

**Britain Today—1**

**Editors' Note:** The following report from London by John Huntington begins a series on crucial issues in Great Britain today. In this and succeeding articles on the race question and the Eden government members will find parallels with American issues. American-born Mr. Huntington is the editorial director of a London publishing house who first became acquainted with the British as an ambulance driver for the British Air Force during World War II.

**By JOHN HUNTINGTON**  
 Special Correspondent

**LONDON**  
**HOW WOULD YOU like to see** your doctor free of charge or your dentist for \$2.00 pay only 14 cents for any prescription no matter how expensive, and, if necessary, go to a hospital and get full treatment—X-rays, consultants' fees, operations, anesthetics, nursing, and, in some cases, convalescence—all for nothing?

All this is true in England, where, for eight years, since the passing of the National Health Service Act, everyone is entitled to receive this sort of individual medical treatment.  
 In England you pay a fixed weekly contribution, supplemented by employers' contributions, for all the social welfare services that were promised to every citizen under the famous Beveridge Plan announced during the war. But you are promised to receive this to the National Health Service—about two cents a week, for instance, to the doctors. But Parliament got a bit substantial sums out of public funds to help defray the enormous expense, and running a health service is very costly—nearly one and a

**Medicine For the Masses Burdens British Treasury**

half billion dollars a year.  
 Many politicians and economists in England are wondering just how much longer the British government will be able to pay her huge annual social service bill, which the NHS is only a fraction.  
 One curious side of the NHS, and one that costs the government a lot of extra money, is that visiting foreigners also get free medical treatment.

**SIGNING UP**  
 Medicine for the masses works like this. You sign on with an NHS general practitioner—a family doctor near where you live. If you feel sick, you visit his office (called a "surgery" in England) during one of the stated times that he sees patients. The rest of the day he's out visiting, and it is usual for him to have an appointments system. If you are too ill to come to his surgery, he'll visit you at home. Even specialists, under the NHS, go to see bedridden patients in their homes.

Doctors' surgeries are usually quite crowded, and you have to wait your turn. The average doctor has between two and three thousand patients, so even if only a small fraction of them are ill, he's kept pretty busy.  
**DUTOR COME**  
 Your doctor eventually comes, the doctor examines you, decides what's wrong and gives you an added burden on hospitals and causes over-crowding, one of the "evils" of free medicine.

Sometimes there is a long waiting list for a bed, particularly for such things as removal of tonsils. In an emergency, sometimes a doctor has to ring up several hospitals before he can find a place for his patient. And, as the quality of treatment varies from one hospital to another, your doctor can-

bed in a hospital ward or arranged for a home delivery, whichever he decides. But you go to hospital, you will be treated by another doctor.

Theoretically, then, you can get the finest treatment in the land, but depending very much on your particular general practitioner. If you do like him, you can change to another one in the same locality. And you can always go privately to the doctor if you really want, provided of course that you pay his fees and the drugs that he prescribes.

Although you must pay the weekly contributions, you do not have to have a National Health doctor. You can still go privately, although many Socialists in the government would like to put a stop to this and do away with private practice entirely. But because the vast majority of doctors and dentists, from the very first, cooperated in making the NHS work, there is now little likelihood of private practice being abolished. Most NHS doctors still have a small private practice, and they are permitted to do so.

General practitioners are over-worked and tend to pass their patients on to hospitals for treatment which, in the more leisurely days, they would have attended to in their own offices. This puts an added burden on hospitals and causes over-crowding, one of the "evils" of free medicine.  
 Sometimes there is a long waiting list for a bed, particularly for such things as removal of tonsils. In an emergency, sometimes a doctor has to ring up several hospitals before he can find a place for his patient. And, as the quality of treatment varies from one hospital to another, your doctor can-



"Come all the way from Australia, eh? Well, the aspirin's free, but socialized medicine doesn't pay for boat tickets."

not always get you the hospital treatment he would like.

Hospital outpatients departments are impersonal, busy places. Patients miss the understanding of their own doctor. They are usually treated by the hospital, not by a particular individual on the staff. If they are under prolonged treatment, they may be seen by several different doctors, each with his own pet theory on how to fix him up. This can be discouraging for the patient, who feels that all this chipping and changing and messing about merely prolongs his illness.  
 The NHS, technically, makes civil servants of its doctors. They sign contracts with local government authorities. Along with other

civil servants, their jobs carry generous pensions, but they must contribute part of their earnings to the government employee pension scheme.

**STANDARDS RAISED**

Four years ago, the standard of NHS doctoring was raised, as an extra year's residential hospital experience, the highest standards by killing any incentive in the rugged individual who wants to make a name for himself. The NHS has been leveling out process, a compromise to get the most adequate medical service for the greatest numbers.

**Hodges 'Safety Valve' Package Asks Too Much Of North Carolina Citizens**

**NORTH CAROLINA** has been asked to gamble the whole cohesive ideal of public education on a single spin of fortune's wheel. The stakes are too high.  
 Gov. Hodges has asked the General Assembly to link all 1956 "safety valve" legislation to the fate of one amendment permitting abolition of the constitutional mandate for free public schools. Thus, a vote for state tuition grants for students whose parents opposed mixed schools would also be a vote for "local option" to close public schools in any given area. There would be no room for choice or selective judgment.

Every person ought to have the right of choice in his own case between attending integrated schools and private schools, without doing violence to the mandatory state-supported system of free public education.

The "package plan" lacks flexibility and fairness. It represents, quite simply, an all-or-nothing approach. Reason and realism require solutions more reflective of the public's selective will.

Confronted with such an amendment on election day, thoughtful Tar Heels would feel compelled to vote against it. They will be unwilling to hang a sword over the public schools in order to achieve a system of state tuition grants.

Elimination of the constitutional provision for state-supported free public schools is too drastic, the remedy being more likely to kill than to cure.

Gov. Hodges was speaking for all of us when he said, "North Carolina's public education system is the pride and prop of the state, and it must be preserved if we want to continue to make progress." The system is also founded on the faith and sacrifice and will of the people. The public's love for its schools is a deeply imbedded tradition, sturdy enough to survive social crisis. But opposition to integration and

approval of means to destroy the public school system are not one and the same thing. For does one necessarily follow the other? We thoroughly disagree with the Supreme Court's 1954 decision banning segregation in the public schools. We believe most North Carolinians share our disapproval. Furthermore, we are in full sympathy with the governor's expressed objective to provide means whereby no child will be compelled to attend an integrated school against his choice. Compulsory integration would indeed pose a grave threat to the public welfare and safety in many areas of North Carolina.

We will support any realistic program to avoid compulsory integration. The tuition grant plan offers possibilities. But any weakening of the mandatory duty to provide free public schools for all of the children is a long backward step that ought never to be taken in North Carolina.

The people should be permitted to vote separately on tuition grants and "local option" to close public schools. The success of a tuition grant plan does not hinge on the permissive privilege to abolish public schools in any given locality.

Whatever questions the General Assembly submits to the people, the largest possible expression of public opinion should be sought. The constitutional amendment in November, when constitutional amendments are normally up for consideration, would provide that expression better than a special election in September.

The decisions ahead cannot be taken lightly. They affect the future possibilities of the state and its people. They must be stronger than wrath or sentimentality or momentary whim. They must be realistic and wise and, above all, constructive. The state's collective conscience will accept nothing less.

**A Ready-Made Policy For Mr. Dulles**

**JOHN FOSTER DULLES'** latest attempt to substitute pretexts for policy on the crucial question of neutrality has finally played out.

This is cause for some rejoicing, but although he has finally come down out of the pulpit the secretary of state still has no policy to counter the tactics by which the Soviet has penetrated the Middle East and won favor among uncommitted nations.

Mr. Dulles' efforts so far are a quarrel of contradictions both of his own statements and those of President Eisenhower.

In an attempt to warm relations between the U. S. and the neutrals, the President said last month that neutrality does not mean indifference "as between right and wrong, or decency and indecency." A few days later Mr. Dulles said that "except under very exceptional circumstances" neutrality is "an immoral and shortsighted conception." While that might in a sense be true, Mr. Dulles' business is diplomacy, not theology, and his statement served no purpose other

than to irritate neutrals he was trying to influence.

Now the secretary has come full circle. There are "very few, if any" neutrals of the immoral kind, he said the other day, adding that a nation is not neutral in the immoral sense if it belongs to the United Nations.

Well, what about the U. S.'s old friend, Switzerland? "I would not want to say that the neutrality of Switzerland was immoral," the secretary replied. He then proceeded to rescue Sweden from immorality by putting her into those nations with "exceptional circumstances."

Actually many other nations have circumstances more exceptional than Switzerland's for staying out of military alliances. In any event each neutral deals with different national circumstances and it is Mr. Dulles' disregard for that fact that led him to his now recanted pronouncement.

The secretary of state seems unable to devise a policy on neutrality, but there is one ready-made for diplomats in doubt. It is silence.

**The Responsibility To 'Sound Off'**

"IN THE PAST," wrote Aldous Huxley several years ago, "there was an age of Shakespeare, of Voltaire, of Dickens. Ours is the age not of any poet or thinker or novelist but of the Democrat. Our Representative Man is the traveling newspaper correspondent who dashes off a best letter between two assignments. 'Facts speak for themselves!' Illusion: 'Facts are ventriloquist's dummies. Sitting on a wise man's knee they may be made to utter words of wisdom; elsewhere they say nothing or talk nonsense or indulge in sheer diabolism."  
 For some reason, we were reminded of this biting indictment of journalism business when we read Morris Llewellyn Cooke's thoroughly delightful analysis in *ENGINEERING NEWS-RECORD* of what ails the engineering profession. Mr. Cooke, himself a distinguished engineer, who has family ties in Charlotte, maintains that engineers don't "sound off" enough. Their devotion to facts is so strong that they often voluntarily muzzle themselves on subjects that are uninhibited by strict laws of nature, he said. "And yet throughout history the greatest events have been precipitated by geographically widespread, and sometimes vociferous, 'sounding off' by peoples possessing only negligible information normally required to reach engineering decisions."  
 Mr. Cooke's conclusion is that: Cannot engineering escape the con-

ditions of the laws of nature? Yes, but only if we have leaders and teachers who know more than the laws of thermodynamics and such like men who love beauty and have the imagination to envision a human society where man is set free by truth and by practice ethical conduct and know that God is the one unassailable and continuing fact in our lives. One whole truth, say some Engineers' Week, each of the 400,000 engineers "sounded off" on favorite themes and then did something about it. The counter would be better off, the profession of engineering would find itself and youth would flock to our standard.

Well spoken. But the lesson applies equally well to other professions and individuals. Many, many Americans are too sudden with silence and conformity for our tastes. They aren't barged. There are no legal restraints. But there is the consciousness that to stray from the orthodox safety zone of "facts" is highly dangerous in a personal sense. Like those who view engineering as "an ascetic training where moods, prejudices and abstractions have no place," they shrink from ideas for the simple reason that they are not. Nonsense. Who'd go to know unless truth and falsehood graze occasionally in a free, open encounter?  
 "Sounding off" is one of America's finest democratic exercises. Don't let it ever wither away.

**Ashley Montagu In The Saturday Review**

**IN SEARCH OF AN ISLAND**

**NO MAN** can survive as an island of himself. No man wants to be an island. But every human being wants and needs to replenish his resources for being social by having a room of his own, as it were, a sanctuary to which he can retire and in which he can be alone with himself, undisturbed

**People's Platform Full Story Untold On Presbyterian College Plan**

**Red Springs**  
**Editors, The News:**  
 THE people of the Synod of North Carolina have a right to know the full story of the incidents that have taken place in regard to the action taken in the consolidation of Peace, Flora Macdonald College and Presbyterian Junior College into what some call "the grand concept of Christian education," to wit: The new college which is to be located in Laurinburg.

The decision to consolidate the three colleges being reached by the action of a small but powerful group was swiftly and smoothly passed by Synod without the general approval or full knowledge of the Presbyterian membership of the Synod of North Carolina. So much discussion is now

heard from all over the state that the whole situation should be aired in order that the rank and file Presbyterian might know exactly what has taken place. This discussion has been witnessed further by the necessity to extend the period for canvassing funds for the new college.

Of course, on the other hand, this small group of advocates for this program say that there will always be a group who will never want to go forward and that there will always be those who are bitter. Anything that the church members know as little about and that has brought such deep discussion should be aired! Presbyterians want to go forward but they want to make sure they are doing it in the right direction.

As announced, the campaign was to raise \$200,000 for the consolidated college and \$500,000 for

This letter is written without malice, although there have been times that are certainly questionable in the minds of many Presbyterians. Such discord cannot be good for our church or the new college, and there is much evidence of a non-support movement by thousands of eastern North Carolina Presbyterians.

The first report on the financial campaign issued by the campaign office on May 21, 1956, is a remarkable document. To the casual reader it would appear that the campaign is a highly successful one. However, a careful evaluation of the facts and figures shows that such is not the case.

As announced, the campaign was to raise \$200,000 for the consolidated college and \$500,000 for

Church Christian Life. In the campaign office's amazing report it is stated, quote, "pledges by the town of Laurinburg and environs for the college, \$300,000." This goodly sum was not contributed to the campaign and was pledged only prior to the location of the college in Laurinburg. It should not have been reported as a campaign contribution.

A further examination of this unusual report shows the following, quote "from 17 churches reporting of 63 churches of the Synod, \$935,869. Anonymous, \$300,000; grand total, \$4,255,869." In other words, this report shows that as of May 31, the campaign has exceeded its goal of \$3,200,000, when actually only \$1,255,869 had been contributed, including two anonymous gifts of \$150,000 each. And still the campaign continues long past the date set for the great forty day. As of June 13, over four hundred churches had not reported an contribution.

Perhaps a few more tons of free barbecue, a few more yards of Stuart tartan, and another airplane might whip up the flagging Presbyterians to a frenzy of generosity!  
 — G. ROBERT GRAHAM

**Richard M. Nixon Is Not The Veep**

**Charlotte**  
**Editors, The News:**  
**IN YOUR** July 12, edition, you mentioned the item on Ike's counter-stumping by plane with an inclusion of the term "Veep," referring to Nixon. This smells of private life and is not a political issue. My paper was not this presumptuous, that it was an Associated Press error from Gettysburg.  
 — D. EMIS

**I Might Do A Little Experimenting With You, Too'**



**Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round**

**Journalistic Mayhem: Acrostic Of Curses**

**Rock Hill, S. C.**  
**HARRY GOLDEN**, editor of the Carolina Israelite and a great natural genius reflects the thinking of an immense section of thinking people.  
 Another writer, Sholem Aleichem, often spoke for an entire people. The literary production of both these writers is enormous. If one can speak of irony as humor, the story by Aleichem of two newspapers in the imaginary city of Kasrilevke, the site of many of his stories, is a delightfully written tale.

The competing papers often ignoring each other and editorially disagreeing on everything would without hesitation indulge in mutual vilification. To keep from mentioning the other, a paper's name the editors would use an alphabetic acrostic that would go like this: "That astirne, begarig, crooked, iron, drunk and unsteady, hair-splitting, idiotic, knave-bending, leprous, mangy, nefarious, ossified, provoking, querulous, rabble-rousing, skimmy, tottering, ugly, venomous, wayward, xenophobic, yellowing and zigzagging a rag whose name we don't even want to mention."  
 — GRAHAM C. REICH

**Quote, Unquote**

Do you know that there are children sitting tonight in chilly dens, starting to death as they huddle around the kitchen table, waiting for hours and hours for lamb chops to defrost? — Sam Levenson  
 Which makes me remember the story of an actor who went to a psychiatrist. "Doctor," he said, "you've got to help me. I have no talent. I can't sing or key. I can't dance. I don't tell funny stories and I'm not handsome."  
 "Why, the solution is simplicity itself," said the doctor. "You've got to get out of show business."  
 "But I can't," the actor said, "I'm a star!" — Steve Allen.

**Vote Promised On Election Reforms**

**WASHINGTON**  
 Missouri's persistent Sen. Tom Hennings finally wangled a promise out of Senate majority leader Lyndon Johnson that he let the Senate vote on the long-bottled election reforms.

**Case Contribution**  
 For months Hennings has sought action on his honest elections bill to clean up campaign corruption. The issue exploded into the headlines after South Dakota's GOP Sen. Francis Case revealed he had turned down a \$25,000 contribution from a Superior Oil Co. lobbyist just before the vote on the gas bill.  
 At that time Johnson ignored Hennings' carefully prepared bill and

jointly joined Senate GOP leader Bill Knowland in sponsoring election reforms of their own. Actually they used most of the Hennings bill. But as soon as the headlines died down, Johnson's enthusiasm for election reforms also abated.

**Time To Vote**  
 Behind the closed doors of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee, however, Hennings and Johnson said that it was time to vote on the honest elections bill.  
 "All right, but give me a week," Johnson finally agreed. "I've got to get know-how to go along."

**Two Problems**  
 Two obstacles, he said, threatened to upset the Johnson - Knowland compro-

mise. First, Arizona's GOP Sen. Barry Goldwater wanted to force labor unions to get approval of the entire membership before spending money for political purposes. This would be opposed by pro-labor Democrats.

**Outsiders**  
 Second, Tennessee's Democrat Sen. Albert Gore wanted to prohibit outsiders from spending more than \$1,000 in any state election. This was aimed at the big Republican millionaires who were being allowed by the Republicans.  
 Johnson said he would talk to Gore about withdrawing his amendment and urge Knowland to call off Goldwater. Then, he promised, the way would be

paved for a quick vote on the honest elections bill.

**Republicans Smile**  
 Republicans have done some quick investigating of Gov. Frank Clement, the roarin' tootin' boy orator from Tennessee who is the Democrats' keynote speaker. They couldn't be happier with the Democrat choice.  
 They find he has so many skeletons in his closet that the Democrats will have a hard time talking much about Dick Nixon's \$18,000 personal expense fund. Clement is ever picky or vice president of the GOP, know right where the bodies are buried.  
 Also, the Republicans are not unhappy over the fact that the Democrats are still snuffing their opportunities.