

Alexandria Latragna

From: Alexandria Latragna
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 11:31 AM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Re: Bruces Beach Plaque comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged



ALEXANDRIA LATRAGNA

MANAGEMENT ANALYST

(310) 802-5063
alatragna@citymb.info

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH 1400 Highland Avenue Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Office Hours: M-Th 8:00AM-5:00PM | Fridays 8:00AM-4:00PM | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Reach Manhattan Beach Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app

Download the mobile app now



From: Steve Napolitano
Sent: Tuesday, July 27, 2021 11:04 AM
To: Alexandria Latragna <alatragna@citymb.info>
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] Re: Bruces Beach Plaque comment

Steve Napolitano
Councilmember
City of Manhattan Beach



STEVE NAPOLITANO

COUNCILMEMBER

(310) 880-7500
snapolitano@citymb.info

CITY OF MANHATTAN BEACH 1400 Highland Avenue Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Office Hours: M-Th 8:00 AM-5:00 PM | Fridays 8:00 AM-4:00 PM | Not Applicable to Public Safety

Reach Manhattan Beach Here for you 24/7, use our click and fix it app

Download the mobile app now



From: rogerhughes89 <rogerhughes89@protonmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 11:32 AM
To: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Bruces Beach Plaque comment

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

Council,

I want to thank you for your consideration of the issues I raised regarding the Bruce's Beach proposed plaque language during last week's meeting. I appreciate your asking questions around the issues that I raised in my email, and am glad that the staff and History subcommittee spokesperson validated and affirmed as correct each of the points that I raised. In particular, I would like to thank Mr. Napolitano for leading the questioning and Mr. Franklin for doing his own original source research to validate what he is being told. It was clear in discussion, and confirmed by the subcommittee spokesperson (Ms Long-Drew?) that several of the plaques assertions were not based in fact. I am disappointed that one of the subcommittee members felt the need to resign simply because their first draft was not blindly approved. I am concerned that the committee does not reflect a diverse representation of the community.

Mr. Napolitano brought up a point during the meeting effectively pointing out that community members had the opportunity to participate in the subcommittee and should have weighed-in on the language there. I would like to point out that is not entirely accurate. The subcommittee meetings are similar to Council meetings. The public has 2-3 min to speak at the top of the meeting, but can not contribute during the meeting. So there is no way for a community member to offer input to the language other than the path taken (submitting emails to council prior to the Council meeting).

I would like to attend the next sub-committee but the date and time are not posted (<https://www.citymb.info/government/city-manager/bruce-s-beach-task-force>). Can staff please let me know the details?

Thanks!

- - - - - Original Message - - - - -

On Tuesday, July 20th, 2021 at 3:23 PM, rogerhughes89 <rogerhughes89@protonmail.com> wrote:

Dear Council,

I would recommend changing or removing 2 paragraphs in the Strand plaque suggestions. They are factually incorrect and incendiary, and are in conflict with the information within the Task Force History Report. I respectfully request that the plaque language focuses on the known facts before memorializing them on our public spaces.

Statement 1:

Harassment at Bruce's Beach

Harassment of the Bruces and their guests from some White neighbors occurred immediately after the resort opened. "No Trespassing" signs were posted directly in front of the Bruces' property on a strip of beach owned by subdivider George Peck. Guests of the resort were forced to walk a half mile to reach the water. As Bruce's Beach popularity soared, White residents expressed concerns about an "invasion" by African Americans. In 1924, the Manhattan Beach Board of Trustees passed a series of ordinances aimed to thwart the Bruces' business and drive the Black community out of the City. When these laws failed to discourage Black residents and their guests, the City pursued more aggressive measures.

Issues with Statement 1:

- 1) Is it fair to call an owner placing a "no trespassing" sign on his private property "harassment"?
- 2) The history report does not cite evidence of white residents complaining of an "invasion". According to the history report, the phrase was loosely associated to a single person by an independent author 32 years later.
- 3) The claim that the Trustees tried a series of ordinances and then resorted to eminent domain is contradicted by the History Report. According to the History Report, the eminent domain ordinance (#263) was filed first, in January of 1924. The other ordinances (273-275) did not follow until June. Thus the statement is incorrect and misleading.

Statement 2:

The Racist Motivation Behind the Eminent Domain Action

On July 4, 1924, the *California Eagle* reported that Black fishermen in Redondo Beach were given Ku Klux Klan pamphlets labelled "Colored Folks Beach three miles North." The *Eagle* speculated that the Klan was "operating unrestrictedly along the waterfront," including Manhattan Beach. The article suggested that the Klan influenced the Board of Trustees in condemning Bruce's Beach.

In a February 4, 1927, letter to the *Manhattan Beach News*, the Bruce family wrote: "...the attempt to make a park out of these two blocks was a direct slap at us because we were not born white people." In 1943, Frank Daugherty, a member of the City's 1924 Board of Trustees, admitted to the *Manhattan Beach News*, "Our attorneys advised the members of the council never to admit the real purpose in establishing the park..."

Issues with Statement 2:

1) The history report clearly states "no evidence directly linking acts of harassment to the KKK", nor do they cite any evidence the KKK influenced the city council.

2) It seems unfair to assume that every other Trustee shared the same motivation as Frank Daugherty. Clearly today's City Council members don't all share the same motivation and opinion. Why would it be different then? The eminent domain action was part of building Live Oak Park as well. Both parks have survived 100 years, and are valuable parts of our city. So it's reasonable to assume some council members thought the parks were good ideas on their own merits.

Alexandria Latragna

From: roycasey@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, September 2, 2021 11:48 PM
To: Bruces Beach Task Force
Cc: List - City Council
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Bruce's Beach History Report and Plaques

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

To all members of the History Advisory Board of Manhattan Beach:

First of all, thanks for all of the many hours each of you invested into this project.

I watched the 7/20/21 City Council meeting wherein proposed plaque language and portions of the underlying history report adopted by City Council on 6/16/21 were sent back to the History Advisory Board for issues raised during the meeting. I wanted to watch the History Advisory Board meeting to address those issues; however I could not find any mention of a scheduled meeting on the City's website. Therefore, I decided to submit my comments for the Board to consider in writing via this email.

Before I comment on the issues raised during the 7/20/21 meeting, I would like to present some other comments for the Board's consideration:

1. **Frank Daugherty** - During the Board meetings on 5/26/21 & 6/28/21, after the history report was adopted by City Council, the question was raised if there was any actual evidence that Frank Daugherty was a member of the Board of Trustees of Manhattan Beach when the Board voted to enact a Complaint of Eminent Domain [and, if so, did he attend and vote at that meeting]. But I could not find where this question was resolved. I assume that someone on the Board has access to the minutes from this meeting of the Board of Trustees wherein the attendees and their votes would be documented. The whole question of racial motivation for Eminent Domain could hinge on this determination because after the issues raised during the 7/20/21 Council meeting, this uncorroborated story from Frank Daugherty told 30 years after the fact, might be the only story remaining to raise doubt about the true motivation of the Board of Trustees.
2. **"Professional Review Feedback"** document presented by the Board - First of all, this is not what the public expressed a need for during public comments. It is obvious from the bios provided that there was no attempt whatsoever to obtain "review feedback" from a bipartisan group of history experts, which was the primary complaint via public comments. Dr. Gross and other Far Left reviewers made substantive changes, provided input and heavily edited many portions of the history report and plaque language. And the Board did not identify their specific input. Professor Rosenthal from LMU submitted a preliminary review in a letter dated 6/13/21 that called out the need for a bipartisan approach that would include reading and analysis of all sources, placing uncorroborated stories and contested memories in the footnotes of the report below the main body so as to not confuse with the factual portion of the report, researching additional sources to include conservative voices, adding a proper context throughout the report vs one small comment in the forward and professional, bipartisan editing that would include removal of biased phrases and wording like the ones Mayor Hadley called out **during the 7/20/21 Council meeting**. Council Member Franklin called out the inclusion of statements that started with introductory phrases like "It has been speculated" and other phrases that call into question the factual nature of many statements in the report, like op-eds from Black activist newspaper bi-lines and op-eds, which should be moved to the footnotes. Mr. Franklin also recommended Dr. Josh Sides as an additional source. **At the 7/20/21 meeting**, all Council Members called out the need for editing but nobody had an answer on how to get it done and even invited the general public to submit their edits rather than mention the obvious solution to hire bipartisan experts. Lindsay Fox summarized the sentiment of the Board very well by saying "Dr. Gross is all we need" (6/7/21 Board Meeting 36min:08sec). As additional evidence that the Board had no appreciation whatsoever for the public outcry for an independent analysis by a fair and balanced team of bipartisan history experts, at the 5/26/21 meeting at 1hr:30min:40sec, Tyler St. Bernard made a comment that the Board using their select group of "reviewers" aligned with public comments that the Board should use professional historians.
3. A **"mystery copywriter"** was often referred to by Lindsay Fox in Board meetings that was not identified by name and it is unclear if that person is included in the list of professional contributors.

4. **Anthony Bruce**, a descendant of the Bruce's that stands to gain from the lawsuit threatened by Dwayne Shepherd, requested via Isla Garraway that a positive quote from Bernard Bruce to be removed from the history report. Bernard had made a statement after the public ceremony to rename the park after the Bruce's that the family was happy (See 5/26/21 Board meeting 25min:30sec). And, Anthony Bruce's input is not disclosed anywhere.
5. **Dr. Allison Jefferson**, a racial activist, provided input on plaque language by adding her opinion that Willa Bruce had a dream of opening a Beach House for Blacks and she was a visionary (5/26/21 Board meeting 33min:45sec) and other recommendations. However, her contributions were not disclosed in the Board's document entitled "Professional Review Feedback."
6. **Dwayne Shepherd**, noted spokesman for the Bruce's descendants, provided substantive input for the history report during Board meetings and perhaps during Task Force meetings. But this was not disclosed to the public. The Board completely ignored the fact that Shepherd has threatened publicly on many occasions to sue the City of Manhattan Beach for damages, "even if we get our land back" [while quoting stories directly from the history report as the basis for damages]. All of his input that I was able to identify during the Board meetings from 5/17/21 through 7/12/21 is clearly aimed at enhancing his chances of prevailing in litigation and increasing the amount of rewards for damages. For example, Isla Garraway and Lindsay Fox read from wording provided via email from Dwayne Shepherd, as follows:
 - **KKK** - 5/17/21 Board Meeting (1hr:19min) - Add KKK involvement harassment of Bruce's and their patrons and influence over the Board of Trustees of MB to enact Eminent Domain. After it was pointed out that the KKK was not active in the area until 3 or 4 years after the Eminent Domain decision, Isla argued that the Bruce's family feels like the role or influence or presence of the KKK is an important part of this story and we should mention it somewhere. During the 5/26/21 meeting, Board members openly explored possible wording to add a reference to KKK involvement and influence (e.g., KKK presence was evident, the growing KKK presence was evident, KKK activity increased, racist actions escalated, in response to exclusionary practices along the shoreline, etc.) Nothing was settled but the final thought was "What did the California Eagle say?" (a Black owned newspaper known for activism against segregation).
 - **Increase claim for damages** - Change the description of the facility from "dressing rooms" to "beach bath house" and add a list of amenities.
 - **Increase claim for damages** - 5/26/21 Board meeting (42min:28sec) - Add a statement that the Bruce's added 2 new structures.
 - **Racial Motive** - 5/17/21 Board meeting (1hr:38min) - Shepherd requested through Isla Garraway that the report include some confusing language from Brigham's Thesis that makes it sound like George Lindsay used the term "negro invasion" when it may have been Robert Brigham. Isla Garraway argued that we [the Board] definitely wanted the family [Bruce's] to give us [the Board] insight as to what they [Bruce's] wanted in their family story and I [Isla] was just thinking from the point of view of the family that he [George Lindsay] was a really important player in the community and came up with the whole idea of Eminent Domain that the City adopted. This is an important issue because misleading readers could advance a cause like giving back the land taken from the Bruce's and all the other land owners affected by Eminent Domain.
 - **Raising questions re Fair Compensation** - Isla then said that Shepherd wanted to add "On 5/16/27, the Bruce's were forced to give up their land for less than market value." Kristan Long Drew pointed out that the Bruce's received more than market value. Also, during the 6/2/21 & 6/7/21 Board meetings, Kristan Long revealed having received copies of the court documents that show the Bruce's waived their right to trial by jury and trial by 3 Court appointed Referees, even though they were represented by a NAACP lawyer, and instead relied upon a valuation determined by a group of 3 Court appointed valuation Referees. Yet, the history report continues to leave this issue of fair compensation open as an unanswered question to ponder if the Bruce's were fairly compensated. And the report does not make it clear that the Board did receive and review the court documents and came up with nothing to support claims of racial discrimination or unfair compensation. This has misled readers of this report to believe that the Bruce Family should receive reparations.
 - **Grand Jury investigation of KKK, Race Wars, Gun Shots, Fires, etc.** The Board showed awareness that these stories about racial violence occurred 4 to 5 years after the Eminent Domain decision in various parts of the country and have nothing to do with Bruce's Beach, but decided to level these stories in the history report anyway.
 - **Uncorroborated stories included in the history report** about MB police harassing and arresting patrons of Bruce Beach Lodge, citizens slashing tires and setting fires to buildings are quoted by Dwayne Shepherd when making statement that he will file a lawsuit against MB for damages.

BELOW IS AN OPEN ITEM LISTING OF "ISSUES, CONCERNS & REQUESTS FOR CHANGES & EVIDENCE"

This recap is intended to help the Board, Council Members and residents keep track of this comprehensive list of open items raised by City Council on 7/20/21 and to help make the issues easier to understand.

BIG REVEAL DURING MEETING - THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF KKK INVOLVEMENT OR INFLUENCE

A shocking reveal occurred **during the 7/20/21 meeting** by what can be described as an intensely scripted courtroom scene from *Law and Order* with Council Member Napolitano acting as interrogator of a witness played by Kristan Long. During this long exchange, Council Member Napolitano asked Ms. Long the same basic question 7 times in a row: Is there any evidence of KKK involvement in Bruce's Beach or KKK influence over the MB Board of Trustees to enact Eminent Domain to take away the Bruce's land and business (paraphrased)?

Ms. Long's final answer about no evidence was "In so far as the Klan's involvement, I don't know."

DOES ADEQUATE EVIDENCE REMAIN OF RACIAL MOTIVATION FOR ACTIONS BY MB BOARD OF TRUSTEES?

KKK involvement and influence was the primary evidence to support a conclusion in the history report that Eminent Domain was racially motivated. Most of these stories about KKK involvement included in the history report came from black activists newspapers. And at the end of 10 months, out of nowhere, **it was revealed during the 7/20/21 Council Meeting** that there is no credible evidence for this claim. So, what evidence remains?

The history reports states that Robert Brigham's amateur level Master's Thesis from 1956 (32 years after the Eminent Domain) "served as a primary resource on the history of Bruce's Beach," which was quoted and used as an authoritative reference 21 times in the history report. And, articles and opinions from black activist newspapers were relied upon as source material 20 times in the history report.

Mr. Brigham himself issued a warning about misinformation in his Thesis: "The misinformation the author encountered in seeking data on the Bruce's and other individuals and incidents related to his subject is significant as it indicates the ease with which fallacy can become 'fact' in a situation of this type."

Council Member Franklin pointed out **during the 7/20/21 meeting** that key statements in the history report taken from Brigham's Thesis included terms like "it was speculated" or "it's understood," which means these statements are not factual evidence. It is abundantly clear that most quotes from Brigham's Thesis are pure speculation based on frequent use of phrases like: "so-and-so wrote, said, claimed, reported, indicated or relayed a story about," or "it is understood that" or "allegedly, it has been said," or "Brigham speculated, Brigham reports, Brigham wrote," etc.

Mr. Franklin made an observation **during the 7/20/21 meeting** that black activist publications were heavily relied upon as sources in the history report (*The California Eagle, Venice Vanguard & Liberator*). It is well known that black activist publications expressed viewpoints and opinions to help fight segregation. To prove a point that these newspapers are not credible sources for facts, Mr. Franklin read a quote from the book, *LA City Limits African American Los Angeles from the Great Depression to the Present*, written by a renowned authority on the subject, Dr. Josh Sides: "The black press of Los Angeles played a crucial role in politicizing its readers more than simply conveying newsworthy information, the California Eagle and the Los Angeles Sentinel, the city's two most influential black newspapers, prodded their leadership to challenge racial discrimination."

The history report itself states, "These accounts [stories] were recited nearly 30 years after they were alleged to have occurred, and some were not from first-hand experience, calling into question the validity and credibility." "These accounts" being referred to include uncorroborated stories like the ones below:

- A "story relayed" in a 1987 letter to *The Beach Reporter* by a resident that was 14 years old in 1924 about a realtor that "allegedly approached the Board of Trustees in 1921 requesting action to discourage African Americans from establishing residency in MB" and later informed the Board that condemnation could be used to "shut down the Bruce's resort."
- During an interview conducted by Brigham, a lawyer for 2 black property owners "said air was let out of tires in cars parked near the Bruce's resort while owners were at the beach."
- "A member of the 1924 Board of Trustees 'claimed' that one night he 'followed a siren to Bruce's Lodge where someone ('supposedly' a Klansman) had set fire to a mattress under the main building."
- "A daughter of black property owner affected by Eminent Domain "relayed a story of a Black-owned home on 23RD Street that was partially burned in 1926, 'allegedly' by a White neighbor, upset that an African-American woman had purchased it."
- Another interviewee "reported "10 Minutes Only" parking signs that were posted on Highland near the home of her mother (Mary Sanders) to make parking inconvenient for their friends and visitors."

After the statement in the history report questioning the validity and credibility of stories included in the report, the report say "we discovered reports by a variety of sources that corroborate acts of violence against members of the Black community in MB." The report went on to express reliance on grand jury investigations in 1928 long after the 1924 Eminent Domain action. Ms. Long admitted **during the 7/20/21 meeting** that the grand jury investigations did not seem to go anywhere and hoped that someone could find those documents.

As a result of heavy reliance on these types of sources, lots of opinions, op-eds, speculation and uncorroborated stories that are included in the main body of the history report and mixed-in with factual statements, which makes the report misleading because it is difficult to distinguish facts from mere stories.

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT FOR THE HISTORY REPORT TO BE FACTUALLY ACCURATE?

- The plaques will have QR codes to link the history report and video posted on the City's website to individuals that want to learn more when reading a brief summary of history on the plaques.

- The report was already used by MBUSD to justify appointment of a “Commission on Diversity, Equity, Social Justice and Inclusion,” plus compliance audits by CLEAR. And the Bruce’s Beach Task Force previously recommended a similar commission and audits for our City Government & Police Dept.
- The report, as written now, can be used as the poster-child by the state for a recently appointed reparations committee and justification for LA County to give back land and pay heirs of the Bruce Family.
- Uncorroborated stories included in the main body of the report are treated like factual accounts, which can be used as evidence to support a lawsuit against MB already threatened by a spokesman for heirs of the Bruce Family for damages (supported by uncorroborated stories) and lost income from their business “even we get our land back.” Court documents will show the Bruce’s were already paid for their business.
- If the report is used to justify reparations, restitution and/or a successful lawsuit against MB by the Bruce’s, then the report will likely be used as evidence by heirs of other property owners affected by Eminent Domain to file lawsuits against the City related to land owned by the City that is worth about \$150mil.

NEED FOR EDITING OF HISTORY REPORT AND PLAQUE LANGUAGE

There was lots of discussion between Council Members about **who was going to tackle the job of editing the revised plaque language after it comes back from the History Committee**, in order to craft language that strikes a fair and balanced tone, adds more context and separates the “story” from the facts. In other words to “get it right.”

Mayor Hadley said the language needs to be “fair” and “accurate” or “we want nothing” and “there is no rush.” She went on to say “our History Advisory Board is staffed with amateurs” but the language “must be right.” The Mayor also said “every word does matter,” and that she “voted for an accurate history of Bruce’s Beach; it wasn’t the story, it was the facts” and also asked for removal of a long list of 15 words and phrases (“pioneer, racially diverse, Jim Crowe era, exclusionary, immediately, soared, invasion, drive the black community out of the city, speculated, encouraged by the Bruce’s success, the legacy, far less, demolished, compelled, and abandoned”).

Council Member Montgomery made his case for an “accurate history” no matter how long it takes, as follows: The History Committee is “charged with” providing “fair, historical, factually accurate plaques.” “We have to address the issues residents want to see,” by asking the History Committee to “re-write accurate verbiage and we’ll go from there.” And we should “take our time to do it the right way,” even “if it takes six (6) months more.”

PLIGHT OF WHITE PROPERTY OWNERS NOT REPORTED IN PLAQUE LANGUAGE

Council Member Montgomery pointed out that the plaque language only focuses on black families that had their property taken away by Eminent Domain. There were 20 property owners of the 30 lots taken by Eminent Domain, including only 6 black owners of 4 lots. Nonpartisan historical experts always focus on ensuring a fair and balanced history and will perform whatever level of research is necessary to report all the facts accurately.

NEED CREDIBLE EVIDENCE THAT FIRE WAS SET TO SLAUGHTER’S PROPERTY

Ms. Long repeated a story from the history report about the Slaughters finding gasoline under their house after it started to smoke and caught fire and a burning cross placed across the street. the time frame seems to be long after the Eminent Domain decision and there is no indication if it was supposedly perpetrated by MB residents. It is not clear if this is a corroborated, factual story, and it conflicts with MB being so welcoming to this family (see below).

WAS “INVASION BY AFRICAN AMERICANS” IN THE REPORT USED IN THE 1920’s OR FABRICATED IN THE 1950’s BY ROBERT BRIGHAM, AUTHOR OF THE THESIS USED AS A SOURCE 21 TIMES?

Council Member Napolitano asked Ms. Long about inclusion of the phrase “invasion by African Americans” by asking “where did the word invasion come from?” Ms. Long replied, “So in this context, it came about in Brigham’s Thesis. And it was unclear that whether or not it was just George Lindsay who said that he feared an invasion or if Brigham was saying invasion.”

WERE THE BRUCE’S ADEQUATELY COMPENSATED?

In addition to determining if racial discrimination motivated the Board of Trustees to enact Eminent Domain, the other critical question is adequate compensation to the Bruce’s for their land, improvements and business. However, nobody seems to have a grip on this answer after 10 months of work by this amateur history committee.

Council Member Napolitano said, “although they received compensation, it was far less than they requested for their property and thriving business. So that goes to the question of whether the compensation was fair or not and who judges whether it’s fair or not?”

Kristan Long replied that it was “above market value” but it was the Bruce’s had requested \$150,000, including \$50,000 for damages. Napolitano then stated “Again the implication is though that there was something wrong about the compensation.” Ms. Long stated “I understand the implication. We don’t know what the exact value of the business was but we can only tell you what the value of the property was.”

Council Member Franklin later pointed out that the Bruce’s were able to purchase a home at 1042-1044 East 20th Street in Los Angeles for about \$7,500. And in 1932 Willa and her son, Harvey Bruce, purchased two commercial properties at 724 East 33rd Street in Los Angeles and 1339 East 18th Street.

Here are some interesting facts. The present value of the \$14,500 settlement is \$60mil, which would be a huge payoff equivalent to \$24mil for 2 lots on the strand (based on \$2,911.23 paid for 1 lot adjacent to the Bruce's), leaving \$36mil paid for the business and buildings. This would be a huge payout by anyone's calculation.

HISTORY SHOWS MB WAS INCLUSIVE & WELCOMING, BUT NOT SHOWN IN PLAQUE LANGUAGE

Council Member Stern stated that there were 3 other properties in MB owned by black families on the south side of 26th Street that were not taken by Eminent Domain proceedings (McCastill, Urban and Slaughter). These properties were located directly across from the 30 lots now known as Bruce's Beach and would have been easy to include the Eminent Domain if the intent of the Board of Trustees was to take land from black property owners.

Kristan Long stated that the Slaughters were a prominent black family in MB that was a "part of the community," their 7 children attended MB schools, and they owned and operated a 10 room beach, boarding house for black patrons at 120 26th St adjacent to the properties taken by Eminent Domain. Ms. Drew further stated that one daughter was a member of the Glee Club in a MB school and was featured on the front page of the Manhattan Beach news. Ms. Long also stated that the Slaughters were allowed to open a beach-boarding house in 1927 that operated until 1930 when the back took it over.

But the history report failed to highlight the fact that this was after the City passed ordinances on 6/19/24 that "prohibited new or additional development of bath houses" per the history report.

Council Member Napolitano pointed out that the history report says 4 out of 5 black families affected by Eminent Domain bought replacement property in MB. Then he asked Ms. Long why there was no mention of this on the plaques. Ms. Long replied, "I think it was just for condense, for you know, being succinct" and "as a writer, everyone knows no one likes to read."

Even though it was commonplace during this era of legal segregation, MB did not restrict ownership of land by people of color in any way and permitted connection to city services and utilities for structures but this fact is not highlighted in the report or included in the proposed plaque language.

Mrs. Bruce agreed the MB was welcoming and inclusive per a quote from her in the LA Times, "Wherever we have tried to buy land for a beach resort [in other cities] we have been refused."

All these stories conflict with misleading statements in the history report that will be read via QR codes that the Board of Trustees of MB passed "ordinances aimed to thwart the Bruce's business and drive the black community out of the city" and the "city pursued more aggressive measures."

NEED COURT DOCUMENTS RE BLACK LADY THAT SUED MB POLICE FOR DAMAGES

Ms. Long repeated another story from the history report that is based on newspaper articles from a black activist newspaper (*California Eagle*). Ms. Long said that a black friend of one of the Slaughter girls named Elizabeth Catley was "the young lady who was arrested and not allowed to get her clothes before she went into the jail in Redondo, because she defied the order of the local [MB] policeman who said she was not allowed to go into the water here [MB]." The history report states that Ms. Catley "was arrested for swimming and 'trespassing' on the private beach" and filed suit for damages against the arresting officer and the MB Board of Trustees."

Council Member Napolitano asked Ms. Long, "since when is it racist to put a no trespassing sign on private property." Ms. Long replied, "Well it's not racist to put a no trespassing sign on private property except for the fact that the only people who were told they could not cross over this land to get to the water were the black visitors to the beach." Ms. Catley lost her lawsuit in City Court and appeal filed in LA Superior Court.

THE MAJORITY OF SOURCES FOR HISTORY REPORT WERE LEFT LEANING

Council Member Franklin made another valid point that the authors of the history report should have used a broader spectrum of sources. Franklin made the same point during the 6/15/21 Council meeting when he proposed adjudication by non-partisan history experts, but his idea was shut down. See discussion of heavy dependence on black activist newspapers and an amateur level Thesis under the subject line above that questions the credibility of evidence remaining that the Board of Trustees acted out of racial motives.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL SOURCES AND CONTEXT TO BE FAIR AND BALANCED

Council Member Franklin read other excerpts from the book written by Dr. Josh Sides, an award winning professor of CA history at Cal State Northridge and Director of the Center for Southern California Studies as referred to above (*LA City Limits*). The history report had only 1 casual reference to this book. Dr. Sides was also recommended to City Council by Dr. Ariel Gross, professor of law and history at USC, to be part of a balanced team of historical experts. Here is a quote in his book from Jefferson Elman, editor of the black LA newspaper the *Liberator* in 1902: "California is the greatest state for the negro." And in 1911, Elman elaborated "only a few years ago the bulk of your present-colored population came here from the south without any money in search of better things and we are not disappointed. The hospitable white people received them kindly, employed at good wages, treated them as men and women, furnished their children with the best educational advantages everywhere, feeling perfectly safe, the colored population planted themselves."

Again, thanks for your long hours of work and I hope this memo helps the Board conclude its scope of work.

Roy Casey