

THE PEOPLE MUST NEED TO CHANGE THE SYSTEM, and baring a miracle at the national level, should try to show it can be done at state level, and to attempt it while there is still time.

Refering once again to Mr Toffler's speeding train, we have increased the speed a thousand-fold, but continue to maintain the same out-dated signals along the way in the mistaken belief that what seemed to work fifty or a hundred years ago will work now. And this from the most advanced technological society in the history of the world.

THE MOTTO OF THE LOTTO

Don't call us...we'll call you.

Imagine for the moment if someone were to campaign for a seat on a grand -jury. Imagine that he said, "Vote for me, and if elected, I'll decide in your favor if you ever get into trouble with the law". But we don't do that. People don't run for juries. Imagine a company spending thousands, hundreds of thousands of dollars to have one or more of their friends placed on a jury that was about to hear evidence in a trial of that company. What would you think about that? What would you think about the jurors thus selected? Yet we compound this process thousands of times every two to four years in local, county, state and federal elections. Are we less moral today, or have we been lulled to sleep by the propaganda of the politicians and the elite political cartel that has purchased them?

Would not any common crook bribe a jury if he could? If you don't want to be indicted by a grand-jury for criminal acts, then you had better hire that jury and keep them there as long as possible. One acceptable way to do this is by starting one or more Political Action Committees (PACs) to finance your man's "election", time and again. And when the people attempt to limit the PAC contributions, as they have done here in California recently, the PACs find ways around this law. The press reported on this on January 2, 1989:

San Jose Mercury News item:

Politicos plot ways around Prop. 73

By Bert Robinson

Mercury News Sacramento Bureau

SACRAMENTO — Seven months after Californians voted to weaken the link between money and politics, officeholders and special interests are quietly devising new schemes to preserve the old ways of doing the public's business.

In fact, politicians and lobbyists now concede that the newly enacted Proposition 73, like campaign reforms of the last two decades, may have far different consequences from those its backers intended.

Political action committees, which will be limited to contributions of \$5,000 per candidate, plan to reshape themselves into clusters of committees that will geometrically increase the power of a particular interest. Politicians, who will have to gather money in smaller chunks, worry that they

See PROPOSITION 73, Page 1&A

Politicians, lobbyists try

PROPOSITION 73, from Page 1A
will have to spend more time building their campaign treasuries than before.

The preparations have grown Byzantine because large portions of Proposition 73, which took effect Jan. 1, remain clouded by debatable interpretations and legal challenges. But from what they see now, the state's top political strategists say the new rules can be manipulated nicely.

"I think most of my clients are going to be able to give pretty much what they gave in the past," said Charles Bell, a Sacramento lawyer who has spent months analyzing the proposition for some of the state's largest PACs. "The main concern you have with something like this is what the competition is doing, and will they beat the system sooner than you."

Always a way around

Even Ross Johnson, the Republican assemblyman who wrote Proposition 73, acknowledged last week that "what one human mind can conceive, another human mind can always conceive a way around."

The plots to undermine Proposition 73 fall into three basic categories.

✓ **Dodging the contribution limits.** Proposition 73 restricts an individual giver to \$1,000 per candidate, a small committee to \$2,500 per candidate, and a so-called "broad-based committee" (one having 100 or more members who supply its funds) to \$5,000. The limits seem tight, but in a Friday



Ross Johnson

... Authored Proposition 73

interview, Santa Clara County Supervisor Susanne Wilson explained how to ease past them.

At Wilson's March "street fair" fund-raiser, contributors will be asked to give \$1,250 each. Noting that the request might appear to run afoul of the \$1,000-per-individual limit, Wilson said, "What will happen is that a man could give \$1,000 and his wife can give \$250. Or he can pay and his corporation can pay." The source of the money, in other words, might be a single person, but there will be separate checks from nominally different contributors, so single-person limits won't apply. Proposition 73 does not specifically ban this.