

# Editorial Page

## Tending To Liberty

The uses of liberty are never easy to determine and maintain, even in a nation with a long history of freedom.

The United States has had freedom for 187 years, and its people are still arguing—often bitterly—about how it can best be enjoyed and preserved.

The political divisions represented by conservatism and liberalism reflect this continuing controversy. Basically, this spread of view is not only inevitable but healthy. Arguing about what freedom is helps to bolster it, to keep it vibrant.

The strains upon liberty are greater today than when this country gained its independence.

Then the adversary was a distant government in England which, though moving steadily toward a constitutional democracy at home, was cracking down on colonial America with the autocratic power.

Today the old notions of an uncomplicated freedom struggle against heavy counterweights.

At first, government reached out to regulate against flagrant abuses of liberty. In the Great Depression, it reached out to assist the destitute, the aged, the unemployed, the handicapped.

World War II, the Korean War and the cold war brought a massive enlargement of the government's role in American life, with defense and related activities holding sway

over a greatly expanded federal budget and biting deep into the economic and political structure.

Nearly all these enlargements have occurred in a brief 30 years, less than a sixth of the country's history as a free land.

Small wonder, then, that millions of Americans shape a mood of protest against the steady encroachments. With the nation growing ever more populous and its problems mounting, the prospect clearly is for more of the same.

No American genuinely wedded to liberty can wish to yield an inch of it casually. Conservatism which acts as a brake and corrective against any cavalier abandonment of freedom serves all free men well.

Conservatism moves toward unreality only when, at its fringes, it calls for such sharp reversals as would leave great problems not only unsolved but largely untouched.

Liberalism is similarly unreal when it calls for an end—by the day after tomorrow—of the struggles against poverty and for peace. Congress cannot appropriate enough money to bring on the millennium.

Our incredibly difficult task, now and for perhaps decades to come, is to find the sane, plausible course that will hold the great substance of our liberties while giving us some solid hope of effective assault upon our baffling array of problems.

## Sale Of Firearms

(Corvallis Gazette Times)

Even before the assassination of Mr. Kennedy with a mail-order rifle costing \$19.95, there was a bill pending in Congress (by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, D-Conn.) for tighter control over the sale of firearms. This bill was originally aimed at mail-order sales of concealable guns, such as pistols but it has now been broadened to include "all firearms."

Presently it is legal to ship shotguns and rifles to licensed dealers and manufacturers and to private individuals who have not been convicted of or indicted for a crime punishable by imprisonment of more than one year and are not fugitives from justice.

Senator Dodd's measure would make the seller and the deliverer responsible for refusing to deliver a weapon to a minor. It would also require purchasers to submit a notarized form giving age, name, address,

criminal record — if any — and a statement of non-violation of local law in buying the gun. This affidavit would have to be "authenticated by the highest local law-enforcement authority in the purchaser's community."

The problem of gun purchase and ownership is a sticky one. The federal constitution says in part, "... the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed," and the Oregon constitution says, "The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defense of themselves and the state..."

The problem is to keep the "bad guys" from having the guns while permitting the "good guys" to have them for their own protection or for hunting. Do you have an answer?

## WASHINGTON REPORTS . . .



## No TV Debates In 1964?

By FULTON LEWIS JR.  
WASHINGTON—The "image" of Lyndon Johnson carried by coaxial cable and bounced off Telstar is that of an austere man.

He is not. There lies the nub of his problem. The President looks stiff and sometimes awkward when on television. He delivers an address looking through clear-rimmed spectacles at his text, rarely looking up at the camera.

When interviewed, he may appear nervous and irritable. He is riled easily. He does not have the warmth of a John Kennedy or a Barry Goldwater.

These are the facts of political life. They make it increasingly doubtful that President Johnson will debate his GOP opponent next year.

White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger, queried by this office, issued a terse "no comment" when asked about reports that Johnson will turn thumbs down on any face-to-face confrontation.

John Kennedy promised more than three years ago he would debate again in 1964. Barry Goldwater has remained silent, publicly, because he is not an announced candidate. But he was ready to take on Kennedy and will debate Johnson if given the opportunity. The other GOP hopefuls — Rockefeller, Stanton, Romney, Martin, Nixon — would almost certainly

press for a debate if nominated.

The turning point in Bill Scranton's 1962 gubernatorial campaign was a debate televised throughout Pennsylvania. Surprising many experts, the Republican candidate completely outshined Richardson Dilworth, his supposedly invincible opponent. He went on to trounce Dilworth by almost half a million votes.

Will Johnson ask his Congressional lieutenants to quietly kill a bill that would permit televised debates next year? That bill would suspend Section 215 of the Federal Communications Act for Republican and Democratic candidates. Unless this is done, free time given the major candidates would open the way for equal time demands by candidates of obscure splinter parties who would clutter the airwaves.

The bill has passed both houses but the Senate made minor changes necessitating its recommitment to the House Commerce Committee. That was more than a month ago.

If Johnson attempts to kill the bill you may expect anguished cries from the GOP. The President finds himself in a real bind. He is damned if he does and damned if he doesn't.

Robert Wagner, Democratic mayor of New York, is mentioned as a likely vice presidential running mate for Lyndon Johnson. The astute Sanford E. Stanton, veteran political analyst for the New York Journal-American, has gone way out on a limb and said Wagner's nomination is almost inevitable.

Wagner, a Catholic, might be expected to strengthen the Democratic ticket in Northern states. He has a strong record on civil rights and is known as a friend of organized labor. (His father authored the Wagner Labor Relations Act as a member of the Senate.)

There are drawbacks to the Wagner candidacy. The mayor is little known outside of New York. He has no experience in national affairs or in the field of foreign policy. He is a poor speaker. He is short and ordinary looking. There is little glamor to him.

Other vice presidential possibilities include Robert Kennedy, Sargent Shriver, a brother-in-law of the late President, Sens. Eugene McCarthy and Hubert Humphrey, California Governor Pat Brown, Chicago Mayor Richard Daley and Adlai Stevenson.

None of these would be the ideal candidate. Bob Kennedy remains unpopular in the South. Shriver has never run for public office and is little known. McCarthy is rather dull. Humphrey is too garrulous and too liberal. Brown is something less than dynamic. Daley is a "boss." Stevenson is a two-time loser.

## "It Is Later Than You Think"



EDSON IN WASHINGTON . . .

## Rights Bill Petition First Johnson Test



By PETER EDSON  
Washington Correspondent  
Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

WASHINGTON (NEA) — A first test on President Johnson's influence with Congress is shaping up on civil rights.

The Johnson goal is simply to get the administration's civil rights bill cleared by the House Rules Committee before Christmas, for floor action early next year.

Octogenarian Howard W. Smith, D-Va., chairman of the Rules Committee, has made a flat statement that he will not let the civil rights bill be reported out this year. He is supported in this position by southern Democrats, the House Republican leadership and a House GOP caucus.

President Johnson has approved an effort by liberal Democrats to force the bill out of the Rules Committee for a floor vote. This can be done only by a petition signed by 218 of the 435 representatives.

According to House rules this petition was not to be placed in the well of the House for signing before Dec. 9 and cannot be considered by the whole House before Dec. 23.

This makes it a battle against time. Many congressmen want to adjourn the session for the Christmas holidays on Dec. 20. Some would like to push adjournment to Dec. 17 or even Dec. 14. Congress would then reconvene on Jan. 2.

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and chairman of the 90-organization Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, thinks that the 218 signatures can be obtained.

NAACP and other Negro organizations have counted congressional noses on this score often enough to know. But Wilkins admits that he doesn't have absolute pledges to sign and that after 200, the going will be tough.

So the outcome will be close and it could be failure. But Wilkins says: "We won't make a bow to anyone's Christmas vacation to get action this year." In other words, he wants Congress to work right through the Christmas holidays. Most

congressmen say there isn't a chance.

But Wilkins, speaking only for himself and not for his organizations, says: "This is a crusade. It can't be guided by cold realism. You have to believe in fairies and magic will be accomplished." This is like believing there will be another Christmas miracle this year. The political question is what will happen if there isn't a miracle.

Wilkins promises retaliation at the polls in the 1964 elections. Failure to sign the petition will place a congressman under suspicion, though it won't necessarily blacklist him. But he will have to live with a bad alibi.

Failure to vote for civil rights legislation on final passage will subject a congressman to NAACP opposition.

Wilkins says that a moratorium on direct political action of this kind has not speeded congressional passage of civil rights legislation in the past. "This year's demonstrations have sharpened appreciation of the issue," he adds.

He refers to "the terror, the persecution, the assassination of Medgar Evers in Mississippi, the death of four little girls in a Birmingham Sunday School bombing as an accumulation of events demanding faster action now."

"Within 24 hours after Argentina threatened to confiscate American oil properties, there were demands in Congress that foreign aid be cut off," Wilkins points out.

"If Congress can get that excited about oil," he asks, "why can't it do something about killing little girls?"

From 25 to 50 Washington representatives of the 80 organizations in the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights are being reinforced by 30 special legislative lobbyists from the United Steel Workers Union to pressure congressmen into signing the House discharge petition.

These forces will be supplemented by volunteers from other labor unions, church groups and Negro organizations in a drive to get some House action on civil rights this year. It is admitted there is no chance to get Senate action before late spring or early summer.

## Error Of Snap Judgments

By BRUCE BLOSSAT

The slender young woman who walked away from the White House a bare fortnight after her husband was cruelly struck down will be remembered as a First Lady unique in American history.

Millions in America and the world saw the incredible courage and dignity with which she met the ordeal of John F. Kennedy's violent death and his solemn burial. It is not clear how many, particularly in her own country, grasped the full import of Jacqueline Kennedy's illustrious example.

For the hard truth is that, until tragedy struck, countless Americans had been sadly misjudging her as a frivolous, flighty, glamor-conscious, pleasure-seeking woman who graced the White House poorly.

All the solid evidence was against this harsh verdict, but unhappily, many Americans — perhaps many in the world — are given to measuring people according to shallow stereotypes.

In Jacqueline Kennedy's case, the stereotype was made of such fragments as these: a "breathless" voice that sounded to some like affectations, pictures of her in such informal attire as Capri pants, or with

wind-tousled hair, or laughing gaily on some foreign beach.

The root truth is that she is a woman of high breeding and great sensitivity, well versed in literature and the arts, independent of spirit (she held her own against the army of Kennedys), a devoted mother determined that her spotlighted children should have as nearly a normal life as possible, a faithful, dutiful wife to a man who held the world's most demanding job.

Far from treating her White House years as a time for frivolity, she used them as fruitfully as any First Lady in the nation's whole history.

She set about with unmatched intelligence and dedication to make of the White House a living repository of all the best in the nation's background. Her restoration efforts were remarkable for their taste and thoroughness, and the new First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, is wisely urging her to continue them.

Mrs. Kennedy also made of the White House a center for the celebration of the arts, a place where the greatness of the spirit could be honored again and again. Here came poets, dramatists, musicians, dancers of high fame.

At no time did this make the

White House less than a home for her, for her late husband and for their children. Somehow it managed also to be school, playground and comfortable home all the while she was busy enhancing its symbolic image for the good of all Americans.

This, then, is the woman whose character and quality were given supreme test in the searing, grueling hours from midday, Nov. 22, until now.

The manner in which she bore herself in that test was no surprise to anyone who had troubled to look beyond the fragile stereotype. She behaved exactly as she had always behaved — true to herself and those she loved.

Now that millions have been awakened to her always visible qualities, perhaps they will move with greater care hereafter in judging not only the broad range of public figures, but their friends and associates as well.

Jacqueline Kennedy should have taught us all to measure people not with surface labels, not by artificial standards which in fact are merely the appraiser's own, but by the only fair gauge: fidelity to oneself, the best in oneself and in humanity.

## IN WASHINGTON . . .

## GOP Raps Guilt Complex



By RALPH DE TOLEDANO

From the moment that John F. Kennedy was assassinated some in public life have tried to make political capital of that tragic event. This does not honor John F. Kennedy or his memory. It is clearly a partisan maneuver to hurt the Republican Party at a time when its leaders are abstaining from political activity out of deference to our national mourning. But the GOP could not remain silent forever.

The House Republican Policy Committee has finally offered a dignified rebuttal to attempts at waving the bloody shirt. What they say is of historic importance—and if it is not heeded the present excesses of the anti-Communists will be followed by a swing of the pendulum which can do much damage to American institutions.

In its statement, approved by House Republicans, the policy committee asserts: "If it was hatred that moved the assassin who struck down our President, that hatred was bred by the teachings of communism."

The Republican policy statement notes, with justifiable concern, that "critics, well meaning and otherwise, have chosen to take this time to revile the Republic and to decry its weaknesses. Let Americans take this time to recognize the strength of institutions which permit us to proceed beyond tragedy. It is this strength which is our living memorial to all those who, in high places or humble, give their lives in the cause of freedom."

But the Republicans' sober statement goes beyond this—to a call for reason at a time when emotion can misrule. "We have our nation's business to do and we have our nation's problems to solve. We have our nation's duty to do it," the GOP emphasizes.

"There must be no inhibition of dissent or quieting of the debate through fear of seeming to disregard the memory of the late President. The denial of discussion would do the greatest disservice to his memory, and to the living nation."

In short, the Republicans in the House call on the Democrats to cease using John F. Ken-

edy's death as a device to smear the opposition or his memory to enact legislation not wanted by the Congress or the nation. No law should be passed as a "memorial" if it is not a good law.

The irresponsibility I am forced to note, of using President Kennedy's death as a means of stirring up anti-conservative sentiment has been tied to a new campaign to abolish the Communists of guilt in all political assassinations.

"Direct action" and "individual terror" run counter to Marxist doctrine, we are told. True, but in full accord with Marxist-Leninist and Communist doctrine.

To say otherwise does dishonor to others murdered by Communist assassins. Jan Masaryk, we know today, was killed by Communist thugs because he tried to slow the Red seizure of power in Czechoslovakia. He was but one.

Refugees from the Soviet Union were systematically murdered in Europe in the 1920s and 1930s. Ignace Reiss, who killed Stalin a murderer, was gunned down in a Swiss forest. Leon Trotsky was killed with an atom bomb by an NKVD agent. The list is endless.

The man who assassinated John F. Kennedy was following a bloody Communist tradition when he squeezed the trigger. Those who try to blame Americans for this crime are playing a dangerous game. Those who obscure the record are cheating history and their consciences. JFK would not have approved.

## Almanac

By United Press International  
Today is Friday, Dec. 12, the 347th day of 1963 with 18 to follow.

The moon is approaching its new phase.

The evening stars are Jupiter, Saturn and Venus.

On this day in history:  
In 1642, New Zealand was discovered by Dutch navigator Abel Tasman.

In 1918, American soldiers attached to the Third Army crossed the Rhine River at Coblenz, Germany.  
In 1928, the New York Philharmonic Orchestra premiered George Gershwin's poem, "An American in Paris."  
In 1937, Japanese soldiers captured Nanking, China, and began systematic looting of the city.

A thought for the day—British novelist A. Conan Doyle, physician and creator of Sherlock Holmes, said: "Whenever you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth."

## THEY SAY . . .

This is the century of science. The artist is only a luxury member of society.  
—Architect Walter Gropius.

We gave Admiral Perry a couple of dollars for some dog sleds and he discovered the North Pole. Today it would cost a billion dollars to do the same thing.  
—Rep. Michael Kirwan, D-Ohio.

To solve two of the world's biggest problems, have Castro and Chiang Kai-shek trade islands.  
—Editor W. M. Kiplinger.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q—What type of plant is the Canada thistle?  
A—A perennial. It reproduces by seeds or by root runners.



## STRICTLY PERSONAL

By SYDNEY J. HARRIS

Purely Personal Prejudices: There is a certain prevalent type of pseudo-religious person who not only feels that repentance washes out past sins but also gives sanction for future ones, so that each act of repentance somehow buys "credit" for tomorrow's transgressions.

People are neatly divided into those who talk about things they don't do, and those who do things they don't talk about, and society comes down hard only on those rash enough to try to combine the two.

Show said so many true and wonderfully witty things that it's a pity one of his silliest remarks is the most often quoted—that "youth is such a wonderful thing, it's a shame to waste it on children"—for in the first place, youth is also a time of trials and terrors which we mercifully forget as we grow older, and, in the second, it is not at all wasted on children, but would be utterly wasted on adults.

Speaking of children, it appeals me to see so many mothers holding their small children in the front seat of the car with them, while the father drives; they would not permit the children to sit on the edge of a second-story porch, yet this "suicide seat" in an automobile is far more dangerous.

The three most important problems facing the 20th century, in my opinion, are (1)

Automation, (2) Population explosion, and (3) Peaceful use of atomic energy; and while the world quarrels about out-moded political and economic concepts, none of these problems is being realistically attacked by any nation or combination of powers, who are still slogging through the mire of 19th century Machtpolitik.

Of all traits, I find that of giving unsolicited advice the most offensive—especially since the chronic advice-giver is usually a person whose poor judgment and rigid convictions have made a mess of his own life.

A father tinkering with his motor was asked by his little boy what a certain part was: "Never mind!" I heard the father say, and the boy slunk away; 10 years from now, the father will wonder why the boy never minds.

A person who is sick and cheerful arouses our admiration, while one who is healthy and sad excites our contempt; however, if we could realize that, with the latter, sadness is their sickness, we might be more sympathetic toward their unattractive ailment.

There may be many disasters and reversals, but only one tragedy in life: to grow old without growing up, to die a withered acorn, without ever knowing what it is like to be an oak tree.

## BERRY'S WORLD



"No, wise guy . . . Lady Bird can't come to the phone!"