

Bob Hurl
Managing Editor

Executive Editor John Weatherly

Feature Editor Tim Gill

Sports Editor Jack Fincher

Copy Editor Jane Shaw

Yvonne Reeves
Business Manager

Associate Editors: Hugh Lawson, Ronald Carr, Marty Layfield, Hanna Saad, Mary Jane Carter, Al Stephenson, Dick Shiver, Davis McAuley

News Staff: Kaye Wells, Dana Poole, Katie Koellner, Bob Carter, Judy Kennerly, Mary Payne, Barbara Bradley, Charron Pitts, Edward Simmons, Betty Hancken, Carolyn Phillips, Elaine Hudson.

Business Staff: Genie Ashurst (Circulation Manager), Jean Smith, Mafalda Regina, Martha Durden, Tommie Harris, Donna Barrett, Jayne Shields.

Feature Staff: Linda Kelley, Frances Bozeman, Susie Gridley, Elaine Kelly, Susan Battles, Deanna Shiver, Sandra Williams, Deann McCauley, Peggy Jones, Elaine Kelly, Linda Kelley, Elizabeth Johnson, Dick Hyer, Joe Williams.

Sports Staff: Carolyn Arnold, Charles Grant, Jack Lamb, Wayne Poore, James Hicks, Bobby Johnson.

The Mercer Cluster is published weekly, except during holiday and examination periods. It is written, edited and published by the student body of Mercer University. All uncredited opinions in it are the opinions of the student editors, and not necessarily the University's viewpoint. All letters to the editor must be signed; names will be withheld on request. Letters do not necessarily reflect the policy of the paper or the opinion of the editors. Letters should not be longer than 200 words.

Acts of Mississippi Students May Set Example

It is a shameful thing that Americans—the students at the University of Mississippi—have acted so violently in favor of a cause that can never be anything but infamous.

While enthusiasm and high-spiritedness are commendable and have long been a part of college life, the students at "Ole Miss" would do well to re-examine their motives. The pranks of high-spirited college students on a Florida beach are one thing. The vicious actions of a defiant racist mob are quite another.

Perhaps their ill-advised actions will serve to sober the thoughts of other college students throughout the United States of America so that they will not allow themselves to be so carried away by ill-considered emotions that they could be led to commit acts of violence and disrespect for law and order that all decent and thinking persons must decrie.

Despite the antics of a freshman during Rat Week, we believe that this could never happen at Mercer.



JOHN WEATHERLY

Should Mississippi Be Allowed To Remain In The Union?

Traditionally states have been discouraged from seceding from the union. Although this tendency has had its opponents from time to time, it has, nonetheless, been able to prevail . . . even in the face of a rather heated debate between our Southland and the Yankees in the years between 1861 to 1865.

Apparently the Mississippi state senator that suggested a bill to sever his state's link with the union was unaware of these considerations. Perhaps it's just as well. It might be well that we forget this tradition long enough to make an exception in the case of Mississippi and possibly Alabama.

Certainly such a move is fraught with clear and present dangers. Two of them come immediately to mind.

First, it would prove uncomfortable for those states near the end of the economic ladder. When the charts are drawn up they could no longer say with relief, "Thank God for Mississippi!"

And secondly, there is also the danger that a Mississippi nation might align itself with the Communists. They might even join with Cuba in allowing the Soviets to stockpile armaments near our borders.

In fact, these are serious dangers and I make little or no attempt to refute them save to suggest that we could "invade" Mississippi with less embarrassment should she be a separate nation as Cuba. (And we trust the far right would insist on this.) But I do want to point out quite firmly that should she remain in the union the results might well prove far more disastrous. Especially, I should think, to us Southerners.

First, Governor Barnett sets a bad precedent for the Negro community when he suggests that laws and judicial decrees are not binding when some groups such as the segregationists find them at odds with their unique interests. Such affirmations can only give aid and comfort to a certain gentleman named Martin Luther King, Jr.

As divergent as their separate interests may be, Governor Barnett and the Reverend King join

hands in the principle that their respective interests are somehow holy—in some way above the feeble, plodding processes of human law. It's the old problem of the Divine and the mundane, the Absolute and the finite. Since the interests of segregation Total and Supreme in Governor Barnett's case and desegregation through a creation of a "Beloved Community" in King's thinking are considered the Truth. And since the Truth must prevail as that is its very nature, the demands of both men must, by definition, ultimately be dissatisfied with purely human law and a spirit of political reconciliation.

Yet even with the advent of King and some sit-ins that look to this sort of philosophy, I believe it safe to say that on the whole the Negroes have been reasonably content to accept our somewhat liberal heritage and act within it. You might recall the French revolution and its rent in the political life France when certain semi-disenfranchised elements "went wild" so to speak. In this sense it seems meaningful to speak of the Negroes as "happy."

Thus I don't see how we as Southerners can stand by and let this outsider, Barnett, join forces with King in agitating Negroes with the tune that they can break away from our nice American Way of Life when it suits individual sentiment.

Further, since Mississippi seems to be blind to the methods of her sister states in dealing with the race problem, i.e., since she seems to be unable to throw the Negro such sops as "token integration" and thus provide at least the illusion of enfranchisement, we can only surmise that a long and stormy history of disordered race relations is in the making.

Such political ineptitude can cause us only further embarrassment before the critical eyes of the world. It can only serve as a smokescreen for the evil actions of the Communists.

For these several reasons I feel that the reasonable man can only hope that Mississippi does secede, that she be encouraged in this move, and that if this fails, that such be forcefully insisted upon by the federal government.

Two Chameleons

Before answering the question as to what a conservative liberal (or vice versa) would advocate, it appears necessary to define the meaning of the words "liberal" and "conservative" as they are understood in American politics today.

Such a narrow definition is needed because, unfortunately, of the vacillating nature of these terms. Liberals and Conservatives, like a chameleon, change their colors with the flow and flux of every series of events. For example, a century ago an American liberal would have advocated "laissez-faire" or the protection of big businesses and private property rights above all else. In other words; liberty was given priority over equality. However, by the time of William Howard Taft and the period of "normalcy" (to borrow Harding's terminology) during the 1920's this political philosophy was associated with staunch conservatism.

Moreover, it should be remembered that liberalism and conservatism usually upon the European continent have completely different meaning than they have in the United States. In many European countries, liberalism means "liberty before equality" and conservatism means "equality before liberty". In fact, this is the case in Canada, our next door neighbor. A Canadian Conservative is a radical New Dealer in the American idiom.

An American liberal today is one who upholds equality before liberty but, on the other hand, also recognizes that liberty is as necessary to the maintenance of the political equilibrium of our society as equality. He sees the democratic process as a means by which each can be maintained in a delicate balance. An American conservative, on the other hand, advocates liberty above equality but also maintains that both elements are necessary for the preservation of America's political equilibrium and stability.

DAVIS MCAULEY

Mississippi: Faulkner and Barnett

A recent comment by Ralph McGill juxtaposed a notable Mississippi citizen with a notorious one: William Faulkner and Gov. Ross Barnett, respectively. Just exactly the nature of the relationship between these two seems, in the light of the present situation in Mississippi, to be both interesting and pertinent.

It is as though the executive branch of the Mississippi state government has chosen to dramatize a vivid scene from the pen of the painfully sensitive Nobel Prize winner to illustrate one of the ugliest emotions of the human heart: hate mixed with a false sense of pride and "right."

To an outside observer it might appear as if the legendary Flem Snopes were standing just in the background, as he always does in Faulkner's pages, directing his henchmen toward whatever his demonic ends are. At first glance it might appear that Gov. Barnett is playing Snopes. Though it is true that Barnett is excellent in ruthlessness and defiance of the law, he fails miserably where Snopes excels, that is in skill. The con-

clusion then is that Snopes, as always, is in the shadows directing.

But actually the most clearly revealed fact is that the brutal philosophy of Snopes is in command instead of the traditionally Southern philosophy of honor and nobility. Faulkner, it seems, knew his home state only too well.

Faulkner was cognizant of another attitude that is vividly revealed in what is happening in Mississippi now—the completely unrealistic attitude toward life that has been adopted in some sections. This theme is reflected in "A Rose for Emily," Faulkner's often anthologized story, and is certainly as true of Governor Barnett as of Miss Emily. They both simply refuse to face the world on any terms except their own. Standards other than those they chose to set for themselves simply are not valid. And the standards Governor Barnett evinces are drawn from an unrealistic background as those of Miss Emily, and will result in equally as revolting a stench in the nose of the nation and the world.

Students Should Support Fine Arts Series

In a little more than a week, on October 15, Mercer will present the first program in its new Fine Arts Series. Carlos Montoya, one of the world's most respected flamenco guitarists, will perform in concert.

Montoya was the first of the Spanish guitarists to present concerts without the help of singers or dancers. It was a formidable idea, but Carlos Montoya realized it with equally formidable success, giving solo recitals both in Europe and throughout the United States and Canada. His incredible arrangement supports itself and has become a legend in flamenco music. Montoya's repertoire is characterized by his practice of creating as he plays, with each recital an original innovation on his own compositions based on the Spanish Gypsy tradition.

This program will mark the beginning of a new effort by the university administration to provide Mercer students with some of the most outstanding artists ever seen in this area.

Now it is up to the students. The university can hardly be expected to provide expensive programs for students who won't bother to come to them. The student body can demonstrate their support for the series and make possible more of the same simply by attending the program.



BEANIE OR HELMET?