

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Elizabeth Lynch <betsi.bell@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 8:12 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No Resolution & No Apology !

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Council - Do not cave in to the Far Left who are trying to brainwash America into a ridiculous ideology. MB is NOT racist. Stop the nonsense. Please do NOT vote in favor of a resolution. Please do NOT vote in favor of an apology. We ALWAYS vote. Thank you for listening.

Timothy & Elizabeth Lynch  
229 25th Place  
Cell 310-569-2355

Sent from my iPhone

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Ed Balazs <ebalazs4@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 8:12 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Cc:** ejbalazs@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

We support Councilman Joe Franklin's acknowledgment and oppose an apology. We believe an apology sets up the City of Manhattan Beach for potential liability that is unacceptable.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best Regards,

Ed and Jamie Balazs

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Susan Lim <gpslim@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 7:23 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach Forum

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear City Council members,

I am writing in regards to the Bruce's Beach Resolution and I do not support this cause. Most of the conservative residents I know chose to not be confrontational and would rather be silenced by those who are louder and more aggressive in their approach to make me and my neighbors feel fearful of our home being vandalized. As you may already know there are multiple cases of vandalism in our city. I hope that you are condemning them as much as we do. Please know that there are many of us residents who are NOT speaking their thoughts and I am here to represent them. I along with many others are very disappointed by some of our council members' action to drag this issue on after the last forum with decisions already been made. This appears to us as a very indecisive move and made us question your leadership. Why are we even considering input from outsiders who doesn't know us? Reparation along with a lawsuit usually does not mean a simple apology. If they are looking for an apology, we will not have any litigation issues. They want money and you are opening up the floodgate for many future requests for reparation. It looked like we issued an apology back in 2007, and if that is what they wanted, it would have been sufficient and everyone should be happy. Why are we in a lawsuit now? It's simple, they want money.

I moved in to this city 10 years ago not knowing that we will inherit this mess. What have we done to deserve this? We should have a disclaimer for future residents moving in to this area that their tax dollars will be going to extravagant art installation for reparation that has nothing to do with our past. I would have a disclaimer before moving in to Manhattan Beach. This whole thing is a waste of our time, which could have been used for more beneficial endeavors, such as helping our inner cities citizens and children, regardless of their race. I would have rather that we spend the money to help people who are struggling especially from the hardships from the pandemic instead of spending it on an expensive piece of art that will only appease some of us for a short while. This issue has come up time and time again and it's time for us to nip it in the bud. I am not for racism as I was a victim myself coming from a country where my race does not have the same privilege as the native people. We have moved on and are living in peace and I know Manhattan Beach can do the same. Let me reiterate, I ask that we not issue a resolution and not apologize. We have done it in the past and it did not work.

Thank you for your time.

Susan Lim  
Manhattan Beach Resident  
14th Street

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Rosalee Eisenstadt <rosalee678@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 6:56 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach issue

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

I have lived and been a property owner in Manhattan Beach for 43 years and believe that Manhattan Beach is not a racist community. Please do not issue any Resolution or Acknowledgement regarding the Bruce's Beach issue. This seems to be an attack on our City and school system by the far left. History cannot be changed. We can just go forward. Citizens today bear no responsibility for whatever occurred one hundred years ago. End the BB Task Force and No to future DEIC.

Rosalee Eisenstadt  
Manhattan Avenue resident

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Eric Gray <egray123@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 6:44 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] No apology

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Council,

I reiterate my recommendation for no apology.

None of us were here 100 years ago. This is history, not an act of anyone here.

Thank you,

Eric  
725 31st St  
MB, Ca

Sent from my iPhone

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Marvin Hixson <marvinhixson@outlook.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 6:42 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Bruce Beach

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear Council Members,

Vote NO on the apology. Stand up to those ideologs who want to divide our society. We are not responsible for the sins of our fathers. I did nothing wrong, will not apologize nor agree that my tax dollar is to be spent on a past mistake . The past is done and gone. Mistakes are to be recognized, acknowledged, and with wisdom never repeated.

Sincerely,  
Marv Hixson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Greg Klein <gklein@tk.capital>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 6:35 PM  
**To:** List - City Council; City Manager  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

I appreciate all of the thoughtful debate about on Bruce's Beach, racism, equality, and unity.

I'm a long time resident and am proud of how our city is working to truly understand possible historic injustices and how we can today learn from any past experiences.

I am deeply sympathetic to the Bruce's Beach issues. My wife's ancestors included Native Americans from the Tonga Tribe and my ancestors included Holocaust victims.

However, it is critical our City first produce a fact based history of Bruce's Beach without embellishments. And acknowledge and empathize with all of the property owners whose property was taken in 1920s. However, without more data, I do not support an apology.

-Greg

Greg M. Klein  
Sent from my iPhone

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Eva Bedingfield <evabed@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 6:15 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Resolution

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Please do not issue a Resolution.  
Thank you

Sent from my iPhone



## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** tomseth <tomin310@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 5:43 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Hello City Council,

I'm sorry this is so late, I just got off work. I was under the impression that the city Council had to give an apology or resolution of acknowledgment for the wrong that was done to the Bruce's 100 years ago. I received a few emails today that made too much sense. Why not do nothing? This gets revisited every decade or so. The discussions have already taken place. Kavon and the rest don't want an apology, they want the money that can come from that apology.

Thank you,

Tom Seth

9 Laurel Square, MB

30 year resident

According activist Kavon Ward,

"We believe it is significant for them (MB City Council) to state publically that they were complicit and that it was their fault. I think that's important in trying to get the restitution the (Bruce) family is asking for. They have to admit guilt. And when you admit guilt, people are going to say what are you going to do about it? How are you going to remedy it?" Interview with the Atlanta Black Star on March 10, 2021.

## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Alison R. Jefferson <alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 8:10 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Support for Apology, Bruce's Beach  
**Attachments:** Jefferson\_book-front-cover-small.png; ATT00001.htm;  
ARJeffersonSupportforApologyApr6-2021rev.pdf; ATT00002.htm; Jefferson\_book-front-cover-small.png; ATT00003.htm; ARJeffersonSupportforApologyApr6-2021.pdf; ATT00004.htm

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Could you please replace my earlier letter of support for the apology for the past Bruce's Beach anti-Black racist action with this revised letter of support for the apology <ARJeffersonSupportforApologyApr6-2021rev>.

Thank you,

**alisonrosejefferson**, m.h.c. | ph.d.  
2021 Scholar in Residence, Institute for the Study of Los Angeles at Occidental College

historian and more  
[alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com](mailto:alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com)  
323.931.6745 tel  
213.509.2515 mobile tel

[www.alisonrosejefferson.com](http://www.alisonrosejefferson.com)

"Optimism is the faith that leads to achievement. Nothing can be done without hope and confidence." — *Helen Keller, author*

"Well behaved women seldom make history." — *Laura Thatcher Ulrich, historian*

5482 wilshire boulevard  
number 199  
los angeles, california 90036  
U S A

323.931.6745 tel  
323.933.2447 fax

alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com

# alisonrosejefferson

**April 6, 2021 Manhattan Beach City Council Meeting.** Consideration of the Bruce's Beach Task Force Recommendation 1.4 (Resolution of Apology) and Alternative Options (Continued from March 16, 2021 City Council Meeting)

## Support for Apology

As I noted in the L.A. Times "Op Ed: What Manhattan Beach's racist land grab really meant" published on Monday, April 5, 2021 (<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-04-05/manhattan-beach-bruces-beach-racist-land-grab>), African American's lost not just land and economic opportunities, but also social and community building space.

If the MB City Council could approve \$350,000 for an artist and an art piece to recognize the lost African American community and the city's racist past, it is contradictory and cynical that the Council representing its citizens, cannot find the moral fortitude to apology for the impact that past actions had on the African American families and community that were chased out in 1924 by White city officials racist, anti-Black land grab through an eminent domain proceeding that took the land for a park.

The Council's action tonight to approve an apology will demonstrate for the public commitment to broader community healing in showing understanding and rejection of racist act in the City's history. This public process of making an apology will leave an important legacy in the public record with contemporary consequences, which shape the present as well as the future.

Respectfully,



Alison Rose Jefferson

Scholar in Residence, Institute for the Study of Los Angeles at Occidental College  
and author of "Living the California Dream: African American Leisure Sites during the Jim Crow Era"



## OP-ED



Los Angeles Times

**A VIEW** toward a portion of the Strand in Manhattan Beach where the Bruce family owned a popular resort — until the city forced them out in 1924. Such places were more than vacation spots. They offered respite from white harassment.

## The true damage in a racist land grab

Leisure places, such as Bruce's Beach, forged Black identity and social networks

By Alison Rose Jefferson

**T**HE QUESTION OF how to acknowledge and repair racist crimes of the past has drawn more urgency in many communities, especially after last summer's nationwide protests for racial justice.

In Los Angeles County, the wrong done to Willa and Charles Bruce and their descendants has captured a lot of media attention, perhaps because it involves a quintessential part of the California dream: a beautiful piece of oceanfront property on Santa Monica Bay.

In 1912, the Bruces, pioneering Black entrepreneurs, opened a popular oceanfront resort business in Manhattan Beach. Their business served a growing community of African American beachgoers, who also bought land and built cottages nearby.

Black visitors and property owners enjoyed the area, which was known as Bruce's Beach, until they were chased out in 1924 by white city officials in a racist, anti-Black land grab through an eminent domain proceeding that took the land for a park.

Recently, some county officials have raised the possibility of giving financial restitution or even returning the land to the Bruce descendants. The city of Manhattan Beach has struggled with this ugly history in recent years, and in 2006, it renamed the site of the razed resort Bruce's Beach.

This year, city residents have proposed placing new interpretive panels and artwork on the site to tell the story in a fuller fashion.

But the damage done was always deeper than the economic loss to the Bruces or the other families who were also driven out. The purging of African Americans from Manhattan Beach destroyed a vibrant social space.

Leisure and recreational places were important to Black identity, regional social networking, community building and economic development in an era of rigid racial segregation in much of the nation.

They were more than vacation spots. They were places of respite from white harassment.

African Americans, like the Bruces, began moving in larger numbers to the Los Angeles area in the decades around the turn of the 20th century, joining a multi-ethnic community that included white people and people of color, as well as immigrants of many national backgrounds.

The majority of new Black migrants relocated from Southern states, often to escape the worst of Jim Crow-era racism, segregation and racial violence. Like others who moved to California, these migrants embraced the idea of the California dream — a lifestyle in picturesque outdoor settings and new opportunities. And they were self-confident and sometimes militant in demanding their rights as citizens and consumers.

But in California, they also

faced discrimination that prevented African Americans from using various public spaces and buying land in many areas.

Building resort businesses and carving out leisure communities was one way Black entrepreneurs, such as the Bruces, responded to those restrictions.

In addition to Manhattan Beach, African Americans invested in real estate in Santa Monica's south beach neighborhoods and the Bay Street beach, Eureka Villa in the Santa Clarita Valley, in Riverside County's Lake Elsinore and Corona's Parkridge Country Club, and a few other places.

These were sites of pleasure but also a powerful challenge to anti-Black public policies and private practices that flourished in Southern California for different periods and in varying forms between the 1900s to the 1960s. In Los Angeles, recreation and relaxation were essential components of liberty — and contested ground in the struggle for civil rights and freedom.

Equally important, Black experiences of these leisure spaces in California and around the U.S. — and the attention they gained in Black newspapers of the era — helped to create a public memory that offered African Americans broader visions of themselves and their communities.

Black Angelenos, in their ambitions and initiatives, challenged the era's white supremacist concepts as they asserted their deter-

mination to participate in popular recreational, cultural and social trends that were considered modern by the 1920s.

In exurban communities such as Manhattan Beach, African Americans bought property so they could control their enjoyment of these activities.

In doing so, they were also countering the power of white people in labeling African Americans as laborers and as inferior. At the same time, Black Angelenos, like white residents, helped to promote the consumption of leisure as "a lifestyle" in the region's identity.

The painful history of Bruce's Beach shows how much racism determines who gets to live the California and American dreams. Appropriately, that spot became a site of reflection and remembrance in 2020, during a national moment of racial reckoning.

How the city of Manhattan Beach will account for the generational loss suffered by the Bruce family is yet to be determined.

But the damage done to the African American community by the city's action in 1924 has contemporary consequences, which shape the present as well as the future.

ALISON ROSE JEFFERSON is a scholar in residence with the Institute for the Study of Los Angeles at Occidental College and author of "Living the California Dream: African American Leisure Sites during the Jim Crow Era."

## Waste less food, and help fix the climate crisis

By Dana Gunders

**S**OMETIME OVER the last month, you probably threw away a banana. Maybe it got too ripe. Or maybe your child didn't like the one he was eating with the spotty, brown skin. You probably didn't think much about tossing it. But all told, Americans throw away 5 billion bananas every year — and a lot more food. Across the U.S. food supply in 2019, 35% of it — some 80 million tons of food — went unsold or uneaten. In California, more than 14 million tons of food were never consumed.

That's a nearly 12% increase in the U.S. since 2010 — despite a leveling off in recent years. This means we are nowhere close to meeting the goals U.S. and global institutions have set to cut food waste in half by 2030. Wasted food has tremendous environmental and economic impacts. It accounts for about 4% of greenhouse gas emissions and 2% of U.S. gross domestic product.

Think about it this way: We are tossing out nearly 125 billion meals a year while a projected 45 million Americans are struggling to put food on the table.

There is good news: The Biden administration has made climate change a centerpiece of its agenda, and ending food waste is a top solution to tackling this global crisis. Last month, the national nonprofit ReFED, where I serve as executive director, completed an analysis of the types and causes of food waste and identified more than 40 solutions to help the U.S. reach the 2030 goal of a 50% reduction in food waste.

By our calculations, an investment of \$14 billion a year over the next decade can eliminate 45 mil-

lion tons of food waste each year and result in \$73 billion in annual economic benefit — a 5-to-1 return. That translates into a reduction of 75 million tons of greenhouse gases — the equivalent of taking 16 million cars off the road each year.

Food is wasted across the supply chain, at farms, manufacturers, retailers, restaurants and in our homes. Solutions that prevent food from being wasted in the first place should be made a priority.

One example is demand-planning software developed in 2017 that helps retailers predict what they will sell. The typical American grocery store stocks as many as 50,000 products. Until recently, the only way to know how many bananas would sell over the course of a week was to make an educated guess.

Today, technologies can comb through sales data and forecast with astonishing accuracy how many bananas will sell on a rainy Monday in Los Angeles, and adjust orders to match.

Our analysis suggests that a \$275-million annual investment in these technologies — primarily made internally by the corporations that own the grocery stores — could reap more than \$5 billion in savings for those same stores and divert 1.25 million tons of food waste from landfills in our country.

Restaurants could nearly double that impact by reducing portion sizes. Eliminating Flintstonian steaks and buckets of fettuccine Alfredo would do more than moderate our expanding waistlines. With lower food costs and slightly higher prices for smaller portions, restaurants could save over \$550 million annually by reducing portion sizes, and consum-

**We are tossing out nearly 125 billion meals a year while a projected 45 million Americans are struggling to put food on the table.**

ers would save \$8 billion in lower prices. The food saved would avert 11.5 million tons of greenhouse gas equivalents per year.

Serving reasonable portions can be an unnerving prospect for the industry. If a restaurant makes its portions smaller, the customer may go somewhere else. But according to the National Restaurant Assn., more than 110,000 restaurants have closed since March 2020 due to the pandemic — that's 17% of U.S. dining establishments. Restaurants that survive have already tried things they never would have considered, such as winter yurt dining. Now they have an opportunity to remake their businesses in ways that benefit the planet and their bottom lines.

Some solutions, like building composting infrastructure, don't offer quite the same return on investment but are critical nonetheless. After all, no matter how good we are at making sure all the bananas get eaten, the peels will always be left over. Composting allows the nutrients in food scraps to be recycled, averts the production of dangerous methane and, over time, leads to healthier soils that sequester carbon and retain water.

This is where the federal government comes in. Giving states the funding to roll out composting and other food waste reduction programs is, by ReFED's calculations, the single most effective way to slash total tons of food waste. According to our analysis, this would require \$13 billion over 10 years. Because this infrastructure requires large upfront capital and the return is low, this is the kind of long-term investment that only the federal government can make, and one that fits squarely into the infrastructure and climate change mitigation policies that the Biden administration has promised to champion.

There are more affordable opportunities too. The government could offer incentives to retailers that effectively employ prevention technologies such as forecasting software, a move that would reduce food waste and potentially drive innovation.

A national consumer education program — think Smokey Bear but for food waste — would cost \$100 million. Households account for 38% of food waste, higher than any other sector, and campaigns to shift behavior are proven to work. Food waste declined in west London by 14% in just six months during the 2013 "Love Food, Hate Waste" initiative, leading the group to expand the program to 10 additional cities.

Reducing food waste is an opportunity for the Biden administration to tackle climate change in an effective and politically palatable way. There is a road map. Now all they have to do is follow it.

DANA GUNDERS is executive director of ReFED, a nonprofit working to end food waste in the United States.

## Missing: A policy for immigrant integration

Biden's Citizenship Act would fund the kind of programs that can finally fill the gap.

By Francisco Lara-García

**T**HE THOUSANDS of migrants trying to enter the United States at the southern border have sparked a fresh wave of political debate over who should be let into the country and how minors and others seeking asylum should be treated.

Republicans have launched a political blitz against Democrats by painting President Biden as the cause of a so-called surge at the southern border. Meanwhile, Democrats in Congress have settled on passing legislation in the House that would provide a path to citizenship for millions of migrants, including "Dreamers" and farmworkers. Neither side is talking about how newcomers should be integrated into American life.

For a nation obsessed with the politics of immigration and the effects immigrants have on society, the U.S. puts very little effort into integration policy. We at least manage to rank in the second tier of countries favorable to immigrants on the Migrant Integration Policy Index, but any help we offer newcomers is patchwork at best; it varies from hostility in some locales to decent programs in others. Many immigrants thrive in America, but their success is, as one 2011 study concluded, "heavily stratified" by "educational and economic resources, racial inequities and legal status."

Biden's immigration reform proposal, the U.S. Citizenship Act, could begin to remedy our laissez-faire approach to inclusion. If it were adopted, it would represent a significant scale of investment in developing a national integration policy.

One key provision of Biden's overhaul would create a national foundation to help coordinate integration efforts with state and local officials and promote citizenship preparation programs among low-income and underserved populations. That alone would improve the scattershot quality of American integration efforts that scholars see as a major problem.

The act would establish a grant pilot program to jump-start integration efforts at the local level and allocate close to \$300 million to English training, workforce preparation and naturalization programs — likely the biggest investment of its kind since the Immigration Reform and Control Act passed in 1986. It also would commission a study on employment opportunities for immigrants with professional credentials earned abroad. As it stands now, many newcomers never find a way to put their skills and education to use in the U.S.

Accelerating the process of immigrant integration is as good for American society as it is for new arrivals. My own research on refugees shows just how far some of the provisions included in the Biden plan can go.

With a co-researcher, I looked at recent refugees from five nations who arrived in the U.S. with varying skill sets and resources. Our analysis showed that refugees who attended basic English language classes were much more likely to be attending school, and those who took job training courses were more likely to have a job. These simple programs were more important for predicting school attendance and employment than other factors, including country of origin, education levels before immigration and prior occupation. In short, the language and workforce funding in the Biden plan could make a real difference in outcomes for immigrants.

Unfortunately, there are already warning signs that inclusion and integration programs could be abandoned as Congress wades into the politics of immigration reform. The current Republican plan, just like bipartisan immigration proposals in 2007 and 2013, does not contain meaningful integration programs. And in an environment where Republicans are attempting to position Democrats as prioritizing the needs of migrants before those of American citizens, some GOP lawmakers will surely object to any program that serves immigrants.

Nor did Democrats keep integration policy in the first round of immigration legislation they pushed through the House. This may be politically expedient, and there is a chance that it can be fixed later. But more likely, the piecemeal approach Democrats are taking will cause integration and inclusion programs to fall through the cracks.

As the immigration reform debate picks up steam, it's crucial that policymakers remember that their task is not just to determine whether and how to let people through the door. They must also address how we want immigrants to interact with American society once they are here.

FRANCISCO LARA-GARCÍA is a Paul F. Lazarsfeld fellow in the sociology department at Columbia University.



5482 wilshire boulevard  
number 199  
los angeles, california 90036  
U S A

323.931.6745 tel  
323.933.2447 fax

alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com

# alisonrosejefferson

**April 6, 2021 Manhattan Beach City Council Meeting.** Consideration of the Bruce's Beach Task Force Recommendation 1.4 (Resolution of Apology) and Alternative Options (Continued from March 16, 2021 City Council Meeting)

## **Support for Apology of Mayor Pro Tem/Councilwoman Hildy Stern**

As I noted in the L.A. Times "Op Ed: What Manhattan Beach's racist land grab really meant" published on Monday, April 5, 2021 (<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-04-05/manhattan-beach-bruces-beach-racist-land-grab>), African American's lost not just land and economic opportunities, but also social and community building space.

If the MB City Council could approve \$350,000 for an artist and an art piece to recognize the lost African American community and the city's racist past, it is contradictory and cynical that the Council and its citizens, would not find the moral fortitude and leadership to apology for the impact that past actions had on the African American families and greater community that were chased out in 1924 by White city officials racist, anti-Black land grab through an eminent domain proceeding that took the land for a park.

The Council's action to approve the apology written by Mayor Pro Tem Hildy Stern will demonstrate for the public commitment to broader community healing in showing understanding and rejection of racist acts in the City as well as the nation. This public process of making an apology will leave an important legacy in the public record for truth telling and social justice which will aid in dismantling structural racism with contemporary consequences, which shape this community in the present as well as the future.

Respectfully,



Alison Rose Jefferson

Scholar in Residence, Institute for the Study of Los Angeles at Occidental College  
and author of "Living the California Dream: African American Leisure Sites during the Jim Crow Era"



## OP-ED



Los Angeles Times

**A VIEW** toward a portion of the Strand in Manhattan Beach where the Bruce family owned a popular resort — until the city forced them out in 1924. Such places were more than vacation spots. They offered respite from white harassment.

# The true damage in a racist land grab

## Leisure places, such as Bruce's Beach, forged Black identity and social networks

By Alison Rose Jefferson

**T**HE QUESTION OF how to acknowledge and repair racist crimes of the past has drawn more urgency in many communities, especially after last summer's nationwide protests for racial justice.

In Los Angeles County, the wrong done to Willa and Charles Bruce and their descendants has captured a lot of media attention, perhaps because it involves a quintessential part of the California dream: a beautiful piece of oceanfront property on Santa Monica Bay.

In 1912, the Bruces, pioneering Black entrepreneurs, opened a popular oceanfront resort business in Manhattan Beach. Their business served a growing community of African American beachgoers, who also bought land and built cottages nearby.

Black visitors and property owners enjoyed the area, which was known as Bruce's Beach, until they were chased out in 1924 by white city officials in a racist, anti-Black land grab through an eminent domain proceeding that took the land for a park.

Recently, some county officials have raised the possibility of giving financial restitution or even returning the land to the Bruce descendants. The city of Manhattan Beach has struggled with this ugly history in recent years, and in 2006, it renamed the site of the razed resort Bruce's Beach.

This year, city residents have proposed placing new interpretive panels and artwork on the site to tell the story in a fuller fashion.

But the damage done was always deeper than the economic loss to the Bruces or the other families who were also driven out. The purging of African Americans from Manhattan Beach destroyed a vibrant social space.

Leisure and recreational places were important to Black identity, regional social networking, community building and economic development in an era of rigid racial segregation in much of the nation.

They were more than vacation spots. They were places of respite from white harassment.

African Americans, like the Bruces, began moving in larger numbers to the Los Angeles area in the decades around the turn of the 20th century, joining a multi-ethnic community that included white people and people of color, as well as immigrants of many national backgrounds.

The majority of new Black migrants relocated from Southern states, often to escape the worst of Jim Crow-era racism, segregation and racial violence. Like others who moved to California, these migrants embraced the idea of the California dream — a lifestyle in picturesque outdoor settings and new opportunities. And they were self-confident and sometimes militant in demanding their rights as citizens and consumers.

But in California, they also

faced discrimination that prevented African Americans from using various public spaces and buying land in many areas.

Building resort businesses and carving out leisure communities was one way Black entrepreneurs, such as the Bruces, responded to those restrictions.

In addition to Manhattan Beach, African Americans invested in real estate in Santa Monica's south beach neighborhoods and the Bay Street beach, Eureka Villa in the Santa Clarita Valley, in Riverside County's Lake Elsinore and Corona's Parkridge Country Club, and a few other places.

These were sites of pleasure but also a powerful challenge to anti-Black public policies and private practices that flourished in Southern California for different periods and in varying forms between the 1900s to the 1960s. In Los Angeles, recreation and relaxation were essential components of liberty — and contested ground in the struggle for civil rights and freedom.

Equally important, Black experiences of these leisure spaces in California and around the U.S. — and the attention they gained in Black newspapers of the era — helped to create a public memory that offered African Americans broader visions of themselves and their communities.

Black Angelenos, in their ambitions and initiatives, challenged the era's white supremacist concepts as they asserted their deter-

mination to participate in popular recreational, cultural and social trends that were considered modern by the 1920s.

In exurban communities such as Manhattan Beach, African Americans bought property so they could control their enjoyment of these activities.

In doing so, they were also countering the power of white people in labeling African Americans as laborers and as inferior. At the same time, Black Angelenos, like white residents, helped to promote the consumption of leisure as "a lifestyle" in the region's identity.

The painful history of Bruce's Beach shows how much racism determines who gets to live the California and American dreams. Appropriately, that spot became a site of reflection and remembrance in 2020, during a national moment of racial reckoning.

How the city of Manhattan Beach will account for the generational loss suffered by the Bruce family is yet to be determined.

But the damage done to the African American community by the city's action in 1924 has contemporary consequences, which shape the present as well as the future.

ALISON ROSE JEFFERSON is a scholar in residence with the Institute for the Study of Los Angeles at Occidental College and author of "Living the California Dream: African American Leisure Sites during the Jim Crow Era."

# Waste less food, and help fix the climate crisis

By Dana Gunders

**S**OMETIME OVER the last month, you probably threw away a banana. Maybe it got too ripe. Or maybe your child didn't like the one he was eating with the spotty, brown skin. You probably didn't think much about tossing it. But all told, Americans throw away 5 billion bananas every year — and a lot more food. Across the U.S. food supply in 2019, 35% of it — some 80 million tons of food — went unsold or uneaten. In California, more than 14 million tons of food were never consumed.

That's a nearly 12% increase in the U.S. since 2010 — despite a leveling off in recent years. This means we are nowhere close to meeting the goals U.S. and global institutions have set to cut food waste in half by 2030. Wasted food has tremendous environmental and economic impacts. It accounts for about 4% of greenhouse gas emissions and 2% of U.S. gross domestic product.

Think about it this way: We are tossing out nearly 125 billion meals a year while a projected 45 million Americans are struggling to put food on the table.

There is good news: The Biden administration has made climate change a centerpiece of its agenda, and ending food waste is a top solution to tackling this global crisis. Last month, the national nonprofit ReFED, where I serve as executive director, completed an analysis of the types and causes of food waste and identified more than 40 solutions to help the U.S. reach the 2030 goal of a 50% reduction in food waste.

By our calculations, an investment of \$14 billion a year over the next decade can eliminate 45 mil-

lion tons of food waste each year and result in \$73 billion in annual economic benefit — a 5-to-1 return. That translates into a reduction of 75 million tons of greenhouse gases — the equivalent of taking 16 million cars off the road each year.

Food is wasted across the supply chain, at farms, manufacturers, retailers, restaurants and in our homes. Solutions that prevent food from being wasted in the first place should be made a priority.

One example is demand-planning software developed in 2017 that helps retailers predict what they will sell. The typical American grocery store stocks as many as 50,000 products. Until recently, the only way to know how many bananas would sell over the course of a week was to make an educated guess.

Today, technologies can comb through sales data and forecast with astonishing accuracy how many bananas will sell on a rainy Monday in Los Angeles, and adjust orders to match.

Our analysis suggests that a \$275-million annual investment in these technologies — primarily made internally by the corporations that own the grocery stores — could reap more than \$5 billion in savings for those same stores and divert 1.25 million tons of food waste from landfills in our country.

Restaurants could nearly double that impact by reducing portion sizes. Eliminating Flintstonian steaks and buckets of fettuccine Alfredo would do more than moderate our expanding waistlines. With lower food costs and slightly higher prices for smaller portions, restaurants could save over \$550 million annually by reducing portion sizes, and consum-

**We are tossing out nearly 125 billion meals a year while a projected 45 million Americans are struggling to put food on the table.**

ers would save \$8 billion in lower prices. The food saved would avert 11.5 million tons of greenhouse gas equivalents per year.

Serving reasonable portions can be an unnerving prospect for the industry. If a restaurant makes its portions smaller, the customer may go somewhere else. But according to the National Restaurant Assn., more than 110,000 restaurants have closed since March 2020 due to the pandemic — that's 17% of U.S. dining establishments. Restaurants that survive have already tried things they never would have considered, such as winter yurt dining. Now they have an opportunity to remake their businesses in ways that benefit the planet and their bottom lines.

Some solutions, like building composting infrastructure, don't offer quite the same return on investment but are critical nonetheless. After all, no matter how good we are at making sure all the bananas get eaten, the peels will always be left over. Composting allows the nutrients in food scraps to be recycled, averts the production of dangerous methane and, over time, leads to healthier soils that sequester carbon and retain water.

This is where the federal government comes in. Giving states the funding to roll out composting and other food waste reduction programs is, by ReFED's calculations, the single most effective way to slash total tons of food waste. According to our analysis, this would require \$13 billion over 10 years. Because this infrastructure requires large upfront capital and the return is low, this is the kind of long-term investment that only the federal government can make, and one that fits squarely into the infrastructure and climate change mitigation policies that the Biden administration has promised to champion.

There are more affordable opportunities too. The government could offer incentives to retailers that effectively employ prevention technologies such as forecasting software, a move that would reduce food waste and potentially drive innovation.

A national consumer education program — think Smokey Bear but for food waste — would cost \$100 million. Households account for 38% of food waste, higher than any other sector, and campaigns to shift behavior are proven to work. Food waste declined in west London by 14% in just six months during the 2013 "Love Food, Hate Waste" initiative, leading the group to expand the program to 10 additional cities.

Reducing food waste is an opportunity for the Biden administration to tackle climate change in an effective and politically palatable way. There is a road map. Now all they have to do is follow it.

DANA GUNDERS is executive director of ReFED, a nonprofit working to end food waste in the United States.

# Missing: A policy for immigrant integration

Biden's Citizenship Act would fund the kind of programs that can finally fill the gap.

By Francisco Lara-García

**T**HE THOUSANDS of migrants trying to enter the United States at the southern border have sparked a fresh wave of political debate over who should be let into the country and how minors and others seeking asylum should be treated.

Republicans have launched a political blitz against Democrats by painting President Biden as the cause of a so-called surge at the southern border. Meanwhile, Democrats in Congress have settled on passing legislation in the House that would provide a path to citizenship for millions of migrants, including "Dreamers" and farmworkers. Neither side is talking about how newcomers should be integrated into American life.

For a nation obsessed with the politics of immigration and the effects immigrants have on society, the U.S. puts very little effort into integration policy. We at least manage to rank in the second tier of countries favorable to immigrants on the Migrant Integration Policy Index, but any help we offer newcomers is patchwork at best; it varies from hostility in some locales to decent programs in others. Many immigrants thrive in America, but their success is, as one 2011 study concluded, "heavily stratified" by "educational and economic resources, racial inequities and legal status."

Biden's immigration reform proposal, the U.S. Citizenship Act, could begin to remedy our laissez-faire approach to inclusion. If it were adopted, it would represent a significant scale of investment in developing a national integration policy.

One key provision of Biden's overhaul would create a national foundation to help coordinate integration efforts with state and local officials and promote citizenship preparation programs among low-income and underserved populations. That alone would improve the scattershot quality of American integration efforts that scholars see as a major problem.

The act would establish a grant pilot program to jump-start integration efforts at the local level and allocate close to \$300 million to English training, workforce preparation and naturalization programs — likely the biggest investment of its kind since the Immigration Reform and Control Act passed in 1986. It also would commission a study on employment opportunities for immigrants with professional credentials earned abroad. As it stands now, many newcomers never find a way to put their skills and education to use in the U.S.

Accelerating the process of immigrant integration is as good for American society as it is for new arrivals. My own research on refugees shows just how far some of the provisions included in the Biden plan can go.

With a co-researcher, I looked at recent refugees from five nations who arrived in the U.S. with varying skill sets and resources. Our analysis showed that refugees who attended basic English language classes were much more likely to be attending school, and those who took job training courses were more likely to have a job. These simple programs were more important for predicting school attendance and employment than other factors, including country of origin, education levels before immigration and prior occupation. In short, the language and workforce funding in the Biden plan could make a real difference in outcomes for immigrants.

Unfortunately, there are already warning signs that inclusion and integration programs could be abandoned as Congress wades into the politics of immigration reform. The current Republican plan, just like bipartisan immigration proposals in 2007 and 2013, does not contain meaningful integration programs. And in an environment where Republicans are attempting to position Democrats as prioritizing the needs of migrants before those of American citizens, some GOP lawmakers will surely object to any program that serves immigrants.

Nor did Democrats keep integration policy in the first round of immigration legislation they pushed through the House. This may be politically expedient, and there is a chance that it can be fixed later. But more likely, the piecemeal approach Democrats are taking will cause integration and inclusion programs to fall through the cracks.

As the immigration reform debate picks up steam, it's crucial that policymakers remember that their task is not just to determine whether and how to let people through the door. They must also address how we want immigrants to interact with American society once they are here.

FRANCISCO LARA-GARCÍA is a Paul F. Lazarsfeld fellow in the sociology department at Columbia University.





# Living the California Dream

*African American Leisure*

*Sites during the Jim Crow Era*

ALISON ROSE JEFFERSON



## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** Alison R. Jefferson <alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 5:57 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for Apology, Bruce's Beach  
**Attachments:** Jefferson\_book-front-cover-small.png; ATT00001.htm;  
ARJeffersonSupportforApologyApr6-2021.pdf; ATT00002.htm

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

See the attached letter of support for the apology for the past Bruce's Beach anti-Black racist action.

**alisonrosejefferson**, m.h.c. | ph.d.  
2021 Scholar in Residence, Institute for the Study of Los Angeles at Occidental College

historian and more  
[alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com](mailto:alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com)  
323.931.6745 tel  
213.509.2515 mobile tel

[www.alisonrosejefferson.com](http://www.alisonrosejefferson.com)

"Optimism is the faith that leads to achievement. Nothing can be done without hope and confidence." — *Helen Keller, author*

"Well behaved women seldom make history." — *Laura Thatcher Ulrich, historian*



5482 wilshire boulevard  
number 199  
los angeles, california 90036  
U S A

323.931.6745 tel  
323.933.2447 fax

alisonrosejefferson@gmail.com

# alisonrosejefferson

**April 6, 2021 Manhattan Beach City Council Meeting.** Consideration of the Bruce's Beach Task Force Recommendation 1.4 (Resolution of Apology) and Alternative Options (Continued from March 16, 2021 City Council Meeting)

## Support for Apology

As I noted in the L.A. Times "Op Ed: What Manhattan Beach's racist land grab really meant" published on Monday, April 5, 2021 (<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-04-05/manhattan-beach-bruces-beach-racist-land-grab>), African American's lost not just land and economic opportunities, but also social and community building space.

If the MB City Council could approve \$350,000 for an artist and an art piece to recognize the lost African American community and the city's racist past, it is contradictory and cynical that the Council representing its citizens, cannot find the moral fortitude to apology for the impact that past actions had on the African American families and community that were chased out in 1924 by White city officials racist, anti-Black land grab through an eminent domain proceeding that took the land for a park.

The Council's action tonight to approve an apology will demonstrate for the public commitment to broader community healing in showing understanding and rejection of racist act in the City's history. This public process of making an apology will leave an important legacy in the public record with contemporary consequences, which shape the present as well as the future.

Respectfully,



Alison Rose Jefferson

Scholar in Residence, Institute for the Study of Los Angeles at Occidental College  
and author of "Living the California Dream: African American Leisure Sites during the Jim Crow Era"



## OP-ED



Los Angeles Times

**A VIEW** toward a portion of the Strand in Manhattan Beach where the Bruce family owned a popular resort — until the city forced them out in 1924. Such places were more than vacation spots. They offered respite from white harassment.

## The true damage in a racist land grab

Leisure places, such as Bruce's Beach, forged Black identity and social networks

By Alison Rose Jefferson

**T**HE QUESTION OF how to acknowledge and repair racist crimes of the past has drawn more urgency in many communities, especially after last summer's nationwide protests for racial justice.

In Los Angeles County, the wrong done to Willa and Charles Bruce and their descendants has captured a lot of media attention, perhaps because it involves a quintessential part of the California dream: a beautiful piece of oceanfront property on Santa Monica Bay.

In 1912, the Bruces, pioneering Black entrepreneurs, opened a popular oceanfront resort business in Manhattan Beach. Their business served a growing community of African American beachgoers, who also bought land and built cottages nearby.

Black visitors and property owners enjoyed the area, which was known as Bruce's Beach, until they were chased out in 1924 by white city officials in a racist, anti-Black land grab through an eminent domain proceeding that took the land for a park.

Recently, some county officials have raised the possibility of giving financial restitution or even returning the land to the Bruce descendants. The city of Manhattan Beach has struggled with this ugly history in recent years, and in 2006, it renamed the site of the razed resort Bruce's Beach.

This year, city residents have proposed placing new interpretive panels and artwork on the site to tell the story in a fuller fashion.

But the damage done was always deeper than the economic loss to the Bruces or the other families who were also driven out. The purging of African Americans from Manhattan Beach destroyed a vibrant social space.

Leisure and recreational places were important to Black identity, regional social networking, community building and economic development in an era of rigid racial segregation in much of the nation.

They were more than vacation spots. They were places of respite from white harassment.

African Americans, like the Bruces, began moving in larger numbers to the Los Angeles area in the decades around the turn of the 20th century, joining a multi-ethnic community that included white people and people of color, as well as immigrants of many national backgrounds.

The majority of new Black migrants relocated from Southern states, often to escape the worst of Jim Crow-era racism, segregation and racial violence. Like others who moved to California, these migrants embraced the idea of the California dream — a lifestyle in picturesque outdoor settings and new opportunities. And they were self-confident and sometimes militant in demanding their rights as citizens and consumers.

But in California, they also

faced discrimination that prevented African Americans from using various public spaces and buying land in many areas.

Building resort businesses and carving out leisure communities was one way Black entrepreneurs, such as the Bruces, responded to those restrictions.

In addition to Manhattan Beach, African Americans invested in real estate in Santa Monica's south beach neighborhoods and the Bay Street beach, Eureka Villa in the Santa Clarita Valley, in Riverside County's Lake Elsinore and Corona's Parkridge Country Club, and a few other places.

These were sites of pleasure but also a powerful challenge to anti-Black public policies and private practices that flourished in Southern California for different periods and in varying forms between the 1900s to the 1960s. In Los Angeles, recreation and relaxation were essential components of liberty — and contested ground in the struggle for civil rights and freedom.

Equally important, Black experiences of these leisure spaces in California and around the U.S. — and the attention they gained in Black newspapers of the era — helped to create a public memory that offered African Americans broader visions of themselves and their communities.

Black Angelenos, in their ambitions and initiatives, challenged the era's white supremacist concepts as they asserted their deter-

mination to participate in popular recreational, cultural and social trends that were considered modern by the 1920s.

In exurban communities such as Manhattan Beach, African Americans bought property so they could control their enjoyment of these activities.

In doing so, they were also countering the power of white people in labeling African Americans as laborers and as inferior. At the same time, Black Angelenos, like white residents, helped to promote the consumption of leisure as "a lifestyle" in the region's identity.

The painful history of Bruce's Beach shows how much racism determines who gets to live the California and American dreams. Appropriately, that spot became a site of reflection and remembrance in 2020, during a national moment of racial reckoning.

How the city of Manhattan Beach will account for the generational loss suffered by the Bruce family is yet to be determined.

But the damage done to the African American community by the city's action in 1924 has contemporary consequences, which shape the present as well as the future.

ALISON ROSE JEFFERSON is a scholar in residence with the Institute for the Study of Los Angeles at Occidental College and author of "Living the California Dream: African American Leisure Sites during the Jim Crow Era."

## Waste less food, and help fix the climate crisis

By Dana Gunders

**S**OMETIME OVER the last month, you probably threw away a banana. Maybe it got too ripe. Or maybe your child didn't like the one he was eating with the spotty, brown skin. You probably didn't think much about tossing it. But all told, Americans throw away 5 billion bananas every year — and a lot more food. Across the U.S. food supply in 2019, 35% of it — some 80 million tons of food — went unsold or uneaten. In California, more than 14 million tons of food were never consumed.

That's a nearly 12% increase in the U.S. since 2010 — despite a leveling off in recent years. This means we are nowhere close to meeting the goals U.S. and global institutions have set to cut food waste in half by 2030. Wasted food has tremendous environmental and economic impacts. It accounts for about 4% of greenhouse gas emissions and 2% of U.S. gross domestic product.

Think about it this way: We are tossing out nearly 125 billion meals a year while a projected 45 million Americans are struggling to put food on the table.

There is good news: The Biden administration has made climate change a centerpiece of its agenda, and ending food waste is a top solution to tackling this global crisis. Last month, the national nonprofit ReFED, where I serve as executive director, completed an analysis of the types and causes of food waste and identified more than 40 solutions to help the U.S. reach the 2030 goal of a 50% reduction in food waste.

By our calculations, an investment of \$14 billion a year over the next decade can eliminate 45 mil-

lion tons of food waste each year and result in \$73 billion in annual economic benefit — a 5-to-1 return. That translates into a reduction of 75 million tons of greenhouse gases — the equivalent of taking 16 million cars off the road each year.

Food is wasted across the supply chain, at farms, manufacturers, retailers, restaurants and in our homes. Solutions that prevent food from being wasted in the first place should be made a priority.

One example is demand-planning software developed in 2017 that helps retailers predict what they will sell. The typical American grocery store stocks as many as 50,000 products. Until recently, the only way to know how many bananas would sell over the course of a week was to make an educated guess.

Today, technologies can comb through sales data and forecast with astonishing accuracy how many bananas will sell on a rainy Monday in Los Angeles, and adjust orders to match.

Our analysis suggests that a \$275-million annual investment in these technologies — primarily made internally by the corporations that own the grocery stores — could reap more than \$5 billion in savings for those same stores and divert 1.25 million tons of food waste from landfills in our country.

Restaurants could nearly double that impact by reducing portion sizes. Eliminating Flintstonian steaks and buckets of fettuccine Alfredo would do more than moderate our expanding waistlines. With lower food costs and slightly higher prices for smaller portions, restaurants could save over \$550 million annually by reducing portion sizes, and consum-

**We are tossing out nearly 125 billion meals a year while a projected 45 million Americans are struggling to put food on the table.**

ers would save \$8 billion in lower prices. The food saved would avert 11.5 million tons of greenhouse gas equivalents per year.

Serving reasonable portions can be an unnerving prospect for the industry. If a restaurant makes its portions smaller, the customer may go somewhere else. But according to the National Restaurant Assn., more than 110,000 restaurants have closed since March 2020 due to the pandemic — that's 17% of U.S. dining establishments. Restaurants that survive have already tried things they never would have considered, such as winter yurt dining. Now they have an opportunity to remake their businesses in ways that benefit the planet and their bottom lines.

Some solutions, like building composting infrastructure, don't offer quite the same return on investment but are critical nonetheless. After all, no matter how good we are at making sure all the bananas get eaten, the peels will always be left over. Composting allows the nutrients in food scraps to be recycled, averts the production of dangerous methane and, over time, leads to healthier soils that sequester carbon and retain water.

This is where the federal government comes in. Giving states the funding to roll out composting and other food waste reduction programs is, by ReFED's calculations, the single most effective way to slash total tons of food waste. According to our analysis, this would require \$13 billion over 10 years. Because this infrastructure requires large upfront capital and the return is low, this is the kind of long-term investment that only the federal government can make, and one that fits squarely into the infrastructure and climate change mitigation policies that the Biden administration has promised to champion.

There are more affordable opportunities too. The government could offer incentives to retailers that effectively employ prevention technologies such as forecasting software, a move that would reduce food waste and potentially drive innovation.

A national consumer education program — think Smokey Bear but for food waste — would cost \$100 million. Households account for 38% of food waste, higher than any other sector, and campaigns to shift behavior are proven to work. Food waste declined in west London by 14% in just six months during the 2013 "Love Food, Hate Waste" initiative, leading the group to expand the program to 10 additional cities.

Reducing food waste is an opportunity for the Biden administration to tackle climate change in an effective and politically palatable way. There is a road map. Now all they have to do is follow it.

DANA GUNDERS is executive director of ReFED, a nonprofit working to end food waste in the United States.

## Missing: A policy for immigrant integration

Biden's Citizenship Act would fund the kind of programs that can finally fill the gap.

By Francisco Lara-García

**T**HE THOUSANDS of migrants trying to enter the United States at the southern border have sparked a fresh wave of political debate over who should be let into the country and how minors and others seeking asylum should be treated.

Republicans have launched a political blitz against Democrats by painting President Biden as the cause of a so-called surge at the southern border. Meanwhile, Democrats in Congress have settled on passing legislation in the House that would provide a path to citizenship for millions of migrants, including "Dreamers" and farmworkers. Neither side is talking about how newcomers should be integrated into American life.

For a nation obsessed with the politics of immigration and the effects immigrants have on society, the U.S. puts very little effort into integration policy. We at least manage to rank in the second tier of countries favorable to immigrants on the Migrant Integration Policy Index, but any help we offer newcomers is patchwork at best; it varies from hostility in some locales to decent programs in others. Many immigrants thrive in America, but their success is, as one 2011 study concluded, "heavily stratified" by "educational and economic resources, racial inequities and legal status."

Biden's immigration reform proposal, the U.S. Citizenship Act, could begin to remedy our laissez-faire approach to inclusion. If it were adopted, it would represent a significant scale of investment in developing a national integration policy.

One key provision of Biden's overhaul would create a national foundation to help coordinate integration efforts with state and local officials and promote citizenship preparation programs among low-income and underserved populations. That alone would improve the scattershot quality of American integration efforts that scholars see as a major problem.

The act would establish a grant pilot program to jump-start integration efforts at the local level and allocate close to \$300 million to English training, workforce preparation and naturalization programs — likely the biggest investment of its kind since the Immigration Reform and Control Act passed in 1986. It also would commission a study on employment opportunities for immigrants with professional credentials earned abroad. As it stands now, many newcomers never find a way to put their skills and education to use in the U.S.

Accelerating the process of immigrant integration is as good for American society as it is for new arrivals. My own research on refugees shows just how far some of the provisions included in the Biden plan can go.

With a co-researcher, I looked at recent refugees from five nations who arrived in the U.S. with varying skill sets and resources. Our analysis showed that refugees who attended basic English language classes were much more likely to be attending school, and those who took job training courses were more likely to have a job. These simple programs were more important for predicting school attendance and employment than other factors, including country of origin, education levels before immigration and prior occupation. In short, the language and workforce funding in the Biden plan could make a real difference in outcomes for immigrants.

Unfortunately, there are already warning signs that inclusion and integration programs could be abandoned as Congress wades into the politics of immigration reform. The current Republican plan, just like bipartisan immigration proposals in 2007 and 2013, does not contain meaningful integration programs. And in an environment where Republicans are attempting to position Democrats as prioritizing the needs of migrants before those of American citizens, some GOP lawmakers will surely object to any program that serves immigrants.

Nor did Democrats keep integration policy in the first round of immigration legislation they pushed through the House. This may be politically expedient, and there is a chance that it can be fixed later. But more likely, the piecemeal approach Democrats are taking will cause integration and inclusion programs to fall through the cracks.

As the immigration reform debate picks up steam, it's crucial that policymakers remember that their task is not just to determine whether and how to let people through the door. They must also address how we want immigrants to interact with American society once they are here.

FRANCISCO LARA-GARCÍA is a Paul F. Lazarsfeld fellow in the sociology department at Columbia University.





# Living the California Dream

*African American Leisure*

*Sites during the Jim Crow Era*

ALISON ROSE JEFFERSON



## Martha Alvarez

---

**From:** PAMELA DAVIDSON <davidson@ucla.edu>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 6, 2021 5:50 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comment on BBTF to City Council on April 6, 2021

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

April 6 2021 – MBCC Meeting – 6 PM

In general, the City Council members showed great leadership at the Council meeting on March 16. Thank you!

### MAJOR QUESTION:

- **Why is another "acknowledgement" or even an "apology" currently under consideration? Is this redundant? And when does the shakedown end?**
- **It needs to end TONIGHT - on April 6th.**

The BBTF report calls for reparations. Anthony Bruce and his attorney in Florida are calling for restitution as noted in the Mar 11 NYT article

- In 2006-07, the 26th Street Park was renamed, "Bruce's Beach" in honor and memory of the Bruce Family; along with the other 30 families, eminent domain payment was made and accepted 100 years ago.
- Now, fast forward to 2021, almost 25 years later, another \$350,000 was allocated for an art expression in memory of the historical events.
- Steve Napolitano indicated in a prior personal communication that he had consulted the City Attorney for legal/financial advice.

Since that discussion other legal experts have weighed in and the general consensus now is that any statement will open up the City to legal and financial liabilities.

In regards to City government, the Council is responsible and accountable for making carefully deliberated, informed decisions for the City/Tax Payers that are legally and fiscally sound;

Since there is doubt and unknown and unforeseen outcomes, the Council members cannot be naïve, but rather choose the fiscally and legally conservative approach on behalf of the City Residents!

In summary: **NO RESOLUTION is in the best interest of the City of Manhattan Beach.**

Thanks for your continued leadership and prudence on this matter.

Sincerely, Pamela Davidson, PhD