

The Oregon Statesman

"No Favor Slays Us; No Fear Shall Awe"
From First Statesman, March 28, 1851

THE STATESMAN PUBLISHING COMPANY
CHARLES A. SPRAGUE, Editor and Publisher

Member of the Associated Press
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this newspaper.

Vandenberg's Address

(Continued from Tuesday's Paper)

I hasten to make my own personal viewpoint clear. I have always been frankly one of those who have believed in our own self-reliance. I still believe that we can never again—regardless of collaborations—allow our national defense to deteriorate to anything like a point of impotence. But I do not believe that any nation hereafter can immunize itself by its own exclusive action. Since Pearl Harbor, World War No. 2 has put the gory science of mass murder into new and sinister perspective. Our oceans have ceased to be moats which automatically protect our ramparts. Flesh and blood now compete unequally with winged steel. War has become an all-consuming juggernaut. It will open new laboratories of death too horrible to contemplate. I propose to do everything within my power to keep those laboratories closed for keeps. I want maximum American cooperation, consistent with legitimate American self-interest, with constitutional process and with collateral events which warrant it, to make the basic idea of Dumbarton Oaks succeed. I want a new dignity and a new authority for international law. I think American self-interest requires it. But, Mr. President, this also requires whole-hearted reciprocity. In honest candor I think we should tell other nations that this glorious thing we contemplate is not and cannot be one-sided. I think we must say again that unsharred idealism is a menace which we could not undertake to underwrite in the post-war world.

Now, I am not so impractical as to expect any country to act on any final motive other than self-interest. I know of no reason why it should. That is what nations are for. I certainly intend that intelligent and loyal American self-interest shall be just as vigilantly and vigorously guarded as is simply obvious, from time to time, in their own behalf by the actions of our allies. The real question always becomes just this: Where does real self-interest lie?

Here, Mr. President, we reach the core of the immediate problem. Without remotely wanting to be invidious, I use one of many available examples. I would not presume, even under these circumstances, to use it except that it ultimately involves us. Russia's unilateral plan appears to contemplate the engulfment, directly or indirectly, of a surrounding circle of buffer states, contrary to our conception of what we thought we were fighting for in respect to the rights of small nations and a just peace. Russia's announced reason is her insistent purpose never again to be at the mercy of another German tyranny. That is a perfectly understandable reason. The alternative is collective security. Now, which is better, in the long view? That is the question I pose. Which is better, in the long view, from a purely selfish Russian standpoint: To forcefully surround herself with a cordon of unwillingly controlled or partitioned states, thus affronting the opinions of mankind, as a means of post-war protection against a renascence of German aggression, or to win the priceless asset of world confidence in her by embracing the alternative, namely, full and whole-hearted cooperation with and reliance on a vital international organization in which all of us shall honorably participate to guarantee that Axis aggression shall never rise again? Well—at that point, Russia, or others like her, in equally honest candor, has a perfect right to reply, "Where is there any such alternative reliance until we know what the United States will do? How can you expect us to rely on an enigma?"

Now we are getting somewhere. Fear of reborn German aggression in years to come is at the base of most of our contemporary frictions. It is a perfectly human and understandable fear on the part of all neighboring nations which German militarism has twice driven to the valley of the shadow within one generation. Fear of reborn German aggression in years to come is the cause assigned to unilateral plans for Russian post-war expansion. Fear of reborn German aggression is the reason assigned to the proposed partition of Poland. Fear of reborn German aggression gave birth to the Anglo-Soviet agreement of 1942, the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement of 1943, the Franco-Soviet treaty of 1944, and to similar unilateral and bilateral actions inevitably yet to come. Fear of reborn German aggression is our apple of discord. This second World War plagues the earth chiefly because France and Britain did not keep Germany disarmed, according to contract, after World War No. 1. In other words, when we deal with Europe's fear—her justified fear—of another rebirth of German military tyranny in some future post-war era, we are at the heart of the immediate problem which beclouds our Allied relationships.

I propose that we meet this problem conclusively and at once. There is no reason to wait. America has this same self-interest in permanently, conclusively, and effectively disarming Germany and Japan. It is simply unthinkable that America, or any other member of the United Nations, would allow this Axis calamity to reproduce itself again. Whether we Americans do or do not agree upon all the powers that shall reside in all ultimate international council to call upon us for joint military action in behalf of collective security, surely we can agree that we do not ever want an instant's hesitation or doubt about our military cooperation in the peremptory use of force, if needed, to keep Germany and Japan demilitarized. Such a crisis would be the lengthened shadow of the present war. It would be a direct epilogue to the present war. It should be handled as this present war is handled. There should be no more need to refer any such action back to congress than that congress should expect chief should have instant power to act, and he should act. I know of no reason why a hard-and-fast treaty between the major allies should not be signed today to achieve this dependable end. We need not await the determination of our other post-war relationships. This problem—this menace—stands apart by itself. Regardless of what our later decision may be in respect to the power that shall be delegated to the president to join our military force with others in a new peace league—no matter what limitations may commend themselves to our ultimate judgments in this regard, I am sure we can agree that there should be no limitations when it comes to keeping the Axis out of piracy for keeps. I respectfully urge that we meet this problem now. From it stems many of today's confusions, doubts, and frustrations. I think we should immediately put it behind us by conclusive action. Having done so, most of the reasons given for controversial unilateral and bilateral actions by our allies will have disappeared; and then we shall be able, at least, to judge accurately whether we have found and cured the real hazard to our relationships. We shall have closed ranks. We shall have returned infinitely closer to basic unity.

Then, in honest candor, Mr. President, I think we have the duty and the right to demand that whatever immediate unilateral decisions have to be made in consequence of military need—and there will be such even in civil affairs—they shall all be

temporary and subject to final revision in the objective light of the post-war world and the post-war peace league as they shall ultimately develop. As President Roosevelt put it in his annual message:

During the interim period, until conditions permit a genuine expression of the peoples' will, we and our allies have a duty, which we cannot ignore, to use our influence to the end that no temporary or provisional authorities in the liberated countries block the eventual exercise of the peoples' right freely to choose the government and institutions under which, as free men, they are to live.

I agree to that. Indeed, I would go further. I would write it in the bond. If Dumbarton Oaks should specifically authorize the ultimate international organization to review protested injustices in the peace itself, it would at least partially nullify the argument that we are to be asked to put a blank-check warrant behind a future status quo which is unknown to us and which we might be unwilling to defend.

We are standing by our guns with epic heroism. I know of no reason why we should not stand by our ideals. If they vanish under ultimate pressures, we shall at least have kept the record straight; we shall have kept faith with our soldier sons; and we shall clearly be free agents, unhampered by tragic misunderstandings, in determining our own course when Berlin and Tokyo are in Allied hands. Let me put it this way for myself: I am prepared, by effective international cooperation, to do our full part in charting happier and safer tomorrows. But I am not prepared to guarantee permanently the spoils of an unjust peace. It will not work.

Mr. President, we need honest candor even with our foes. Without any remote suggestion of appeasement—indeed, it seems to me that it is exactly the contrary—I wish we might give these Axis peoples some incentive to desert their own tottering tyrannies by at least indicating to them that the quicker they unconditionally surrender the cheaper will be unconditional surrender's price. Here again we need plain speaking which has been too conspicuous by its absence, and, upon at least one calamitous occasion, by its error.

Mr. President, I conclude as I began. We must win these wars with maximum speed and minimum loss. Therefore we must have maximum Allied cooperation and minimum Allied friction. We have fabulously earned the right to be heard in respect to the basis of this unity. We need the earliest possible clarification of our relations with our brave allies. We need this clarification not only for the sake of total Allied cooperation in the winning of the war but also in behalf of a truly compensatory peace. We cannot drift to victory. We must have maximum united effort on all fronts. We must have maximum united effort in our councils. And we must deserve the continued effort of our own people.

Tax Discount and the War

Editor Ruhl of the Medford Mail-Tribune is opposed to the sliding scale of discount which the Walker plan set up for income tax payments. He writes:

When a war is on let all who have incomes willingly pay large portions to support the war. Instead of refunding income taxes in state or nation, use the money raised to support the war effort, nationally and WITHIN the state.

The discount plan helps support the war effort, because the lower one's state income tax the larger the reported income on which he pays federal income tax. Money either accumulated in the state treasury or expended in the state makes no contribution to the war effort.

As a general rule it is safer to avoid large balances in public treasuries.

Interpreting The War News

By KIRKE L. SIMPSON
ASSOCIATED PRESS WAR ANALYST

In comparison to German broadcasts claiming a new break-through against the American Seventh army in the west to capture Hagenua, communications hub of the Rhine-Lauter salient above Strasbourg, Allied supreme headquarters gave small evidence of grave concern.

General Eisenhower's spokesmen seemed wholly confident that the battle of the now substantially liquidated Belgian bulge and the Russian sweep across Poland put an end to Nazi offensive possibilities in the west of any major scope for the winter at least, if not forever.

That conclusion seems well justified. Certainly with Russian spearheads less than 150 miles from Berlin at two or more points and still rolling, the mass of German strategic reserves must be moving eastward.

Quite aside from the sapping effect on the German deployment in the west the astounding Russian winter campaign may have, however, events in the west of themselves tend to wash out the possibility that the Nazis can mount another counter-attack of anything like the hitting power displayed in the Belgian break-through. There is for more reason to expect early Allied resumption of major offensive operations than to view enemy operations on the Seventh army front in the Karlsruhe corner as more than diversionary and strictly limited in scope.

That is true for several reasons. For one thing, there is no strategic objective at which the Nazis could be aiming in the Karlsruhe corner section such as warranted the attempt in Belgium which came perilously close to disrupting the whole Allied west front deployment. The vital hinge in Allied rear communications once lay just beyond the German bulge front. There is no comparable situation in the Karlsruhe corner, important as the Hagenua road and rail hub is locally to the American front there.

Another factor that the Nazi command in the west must weigh is that General Eisenhower has available massed forces in the center to throw either north or south now that the Belgian bulge is all but flattened out.

British Second army troops have all but reached the Roer line in the Mass-Roer triangle. From its onset that operation has had the appearance of a necessary preliminary to some other Allied attack of far greater scope once the Roer was reached, not of a break-through attempt in itself.

It seems obvious that the German escape from the Belgian bulge was designed primarily to release mobile troops all but trapped there primarily for deployment in reserve northward. To that has been added the urgent need of thinning down west front reserves to help meet the Nazi crisis in the east.



Distributed by King Features Syndicate by arrangement with The Washington Star

The Interloper



(Continued from page 1)

the fish commission escape from tithing other self-supporting activities will demand similar treatment. And if a direct appropriation is to be made, where's the money to come from?

The argument of the interim committee is that the fishing industry is an important one in Oregon, furnishing a great amount of employment, paying substantial sums in taxes and providing the people with excellent food products. Industrialization and earlier-exploitation of fisheries have injured commercial fishing, and the construction of dams poses very serious threats to its future. The only way this valuable industry may be maintained is by expending greater sums on propagation, research and regulation. Unless that is done it is anticipated that commercial fishing in the Columbia will swiftly become decadent.

The trouble seems to be that the fish is just a fish. If it were wool and said "baa" it would share in the \$12,000 appropriation for improvement of range livestock. If it said "moo" and gave milk the fish might rate with dairy cattle which draw down \$12,000 a biennium of state funds. If it laid eggs once a day instead of once a year it would get consideration like chickens and turkeys, with \$15,000 a biennium. Or if it glued itself to a rock and didn't wiggle its tail it might rank with oysters which got \$5,000 last biennium. If it were bark instead of scales it would come in for \$35,000 in wood research.

Or if fishes were as malicious as rodents they would have a nuisance value of \$8000; or if they caused as much trouble and loss as noxious weeds they would rate \$18,000 from the state treasury. Being only fish which are packed by a few big packers after being caught by the Finns and Swedes and Norwegians of Astoria and river points they make a contribution to the general fund.

Senator Chessman has fish relief as his number one project at this session of the legislature.

News Behind the News

By PAUL MALLON
(Distribution by King Features Syndicate, Inc. Reproduction in whole or in part strictly prohibited.)

WASHINGTON, Jan. 23.—No spyglass is needed to see what lies behind the proposal of Mr. Roosevelt to supplant Jesse Jones with Henry Wallace as commerce secretary for the fourth term. It is quite evidently a move by the leftwing forces, under whose influence Mr. Wallace operates, to capture control of what they always have claimed was the Jones financial hegemony.

These forces, which the public sees mainly expressed in the prominence of Sidney Hillman in the CIO, would gain the inside track in the government mortgage and loan business amounting to billions and reaching out into every bank and many a business. Mr. Jones has built up what amounts to a \$40,000,000,000 (billion) mortgage empire for the administration.

The job of commerce secretary has meant little to the public. Until Jones took that chair it meant only management of government statistical bureaus relating to business, here and abroad, the bureau of standards, patent office, weather bureau and similarly unimportant (ideologically), etc.

But Jones brought into it the big lending agencies, RFC, defense plant corporation, defense supplies, metals reserves, federal mortgage association, disaster loan corp and such which wielded a dominant financial influence out through the country.

The proposed transfer of all this to ultra leftwing influence is what shocked many senators into the comment which has been published. Many other stories are being told, purporting to give the inside inspirations for the president's decision. Most of them relate to the personal feuds involved.

One of the great gunning games of the administration has long run between Wallace and Jones. Some say this is the reason why Wallace asked for the post, merely to oust a bitter antagonist who defeated him in their earlier row.

Bad feeling also has existed between the president and Jones since the Texan had been unable to quiet antagonism to the fourth term in his home state. The leftists long have charged Jones with treachery, but never proved it, and I had personal experiences in the last campaign which proved to my satisfaction the Jones loyalty to the fourth term. His job which represents his life's work was at stake, he thought.

All this is superficial and inconsequential no matter which side you are on. That the president would be guided by personal antagonism in such a matter will be difficult to be believed generally. The average inner feeling in the senate, as I judge it—or at any rate the common sense viewpoint on the issue—is this:

Mr. Wallace did as much public work as anyone for Mr. Roosevelt's re-election, although there are others, possibly including Mr. Jones who did great inside work. Certainly Mr. Wallace deserved a job and a job of his choice.

But that he would ask for the commerce secretaryship is somewhat strange in itself. He is about as well fitted for it as say Mrs. Roosevelt who also did good campaign work (in the average congressional opinion, and mine). She, too, was popular with the leftwing influence, no doubt equally dislikes Mr. Jones and has had about as much experience in the complex high finance involved in the new deal's

Three Yank Medics
Volunteer to Stay
With the Wounded

ON THE BELGIAN FRONT, Jan. 20.—(Delayed)—(AP)—During the early stages of the German counter offensive a battalion commander found his outfit nearly surrounded and heavily outnumbered. The position could not be held and it became necessary to withdraw before the final lone corridor of escape was cut off.

But even that corridor was chopped and slashed by shellfire. Mortar burst regularly all along it and small arms fire indicated how difficult it was going to be just getting out of it. He realized it would be impossible to take 18 wounded men out with the rest of the battalion—regardless of his wishes—and told them so in terse sentences.

There was a quiet moment. Then a medical aid corporal from Oakland, Calif., spoke softly: "I will stay with the wounded, sir. They'll be needing attention until—" his voice tapered away into silence.

There was another moment's silence as the men's minds considered the possibilities. Even when the Germans eventually would arrive there had been nothing lately to indicate they would conform to "the rules of warfare" as far as the medics were concerned, and besides, shells, mortars and the like know no Geneva regulations whatever.

Another medical corporal from Portland, Ore., looked at a private, first class, from Berlin, Pa. Then in three quiet words, they said together what they had to say: "Count us in."

That is all there is to their story when you put it down on paper. You can't print their names yet and there isn't anything else to tell because you do not know what happened. But there was a lot more in the minds of the rest of the boys in the battalion as they filed out.

As they looked back, they saw three anonymous medics tending the wounded while they waited—for mortars, shells, rifle fire or the tender mercies of SS supermen.

Capt. William J. Hagood, of Corbin, Ky., can't speak French but he can understand pictures. When he knocked at the door of a Belgian house, all he wanted was a place to spend the night. He was tired.

When an old man answered the door, he spouted French.

From the administration's own standpoint of keeping financial forces marshaled efficiently in the government interest, it would seem to me to be impossible for Mr. Wallace to do a good job.

The president unquestionably has placed a higher estimate than is placed here on the man whom his campaign manager told him was not sufficiently popular in the country to be carried on the fourth term ticket in the recent elections.

What I cannot understand is why Mr. R. did not offer Mr. Wallace instead of Mr. Jones a choice of ambassadorships—a line of work in which he has had experience in Mexico and China.

That failed. Then he made many gestures. That failed. But Bill was tired and it looked like a good place to spend the night. Finally, the old man invited him inside and Capt. Hagood thought he was set for a night's slumber. But the old man and his wife and their 12 children. Weary William took the hint and went next door for sleeping quarters.

By the time the war is over—speaking of payday—the men of the 84th "Ralliplitter" division ought to be international currency experts. In five months, they have been paid in money of five different countries and have been involved in financial transactions of several additional lands.

It began when the division was staging for its departure overseas and drew its last home pay in American dollars. The next payday the men were in England and received pounds. The next time they were in France and drew French francs. By the (Continued on page 10)

Your Federal Income Tax

No. 17
Adjusted Gross Income
The term "adjusted gross income" is relatively new in income tax literature but it is, directly or indirectly, a vital factor in determining the Federal income tax liability of millions of taxpayers.

For instance, in the case of a wage earner with no income except his wages, his "gross income" for tax purposes is his total receipts. For a merchant or store proprietor, however, "gross income" under the law and regulations is total receipts less the cost of goods sold. In previous years the tax rates could not be applied to the income of the merchant and the wage earner with equal fairness until the "net income" of each had been determined after deducting not only the cost of doing business but also all the deductions and credits which the law allowed, including allowable personal expenses such as contributions, medical expenses, taxes, interest, and casualty losses.

The 1944 law in effect divided all deductions into two groups. One group consisted of (a) all expenses directly incurred in a trade or business, the deduction of which from total receipts is necessary to put the income of the merchant, farmer, professional man or other business man on a par, for income tax purposes, with the income of the wage earner before considering personal expenses. In this group were also included (b) deductions which represent expenses attributable to property held for the production of rents or royalties, (c) expenses of travel, meals and lodging incurred by an employee while away from home in the service of his employer, (d) reimbursed expenses in connection with his employment, (e) deductions allowable to a life tenant or income beneficiary of property held in trust, and (f) allowable losses from sale or exchange of property. The income remaining in the case of each taxpayer, after the deduction of these expenses from the respective kinds of income, is uniformly called "adjusted gross income."

The other group of deductions consisted of the allowable personal expenses, having no relation to business or investments, which are deductible from the adjusted gross income to arrive at net income. To provide taxpayers with an easy method of legitimately avoiding the burden of having to itemize these deductions in detail and of having to support them with evidence, the law provided a substitute, called the "optional standard deduction for individuals," which the taxpayer may use, if he chooses, instead of itemizing his actual deductions. If the adjusted gross income is \$5000 or more, the standard deduction is \$500. If adjusted gross income is less than \$5000, the standard deduction is approximately 10 percent of the adjusted gross income.

LITERARY GUIDEPOST

By W. G. ROGERS

"ASSIGNMENT WITHOUT GLORY," by Marcus Spinelli (Lippincott; 62)

Maybe you think the danger spots in this war are the Philippines and the western front in Europe, but the authors of thrillers warn warningly to South America. There, in volume after volume, they are saving the United Nations from annihilation at the hands of nefarious axis agents. Sometimes it's spy work, sometimes it's spinach, now it's Spinelli.

This native of Brazil and U.S. citizen was drafted into the army, trained in tanks, became a corporal, transferred to army intelligence in Florida. The hero of his book was trained in tanks, became a corporal, transferred to intelligence and worked out a base in Florida.

This remarkable coincidence makes the story seem thus far absolutely dependable. Spinelli himself went on to an honorable discharge. Pedro Amaral de Oliveira da Costa in the book, however, ran down and exterminated some spies and uncovered a German communications network in the jungles of Matta Grosso. He escaped being skinned alive, literally, just 25 pages from the end; presumably he was preserved against the day when Spinelli, Lippincott and the United Nations will need him again.

You may disapprove heartily of the book on literary grounds, but it would be most unpatriotic not to like it, for it is after all the story of an intrepid fellow American who, with however little wit, outfoxed an enemy

"THE YOUNG IDEA" By Mossler



1-24 Cop. 1945 by United Feature Syndicate, Inc.
"Then, too, you must realize that marriage has its seamy side—there might even be times when you'll run out of juke box needles!"

STEVENS DIAMONDS WATCHES JEWELRY

Stevens & Son has an outstanding selection of chic Costume Jewelry... you'll find many, many pieces to add a sparkling touch to your costume for daytime and evening wear.

Bracelets
Earrings
Rings
Clips
Pins

Credit If Desired

Diamonds
Re-set
White You
Wait

Stevens & Son
530 Grand St.
Salem, Oregon

Store Hours:
9:30 A. M. to 6 P. M.
Not Open Saturday Nights