

The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-eighth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the administration or the student body.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is the official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Richard Overstreet, Chairman.

All editorials appearing in THE DAILY TAR HEEL are the personal expressions of the editor, unless otherwise credited; they are not necessarily representative of feeling on the staff, and all reprints or quotations must specify this.

NOVEMBER 19, 1960

VOLUME LXIX, NUMBER 57

Fanning The Fire

Every year on this day the citizens of Durham and Chapel Hill, warm friends under normal circumstances, assume a ritualistic antagonism toward each other that stretches totally beyond reason.

Men who will never again see the sunny side of forty prance around like star-struck freshmen, waving pennants and dispensing with a goodly round of old college cheer.

Alumni, men and women alike, suddenly feel the bond with Alma Mater tighten—the bond that was scarcely felt when academic contributions were being solicited. They pour onto the campus by the thousands to plunge themselves into the unreality of trying to relive their salad days.

And the students at both Duke and the University of North Carolina, who have just finished professing love for each other in a "Love Feast" of student leaders, would now gladly and with completely malicious intentions bash each other's heads in at a moment's notice.

A visitor from another planet would be amazed to discover that all this commotion has arisen because two schools are going to hold

a football contest. It is, of course, a good tradition to have strong rivalries and to play a hard, clean sixty minutes of football for the right to display the Victory Bell.

What is not good is that everyone has to take this game, or any other game, for that matter, so seriously. It is, after all, only a game. Its outcome will not influence anything except the season's records of both teams—those records themselves being composed of mere games.

We hope that, as the sun sinks behind the West side of Kenan Stadium and the autumnal chill grips the assembly in the closing moments of the battle, both victory and defeat can be accepted with some degree of grace; that victors will not deem it necessary to break things or paint the score on buildings around either campus; that losers will not vent their sorrow by mobbing referees or staging a free-for-all on the field after the game.

One fact that football is only a game does not mean that it cannot be a good game. We expect to see sixty minutes of hard, fast, clean football this afternoon on Kenan Stadium field.

It's not the players we worry about; it's the "fans."

Socialized Medicine?

Is socialized medicine a good idea for America?

Ian Ward from Preston, England, says that "a central administration is more efficient than a large number of small, private units."

England has almost totally socialized medicine.

"The health of a nation is the affair of a nation," the Birmingham University physical education instructor said.

For proof of the worthiness of this idea, Mr. Ward cited two advantages: (1) The poor are always able to have medical treatment; and (2) no one would be financially crippled by even a serious illness.

In England, medical bills are not paid directly to the doctors. Instead, a tax of about \$50 a year is levied. This tax, which is the citizen's National Health Insurance premium, takes care of medical bills, unemployment and old-age pensions.

There are other expenses. A prescription costs 10c. Dental work costs a flat \$2.80 (even if it takes four appointments to do the necessary work). It costs no more to have three fillings than it does to have a partial plate, consisting of three false teeth.

There is no charge for an office call, check-ups are free.

Mr. Ward said it is untrue that there is no choice of doctors. You can choose your doctor if he does not already have a full quota of patients. Also, if your doctor goes on vacation, there will always be a replacement.

Jeffrey Jones



'Rules, Hell! We Gotta Beat Dook'

BILL HOBBS

The Questions Of Peace, Red China, Mr. Kennedy

Sen. Norris Cotton (R-N.H.) recently attacked one of the men most likely to be our next Secretary of State—Chester Bowles. In doing so he raised anew the important question, "What will be the new administration's policy toward Red China?"

The answer to this question will depend on several factors.

The issue of peace was one of Kennedy's chief campaigning points. He was a man who wanted to be remembered as the President who kept the peace. He would work fervently for world peace.

When he became president-elect, Kennedy was warmly congratulated by Nikita Khrushchev. The Russian leader implied a hope for more fruitful disarmament negotiations with the new American administration. This apparent endorsement of the new president is of course to be taken with a grain of salt. The Chairman's incredibly rapid shifts of mood and attack are too well known to allow a great deal of optimism over coming international negotiations. Khrushchev is quite probably testing the strength of our new president-to-be.

Nevertheless, it seems probable that Mr. Kennedy will enjoy the possibility of constructive negotiations with the Russians for a certain amount of time at the beginning of his administration. He is under an obligation both from his campaign and from his intelligence to make the most of this opportunity. Any significant diplomatic success at the beginning of his term will enhance both his power as a president and the position of America during his presidency.

One field of diplomacy which is certainly ripe for advancement is disarmament. World leaders from almost every country have expressed a desire to enact an effective system to insure peace along these lines. Innumerable non-government intellectual leaders such as Albert Schweitzer, Bertrand Russell and the late Albert Einstein have expressed the same desire. The question has been frequently raised in the UN (including just a few days ago in a move by India endorsed by Russia). But still we have no disarmament. Still we have no peace.

A major impediment to a successful system of world disarmament is the United States' policy of non-recognition of Red China. It seems somehow futile and childish to consider disarmament on a world-wide scale without recognizing Red China. She is, in the words of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, "an obstreperous, aggressive nation." She is the major force working against peace today. And yet we avoid her. We refuse to come to grips with her on any logical or realistic terms.

China may already have atomic weapons. If she does not, it is simply a matter of time until she does. We cannot afford to put off realism any longer. We must eventually come to grips with this obvious power.

The objections to recognition of the Communist Chinese have been valid in the past. The problem of the overseas Chinese and their reaction to American recognition of the Reds is not a simple one. America's prestige (especially in the Far East) could well suffer if the move was considered a concession out of weakness to the Communists. Chiang Kai-Shek's American lobby would react with a confused yelp of dismay.

However, it is extremely possible that Mr. Kennedy, as the leader of a brand new American administration, is in a position to overcome many of these obstacles. The recognition of Red

China would be a logical shift in policy due to the new government policy under Kennedy, not due to American concessions to Communism. It would not be the reversal of his administration's traditional stand. His administration is not tied to the past. It can set out in new directions without being charged with reversal of policy.

Reuters news service reported November 15 that the interviews of American author Edgar Snow with Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai indicated that, "China will continue to demand the withdrawal of all American forces from Formosa as the only acceptable condition for mutual recognition between the Chinese and American governments."

If Kennedy, in one of his first moves as President, could state that the United States would recognize Red China for the express purpose of having her join

an international conference on peace through world disarmament, we feel that the results would be beneficial. A refusal to participate in such a conference after recognition would be an extremely concrete and graphic display of Red China's militarism to the undecided nations of the world. If she accepted, Red China would have been brought into the community of those working for world peace by the dynamic action of a new American leader.

The neutral-nation pact at the recent stormy UN session, aimed at obtaining a meeting between Khrushchev and Eisenhower, indicates the perturbation of the small nations at the idea of a large-scale nuclear war. A step in the prevention of such a catastrophe by Mr. Kennedy might win favor for his administration from these undecided nations. This would of course be most desirable at the start of a new administration, or at any time.

One thing would have to be essential in such a move—strength. Kennedy would have to convince the world that he was most willing to take any reasonable steps for world peace, but he could not show or have the smallest iota of weakness in his stand. He would state in the most unequivocal terms his determination to continue complete American defense of Formosa. He would point to the increasing number of votes in the United Nations for consideration of admission of Red China. He would be cementing relations with Great Britain by following her long-standing policy of recognition. He would present the picture of a strong man leading a strong country which was willing to face the problem of world peace with realism and intelligence.

In summary, 1) Mr. Kennedy wants peace; 2) He is in a fortuitous position as regards Khrushchev's attitude and the absence of ties to past policy; 3) disarmament is an accepted method of obtaining peace, but a method which of necessity involves recognition of China. Therefore, we feel that Mr. Kennedy should adopt the traditional American position of a strong nation willing to work with weaker nations for common humanistic goals.

This is not a pat solution. It involves many problems, but the rewards can be great. It is not a certainty in any sense of the word.

However, one thing is most certain: we cannot afford to relegate the problem of Red China to a back shelf any longer; we cannot let this opportunity for action pass unnoticed. Mr. Kennedy may decide to ride with the present situation. He may decide on an entirely different course of action. He must decide something, and we can only hope it will be a wise decision.

Nancy Carroll Brown

A Letter On Algeria

Dear Editor,

Eighty professors of mathematics, mainly from the University of Paris, have just signed up a common declaration sent to Mr. Michel Debre, Prime Minister of France. In this protest against the colonial war in Algeria, Professor Godement writes (See *L'Express*, October 13, 1960):

"If it becomes clear that one cannot be a mathematician in France without being implicitly or explicitly the accomplice of a fascist government, then many of us would automatically have to face the following alternative: either to take another job (but one cannot easily drop mathematics), or to go to another country, whatever the consequences of this solution may be."

On the other hand, U.N.E.F. (Union Nationale des Etudiants de France) has planned a national campaign of protest at the end of this month. Jean-Paul Sartre has made very clear statements supporting the Algerian war for independence. He even testified along with other teachers like Professor Mandouze at the military court in favor of Francis Jeanson, Professor at the Sorbonne, who was tried because of his sympathy for the Algerian Nationalists.

This is not only a protest, but also a message of solidarity to the group of 121 (up to the present) top French intellectuals who are now running the risk of being persecuted because of their joint "Declaration on the Right of Insubordination in the Algerian War."

I would appreciate your publishing part of this Declaration in our campus newspaper. I feel that this is a problem in which American students and intellectuals are concerned.

Much has been written on the Algerian war since November 1, 1954. This is the only hot war in the world today and very few Americans realize its profoundly dramatic consequences for the Algerian and the French people.

There is no need to recall the position of the Algerian people who have been fighting for six years and have paid the heaviest cost of freedom in history.

I would like now to call your attention and the attention of the students on campus on the tragic impact of this colonial war in France itself.

This war, on November 1, 1960, will enter its 7th year.

Sincerely yours,
Rachid Benoumeur
Graduate Student in
Comparative Literature
Sponsored by the U.S.N.S.A.

The following are excerpts from the Declaration:

—We respect and we judge justified the refusal to take up arms against the Algerian people.

—We respect and we judge justified the conduct of Frenchmen who feel it their duty to bring aid and protection to the Algerians, oppressed in the name of the people of France.

—The cause of the Algerian people, which contributes decisively to the destruction of the colonial system, is the cause of all free men.

Ferlinghetti To Ernest

To the Editor of the DTH:

Dear Ernest Hemingway—

What about Cuba, baby?

Ain't you got anything to say after all that time you spent fishing under Batista?

—LAWRENCE FERLINGETTI

REFLECTIONS

Has anyone noticed the amazing facial similarity between Joseph Mobutu and a well-known entertainer? It makes you wonder a little if perhaps Mobutu and the entertainer should exchange roles.

Mobutu could do his song and dance here and get paid for it. On the other hand, could the entertainer in question do as good a job in usurping power?

It's a question worth pondering for a bit. Maybe we could work out some kind of exchange program.

It might save a country and provide some good Sunday TV at the same time.

Mock UN Assembly

The United Nations Model Assembly held on this campus last year proved to be a stimulating and fun-filled experience for the many southern participants.

This February 22 through 25 the Assembly will be held on the Duke campus. Frederick Boland, President of the U. N. General Assembly, and a central figure in the critical debates last month with Premier Khrushchev, will be the presiding speaker for the three-day affair. Besides the educational aspects of the gathering, there will be a banquet and several other social functions.

We urge students to fill out applications in the "Y" office immediately; they must be returned by December 3. The main prerequisite for participation is the ability to enter into the spirit of debate and assume the personality of the country represented. (This year one of the UNC delegations will probably represent the USSR.)

We feel quite fortunate that the affair will be in our immediate area again this year and encourage UNC students to take an active interest in the 1961 United Nations Model Assembly.

M. S. B.

Should Governor Davis Be Jailed?

The duel between Louisiana and the federal government over integration of New Orleans schools is a comic opera that could too easily become a bloody tragedy. If such is the result, the blame will belong to the legislators and Gov. Jimmie H. Davis.

These gentlemen are playing a cruel and unfair game with the anguished emotions of parents and children having a sincere and deep-seated distaste for integration. Cruel because they have encouraged the attitude of defiance that

could lead to mob violence. Unfair because they have withheld vital knowledge from these parents and children. That knowledge is that the mass production of evasive legislation by the legislature is nothing more than a farce, and that the governor's promise to go to jail to prevent integration falls in the same category.

In a contest involving the power of federal court orders—be they right, wrong or indifferent—there can be only one result, and that is the supremacy of the court order. The alternative is anarchy, and is intolerable. Thus Little Rock.

An even fresher example is Virginia where bitter-enders urged Gov. J. Lindsay Almond to go to jail to hold off the inevitable. The governor, who had been holding it off by legitimate legal maneuvers for a long time, had this to say:

"I am willing to serve in durance vile with those who give the advice if it will accomplish the desired purpose. (But) I know of nothing more futile than a penal sentence that contributes nothing but the ridiculous . . ."

It would serve no purpose other than his martyrdom for Governor Davis to go to jail. But it could be argued with some merit that he either should go or ask the citizens he has inflamed with empty gestures to leave the streets before blood is needlessly shed.—From the *Charlotte News*.

The Daily Tar Heel

JONATHAN YARDLEY
Editor
WAYNE KING, MARY STEWART BAKER
Associate Editors
MARGARET ANN REYNOLDS
Managing Editor
EDWARD NEAL RIBBS
Assistant To The Editor
HENRY MAYER, LLOYD LITTLE
News Editors
SUSAN LEWIS
Feature Editor
FRANK SLOESS
Sports Editor
KEW PRISHMAN
Asst. Sports Editor
JOHN JUSTICE, DAVIS YOUNG
Contributing Editors
THE BUSINESS
Manager
RICHARD WEINER
Advertising Manager
JOHN JESTER
Circulation Manager
CHARLES WHEESER
Subscription Manager

The Daily Tar Heel is published daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant with the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4 per semester, \$7 per year.
The Daily Tar Heel is a subscriber to the United Press International and utilizes the services of the News Bureau of the University of North Carolina.
Published by the Colonial Press, Chapel Hill, N. C.