

# Proposition 2 Sets Taxes for City-Owned Property

By HENRY C. MACARTHUR  
 Capitol News Service  
 SACRAMENTO—For the next several issues, this column will deal with the propositions to be placed on the Nov. 5 general election ballot.  
 Proposition 2 relates to the taxation of publicly owned property outside of the county in which ownership of the property is located.  
 In other words, should a municipal district of a large city and or city and county acquire property in another county, it would be taxed

as provided by a formula written in the constitution under Prop. 2.  
 Presently, such property is assessed by the county assessors in the county where it is located, and the rates fixed on the basis on property in the entire county, rather than on a formula as proposed, on the basis of a state-wide rate.  
 Obviously, the proposed amendment is a method of reducing property taxes on municipal utilities, involving primarily water and power. Senator Gordon Cologne, R-Riverside, and Senator

George Moscone, D-San Francisco, are the two lawmakers who write arguments in favor of the amendment in the ballot pamphlet.  
 The amendment would be highly beneficial to San Francisco and Los Angeles, as well as other cities of high population, which depend on their water supplies from counties far distant from the area of usage. Moscone says:  
 "This amendment continues the taxation of these publicly owned lands, but sets up a state-wide formula so their assessed valuation

will increase at a similar rate to the general increase in property values throughout the state, an estimated 5 per cent per year.  
 "This measure will assure continuance of an adequate tax base related to these lands. It will also assure public agencies owning the property that their citizens will not bear more than an equitable share of taxes levied in the taxing counties."  
 Senator Cologne further claims that the taxes levied by the counties in which the lands are located add to the

cost of public utility taxes in the cities of California, and that it is not fair to allow assessments in those counties without reasonable controls.  
 Refuting the arguments are Senator Richard J. Dolwing, R-San Mateo, and Assemblyman Leo J. Ryan, D-Santa Clara, who maintain that the right to assess should be kept in the county where the property is located.  
 They state that the principal aim of supporters of the amendment is to lower

taxes for large governmental land-owners by taking the taxing power away from the people, thereby increasing the tax burden on home owners and businesses in many California cities and counties.  
 "Most municipalities owning property in other counties are large and wealthy," they say, "while the counties in which such lands are owned usually are small and less wealthy."  
 "Why, then, should large municipal utilities receive favored tax treatment at the

expense of local taxpayers? Prop. 2 has the effect of relieving large public agencies of their responsibility to pay their fare share of taxes. Counties will be defenseless against increases in cost of government and services, because their income will be fixed."  
 Thus, the battle on Prop. 2 shapes up as a dispute between urban and rural California, with the cities attempting to get a tax break at the expense of taxpayers in the smaller communities of California."

Your Right to Know Is the Key to All Your Liberties

## -Comment and Opinion-

TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1968

### The New Left Threat

Millions of college students are returning to campuses throughout the country to begin the fall semester. They represent both the hope and the shape of the future. From the standpoint of educational opportunities and intelligence, they are far better equipped than any preceding generation to participate constructively in developing solutions to the many complex problems confronting our nation.

It can be expected that most of these young people will fulfill the promise they represent to us. In so doing, they will join hands with the millions of Americans of good will who actively seek meaningful solutions to our social life. If our joint progress in this regard is impeded and deterred, much of the trouble will come from a growing band of self-styled revolutionaries who are using college campuses as a base for their destructive activities. This comparatively small group of arrogant, hard-core militants have contempt for the majority and our democratic processes. They regard themselves as the nucleus of an elite dictatorial ruling class of the future.

These extremists openly avow that their aim is to overthrow the existing order. Under the guise of academic freedom and freedom of speech, they profess to seek a dialogue, when actually what they seek is a confrontation with established authority to provoke disorder. Through these confrontations, they expect to smash first our educational structures, then our economic system, and finally our government itself.

It is vitally important to recognize that these militant extremists are not simply faddists or "college kids" at play. Their cries for revolution and their advocacy of guerrilla warfare evolve out of a pathological hatred for our way of life and a determination to destroy it. The workshops they hold on sabotage and how to use it to further their objectives are grim forebodings of serious intent.

This New Left movement, as it is known, is growing both in numbers and varied forms of violence. Last spring, major disorders precipitated by the revolutionary adherents of the movement occurred on a number of college campuses. In the violent uprising at Columbia University, militant students and outsiders took over several buildings and committed senseless and deliberate destruction. The incident triggered similar disturbances on other campuses. Changes may be necessary and improvements in any institution can be made, but this is not the way to do it.

Encouraged by their "success" at Columbia, the anarchists in the New Left movement are boldly spreading the word that they intend to "create two, three, many Columbias," in the manner of one of their "heroes," Che Guevara, the Cuban revolutionary who cried "create two, three, many Vietnams!"

The main thrust of the New Left movement arises from the concerted efforts of the Students for a Democratic Society. Many of its members and some of its national leaders openly profess their faith in communist concepts and their determination to "restructure" our society. One of the militant spokesmen of this group stated, for example, that "perhaps 25 universities linked to the movement would be too much for the police—for the dominant class—and we would get what we demand."

The New Left leaders plan to launch a widespread attack on educational institutions this fall. They are relying on collegiate dissidents and militants to bolster and accelerate this drive. It would be foolhardy for educators, public officials, and law enforcement officers to ignore or dismiss lightly the revolutionary terrorism invading college campuses. It is a serious threat to both the academic community and a lawful and orderly society.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, Director  
 Federal Bureau of Investigation

"IT'S TIME FOR A DIET!"



### Quote

"The California residents who are most gravely threatened by skyrocketing property taxes are our senior citizens. These people are no longer working and many of them must live on very small fixed incomes. Some of our elderly may actually lose their homes unless we act to give meaningful tax relief now." — State Sen. George Deukmejian.

### Press-Herald

Glenn W. Pfeil  
 Publisher

Reid L. Bundy  
 Editor and Co-Publisher

Published Each  
 Wednesday and Sunday

2238 W. Sepulveda Blvd.  
 Torrance, Calif. 90510

I've Got Just the Medicine



ROYCE BRIER

### Idea of Foreign Aid Is Becoming Outdated

At this time 28 years ago most of the productive world was impoverished and disorganized.

Mainland Asia had suffered for decades from marching armies, and Japan's industries were flat. British and German cities, including London and Berlin, were physically crippled. France was physically in better shape, but the people were demoralized by German occupation. So were the Italians.

All these peoples, numbering about 200 million in the West and 800 million in the East, had been our customers before the war.

The better American politicians and businessmen became aware that unless this third of mankind could be rehabilitated, our market for goods would be non-existent or severely depressed for years. This factor, with a leavening of humanitarianism, prompted a massive aid program. Its main effort was called the Marshall Plan, but supplemental aid with spread over wide areas, such as Latin America and the Mideast.

In the next 25 years aid in cash and credit exceeded \$100 billion, about a third military aid presumed to protect governments and territories.

Aid was in some cases successful, in some cases a failure, depending on the character of the people aided.

Western European aid was a success for the first five or ten years of emergency. But aid in some regions accomplished little, due to miscalculation or the sloth of the receiving people. The first to recover and regain their footing were the Japanese, and the other defeated people, the Germans, were not far behind.

For some years in the 1950s we dispensed aid running to \$6-\$7 billion annually. A considerable proportion of this was returned to us in the purchase of goods, but even so, the American people began to question aid in seeming perpetuity, which appeared to be the goal of some American politicians, such as Japan, Britain, West Germany and the Soviet Union, is also decreasing under what U Thant has called "fatigue and disenchantment."

Opinions on Affairs  
 of the World

politicians and many foreign politicians.

Absurdities in the misuse or futility of some aid began to crop up in the news. Each year the Congress was less inclined to grant the aid demands of the Administration.

The idea of congressional appropriations in aid began to lose steam several years ago. It seemed those people and nations which could make effective use of aid diminished in number, leaving only those who subsisted on handouts and were unwilling to help themselves. Aid this year is down to \$1.6 billion.

The next Administration will face increasing difficulty getting congressional appropriations. Aid advocates are therefore laying plans to shift most of the burden to what they call the "private sector."

This means diversion of many aid demands to quasi-private development banks, or outright investment borrowing. With this system, applicants for economic and technical assistance will have to prove need and good management. The American taxpayer will be relieved of at least part of the annual burden.

Aid provided by foreign

HERB CAEN SAYS:

### It's Perfect for Mixing Martinis

Item: Among my most prized possessions is an original blue glass pitcher from the days when Shirley Temple was the most famous little girl in the world. Her smiling, dimpled face is embossed in white on the glass pitcher; this renders the vessel ideal for the mixing of a perfect martini, the formula being: "Gin to the chin, vermouth to the eyes" . . . Item: When ladies like Mrs. Suzy Strauss go to bars like Breen's or Hanno's, they order a "geranium." That's bartenders' code for "a gin martini onna rocks wit' a twist stada an olive," which, ladies like Mrs. Strauss insist, doesn't sound ladylike . . . Customer to bartender at Joe's in Hillsdale: "Gimme a mental martini." Bartender: "Whazzat?" Customer: "You pour the gin, 'll think vermouth," which, as martini jokes go, is fairly dry. . . .

The foregoing is merely by way of illustrating that the martini, the squares' LSD, is still very much with us. (Glenn Dorenbush in the Haight-Ashbury: "If you think these kids are bad now, wait till they discover martinis.")

Maybe I should mention en passant that I'm all FOR the idea of the martini having been invented in San Francisco; it's just that in 30 years of desultory research, I've uncovered no hard evidence. Even Charles Clegg, who, as the late Lucius Beebe's drinking and business partner, has access to all known writings on the subject, admits he draws a blank on the martini's origin. "I do know, though," he adds, "that the Gibson was invented in San Francisco." Oh? "Certainly," he goes on with brash confidence. "By the stockbrokers on Montgomery." Oh? "They like to drink martinis in the morning, you know, and switched the olive to an onion because the onion wilts the smell of the gin, which was offensive to old ladies." Oh.

Even more ridiculous are the ingredients, which Prof. Thomas listed in his "Bon Vivant's Companion," published in 1862: "1 dash bitters, 2 dashes maraschino, 1 pony Old Tom Gin, 1 wineglass vermouth (!), 2 small lumps ice." A long way indeed from the 16-1 martini, and anyway, if the drink WERE named in honor of Martinez, wouldn't that town have a statue of Jerry Thomas in the main square?

WILLIAM HOGAN

### Historian Takes Look At Book-Burning Era

"Comstockery!" was George Bernard Shaw's retort in 1906 after the celebrated vice society champion had ungraciously called him "a foreign writer of filth." The word was incorporated into the language.

The morals crusader Anthony Comstock (1844-1915) was the author of a New York State statute forbidding immoral books; later secured strict federal postal legislation against obscene matter; was responsible for the destruction of some 160 tons of literature and pictures and, in the eyes of liberals of his day, became the symbol of national repression and licensed bigotry.

Attempts at literary censorship are always with us. They did not decrease after the demise of Comstock. They soared during the 1920s when vice societies, "clean books" advocates and the religious press exploded with alarm and indignation over James Branch Cabell's "Jurgen" or Radclyffe Hall's romantic treatment of lesbianism, "The Well of Loneliness," the "sea of filth" produced by such scoundrels as John Dos Passos and Theodore Dreiser.

"Literary garbage wagons," they were, fit only for "jungle and the sty."

In "Purity in Print: Book Censorship in America," the Amherst historian Paul S. Boyer looks back at the vice societies of the 19th Century and the first World War years. But he concentrates chiefly on the 1920s when firm-jawed guardians of our literary morals called for outright book-burning in the land.

Browsing Through the  
 World of Books

Fellow writers often were not in sympathy with the victims of attempted suppression. Edwin Markham, the popular author of "The Man With the Hoe," viewed with alarm the decadent tendency in the fiction of 1923. "These young radicals," he wrote, "are spreading a contagion that will tend to corrupt youth and to engender an enervating cynicism in all minds." And George Barr McCutcheon, author of "Graustark" and other popular turn-of-the-century romances, felt that "if there

is no other way to clean our rapidly spreading Augean stables . . . I am for censorship."

The author suggests that recent events, including the Supreme Court's 1966 decision against the publisher Ralph Ginsburg and other "scattered evidence" from bench and legislatures, suggest we may be on the threshold of a period of increased censorship activity.

Of course, some of the boys in the back room, or on the last exit to Brooklyn, are always pushing a little too vigorously. Our scholarly author quotes the late publisher Donald Friede, who came to view his role in "The Well of Loneliness" case somewhat ruefully in later years.

Writing in 1964, Friede noted: "When I see some of the books published today, I cannot help but wonder if our fight against censorship in the '20s was really wise . . . 'Fanny Hill' in paper. And 'Naked Lunch' in any form! . . . But I suppose there are some people still willing to play the piano in the literary brothel. Certainly the pay is good . . ."