

Torrance Herald

Co-Publishers
KING WILLIAMS - GLENN W. PFEIL
REID L. BUNDY - Managing Editor

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1963

Red Cross 100 Years Old

This year the Red Cross marks the 100th anniversary of its founding in Geneva, Switzerland. That year, although since the beginning of time man had evidenced some feeling for the suffering of his fellows, marked the first time civilization incorporated the universal impulse of mercy into an effective global organization.

In the past century the Red Cross emblem has silenced guns in battle so that persons who are not active combatants could be aided. By international treaties, known as the Geneva conventions, this symbol of neutrality protects wounded and ill combatants and the people caring for them, those taken prisoner, and people whose homelands have been occupied by enemy forces.

In peace the Red Cross is the universal symbol around which good people rally to aid and comfort the victims of earthquakes, floods, storms and other natural disasters. In fact it is as natural to find the Red Cross on hand at the scene of a disaster as it is to expect the fire department to be fighting a fire.

The Red Cross is organized in 90 countries of the world with a membership total of 157,000,000 members, thus averaging one Red Cross member for every 20 persons in the world.

The Torrance area Red Cross chapter is incorporated in the Southern region of the Los Angeles Red Cross and the 1963 fund campaign is headed this year by Wendell Black whose organization is currently engaged in preparing for a successful effort.

Without under emphasizing the primary need for funds to carry on this great work, campaign directors are quick to point out if it were not for the two million men, women and young people who gave freely of their time to work with the Red Cross, the costs of the organization's services would reach staggering proportions.

The President of the United States traditionally proclaims March as Red Cross month. This year's campaign slogan befits the important anniversary occasion: "Always there . . . with YOUR help."

Keep Up Good Fight

While the chances of this city becoming a site for the much discussed state college were dimmed by the site selection committee of the California Board of State College Trustees in their decision to favor Fox Hills Country Club (a long way from a large segment of the student body it supposedly will serve) proponents of the Torrance location intend to continue their fight.

Second choice of the committee was the Palos Verdes Peninsula.

Mayor Albert Isen accused the committee of setting up double standards in choosing a 100 acre site in Fox Hills when this city had been proceeding on the premise that at least 320 acres were needed in Torrance.

While recriminations are natural when people are heatedly pursuing a cause, it would appear that Torrance interests must now come forward with an alternative high rise suggestion that might possibly effect a change in the site committee's final decision during their two-month adjournment.

The mayor and the City Council and Mrs. Kenneth Watts and the others who have labored so hard and so well in this city's cause, deserve and, we are sure, have the gratitude of the people of the community. They can be counted upon, we are certain, to exhibit the same resourcefulness during the next 60 days in hopefully proceeding on the thesis that the fight is never over until the final gong is sounded.

Party Identity Going?

Little by little, but with the sureness of the ebb and flow of the tides, the old, fine distinctions between the two great political parties of this country have been slipping away. Party loyalty, as the nation once knew it, is virtually a thing of the past. Nowadays it is commonplace for a Democratic presidential candidate to carry a state while the Republicans sweep the local and congressional offices. And vice versa.

There is every reason why this should be so. Once the parties, and the men who represent the parties, stood solidly on one side or the other of issues—bimetallism versus a solid gold standard, free trade versus high tariffs, internationalism versus a Washingtonian nationalism, more government power versus a rigidly limited government, and so on down a long, dramatic list. No longer. As the Portland, Ore., Journal, puts the question: "On the basis of political and social philosophy, for instance, why is Senator Hubert Humphrey in the same party as Senator Strom Thurmond, or Senator Barry Goldwater in the same party as Governor Nelson Rockefeller?"

So, in these times, we vote for individual men and women, not for a strong, clear party policy. Whether this is good or bad is certainly a matter of argument. But the fact exists, and the impact on the American governmental system is profound.

Mailbox

To Torrance Herald:

I enjoyed reading your editorial commenting upon my speech before the Torrance Chamber of Commerce.

I was particularly struck with your reference to my "Candor" in discussing the problems and policies of my office. As you say, it may be a departure from the norm, but it is my norm. I believe

the public has a right to know what the Assessor's office is doing, and how and why it is being done.

We are trying to keep the public informed and we appreciate your cooperation in this effort via the pages of THE HERALD.

Very truly yours,
Philip K. Watson,
County Assessor

Lesson Of The Newspaper Strikes



ROYCE BRIER

Western Europeans Not So Dumb, It Now Seems

You may note a gradual shift in the American attitude toward President de Gaulle's skepticism of America's position in western Europe. While at first we condemned him for undermining the Atlantic alliance, many Americans are having second thoughts.

They do not argue de Gaulle is necessarily wise; they do call into doubt the total wisdom of the American solution for Europe. There may be some partisanship here, but basically the problem reaches through three Administrations.

In the last century the Americans were preoccupied with building an empire, and were mildly prejudiced against Europe, considerably swayed by European immigrants, who had left to escape the constrictions of the European society. We acknowledged Europe as the seat of civilization and culture, but we did not like their political order.

This order produced a grand explosion in 1914, and many

of us thought it served them right for tolerating such an order. But we soon perceived we could not see France and Britain overwhelmed by the Germans. Our sheer industrial might spared them.

We did not like this enforced venture, which took a postwar turn we considered folly, and anti-Europeanism was a major factor in our political life. But then arose Hitler, and an even greater menace, and we had to move again in our own interest, this time with a Pacific enemy.

Again our industrial-technological capability stemmed the tide, but again, having won, we faced a new menace in international communism. We picked the Europeans up and organized them against this menace, and in so doing achieved a sort of overlordship of the Western world. We had the Final Weapon, but soon the Communists got it, and stalemate ensued.

We had a plan for saving the free world, and three Presidents pushed it. But this plan was not rooted inevitably

in our superior perception of how free mankind should behave, but in our superior industrial and military power.

Meanwhile, the west Europeans reached full economic and social recovery. Many did not resent our overlordship, indeed holding it still needful to their security, but increasingly many have resented it and held it redundant. President de Gaulle speaks for these few people.

The second thought of some Americans now is that there is no universal law that Americans are wiser than Europeans about Europe and history. Granted their political order, circa 1900 and 1935, brought disaster—this does not discount their long-range comprehension of their role on earth. De Gaulle may be wrong for the moment, but for half a millennium the west Europeans have been the most gifted and knowledgeable ethnic group ever seen, and we may be a little young to insist they do as we say.

Talk of the World

War Talk in Italy Levels On Battle Against Insects

ROME — There's plenty of war-scare talk coming from various capitals of the world these days, but here in the Italian capital most folks are talking about a war they're looking forward to. This is the Insect War of 1963—or whatever else the Romans may call it some day.

Lining up in battle formation are more than 60 billion imported warrior ants, mercenaries from Sweden, whose objective is to wipe out the enemy columns of Italian caterpillars chewing up the nation's forests.

The battle cry has been sounded. It's a fight to be last ditch as the mobilized insect foes lay siege across the front. This is one military campaign which will not end in an armistice or an unconditional surrender.

The brass here in the Eternal City, more particularly the Italian Department of Forests, is keeping close tabs on the campaign. This is Italy's last desperation blitzkrieg to wipe out the invader which so far has resisted the imported killer ants from every one of the Boot's NATO allies.

"We had thought for sure," explained Dr. Mario Pavan, government entomologist, "that the red ant we transplanted from the United States would do the job. But our strategy didn't work. The Yank expeditionary force

couldn't take our cold weather and suffered a Napoleonic defeat."

Since the Processionaria worm, a pale green wriggler which is mostly mouth, has been damaging Italy's scarce forest reserves at the rate of an estimated \$1 million a year, the state is placing its faith in the red Rufopratensis recruits. These Swedish creatures are winter-hardened and feast primarily on caterpillars' eggs.

As if this isn't woe enough, Italy is facing another insect crisis that threatens to destroy some of the most famous landmarks and art treasures. The culprit is the white termite.

Since ancient times, this hidden little guy, who goes under the pretentious name of Lucifugus, has been carrying on his own special brand of sabotage. And the damage he has done from within Italy's ancient palaces, library treasures and works of art cannot even be estimated.

According to the Italian State Agrarian Inspectorate, some of the monumental edifices are already in the advanced stages of destruction. Although Italy has been trying out every kind of insecticide known to man, the trinites haven't been thwarted. In desperation the government has set up a modern chemical lab, staffed with 40 scientists and 140 technicians,

to come up with a formula to halt the tiny saboteurs and their voracious appetites.

Romans are betting that the might of science might make the mighty mite eat humble pie yet.

Quote

BUFFALO, WYO., BULLETIN: " . . . Chairman Harry F. Byrd of the senate finance committee, and the best-informed budget analyst in the nation, is not impressed with the deficit estimate. His own projection is that spending will top \$100 billion and if the Kennedy tax cut is voted by congress, the deficit will be \$14 billion."

MARKSVILLE, LA., NEWS: "Every elected or appointed government official or board, receiving or otherwise handling public funds, should publish at regular intervals an accounting showing where and how each dollar of taxpayer money is spent. The Weekly News holds this practice the greatest safeguard against corruption in office, and believes it to be a fundamental principle of democratic government."

JANET LEIGH, Hollywood — "Get me being an actress. I used to get nauseous in Speech 1A."

AFTER HOURS By John Morley

Economics is Basis for Cold War Manipulations

The cold war between East and West is a war of economics. The military threat is but a weapon of pressure in the tug-of-war of international trade.

The Communist bloc controls a trade area of about one billion people . . . the free world, the industrial nations—U.S., British commonwealth, Western Europe, Japan, Scandinavia, etc.—controls about 600 millions . . . and the less developed, emerging areas of the world represent about 1.4 billions . . . of a total world population of about 3 billions.

While the free world controls about 600 million people, it controls about 65 per cent of the industrial productive capacity of the world.

So the main objective, in our opinion, in the cold war is to win the trade area of the emerging world of 1.4 billions.

This is why communism is feverishly penetrating in these backward areas by subversion, coercion, terror, revolution, as in the case of Cuba, the Congo, and into the hungry millions in South America, Asia and the Far East.

This is why Russia has invested millions in making Cuba a base of Communist subversion in this hemisphere.

If communism succeeds in gaining control of the trade area of 1.4 billion, or any substantial part, the present high U.S. standard of living will collapse and with it the whole free world. It will be communism which will then expand its industrial productivity and its power to wage and win nuclear war.

The stakes of life and death rest today on who wins the trade war. The unification of Europe into a strong trade area and its present advantage of market outlets around the globe, plus the economic power of the U.S., gives our side an enormous advantage in the cold war.

Even though the common market will hurt our trade abroad, the U.S. must support it as the lesser of two evils.

The U.S. exports annually about \$20 billion worth of goods and imports about \$15 billion; one-third of this is with Western Europe. Of this the common market nations last year bought about \$4 billion from us, and sold us \$2 billion.

Our favorable balance of \$2 billion here alone would be greatly reduced if we failed to adjust our tariffs to help the common market.

This is why Congress gave President Kennedy the authority in the Trade Expansion act last Fall . . . to negotiate for the elimination of all tariffs on goods in which the U.S. and the common market together account for 80 per cent of the free world trade.

The President also has authority to negotiate all tariffs downward by 50 per cent to 1967. There is no doubt that many U. S. industries will suffer, like wool.

Over 3 million U.S. workers are directly dependent on our export trade. These will be hurt by the common market . . . so the trade act provides for federally-financed unemployment benefits to these workers. As undesirable as this is, we seem helpless to find another solution.

The wages inside the common market average about one-third of ours. But the productivity of a U.S. worker . . . if he really puts out his maximum, which at present he is not doing . . . can exceed the productivity of a European worker by at least three times.

We can produce a better quality product, at a lower cost per unit, in volume. So it is not so much the differential in wages between a common market worker and a U.S. worker as it is the cost per unit.

U. S. industry provides the modern machinery, excellent working conditions, benefits, incentives, to make the U. S. worker more productive . . .

if he gives his employer a good eight hours work for the high eight hours pay. But our labor unions are cutting more and more into this time, to the point that an eight-hour day is now about seven hours or less, and going down.

Economists in Switzerland have been telling me for years that the U.S. preferential economic position in world trade is in danger through the common market and other closed markets in Europe. It means, as I see it, that we will be forced to gradual reduction and later elimination of all our tariffs, quotas and restrictions, in order to receive favorable terms from market blocs.

We may even join an enlarged common market of the free world. But all this involves serious changes in our country.

We are facing a prospect, at least in the economic field, of losing a large measure of traditional American freedom of action. This is bad. So bad that it could have serious repercussions within the U. S. political structure. It could mean the worst controls ever experienced by our people.

Our loss, of course, will be Europe's gain. It will strengthen and re-vitalize the free industrial world. It will check the Communist drive in the emerging areas of 1.4 billions of people, where the average yearly income is \$95 against \$2,600 in the U.S.

This is the major challenge of the common market to the U.S. economy. The shock can be greatly cushioned if labor unions would pull a little harder on the oars and stop rocking our economic boat by higher wage demands without higher productivity.

Our Man Hoppe

Problems of 'Doing Nothing'

Art Hoppe

Oh, there's nothing more heart-rending than a plaintive letter from an old and dear friend, reduced to begging for help. This one's from my old and dear friend, Mr. Don McClure, a former ace newsman who's gone steadily downhill. And is now public relations director in Washington for the new Domestic Peace Corps.

He took the job selling the idea of this new peace corps to the public because it was "a challenge." A challenge, if you ask me, like piloting a kamikaze plane is a challenge. Congress is truculent, the people are apathetic, the press is dubious. And, personally, I think he should rename it the Emergency Development & Salvation for Everybody League. Which comes out EDSSEL.

But, anyway, Mr. McClure hasn't even got the idea off the ground yet and everybody's shooting it down. Which certainly isn't fair. And it's all due to a horrible misconception: everybody in Washington thinks the Domestic Peace Corps is working!

But let's let Mr. McClure's plaintive letter explain his peculiar problem. I quote.

"You'd be surprised how many people are confused. Particularly pundits. And congressmen. Reporter magazine says the Domestic Peace Corps is already at work without action from Congress. Editorial writers picked up the refrain: 'Another New Frontier operation—set up the operation then ask Congress to approve it.'

"Meanwhile, congressmen beat a frisky path up our rickety stairs to see this operation in action. We tell them we are merely planners, not doers. That we are paving the way, laying the groundwork, gearing up! That we will do nothing until Congress says yea or nay. But they don't believe us. 'You don't need a Congress,' they huff. 'You're in business already.' Short. Stomp back down the rickety old stairs. And there goes another vote for the program.

"So, you see our problem. Probably the most peculiar PR problem in the history of government. What I have to prove is that we aren't working. That we aren't operating. We're the only organization in Washington that has to prove to Congress we aren't doing anything.

"To compound matters, since we really don't exist, I can't even unleash the ultimate weapon of all PR operations: The press release! We don't even have a letterhead. "Sigh."

But then, Mr. McClure manfully pulls himself together and closes: "Of course, we will work hard. The whole program will work fine. As soon as we can convince Congress we aren't working so they will give us permission to go to work. Help!"

Well, I never did care much for the Domestic Peace Corps idea. But fair play is fair play. Mr. McClure can count on me. What's friendship for? Let Congress call me to testify. Who knows Mr. McClure's character better than I? Yes, sir, if there's anybody anywhere who isn't doing any work, it's Mr. McClure.

What's more, I spent a couple of days looking into the Domestic Peace Corps last time I was in Washington. And I stand ready to say that it, too, isn't working. Heck, for Mr. McClure's sake I'll go a step further: Personally, I doubt it ever will.

Morning Report:

It's hard to believe, but it's true. The richest country in the world—that's us—is broke. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon hasn't got two billion-dollar bills to rub against each other.

Of course, everybody is willing to loan him a buck or so to make ends meet. But he can't borrow because we've reached the debt limit of \$308 billion.

So he asked Congress to raise the limit. Out statesmen will, of course. They always do, after they talk a while about how terrible it is to go further into the hole. Meanwhile Congress voted its first major law of the session: \$508 million to farmers for not growing wheat.

Abe Mellinkoff