



# Oh Yeah

by F.N. Stewart

When a person admits to himself that he is an atheist, he has placed himself within a minority of society. Actually there runs a scale between atheist and theist. By Webster's definitions, if we establish a scale, we put atheist at one end and theist at the other. An "Unbeliever" implies a loss or lack of religious faith without suggesting a substitute for it. Next to this would come the "Agnostic" who withholds belief because he is unwilling to accept the evidence of revelation and spiritual experience. At about the middle point and moving towards the positive is "Deist" who rejects the conception of God as an active ruler and guide known through revelation while believing in a supreme being as creator of the universe. At the end would come "Theist" or believer who accepts the supreme being of God.

After rejection of a God, the main thought which comes to mind is the fact that the Atheist then admittedly stands alone. Therein lies a deep thought. For God is usually accepted as a companion. The atheist then must search across his mind looking for a reason for such an admission. Rebelling from a figure of authority is not sufficient reason to deny what the majority of the world confirms. This is in a sense what an atheist has done. The reason could not be just to turn against the majority, or to be different. Many within the faiths rebel against authority figures and many turn against other majorities in society.

For the atheist it probably seems as if religion has become an adult's fairy tale. There seems to be a pretending feeling about it. It's like the time we are children playing "make believe." There are too many discrepancies, not enough facts. It leaves too big a gap for "hope" and "belief" to fill. An atheist must feel that believers accept blindly that which they do not understand or can not explain. The miracles which impressed the first believers, he finds unbelievable. Science has pushed us to a new great frontier, perhaps beyond religion; so perhaps the atheist has found a lack of material to believe.

Science has stepped forward to challenge religion, and very seldom defends it. With the advances in anthropology and psychology questions arise concerning what has been said in the Bible and people representing the religions have attempted to hold their ground and reply before the onslaught. It has been said by these defenders that the Bible is not to be taken literally. We are to use the Bible as a guide. The question then arises for the atheist, "What about those in times past who took the Bible literally, those who believed every word?" Is not religion giving ground a bit to admit that we can no longer take the Bible literally? Hasn't science pushed religion to the point where religion is having to stand on defense? Religion now seems to be defending its very existence. It seems to be used to answer only that which science must speculate toward, because science will not make a statement until it can prove it.

Maybe then it is science or knowledge which places a person at a point where he denies that gods exist. Perhaps, it is this backing of fact which makes a person stand without supernatural aid. We say that we accept Darwin's theory, then we ask, "Where does man get a soul?"

Perhaps atheism is flowering and religion is falling because the church is decaying from within. I don't think that the Sunday-morning Christian which we have so many of in these times is the kind that Christ intended. I speak of the hypocrite. I speak of the one who prays for mankind on Sunday mornings then cheats in his business Monday morning. I speak of one who curses at another motorist while driving home from church. I speak of the white churches in the southern states which won't allow the black to pray beside them to the same god. I speak of the Catholic when she takes her birth control pill before going to church. I speak of the black militant who riots Sunday night after he has been to prayer service. I speak of the soldier who prays before going to kill. Going to kill in the name of God. I speak as an atheist might speak, and perhaps the inside of the church is why.

An atheist is not necessarily one who has no ethics, morals, human understanding, or love. Denying that a god exists does not turn one against mankind. It may even strengthen his feelings for other human beings. There being left no supernatural aid to which he can turn in his own time of troubles, mankind may be the place to which he turns. But try as he may, there is no way he can totally neglect mankind in his time of good fortune. An atheist has to live among men. A believer doesn't have to live next door to God.

There are certain precepts of conduct set down by every organized religion in the world. These precepts may be followed without accepting a divinity to go along with them. It is surprising how much alike these precepts are. Perhaps the divinities exist to punish those who do not follow the precepts. But psychology has shown that punishment is an ineffective way to teach. A divinity is not necessary for men to love one another. Loving one another under threat of the soul's salvation is not the best way to love. Man does not need a god to live with his fellowmen. Man only needs a god for himself. He seeks through God his own salvation, he seeks his own afterlife.

In being an atheist, he admits that each second which ticks away is part of his life. He admits there is no second time, or second source from which more living will come. He admits he stands among men walking to a final death. Death, the time when we cease to be in men's reality and remain only in living men's memory. He seeks no heaven of pearly gates and golden streets, for pearl and gold are the dreams of men. And men die final deaths. He fears no hell's fire because hell is a punishment of gods, and in his mind there exist no gods. Death will come to him as it has to all men before him and will to all men after him. He does not seek death for he enjoys living, but he does not fear it because death is no more than a cessation of living. He will not bow to any man's God, nor shall he deny any man his BELIEF in a God. He shall stand alone,.... alone except for his knowledge and mankind.

# Talking New York

By Cindy Trexler

On October 31 at 8:30 A.M., Sherry Drake and I boarded an Eastern Airlines Whisperjet bound for New York City. What was, one might inquire, the purpose of this trip? It certainly wasn't to buy another red coat, to feed hot pretzels to the squirrels in Central Park, or to be frisked by the guards in the Administration Building at Columbia University. Nor was the purpose of the trip to eat Escargot at "La Brasserie" or to descend into hell (meaning of course to ride the subway). Actually, Sherry and I were attending the 44th Annual Conference of The Associated Collegiate Press which was being held in conjunction with the National Council of College Publications Advisers Conference at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, October 31-November 2.

The ultimate reason for attending this conference was to improve the quality of the yearbook here on campus by exposing ourselves to new ideas and new techniques in yearbook production. The only way to improve the quality of such a publication is to keep informed of the innovations that are occurring nationwide. One does not keep the creative faculties of the mind alert by staying at home and talking about what so-and-so did with their high school annual last year, nor does one listen to those individuals who think that Carolina's YACKETY-YACK should be a source of ideas for our yearbook. An idea is not necessarily "groovy" just because Chapel Hill did it.

The A.C.P. Conference, like most other conventions was, in essence, a series of workshops and lectures given during morning and afternoon sessions in different rooms at the Waldorf-Astoria. The most unfortunate aspect of the convention was that it was impossible to attend all the lectures being offered. Since many lectures were being given at the same time one had to be selective and try to decide which would be most beneficial. The speakers were, in every case, top-notch.

Most of them were professors of Journalism at large universities, but some were professionals from the various printing companies or authors of books about college newspapers and yearbooks. For instance, Prof. William Mindals, head of the advertising sequence at the University of Texas, School of Communications, gave a short course in newspaper advertising; Benjamin W. Allnutt, author of PRACTICAL YEARBOOK PROCEDURE, talked about yearbook themes and how to

develop them effectively; Prof. R. Smith Schuneman, Associate Professor of Journalism at the University of Minnesota, conducted a very informative four-part workshop on photojournalism; the Press Secretary to Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, John C. Obert, gave a lecture entitled "who Manages the

News;" and Prof. C. J. Medlin, author of SCHOOL YEARBOOK EDITING, LAYOUT AND MANAGEMENT, talked about planning the yearbook, the basic steps from start to finish. To continue listing the speakers at this convention would require a full page in this newspaper. Another beneficial part of the conference was the display that the major printing companies had assembled in the lobby of the hotel. The biggest yearbook printing companies in the country were there: American Yearbook Company, Foote and Davies, Hunter Publishing Co. and Taylor Publishing Co. Many of the smaller companies such as Delmar, Paragon Press, and Walsworth Publishing Co. were also represented. Each company had a booth in which were displayed various pamphlets and about a dozen of the best yearbooks they produced in 1968. I was quite flattered to find that Hunter Publishing Co. chose to display the 1968 ROGUES 'N RASCALS. It gave me a great deal of satisfaction to know that yearbook staffs from all over the country were seeing our yearbook, and, as Jim Hunter a company representative, later told me, enjoying it very much. This continuous browsing at the displays went on in the lobby all day long. Besides providing convention delegates with the chance to see other yearbooks, it also gave them the opportunity to meet other students. The exchange of ideas that ensued from these brief encounters was a very interesting and worthwhile

part of the trip.

Now that you are fully informed about what happens at the ACP - NCCPA conference, you probably wonder just how much Sherry and I gained from this experience. Other than a dozen long-stemmed roses, I really can't say with any certainty. That is something that remains to be seen. One northern school is currently in the process of putting out a "year-box." This square box will contain pamphlets for the various sections, balloons, buttons, posters, and any other items which students can identify.

Does all of this sound way-out and radical to you? Possibly so. But it is happening across the country in countless numbers of "avante-garde" yearbooks. And I can truthfully say that the UNC-C's yearbook is keeping with the pace quite well. It was, well-received by the countless number of students at the convention, and upon request a copy was given to Bob Merriman, a representative of Duranel Cover Manufacturing Co. who wanted to show it to the schools he services in the Chicago area; and after seeing Brent Steele's copy of the Rogues 'N' Rascals, several of the faculty members at Wisconsin State University have inquired as to how they might obtain a copy. Such wide acclaim cannot be ignored. The success of the Rogues 'n' Rascals is due primarily to the good job done by its editor, Mrs. Candy Kimbell Sauber. She attended the ACP-NCCPA conference last year, and chose not to ignore the latest trends in yearbook production.

## Myths Exist On Campus As Well As Off Campus

(Continued from Page 2)

is perhaps the most painful experience known to thinking man. When confronted by a paradox, man either turns off or takes the easy way out—even if he recognizes the easy way as incorrect. (I, of course, once again over-simplify, for some people do struggle with paradoxes and perhaps even learn to live with them.) But in the Western world, all questions must be answered. What if the world IS a paradox? What if it IS too complex for us to understand? Do we create our own reality burdened with our limitations, or do we suffer with the truth?

Hoffer on Fanatics

A more current myth seems to be that life can have no meaning unless it is spent in some form of humanistic endeavor. What I find so frightening about this, however, is not the efforts of people to make the world better, but the way they seek to go about it. I often question the motives of people who set out to change the world: are they seeking to create a better world, or are they running away from one they can't accept? The only time I feel like running is when somebody tries to force me to take part in the revolution.

Eric Hoffer has said that fanatics strengthen their own faith by converting others, that proselytizing is more a passionate search for something not yet found than a desire to bestow upon the world something they already have. I think this is true; and perhaps, in my own funny way, I too am a fanatic. But you don't have to risk eternal damnation in hell's fires if you choose not to come with me: you've already got your own hell to live in.

Finally, the people who demand that we get involved also demand that we take a side. Talk about psychological implications—they see the whole world as one big battleground! I don't think that the world is that easily explained, though I sometimes wish it were. If it were, I would be among the first to commit myself to the winning side. Life is not, however, a battleground. Life is not a game. Life IS, dammit!

Yeah, they've created life on the UNC-C campus, but they've not given the creature a soul; and without a soul, without meaning, it's a zombie. Don't ask me to feed it.

