

The Mercer Cluster

May 5, 1967

Volume XLVIII, No. 17

EDITOR-IN CHIEF
Tom Cauthorn



ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Wright Davis

BUSINESS MANAGERS
Barbara Gantt
Harry Moore

MANAGING EDITOR
Becky Sims

Editor at Large Clyde Hoover
Exchange Editor Russ Drummond
Executive Editors Bill Dayton, Bobby Phillips
Sports Editor Art Hapner
Feature Staff Claudia Young, Kim Kieburtz, Reid Banks, Dan Newell
Staff Wardlyn Mills, Dori Ripley, DIAnne Bradford, Tad Mollenkamp, Pat Armstrong, Grady Kirbo, Willard Clutchmyer
Faculty Advisor Prof. Anthony Stansfeld

The Citizen and the University

By Senator J. William Fulbright

Second In A Series Of Four Articles From The Senator's Book "The Arrogance Of Power"

Freedom of thought and discussion gives a democracy two concrete advantages over a dictatorship in the making of foreign policy: it diminishes the danger of an irretrievable mistake and it introduces ideas and opportunities that otherwise would not come to light.

The correction of errors in a nation's foreign policy is greatly assisted by the timely raising of voices of criticism within the nation. When the British launched their disastrous attack on Egypt, the Labour Party raised a collective voice of indignation while the military operation was still under way; refusing to be deterred by calls for national unity in a crisis, Labour began the long, painful process of recovering Great Britain's good

This is the second of four articles taken from the chapter titled, "The Citizen and the University" from "THE ARROGANCE OF POWER" by Senator J. William Fulbright.

name at the very moment when the damage was still being done. Similarly, the French intellectuals who protested France's colonial wars in Indochina and Algeria not only upheld the values of French democracy but helped pave the way for the enlightened policies of the Fifth Republic which have made France the most respected Western nation in the underdeveloped world. It has been in the hope of performing a similar service for America on a very modest scale that I criticized American intervention in the Dominican Republic and that some of my colleagues and I have raised questions about the wisdom of American military involvement in Vietnam.

The second great advantage of free discussion to democratic policy-makers is its bringing to light of new ideas and the supplanting of old myths with new realities. We Americans are much in need of this benefit because we are severely, if not uniquely, afflicted with a habit of policy-making by analogy: North Vietnam's involvement in South Vietnam, for example, is equated with Hitler's invasion of Poland and a parley with the Viet Cong would represent "another Munich." The treatment of slight and superficial resemblances as if they were full-blooded analogies — as instances, as it were, of history "repeating itself" — is a substitute for thinking and a misuse of history.

There is a kind of voodoo about American foreign policy. Certain drums have to be beaten regularly to ward off evil spirits — for example, the maledictions regularly uttered against North Vietnamese aggression, the "wild men" in Peking, communism in general, and President de Gaulle. Certain pledges must be repeated every day lest the whole free world go to rack and ruin — for example, we will never go back on a commitment no matter how unwise; we regard this alliance or that as absolutely "vital" to the free world; and of course we will stand stalwart in Berlin from now until Judgment Day. Certain words must never be uttered except in derision — the word "appeasement," for example, comes as near as any word can to summarizing everything that is regarded by American policy-makers as stupid, wicked, and disastrous.

Free and open criticism has a third, more abstract but no less important function in a democracy: it is therapy and catharsis for those who are troubled by something their country is doing; it helps to reassert traditional values, to clear the air when it is full of tension and mistrust. There are times in public life as in private life when one must protest, not solely or even primarily because one's protest will be politic or materially productive, but because one's sense of decency is offended, because one is fed up with political craft and public images, or simply because something goes against the grain. The catharsis thus provided may indeed be the most valuable of freedom's uses. **The Vietnam Protest Movement**

While not unprecedented, protests against a war

in the middle of the war are a rare experience for Americans. I see it as a mark of strength and maturity that an articulate minority have raised their voices against the Vietnamese war and that the majority of Americans are enduring this dissent, not without anxiety, to be sure, but for the moment at least with better grace and understanding than would have been the case in any other war of the twentieth century.

It is by no means certain that the relatively healthy atmosphere in which the debate has been taking place will not give way to a new era of McCarthyism. Critics of the Vietnamese war are being accused of a lack of patriotism, and these accusations are coming not only from irresponsible columnists but, with increasing frequency, from the highest levels of government. This situation is likely to become worse. The longer the Vietnamese war goes on without prospect of victory or negotiated peace, the higher the war fever will rise; hopes will give way to fears, and tolerance and freedom of discussion will give way to a false and strident patriotism.

In Mark Twain's novel *The Mysterious Stranger* a benevolent and clairvoyant Satan said the following about war and its corrosive effects on a society:

"There has never been a just one, never an honorable one — on the part of the instigator of the war. I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in so many as half a dozen instances. The loud handful — as usual — will shout for the war. The pulpit will — warily and cautiously — object — at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, earnestly and indignantly, 'It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it.' Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing: the speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers — as earlier — but do not dare to say so. And now the whole nation — pulpit and all — will take up the war-cry, and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing falsities, and will diligently study them and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception."

Past experience provides little basis for confidence that reason can prevail in an atmosphere of mounting war fever. We must try nonetheless to bring reason and restraint into the emotionally charged atmosphere in which the Vietnamese war is now being discussed. Instead of trading epithets about who is and is not giving "aid and comfort" to the enemy, we would do well to focus calmly and deliberately on the issue itself, recognizing that all of us make mistakes and that mistakes can be corrected only if they are acknowledged and discussed further that war is not its own justification, that it can and must be discussed unless we are prepared to sacrifice our traditional democratic processes to a false image of national unanimity.

(Excerpted by permission of Random House, Inc. from "THE ARROGANCE OF POWER," by Senator J. William Fulbright, Copyright, 1966, by J. William Fulbright.)



By Tom Cauthorn

Last Wednesday, April 26, Representative John J. Flynn of Griffin announced that 42 colleges and universities in Georgia would receive \$1.1 million to finance work study programs for 4,577 students. This outlay of cash comes under the U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity and will allocate for payment of ninety percent of the Economic Opportunity Act during the summer and seventy-five percent during the fall and winter months.

Unfortunately Mercer was not included in the list of schools and this omission is quite distressing when one reviews the announcement. \$284,280 was listed for the program in nine Atlanta-area schools which included Morehouse College, Morris Brown University, Clark College, Georgia Institute of Technology, DeKalb College, Spelman College, Georgia State College, and Emory University. These schools are representative because the list includes University-System schools, private institutions, and church affiliated universities.

West Georgia will receive \$132,060 in funds for 400 students and among others in the list was Berry College getting \$50,700.

It would be quite easy to dismiss the list and the amounts as irrelevant if the question of Mercer's solvency was not a constant topic among students. Of course one can say that these funds are for only one isolated function of a university and therefore are not really important.

Indeed, the amounts are important and so are the forty-two institutions which will receive these amounts. Although the appropriations are not large they are amounts which would free a corresponding proportion of funds in the Mercer budget for other facets of the university's activity.

We are concerned with the number of faculty members who leave Mercer each year to seek a better position or often to receive a higher income. It is logical to suppose that the more money incoming to Mercer would make possible a proportionate raise in standards and excellence in all the ramifications of the university.

These figures are not antagonistic to Mercer's current policy on Federal money but are rather a suggestion or simply meant for thought when next year begins. We should ponder the advantages of extra funds against the disadvantages of a modicum of outside controls. Mercer must not only provide an ever improving atmosphere but also should lend a voice to forces of change and improvement. These Federal dollars are not gifts but rather returns on tax and the conservative trust in the republican welfare state.

Daylight Saving Time, Or Date-Night Wasted Time

by Dan Newell

Anyone who managed to set his or her clock ahead (instead of back) last Saturday night, and has secured his or her date for this coming Friday night, is in an ideal position to make the observation that daylight saving time is really date-night wasted time.

Consider these two axioms: (1) The number of hours in a day are constant, if the number of daylight hours are increased, the number of dark hours are decreased. (2) In the dating situation, "the hours spent in daylight receive considerably less emphasis than those spent in the dark" (this axiom is con-

siderably older than the first and probably better known). Combined with the fact that the number of hours a male may spend with a co-ed is limited to so many light

and so many dark, these two axioms lead to the conclusion that daylight saving time is the worst thing that's happened to Friday nights at Mercer since the WSGA

handbook. Some simple mathematical calculations will support this conclusion. Suppose you pick up your date and she signs out to go bowl-

ing at the creek. If it is 7:00 p.m. EST, you will arrive at the creek before the dark hour of 8:00, and you will be able to start bowling right away. You will be bowling total darkness from 7:45 till 12:00 i.e., four and one-quarter hours. But... we are on daylight saving (Continued on page 8)