

The Daily Tar Heel

The official newspaper of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where it is published daily at the Colonial Press, Inc., except Monday's examination and vacation periods and during the official summer terms. Entered as

second class matter at the Post Office of Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed \$4.00 per year, \$1.50 per quarter; delivered \$6.00 per year and \$2.25 per quarter.

Editor Glenn Harden
 Managing Editor Bruce Melton
 Business Manager Oliver Watkins
 Business Office Manager Jim Schenck
 Sports Editor Mary Nell Boddie
 Sports Editor Billy Peacock
 Subscription Manager Chase Ambler
 Associate Editors Al Perry, Beverly Baylor
 Feature Editor Walt Dear
 Advertising Manager Marie Costello
 Staff Photographers Rufin Woody, Hal Miller
 Circulation Manager Neil Cadieu

News Staff--- Thomas McDonald, Barbara Sue Tuttle, Clinton Andrews, June Pearson, Thomas Long, Virginia Hatcher, Betty Kirby, Jody Levey, Gayle Ruffin, Sandy Klostermeyer, David Rowe, Marion Benfield, Jim Oglesby, Joe Raff, Emmett Nesbit, Betty Ahern, Wood Smethurst, Trueman Hon, Sue Burress, Bill Scarborough, Barty Dunlop, Jerry Reece, David Buckner, Varty Euckalew, Punchy Grimes, Bob Wilson, Jim Nichols, Paul Barwick, Bob Pace.

Society Staff--- Nancy Burgess, assistant society editor Peggy Keith, Dian McComb, Lindie Lindeman, Betty Jean Schoeppe, Beverly Lively, Nancy Ann Ader, Wanda Lou Phipott, Celia Lively.

Sports Staff--- Zane Robbins, Ken Barton, Alva Stewart, Eddie Starnes, Buddy Northart.

Business Staff: Richard Adelsheim, Judy Taylor, Flossie Kerves, Geraldine Miller, Flossy Rigg, T. P. Runsey, Dee Fuhai, Sandra Jamieson, Joan Jacobi, Peggy Jean Goods, Isabel Barksdale, Midge Ward, and Margaret Padgett.

by Harry Snook

Nonplus

In the midst of our Carolina campus, which is loved and respected for its liberality and tolerance, there is a powerful group which is intolerant and proud of it.

The people making up this group are not Communists. They are, surprisingly enough, Christians! More specifically, they are Episcopalians.

And it is a fact that this group, which may be taken as representative of orthodox Christian doctrine, is not only intolerant, but deliberately so. They act in an intolerant manner and they mince no words in stating their allegiance to the practice of intolerance.

Here are the true facts on an actual situation that developed on our campus last year:

The Episcopalians were not happy with the organization of Religious Emphasis Week. They were so unhappy that they formally resolved not to participate in such a Religious Emphasis program this year. It's a matter of record.

They didn't stop with merely withdrawing from the interfaith program. The Episcopalian vestry went so far as to draw up a resolution stating that the interfaith program was one requiring tolerance and that since Christianity could not be tolerant, they would participate in no more such programs!

The essence of their argument was that any real Christian must observe the words of Christ to the apostles when He bade them go out into the world and convert it. So it is a primary requisite of a Christian that he may observe the value of no other faith. He not only must accept Christianity exclusively, but he must also spare no effort and tolerate no obstacle in his recruiting.

Therefore, these good Christian Episcopalians decided, they could hardly participate in Religious Emphasis Week, which called for toleration of Jews on the campus!

And they worded not one, but two resolutions to this effect. To them there was one faith and one only and there could be no toleration of any other—even in a general program of Religious Emphasis!

The Episcopalians are not cooperating—or tolerating—this year in plans for an inter-faith program. They are contributing nothing financially. They are participating not at all.

These good Christians are going off into their own corner, hiring their own private lecturers and—get this!—offering to let their lecturers talk elsewhere on the campus!

Such is typical of any doctrine of "exclusiveness" or final "truth" or absolute. A bar is raised against a common meeting ground for people with different ideas and opinions.

Tolerance, though, is vital to democracy and a free people. For we are a varied people of different abilities and desires and races and creeds.

Any God which forbids tolerance is not good.

by O. Mac White

Worm's Eye View

Since for three paragraphs of criticism he has been publically accused of attacking Henry Bowers, the Eely One figures he might as well live up to the accusation and really level a blast at our student body president.

Bowers claims the worm's eye view depicting his part in the presentation of non-segregation to be erroneous, misrepresentative of his true attitude, and based on a misquotation.

Error is disclaimed by the worm as he merely stated a fact which our president admits — he was not present at the meeting.

Said Bowers in his statement which appeared on the front page of The Daily Tar Heel. "I did not attend the meeting because the group there was composed of representatives of various student groups and was not acting in behalf of Student Government."

As was pointed out in the previous column the group that went before House claimed to be representative of the student body. If a president does not represent his constituents, then a few political science texts will have to be revised. As president, as has been said, Bowers certainly had a place in that meeting.

And here is something that has not been mentioned. Bowers was one of the organizers of the whole passing marathon. As a matter of fact many persons thought the "main resolution" which initiated the individual organization resolutions was a student government resolution. The worm knows for a fact that at least one organization presented it as such at its meeting. So again it is concluded that Bowers should have been at the meeting.

Bowers was also the one who made the appointment with the Chancellor for the resolution presenting meeting.

And here is something else, admittedly hearsay. He was present at the warm-up meeting of the group in the Y Cabinet room immediately before it went into South Building. When the big moment came, however, it seems he took a powder.

As to misrepresenting Bowers' true attitude, the worm answers that he is no mind reader. He can only judge by outward appearances.

The statement — "House did not come to me, why should I go to him?"—Bowers said he couldn't recall. The worm does. It made quite an impression in his grey matter. It was the direct answer to a direct question. The worm has two witnesses, although one of them, being Dick Murphy, will probably call me a liar. He has done it before.

"Mr. White," said Bowers, "drew his conclusions from an informal discussion I had with him on Thursday (Oct. 4) evening. During the discussion, which I did not consider a formal interview, Mr. White took no notes."

Is it that Bowers does not feel obligated to speak the truth in informal discussions, or is it that the truth made public might cause fluctuations in his popularity ratings?

Yes, it started that Thursday as only a chat, and, no, I didn't take notes. But to remember one sentence, and especially that sentence, even a worm doesn't have to take notes.

So the question is still unanswered. Just why wasn't Henry Bowers there to speak up for the students?

What Now, Mac?

The young conservative club to some people might be a respectable organization if it had several honest and sincere people in the group. But the people who are only in the organization to bring about a laugh when they try to say the whole idea is a joke should be kicked out now.

These are the people who bring about all the trouble in the world. The ones who cannot be sincere in something that should be sincere and honest.

We hesitate to call any names at this time but we will point out that the presiding officer at the first meeting was very much surprised at the number of people who appeared at the meeting with a sober atmosphere and honest conviction about the formation of the club.

Also the secretary is one who has shown himself to be a liberal by his recent action in different situations and questions that arise on the campus.

Until the people who claim to be intellectuals and have a certain degree of common sense realize that they must be sincere and honest with themselves and the rest of the world we will continue to have the sorry mess of affairs that we have today.

Not only are we referring to the "conservatives," but also several other so-called honorable people in high responsible positions on the campus.

We would appreciate if they could only admit they are wrong when proven so.

Letters

Editor:

Henry Bowers, president of our student body, wittingly or unwittingly is a liar.

Bowers denies responsibility for the statement "House has not come to me why should I go to him." I was present at the discussion (held at The Daily Tar Heel office at 11 p.m., Thursday, Oct. 4). Here's what happened:

Henry, shame on you. You said that statement. And a number of others along the same line. No one had to infer anything. You left no doubt as to what you meant. Your attitude was quite evident.

Listen Little Henry: Your attitude was so evident that Mac White snorted in disgust at both you and Dick Murphy. Then Mac suggested the two of you leave. You did.

I have little personal interest in the matter except to set the truth told. Here's hoping your memory won't be so convenient and your statements so evasive from here on out. Since you said it, for God sakes don't back down!

Rolfe Neill

To The Editor:

After reading what North Carolina's Coach Carl Snively said about the game last Saturday, I suggest we send him a handkerchief to cry into. When the coach of a college team can't take defeat gracefully, he should

be removed. Unless I'm mistaken, Texas had to play in the same heat also, and it also seems that our second and third string men are better than their first string. Maybe the Tar Heels should try to get in shape. That's been known to help.

Charles Mankin
 University of Texas
 (Reprinted from The Daily Texan) Ha!

Editor:

I propose that the student dining hall, Lenoir, be renamed Tiffany's. I am not the one to say that the prices are high, I'll say that the prices are outrageous.

The management, not long ago, said in order to reduce the prices of the delicious morsels, the staff must be cut. Well, the staff was cut—many students lost their jobs. Rising fast in the ranks were the full time, well paid employees. This was supposed to cut prices. The ridiculously high prices still remain ridiculous. In my wildest dreams, I can't imagine what happened. Nevertheless, in the dreams of this idealistic student I can see Lenoir being of more help to the University. I see the ranks of Lenoir full of part time working students, and the food selling for reasonable prices.

Madam Editor, am I being too idealistic for our culture in the twentieth century?

Stan Tesler
 214 Graham Dorm

Roy Parker's Column

THIS COLUMN is coming by remote control these days. During the summer—after living the trials and tribulation of a summer session, this columnist found out that TB was a buddy of his. Consignment to a Wilson sanatorium followed shortly and we now get our news of UNC via state papers and personal mail.

THERE'S a certain perspective gained by being thus part and unpart of Carolina. We claim we're part because right now we are working off a pile of incompletes for the Journalism School.

FROM SOME REPORTS, UNC sounds like the same old place. Such a line comes from those in the faculty and administration. They have seen too many years, students, and events to get excited about any one of them.

ON THE OTHER HAND, student friends are full of quotes about "new coeds," "new year," "everything different." And they are all full of ideas, plans and courses of action which, they are sure, are unique and new to them alone.

A MEETING OF THE MINDS between administration-faculty

and student body might be easier to reach if both groups would temper each other's actions and words by remembering this basic difference in each other's thinking.

BUT IF SUCH WERE SO, there wouldn't be much to fuss, rave, rant, and cuss about in The Daily Tar Heel and campus political parties would have little with which to go platforming, and many a dorm room or fraternity house bull session would collapse for lack of a subject. Maybe it's too much to ask anyway.

WHERE IS HE DEPT: Who, Tom Eller? Carolina's former student body president (1947-48), writer of "Student Control at UNC," and all-round perfect gentleman and servant of Tar Heels, is now an Army man at Fort Jackson, S. C.

THAT'S ABOUT ALL for this installment of the series. Anybody got any gripes, orchids, or news for this columnist, just send it to Roy Parker at the County Sanatorium, Wilson. If no burning questions or ideas, just write a name on a card.