

Press-Herald

GLENN W. PFEIL Publisher
REID L. BUNDY Managing Editor

Sunday, June 19, 1966

GUEST EDITORIAL

On 'Police Brutality'

Law enforcement today is being degraded, purposely in many instances, by the widespread and indiscriminate use of the term "police brutality."

This practice is called a guilt-by-language process by some individuals. They may be right. For example, the word "juvenile" has been associated with "delinquency" so often and so long that now, when used alone it has a disagreeable connotation to the public.

"Police brutality" conjures up visions of hulking men in uniform clubbing and beating innocent people. Rarely, however, does the term fit the circumstances to which it is applied. It is used in wild accounts of enforcement officers' lifting limp demonstrators who block busy thoroughfares, in references to oral commands by policemen who disperse potential troublemakers, in depicting efforts by officers to halt violation of the law, and in describing any number of the sworn duties performed by policemen.

We know there is a calculated and deliberate attempt by some groups to inflame hostility against law enforcement by charging "police brutality" without cause. To a large degree they have succeeded. The term is bandied about in all media of communication without serious consideration as to its true meaning or its harmful effect on a profession which is charged with enforcing the basic rules of civilized living.

I agree with a growing number of responsible news editors, public officials, and law-abiding citizens that it is high time to get this "pet slogan" into a better perspective. We do not deny there have been instances of misuse of force by enforcement officers, but such incidents are not as prevalent as the public has been led to believe. A general and accepted principle of the law has been that an officer may use such force as is necessary to make lawful arrests, protect his life, and perform other specific duties. Frequently, however, the choice is not his to make; he HAS to use force or be maimed or killed and have the rights of all the people trampled by those who have no respect for the law or due process. Even then, his best efforts often are not enough, as evidenced by the appalling number of officers assaulted and killed each year.

Policemen have the same basic rights as others. There is no reason why they should be singled out for ridicule by invalid blanket accusations. The public, the press, and law enforcement itself should launch a concerted drive to stop the semantic indictment of police. Allegations and incidents should be reported and described in realistic, impartial, and truthful terms. If an officer is assaulted while making an arrest and uses undue force to subdue the person, then call it "undue force." If an officer uses profane language to a citizen, then describe it as profane language. If an officer is thought to be biased or prejudiced in his treatment of groups or individuals, then the complaint should so state. But the constant cry of brutality as a catch phrase, exploited and used as camouflage for illegal conduct, is dead wrong. It is a stigmatization of police by rote.—John Edgar Hoover Director, FBI (Reprinted from the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin for June).

Others Say:

The Burns Report on UC

Much as some people would like to sweep under the rug the Burns Committee blast at Clark Kerr's administration of UC at Berkeley, it just won't sweep.

One very good reason it won't be revealed by California Farmer. Following a word-for-word study of the report, the respected agriculture journal declared editorially that "we can come to only one conclusion and that is that under the Kerr administration there has been a serious breakdown in discipline not only of the students but of the faculty."

The following direct quote from the report is cited in substantiation by California Farmer:

"It remained for Professor Smale to articulate the theory behind the VDC (Viet Day Committee) demonstrations and agitation. When interviewed by a newspaper reporter he was asked if he wanted Peking and Hanoi to defeat the United States.

"Of course," he said with a smile. "We want the Viet Cong to defeat the U. S. for international reasons. If the U. S. is defeated in Southeast Asia, this will help break the American power elsewhere in the world. This would give new impetus to revolutionary social changes in such places as Africa and Latin America, and if surrounded by revolutionary change, it will in turn make it easier to achieve radical social change in the U. S."

Is this what we want our young people to learn at our State University?—California Feature Service.

Morning Report:

On the basis of performance, it seems to me that Fidel Castro should at least be named as Assistant Director of U.S. Immigration. Because in the past six months he has allowed more than 20,000 Cubans to enter this country.

I haven't got the exact figures at hand, but I don't think any one member of the Immigration Service has done that well.

Of course, Fidel is letting Cubans leave his island because he wants them out. It's the quickest way to get rid of people who can't stand him. At the same time he is expecting his most red-hot supporters to stir up revolutions in Latin America. Cuba may be an almost deserted island one of these days, but every last person left will be a rabid Castro supporter.

Abe Mellinkoff

No, No—It's Not for Myself



FROM the MAILBOX

Mother Tells Her Sons About School Bond Vote

Editor, Press-Herald:
(AN OPEN LETTER TO MY SONS)

Boys, I know you cannot yet understand what is about to happen to you, and actually neither can I. Perhaps I can explain some of what will probably happen so that you will be a little better prepared next year. Last week when Mother and Daddy went to vote, we told you that one of the things we were voting on was whether Torrance would spend some of the money we pay in taxes to help build more schools and to make the ones we have now better. We told you it would make it possible for you to go to school as you should and not have to go on what some call "double sessions."

I prefer "half sessions." Instead of going at 8:30 as you have been doing you may be told to be at school by 7:30 or not until 1 or 1:30. If you start at 7:30, you will be through with your day shortly after noon and if you don't go until 1 or 1:30, your daddy will probably be home from work before you get out of school.

I know that some people will say that you still have the same amount of hours at school, but this is not the point. Your teachers cannot be expected to do the same job with the same high quality day after day if they must teach twice as many children every day as they were trained to teach.

This is not the only problem you may face next year. There may not be enough books to give one to each child in your room. You may have to share your reader or science book with one or two others. This will put you at a disadvantage when you are called on and you haven't had a book for a day or two, but there are some people who think this isn't that important.

Another change you will most certainly see is that of more children in your rooms than before. The state says the ideal class should have about 20-25 children. Don't be too surprised in September if your rooms have closer to 35-40 children. Without more classrooms built there will have to be more put in each room.

I can see in your faces the question "Why?" "Why would some people vote against something as important as this?"

Actually, I don't know; but I have some ideas as to maybe why. If we were to have enough classrooms, books, materials, and to pay enough to keep good teachers, some of the diehards

who love to complain about how bad the younger generation is, and how little they are learning, and how terrible it is about the drop-out problem would lose some of their favorite topics. Too, perhaps there are some people who haven't bothered to find out what the situation really is in our schools since they don't have children in the schools yet—or any more.

Perhaps some people simply object to spending any more money on their children's education. What they don't realize is how much more, how very much more they would have to pay if they put their children into a private school with the same standards as our public schools. Some may feel that we as parents shouldn't have to spend the money, but that the federal government should put more money in. These are usually the people who will scream the loudest if the government wants a say in how the money is used.

This is all way beyond your understanding, I know, but there is still a chance, a small one I'll admit, that all this won't be necessary. The school bond issue may be put on a special election in June or on the big general election in November. We can hope and pray that then more people will be aware of the problem and needs in our schools. Whatever happens, you know that your daddy and I will be behind you as always and will do all we can to make your school years as enriching and exciting as we can.

Mother
(Mrs. V. P. M.)
Torrance

Editor, Press-Herald:

The professional educators of the Torrance City School system have been politically vocal in their protestations over the defeat of the recent proposed school bond. Dr. Hull was quoted as objecting to requirement of a two thirds majority necessary to pass a bond issue. The voters have been led to believe that \$9 million is the cost of preventing double sessions. The words "equalizing facilities" were reported in word and print again and again.

My Neighbors



HERB CAEN SAYS:

Bay City Strong Point -- Cadavers Keep Very Well

The latest example of a great man falling flat when faced with Everybody's Favorite City is of to be found in the late Dylan Thomas's letters to his wife, Caitlin. Now Thomas was a great poet, one of the greatest of the age. But he rises not too far above Convention Bureau prose when attempting to describe the indescribable. Excerpts:

"Oh, San Francisco! It is and has everything . . . The wonderful sunlight, the hills, the great bridges, the Pacific at your shoes. Beautiful Chinatown. Every race in the world. The sardine fleets sailing out. The little cable cars whizzing down the city hills. The lobsters, clams and crabs. Every kind of sea food there is. And all the people are open and friendly . . . And the city is built on hills; it dances in the sun for nine months of the year; and the Pacific ocean never runs dry."

But maybe he was saving the really pulsating stuff for a poem he never got around to writing. It was only a letter to his wife, after all.

Shorty after reading

Thomas, I ran across a

piece of evidence indicating

that whereas the writers of

today might be a touch too

boastful about the city

(which, after all, is grander

than any other, to put it

mildly), our predecessors were much worse or better, depending on how you feel. We contend only that San Francisco is a splendid place to live. But back then, certain people were teiling the world that this was the only place to DIE, man.

I quote from the 1877-78 announcement of the University of California College of Medicine in S.F.: "The

San Francisco

faculty of the Medical Department feel warranted in claiming for San Francisco a superiority in climate over any of the Eastern cities. Indeed, the opportunities for prosecuting the study of practical anatomy in this city are superior to those of any other known region of the globe.

"Independent of the advantages in climate, material for dissection is abundant and cheap, and our salubrious breezes not only preserve the cadaver for an indefinite length of time, but secure the health of the student from injury in consequence of the effluvia, so constant and attendant upon dissection elsewhere."

"Students, therefore, of all tropical countries, and of the Southern States of our Union, as well as of the North, who are unable, from these causes, to prosecute their studies at home, will

find it greatly to their advantage to repair to San Francisco."

How does that grab you, Charlie? Come to San Francisco, where even the corpses look like the just spent two weeks in Palm Springs.

Deepthink: Since nobody

in San Francisco can agree where the new freeways should go—or whether, in fact, they should go anywhere at all—perhaps the time has come to examine the problem from the other end. I mean the automobile itself. The question before the house is: Has the American automobile grown too big for its own and everybody else's good?

Personally, I drive one of the smallest cars on the market—a box on wheels. You don't get into it, you sort of slip it on, like an overcoat. It burrs so little gas that sometimes I think the gauge is stuck, in which case I pick up the car and shake it. Among its other advantages is that it parks in ridiculously small spaces, has an engine that can be repaired with paper clips and a tweezer, and is frisky enough to scoot in and out of traffic like a waterbug. Besides that, there's the inverse snobbery (the huge car as a Status Symbol has sort of lost its meaning, anyway).

ROYCE BRIER

Viet Nam War 'Explained' By Senate Head Shrinkers

Civilized man has always mediated the brain processes that make him act as he does. In the "Commentaries," Caesar evinces a remarkable understanding of the psyche of his antagonists in Gaul, and won many a battle with it.

What, then, could he have achieved had he had the benefit of Freud? Yet we must note Caesar's perception related only to the Gallic leaders he overcame. He was not interested in psychoanalyzing the barbarian armies, nor in what made his own Legions tick, excepting his legates.

Now it is a cliché that Freud and his school have wrought a profound revolution in the study of human behavior and its roots. It has produced a vast cult spreading across the Western world, with its own practicing priesthood and an even vaster multitude of disciples including a fringe of frauds. Though factions of this priesthood may quarrel

among themselves about what is true and false, it is extremely self-assured when confronted by laymen.

The institution has impressed everybody, including apparently Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and Administration gadfly. The Senator had a com-

World Affairs

pany of these savants before the committee to inquire into the Viet Nam war. This is an unabashed first: in Senate hearings, but it can hardly be said the psychiatrists told us anything startling. Curiously, they shunned psychiatric jargon and were downright lucid.

The implied proposition: can assured psychiatric knowledge (sic) about individual human behavior be profitably applied to national behavior?

Dr. Jerome Frank, psychiatry, Johns Hopkins Uni-

versity, didn't think so. He said it would be "rash" to make "solid or positive inferences about the behavior of nations from that of individuals." But he added the Viet Nam War has "assumed an ideological character similar to the holy wars of former times, and this has ominous implications."

"The notion that one can cause people to abandon their ideologies by inflicting pain on them, should have died out in Rome with the Christian martyrs."

Dr. Brock Chisholm, a Canadian psychiatrist, speculated on the "hawk-dove" equation as it is pressed on President Johnson's psyche, and warned against "experimenting with calculated escalation as a strategy for dealing with 'wars of national liberation,'" calling it a "baited hook" for democracy. He also mentioned a rather threadbare, through experience, factor, to wit, that non-white nations are suspicious of the white race. A third man, Dr. Charles Osgood, psychologist, University of Illinois, thought opponents can be lamed into surrender, but not into "honest negotiation."

All three struck a dubious attitude on the war, but really said little more than Senator Fulbright, not a psychiatrist. He said: It sometimes seems almost incredible to me that in order to give an election to people who have never had an election, we are willing to kill thousands of them."

Substitute "enlightenment" for "election" and you are back to Caesar in Gaul.

While we have judicial recourse in protesting and testing unjust laws, we have no similar mechanism by which to appeal unjust or unreasonable governmental policy.—Michael Brown, USC lecturer.

No matter what happens or where I go, I never feel I walk alone. I like people, and I have found everybody to be helpful.—Lemmy, Malaysian artist.

Freeways can only be part of an overall plan; they cannot be the plan itself.—Michael Heiberg, Hermosa Beach.

WILLIAM HOGAN

Howard Hughes -- Natural Wonder in Living Flesh

The promotional news today is that at least one reader doesn't like "Howard Hughes," a biography by the social critic John Keats ("The Insolent Chariots"). And that is Hughes — the shy, enigmatic, enormously wealthy Texan, the onetime boy mechanical genius whose career has been involved with building airplanes, an international airline (TWA), missile systems, communications satellites, motion pictures (back to "Hell's Angels," with Jean Harlow and Ben Lyon, 1930), and beautiful women.

An action has been started to enjoin Random House from publishing and selling this biography. The plaintiff is a corporation called Rosemont Enterprises, Inc., organized last September by three directors, all of whom are now or were formerly connected with the Hughes Tool Company. Nevertheless, Random House has issued the book, with a neat and inadvertent promotional assist from the Rosemont people.

Hughes likes his privacy, and Keats' book—nothing if not an "unauthorized" biography—seeks to invade an almost monastic privacy the industrialist, now 60, has built around him over a generation. Example: "Two personal aircraft, a dusty DC-6 and Convair, stand waiting at Santa Monica airport. They have not been flown for years. Young men sit in old automobiles be-

dollars; who manufactured film stars (Jane Russell), had the pick of others as girl friends (Lana Turner), and at last married one of them (Jean Peters), perhaps because she played hard-to-get.

Keats tells us that Hughes is "as capricious as Caligula and just as self-centered." Yet he represents some kind of American Dream, and the facts as Keats assembles and dramatizes them make a far more interesting document than Harold Robbins' tasteless fiction, "The Carpetbaggers," which was said to have been based on some amorous elements of Hughes' career.

Hughes being Hughes, the book is never dull. For instance: Hughes putting together the finishing touches, right down to the carpeting, of a new aircraft, the Constellation, and at the same time running through piles of photographs of actors who might play leading roles in "Billy the Kid," preferably faces and forms not seen by the camera before.

Books

side them day and night. Other young men sit on the porches of opulence, and yawn. They wait for Father to return from San Limbo, not really believing that he ever will."

Without getting near his subject, Keats investigates an American legend of classic dimensions, if as seemingly outrageous as the night thoughts of a Hollywood script writer. For here is some man from "Marlboro country"—handsome, able, untutored, suspicious of book larnin', who ran a personal fortune into a billion

Quote