

Press-Herald

GLENN W. PFEIL Publisher
REID L. BUNDY Editor and Co-Publisher
Torrance, Calif., Wednesday, March 6, 1968

The Signs Among Us

The touchy subject of business signs, ranging from those painted on buildings to the revolving globes, shields, and buckets, is much with us again.

Proposals which have been in the process of developing over much of the past year are being considered now by a City Council committee, and will go before the full Council for a decision soon.

Proposals under consideration include those prepared by the city's planning department and those drawn up by a merchants' committee. There is practically no agreement in the two sets of proposals.

The planning department proposals, which have been criticized as too stringent, would outlaw many of the present business signs in the city, and carries with it an abatement section which calls for removal of all outlawed signs within a four-year period.

The Council's committee has properly indicated that it is not in favor of the harsh abatement requirements. Many of the signs which would fail to meet the strict code represent heavy investments and even their removal would often be a burdensome business expense.

Signs may be the most important point of identification for most businesses. To put severe restrictions on them would not be in the best interest of the city whose revenue now depends largely on the generation of sales tax dollars.

The city may be able to do without the sandwich boards set up in front of businesses, but let's not force Sam's to do away with that beautiful restaurant sign, nor Union Oil to do away with those big orange globes over their stations, or force Standard Brands to reduce the area of its painted front.

Even Colonel Sanders should be able to have his bucket of chicken turning in the Torrance skyline. It's a way of doing business.

A Deserved Recognition

Presentation of the Citizen-of-the-Month award sponsored by Great Lakes Properties to Joe Wilcox, Executive Secretary of the Torrance Family YMCA, recognized one of Torrance's ablest community leaders.

In Mr. Wilcox, Torrance has found a tireless worker whose efforts on behalf of the community's young people has worked wonders.

It was still another side of Joe that the Great Lakes Properties people found impressive when they went looking for the latest Citizen-of-the-Month. It was the annual Navajo Project which the Torrance YMCA has developed under his leadership and which has involved thousands of Torrance families in a Christmas outpouring of help for the Navajos of Arizona for a decade.

A measure of the program is its emphasis on involvement of time and self, not money. That's the way Joe works.

We applaud the selection. It's a recognition Joe richly deserves.

Opinions of Others

What is probably the most sensible idea to come out of Washington in a good many years is the one made by a congressman . . . that able-bodied men on relief rolls be required to do some work in exchange for their checks. One possibility mentioned was picking up debris along public roads. Many similar types of work could be considered. This suggestion is probably quite appalling to most of the present generation of reliefers who have been brought up in the belief that the government owes every man a living, but those of us who can remember the depression days of the 1930's are made to wonder how, why and when the idea of performing some service in return for government support was dropped.—Italy (Tex.) News-Herald.

We doubt that many people fully realize how vital advertising is to our society in spurring competition and thus protecting the consumer. . . . Advertising, more than any other factor, establishes prices and protects the buyer from being charged exorbitantly. . . . Because of advertising, the public is becoming harder and harder to bilk. . . . Thus, those suggestions for more stringent regulations and limitations of advertising are aimed, though perhaps indirectly, squarely at the heart of freedom of the press. Restricted advertising means, in the final analysis, press censorship. . . . Advertising is the very foundation of the free press. And that is why freedom of the press, freedom of enterprise and the unrestricted right to advertise will all succeed or fail together.—Delta (Colo.) Independent.

Morning Report:

It is only natural that with firemen, cops, and garbage collectors pulling strikes, teachers should follow the trend. But they are in the worst position of all. Nobody is on their side except mothers who can't stand the kids being at home.

The issue really boils down to what is more important: uncollected garbage or undistributed education. Does society suffer more when there is garbage in the streets or kids who should be in school?

I don't recall that any of the last three Presidents of the United States ever even mentioned garbage once in a State of the Union address. Education gets all the hallowed mention but garbage collectors get the big raises. I thought the teachers should know this.

Abe Mellinkoff

What It Feeds On



ROYCE BRIER

Information Army Buries Nation in a Paper Flood

In the summer of 1800, President John Adams moved the government from New York to the new capital city, Washington. He moved the government records in boats, and took with him 146 federal officers and clerks.

This neat nest of files and people would hardly fill a corner of one of the government publicity bureaus today.

John S. Knight, the publisher, recently noted in an Ohio newspaper that government public relations and information programs are now costing taxpayers \$425 million annually. He pointed out that this exceeds the cost of operating the Congress, and exceeds the combined outlay for major gathering by the two major press associations, the three television networks and the ten largest newspapers.

He might have added that it equals the total cost of maintaining the government in the first McKinley administration, late 1890s.

This \$425 million represents the salaries of at least 35,000 individuals, plus maintenance cost, including travel, communication, and

supplies. What does this "information" army do?

First, it generates an immense flood of paper, bulletins, reports, arguments, undulating all American press and television services, the Congress, the states, and often rival bureaus. The embassies have their own information staffs, and so likewise do the military services. This snowstorm of

Opinions on Affairs of the World

paper criss-crosses the world and bogs the mails.

Its primary purpose is to perpetuate, and enlarge, if possible, the bureau or department issuing it, and secondarily to provide information to the people about phases and problems of their government.

Very little of this written material is objective; it presents the point of view of the issuing bureau, and glosses over or omits any opposing point of view.

When a bureau errs, or is in trouble with the Congress or independent news media, it buzzes like a beehive in its own defense. And, alas, some of the written material is devoted to praise of the bureau chiefs and their own

staffs, central or regional.

The bureaus presume the newspapers avidly read their copy, but in reality the newspapers throw most of it away. Only a gullible newspaper would fail to see through the special pleadings. But the newspapers do heed public relations men in direct contact with reporters, often to the public profit. The most notable example is the White House press secretary who, to put it bluntly, is a press agent for the President and his administration.

But the whole system is so patently self-serving that it is doubtful if a tenth of the written material issued ever reaches general circulation.

No other modern nation (with one exception) expends so much energy and money telling its people what they should think, and no other people, with the exception, spends so much of its own pocket money to be told what to think. The exception, of course, is the Soviet Union, which monopolizes all news, the Russian people having no means of arriving at an independent judgment about their government, and the events of the world.

WILLIAM HOGAN

Winners in National Book Awards Judging Today

Judges for the 19th annual National Book Awards have been named "leading nominees" for the six \$1,000 literary prizes which will be awarded today at ceremonies in New York City. This is the book industry's own tribute to authors. These "leading nominees," which panels of judges have been considering, were released by the National Book Committee to "stimulate public interest in the literary arts and good books."

Fiction judges Josephine Herbst, Granville Hicks, and John Updike, reported five titles: "Why Are We in Vietnam?" by Norman Mailer; "A Garden of Earthly Delights," by Joyce Carol Oates; "The Chosen," by Chaim Potok; "Confessions of Nat Turner," by William Styron; "The Eighth Day," by Thornton Wilder.

The Art and Letters jury, F. W. Dupee, Hilton Kramer, and Wylie Sypher, re-

ported: "Music, The Arts and Ideas," by Leonard Myers; "A Primer of Ignorance," by R. P. Blackmur; Conroy; "The New Poets," by M. L. Rosenthal; "Selected Essays," by William Troy; "Beardsley," by Stanley Weintraub.

The History and Biography jury, Daniel Bell, Quincy Howe, and Justin Kaplan, are considering: "Woodrow Wilson: The Academic Years," by H. W. Bragdon;

Browsing Through the World of Books

"The Cold War as History," by Louis J. Halle; "To Move a Nation," by Roger Hillsman; "Memoirs," by George Kennan; "Lost New York," by Nathan Silver.

Science, Philosophy and Religion jury, Rene Dubois, Phillip Morrison, and Edward Shils, report: "The Biology of Ultimate Concern,"

by T. Dobzhansky; "The New Industrial State," by John Kenneth Galbraith; "Death at an Early Age," by Jonathan Kozol; "Mind: An Essay on Human Feelings," by Suzanne Langer; "The Myth of the Machine," by Lewis Mumford.

Other juries have been considering poetry and works of translation into English, including a new translation by Richard Lattimore of "The Odyssey of Homer."

The National Book Awards are donated by the American Book Publishers Council, the American Booksellers Association, the Association of American University Presses, the Book Manufacturers Institute and the National Translation Center. Awards are administered by the National Book Committee, a non-profit, educational association of citizens reflecting the public interest in books and reading.

HERB CAEN SAYS:

McQueen's a Cool Cat; A New Breed of Actor

Steve McQueen is one of the new breed of movie star—cool, straightforward, articulate in a rather plain manner, and glamorous without seeming aware of it. His hair is long, but sort of shaggy. His clothes are expensively mod. He shuns night clubs, expensive restaurants, and other see-and-be-seen places.

Also unlike the old-style movie hero, he prefers motorcycles and English minis to mile-long limousines, and he refuses to surround himself with a protective wall of press agents. He is one step beyond the Marlon Brando type, which has also become out of date. The Brando's give the impression of being surly, secretive, and anti-social. The McQueens talk freely—even to the press—and never use those hateful words, "Off the record." The closest they'll come is a "This is between us," followed by a long, level look and "You know what I mean." You know what they mean.

I caught up with McQueen at a smallish hotel on the San Francisco waterfront, in the shadow of the Ferry Building. He was on the top floor with his camera crew, shooting scenes for his next movie, "Bullitt," that bring the name of the S.F. police lieutenant he portrays. "Yeah," imagine me playing a cop," he smiled wryly. "I'm not a cop-lover—anything but. Actually, I used to be a full-fledged cop. HATER—they kicked me around plenty when I was a kid. And a uniform—any kind of a uniform—still turns me off. But we all have to do our thing, and some cops are pretty good guys. They know some of the laws are ridiculous, too."

It was McQueen's idea to shoot the film in San Francisco. "I suppose the story

would make as much sense in Los Angeles, Chicago, or New York," he said, "but San Francisco is where it's at today—this is the relevant city of the United States. So much is happening here, in such a small area—you can actually feel the excitement, see it, smell it. We've rewritten the script to get more of the 'feel' of this place—and I don't mean shots of bridges

Report From Our Man In San Francisco

and cable cars, they've been done to death."

He stared out the window at the nearby gray Bay, where a red-stacked tug was nudging a freighter, a troop transport was heading Golden Gateward, and the bridge arched mistily into the distance. "Yeah," he breathed, "this is where it's at. You know, the cop I'm playing is relevant, too. He isn't even married. He lives on Telegraph Hill with a very hip English photographer, and they're really hung up on each other. And my boss—a tough captain—he has two kids who are hippies, the beads and all. The world is changing and you can see it all in San Francisco."

He waved a casual goodbye, jumped into his tiny brown Austin-Cooper and roared away up the Embarcadero, toward the hilltop penthouse he's occupying while here. But the penthouse doesn't make him resemble the movie stars of yore—not in San Francisco, where almost everybody lives in a room with some kind of view or another.

What with Seiji Ozawa becoming the next conductor of the S.F. Symphony and the Japanese Cultural Center opening big on Geary Parkway, the Japanese are

very hot these days—so I thought I'd let you in on something arcane supplied by Prof. S. I. Hayakawa, the very big semanticist who is also Japanese, the thing to be. The Japanese, he reports, call California "Kashu," pronounced "cashew," as in nuts. They call Los Angeles "Rafu," which is short for "Rassanjerus," I Paar you not. Sacramento is "Ohfu," as in "Ohfu, I didn't vote for Reagan." And S.F. is "Soko," which means "Mulberry Harbor." I don't know why and neither does Prof. Hayakawa, whose friends call him "Don." Why?

Baseball note: The ideas of March dept.: The Giants obtained Second Baseman Ron Hunt from the Dodgers to plug that big hole in their infield, but how about the leak in the box office? The rival Athletics, newly-installed at the Oakland Coliseum (infinitely more comfortable and attractive than miserable old Candlestick Park), report that fully one-third of their box seats have been bought by—San Franciscans. And if the Giants field a second-division team, with the inevitable sag at the box office, the cry will grow louder to abandon Candlestick—a wanderswept disaster from the beginning—and build a new stadium in the South of Market district, handy to the downtown area.

Mayor Joseph Alioto, a Candlestick-hater himself, has all but come out for this plan (incredible, since Candlestick is only eight years old). In fact, he is already on record as opposing a multi-million dollar scheme to "improve" the park. His rhetorical question: "How do you go about improving a mediocrity?" The worried Giants can only pray that the Athletics perform as clownishly as they have in the past.

SACRAMENTO SCENE

Retiring Legislators to Reap Added Pay Benefits

By EDWIN S. CAPPS
Capitol News Service

SACRAMENTO — When three members of the California legislature turn in their suits at the end of 1968, after long years of service, they will have many fond memories of their days in Sacramento, as well as from \$700 to more than \$1,000 a month in retirement benefits, to show for it.

So far, three assemblymen have announced retirement plans but the law of averages provides that about that many more will go into involuntary retirement, via the voting polls.

Announcements of retirements have been made by Assemblymen Edward E. Elliott, D-Los Angeles; Charles W. Meyers, D-San Francisco; and Stewart Hinckley, R-Redlands.

Elliott was first elected at a special election in 1947 and, in terms of seniority in the assembly, ranks about fourth. Meyers was elected in 1948. Hinckley was elected in 1947, serving through 1954. After eight years in a federal position, Hinckley was re-elected to the legislature in 1962.

Elliott's retirement income will be about \$1,008 per month, or \$12,100 a year. Meyers will be just under \$1,000 a month, while Hinckley's retirement pay will amount to just under \$765 per month, or nearly \$9,200 a year.

Because of their longevity, all three members served a lot of their time in the legislature when the salary was only \$3,600 a year. That was increased in the mid-50s to \$6,000 a year and, under Prop. 1-a in 1966, was boosted to \$16,000.

What this amounts to is that the retiring lawmakers

will be drawing benefits of three times their annual salary for part of their service and twice the salary for many more years of their service.

William E. Payne, executive officer of the employees' retirement system, which also handles the legislative retirement system, admits that the method under which legislators' retirement allowances are computed is a bit complicated. At present, under a rule of thumb, it amounts to about \$50 per

month for each year of service. Thus Meyers and Elliott will receive about \$1,000 per month for roughly 20 years' service.

While the three retiring assemblymen are the first to leave the legislature and gain some benefits from the salary raise of 1967, their retirement allowances will be low in comparison to those who will be retiring—voluntarily or involuntarily—after they have drawn the \$16,000 salary for a few years.

A Letter . . . To My Son

By Tom Rische
High School Teacher and Youth Worker

Dear Bruce,

If we spare the rod, will we spoil you? As a growing boy, how much discipline will you need?

I don't subscribe either to the "spare the rod and spoil the child" theories of the Victorian Era, nor to its opposite number, "don't do anything that'll frustrate Junior and interfere with his right to free expression." Each represents in its own way, a common American tendency to go to extremes.

This is a view presented in the latest issue of U.S. News and World Report by Dr. Joseph Babbitt, executive director of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children. He cites studies showing that youngsters with lowest opinions of themselves come from "too strict" homes, but that those from "too easy" homes don't rank much better.

Highest in self-esteem, he says, are youngsters who

have reasonable limits put on them.

Although some of my problem students come from "too strict" parents, more seem to be from homes where parents tried to give their child "everything" and didn't want to "frustrate" him. Some parents even seem afraid that kids won't like them if they exert authority.

"Dominated" kids often can't make decisions on their own; "free" kids often are completely confused by an adult world that doesn't provide and/or love and applaud them as Mama and Daddy once did.

Equally confused are youngsters who never can be sure whether their parents are going to be strict or lenient—whether Pop will "blow his mind" at some small mistake or only smile and say, "Boys will be boys."

Yours for moderate consistency,
YOUR DAD.