

EDITOR'S NOTE: On Tuesday, September 19, John George, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Comm. for Quality Education made the following presentation before the Oakland School Board and many of the members of the Oakland Education Association.

AD HOC, TEACHERS AND SCHOOL BOARD

Mrs. Corneille and Gentlemen:
I want to say a few words today about the demands of the Oakland Education Association and their relationship to the problems which have plagued the Oakland schools for years.

In one sense, the community as a whole should welcome the involvement of the largest teachers' organization in the public arena, fighting for recognition that teachers, as those most intimately concerned with the education of our children, must have a significant voice in the creation and execution of policies and programs which govern their professional lives.

Their demands parallel those of the poor and the minorities, who are demanding with greater and greater energy the right to have some say in the decisions which affect their lives. And like those who fight in what is known as the movement, teachers are beginning to realize that the institutions against which they are struggling are highly resistant to change and especially to the sharing of power with others.

All this is to the good. But the OEA is relatively new to this kind of warfare, and therefore has failed to achieve a perspective which would encompass the real needs and grievances not only of themselves as teachers, but of the students and parents who are equally governed by educational policy decisions.

A community in which education were of the highest importance would be one in which teachers, students, parents and adminis-

trators would function together, with mutual respect and cooperative effort, to fulfill the essential job of educating not only students but also the community as a whole.

But the OEA's demands indicate more fear than respect for their students. They talk of "disruptive children" and seek both wider disciplinary powers and more police protection.

Certainly there are disruptive children, but the real question is not how to get rid of them, but how our society and our school system contributed to their becoming that way. When people talk of the "culturally disadvantaged" or the "socio-economic environment" they always manage to forget that the schools are part of that environment and help to establish that disadvantage. The disruptive child is communicating his refusal to accept a meaningless experience, and I for one prefer him to those who are "good" and "well-behaved" and who are passed through school without learning a thing.

We want the schools and the teachers to accept their responsibility for changing the environment and the advantages of our children. To do this, an environment must be created for each child in which he knows that his worth as a human being is respected and cherished. This is the only way that a child can himself

learn to respect and cherish others. It must be an environment of absolute fairness--and when the Ad Hoc Committee made its discipline demands, what we wanted and still want, is just that - due process for students means fairness.

The community has a responsibility to its teachers to support them financially and professionally so that they can teach; but the teachers have an equal responsibility, and that is to teach well. We propose that semi-annual evaluations be made of each teacher to determine whether that teacher is fulfilling his or her professional responsibilities; that test scores be released on a school by school basis so that the community can judge for itself whether there is progress, stagnation or regression in particular schools; that teachers take it upon themselves to expand their perspectives, come into the community instead of fleeing it at the end of the school day, work with parents and community leaders to open communications and cooperative efforts. If this is done, teachers will find that their fight for better salaries will hardly be a fight at all, because the people will understand it and support it from the outset.



and white man get together, not letting anyone run over them, that cities like our Oakland may some day show other "Never never lands" of dreams the way.

We are faced with the possibility of so-called riots every day. We do not need any forecasting. We the Black people and the poor can do nothing else but revolt to just get along - revolt from the "being told what to do" approaches of those who think they know what is good for us. Unity of Black and white poor working together will be able to demand that the professional serve their needs. This will truly change the moral standards of our country to one of full employment, equal treatment, the right to develop their schools in whatever manner they wish, and put the professionals to work for them, planning ways to meet the challenge of a peaceful world. Then and only then, the professional "New Left" will be serving the interests of the poor people, the Black people, for whom they now cry crocodile tears for, and make all kinds of plans of how to tell the poor what they need. It is about time that an organization of professionals comes along which will take its leadership from the poor community of Black and Whites and serve their interests instead of serving up the poor Black and White to professional schemes.

**In Memory of
JIM DIXON
A Good Friend**

CALIFORNIA'S NON-WHITE GOVERNORS

Dr. Jack D. Forbes

In the last decade, a number of persons of Mexican, Indian, Afro-American, and Asian-American backgrounds have been elected to public office in California. If this trend continues, the day may come when non-whites and mixed-bloods will be able to achieve the kind of political success which they experienced between 1822 and 1847, when California was a part of the Mexican Republic.

During the Mexican era California's population was overwhelmingly Indian. The political life of the coastal region was, however, dominated by Spanish-speaking persons of racially mixed ancestry. The bulk of these latter individuals were of mixed Indian, African, and European background although the upper classes tended to be of predominantly European character. Dark-skinned persons often did rise to positions of wealth and power, though, and this is especially true after 1831.

Even during the Spanish era (1769-1821) many individuals of non-white background occupied important offices of a local character (mayoralities, for example) or became officers in the military, but during the Mexican period many mixed-bloods were able to occupy still higher positions.

Three of California's governors are known to have been of significantly non-white ancestry. The first of these was Lt. Col. Manuel Victoria, called "el gobernador negro" (the black governor). Victoria was very dark-skinned but whether he was a full-blood African or of only part-African ancestry is not known. In any event, his dark coloration made him something of a novelty in California, where no previous governor had been of a markedly non-white character.

Victoria was serving as comandante of Baja California when, in March 1830 he was promoted to the governorship of both Californias. He assumed office in California in December and immediately attempted to restore order in the unstable province. His efforts in this direction, as well as his direct, military methods, served to antagonize that class of ambitious Californians who hoped to divide up the land and wealth of the missions. A revolt occurred in December 1831 and Victoria was wounded in battle and forced to retire to Mexico. H. H. Bancroft, the noted California historian, described Victoria as an "honest and energetic officer."

The second non-white governor

was Brigadier-general Jose Figueroa, a swarthy mestizo (Indian-non-white mixed-blood) of Aztec background. After a notable career as a soldier fighting for Mexican independence, Figueroa was sent to Sonora as comandante in the late 1820's. From 1833 to 1835 he served as governor of California, during a critical period. The missions were breaking up; a system for integrating the ex-Mission Indians into the general society had to be devised; and new settlements were needed for the defense and development of the province. Bancroft states that "Figueroa is known as the best of California's Mexican governors, and in many respects (he) merits his reputation. He was an intelligent man, of good intentions and liberal views . . . and made no serious mistakes." Recent historical scholarship has tended to question many of Figueroa's programs, but it is clear that he was at heart the equal of most of California's governors, in spite of the handicaps involved in ruling a bankrupt province always on the brink of anarchy without the presence of personally loyal troops.

The third non-white chief executive was Pio Pico, the last Mexican governor. Pico was a grandson of Santiago de la Cruz Pico, a mestizo, and Maria de la Bastida, a mulata (half-African Negro, half-European). The Pico family typified the many mixed-bloods who rose to prominence in the Mexican period. Pio Pico was notably successful in acquiring ex-Mission estates and working up the political ladder. He almost became chief executive in 1831, served often in the legislature, was mayor of Los Angeles, and from 1845 through 1846 held office as governor. Pico was a man "of ordinary intelligence and limited education; of generous, jovial disposition; reckless and indolent; with a weakness for cards and women." His governorship was marred by factional disputes with other Mexicans and by the U.S. invasion. It would be nice to say that Pico was a successful governor, but the fact is that he was simply "average" and the issues he faced demanded a better than average man.

On the whole, California's non-white governors performed satisfactorily. How long must we wait before modern California duplicates the racial tolerance of a century ago and gives another non-white governor a chance?

OAKLAND GAMES

THE ROLL OF THE PROFESSIONAL

IN CHANGE

By Bill Lowe

I note with great interest a story in another newspaper which quotes Mr. Robert Sheer as saying, "The New Left is not a small number of radicals but professional people and others (my note, not defined) who feel we will change the moral tone of America."

I would like to ask how, and give a few of my views as to how they are trying to do it. The "Professionals" have the answer for the poor. They write up the rules which set up this less-than-moral tone of America we live in, for you can find that a large number of legislators are not of the new radicals, but of the professionals. Yes, more money should go to end poverty in Oakland and other areas. But of the millions already put there, it is not the poor people, the Black people who live in the area looking for work as a way out of poverty, who control the funds, but the professionals who have made a great thing out of it. It is the poor people who can change the moral tone of America, calling upon the professional to do as they wish in their behalf - not the professional saving the poor and the poor following them as they have for so long in the past.

**Have something to
sell or rent?
Want to buy or trade?
FLATLANDS WANT ADS
Reach 7,000 Families
Only 50¢ a line
Call 653-6886 anytime
or mail your ad to FLATLANDS,
Box 10287, Oakland, 94610**