



Right to bear arms not as absolute as many persons seem to believe

With the sudden death of President Kennedy, almost surely through the efforts of an assassin armed with a mail-order rifle, proposals to limit the ownership of arms have been raised again. The proposals are not new. They have been made sporadically for some 40 years. They have been opposed for the same 40 years by members of the same groups — with hunters, arms and ammunition manufacturers, gun buffs furnishing most of the vocal opposition.

Those whose memory of the federal Constitution is somewhat hazy pay little attention to the demands. After all, they seem to remember, the Constitution guarantees a man a right to own and carry a gun.

This is a comforting memory when the right to own and carry a gun is being threatened. But it's certainly an over-simplification, if not an outright erroneous conclusion to draw from the language of the Oregon and U.S. Constitutions.

Oregon's Constitution puts it this way:

"The people shall have the right to bears arms for the defence (sic) of themselves, and the State . . ."

The Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution says:

"A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

The constitutional right to bear arms, as far as the state of Oregon is concerned, is clearly limited to arms to be used for self defense or for use in a state militia. The same

conclusion is drawn from the specific language in the United States' basic law document.

The right to bear arms has been limited somewhat in various jurisdictions. Best-known of these is New York's Sullivan Law, providing for the licensing of firearms in that state, and limiting those to whom licenses are granted. Yet New York has one of the highest gun-involved crime rates in the entire world.

Will the enactment of laws controlling the sale and possession of firearms, short of complete and effective disarmament of the citizenry, prevent the brutality and senseless murder committed by the assassin, the felon, the criminally insane, the juvenile delinquent? Would such laws in force at the time have prevented the assassination of the late President Kennedy? Probably not.

A law requiring each firearms purchaser to provide an affidavit stating that he is of age, has not been convicted of a felony, and has not been committed to a mental institution might deter some individuals, particularly juveniles, with only an inclination toward the misuse of firearms.

The solution to the firearms problem lies in restraining the irresponsible, the criminal, the mentally disturbed, and the inexperienced of youth, and not in the control of an inanimate object which can be used for good and evil only as directed by the minds of those who possess it. Get as tough as the law can devise on the criminal who has proved his evil intent. But do not further limit or destroy the American citizen right to bear arms.

Quit kidding, West Coast

West Coast Airlines has sent out its 1964 calendar. A pretty one it is. Four big pages, each one covering a quarter of the year, bear excellent pictures of Pacific Northwest scenic wonders.

A note at the start of the calendar says, in part:

"From the large oval window of our F-27's, West Coast passengers have an unobstructed view of a land that nature has blessed . . . Crater Lake — jewel of the high Cascades . . ." And sure enough, there's Crater

Lake in one of the photographs.

But from an F-27? Hardly. The closest aerial route to Crater Lake is the airway from Klamath Falls to Roberts Field at Redmond. And West Coast pilots do, when weather and schedules permit, let passengers on that route take a look at Crater Lake.

But passengers get that look from the small windows of a DC-3, a shivering old bucket of bolts built 20 or more years ago, but still furnishing airline service in this area. Quit kidding, West Coast.

Is boxing nearing end?

The news this week that teevee has just about dried up its reservoir of boxing talent was to be expected.

What other result could there have been? Teevee boxing started out in about the early 1950s with as many as four televised matches each week. In recent months this has dwindled to one and sometimes none as promoters ran out of fighters. At this point it appears that televised boxing may become a thing of the past except for important matches.

We should have prefaced that last sentence with an "if" . . . if box-

ing manages to continue as a sport at all.

It is no secret that boxing is dominated by the underworld element, that many fights are "made" before they even begin. This is too bad. The only result can be an eventual elimination of boxing as a sport. It looks like we are on the verge of this at the present time.

There will be a lot of us who are sorry to see teevee boxing go by the boards just as we will be sorry to see boxing itself become a thing of the past.

Soviet image as champion of Africa soiled

By Phil Newsom
UPI Staff Writer

The violent demonstration of African students against racial discrimination in the Soviet Union was an embarrassment to the Russians because it tarnished their image as champions of black Africa.

It also came as a shock to many Russians who saw the demonstrators surge to the very gates of the Kremlin, within sight of Lenin's tomb, in the first such outbreak in 40 years.

It led the Soviet news agency Tass to warn that "anyone who does not want to abide by (our rules and laws) is free to leave our country at any time."

In the battle to win men's minds, both the Communist and the Western nations have relied heavily upon education as part of their strategy.

The magazine East Europe, published by the Free Europe Committee, estimated in its March issue that there are about 30,000 foreign students in the Communist bloc, including Red China.

At the same time, it said, there are 168,000 foreign students in the four principal Western countries — the United States, Britain, West Germany and France.

Problems Common

On both sides of the Iron Curtain, the problems of the foreign student may have elements common to all. These would arise from differences of custom, and especially the sensitivity of the underdeveloped nations.

But in the Soviet Union and the satellites it is clear that many Africans are not getting the treatment they were led to expect.

In Moscow the students were protesting the death of a Guantánamo student allegedly slain because he planned to marry a Russian girl.

The Russians said he had been drinking, fell down and froze to death.

Not The First

It was not the first African protest against Soviet discrimination.

In 1960, when the Russians quashed an attempt to organize an all-African students' union, three of its leaders later published an "open letter" which declared:

"For Soviet leaders to pose before the world as champions of oppressed Africa while they oppress millions in their own country and their satellites is hypocrisy at its worst."

The students further declared their "wish to stress the great danger communism is to true Africanism."

Among their complaints was one that the Soviet authorities refused to permit imports of books and jazz records.

But of deeper significance were other protests against Communist political indoctrination which denied diplomas to those not adept in the slogans of Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

Same Elsewhere

In Hungary and Poland, African students have protested their isolation. In Bulgaria 25 Ghanaian students left school protesting not only their isolation but also the discrimination and indoctrination to which they had been subjected.

In Czechoslovakia, the official Communist newspaper found it necessary to warn against attacks on African students and to deny that they were living in luxury at the expense of the Czech people.

News of the Moscow incident received wide distribution in West Africa. Nigerian dailies accused the Soviets of preaching tolerance but practicing racial discrimination.

Barbs

A writer says that women eat less than men and he is backed up by figures.

Wild life is decreasing in some states for two reasons — lack of food or the cover charge.



When it comes to watching the clock at the end of the day most stenographers are good lookers.

At a family reunion in Florida there were thirty-five cousins, 26 uncles and a million ants.

THE BULLETIN

Friday, December 27, 1963
An Independent Newspaper

Robert W. Chandler, Editor
Glenn Cushman, Gen. Manager
Phil F. Brogan, Associate Editor
Loren E. Dyer, Mech. Sup't.

Jack McDermott, Adv. Manager
Del Usseman, Circ. Manager
William A. Yates, Managing Ed.

Printed at Second Class Matter, January 8, 1917, at the Post Office at Bend, Ore., under Act of March 3, 1879. Published daily except Sunday and certain holidays by The Bend Bulletin, Inc.

Capital Report

Is it time to change Bill of Rights by repealing 'right to bear arms'?

By A. Robert Smith
Bulletin Staff Writer

WASHINGTON — Is it time to change the bill of rights by repealing the historic "right to bear arms" provision of the U. S. Constitution?

Many members of Congress, editorial writers and private citizens are clamoring for a crack-down on unregulated sale of guns, especially via the mail order catalogue, the convenient method which served Lee Harvey Oswald. Most of them give a passing salute to the Second Amendment.

"Any legislation, state or federal, must consider the constitutional right of our citizens to bear arms," said one senator who wants a crackdown on guns. "Responsible citizens have the right to possess firearms for purposes of self-protection, security of the nation, hunting and recognized sporting activities."

The Second Amendment was a sensible necessity when adopted in 1787. It reads in full: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

For the ex-colonists who had secured a free state by taking up their muskets and squirrel rifles to defeat the British troops, it was manifestly important to assert that all citizens in the new United States of America had a right to keep such weapons in case they needed to defend their hard won freedom. And, of course, before long they needed those guns once again to fight off the British in the war of 1812.

The supposition inherent in the right to bear arms concept was that when oppressors threatened, freedom would be defended by free men taking up the musket from behind the door.

But technological changes in weapons and military practices have made the right to bear arms an anachronism in 1964. If freedom today is dependent upon free men maintaining weapons in their homes, then its high time we got every red blooded American to invest in a household anti-tank gun, plus

several automatic weapons and mortars for the wife and kids. (They could be bought on the installment plan, which would stimulate the economy, and could be stored in our fallout shelters.)

All the deer rifles, shotguns and revolvers in any American town would be a prickly nuisance to an invading armada, moving in to take control, but they would keep freedom alive about as long as the rebellious Hungarians were able to last against the Soviet tanks which rolled into position to crush the uprising a few years ago.

The "well-regulated militia" upon which American freedom depends today is still composed of citizen members, but when they report for active duty they are advised to keep their sport guns at home. Instead, they are handed weapons that were inconceivable in 1787 (or even 1937), weapons provided by the state because they are so costly and complex no militiaman can supply his own as in colonial times.

If freedom should ever be threatened in America by a domestic dictator, his power to control unrest would depend upon whether the Pentagon obeyed his orders to put down rebellious citizens. The power of citizens to retaliate would depend not upon their use of target pistols, skeet guns or even the surplus Army carbines the government is selling today, but upon their courage and determination to frustrate the dictatorship through non-violent resistance — the sildown strike in factories, dairies, farms, trains that could paralyze the nation more swiftly and surely than sniper fire from each rooftop.

The Daughters of the American Revolution customarily pass ringing resolutions against any attempt to tamper with the right to bear arms, lest liberty be lost. But a valued liberty of free men is speedily being lost because of this out-dated right. Citizens are no longer at liberty to walk city streets after dark because armed hoodlums will stalk them, transforming the delights of leisure into the terror of the chase.

The unfortunate misfits of society who once took their guns

and headed for the western frontier now have no place to go. These, the Oswalds among us, are trapped in the city. They have gunned our urban centers into places of terror for innocents abroad in the streets. Yet we assert everyman's right to bear arms as though freedom were dependent upon it.

It is time to repeal the Second Amendment. A case could be made for outlawing all guns, just as narcotics are outlawed, because of their danger. But at the very least, the possession of guns should be made a carefully restricted privilege and not a right of every citizen. The privilege should be granted only to those who prove their trustworthiness.

Every American may think he has a right to own and operate an auto. But in fact it is a restricted privilege. He has to reach a certain age, to pass certain qualifying tests, to demonstrate safe driving ability. Even so, we suffer a high death toll on the highways — but we justify the auto because of compensatory benefits.

The notion that there are compensating benefits for the high risk of the right to bear arms — such as protection of the home — is hard to defend. For every housebreaker that is scared off by a gun-toting home owner, probably two or three others living in such protected homes are shot in accidents or family arguments. A pistol in the bureau drawer is usually a greater threat to those inside the house than those supposedly threatening their security from without.

It will take time to repeal the Second Amendment. Many Americans still think in frontier terms. Watching TV westerns by the hour won't bring us any closer to the realities of contemporary life, to the paradox of a six-gun psychology in a suburban setting.

It should be repealed because the right to bear arms, as exercised by every strange character who feels insecure without a gun, threatens our freedom instead of protecting it — our freedom from individual harm, our freedom to enjoy the good land and the good life for which we have worked and fought.

Washington

President Johnson forced to pay to get absentee congressmen back for aid vote

By Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON — If the American taxpayers knew the extent to which the President of the United States had to beg, implore, and cajole congressmen to come back to earn their salaries by voting just before Christmas, there would be a national move to reduce congressional salaries instead of increasing them.

The Johnson administration had to charter a special airplane to pick up Democratic congressmen, some of whom refused to return to earn their salaries unless their way was paid back to Washington. The Democratic National Committee had to foot the bill.

One of those who were picked up by special plane was Ed Willis of Louisiana, chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, who was finally located out of the Gulf of Mexico fishing. As chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee, Willis is supposed to set an example of good Americanism, but he had ducked out of Washington just before a crucial vote and a special plane brought him back.

One man who at first refused to come back at all was B. F. Sisk of Fresno, a member of the Rules Committee whose presence was vital if President Johnson was to get his foreign aid bill ok'd by the Rules Committee before Christmas.

When Hale Boggs of Louisiana, the Democratic whip, got on the phone, Sisk at first refused to return. Finally the President of the United States got on the wire. Only then did the Democratic congressman from California agree to come back and earn his salary.

California Absentees The Johnson administration had to pay for tickets out of committee funds for the following California Democrats who had gone home, in order to get them back to vote:

Cliff Davis of Tennessee was willing to come back but there was 13 inches of snow in Memphis and no plane could land. Herbert Bonner and Henry Fountain of North Carolina got in an auto wreck en route to the airport.

Two Democratic Congressmen from Michigan could have made it in time for the crucial vote Monday if they had been willing to leave home the night before. But they didn't seem to think they owed the taxpayers that much. Harold Ryan and Bernard Grabowski left Detroit Monday morning instead of Sunday night. By that time, the weather over Washington was a bad and they couldn't land. Their two votes, plus Roy Taylor's of North Carolina who also waited too long to fly back, would have meant a Johnson victory in the two-third vote needed to get the foreign aid bill past the House on Monday.

Clarence Cannon of Missouri, who has talked so much about efficiency could not be reached at all to come back to vote. Nor could Wayne Aspinall of Colorado or Thomas Abernethy of Mississippi. Adam Clayton Powell of Harlem as usual was in Puerto Rico, but agreed to fly back.

This record of absenteeism took place despite a session of Congress which had enjoyed more vacations than any other in recent history — a total of six. They began with the Lincoln birthday vacation in February, followed by the Jefferson-Jackson day vacation, then Memorial Day, then the Fourth of July, then Labor Day, and then Thanksgiving.

These were not just ordinary one- or two-day vacations. When Congress lets itself off work it takes off for at least a week, usually two weeks.

Despite this, Congress started walking out for a Christmas vacation while still in session and while the President had made it clear that he wanted all money bills cleaned up before Christmas.

If an American business firm permitted similar absenteeism it would go bankrupt. Perhaps what Congress needs is a system of salaries raised on the number of days congressmen are present for work.

Shipyard

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| ACROSS | 4 Nocturnal |
| 1 makers | 5 Spirals (Roman) |
| 8 tape | 6 Fish |
| superintendent | 7 Ship repair |
| 12 Plato's ideas | 8 Winged seed |
| 13 Above (contr.) | 9 Colored |
| 14 Sent of | 10 Vocal |
| 15 Eau (Bib.) | 11 Divided into |
| 16 Work steadily | four parts (her.) |
| 17 Canteen lunch | 19 Number |
| 18 Greeting to an | 21 Consumes |
| officer | 24 Below (naut.) |
| 20 Implacable | 25 Rinses |
| 22 Legal point | 26 Adjective- |
| 23 Frightening | forming suffix |
| 24 Implement | 27 Blind impulses |
| 25 Foreigner | (Gr.) |
| 26 Man who caught | 28 City in the |
| Diana bathing | Netherlands |
| (Gr. myth.) | |
| 31 Shellac sources | |
| 32 Supplies (ab.) | |
| 33 Female deer | |
| 34 Eggs | |
| 35 Roman goddess | |
| of hope | |
| 36 Dams (coll.) | |
| 37 Electric | |
| 38 Scheduled | |
| 40 Age | |
| 41 Small bed | |
| 42 Pay | |
| 43 Written | |
| message | |
| 44 Celebes or | |
| 80 Lion | |
| 82 Gaelic | |
| 83 Ship's plate | |
| 84 And so on (ab.) | |
| 85 Girl's name | |
| 86 Camera part | |
| 87 Mail (India) | |
| 88 Spore | |
| DOWN | |
| 1 Observes | |
| 2 Verdi's opera | |
| 3 Object of | |
| workshop | |

Political good feeling won't last very long

By Lyle C. Wilson
UPI Staff Writer

The era of good political feeling now warming the Johnson administration in its toddling weeks probably will end with a bang in the second week of January when the new President addresses to the Congress his first annual message on the State of the Union.

Until then, the voters can continue to amuse themselves with the new word game: "Is he or ain't he?" The game, of course, seeks to identify Johnson as a conservative or as a liberal. It is not easy.

There is in Washington, D.C., an organization known as Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA). It keeps account of congressional votes on which it scores senators and representatives on their support of the nation's welfare as ACA sees it. ACA is a hard-nosed conservative outfit.

ACA has an overall rating on the basis of a legislator's consistency in voting to promote sound economic growth through constitutional government and opposing collective morality and socialized economy through centralized power. President Johnson's Senate votes in 1960 were rated a poor 10 per cent by ACA's yardstick.

Gets Low Scores

ACA gave him a sorry 9 per cent for 1960 support of sound money and opposition to inflation; 7 per cent for support of economy and conservation against waste; 7 per cent for supporting the private competitive market and opposing government interference; 13 per cent for supporting local self government against central government interference; 9 per cent for support of national security. ACA graded Johnson zero on opposition to government ownership and in defense of individual liberty. A perfect score from the ACA standpoint would be 100 per cent.

An opposite number to ACA is Americans for Democratic Action (ADA). ADA had been condemning Johnson for years as a Democratic leader until he succeeded to the presidency when ADA began to have kind words for him. In September, 1955, ADA bracketed Johnson together with Sen. John F. Kennedy in voting during the first session of the 84th Congress only 66.7 per cent in favor of liberal legislation.

In 1959, ADA was accusing Senate Democratic Leader Johnson of surrendering to President Eisenhower on Democratic party principle, especially in unholy appeasement on the issue of civil rights. "Early in the session (first of the 86th Congress)," ADA complained, "Speaker Sam Rayburn and Senator Johnson snuggled into a straight-jacket offered them by the (Eisenhower) administration."

Singled Out On Oct. 18, 1959, ADA said: "All senatorial hopefuls, except Sen. Johnson, scored 100 per cent on the ADA voting record presented at the quarterly national ADA board meeting this week." This referred also to the first session of the 86th Congress.

On June 30, 1960, in opposition to Johnson's campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination, ADA said: "He (Johnson) is a conservative, anti-civil rights, gas-and-oil senator. He has supported all of the major anti-labor legislation enacted during the past two decades and bragged about it."

As so often asked: "Is he or ain't he?"

Answer to Previous Puzzle

