

SATURDAY, AUGUST 2, 1947

Incompatibility in Our Letters

Roundabout fashion by way of the Raleigh News and Observer and the Salisbury Post, we have obtained some of the details of a spirited tussle between novelist James Street and Editor E. A. Bevin of the *Charlotte News* of Silver City.

Novelist Street wrote a story, *Symphony in Silver City*, printed in the August issue of *Good Housekeeping* magazine, which filled Editor Bevin to the point of declaring editorially that "Folks hereabouts are pretty well reeled up at some of the breakbacks James Street has thrown at our town in his story." The final insult was the editor wrote that "Somewhere in Mr. Street's story he refers to us as 'vipers' as a temptation term for country people."

Reading the *Charlotte News* in person, Chap. Hill, where he presently hangs his hat, Mr. Street dashed off a letter to the editor which is of interest mostly for showing that novelists are quite as vicious as the newspaper men. Pointing out that the objectionable comments on Silver City came from characters who were carefully portrayed as low types, from whom nothing better could be expected, the novelist charged that the editor missed the point which was underlined in the fact that the characters in the tale were the citizens who loved Silver City. As for calling them vipers, Mr. Street retorts, "You don't know your words, sir. I suggest your column shows bad manners, bad grace and, frankly, a whopping measure of stupidity."

We aren't certain whether or not the editor's better taste in choice of words and who comes off first in the argument, but that is irrelevant and immaterial. The question is why there was any shouting in the

first place, or at least why were Mr. Street and Mr. Bevin moved to such passion? Since this difference between editors and novelists is one that comes up frequently, we offer what may be a partial explanation.

There is a natural, deep and everlasting incompatibility between newspaper editors and novelists which has its origin in the fact that the first is tied hopelessly to our place and the second has no home. The editor is sensitive about what others say of his town because he knows that it belongs to him as to no one else. He knows every house, every street sign and every corner of the place. When he sees a point that he regards as the least inaccurate or distortion down to the most insignificant detail he is injured, he broods, he reaches for the typewriter to set the place off his chest. He is privileged to criticize his home town and his people because he is the proprietor who is sure that nothing and no one in the town—well, hardly anyone—are really very bad, and all that he is doing is trying to make things better. Inevitably the editor distrusts the novelist, a restless soul who can't stay in one place and who sees everything differently. Sometimes we see things that aren't there more often he brings out what no one else can see and it will have a wonderful beauty or a marvelous ugliness that will bewilder the editor. The novelist loves the town too, but the editor's affection is torn between many towns and he wanders over America haunted by the memory of home, which can never hold him. His is the eternal problem that so troubled North Carolina's own Tom Wolfe.

You're Connected With Infra-Red Rays, Ain't You?

Marquis Childs

Senators In Air



WASHINGTON The Brewster investigation of Howard Hughes' wartime airplane-construction contract has accomplished at least one good end already: "It has brought out into the open the political pulling and hauling to get overseas air routes and the Government subsidies that go with them."

So far, this has been merely incidental to the effort to find out the truth. The latter is the show. The big show is if any Senator or group of Senators has been in the politics to look into it. In the politics behind the assignment of the overseas air routes, the pressure used for this or that line.

OLD CUSTOM It has a little the sound of the old days when the railroads were battling for position and power when Senators were bought up by the powerful money interests.

It was a crude process that rarely came to public attention. Up to 1940, the money to operate overseas was Pan-American Airways. Under the direction of Juan Trippe, the man in charge of the airline, it was in a field in which daring and imagination are conspicuous qualities. Pan-American's routes were to Europe, Asia and Latin America and Europe.

In 1941 a rival line obtained a certificate from the Civil Aeronautics Board to fly to Europe. Established after the war by the Overseas Airlines, it became a competitor of Pan-American. The new airline was to fly to Paris, Rome, Cairo and other world capitals. Hughes' deal was to give exclusive privileges to fly to Paris, Rome, Cairo and other world capitals. Hughes' deal was to give exclusive privileges to fly to Paris, Rome, Cairo and other world capitals.

INVARIABLY ELLIOTT Trippe and other Pan-American executives were busy in Washington. There have been repeated intimations of political pull, especially in

the case of Hughes, whose name is invariably linked with that of Elliott Roosevelt. But then, so has a leading Senate Democrat, Pat McCarran of Nevada, who has never missed an opportunity to aid Pan-American. Other Senators are linked to other airlines. The name of Senator Charles McNary, Democrat of Washington, frequently is mentioned in connection with Northwest Airlines. McNary is said to have secured an inland air route extension from Seattle to Portland on the route through Seattle, blame him for checking them out. McNary's name is also linked to the subsidies to the airlines. How much has actually gone out to the airlines is a complicated question of post office and airline bookkeeping. Certainly it is hundreds of millions and it may be billions. How much has been returned to the Government for carrying the mail is also a matter of figures and the interpretation of the law. The Government's prerogative of the ordinary citizen. A Senate committee should find out.

Why Not Relax For Peace?

No responsible Republicans have come forward to indicate the admirable proposal offered several days ago by Senator McMahon, the Connecticut Democrat. For that matter, the McMahon Plan has not provoked a visible response from any responsible Senator except a few editorial columns, and the general tone of that reaction is that the whole idea is impractical.

It probably is necessary to remind our readers of what the McMahon Plan contemplates. Briefly, the Nations State Senator suggests that we, the American people, take the lead in having the nations declare "a moratorium on world tension." During the period of armistice, which would follow the declaration, each nation would reduce its military expenditures to the minimum level necessary for maintaining its internal security. It is the McMahon theory that the vast alliance that would reign throughout this period would have a marvellously beneficial effect on the world situation, producing a universal trend toward compromise.

It is, of course, a completely impractical idea, as others have said. It also contains the same advice as the McMahon Plan since the conflict between Russia and the United States started, and the fact that it is impossible to obtain serious consideration for it in any responsible quarter shows just how far we have travelled along

the road to international lunacy. Equally as impractical as the McMahon Plan is the thought recently expressed by a distinguished European, Dr. B. Bydovsky, president of Charles University in Prague, on a visit to this country. He said:

"There is more optimism over the future of Great Nations here in the United States than anywhere else, and it is because you are always speaking in terms of 'if' and 'but'. But in Europe, there is no such optimism. For Europe it is unthinkable that the world will place an embargo on the word 'war'. Your people could think that."

For America, war is unthinkable, too, although it is not like to hear the McMahon Plan or the Bydovsky's of the world. But perhaps we still can read and understand statements like the one which For-estall recently declared to American businessmen. We do not like to hear that the Marshall Plan is going to cost six billion or nine billion dollars. We refuse to believe when *Fortune* tells us that it will require a great effort on our part to bring it in to have a program that will bring world recovery and stop Russian aggression without war. But we accept without question when the Treasury tells us that the last war cost us \$311 billion. And what do we think the next war will cost us? It is unthinkable as Dr. Bydovsky has said, or in *Fortune's* words, "It will be the Last World War—the one that will never get in the history books."

Salute To Secretary Of Defense

There is more of a problem than meets the eye at first place in the question of how many guns the new Secretary of Defense is entitled to have. It involves more than the matter of rank and pay, although it is really a matter of rank. The new Secretary of Defense in Washington there must be some answer to it. Let's see if we can work it out from the point of Charlotte.

First, it is obvious the new Secretary of Defense is entitled to more guns than the Secretary of the Navy, from the outside and who gets them. He can't have 20 as there is an unexplained and therefore inviolate Navy tradition against twenty or any even number. He can't lower the Secretary of the Navy's number by taking over his nineteen, as that would raise countless other complications. He can't take 21 as that belongs to the President. We are, for a moment at least, in a quandary.

However, out here in the clear Tar Heel air, away from the brass and the protocol and all the problem quickly reduces itself to simplicity. The only answer is that something unprecedented must be done, an

answer that never occurs to the best Washington minds. But here it is.

Something spectacular must be done, without ruffling the dignity of Commander-in-Chief Truman, of course. The tremendous significance of the event represented by the creation of the Defense establishment requires nothing less. Secretary of Defense Forrestal properly stated the importance when he recently declared that unification of the armed forces is the most decisive step taken since the foundation of the Republic. It is democratic America's way of arming itself for the atomic age with a military authority that matches the power of authoritarian states while preserving safeguards for our Constitutional institutions and liberties.

Under the circumstances, even a 21-gun salute will hardly do. For one time at least, why not line up all the ships of the Navy and fire the whole blooming works at once, just for the hell of it and on the good chance that the blast will be heard in the ears of our way of letting everyone know that we love everyone and are feeling fine.

The best minds can work it out from there.

Another Voice

We heartily pray to send Thy Holy angels from the brass and the protocol and all the problem quickly reduces itself to simplicity. The only answer is that something unprecedented must be done, an answer that never occurs to the best Washington minds. But here it is.

However, out here in the clear Tar Heel air, away from the brass and the protocol and all the problem quickly reduces itself to simplicity. The only answer is that something unprecedented must be done, an

answer that never occurs to the best Washington minds. But here it is.

However, out here in the clear Tar Heel air, away from the brass and the protocol and all the problem quickly reduces itself to simplicity. The only answer is that something unprecedented must be done, an

answer that never occurs to the best Washington minds. But here it is.

People's Platform

Chamberlain And Bevin

CHARLOTTE

ON a memorable day in 1939 the tall figure of Prime Minister Chamberlain stepped from a plane at a London airport and made the momentous announcement: "Peace in our time." But history, aided and abetted by the innumeral forces of aggressive militarism, proved him in respectable error that "our time" in the realization of peace was exceedingly short. Hardly had the words been spoken before the machinations of war were rolling across Europe, carrying before them the tide of crushing humanity.

Paralleling the mistaken assumptions of the disillusioned Mr. Chamberlain, the present British foreign minister Ernest Bevin has recently revealed his observations and "valuable" declaration. There is a prediction that links a generation so far as I can see. A prediction that links a generation so far as I can see. A prediction that links a generation so far as I can see. A prediction that links a generation so far as I can see.

Obviously Mr. Bevin's statement is incompatible with fact, and under two basic facts. It is unable to "see" or to understand the stark reality, preferring to guide the lie and beguile the gullible.

A diplomatic war is already in progress over a great part of the world's surface. It is a two-way war of free enterprise and the mutual good and well-being of all in a dictatorial totalitarianism. The two are incompatible, so directly opposed to each other that they cannot exist in the world together.

Nearly the whole of Europe is suffering from an indefinite lump of Communism. Hostilities are raging in Greece, Poland and China, supported and condoned by Soviet Russia, which constitutes a danger of a catastrophic nature. The world is in a state of confusion and the world is in a state of confusion.

Official quarters in Washington express the conviction that the current hostilities directed at Greece is merely the forerunner to extensive belligerency in the Near East, which will culminate in a major clash of political and economically opposed forces in a continental short time.

Nothing could be clearer than the fact that Soviet Russia is intent upon the task of communizing the world, either by far more direct means, or by means of a more subtle, but no less effective, method. Mr. Bevin wishes to acknowledge this.

Official quarters in Washington express the conviction that the current hostilities directed at Greece is merely the forerunner to extensive belligerency in the Near East, which will culminate in a major clash of political and economically opposed forces in a continental short time.

Nothing could be clearer than the fact that Soviet Russia is intent upon the task of communizing the world, either by far more direct means, or by means of a more subtle, but no less effective, method. Mr. Bevin wishes to acknowledge this.

Official quarters in Washington express the conviction that the current hostilities directed at Greece is merely the forerunner to extensive belligerency in the Near East, which will culminate in a major clash of political and economically opposed forces in a continental short time.

Nothing could be clearer than the fact that Soviet Russia is intent upon the task of communizing the world, either by far more direct means, or by means of a more subtle, but no less effective, method. Mr. Bevin wishes to acknowledge this.

fantasy in the last war; we'd be better off if we Pearl Harbor'd Russia instead of waiting for them to do it to us.

—JAMES FRAZIER.

A New Type Of Army

CHARLOTTE

Editors, The News: I July 30 issue of The News regarding the Army issue. The fourth paragraph of this editorial may have had an impression on the minds of some readers. I am afraid to the effect that there may be an important difference between the Army and Navy Reserve organizations here in Charlotte. Such a quite far from the case.

What was only a harmless fact as far as the Army Reserve is concerned, has become institutionalized. It is now a fact of life. The Army Reserve is a part of the Two-World concept. The Army Reserve is a part of the Two-World concept. The Army Reserve is a part of the Two-World concept.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

Life In Two Worlds

CHARLOTTE

GENERAL EISENHOWER has said that he has two worlds. He has two worlds. He has two worlds. He has two worlds. He has two worlds.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.

One wonders (forgetting for the moment the question of who is to blame for this) what the Army Reserve is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing. It is doing what it is doing.