

UNC NEWS

Bill Wuamett
EDITOR

Bill Hobbs
CO-EDITOR

Fred McConnel
BUSINESS MANAGER

Associate Editor Jeane Murdoch
Editorial Assistant Jean Wells
Photographer Richard McKee
Contributing Editors Irving Long, Mike Robinson,
Garry Blanchard
Mexico Correspondent Linda Cravotta
Assistant Business Manager Scott Kleiman

Office Telephone—942-2356

The UNC News is the official publication of the Summer School Publications Board of the University of North Carolina. It is published every Thursday by the Chapel Hill Weekly publishing company. All editorials appearing in the News are the opinions of the editors, unless otherwise credited; they do not necessarily represent the opinions of the other members of the staff.

Conservatives

Monday night an Episcopal minister said the American church is sick because it refuses to recognize the unity of man. The minister is a former Freedom Rider.

Monday and Tuesday nights a young Negro appealed for help for the Negroes in Monroe, N. C., whom he said are the victims of social, economic and judicial oppression.

Saturday a Chapel Hill playwright talked with a condemned man at Central Prison in Raleigh in an effort to save the man's life.

These instances are all different, yet they are alike.

They are alike in that all three have a common belief at their base—a belief in the brotherhood of man and a belief in equal rights for all; white, black, poor, rich, upright and criminal.

This common belief is often discredited because of its connection with socialism and other systems that seek to reduce man to a common denominator.

This is invalid. It is, we think, simply an excuse for ignoring situations that would take a lot of bother and time to correct when we could all be at home watching TV and sipping scotch.

This invalid belief is often connected with Conservatism. The Conservative too often says that segregation, voting rights, fair employment practices, and capital punishment are issues for the individual to decide, and aside from his own personal decision, its none of his business.

This is not invalid. Its absurd.

It is true that the legitimate concern of the American Conservative should be with individual liberty. This does not absolve him, however, from concern for the liberties of others. The liberty of EACH individual is preserved and insured only when the liberty of EVERY individual is preserved.

When the individual ignores segregation in his church, he makes a mockery of Christianity.

When the individual ignores segregation in his schools, he makes a mockery of the right of all citizens to a public education of equal value with that of all other citizens.

When the individual ignores job discrimination against Negroes, he not only mocks the value of the individuals of that race, but also endangers his own job, which may be taken for reasons equally flimsy and arbitrary.

When an individual ignores capital punishment, he makes a mockery of a justice system supposedly set up for rehabilitative purposes, and solidifies the opportunity for similar "justice" to be meted out to himself at some future date.

The Conservative cannot play blind man's bluff with these injustices. He cannot ideally, because he thus denies every man's right to the same liberties he himself has. He cannot practically, because by so doing he risks the loss of his own liberties in the future.

He can only do it hypocritically.

We think it is time for the Conservative movement in America to take positive concrete action to solve the above problems on the individual level.

We think it is time for the movement to stop screaming about federal intervention when Negroes are being denied an equal education.

We think it is time for the movement to stop complaining about increased welfare spending when Negroes are living in poverty in colored towns all over the South.

We think it is time for the movement to put its money where its mouth is.

Medicare Defeat Justified

(Editor's note—The following is a letter which Sen. Norris Cotton (R-NH) sent to his constituents following the defeat of the Anderson Medicare bill.)

The Anderson Medicare Bill is dead, but the political uproar over it has just begun.

The vote was far from partisan. I voted against it as did 30 other Republicans. So did 21 Democrats, among them the chairmen of the Senate's 10 most powerful committees, and some of the President's closest friends including the senator who stood up with him at his wedding. They had to have strong reasons. I can only give you mine.

After our attempts to improve the Anderson proposal had been rejected and the final vote came, I asked myself one simple question. Would the Anderson Medicare plan really aid the old people who need help? The answer is "No."

THIS BILL WOULD HAVE GIVEN ONLY A MORSEL OF MEDICARE TO THE ELDERLY WHO NEED IT, BUT WOULD SPREAD THAT MORSEL TO MILLIONS OF THE WELL-TO-DO WHO DON'T. Thus, its cost would shut the door on adequate Medicare or increased Social Security benefits in the future.

There is the statement: Now for the proof. The Anderson Bill wouldn't have paid a penny for doctors' bills. It would pay no surgeons' fees—no dental bills—no medicines outside the hospital. It wouldn't even pay hospital bills until the patient paid \$90 for the first 9 days. The average hospital stay for older persons is 7 days, so the Bill failed miserably to meet their needs. Experts conceded it would cover only 25% of medical costs.

One of its empty promises was care in nursing homes. But to qualify, the nursing home must be connected with a hospital. There are few such in the Country and none in New Hampshire. The whole scheme was like trying to throw a 25-foot rope to a person drowning 50 feet from shore.

Now consider how it would prevent our providing really worthwhile care in the future. This Bill covered everyone over 65—an ever-increasing segment of our population. Its cost would constantly jump payroll taxes for Social Security. It was estimated these taxes would reach 12% to 15% within a few years. That would kill all hope for increased benefits to the needy—and what a burden on young fathers and mothers striving to raise and educate their children!

Why did the powers that be demand such a plan and lash the faithful to vote for it? Because bureaucrats distrust State Governments. They want all welfare dished out from the top. That's why they haven't lifted a finger to tell people about the present Kerr-Mills program. Furthermore, they are against limiting Medicare to those who need it. "It humiliates the old people," they cry. You get a picture of social workers quizzing oldsters on how many cents a week they spend for tobacco. Actually, the test now is purely a matter of income and resources and is up to the States. In New Hampshire a single person is eligible who doesn't receive more than \$1800 a year, a married couple \$3000. They may own their homes and a limited amount of other property and savings. I was one of the Senators who offered a substitute bill providing Medicare

for all who do not pay a Federal income tax—hardly a humiliation!

New Hampshire's elderly are already better off than they would be under the Anderson scheme. Our Commissioner of Public Health informs me that we provide virtually total medicare for the elderly of limited means. This includes doctors' calls at home and all hospitalization recommended by their physician, with no cost to them. Furthermore, our State can go as far as it likes in expanding its medical care and the Federal Government will pay nearly 60% of the cost. The best way to improve Medicare is simply to increase the Federal Government's share. This couldn't be done if the Anderson Bill had passed.

In a nutshell, the Anderson plan was a fraud on both old and young because:

1. It would cover no doctors' bills and very limited hospitalization.
 2. It could honestly be called a "millionaires' bill" because it would waste billions on those in the upper income brackets.
 3. It would boost payroll taxes barring either expanded Medicare or increased Social Security payments in the future.
 4. It would burden workers with families to support.
 5. It would freeze Medicare in a Federal pattern so our State could not tailor our medical aid to the needs of our own people.
- Make no mistake. When you look at the Anderson Medicare scheme you are not viewing a sweet old lady in bed with kimono and nightcap. You are staring into the eyes of the wolf that ate Little Red Riding Hood's grandmother.

Others Need J. Colleges Too

(Editor's note—The following is an editorial from the Minnesota Daily which shows that the problems of higher education and the need for community colleges to meet these problems exist in other states besides North Carolina.)

Establishment of junior colleges around the state could be of great advantage to the University.

Most students don't come to the University because of its smashing lower division program. They come because they want to be doctors and we have an excellent medical school, or they want to be engineers and we have engineering departments which are known for their important contributions to science, or they want to be journalists and we have one of the top journalism schools in the country, or they want a good liberal education and we can offer them a variety of courses taught by nationally and internationally known faculty members.

Our attention in recent years has been focused more and more on incoming freshmen and what to do with them. Large chunks of the budget are eaten up by dozens of additional freshman English classes, rapid hiring of faculty, new buildings and other essentials of meeting an ever-increasing student enrollment.

As a state institution, the University cannot limit enrollment, but if emphasis on getting more space and staff for more people continues, it can only be detrimental to the upper division and graduate sections. The strength and prestige of a university is, after all, in the quality of students that come out, not the number of students that go in.

Upper division classes get larger each year and the need for increased faculty also grows. Graduate research space and

equipment is limited. Each year we lose top staff members to better jobs in other educational institutions and business.

University administrators are well aware of these problems, but there is just so much they can do with the personnel and funds available through the Legislature.

The University will probably always be a four-year and graduate institution, but junior colleges could take a great burden off University shoulders and we could then spend a larger share of our energies and finances on

improving the advanced programs.

Students can get a good lower division background at most accredited colleges and junior colleges. It is in the junior through graduate years that the University shows its worth by offering degrees in dozens of academic fields, taught by experts using the latest equipment.

The University has a good reputation as an educational institution, but this reputation will remain only as long as we maintain our high standards at every level. We can't do everything.

Students Should Seek Help

I met the returned service man on the campus about a week after our lunch together. He said he definitely was not coming back to the University in the fall. He said, in answer to my question, that the University had made it almost impossible for him to come back. That instead of wiping out his previous record and letting him start over, as State College does for returning service men, he was told by his advisor that if he was 5 quality points down when he left here he would be 10 quality points down when he came back. He said that he and several other service men felt that they had been kicked in the teeth. The reason for this manipulation of points was that the quality points had been raised from 3 to 4 points in his absence, therefore he was twice as far down as when he left. He lives in Greensboro and plans to go to Guilford College, then to Wake Forest College.

I called the administration and recited the case of the service man. I was told that anyone could remain under the 3 point quality system, or could elect the 4 point system, and I was

asked to tell the student to go to the administration and talk it over. Before I ran across him again, I found out he had dropped out of Summer School. One of his professors said he dropped out because he wasn't ready to study. At the office of Student Affairs I was told that the student came to the office and said he was leaving because he wasn't getting anything out of school.

I still don't understand why his advisor didn't tell him he could stay on under the 3 point system. The boy is gone, and we will never know all the answers. But I sometimes wonder if the advisors know any more than the students. Since the student isn't here there is no way of getting to the bottom of it.

I thought the tribute to Dr. Lashley when he retired, by one of his former students, was one of the most beautiful I ever read. I wish there could be more such tributes from students to all professors. After all, that is what they are here for, to lend a helping hand.

—OTELIA CONNER