

Press-Herald

GLENN W. PFEIL Publisher
REID L. BUNDY Editor and Co-Publisher
Torrance, Calif., Wednesday, May 31, 1967

How Will You Vote?

Summer arrives this year on June 21. For most of us, it is the most pleasant season of the year. It is the season when the works of nature reach full bloom. It is the season of picnics, of hunting, fishing trips, and camping. It is the season when the family car will carry vacationers far and wide across the land to see the sights and wonders which abound in this country.

Weekenders flock to the beaches and to lakes. Some are looking for quiet relaxation. Others will participate in exacting sports such as water skiing. A few will devote time to contemplating the wonders of the world in which we live. The latter will gain greater enrichment from summer than the rest of us. In their behalf, it is but fitting to issue a plea and a warning to all and sundry as the long worms of traffic stream out of the cities this summer for the mountains and the seashores. Every auto will be loaded with potential garbage, as well as people. Multiply each auto by tens of millions, each carrying its quota of paper plates, beer cans, melon rinds, all the refuse of living—and we come up with a pollution problem of awesome proportions.

Whether there is beauty left for future generations to enjoy depends on the behavior of the people. They have the power to leave a heritage of beauty or blight. The choice is made and a vote is cast whenever trash is tossed out of the family car along the roadside or left at the spots which nature provided for camping or picnicking. How will you vote?

Too Hot to Handle

During a recent interview with members of the staff of U.S. News & World Report, William J. Clapp, president of the Edison Electric Institute, made some observations about burying high voltage transmission lines that will come as something of a high voltage shock to beautification enthusiasts who think all you have to do to get power lines out of sight is to dig a ditch and put them in it. But, there are heat, insulation and power loss problems to be solved.

When asked about burying such lines, Mr. Clapp replied, "If we had to put all the transmission lines underground that are overhead today, we'd have to about double our rates in order to get enough return to pay for it. We have about 9 billion dollars invested in overhead-transmission facilities. To put them underground would cost an estimated 180 billion dollars. That's about three times the industry's total investment. You could put all the country's railroads in tunnels for less than that. And besides, nobody today knows how to do it."

So again, when we come up against the problem of improving our environment, the first thing to recognize is that many desirable changes will be the long run result of technological development. Even now, some distribution power lines are being put underground in new real estate developments. As the years pass, the problem of how to put all lines underground will probably be solved. In the meantime, it would be well to keep our sights on the attainable as well as the desirable.

Who's the Watchdog?

Legislation now before Congress would provide for the use of as much as \$90 million of federal tax revenues to finance the next presidential campaign. This scheme seems destined for burial in this session, but similar proposals will be presented again. If tens of millions of tax dollars are to be turned over to political war chests, the question arises as to what agency or group might effectively keep an eye on the fair allocation and spending of such huge sums of money.

After witnessing the shenanigans of some of the high officials during the past year, many taxpayers wonder what would happen to \$8 million of their tax dollars in the hands of office seekers. At this point, it appears that it would take a mighty sharp, nonpolitical group to keep the burglars' hands out of the cookie jar.

Opinions of Others

In our vast space program it is possible we may, in not many years, put a man on the moon—but here on earth, with so many strikes, and threats of strikes, it seems very difficult to keep one on the job.—Port Gibson (Miss.) Reville.

Findings of a national public opinion polls on reduction of federal spending in preference to a tax increase are hardly surprising. The public favored reduced spending by a 13-1 margin. This would leave little doubt, it seems to us, that congressmen and senators would be doing the popular thing in voting for reduction in expenditures.—Bedford (Ind.) Times-Mail.

Morning Report:

England has nobody but herself to blame for being turned away from the Common Market by General Charles de Gaulle. The aging Charley never forgets a British slight.

Take the battle of Hastings (1066). The English lost and had a big chance then to join the European Community. They rejected it. Refused to take up French and only speak it to this day with a strong accent. England also made bad cooking a mark of national merit obviously to annoy the French—and then went on to cream the French Army at Crecy (1346), Agincourt (1415), Quebec (1759), and Waterloo (1815).

Maybe de Gaulle did not make any of those battles, but he surely has been around a long time.

Abe Mellinkoff



HERB CAEN SAYS:

Toper Clangs Cable Car Bell, 10 Get Cheap Ride

Quaint, colorful San Francisco dept. (cont'd indefinitely): The other night, a nasty drunk aboard a crowded Powell St. cable car rang the fare bell eight times—ding, ding, etc.—and then jumped off, cackling. What makes this unfunny is that the conductor was stuck for eight fares (\$1.20). So Passenger Ron Bygum passed the hat and quickly raised \$2.70 for the conductor—who, being quaint and colorful—didn't pocket the extra \$1.50. The next ten passengers rode free, much to their delighted surprise. Ding, ding.

Uncle Shel Silverstein, whose drawings are always good, is positively brilliant about Britain in the June issue of Playboy. Particularly amusing: The wavy-haired, wasp-waisted young man who is saying limply "Homosexuality used to be a major offense here, then it became a minor infraction and now it's legal. However, we won't stop fighting till it's MANDATORY!" On Geary, Herb the Furrier overheard a cab driver complain to a woman passenger: "This 15-cent tip is an insult." She: "Oh? How much should it be?" Cabbie: "Another 15 cents at least." She: "My dear fellow, I wouldn't DREAM of insulting you twice!"

Glenn Dorenbush refuses to worry about the so-called summer invasion of 100,000

hippies. "Things could be worse," he points out. "We could be invaded by 100,000 squares" (oh, we will, we will be!)... Nice piece of underwriting in Paul Krassner's Realist: "The Junior Chamber has unveiled its Ten Outstanding Young Men of the Year, who thus join the distinguished company of such past winners as Billie Sol Estes and Bobby Baker."

Today we have a story **San Francisco**

that sounds like an old joke but isn't. Scene: Monterey County courthouse in Salinas. In for marriage license come a couple well known in these parts—he being 55 and rich, she being 24 and good-looking. After "Occupation" on her license application she writes "Retired"—and the clerk scratches it out with the observation: "At 24, you're too young to be retired." "Look, buster," she replies, eyeing him levelly, "when a mis-

Quote

The mood of most of the people tends toward conservatism. Economy. Budget cutting. Yet the strains of growth and demands for better services are working in the opposite direction with great force.—Assemblyman Carlos Bee, speaker pro tempore.

Was It Sudden?

Jerry Marcus



52,500 died and 4,400,000 were injured in highway accidents in 1966.

AFFAIRS OF STATE

Another Silly Bill Gets Its Legislative Hearing

3-36—ANOTHER SILLY
Capital News Service

SACRAMENTO—It seems a shame that the legislature—burdened with the awesome task of adopting a \$5 billion budget and putting the arm on the taxpayers for from \$1 to \$1.5 billion in new taxes—must take the time to hear all of the silly bills that come along. But such is democracy.

One of the more ridiculous bills of the session had its day in court last week before the assembly committee on governmental efficiency and economy. This was AB911 by Assemblyman John L. Burton, D-San Francisco, which would have required that all war toys be labeled with a warning that they might be harmful for children.

Burton made somewhat of a circus out of the lengthy hearing by putting on display a number of cannons, machine guns, tanks and the like. His witnesses included a psychiatrist who said playing with war toys could result in children becoming violent when they grew to adulthood.

Another was Mrs. Gladys Sargent, who camps in the legislative halls in behalf of humane societies. While Mrs. Sargent generally is opposing bills dealing with hunting, she also appeared to favor Burton's bill, saying it would be better for the youngsters to have pets than to have war toys.

There were two basic and fatal weaknesses in Burton's

bill, which opposition witnesses and members of the committee had little difficulty in establishing. The first is that there is a great variety of opinion among the medical profession as to whether playing with guns or other weapons actually contributes to violence in children or in their later years.

One witness quoted a noted psychiatrist as saying:

Sacramento

"A child is no more likely to become an outlaw by playing with guns than he is to become a saint by playing with churches."

The other flaw was that, on the basis of this uncertain information and opinions, the labeling provisions of the bill would apply to just about everything but a Raggedy-Ann doll. The required label would have read: "Toy depicting violence or war. May be harmful to children."

Such toys were defined in the Burton bill as including, but not limited to "any toy which resembles any deadly weapon, as defined in subdivision (f) of Section 3024 of the Penal Code, military figure or equipment, or criminal figure or equipment."

A witness from the hobbies industry had model kits for building "Old Ironsides" or "Pt-109," the navy ship of the late John F. Kennedy. The witness said he believed these hobby kits would come under provisions of the bill

and this pointed to the ridiculous nature of the measure.

The wording of the label itself also was of some concern to opponents from the toy manufacturing industry. While the aim of the bill was to prevent children from developing violent or war-like tendencies from using such toys, the public might not have understood this from the label.

It was pointed out parents, reading such labels, might fear there was something dangerous about putting together a model of "Old Ironsides," and their offspring might in some way be injured.

Certainly, there are those who deplore some of the less tasteful toys of modern times and it is the public's right to choose not to buy them. It is curious, however, that the same liberal element which seemed to be pushing Burton's bill (perhaps because of their general peace or anti-Vietnam war leanings) is the same element which opposes any form of control over pornographic literature. And who is to say this could not be as harmful to youngsters as war toys?

The debate did not seem to produce any racial overtones so it may have been just a coincidence that the three Negro members of the G.E.E. committee voted in favor of the Burton bill while the other members all opposed it.

ROYCE BRIER

Foot-Dragging By Allies Left De Gaulle Burning

If you would know what's biting Charles de Gaulle, you might try reading "Is Paris Burning," the best-seller of last year.

When Mr. de Gaulle walked away from the fall of France, he became the Francophile of the century. He spent five corrodng years waiting to get to Paris.

But he was a difficult and imperious man, and Roosevelt and Churchill, themselves a bit imperious, didn't like him. They felt that as the rescue was theirs, France was their problem, and on high policy grounds they evaded a commitment to install de Gaulle as the leader of France restored.

This reluctance endured

to the day of the Liberation, and is well documented in the book. The Communist and bourgeois resistance forces were about evenly divided. Hitler was demanding Paris be destroyed. His Paris commander was stalling. On strategic grounds, Eisenhower wanted to bypass Paris. De Gaulle demanded he "rescue" Paris

World Affairs

from a Communist takeover when the Germans left. He finally rebelled, said he would withdraw French troops from the Allied pool, and liberate Paris himself. Eisenhower reconsidered, and French and American troops entered almost simultaneously.

De Gaulle never forgot

it, and in the terror he was But this hostility has roots living, you probably wouldn't. He doesn't like and never will like, the Anglo-Saxons, as he alludes to them.

in the centuries, going back to the English kings who once had a piece of France. De Gaulle passionately believes no Briton and no American should have any influence on the Continent.

As de Gaulle sees it, the weapon today is not military, but economic. The American economic power is frightening, and Britain is an appendage of it, he says. He said it when he again vetoed Britain's entry in the European Common Market.

He cited Britain's "insularity" and its ties with the Commonwealth, but his overriding reason is "special ties" with the United States. Among these ties: British support of the Vietnam war. To be eligible, Britain must make basic economic and political readjustments. Otherwise Britain's entry would "destroy" the Market. He said: "The strengthening of the European spirit perhaps is due also to the threat raised in the technological field by the dominating spirit of the Americans."

This "European spirit" he invokes has lately been shared by West Germany, and in some degree by the Low Countries and by Italy. There has been very little from Washington, and nothing at all from President Johnson or Secretary Rusk, indicating they understand or are seeking to understand the deep historical causes for the phenomenon de Gaulle. They seem to think he is being merely petty, and to maintain a hurt silence over it. This is world statesmanship?



WILLIAM HOGAN

America's Ills As Seen Through Pessimistic Eyes

The Critic: In "Growing Up Absurd," "Compulsory Mis-Education," and other works, Paul Goodman has become one of our most vocal, resonant and controversial social critics. (He is a psychoanalyst as well as a writer in many fields.) A short new book, "Like a Conquered Province: The Moral Ambiguity of America," is based on Goodman's Massey Lectures, sponsored by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, on a political theme.

Again, this is an abrasive, thought-provoking collection of essays of almost Orwellian pessimism in which Goodman takes a hard look at the ills that beset America (a professional parlor game these days). He sees his country as something "like a conquered province" with foreign rulers, except that they are not foreigners and we are responsible for what they do.

He finds that the "vital conflict" today is not between one bloc and another, nor between Left and Right, but between a worldwide de-

humanized system of laws and human decency and perhaps survival.

I think the following paragraph, out of context, suggests the skill in Goodman's total point of view:

"Some feel, with a kind of Vergilian despair, that the American empire will

Books

succeed and will impose for a long time, at home and abroad, its meaningless management and showy style of life. For instance, we will win in Vietnam, though such a victory of brute military technology will be a moral disaster. Clubbing together with the other nuclear powers, we will stave off the nuclear war and stop history with a new Congress of Vienna. American democracy will vanish into an establishment of promoters, mandarins, and technicians, though maintaining for a while an image of democracy as in the days of Augustus and Tiberius. And all this is probably the best possible outcome, given the complexities of high technology organization, mass

education, and overpopulation."

A brilliantly stated and depressing polemic, in any event. (Random House, \$4.94).

Notes on the Margin

"The CIA File," by the editors of Ramparts, will appear this summer, first title in a series of books planned by Ramparts in conjunction with McGraw-Hill. The CIA book expands on the controversial story Ramparts broke on CIA subsidies to students. About 80 per cent of the book's material is reported to be new.

"All the Little Things," the new novel by Wallace Stegner of Stanford, considers this question: Why does the older generation feel as it does about what is happening in the world today? Vikings will publish it in August (a Literary Guild selection).

Coward-McCann has announced October publication of "Fool's Gold: The Biography of John Sutter," by the Sutter librarian and historian Richard H. Dillon (Merevether Lewis).