company was aware of a possible fire hazard.

"We cannot condemn too severely the conduct of the Ford Motor Company, said the court opinion. "It gave false answers to interrogatories under oath. It secreted evidence damaging to its case."

Nukes Sinking, Solar Gaining

Washington(UPI)—Government failure to solve radioactive waste problems in turning Americans increasingly against atomic power plants, according to pollster Louis Harris.

No other source of energy is in such disfavor, Harris says.

"A vast majority is worried that this country does not have a nuclear waste disposal program," he said. "As long as there is not a policy on nuclear waste disposal, the future of nuclear energy will be in doubt."

Americans nationwide are 47-34 percent for increasing US reliance on nuclear power, Harris said. Nine months ago Americans favored nuclear power 61 to 24 percent, he said.

Harris said the polls showed Americans 69-17 percent in favor of stepped-up offshore oil drilling, 80-8 percent in favor of a crash program in solar energy, 66-18 percent in favor of building deepwater ports for oil supertankers and 68-15 percent for incentives to promote conversion from oil and natural gas to coal.

Americans are 66-22 percent against any policy that would slow environmental cleanup programs to improve the economy and 65-22 percent against any degradation of the environment to produce more energy, Harris said.

Reluctant Regents Tab Think Tank Re: Money Morality

from LA Times

The UC Board of Regents in an untallied but apparently close voice vote agreed to subscribe to the services of the Investor Responsibility Research Center, Inc., for a one-year trial period.

The research service will provide the regents with information concerning the social consequences of UC's investment practices at a cost of \$6,700 for the year.

"If it comes to me it will go in the wastebasket immediately," regent Edward Carter said. Other conservative regents agreed with regent Verne Orr, who said the information provided by the IRRIC is "amateurish and naive."

In the past the regents have rejected proposals to join the IRRIC as well as other suggestions aimed at changing UC's age-old policy of managing its multimillion-dollar investment portfolio according to traditional business principles.

In practice this has meant selling and buying stock with the sole intention of receiving a substantial and secure return on each dollar invested.

At the regents regular meeting in May the special committee will recommend that the regents establish a Council on Social Responsibility in Investments, composed of UC students, faculty members, staff members, and alumni representatives.

Most conservative regents have already served notice that they intend to oppose the recommendation on a variety of grounds including the belief that such a council could not tell them anything they could not find out by simply by talking to other regents.



...when Gillette puts a factory in Cuba.

Small Blow Against Apartheid

ATHENS, OHIO—Ohio University's Board of Trustees voted to withdraw its investments in companies that operate in South Africa, making it the first of this state's institutions to lodge such a protest.

The University had \$52,000 of stock in Getty Oil, ITT, Mobil Oil, Emery Freight and Monsanto, all of which do business in South Africa. The Board's vote was 4 to 3.

this is a recording. return to the kitchen. this is a recording

Mexican Prostitutes Unionize

from Her Say

Mexico City, Mex.—Prostitutes in Mexico City say they will form a national union to protect themselves against police extortion and harassment. Vergara Perez, a spokeswoman for the city's estimated 70,000 prostitutes, said that a petition will be delivered to President Jose Lopez Portillo outlining the problems the women face with law enforcement officers in that city.

Recently, Mexican prostitutes threatened to divulge the names of high members of the Spanish government who frequented bordellos unless police harassment stopped and working conditions improved for prostitutes in that country.

Victims of Monogamy

from off our backs

SEATTLE—Claudia Thacker, a 41 year old battered wife recently convicted of the second degree murder of her husband and sentenced to 5 to 20 years in prison, has been allowed to remain free on her own recognizance while awaiting her appeal. The prosecution had argued throughout the trial that Thacker was not an abused woman and that the reported incidents of her abuse were fabricated and exaggerated. He apparently convinced the jury whose foreman said at the sentencing that Thacker's husband "seemed to have been a nice person with a sense of humor." That sense of humor included pelting his wife with BBs, blackening her eyes, molesting their 13-year-old daughter and repeated threatening to kill them both.

...more sexual abuse

from In These Times

A Manhattan criminal court judge recently ruled in favor of a woman who brought suit against a man who pinched her on the subway at rush hour. The defendant asked that the charges be dropped, claiming that his action did not constitute a crime. Judge Benjamin Altman ruled, however, that pinching a woman's buttocks without her consent was sexual abuse in the third degree, a misdemeanor punishable by up to three months in jail.

Although criminal court proceedings are not normally precedent-setting, Altman's ruling has been widely reported in law journals.

WORDS TO PONDER...

Barbara Walters: "Will you ever shave off that beard?"

Fidel Castro: "We would be importing Gillette razor blades, right? I don't know if they are still making them in the US, but...Do you know why we left our beard? Because we did not have razor blades. But as time passed, the guerrillas were known by their beard. It was more difficult to introduce a spy. They had to wait many months for the beard to grow. So that is why the beard became a useful thing. And finally, it became a symbol."

(Excerpt from ABC's Barbara Walters interview with Fidel Castro)

Bombers Make Connections

San Francisco, Calif.—Two bombs exploded at a Pacific Gas & Electric substation in the bay area damaging transformers and knocking out power to about 50,000 customers for over two hours last Tues, Mar 8.

The New World Liberation Front claimed responsibility for the blast in a communique to the Associated Press. The NWLF said they had bombed the PG&E station because it supplies power to US Steel and Union Carbide, companies that "have prospered off the black lungs and early deaths of coal miners."