

It has come to my attention that you have been editorially critical of the Georgia Baptist Convention for not allowing Mercer to seek funds from the United States Government. I am sure that you would not intentionally suggest that Georgia Baptist disobey one of God's Commandments, but this is what you have done. It is obvious when someone takes money from another by force that God's law forbidding one to steal has been breached. It is not so obvious when one prevails upon Congress to pass a law to take money from the taxpayer. Even if we see examples of this every day, let us not fall into the trap of believing that if it is legal it is not stealing.

Another danger in becoming too dependent on the Government involves the First Commandment. In this age of pensions, grants and subsidies, we are in danger of feeling that the Government can do more for us than God. Let us remember that we are first dependent on God for our life, our being and all that we have.

The Bible tells us to render unto Caesar but it does not say to give Caesar more than one gives to God or to expect more from Caesar than is expected from God.

Do you think that it is wise for you to seek financial support from the biggest debtor in all history when an institution founded by God and centuries older is supporting you with more than just money.

Very truly yours,
Robert S. Gellerstedt, Jr.
East Point, Ga.

If any answer is necessary for this letter, we include a letter to the president which we feel is fairly representative of student opinion on this issue.

November 30, 1966
Mercer University
Macon, Georgia

Dear President Harris:

A meeting of the Student Government Association and other campus leaders has been held to discuss the recent action of the Georgia Baptist Convention, and this letter reflects the spirit and unanimous expression of that meeting. The urgency of this matter and its close connection with the future of the University compels us to voice to you our deep concern and our request that you convey it appropriately to the Trustees of the University.

Four years at Mercer has not only provided us with opportunity to pursue an education and a degree, but has also given us a deep love of the University as an institution and even as a personality in her own right. Thus, our concern and devotion will not cease with commencement but will continue through the years ahead. We are writing, therefore, both with a concern for Mercer's present and an even greater concern for her future. We believe that we are not only mirroring the concern of our fellow students, but also voicing their almost unanimous opinion of what must be done.

The needs of this University, or any quality university, cannot be met with tuition alone. We cannot but voice our concern that Mercer's inability to accept federal funds will be reflected in mounting tuition costs. Unless additional sources of revenue are soon found, Mercer will be forced to recruit her students from only very wealthy families, which will be a deplorable departure from her tradition. We strongly doubt that substantial gifts

from private benefactors will be forthcoming when we refuse to accept aid from our government. It seems logical that the benefactor would want to place his money in an institution which has demonstrated fiscal responsibility and which he believes will continue to exist. We therefore urgently recommend that federal assistance be accepted.

We see no prostitution of Mercer's integrity, spirit, or way of life by accepting federal funds. If we refuse federal aid, we will be sacrificing her future for principles which when critically examined are not relevant to contemporary education. Such a sacrifice is beyond comprehension. To emaculate this University on the altar of prejudice and worn out tradition will be a tragedy too great to comprehend.

The Georgia Baptist Convention has already demonstrated that it is either unable or unwilling to provide for our minimum current needs, much less for the cost of future development and progress toward excellence. If we are to grow and prosper, if we are to maintain our scholastic standards and progress, we cannot wait hat in hand as the years go by. Our continued reluctance to face this basic issue is not only hurting future progress, but also impeding our efforts in the present. Meanwhile, we are immensely concerned that our accreditation may be placed in jeopardy. When facilities are not built or construction is postponed; when there are shortages and slashings to meet budgets; when we have cramped quarters and curtailed programs, then something has to be done.

We are grateful for your efforts and your rich accomplishments. We are writing to implore that you carry on with the work of improving this institution and making plans for its growth and future development. To postpone is to lag. While we are hindered today, the students who follow will be more sorely hurt. Our love for Mercer and our concern for her future impel us to write. The time is passing quickly, and some accommodation or solution that will enable Mercer to reach the Twenty First Century must be achieved.

We know that you share our love for Mercer and our concern for her, and we are confident that you have the ability to do whatever is necessary to insure her future. We thank you for your attention to this matter, and we want you to know that you have the complete support of us and our fellow students in whatever action you undertake.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed)
Steve Moody, President
Student Government Association
Jacob Beil, Chief Justice
Mercer University Honor
Council
Davis Laney, President
Interfraternity Council
Senior Class

**STUDYING
CAUSES
CANCER**

In the weeks ahead students will be given an opportunity to evaluate their instructors, courses and the general course of instruction at Mercer in a study undertaken by Margaret King and Claudette Walls, students of sociology who are conducting the research as a class project for winter quarter. Students are urged to cooperate and participate by completing the blanks which will be made available at a later date.

LETTERS POLICY

The Cluster welcomes letters on any subject pertinent to and involving University students. The editor reserves the right to edit letters to conform to style, good taste, space limitations and libel laws.

Letters should be typewritten and should not exceed 300 words. No unsigned letter will be printed, but names may be withheld upon request.



Academic Incest and the Brain Drain

Will members of this year's senior class be allowed to teach at Mercer next year? What is being done to replace with qualified people those teachers who leave Mercer each year? And, who will teach in the science center when it is completed?

Such questions may seem at first exaggerated, but they are becoming with time quite pertinent. The plight of Mercer's faculty is becoming embarrassingly obvious; to pretend that these problems do not exist, that all is as it should be, is to be either incredibly naive or purposely deceptive.

Few people would disagree that Mercer needs new buildings. But more than new science centers, or swimming pools, we need competent teachers for the classrooms we already have. The cover is not as important, really, as the book inside it, and a glance behind the chamber-of-commerce idea that the value of a school is proportional to its modern buildings is revealing and disillusioning.

Mercer's psychology department, to be specific, includes only one Ph.D. who must teach four courses, two part-time teachers, and a "visiting instructor" whose only degree is an A.B. from Mercer. Two full-time Ph.D.'s left the English department last year, and to replace them, a retired Wesleyan professor was hired to teach one class a quarter. His competence is not in question, but he can hardly fill the vacancies left by Dr. Snipes and Dr. Christopher.

Of the eleven courses listed under Political Science in the catalogue, two are taught by a Christianity teacher (Cox), one by a history professor (King), and three by the only member of the Political Science department. The catalogue reads, "A Political Science major consists of seven courses above Political Science 50." (p. 110). Since only five courses above Political Science 50

are taught, this must be quite difficult. And other inequalities exist. The art department, which has four members and offers no major is juxtaposed against the sociology department whose two members must teach all twelve courses. In several departments, notably psychology, part-time people are hired as temporary measures.

A careful reading of the back of the 1966-67 catalogue reveals several interesting and not encouraging, insights about the faculty. Of 113 faculty members listed, 25 had received at least one of their degrees from Mercer; this sounds alarmingly like academic incest. There are four Emeritus professors listed, none of them teach; three of them hold degrees from Mercer. The faculty roster is further padded with names of people who either do not teach or are not present; most notable is that of Nathaniel Lewis Kaderly, Ph.D., whose title in the catalogue indicates that he is an English teacher, but in the last 4 years, at least, he has not been here. There are 10 teachers listed, in such departments as mathematics, psychology and German, whose only degree is an A.B. Finally, last quarter, Economics 50 was taught by the "Assistant Professor of Secretarial Studies."

No comment is really needed; every Mercer student is aware of what has happened to the faculty. It seems to us that this problem, the rebuilding the faculty to make Mercer competitive again, deserves top priority on Mercer's already-full list of problems.

Without a good faculty, imposing buildings are useless. If we had wanted to be taught by "graduate assistants," we could have gone to the University of Georgia and saved a lot of money.

"COLLEGE EDITORS PUZZLE EVERYONE"

DIANA DENTON

Some time ago a piece carrying this title fell into my hands. At the time I found it quite amusing and somewhat relevant, since I had only recently gone into retirement from that position of time-honored "scape-goatism," and looking back with all the wisdom of one who just a few short weeks ago had held the job, I could understand only too well what the author must have meant.

At times like this, however, I find it more relevant still. Why is the editorship a job that no one wants (the answer to that one is quite easy, but here's the cincher)—until one editor has for some reason or another been dropped from the office and it becomes a job that no one in his right mind would touch with a ten-foot pole? Or does Mercer merely choose an astrologically-ominous season to elect her editors? In the spring elections for the past four years, an editor has been elected for the Cluster in a completely uncontested campaign, yet when fall quarter of the past two years has seen the demise of those wearing the ink-and-blood-stained apron of the votary, there has always ensued an election with a surprising number desiring the post and often surprising in the identities of those who then offer themselves for public service.

But such idiosyncracies of Mercer's electoral processes are not the only interesting aspects of the editorial question. Editorialist Mike Engleman of the Dallas, Texas, Morning News once wrote in his column: "College editors puzzle everyone, and no one in his right mind could ever figure out why college editors write what they do.

Being editor of a college newspaper is like driving down the highway with one headlight burned out—everyone knows you're cockeyed except you. Not only does the college editor believe his pen is mightier than the proverbial sword, he is convinced it's more powerful than the dean of men, more popular than the captain of the football team and, above all, more far seeing than the University President.

THE COLLEGE editor must prod an unconcerned administration into getting the chug holes in the campus streets patched. He must expose the brutal tactics of the campus police who insist on ticketing automobiles parked in fire lanes. ("And why do we need fire lanes on this campus? All the buildings are made of brick.")

He cannot allow any hot story to escape public attention, including the one about the professor who was seen in a nightclub across town with a blonde.

Not only is he charged with the sacred responsibility of publicly advising the school's president, he must also give public counsel to the president of the United States.

And what does he receive in return? The president tells him he will lose his job the next time he proposes an all-school panty raid. His English professor chides him in front of the entire class for writing "like" instead of "as." He is condemned by the student council in a 20-0 vote (his fraternity brother voted "present").

He is expected to edit a 27-page letter on the meaning of mankind for the letters from readers column. And the chug holes never get filled.

Some critics believe that the policy of letting the student editor be his own boss is the best answer. After spending an exhausting year advising everybody on everything, he usually grows up to be a newspaperman—at which time he learns quickly that he doesn't know very much at all.

When he has worked for a while on city newspaper, he looks back and admits that no one can explain why a college editor writes what he does—not even an ex-college newspaper editor. And that includes this writer."

This writer might add that the college editor is also at times informed he writes "like" an "as"—and at times may stoop to plagiarism!