



Ruthia McGlaun
EDITOR

Betsy Livingston
BUSINESS MANAGER

Robert H. Hurt
MANAGING EDITOR

John Krueger
NEWS EDITOR

Executive Editor
LUCIAN ASBELL

Staff Photographer
WARD LOWRANCE

Associate Editors
GRANGER RICKS
LARRY MAIORELLO
HUGH LAWSON
NELL HITCHCOCK
RONALD CARR

Copy Editor
JEANE FULWOOD

Feature Editor
TIM GILL

Sports Editor
CHARLIE ETHERIDGE

Social Editor
MARY JANE CARTER

Contributing Editors
ELAINE HUDSON
ANNE JOHNSON

News Staff: Lynn Holmes, Don Power, Bill Sarbrough, Amy Garrison, Karen Kennedy, Loy Knight, Dick Shiver, Carolyn Arnold, Kaye Wells, Dana Poole, Ann Walker, Cynthia Adams, Mary Payne, Katie Koellner, Arnold Brawner, Margaret Smith, Lynda Shaw, and Barbara Bradley.

Editorial Assistants: Jean Smith, Judy Kennerly.

Business Staff: Embry Collins

Feature Staff: Ronald Carr, Allen Lewis, Toni Vissage.

Sports Staff: Jack C. Fincher, Bobby Lamb, Jere Key.

The Talent and Energy of Georgians

Few people believe that any of the plans formulated by state officials to save the county unit system will be able to actually accomplish this after the action of the Federal court in Atlanta. However, the three judges did say that if the county unit system could be made as fair as the electoral college for selecting presidents that unit voting is not objectionable. This does give defenders of the county unit system considerable encouragement.

It is hoped that as much good energy will not be wasted by Georgians fighting this federal court decision condemning the county unit system as it has operated in Georgia recently as has been expended by Georgians fighting other court decisions of late. Much of the talent and energy of Georgia has been spent defending customs and institutions that simply are not worth it. When enough Georgians really aim to abolish discrimination and corrupt political practices it will be unnecessary to resent federal court decisions. We will have effected the desirable political and social amendments ourselves.

LUCIAN ASBELL

Nonconformists and Events

UPON IDEAS: What manner of yawning sophistication is this I sense about me? What sort of minds inhabit the co-op trading trifles as if fanciful, whimsical little imaginings and jabber were the things to discuss after having thought out all the larger matters? Is it conceivable that some persons who are able to thus do nothing actually may not be able to yield a comprehensible answer to any question of much importance? Surely not, for such carefree silence must stem from a reasonable assurance that they have a variety of good answers or can destroy the question by demonstrating against all comers that life is quite without meaning. At least some such condition should be the case among persons who give themselves out as being in a place to learn if they are able to affect such a superior and elevated attitude. I say "affect" because it seems to be a simple matter of affectation.

Now if we are only affecting either of these learned attitudes, then it must mean that we lack the knowledge to back up either a set of careful, believable answers to matters of large concern or in the other case we are a bit fearful that we may be forced to admit our existence has some meaning when we try to tell the opposition that it has none. In either case our deficiency must be a lack of knowledge. Ah, but how can this be among minds sure that they are some of the finest minds in all the world, among persons so well favored in wit, beauty, elegance, or among persons who have surely reached a high level of sophistication?

You say the world generally is round; the earth revolves about the sun. Kindly tell me why Copernicus instead of Ptolemy. Ptolemy would demand an explanation. Would we have to yield? Are there yet objective proofs? Explain to me your indeterminate freedom. What are these objectives moral truths? On the other hand what assures you there are none? Tell me a bit about the electron or some of the smaller subatomic particles. What does the word "entropy" imply? Is it possible that a devil deceived you into this religion? What do you mean by "my Self?" Tell me on what your knowledge rests or affirm the impossibility of knowing. What do you mean, "I know?" This could be a very long list indeed, but the point seems clear enough.

Let us then return to our question. Is there nothing to be thought about and nothing to be learned? Why this silent yawning, affected, and disgusting air of superiority and sophistication

which is all too widespread?

In defense of pastors: They (pastors) are sometimes a bit thick skulled and slow, being rendered thereby at times somewhat ridiculous and the loser in many a joke or story. But despite these limitations which block their ability to communicate, it is hard to deny that most of them being motivated by their response to an overwhelming love probably have more concern, care, or love for things human than those who laud humanity so extravagantly. What deaths the best of these men must die when they who are wholly given up to other than this world and yet bound herein, rise up among other men aware that from what God seems to require of them they are far worse than any of those to whom they speak. To believe "foolishness" is hard indeed, but in this condition to proclaim it before men requires a courage that does not arise from human dust alone.

Upon nonconformists: If "ist" implies conformity to certain ideas, attitudes, or what not, then there can hardly be such a thing. Whatever people have in mind when they apply this word to themselves or others it seems they might do better to end the word in "er" for this ending seems to refer to a distinguishable person instead of a type of persons. However, I trust nonconformity is going out of style, for I see that some of this place's lowest types have come to adore it while many of the merely mediocre have forgotten about it. (In case you feel a bit of guilt and come to hate me let me hasten to say that I actually had no one in mind, but was merely sharpening my tongue on a well worn stone.)

Upon events: Are you in there? Yes. Then let me in. No. I said let me in. I said, no. Then I'll come in anyhow. You shouldn't have. Look at me. No. Do you fear to? Yes. Why do you fear? It doesn't matter. Now you cannot help but see me. Then I see you. What do you see? You. But what about me? Nothing. Do not resist me. I shall resist you. And I shall overcome you, and you are as weak as putty or water. I am weak. And you yield? I yield, yes. Will you come again? I don't know. I would like to know. Does it matter? No. You love me. No, I do not. Then I shall not come again. But you could, you know. Then it does matter. Yes, it does. Does it matter because it's me? No. Then why does it matter? It matters for my own sake. Then I shall not come again. It's as well, for that way it doesn't really matter.

The Buddhist and the Christian Encounter

By RONALD CARR

In his Thursday chapel address, Dr. Calloway spoke on "The Buddhist Way to Peace". He described Buddhism as "a quest for escape from all suffering by the conquest of desire." Desire, the Buddhist reasons, is inevitably frustrating. Thus, freedom from desire brings undisturbed tranquility. To want nothing is deliverance for the Buddhist.

"How does one achieve this utter detachment, this undisturbed tranquility?" Dr. Calloway asked. "The Buddhist's answer is", he said, "the recognition of the universal truth in oneself". This universal truth could probably be summed up in one sentence: No 'self' is to be subject to desire and nothing is to be desired. "This", Dr. Calloway affirmed, "is not a mere intellectual realization. It must be an existential experience."

The "Enlightenment" which for the Buddhist, is this state of utter detachment or undisturbed tranquility, can be acquired through two ways: (1) Hinayana and (2) Mahayana. Both of these are philosophical concepts as well as alternate approaches to the "enlightenment."

In Hinayana, everything is conceived as "sandcastles on the beach of eternity". To the Hinayana Buddhist the "enlightenment" (nirvana) is realized through the conquest of desire, though its nature is beyond the possibility of description by any analogies derived from the world of ordinary experience, the world of external phenomena. The Hinayana Buddhist, however, does conceive of objective existence, but, nevertheless, he knows that these phenomena are temporary and transitory. They are "sunya". Nothing has an abiding identity. Thus, in realization of this truth, the Hinayana Buddhist has no desire for sandcastles (things in the external world) which will be swept away by the angry seas of eternity. The Hinayana Buddhist, in other words, can conceive of the external world as existing but, because it is so transitory, he can view this world with utter detachment and tranquility. The word, "Hinayana", means "the lesser vehicle", signifying that there is only one way to "nirvana", the orthodox method given by Gautama, founder of Buddhism.

"Mahayana" means "the greater vehicle". The Mahayana Buddhist believes that there are many roads to the top of the mountain (enlightenment).

Mahayana Buddhism, like Hinayana Buddhism, leads to passionless detachment. However, the Mahayana Buddhist must conceive of all reality as simply ideas. In fact, the "self", in its essential being, is the mind (of the individual) which conceives of an external world. Dr. Calloway gave this analogy:

"Pretend you are facing a gigantic mirror. Everything you see is merely a reflection in this giant mirror. These reflections, however, have no objective source. They are coming out of the mirror itself. Now, if you can conceive of your mind as that mirror, you have just entered "experientially" into the Mahayana experience." Moreover, if one can conceive of this mirror constantly as the "mirror of his own consciousness", affirming that "nothing has existence outside his mind", he is a Mahayana Buddhist." In short, to the Mahayana Buddhist, nothing is, in reality, external to the mind. The practical result of Mahayana "enlightenment" is the same for Hinayana "enlightenment": The mind is divorced from all desire since it has rejected, or, at least rendered meaningless, the external world of phenomena. It is thus free to float lightly, like the lotus leaf, a sacred symbol of Buddhism, on the restless seas of an angry world. This "existential experience" is Dr. Glover maintains, "an escape from the fear of historical existence."

"The Buddhist", Dr. Calloway affirmed, "cannot have value judgments. Everything has an absolute sameness. There are no signs of distinction between phenomena because they are all of the same kind. There is no birth, no death, no good, no evil, nothing worth striving for, and nothing to be avoided. Any distinctions would imply an external world, and the external world can be, at best, a delusion for the Mahayana Buddhist."

"Conceptually considered", Dr. Calloway pointed out, "the enlightened Buddhist' mind seems negatively, as a 'renunciation of life'. However paradoxically, the Mahayana Buddhist can positively accept the world, since by desiring nothing, he can accept everything and can affirm even the external world as "delightful signs of the Buddhist manifestation of ultimate reality."

Little Words of Thanks And Inadequate Expressions Of More Than Gratitude

Despite the people who come and go calling themselves editors, columnist and peddlers of ads, the CLUSTER seems to be a merry institution with the capacity to endure. An editor is grateful that completely demolishing the CLUSTER seems to lie beyond the ability of one incompetent. But most of all an editor is grateful to those persons who collaborated to form a staff. The following persons merit something beyond little words of thanks:

Betsy Livingston, who can turn a hasty dollar, and who ran half the Cluster "period."

Fulwood, the theologian-biologist-executive who can give structure to anything and has done as much for a few organizations on campus including the CLUSTER. She should do USC a lot of good, since they have invited her up to do graduate work, next year.

Bobby Hurt, who knows what a newspaper should be; one is inclined to say it runs in the family.

Ward Lowrance, the most over-worked man on campus, an artist among other things.

Lucian Asbell and Tim Gill who afforded us something to be against on weeks when their columns did not afford us something to delight in. They are the spirits of any publication.

Larry Maiorello, one of the sane members of the CLUSTER. One with concern for the campus and the CLUSTER, who will edit "it" next week.

Granger Ricks, columnist and advisor. We are glad Yale will have him next year if Mercer can't.

Hugh Lawson and Nell Hitchcock. Their contributions were sports articles and ideas concerning various and sundry things.

John Krueger, Charlie Etheridge, Jack Fincher, Jr., and Jere Key, who covered basketball, tennis, baseball and other sports.

Ronald Carr, who contributed copy that nobody else was persevering, honest, or qualified enough to submit.

Hanna Saad, Lee Going and Dick Shiver who supplied the CLUSTER with a few good moments.

David Payne who covered fashions and knew his subject.

Mary Jane Carter, social editor. (Social, competent and utterly dependable.) The Cauldron will prosper next year when she edits it.

Margaret Smith who would have made a fortune typing for the Cluster if it had paid her as much as twenty-five cents per hour.

Dana Poole and Kaye Wells. They performed unglorious tasks like mailing out and delivering papers.

Elaine Hudson, Anne Johnson and Katie Koellner, three of the happiest things that happened to news staff, or the freshman class.

Every other member of the business and news staff. To those good friends of the Cluster who sent their pledges to chase copy, and to the poor pledges, inadequate words of thanks.

Editor