

THE MERCER CLUSTER

Editor  
Billy Geeslin

Business Manager  
Tuck Callaway

Clyde Calhoun } Managing Editors  
Annie Wheat Jones }  
Ernest Baskin ..... Advertising Manager  
Leon Garfield ..... Sports Editor  
Harry Goldgar ..... Feature Editor  
Eleanor Bethea ..... Fraternity Editor  
John Couric ..... News Editor  
Adel Jones ..... Circulation Manager

News reporters: Ward Pritchett, Lee Wood Jr., Margaret Zeigler, Gordon Eldridge, Gainer Bryan Jr., Ann Millican, Harry Smith, John West, Bob Darby, Cecil Bowen, John Hearne, Harold Hollingsworth, W. C. Calhoun, Mary Halliburton and Carter Hill.

Feature reporters: Evelyn Neel, Sarah Boone, Mrs. Bessie Jolly and Bill Preston.

Business Staff: Frank Bozeman, J. B. Burch.

Sports reporters: Ben Watkins, Assistant Sports Editor; Malcolm Thomas, Lee Coney, Bob Sparks, Q. R. Nolan, Raymond O'Quinn, and Dorothea Kilgore, Coed Reporter.

Entered as second-class matter September 8, 1924, at the post office at Macon, Georgia, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Published each Friday during the college year except holidays and final examination periods by the students of Mercer University.

Rank Propaganda

Students interested in trickery and deception as employed by the artful propagandists of Herr Hitler, Stalin, et al need not cross the waters of the Atlantic to find fit material for their study.

Indeed, it became apparent this week that we have in our midst propaganda artists who, with little effort, could replace such "small fry" as the Nazi Minister of Propaganda Goebbels. And what's more they could probably take over without any more pre-training than that which they have received at Mercer.

We refer of course, to the ignorant, spineless—and we might add gutless—authors of the now well-known mimeographed sheet, "Goose and Gander Gossip". Ignorant because they apparently have never functioned as a member of the Cluster staff and know less than nothing about printing costs and the mechanics of publication. Spineless because they continually presented only one side, if it can be called that, of every point they popped off about. Gutless, because at this writing they have refused to even admit they wrote the "thing." Although we did not wish to dignify the propaganda by publishing it, The Cluster offered to carry the contents of the sheet but could find no one willing to sign their name to it.

A seven-year-old could find holes big enough for the whole Mercer backfield to go through in almost any part of the argument (?).

As a general rebuttal to the whole sheet, one needs only to bring out the fact that, if it is conceded that discrimination is being practiced on the Cluster, it is merely an outgrowth of the deplorable political system now in effect on the campus. A third-rate contractor will tell you there can be no thought of repairing the roof of a house until the foundation is laid. So by condemning what they describe as "partisanships" in any phase of campus life, these anonymous propagandists are shooting at exactly what they purpose to uphold.

Typical of their inaccuracy is the point raised about favoritism to the editor's "tribe" during rushing season. True, two feature stories about alumni of his fraternity were published. But not a word did the deceivers say about the other contents of the three editions issued during rush period. Investigation reveals that stories were carried featuring three members of Kappa Sigma fraternity and two pictures of brothers of that group, a picture and story concerning SAE's, one picture of a Kappa Alpha and one picture of a member of ALT. Two non-fraternity men were pictured as was Lee Battle. We do not know the greek ancestry of the latter.

It is fortunate that regardless of the many evils of our political system, it has not placed these anonymous propagandists in office.

Thank God for that.

LETTERS TO THE CLUSTER

The following unsolicited letters were submitted to the Cluster following distribution last Tuesday of an anonymous Mimeographed sheet entitled, "Goose and Gander." Editors regret that space limitations prohibit publication of a letter written by Sam Lowe, aspirant to the editorship last spring. However, since Lowe's letter was essentially favorable to the editorial stand taken by the Cluster last week on the subject of politics at Mercer, it feels that no injustice is being done. These columns are now, and shall continue to be, open for the expression of student opinion. Letters directed to the Cluster should be left in the offices of the paper in Penfield Hall.

Editor of the Mercer Cluster:

On the morning of December 5, we were presented with copies of the current GOOSE AND GANDER GOS-SIP, the initial issue of which was received with much pleasure, since we are mad at no one. We herein answer this noble sheet in our capacities as fairly important, and more or less influential, members of the business and editorial department of the Cluster, respectively.

I, Ernest Baskin, Jr., would like to take issue over the ninth paragraph of the GOOSE AND GANDER GOS-SIP, relative to the pruning of the Cluster and the Cluster expenses.

My political friends, the Quack Boys, have committed a grave political error, one common in Georgia politics I admit, but which I did not expect our polished politicians to do in such an amateurish manner. In other words, they made a flagrant inference in the ninth paragraph before researching to see whether the statement was true or false. Shame on you, Quack Boys, shame on you. You appear to be amateur politicians.

In the first place, if you will drop by Room 221 in Sherwood Hall anytime, I will be only too glad to let you pore over the Cluster's books to your heart's content. It may interest you to know that the Cluster cost twenty-two (22) dollars more per week for the first eight issues than last year for the printing expense only. The printing cost of the Cluster this year for an issue (four five column pages) is exactly the same as the printing cost of the Cluster last year for an issue (four six column pages). Indeed, Quack boys, the printing cost has increased due largely to the installment of the new streamlined type.

The Cluster appropriation has been increased thirty-three cents per student for the school year; the local advertising shows an increase over the same period for last year, I admit. However, the national advertising is off considerably. I am sure that my illustrious friends, probably acquainted thoroughly with the publishing field, know that the national collegiate advertising is in the hands of a monopoly. You take what they give you, and can make no comeback. Two of our major national accounts are the same for this year, while we have lost two others through our national service, a fault no one on the present staff is to blame for. They simply stopped their collegiate advertising. The national advertising income has been cut some one-third since last year, a fact which is very apparent after some little study. I will be happy to show you files of this year and last year's Cluster to prove this point.

Thus, you see, since our per week income is up only a few dollars over

that of last year, we found it difficult to meet a new budget of twenty-two additional dollars per week.

In fact, old chaps, the Cluster is definitely in the RED at the present moment, and that is why the size of the paper was pruned. As soon as the deficit is overcome, the former size will be resumed, I promise you.

In fact, politicians, if you can find ANYONE who wants my thankless job in order to put out a larger Cluster, I will gladly resign, teach him (or her) all I know about the local situation, and even throw in something to boot. I warn you in advance, however, that it is a profitless job.

I, Harry Golagar, stand in the peculiar position of last year having run, and having been defeated by a not-too-numerating margin, for editor of the Silhouette on the opposite ticket from the editor of the Cluster. My political sentiments, that is, were definitely on the side of the publishers of last Tuesday's propaganda sheet.

Nevertheless, I KNOW, and can speak from experience, that the editor of the Cluster has been consistently absolutely fair and impartial in selection of his staff and in writing his editorials. The mere fact that I hold a fairly prominent position on the paper is proof enough of this.

If more proof is desired, however, it may interest the Quack boys to know that for over a month at the beginning of the quarter, Editor Geeslin practically begged a freshman who had been editor of his high school paper—and who had pledged a rival fraternity—to come out for the Cluster. This freshman consistently refused—why, I do not know. If it happens that there are twelve members of the editor's fraternity on the Cluster staff, it is simply because they came out for the paper and showed themselves worthy, and for no other reason. Let me repeat here that politically I am, and almost undoubtedly will continue to be, aligned with the faction opposing that of the present Cluster editor—but I seek for truth.

The Cluster's campaign against dirty politics is a result of STAFF CONFERENCES among the editors of the paper, including myself. It is thus distinctly not the single idea of Mr. Geeslin at all, but the unanimous decision of all members of his editorial staff. One instance of the awful travesty of our campus politics is here a case in point: Last year the present editor of the Cluster was almost defeated in the spring elections by a man absolutely without journalistic experience or interest in journalism as a career.

The matter of smaller cuts of some people in the homecoming issue, which is getting rather picaresque, it seems to me—can be answered briefly in the fact that these were the only cuts of these people. And unfortunately, the Cluster is not in a financial position to have special cuts made whenever it wants to run a picture. Full details on this point may be had from the business manager or any of the rest of us.

Both of us, in fact, although we have attempted here to give the FACTS—and we cannot but believe that we are in a better position to know the facts than our friends the Quack Boys—will be happy to further explain and elucidate the points involved in personal conversation with the Quack Boys. If, that is, they are not afraid to reveal themselves.

Sincerely,

ERNEST BASKIN  
Advertising Manager  
HARRY GOLGAR  
Feature Editor

December 5, 1939

Editor of the Cluster:

Dear Sir:— Since my name is being mentioned in connection with the newest of our campus publications, I feel obliged upon to state my position on the issue raised by your editorial of December first.

I should like to say that I do not charge the present editor with misappropriation of funds or excessive favoritism toward his own fraternity. I do find that possibly some degree of favoritism has been shown but I am inclined to believe that our editor might have been so influenced by "the Mercer Brain Trust"—I would think that such as has happened has not been intentionally political in nature but perhaps due to the editor's own gullibility, I do not find him blameworthy.

As most of the students on this campus know, I have long been a friend of what is popularly called "campus politics" as they exist at this institution. I have frequently made the statement and I make it again that the various attempts to reform the methods by which we elect our campus officers have been no more than the mere pulling of a skunk across the path in an effort to mislead the students of this university. I know that in the past the effort has not been sincerely made but has been made from the standpoint of personal advantage. I agree with the author of Goose and Gander in condemning this as the lowest possible order of political activity.

It seems to me that the point raised in your aforementioned editorial is whether or not our present system of election should be junked in favor of a bunch of idealistic poppycock or should it be retained as the fairest and best means of taking care of this vital student problem.

We need color at Mercer. Our present political system gives us some measure of it. For the sake of all that's worthwhile, let us resolve not to lose what little of the precious stuff we have left. It seems to me that past editors of your paper have been instrumental in tearing down the other traditions that contributed to the things that made our school unique.

You have very capably presented one side of the picture. As outlined by you, perhaps most answers to your question "Is this what we want?" would be NO! I am sure that those of us who know however would answer YES because the picture you have presented is biased and prejudicial. You have outlined the machinery that is used true enough, but your interpretation of its management is unfair, misleading, and wholly out of order. As I said a few moments ago, once again the skunk is being dragged across the path!

The system that is in use at Mercer today closely corresponds to that used in our national, state, and city elections. It is the same system that has been in use since the early days of our republic. If that system has been good enough for these important things—it's good enough for Mercer. We who favor the retention of our present system feel that the operation of our present system of electing officers gives the student body not only an inside view into how actual elections are conducted but gives him the thrill of actually being in on the thing.

Regardless of system, the best man will not always win, but I would be loathe to say that the men who have been elected here under this system were not as good as we could have gotten under any other system. In closing I would like to remind those who now sit in the seats of the mighty that it was under our present system that they got where they are—I fail to see how they can condemn a system which gave them their job but, perhaps that's gratitude.

I call upon those here who want to see Mercer preserve the things that go to make her what she is to rally to the support of this grand old institution that we Mercer students have thus far preserved. Protect her from the onslaught of those who would take a system that is fair, just altogether praiseworthy in spite of its defects and substitute an unworkable utopia that after all is probably just another Munich.

Yours truly,  
J. E. RICKENBACKER

Editor's note: The remarks concerning the personal integrity of the editor are sincerely appreciated and we promise to guard against the "gullibility" mentioned in the future. The Cluster can in part repay the writer by saying that he has been outstanding in several phases of campus life. But as for this mythical See EDITOR'S NOTE, Page 4

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

This is to certify that I have reviewed the records kept by the Business Manager of the Mercer Cluster, for the year 1939-40, and below is an itemization:

Estimated income from sale of ads, both national and local, plus income from student fees to date, December 1, 1939, \$467.83  
Estimated expenditures, printing bill \$618.50  
typewriter 10.75  
Engraving 5.35  
survey 5.00  
\$639.60

Estimated deficit

\$171.77

Yours truly,  
M. R. BROWN, Treasurer.

To the Editor,  
Mercer Cluster.  
Dear Sir:

This is to certify that account on Cluster shows a deficit of \$181.63 as of September 1, 1939.

Yours truly,  
M. R. BROWN, Treasurer.