FREE

#176.8 Oct-Nov The Fall Begins 2017

Greenfuse

E PLURIBUS UNUM

VOX POPULI

The force that through the green fuse drives the flower
Drives my green age -Dylan Thomas

JAG ©1000

WHY CALIFORNIA IS BURNING

The recent fires in California offer lessons that every westerner should pay attention to.

First: forest reduction projects will not preclude large wildfires or save communities when there is low humidity, high temperatures, drought, and high winds. Just as tropical rainforests thrive on rain which we can't stop, western ecosystems thrive on wildfire, and it is climate/weather that drives large wildfires not "fuels". We cannot log our way out of growing wildfire induced home losses.

Just like it would foolish and ineffective to try to kill all mosquitoes, trying to preclude wildfires by forest reduction projects, we should focus our efforts on making our homes and communities more resistant to the wildfires which are inevitable.

Second: homes burning down can be prevented in most cases by the implementation of fire-wise policies. Things like metal roofs, removal of grass by homes, and other measures can go a long way towards keeping a home intact even in the face of a major wildfire.

However, these policies must be implemented at the community level. If your neighbor's home is a fire trap, even if you have done all the proper fire wise policies, your house is vulnerable. Structure fires are much hotter and burn longer than a forest fire, and in many cases, what you find is a single home ignites and then like dominos falling other homes catch on fire. This is exactly what is occurred in California communities like Santa Rosa.

"Fire" Continued on page 16

Musician Leads Fight Against Panhandling Ban

A musician and his dog Boots have made Eureka, California the latest battleground in the fight over anti-panhandling laws, which a number of courts have struck down as unconstitutional.

The Eureka City Council in March passed an ordinance outlawing begging for money near banks or ATMs, gas stations, median strips, public transit stops, intersections with traffic signals and entryways to shopping centers.

Oscar Leatherman, a 63-year-old musician who lives in a van with Boots, a Chihuahua-Jack Russell mix, sued the city in Federal Court, claiming the law violates his First Amendment rights by barring him from holding a sign on a public sidewalk.

"Mr. Leatherman never verbally requests a donation from passersby when busking," the 21-page complaint states. "Instead, Mr. Leatherman plays music for the public to enjoy while going about their business, and props a sign on his guitar case that reads 'Good Karma $1.'"

In recent years courts have struck down similar panhandling bans in Colorado, Florida, Illinois and Massachusetts.

Those rulings are based on the 2015 Supreme Court ruling in *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, which challenged a town's limits on how long churches and nonprofits could post signs announcing events.

The *Reed* ruling expanded the types of free-speech restrictions that must pass stricter scrutiny to survive constitutional challenges, said Tristia Bauman, senior attorney for the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, of Washington, D.C.

"Reed v. Gilbert clarified that viewpoint restriction is one type of content-based restriction on speech, but not the only type," Bauman said. "When a restriction looks different based on the content of speech, even when there is no viewpoint restriction, it is content-based and must satisfy strict scrutiny."

To survive strict scrutiny, the government must show it has a compelling interest in limiting a particular type of speech, a hurdle many municipalities have failed to overcome, Bauman said.

"Panhandle Ban" continues on page 16

County's Compliance Contradictions

"The Planners got a great idea: **why not have the pot growers pay to upgrade those old logging roads to Class 4 standards (20' wide, basically). And compel them to join road associations which can assess them for the repairs.**"

"I suspect many roads in the county are not 20 ft wide. So your choice is going to be spending large amount of money improving roads that aren't on your property, or dropping out of the legal system and I don't think that's a good choice to give people. I mentioned to the supervisors I think they should take the cannabis tax money and use it to bring the roads up to standard. I got no response"

"The private road system in Humboldt county is larger than the public road system. I asked the Public Works guy about this. He told me that there are 6100 miles of roads in the county. 1200 of them are county roads. But the total includes city streets etc so it is still not clear how many miles of private roads there are... It's incredible that they would propose this law without any research into what cost they are proposing to impose on those growers who are trying to be legal."

"I asked about this. Public Works says if anybody - like a developer for instance - wants a road brought into the county system they have to set up a tax district to pay for it. Maintaining the roads is a basic county function, and this is a complete withdrawal from it. "

"They have proposed, and it's up to the Board of Supervisors whether to go along, that grows under 3000 square feet be exempted. I proposed, that all people applying for permits for grows prior to 1 Jan 2016 be exempted. No one on the stage jumped up and said "Amen"

"But I did get a ***"Oh for Christ's sake"*** look from Estelle. Same thing happened next meeting when I asked if there wasn't something they could do to change the status of the roads so they could get Federal Funding for the private roads just like that do for the public ones. Another *"Oh for Christ's sake"* look. Probably I should be talking to their lawyers not a Supervisor with no legal education. There is something in the law that qualifies the roads for Fed Funds. Perhaps it's not possible to make changes that would add the private roads and pick up another $20 million, but for $20 million it ought to be worth a look - and not the kind of look I got."

"Director Ford from the Planning Department says he has hired 3 or 4 new Code Enforcement officers and will be sending them out to investigate things. That creates mixed feelings in a rural crowd because we remember when the Code Enforcement agents were going to used to run us all out. (in the 1980s). Thing is the cops are scared of going out alone to investigate gardens, so who is going to go out with the Code Enforcement people. If its the cops then we're back where we started. Adding 3-4 people is a drop in the bucket. Ford and Fennell have been excited in the past about the possibility that some people were just pretending to get permits as a way to keep the cops off this year. I'm concerned that the new CEOs will simply go to sites of people who applied for permits which will be counterproductive. There will have to be 1000s of arrests to be effective, unless they can get thousands more into the permitting system. The new ordinance, even with some improvements they have made, will not do that. I'd be surprised if they get 200 with it."

"Let's say 3/4s of the growers in the county are in the black market, they represent more than 3⁄4 of the cannabis being grown because they tend to be larger. We have a new sheriff in Humboldt- Honsel, he said he could get as many as '1% of the black market', and frankly I don't think he can do that [much}... The success of the legal market depends very much on the suppression of the illegal market."

"What they should be doing is making getting legal more attractive. In my opinion the county has been a little too greedy ...They are trying to make being illegal less attractive. And yes if they arrest you it will be unattractive. But if your chances are 1/100, of making a lot of money or getting caught, those are good odds. The county, the state, the agencies must decrease the price and make it more attractive to legalize."

As told to Greenfuse by
Eugene "ED" Denson

READY FOR MURDER?

Here is a quiz to give you and your friends and relatives developed by the Extremist Crime Data Base, and published by the US Government Accounting Office, the Congressional fact finder/fact checker.

Answer Yes or No. Are you:

1 fiercely nationalistic. Y / N
2 anti-global. Y /N
3 suspicious of centralized federal authority Y /N
4 reverent of individual liberty (especially right to own guns' be free of taxes Y /N
5 belief in conspiracy theories that involve a grave threat to national sovereignty and/or personal liberty Y /N
6 belief that one's personal and/or national "way of life" is under attack and is either already lost or that the threat is imminent Y /N
7 Belief in the need to be prepared for an attack either by participating in or supporting the need for paramilitary preparation and training or survivalism Y/N
8 In addition, many persons having violent extreme far right views express support for some version of white supremacy, the Ku Klux Klan, and neo-Nazism Y/N

If you answered all 8 of these with a Yes, chances are you are a prime *"lone wolf"* candidate for mass murder. Personally I can check off 5 out of 8: numbers 2,3,4,5,6. But then I am alt/left and the US GAO report concludes that no fatalities can be attributed by people like me. Too much *antifa* on the left. Our hatred of violence I surmise makes alt/leftists immune from hatching death plots for others. So far. The guy who shot up the Congressional ballgame typically didn't manage to kill anyone.

"MURDER" Continues on page 15