

The Oregon Statesman

"No Favor Sways 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.

Seeding the Burn

The Statesman would take the advice of State Forester Nels Rogers on the matter of seeding the Tillamook burn with field grasses. He discourages the plan which emanates from a meeting in Forest Grove, asserting that a mat of grass over the burned area makes an easily ignited torch. This would increase rather than diminish the danger of new fires.

The best natural protection against fires is slick leaf brush at first, followed by a new crop of forest trees. It is much easier to stop or smother a fire in green brush or trees than in grass which dries out as soon as the rains stop in summer. What Rogers proposes is a comprehensive plan for restocking the area with forest growth—fir, hemlock, cedar. There should be broad fire breaks and plenty of roads and trails for protection purposes.

While it is true that the present fire has destroyed the new growth that was getting a start on portions of the area, which sets back the harvest of trees by perhaps another decade, the fire is not without some benefit. It has destroyed a vast quantity of forest litter, snags, down logs, debris remaining from former fires and from later logging operations. As long as this material was there in great abundance it was a menace. Better have the fire now than five years from now. Without doubt there is still a large quantity of combustible material, but it must be far less than before the fire. Perhaps it is getting down to where future fires may be easily controlled.

As far as erosion goes, grass seeding might halt that, but the country is already badly eroded. There is hardly a level quarter section in the whole area. The only economic value the land has is tree growing. Replanting with forest is the only practical thing to do with it, and the need for that is most urgent.

We must look at this with no narrow vision, but in terms of a great state forest in which the state will invest millions to create great future wealth. If the state will not do this it should step aside and invite the federal government to convert the area into national forest.

From Radio Tokyo

Almost plaintive is the AP dispatch from Manila admitting that Radio Tokyo has been scooping correspondents attached to the MacArthur headquarters on the general's plans for occupation of Japan. It says:

The developments marked one of the strangest situations of the war's end, in which American correspondents found Tokyo radio always their most potent competitor in supplying news of major events.

Only because Tokyo radio had been broadcasting them for 45 hours were MacArthur's landing plans and dates of the beginning of the occupation announced here. The correspondents in Manila had been forced to stand helplessly, unable to break stories about which they all knew.

This is restrained language for a baffled newshound. We can well imagine the fulminations behind such screen of polite expression. It must be bitter as gall for newsmen at Manila where the Japs were given notice of MacArthur's plans and requirements to have all the publicity come from Tokyo, without even a handout at Manila.

But what makes them burst their blood vessels is the refusal of MacArthur to let American newsmen accompany the first airborne troops into Japan. The Japanese have inquired about the number of correspondents to expect and indicated a desire to give them assistance in their work. But MacArthur has ignored their inquiry. There is no assurance that reporters may be on hand to witness the great act of Japan's surrender on the battleship Missouri, although we expect that correspondents and photographers, especially the latter, will be on hand to report MacArthur's descent from the skies and grand entry into Tokyo.

Oh well, if American newsmen can't make it, we'll still get the news—from the Japanese reporters!

Rockefeller Out

Nelson Rockefeller, who really did try to do a good job for the United States through Latin America, is out as assistant secretary of state. He is blamed with the bum judgment on Argentina, helping that country to crash the gate at San Francisco. The subsequent activity and attitude of the Peron regime in Buenos Aires showed how unrepentant it was. Most people have been holding their nose over the recognition extended to that country.

As further evidence of contrition on the part of our government the president has appointed Spruille Braden, now ambassador to Argentina, as Rockefeller's successor. Braden has been pretty frank in his talks in Argentina, incurring the dislike of the ruling officials. But the people have greeted his public appearances with applause. This elevation by Truman is a very plain slap at the regime trying to hang onto power in Argentina.

Britain and Lend-Lease

Prime Minister Attlee revealed surprise as well as chagrin over the termination of lend-lease by the United States. And Winston Churchill pulled the stop on our obligation to a faithful ally who had held the fort while American armaments were prepared. Yet both must know the terms of the lend-lease law, that shipments were to end with the war's close.

Attlee confesses that the termination puts Britain "in a serious financial position." That is doubtless true. Britain existed as an importing country, paying for its excess of imports by interest and dividends from overseas investments and by services such as shipping and insurance. During the war its foreign investments

were greatly reduced, and its income from services likewise. In addition, the dominions like Australia and South Africa and the dependency of India have built up large balances in London. Britain cannot pay these debts immediately. Its needs for imports of foods and materials continue; and it must look to foreign countries for grants or for credits.

While it was necessary under the law to end lend-lease, the United States ought not to ignore Great Britain's plight. Self-interest if nothing else should prompt us to assist that country in getting on its feet. Perhaps out of some of the other funds congress has generously provided means can be found to finance British requirements, giving Britain a little time to effect its own reconversion.

Interpreting The War News

By JAMES D. WHITE
Associated Press Staff Writer

SAN FRANCISCO, Aug. 25—(AP)—Rolling in from the Pacific in the wake of war come rumblings of civil war in China.

Americans trying to focus clearly on the Chinese picture, muddled as it is by the past and shrouded by the future, might keep a number of factors in mind.

First is that the situation is incompletely reported. Chungking's self-protective censorship still operates. Relaxation has been promised, but for the future.

The dissident communist radio functions in Yenan, and has broadcast many reports of the aggressive action its troops are taking toward occupation of key Chinese points as the Japanese surrender. It broadcasts accusations that Chungking's Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek is a fascist and is dealing with traitors in restoring Chungking influence in the Japanese-held part of China.

American correspondents have visited Yenan in the past, but even if any are there now, Chungking's censorship could operate to screen what they might have to say. This is because the Yenan transmitter has no formal arrangement with the outside world for commercial traffic, and press dispatches from Yenan go out by land wire via Chungking, where of course they are subject to censorship.

The next thing to remember is that the present dispute is merely the latest phase of a long-continuing rivalry where, in recent months anyway, each side has made offers chiefly distinguished by provisions known to be unacceptable to the other. Each meanwhile has entreated the other to put national interests first and forget the past.

The present impasse seems typical, with both sides making subtle faces at each other. Chungking's Generalissimo Chiang "humbly" asks Mao Tse-tung, the red leader, to come to Chungking to confer on how to avoid civil war. From the Chungking standpoint this is perfectly reasonable, because as the head of state Chiang does not go to others; they come to him.

But from the communist viewpoint, this invitation is one which automatically would place Mao at a disadvantage in negotiating—he would be making the first concession. The reds have built up strong popular support and resent assumptions they are in the wrong. And right or wrong Mao Tse-tung is not forgetting that Chiang Kai-shek's forces once chased him and his ragged red army 4000 miles in a bloody civil war after Chiang became supreme in China with communist help.

So instead of accepting the invitation himself, Mao sends his deputy, Chou En-Lai, and another red negotiator named Lin Tso-Han, both of whom have spent months in Chungking before this in negotiations which failed. Not very promising, to speak conservatively.

It may be noteworthy that neither side has proposed meeting at an intermediate point, such as Sianfu. If Chiang Kai-shek remembers that he was kidnapped at Sianfu in 1936 (not by the reds, but while he was dicker with them) the reds can recall that the settlement reached there did not last. Each side blames the other for the lapse.

The third thing to remember about the present phase of the impasse is that both sides realize they are approaching a showdown—either negotiated, or, failing that, one to be fought out in tragic civil strife.

If the past is any criterion, this makes both sides anxious to maneuver to the last possible moment before a decision is forced. All reports—Chungking, Yenan and Japanese—present a picture of both central government and communist forces racing to fill the void which surrendering Japanese forces will leave. Each wants as many marbles in his pocket as possible for trading purposes.

Each side thinks the showdown may mean political life or death. The fundamental red demand is political equality in China—and Chungking fears that would mean the strong democratic appeal of the red reform program loosed within its rural economy which is dazed by the war and which might see little more than landlords and usurers to be lost in a change.

The fundamental Chungking demand is that the reds give up their separate army and copulatory political independence. The reds fear that without guns to defend themselves they would be herded into concentration camps by what they say is the fascist element in Chungking.

There is nothing much new in this situation. Before the war the rest of the world didn't care enough to bother, and during the war it was too busy. But now the seemingly irreconcilable differences between Chungking and Yenan loom large in Washington, Moscow and London.

Chungking is the recognized government of China. Not even Moscow regards the Chinese communists as communists, although the American writer, Edgar Snow, who has spent much time with them, says that while they operate as agrarian reformers now their ultimate goals remain communist goals.

Chungking has in its pocket six brand-new and still unpublished agreements with Moscow. The Chinese reds have nothing but a fait accompli they appear to be trying to expand from day to day.

Those agreements may or may not contain the fate of red China, but until they are published, the maneuvering before the showdown in China is likely to continue.



Distributed by King Features Syndicate by arrangement with The Washington Star

Return of the Hero

The Literary Guidepost

By W. G. ROGERS

THE FREE STATE, by D. W. Brogan (Knopf; \$2).

Few defenders of the free state which the western Allies have fought so desperately to preserve in the last six years are so eloquent or so persuasive as this Scotsman. His little book was written to explain to Germans why they lose wars; it's equally important to us for it explains the other side of the question: why we win them.

He apologizes for the evil use to which Americans and British alike devote freedom; for political parties and politicians; for our armies constantly pestered by civilians.

But politicians, he asserts, despite their faults are the "only alternative governing class to courtiers, policemen, soldiers gangsters," and Germany's tragedy is her prolonged lack of a "real political life." Democracies may be inefficient but, as Brogan notes, "if the object of military efficiency is to win wars, military efficiency in the German sense, is a contradiction in terms."

You'll enjoy this book for its ideas and the clarity of phrasing; even if you hated it, you ought to read it.

THREE MEN IN NEW SUITS, by J. B. Priestley (Harper; \$2.50). Pretty idea, excellent title, dull and commonplace workmanship... that is this new novel by the author of "The Good Companions."

Three soldiers come back to their homes in England. Representing the upper, middle and lower classes, they go their separate ways, one to a wife who has been playing around with the Yanks; one to farm parents who have labored and saved and fashioned a secure niche for him, and to heck with the rest of the world; and the third to the group which schemes to keep its powers and privileges.

They will not act, declares one, "like a lot of half-starved dogs round a lump of horse meat." Another asserts: "We don't want the same kind of men looking after our affairs."

It's prophetic, but trite. People like these won't make the new world, because they are not real people; they resemble comic-strip characters paper thin, with attached tabs bearing words.

GRIN AND BEAR IT

By Lichty



—Is weel German can claim he was never Nazi—What can Hon. Nipponese claim he never was?

Kenneth L. Dixon AT THE FRONT!	French Ex-Premier Herriot Wins New Fame as Mayor
-----------------------------------	--

By ROBERT C. WILSON
(Substituting for Kenneth L. Dixon)

PARIS, Aug. 25—(AP)—Edouard Herriot, three times premier of France, is winning new fame today as mayor of Lyon, where he is solving France's most pressing problem—how to get enough to eat.

The capital daily "voice of Paris" hails him as "the conqueror of poverty and the black market," reporting Lyon as perhaps the only city in France where there is enough to eat at reasonable prices, with plenty of meat, fish, fruit and vegetables. "Since Herriot has been back, the milk ration has doubled," a worker said.

In France today this is as if an American politician suddenly found hundred-dollar-a-week jobs for 10,000,000 workers.

Even taxi rides are rationed in Paris. The city has 220 cabs, but the only way to ride them is with a priority card good for doctors, pregnant women, and the sick and wounded. Slowly, steadily, France is getting back on her military feet, adding a new armored division this week to the army. In France as in America, radio programs are the target for severe criticism. There are no singing commercials on the French air because there is no advertising, but "Laurere" editorially complains of the lack of good music of France today is "expensive noise."

France is suffering her worst drought in 50 years. The situation in southern France is called "catastrophic" by the agricultural ministry. The wheat harvest is expected to fall 55 per cent below prewar levels, extending bread rationing through all of 1946. A fifth of the vegetable, potato and fodder crops were wiped out by the lack of rain, further aggravating the country's food shortages.

Worried by an increase in crime, black market trading on the sidewalks, night clubs staying open till dawn, and "quadrupling" of prostitutes, Paris papers are saying that the city threatens to become "another gangster-era Chicago." The ever

economical French are complaining that the Petain trial cost \$20,000 daily. The atomic bomb announcement led the French to take inventory of their mineral wealth. They find reassurance in the radioactive deposits in Brittany and the Pyrenees, and the rich radium beds of Madagascar, all of which are "enough for peace needs."

IT SEEMS TO ME

(Continued from page 1)

crowding into town, and the housing accommodations simply aren't here. It is plain as a wart on a nose that a rapid expansion in house building will come here, now that materials are thawing out. In spite of high costs the building will go forward out of sheer necessity for housing.

That necessity may result in grief in the future, to those who buy over-priced houses. A writer in the July Harper's gives a warning: "Don't get stuck with a house." He says:

"In the next few years many unwary home-buyers, including many returning veterans, are going to endanger their financial futures. Houses bought in haste will provide unhappy places in which to repent at leisure; so the wary buyer will move slowly. He will discount many of the gaudy claims that 'home ownership is the sure-fire way to get good housing at cheap cost.' He will consider not only the present needs of his family but probable future needs. He will appraise the special dangers of buying in the present hectic market. He will make his final decision only after he has considered all the possible alternatives by which his housing problem can be met."

That is sound advice. Whether a house is a good or poor buy depends not alone on its market value but on the needs and situation of the family considering it. The family which is permanently situated can afford to pay more for a house than those who are transient. Shoppers for houses must consider the house size in relation to their needs both now and during the coming years. They should avoid "being stuck" with a house too small as their family grows; or too large as their children take wing from the home nest.

Finally the purchaser should measure price not only in terms of cost and present market, but in terms of his own financial situation. The article referred to recommends the "100-times" rule. Compute how much you can afford to pay monthly for a place in which to live, including cost of heating and estimate of taxes and insurance per month. Then multiply that by 100. This if one can afford to pay \$50 a month for housing, he can afford to buy a \$5000 house (try and get one!). That, I should say, is a conservative rule.

Home ownership has long been fostered. It gives a family a real feeling of security, of holding a place in a community. But home ownership that is insecure because of its financial burden can be a source of great worry. In the present tight situation prospective purchasers should not throw caution to the winds or their dream home may become a headache.

News Behind the News

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

WASHINGTON, Aug. 25—I do not know anything today... If you are looking for inside stuff, skip this one, or, on second consideration, maybe this is the inside stuff. I just decided to read the papers like you do today... after all, why should I go out worrying my head and digging up inside stuff when the tax collector just came in and reminded me that whatever my brain and energy development must be taken by him, in great part; in fact, in whatever part he decides, he told me... Those fellows had a way about them in the Roosevelt administration, a way which avoided me, because I knew that inasmuch as I was contesting for reality and facts in the face of an administration which derided both, I had better set my book-keeper up on their basis. Whatever they wanted I gave them. It seemed a shorter price than

selling out my individual independence of thought. I figured if the Morgenthau tax collectors could take me, anyone could. They knew that and did not come around, but now they have come in again, and I do not mean reasonably, but ferociously.

They sent a fellow in here who says he will take me regardless of the fact that his own bureau set up my tax business in the past. There seems to be a change. (Please do not consider this news, you editors who have complained I do not carry the dirt, but taxpayers please take notice, and pay no more than you are legally required to. After all, we are paying \$45,000,000,000 a year out of the sweat of our brows and minds, and if the Roosevelt administration, with all its powers could not take an adverse critic that way I do not think the Truman administration can take you or me.) It has great power but if it wants to destroy the power of right, let me be the first to fall. I would not want to live in the kind of a world tax collector decrees for me and changes.

The Safety Valve LETTERS FROM STATESMAN READERS

Concerning the C.O.'s To the Editor:

In your "It Seems to Me" column of Thursday, August 16, you discuss some of the difficulties which appear in the stand which the conscientious objector takes. Permit me to state at the outset that I do not like the term conscientious objector, because it is a negative expression. I do not object to war simply because, as you said, it is immoral and senseless. I am a pacifist because I believe that there is a way, better than war, to settle our differences. My stand is positive, not negative.

I realize that some arrive at the position of a conscientious objector from philosophical reasoning. They do not claim to be religious. Others from an economic point of view. We Quakers (who maintain the pacifist position) start from a distinctly religious experience. We feel that our experience of God takes out of our hearts everything that leads to war. This conviction is strengthened by the definite words of our Lord and Master: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Love, bless, do good to, pray for, do not seem to us to mean to kill.

We profoundly respect and admire the young men who have felt it right to go at the call of our country to foreign lands and there have shed their life's blood. There can be no comparison between their sacrifice and that made by a young man in civilian public service. However, this they all have in common: they each have done what they felt was right. A submarine officer recently said to me: "That is what we are fighting for."

Since we are all members of society we cannot avoid reaping the benefits which we all pray may follow this disastrous war. Neither can we, nor would we, escape from the burdens which it entails. We all reap the benefits of the labor of others. We eat the fruit from trees others have planted. We drink from wells others have dugged. We live in houses others have built. We can balance the account only by passing on to others the creations of our intelligence and toil, and bequeathing to coming generations a better world than we have known.

It is an open question whether humanity has made its greatest progress towards liberty and justice by means of war, or by the methods of peace. It is a difficult problem to always know what to do in certain situations. If a tyrant threatens our liberties, it is hard not to resist with force. However, tyrants are not immortal. Truth and freedom have persisted in spite of them, and often without the resort to force.

The stand of a pacifist takes a lot of faith: faith in God that He can and will care for us; faith in mankind that there is in them that which will respond to just treatment; faith in the right, that it will ultimately prevail. Let me assure you that I read your editorials with great pleasure and profit. This is not written for the sake of argument, but only to attempt to show that our position is not the result of crooked thinking, but is the only position consistent for some of us as followers of the Prince of Peace.

An enemy conquered is still an enemy. An enemy made into a friend ceases to be an enemy. One can hold a man down only by staying down with him. Milton once asked: "What can war but endless war still breed?"

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

Incidentally, we are paying about \$45,000,000,000 a year into this government for the privilege of having a new (Truman) tax man come around to challenge and destroy what a Roosevelt tax man thought was impregnable, asked for, and got.

As I say, this has put me out of the humor of trying to find any inside news today. Why should I work, or why should anyone, when a government has the power (and exercises it) to take your sweat and your energy, in whatever proportion it decides? Fairness, justice, and law do not mean anything, this tax agent told me, so why should I sweat. Actually he decides what my income shall be, and changes it from year to year to suit his purposes. This fellow actually pretends I should disregard all the rulings of his bureau in the past and accept this somewhat cloudy mind on all propositions. Why should I work? They promise us, they say, an easy living in luxury at whatever figure the politicians decide for old age (I'm getting old enough to receive anything they might permit) so why work. Let us, all oppressed people that we are, just follow the advice of Mayor LaGuardia, who said it would be foolish of us to cash our bonds and buy anything, and what we need is a government which will pay us something.

LaGuardia might be irrationally right. Why not disorganize our capitalistic system and let everyone live off the government. Frankly I have half a mind to join with them, abandon all my principles, integrity and what I like to regard as a decent, understanding honor, and join those who want to live off the government instead of supporting it.

If the government wants to pay me, why should I pay the government unjust extraction. If I feel less interested in people's rights tomorrow, I may submit you another column showing how the Hillman administration (pardon me, I meant Truman who was cleared with Sidney at Chicago and is developing congressional affairs now that way) planned to stampede the government and take congress at a cost of \$6,000,000,000.

If you do not see me again, just say I joined the CIO and decided to live off the government instead of working to support it through taxation. As a matter of fact I probably will go fishing.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

—Chas. C. Haworth, 410 W. Rural Ave.

STEVENS MANUFACTURING JEWELERS

Diamonds Reset While You Wait

Reveal the brilliant levelness of your diamond with a new modern mounting.

Extended Payments

STEVENS & SON

339 Court St.