

GLENN W. PFEIL . . . . . Publisher  
REID L. BUNDY . . . . . Managing Editor  
Wednesday, February 24, 1965

### Assembly Joins Battle

California's court-imposed July 1 deadline for reapportionment of its State Senate is a quick four months away and any hopes of beating the deadline with a workable plan to recarve the State's senatorial districts must be put down to wishful thinking.

The only real hope lies in the direction of Washington, D. C., where Congress is being petitioned to intervene and override the Supreme Court's senate-wrecking decision. Even then an amendment to the U. S. Constitution appears to be the only way out of the dilemma.

The drive to get Congress interested in action on some front received a boost last week when the California Assembly, after a period of procrastination, joined in the petition to Congress to offer an amendment which would permit one house of a state legislature to determine its membership on a basis other than population.

As it now stands, California's Assemblymen are chosen on the basis of population, the Senate on the basis of geographical areas, mostly counties.

Extension of the Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" decree could lead to some ridiculous problems for many of the nation's political subdivisions . . . even, as has been suggested, the reapportionment of meekly abandoned districts.

The changes it would bring to municipal and state government as we now know it are hard to imagine, but these changes are certain to be undesirable.

Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (R. Ill.) has introduced an amendment with the support of the American Bar Association that would let state legislatures have one house apportioned on a basis other than population if approved by the voters. Support of this plan and the plan submitted by Sen. Thomas Kuchel (R. Calif.) is needed. Out of such efforts by two of the Senate's leading Republicans can come a solution to the current threat to our State Legislature.

Our representatives, from Sacramento to Washington, D. C., should be asked to get behind these efforts.

### Service Above Self

Rotarians in Torrance observed the 60th anniversary of the founding of the first Rotary Club yesterday. The granddaddy of all modern service clubs was first organized Feb. 23, 1905, by four young men in Chicago.

"Service Above Self" and "He Profits Most Who Serves Best" are the twin mottos which express the Rotarian's basic concept of service in personal, business, and community life. More than 560,000 Rotarians in 11,000 clubs scattered throughout 127 countries are now dedicated to the principles of service.

Throughout its six decades, the Rotary Club has stood for fellowship among business and professional men, for high ethical standards in vocations, for community improvements, for aid to the crippled and the needy, and for the advancement of international understanding through friendship.

Communities throughout the world are benefiting from the varied and purposeful work of their Rotary Clubs, though the work is often done without fanfare.

To the Rotarians of Torrance, we extend congratulations on their 60th birthday. May they continue to grow and to be imbued with the spirit of service.

### AS OTHERS SAY:

"Gasoline prices, believe it or not, are the lowest in 45 years—that's if you discount the taxes. Retail prices are averaging 19 cents a gallon before the average 10.3 cents in taxes. Since 1948, state and federal taxes have increased an average of 4 cents a gallon. A continent refiner recently cut its wholesale gasoline price by a half-cent on unbranded gasoline. Three DC refiners are reported considering cuts. It's really 16611 50g to know some items are holding their own as price is concerned, when most everything is on raise."—*Mobile (Iowa) Record*.

DA 3-99

sociate Justice Arthur J. Goldberg of the U.S. Court, in a speech, has proposed that victims be compensated by government. Now there's that should boost our crime rate beyond anything can be blamed on TV. Crime should not pay for itself."—*St. Joseph (Ill.) Record*.

price vanity? The nation's postmasters have had to hang three-by-five foot pictures of Johnson and Postmaster General John Gronbeck in post office lobbies. Each postmaster was given a report in the regional office that he had with the order. Estimated cost of putting these in the nation's 34,080 post offices: \$500,000."—*Herald-Press*.

ing Report:

it, President Johnson's middle of the road program. His latest message to Congress is an end to crime in Washington, D.C. implication that the President is also opening a hard time filling the hall. Which was Barry

with the bombing of North Vietnam, it seems administration has just about taken over the program. In the election, LBJ swept many Republicans into his fold. If he now can scoop up the next GOP candidate, the next GOP candidate will have a hard time filling the hall.

as if Mr. Johnson is not only fulfilling campaign promises but his opponent's as well, could do more.

Ed H

Abel Mellinkoff



### ARTHUR HOPPE

## If You're Itching for A Fight, Scratch Here

The Vietnam crisis grows grimmer. Our leaders can't seem to find any way out. But I say we shouldn't underestimate the Yankee ingenuity of our fighting American GIs out there in the field. For in an incredibly ingenious display of common sense, our fighting American GIs have hired somebody else to do their fighting for them.

This ray of hope comes in a press dispatch from Qui Nhon. It says our military advisers are chipping in \$5 a month each out of their own pockets to hire fierce Nung tribesmen to guard the local air field. The Nungs, says the dispatch, "are famous for their loyalty to their employers and their love of a good fight."

So here, clearly, is the ideal solution to the whole thing. On the one hand we have the Nungs, who love a good fight. And on the other we have us Americans, who can always provide one for them. No more mutually satisfactory arrangement could be envisioned.

Naturally, I don't mean to imply we Americans don't love a good fight, too. I doubt there's ever been a

nation which loved a good fight more than ours.

Who among us cannot help but thrill to such hallowed names as Lexington, the Alamo, San Juan Hill, Chateau Thierry and the Bulge? Look at the popularity of movies, books and the television program about war. Any war, Ah, the crash of cannons, the roll of drums, the banners flying—it all makes any American heart beat more bravely.

True, in wartime it's somewhat different. We still relish reports of famous victories won by our gallant fighting men on far flung battlefronts. But an odd thing happens. The love of a good fight diminishes in direct ratio to how close you happen to be to the front lines.

This love undoubtedly flourishes at Staff Headquarters. And, as far as I know, it may be a going thing at the regimental level. But speaking from personal experience, the one thing the American fighting man on the front lines loves least is the prospect of a good fight.

He hopes and prays his officers will somehow avoid

getting him into a good fight. The one thing he dreads, night and day, is a good fight. He is thoroughly opposed to fighting anybody anywhere. When a good fight breaks out, he devoutly wishes he were in some other neighborhood. At heart, I'm convinced, the American fighting man is a true pacifist.

Thus I feel we can safely say that most of us Americans dearly love a good fight. As long as we're not personally involved.

So thank heaven for the Nungs. We can now withdraw our sensible fighting men from Vietnam in good conscience. With the millions we spend there each month, we can hire all the Nungs in the world. They can do what they love best: Blowing holes in each other. And we can do what we love best: Watching them on television.

Go ahead, call me a liver-livered coward. Maybe you're looking for a fight? Well, put up your dukes. I'm itching for a good fight myself. And like any red-blooded American, I'll be happy to oblige you. I'll hold your coat.

### From the Mailbox

## Urban Renewal Benefits Challenged by Mothers

Editor, Press-Herald

The San Pedro mothers who are trying to raise their children to be of high moral character—responsible in their actions—are most alarmed: they are most concerned for the safety and future of their children. The rapid rise in juvenile crime throughout the nation and here in San Pedro makes it apparent that the attitude shown by community leaders is setting a poor example—detrimental to the moral health of our children.

One case in point is San Pedro's program for socialistic Urban Renewal—a plan by which government confiscates one man's property for sale to another. We mothers can describe this action by no other word than STEALING—an immoral and ungodly act—Supreme Court decisions to the contrary, notwithstanding.

ing. Yet our leaders tell us that this stealing is all right if it is for the "public good." We mothers say stealing is a crime!

We are told that old buildings are synonymous with sordidness—that new buildings create virtue. We say that buildings create nothing—neither good nor bad; it is the people who create good or evil.

We are told that Urban Renewal will remove the unsavory element from our community. It is not the unsavory element to which our children turn but to our community leaders. Should public theft be their example?

We ask you then, community leaders and public servants, to stop for one moment and ask yourself these questions:

By what standard will I guide my life? What

moral values really have meaning to me—and for my family? What kind of climate is necessary for the nurturing of our young people?

These questions must be answered—then, and only then, can community decision be reached. And if, by chance, the vote should be "yes" for socialist Urban Renewal—a "yes" for stealing—then that day will surely come when we shall say:

"Woe unto you . . . for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness."

Is this what you really want for your children, San Pedro?

ESTHER MUNCASTER  
San Pedro Mothers for Human Renewal

### JAMES DORAIS

## Union Brass Asking for Nationalized Railroads

Of all the ideas that have been advanced to cope with the many problems accompanying the increasing automation of industry, none has been more ludicrous than the recent proposal of the Railway Labor Executives Association that the federal government nationalize the country's railroads in order to ensure featherbedding.

Actually, the government, during the Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson administrations, played an important part in negotiating settlements between railroad management and labor to eliminate featherbedding jobs outmoded by technological progress.

Apart from that consideration, the idea of nationalizing the railroad system is about as up to date as the prohibition movement. The enormous operating losses and inefficiency experienced under government operation of the nation's railroads in World War I so soured the country on government ownership of transportation facilities that such a proposal was never seriously advanced during World War II.

As economist Lawrence Fertig points out in a recent article, taxpayers in countries that have nationalized their railroad systems share the common experience of loss of tax revenue (America's railroads pay taxes in excess of \$500 million a year) and paying for huge operating deficits. The annual deficit of the government-owned railroads of Argentina is reported to be \$358 million; the nationalized railroads in Europe are consistent money losers.

An often noted example of the difference between comparable government-owned and private enterprises is the experience of the U. S. Postal system, which has an accumulated deficit of \$10 billion and is currently considering rate hikes of as much as \$300 million annually as contrasted with the nation's largest investor-owner utility, American Telephone, which pays huge taxes, returns dividends to its stockholders and has recently reduced long-distance rates to subscribers totalling about \$100 million a year.

In the current issue of *Freemans Magazine*, economist Paul Poirot talks of a 1907 bill for electrical service, mailed by a public utility to a customer in Wichita, Kansas. The bill—in the

amount of \$7.00, for 14 kilowatt-hours of electricity—was mailed on a penny postcard.

In the intervening years, the postage rate has increased 400 per cent to 4 cents a card, while the price of electricity per kilowatt-hour has decreased from 50 cents to 2 cents.

As Poirot points out, a home today, fully electrified with air conditioning and heating, would use about 24,000 kilowatts a year at a cost of \$480. At the 1907 rate, the cost would be \$12,000; if rates for electrical service had increased at the same ratio as rates for postal service, the bill would be \$48,000 a year.

Hardly a convincing argument for nationalizing the rails or any other industry!

amount of \$7.00, for 14 kilowatt-hours of electricity—was mailed on a penny postcard.

In the intervening years, the postage rate has increased 400 per cent to 4 cents a card, while the price of electricity per kilowatt-hour has decreased from 50 cents to 2 cents.

As Poirot points out, a home today, fully electrified with air conditioning and heating, would use about 24,000 kilowatts a year at a cost of \$480. At the 1907 rate, the cost would be \$12,000; if rates for electrical service had increased at the same ratio as rates for postal service, the bill would be \$48,000 a year.

Hardly a convincing argument for nationalizing the rails or any other industry!

### Quote

The heart and soul of the honor system is group acceptance. It can only work where the students have a strong sense of common interest and want to make it work.—Byron H. Atkinson, UCLA dean of students.

Let us not mourn, but honor, Winston Churchill as the greatest man who has lived during the lifetime of those he has left behind.—Cecelia DeMille Harper, Los Angeles.

### ROYCE BRIER

## Brinkmanship: Can We Learn From the Past?

Nine years ago John Foster Dulles gave his celebrated "verge of war" interview to *Life* magazine, and the word "brinkmanship" was born.

The word became a derogatory term for partisans in America, but it was equally deplored in Britain.

Mr. Dulles was speaking partly about South Vietnam. There he procured a small United States "advisory" intervention, since grown to 22,000 men, in support of the new Diem regime, which was having some trouble with communist guerrillas.

The Secretary staunchly defended "brinkmanship." He said we had to let the Communists know we meant business, and that we had to defend free men against aggression. He announced as an axiom that if we did not act in Saigon, we would open all Southeast Asia to Red Chinese conquest.

The axiom stuck without

much clinical examination, and has been honored by two Democratic Administrations, the members of which deplored Mr. Dulles's original position.

As you know, however, the nine years in Saigon have gone from bad to worse, and it is hardly to be doubted a majority of the American people are sick of it, but nobody has a way out.

Do we learn by experience? We face another situation, not exactly parallel to that in Indochina, but capable of creating unforeseen difficulties for us, as Mr. Dulles's brinkmanship created unforeseen difficulties.

This is Malaysia. The demagogue Sukarno of Indonesia has been steadily building his forces in North Borneo and has sworn to destroy Malaysia, which he brands as a puppet of Britain.

Manifestly, Sukarno's reckless rapacity threatens

Australian interests in the west. The Australians have a small engineer unit in north Borneo, and are proposing to send combat troops.

This could involve the Anzus treaty for mutual defense between the United States, Australia and New Zealand. A minor clash does not bring the treaty into force, but serious warfare between Australia and Indonesia would.

The treaty of course does not commit us to defend Malaysia, though Britain is so committed. But our commitment is clear as to Australia, and we cannot in fact accede to an unprovoked attack on the commonwealth.

One thing we don't need is another nine-year war out that way, "advisory" or otherwise. We don't need any more axioms, either. It would appear therefore, wise to study this obligation, to untangle it and measure its potential.

### WILLIAM HOGAN

## Noel Coward in Modern Dress Still Interesting

Noel Coward's "Private Lives" was first produced in London in September, 1930, and in New York the following January, with Coward, Gertrude Lawrence, Laurence Olivier and Jill Esmond in the leading roles. That dates everybody, including some of us who remember "Private Lives" as the epitome of British and continental sophistication in the depression years. (An callow youths, we were beguiled by the movie version in 1934 with Robert Montgomery as the brittle Elyot Chase and Norma Shearer as Amanda, the Gertrude Lawrence role.)

The play bore down on the romantic problems of some idle young English rich, and how Amanda would rather marry a boor constrictor than her former husband, Elyot, whom she really loved, of course. It was all terribly trivial, superficial and escape theater of almost "Wizard of Oz" proportions. Nevertheless, Coward's dialogue sparked like the lights of the Duke of Westminster's yacht beyond the terrace, and all of us sighed with envy and admiration for the whole magical shebang.

Well, more serious drama came along, and intimate movie comedy gave way to wholesale sex and sadism. Indeed, Noel Coward's plays went out of print.

Edward Albee, of all people—be it "Tiny Alice," "Virginia Woolf" and other works far removed in time and atmosphere from the early Coward shows, admits to being a Coward aficionado. Albee contributes an introduction to a Delta paperback, "Three Plays by Noel Coward" (\$1.95), in which he admits that not many playwrights today can write dialogue like that in the dusted-off works at hand. These would be "Private Lives," of course; "Hay Fever" (1925) and the uncut version of "Blithe Spirit" (1941).

Writes Albee, today's fair-haired boy of avant-garde theater, commenting on the fact that Coward considers himself to be old-fashioned: "Let me remind him that the theater goes in many directions simultaneously, and that plays like 'The Adding Machine' of Georg Kaiser's 'Gas'—both

terribly avant-garde for their day—are as timely now as anything by Scribner, while Gogol, say, has the laugh on everybody . . ."

Albee further reminds Coward that what becomes old-fashioned has within it, from the start, the dry rot to permit the disintegration. If one reads these plays today, he finds that they still dance and sing. Fashion and taste may change, and "Private Lives," especially, remains as superficial as the icing on an old wedding cake. Yet it remains marvelously cock-eyed entertainment, and it is interesting to note that the author of "The Zoo Story" is professional and astute enough to recognize this eternal crispness and artistry-cum-urbanity.

It is all good reading—and don't overlook that improbable farce, "Blithe Spirit," for a heady example of Coward at work. And having read the book, one must agree with Albee that the aging sophisticate should relax about his work. It stands a very good chance of being with us for a long, long time.

