

Easy effort avoids hard life

Making a small effort to find an opportunity that can change your life and your family's lives is the smartest investment anyone will make. Our lead story in this issue about Edalid Berumen and the Fruitvale Academy is a great example of turning a small effort into a large benefit.



When her baby Cynthia was born, Edalid thought she was on her way to being a high-school dropout with few opportunities in her future. She wanted to stay in school, but it didn't look possible. Edalid's mother, Andrea, believed strongly in the importance of education and refused to just let her daughter's education end. Andrea did what many people do not do — she took some initiative and effort to find an opportunity. She went to the Oakland school district office to ask about options. Ultimately, it led her to learn about The Fruitvale Academy, which is now helping Edalid get her high school diploma and providing daycare at no cost. Andrea's small effort will make a big difference in her family's future. It will probably make the biggest difference for baby Cynthia's future.

Finding this kind of an opportunity is not difficult at all — there are so many programs and organizations helping people in need. Being connected and involved with your community makes it even easier to find such opportunities. When you get involved, opportunities often find us with no effort on our part! The most difficult part of finding any opportunity is to just make some effort, which isn't difficult at all. It's especially not difficult when you're doing it for your family and it will benefit the whole community.

Opportunities are everywhere. Whether it's for education, love, health or wealth, opportunities surround us every day. Where will you put your effort today?

Saludos,

Elena Miramar
Publisher, *Visión Hispana*



La Proposición 8 estuvo del lado equivocado de la historia

POR JOHN RUSSO FISCAL DE LA CIUDAD DE OAKLAND

Algunas semanas antes del día de las elecciones, oficié en la boda de un colega.

Como otras 18,000 bodas que se han llevado a cabo en California desde que la Suprema Corte del estado falló a favor del matrimonio entre personas del mismo sexo, la boda de mi colega fue la celebración del compromiso de una vida entre dos personas; y de la victoria de una continua lucha por los derechos civiles.

Mientras mi colega y su pareja intercambiaban votos, parecía casi imposible que los californianos pudieran votado a favor de decirle a esta pareja, y a miles de parejas amorosas como ellos, que su unión es menos que un matrimonio.

La proposición 8, que corrige la constitución estatal para quitarles a parejas del mismo sexo el derecho al matrimonio, de hecho borrando la Cláusula de Protección Igualitaria para parejas gay, fue un golpe personal y doloroso para miles de familias de California.

El mismo día en que la nación eligió a su primer presidente negro, una pequeña mayoría de californianos respondió a una campaña basada en el miedo y la desinformación, y vota para conservar la discriminación en contra de otro grupo minoritario en nuestra constitución.

Recientemente, Oakland se unió a la demanda de San Francisco en contra de la Proposición 8, que argumenta que tal redefinición arrolladora de la protección de la igualdad no puede ser hecha por un simple voto mayoritario.



Va a ser difícil para cualquier abogado argumentar que la Proposición 8 no niega la protección de igualdad a un grupo particular de personas, negar los derechos de igualdad a parejas del mismo sexo fue el objetivo de someter la medida al voto.

Esta Proposición 8 es una falla fatal. A lo largo de nuestra historia, el progreso de los derechos civiles ha estado basado en el principio constitucional fundamental que protege en contra de la "tiranía de la mayoría".

Este principio de protección igualitaria se encuentra en el corazón de nuestro sistema constitucional. Este garantiza que una mayoría poderosa no puede usar el proceso democrático para quitarle sus derechos a un grupo minoritario poco popular.

Casi cada paso adelante en los derechos civiles fue posible por la defensa de la Cláusula de Protección Igualitaria

por parte de la corte. La Suprema Corte de los Estados Unidos apoyó el derecho al voto de los Afroamericanos y terminó con la segregación escolar, todo en contra del fallo de la mayoría.

El gobernador Arnold Schwarzenegger está en lo cierto cuando compara la Proposición 8 con la vieja ley de California en contra del matrimonio interracial, lo que fue apoyado por la mayoría de votantes en los años 40, pero que fue abatida como inconstitucional por la Suprema Corte del estado.

La Proposición 8 está en el lado equivocado de la historia. Recientemente, la prohibición en California en contra del matrimonio de parejas del mismo sexo irá por el mismo camino que "separados pero iguales" y la exclusión de las mujeres de las casillas. La única pregunta es cuándo y cuántas familias permanecerán en la desigualdad ante los ojos de la ley hasta entonces.

Déjà vu for California's Budget, Terminator-Style

BY WILLIAM F. SHUGHART II

Those wearing green eyeshades in Sacramento seem to think that by taxing and spending more they can "create" jobs and reverse the current economic downturn. Yet California has been in the doldrums and state revenues have been flat or shrinking over the past few years not because its government is too small, but because it is too big. The latest budget crunch, along with Gov. Schwarzenegger's package of ad hoc responses to it, should be proof positive that prosperity will return to the state only when government gets out of the way.

With \$11.2 billion in red ink just six weeks after the budget for this fiscal year was signed into law, things aren't quite so dire as they were when then-Gov. Gray Davis faced a projected \$35 billion budget deficit for fiscal year 2004 and proposed a mix of spending cuts and across-the-board increases in fees and taxes, including upping the state's top marginal personal income tax rate, the sales tax rate, and the excise tax on cigarettes.

Fast forwarding to present day, the same bad fiscal policy ideas are being championed in Sacramento, with a bit of a twist. Gov. Schwarzenegger wants to tax and spend the state's way toward budget balance. But the combination of economic stimulus proposals he announced on November 6 is like rearranging the chairs on the deck of the Titanic after hitting the iceberg.

Except for tax credits granted to television and film production companies, all Californians will see their taxes go up. The governor is asking for a "temporary"

(three-year) increase (from 5 to 6.5 percent) in the state sales tax earmarked for the General Fund, thus raising the "core" sales tax rate to 8.75 percent. As if that news weren't bad enough for retailers and their customers, the few areas of

ance fund.

Higher taxes, whether levied generally at the retail level or imposed selectively on consumers are job-killers that will place high-tax California at an even greater competitive disadvantage than it is already.

On the spending side, Gov. Schwarzenegger wants to accelerate hospital construction to the tune of \$160 billion and to use existing bond monies earmarked for infrastructure projects to pay for retraining residential construction workers. Shifting public works projects from the future to the present may stimulate the economy modestly, but such projects typically have long lead times and California's taxpayers still have to finance them.

Offsetting whatever economic stimulus those new expenditures would provide, the governor also asks for a \$4.5 billion reduction in the General Fund, including \$2.5 billion less for K-14 education and a somewhat smaller cut for the state's institutions of higher learning, leading to higher out-of-pocket educational expenses for students and their families.

Making common cause with Washington, the Governor also wants to "help" the state's mortgage lenders renegotiate home loans in order to reduce foreclosure rates. One would think that lenders already have an incentive to do that very thing, as they have been doing for months in Florida.

No government can hope to balance its budget without encouraging growth in the private sector, which is its only source of revenue. The formula is well-known:

cut taxes and cut spending; live within your means.

William F. Shughart II is a Senior Fellow at The Independent Institute in Oakland, CA, a Distinguished Profes-

or of Economics at the University of Mississippi, and editor of the Independent Institute book, Taxing Choice: The Predatory Politics of Fiscal Discrimination.



Nuestra Misión:

Ser una fuente de noticias e información independiente y confiable que enriquezca la vida de las personas y construya puentes entre las diversas comunidades del Area de la Bahía.

Our Mission:

To be an independent and trusted source of news and information that enriches people's lives and builds bridges between the diverse communities of the Bay Area.

CONTENIDO

Noticias Locales	Page 2-3
Locales	Page 4
Opinión	Page 5
Nacionales	Page 6
Internacional	Page 7
Clasificados	Page 8
Entretenimiento	Page 9
Deportes	Page 10
Deportes	Page 11
Local	Page 12

Elena Miramar
Publisher/Editor

Alejandra Corte
Associate Editor

Darren Balleger
Advertising

Angel Solis
Account Executive

Claudia Gonzalez
Design

Edgar Gómez
Guillermo Vilchez
Julio Vichez
Distribution

P.O. Box 1411, Alameda, CA 94501
510-865-6274 contact@visionhispanausa.com

El periódico Visión Hispana no se hace responsable de las ofertas de los anunciantes. Todos los derechos reservados. Prohibida la reproducción total o parcial de su contenido.

(510) 865-6274