

UNC NEWS

Bill Wuamett
EDITOR

Bill Hobbs
CO-EDITOR

Fred McConnel
BUSINESS MANAGER

Associate Editor	Jeanne Murdoch
Editorial Assistant	Jean Wells
Sports Editor	Marty Kruming
Feature Editor	Kathy Alsop
Cartoonist	Jane Hamlet
Photographer	Richard McKee
News Staff	Harry Tocce, Kay Barnhart, Don King
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.

Hogwash

There exists here at Chapel Hill and a couple other places in the state an organism known as the "greater" university. There are now three branches to this organism; three corners to a sacred triangle of learning within which numberless generations of fragile Tar Heel minds have been nurtured and guided by the traditions of a great Southern institution.

This capstone of higher education in the state and the South has not been created overnight. It has required the concentrated efforts of hundreds of brilliant minds to acquire the magnificent libraries and brilliant staffs now at these three institutions. But even what we have is not enough—it would be foolish, therefore, to attempt to create a new branch of this university in Charlotte. We cannot spread our resources that thin. It is better to have one great institution of three branches than to try to expand at this time.

Hogwash.

The "greater" university is greater only in the sense that it is larger than it once was. And it's about time some people realized this instead of reminiscing about the good old days when "father" Frank Graham was guiding the destinies of this ivy-covered tower.

* * *

The facts in favor of further expansion are rather hard to dispute.

1. There now exists in the Southern Piedmont of North Carolina a city of over 200,000 people. Charlotte has no four-year college.

2. There exists in the state an over-supply of students desiring a college education. Many of these students have an under-supply of money.

3. A state university has an obligation to supply its citizens with an opportunity for higher education. Unfortunately, this obligation applies to the poor as well as the rich, and if the people cannot afford to come to Chapel Hill, the University must go to the people.

4. This obligation has best been met in other states by the establishment of university branches that get the job done with a minimum of costly frills.

* * *

And quite frankly, we really don't care that it just wouldn't be done at Harvard or by the Greensboro Daily News; a four-year state-supported institution is needed in Charlotte. Not a junior college, not a teachers college, but a four-year institution that is also a fourth branch of the university.

It won't be cheap and it won't happen overnight. President Friday has acted wisely in requesting a thorough survey of all questions involved. We hope these surveys will be finished before the 1963 Legislature convenes.

But whether they are or not, it is time for the myth of old Chapel Hill and the "greater" university to be flushed down the old well and forgotten. The "let them come to Chapel Hill" philosophy is just a little less than

BILL HOBBS

Conservatives And CLEF

Last Sunday the New York Times reported that a group known as the Civil Liberties Educational Foundation was mapping plans to improve high school teaching about the Bill of Rights and the idea of personal freedoms.

Besides the natural interest students and faculty here should take in such a project, UNC has a unique connection with this project since Dr. Frank Graham, former president of the University heads the group (C.L.E.F.)

Dr. Graham's group is worried. It has examined a 1960 study by Purdue University of the attitudes of 10,000 high school students. This study shows, among other things, that one third of the high-schoolers would abolish the right to circulate petitions and that 43% either favored curbs on public speech or were undecided on that issue.

The educators of the C.L.E.F., as the Times said, believe that freedom, to be preserved, must be understood—and this is apparently not the case among many high school students today. The educators also understand that besides preserving freedom, we must extend it to other peoples through the cold war, and that we cannot do this if we do not know what it is all about ourselves.

The problem, then, is obvious: that American high school students are not being taught the full meaning of the word "freedom" they hear so much about in their history books; and the implica-

tions of the problem are equally obvious: that an incomplete understanding of freedom can lead to an incomplete willingness to protect and extend it.

Dr. Graham's group is taking several steps to correct this situation. Next Friday representative high school teachers and university professors will meet to discuss methods of "building the understanding of the basic freedoms into the high-school curriculum." The group is also preparing civil liberties, bibliographies, questionnaires and pilot projects in the field.

In short, the picture, while not exactly rosy considering the Purdue study, is hopeful. But these hopes may be dashed.

For there are those among us who equate "civil liberties" with "liberalism" and "liberalism" with evil. It has long been a contention of conservatives that the educational system of this country is riddled with liberals bent upon indoctrinating the youth of the nation with their political ideas.

This belief, for instance, is given lucid expression in a chapter of William F. (Fair-haired-boy-conservative) Buckley's book *Up From Liberalism*. It has given vindictive and not so lucid expression in the McCarthy era when professors with varying degrees of liberal ideas were fired for their ideas.

And the conservatives are not entirely full of hot air. In Buckley's book, for instance, there

are several entirely valid and irrefutable examples of liberal "indoctrination" practices in American colleges.

The point here is not whether there are too many liberal "indoctrinators" in the colleges and high schools, or, for that matter, whether there are too few.

The point is that Dr. Graham is a liberal, and that is entirely possible, or probable, or even predetermined, that conservatives such as Mr. Buckley are not going to like the ideas of this Civil Liberties Educational Foundation. It would be entirely in keeping with their past performances for conservatives to attack this group on the grounds that it is just another liberal organization designed to propagate liberal ideas among students.

And we will all be the losers if they do.

* * *

We would suggest to the conservatives some alternatives before they go off screaming. First, we would ask them not to go into the matter with their eyes shut and their mouths open. From the report we have, the group seems to be a responsible set of persons honestly interested in improving education in a vital field. It is certainly no automatic fact that all efforts by liberals in the field of education are designed solely to promote their own beliefs.

Second, we would remind the conservatives that they should be as deeply concerned with civil liberties as the liberals. They talk constantly of preserving individual freedom, and here is an area in which they can perform a valuable service to preserving individual freedom. We ask them to interest themselves in this endeavor constructively, to join in this effort to improve the basic teaching of civil liberties. In doing so they would also serve to give the program a balanced, responsible outlook if they believe it does not have one now.

And we feel these points can apply equally to liberals.

Maybe it seems like a small matter. After all this is a small group, and there are others of its kind. Nevertheless, it is concerned with an extremely important issue, and if it can come up with some effective means of solving the problem we will gain greatly. One thing is clear: the group will not arrive at any such means if it is harried and beset with the often absurd dialogue between liberals and conservatives which clouds so many educational projects today.

We hope that both the liberal and conservative men involved in education will not look at this project as a means for advancing their own ideological gain, but as a means for advancing the knowledge and understanding of the American student.

Robinson's Ramblings

The world owes a vote of gratitude to Roger Price and Leonard Stern, who have come out with a startling theory about people's names.

These two professors have discovered that you become the kind of person your name sounds as though you should be. It is all explained in "What Not to Name Your Baby," which was written and published by Price and Stern.

As the title indicates, the Price-Stern theory is that parents make their children what they are when they name them. For example, "Earl is a small fellow with no chin and a deep voice who married a big woman. (See, they're off to a bad start. Poli Sci Prof Earl Wallame has a strong jutting chin, a petite wife and not a particularly deep voice.) Mark and Woodrow are popular teachers at a Midwestern college. Harry always knows where to get more ice."

Or: "Arlenes have big eyes and talk a lot. (Arlene Francis—the perfect example.) Charlottes like to be a Pal to their men friends and wear heavy black-rimmed glasses. Gertrudes, when young, tend to have too many teeth and dull hair; but they improve themselves. By the time they're 17, they're call-

ed Trudy or Gert depending on whether they have become cute or smart."

Dr. Price shows that when babies are first born, they are all about the same until given a name. The baby acquires its personality and society begins to treat it as if it had the type of personality the name implies. The child, being sensitive, responds consciously and unconsciously, and grows up to fit the name.

The book is filled with hundreds of names and the descriptions of the people who go with them. ("Jerome always finishes what's left on your plate. He acts like he doesn't want to but is doing you a favor.")

Price started formulating the theory when he was going to grade school. It was right after a girl named Carlotta, the local optician's daughter showed a preference for a tall, curly-haired athlete name Lance. He explains:

"I could not understand why she preferred him to me. I made better grades than he did and could help her with her geometry. And her mother liked me best. I finally decided it was all because of our names. He looked and acted like Lance, and I was pure 100 per cent Roger."

I hope the general outline of this theory is getting across to you, particularly to Horace Sutton and his wife who live in Victory Village. She recently had a baby and at this writing, two weeks later, they are still not agreed on a name. By consulting the Price-Stern book, they can be practically sure of the child's future. Fortunately, the baby is a girl, for a boy might have been given the father's name, and according to the Price-Stern theory, every "Horace says he's going to make a long story short, but doesn't."

APOLOGIES

Last week's editorial in the News was factually incorrect when it stated that administration officials had denied the use of Emerson Field to a town Little League because it was segregated. The official statement said instead that use of the field had been denied because of the conflict involved over integration of the league.

The editor regrets this error.

Reflections

Some definitions from the new southern edition of Webster's.

Chile—A youngun.

Ice cool—A school where students go before coming to college.

Fussed—What comes before second.

Foe—What comes after three.

Riot—You're absolutely riot about that.

Again—The opposite of for.