

TWO EVIL ENDORSEMENTS  
**YES**  
ON MEASURE S

Let me ask you a question. Do you think capitalism is fair?

But won't stopping development make the problem worse?

Anyone who quoting Econ 101 "supply and demand" is telling you our housing crisis is a crisis of supply, a shortage we can build our way out of. Tell them to check the high vacancy rate at new buildings (12-20%), and the price of new buildings (which demands double the average Angeleno's income). Tell them to take Econ 201, where they might learn about "spillover effects," when property values rise adjacent to new building. Tell them to take Econ 301, where they might study financialization and realize the market doesn't produce homes it produces opportunities for investment.

Then, tell them to check the demolition registers of Elis evictions that raze truly affordable rent-stabilized homes for luxury vacation (vacant) towers. Shut up and listen to tenants talk about the rise of evictions, landlord harassment, blatant racism, and scams. Oh, and our homes aren't interchangeable, or abstract. They connect us to our neighborhoods, where we hug our families, run into our friends. Our housing crisis isn't a crisis of supply, it's a crisis of affordability and displacement. Shred that Economics degree. Start over with Ethics.

Greatest good for greatest number!  
Invisible hand! Meritocracy!

We're done here.

Any shade of no, nope, or never

Fuck apartments I can't afford to live in that wreck the places I actually can!

Measure S is a moratorium on the kind of new real estate development that needs the city to approve a general plan amendment or grant a spot zoning exemption. This means, Measure S would stop only 5% of new projects.

But isn't Michael Weinstein...like...bad?

Now, the Measure's initiator, Michael Weinstein has connived to turn AIDS into a booming business (assessment only a little brutal), championed one unforgivable measure (condoms in porn, thankfully defeated), but also one worthy one (regulation of drug prices, woefully defeated). I'm willing to appeal to his self-interest and that of other crotchety property owners if it means giving renters a break. (Anyone who tries to tell you that Measure S is only for "Not In My BackYard"ies, is ignoring those of us fighting to keep our yard. I'm fine with density, just not only for the rich.)

But won't Measure S block affordable housing?

Anyone who tries to use poor or homeless people as a pawn in their argument to tell you that Measure S will stop "affordable" or homeless housing is 1) hiding their alliance with Eli Broad, Mayor Garcetti, and the Times Editorial Board (who Mike Davis called development pawns). 2) not telling you that the "affordable" they want is a euphemistic feel good veneer for subsidized luxury and market development with a scant few income-capped units that are too expensive for the actual poor. 3) whining about the inconvenience of finding other ways to build buildings.

The alliance of developers and city government has built their No campaign around "it goes too far." Actually, it doesn't go far enough. Measure S will stop just 5% of LA's unaffordable housing development, which cannibalize truly affordable rent stabilized apartments and accelerate displacement. Get the fuck on board. (Next stop: public housing and universal rent control.)

More info: Why the LA Tenants Union Supports Measure S:  
<http://bit.ly/2lQZeVh>

Displacement Impact Report: Just ONE luxury housing development can burden or displace 43,756 residents:  
<http://bit.ly/2kWc8Ar>