

vigor asking the state to change the age and citizenship requirements for voting. The Council expressed its opposition to the USA PATRIOT Act; and its support for democracy in Ireland; none of which the Council has any jurisdiction.

But the Council remains silent on the right of persons with disabilities to travel. This right remains violated every time it snows in the City. Many sidewalks are impassable for persons who use wheelchairs, for persons who use canes, and for persons who use guide dogs. Even when the sidewalks are cleared, the intersections remain blocked.

I am not mobility impaired. Yet I have difficulty walking after a snow storm. The right to travel is a more basic right than the alleged right to marry.

But in spite of the clamor of public officials and journalists, some persons with disabilities are denied equal rights in marriage laws, which the Gay and Lesbian Lobby obtained in a recent court case. They speak of "equal rights for all;" but they mean equal rights for gays and lesbians.

Why are the restrictions of persons with disabilities unaddressed by the court, Gay and Lesbian lobbyists and journalists?

The American Heritage Dictionary, 2nd College Edition 1991, defines bigot as: "A person who is rigidly devoted to his own group, religion, race, or politics and is intolerant of those who differ."

Bigotry is defined as: "The attitude, state of mind, or behavior characteristic of a bigot; intolerance."

Favoring the Gay and Lesbian Lobby shows bias for one special interest group, by the City Council. On December 8, 2003 I spoke before the meeting about the difficulty of persons with disabilities when there is snow covered sidewalks. Yet during the meeting not one, none of the City Councilors mentioned this difficulty, though they spoke on snow removal and snow clearing for a substantial amount of time.

Further catering to the Gay and Lesbian Lobby, the Council voted on the recommendation of the City Manager to violate a Supreme Judicial Court order to not use taxpayer funds for domestic partner benefits. They ignore the court case which declared that practice illegal. But they want to enforce a court case which the court itself said would not go into effect for 180 days. If that is not bigotry and selective enforcement of laws, it has no meaning in the language.

In addition, the City's cable access station, run as a private station by the Executive Director for 15 years, continues to abuse its power for personal and political purposes contrary to state and US laws.

On one occasion in 15 years, the \$800,000 received from the City was used for a staff production on Disability Rights. One in 15 years! And that came only after three years of complaints from me, and after I filed a complaint with the MCAD.

It was also after the Executive Director came into the studio on December 10, 2002, as I was to go on the air, and literally screamed at me for five minutes to shut up and to stop saying what I said. I reminded her that I had a right under the US Constitution to express my opinions and that she was abusing her power.

One regular practice of the Executive Director is to use young women as bait for provocations to chase critics from the station. This happened in 1999 with one citizen; and again during 2002 and 2003 with

Letter to City Council from R Bercaw Dec. 11, 2003

me. It is the reason why I have completed no productions at the station since October 2002. I stay away out of fear of false accusations from the gay and lesbians who run the station.

The Executive Director like other City officials openly favors certain well funded and well connected protected lobbyists for special interest groups, while they openly abuse other vulnerable citizens, e.g., people with disabilities; and deny to them equal access to the station's facilities and programs.

My several complaints to the City were ignored about this personal insult by the Executive Director. But again on December 8, 2003 when I went to return a camera to the station the Executive Director, a black police officer, ~~or~~ informant, along with one of her (CCTV's) obedient employees openly tried to provoke me in order to chase me from the station.

The male appeared to be a police employee who protects drug dealers from a foreign jurisdiction, using a young woman as bait. David Zermeno and the Executive Director along with the black police employee, tried to use her to accuse me of sexual harassment. This is the pattern of gay police employees to discredit me for more than 25 years in three states. My complaints to City officials about police abuses, have been ignored for 15 years.

On Tuesday December 9, 2003 at about 5:15 PM, after my live show on CCTV, David Zermeno said to me as he listened to my conversation with another member of the station, "You better watch what you say." This is only the latest instance of antagonism by staff at CCTV in response to my complaints about harassment and denial of privileges enjoyed by others.

This is one more example of bigotry at a City funded agency. It is an illegal abuse of power and a violation of state and US discrimination laws.

All of this in addition to daily harassment at my residence where gay and lesbian police informants harass me every day tormenting me and trying to provoke violence. This is one more instance of bigotry by City officials who refuse to stop the abuse and join in frequently.

All of this is a serial violation of US law under color of law, violating guaranteed Constitutional rights, The First Amendment, and the MA Civil Rights statute. The intimidation and retaliation by City officials, Police informants and CCTV officials for my protected speech and for my efforts to enjoy the same rights as other citizens is a repeating violation of those laws.



8

2003 DEC 11 P 4: 38

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
ENOUGH ROOM, ROY BERCAW, EDITOR
PO BOX 400297, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02140 USA 617-491-0433

Honorable Cambridge City Council
795 Mass Avenue
Cambridge MA 02139

December 11, 2003

Bigotry in Cambridge

The Council meeting of December 8, 2003 demonstrated two troubling aspects of the City Council in addition to misplaced priorities. Before the meeting began a citizen approached some City officials inquiring how to be heard at the meeting about a problem with snow removal; one day after a 25 inch snowfall in the City.

He asked some of the Councilors to suspend the rules so that he might speak on the matter, which was not on the Council agenda. They all refused. I heard Councilor Reeves say to the man, "You're bipolar."

This is a shocking statement for any public official whether true or not. It would be a violation of the right to privacy if it came from a medical professional. Upon what did Councilor Reeves base this statement? Was it his own personal opinion? What did it have to do with the citizen's request to speak and for the privilege of a rules suspension?

It is not as if the Council seldom suspends the rules. This happens more than once every meeting, often in violation of the Council's own rules on rules suspensions. One time the Council suspended the rules for Harvard students who wanted to speak on the bombing of the Puerto Rican Island of Vieques. This citizen wanted to speak on snow removal; a matter within the Council's jurisdiction.

It sounded as if Councilor Reeves dismissed the citizen due to Reeve's perception that the citizen was bipolar. If so that was a violation of the Chapter 151 B of the Mass General Laws, the US Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Coming from Councilor Reeves this is especially worrisome. If anyone on the Council knows discrimination, it is Councilor Reeves. On many occasions he recounted his personal experiences in Cambridge of overt bias based on race and sexual preference. He is especially sensitive to such bias. The Council never addressed bias toward persons accused of mental illness. All they do is print a statement that the City does not discriminate based upon disability.

But why is that statement exclusively about disability based bias? Does it mean that the City DOES discriminate, based upon race, religion, sexual preference, gender or other protected categories? Why does the City isolate one form of discrimination?

If that was the only instance of bias based upon disability it could be ignored. But the matter of snow removal indicates that the City is indeed inattentive of the needs and rights of persons with disabilities.

At earlier meetings the Council demonstrated its zeal in support of the recent state court case revising the definition of marriage; its

4223

Communication #8

A communication was received
from Roy Bercaw, regarding bigotry
in Cambridge.

In City Council December 15, 2003

PLACED ON FILE