

The Mercer Cluster

MERCER UNIVERSITY, MACON, GEORGIA

October 19, 1962

Volume XLIII, No. 5

Larry Maioriello, Editor

Bob Hurt
Managing Editor

Yvonne Reeves
Business Manager

Executive Editor

John Weatherly

Feature Editor

Tim Gill

Sports Editor

Jack Fincher

Copy Editor

Jane Shaw

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, Sandra Faulkner

Business Staff: Genie Ashurst (Circulation Manager), Jean Smith, Ma-falda Regina, Martha Durden, Tommie Harris, Donna Barrett, Jayne Shields, Peggy O'Halloran, Betty Anne Lambert.

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

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



MONTOYA AND WIFE DURING CLUSTER INTERVIEW

Good Concert Good Audience

The recent concert in Willingham Chapel was probably as much of a success as any program of its kind ever held there. Certainly it has been many years since an entertainer has received a standing ovation at Mercer. Of course Montoya himself deserves the credit due a performer of his caliber, but we would like to congratulate the persons who are responsible for arranging his concert for Mercer. If the succeeding programs in the Fine Arts Series are of equal caliber, they cannot help but be huge successes.

Congratulations must go also to the Mercerians who came out to see and hear the concert. The audience included not only students, but also faculty, deans and many other staff members of the University. Perhaps partly because of the composition of the audience and partly because of the quality of the program, this was not a typical chapel audience. It was a well-mannered, attentive audience—no talking, whistling, whispering or shuffling in its seats during the musical portions of the show—yet when the occasions called for it the audience showed itself to be a very enthusiastic and appreciative one, applauding thunderously when Montoya's amazing hands ceased their magic and dropped to his lap.

The concert might not have been quite so successful however, but at a crucial moment early in the concert the unsung hero of the evening turned off the electric fans which had been drowning out some of Montoya's more delicate left hand passages.

We hope that Mercerians will continue to show this kind of support to future events which are made available to them.

Letters To The Editor

Dear Editor:

Shame on you Weatherly!

Just who do you think you are to attack a fine, upstanding Patriotic, Constitutional, 100% Mississippian, like Barnett? You talk about philosophy (sic, Ed.), but I'll be darned if I can figure yours out. All Patriotic Mississippians can understand Barnett's time proven maxim: Against, Against, Against (anything).

When you say that Mississippi would join Cuba, you really are out of it. Anyone who keeps up with the international scene knows that the Magnolia state would never join those radical Cubans; they would join the Conservative Albanian Communists!

Signed,
Peter Abelard

Editor

Mercer Cluster

The Cluster reached the height of lowliness in its October 5 issue. Where does this John Weatherly stop? First he wrote an obnoxious column and then he topped it off with an offensive "cartoon".

Such a cartoon berating the esteemed University of Mississippi should never have been printed. When the students at the University of Georgia threw their bricks, I am sure that Ole Miss's publications didn't tear them down.

Tom Privette had a grand idea with which I concur, Good-by John!
Bobby Douthir

RONALD CARR

Leftist Fallacies

(This is the fourth article in a series of six.)

Some people who claim to be patriotic Americans would advocate that equality be maintained at the absolute exclusion of liberty. They would advocate the destruction of private enterprise and individual initiative, the backbones of our American democratic system. They would hark back to Marx's maxim: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs."

Obviously, this socialistic maxim does not provide the key to an egalitarian society. Neither abilities nor needs are equal among the members of society. In fact, in a completely socialistic society, it is very conceivable that a lazy individual will be able to reap as much of the harvest as the most industrious individual. Moreover, it is also conceivable that a potentially industrious individual might, in disgust, sink to the level of the "ne'er-do-well".

In other words, when the man of ability and ambition has his motivation curbed, when he is not free to realize his latent potentialities to their fullest, he will inevitably degenerate to a lower level. Of course, an individual may be theoretically free to realize his potentialities in a socialistic society, but, because there is no "freedom of opportunity" there is, in effect, no real freedom. There remain other obvious fallacies in a social-

istic society beside the above mentioned elimination of the motivational factor. A socialistic (or communistic) society overestimates the dignity of mankind. John Stewart Mills warned against what could happen in a "tyranny of the majority over the minority". It seems to be a serious fallacy in Marxian Communistic ideology, that it assumes that there will be a socialistic Utopia when the "capitalistic exploiters" are finally destroyed as a class, leaving only one class, the working masses.

However, even individuals within the masses may want to rise above the common herd. These individuals may be greedy or simply ambitious, knowing full well that they are not getting a share of the general wealth commensurate with abilities. In other words, superior individuals within the masses may, in fact, eventually form a new minority or "elite". It is in recognition of this fact, that the Russian communists have not permitted the State to wither away. However, the Communist Party in Russia in enforcing equality has also formed an "elitism", in fact, the worst kind—a Stalinist Elitism. In other words, there will always be an "elitism" regarding less of what form it takes because of the simple fact that all people are not equal in ability.

DAVIS MCAULEY

Progressive Prejudice

In the wake of recent racial disturbances it has become apparent who stands on which side of the segregation-integration issue. For despite the claims of some, integration is the real principle at stake rather than the propaganda term "State's Rights."

Response to opinions expressed in a recent Cluster place two groups firmly in the segregation camp. To be sure, blanket statements inherently entail exceptions, but it can be said that the most vocal groups favoring segregation—and presumably then the groups supporting it strongest—are freshmen and law school students.

Certainly the freshmen may be largely excused from any severe censure by virtue of their being so recently from environments where the influence of liberal education is not likely to have been so great as at Mercer. It may be hoped that as their outlooks on the areas of human knowledge and relationships is broadened, this one prejudice against Negroes may vanish as painlessly as do the myriad other notions that are discarded in the process of educating the mind and spirit.

It is disturbing in the extreme, however, to contemplate the opposition to the progress of human dignity encountered in a school preparing practitioners of the bar. This opposition takes on added meaning when it is recalled that traditionally the bar furnishes a large percentage of politicians

both in state and national arenas—though recent Georgia history reveals more notoriety than fame.

Surely it may be assumed that a fair percentage of the present law school student body have political aspirations. They then will seek to guide Georgia and the nation. And still they insist—allowing for exceptions—on holding a view that has been declared by the highest authority that this nation recognizes as incompatible with the principles of the Constitution. The authority referred to is not the Supreme Court but the court of the will and thinking of the American people. Traditionally the Supreme Court has reflected the consensus of American thought. That was true in the case of the "separate but equal" decision in 1893, and there is no reason to suppose that the 1954 Brown decision was less representative. Even Georgia herself recently rejected a former governor who evinced racial segregation.

Present-day students with one eye on a political career should take the present day into consideration. Few institutions have failed to change since 1893, and politics is no exception. But on the contemporary campus of Mercer is a group of professional students who ardently evince a standard long ago abandoned where the blessing of education has been added to the Constitutional canon of benefits secured to posterity.

JOHN WEATHERLY

The overwhelming response of agreement my last column found was most gratifying. I had always felt that Truth walked alone. And I'm glad to have been proven wrong in this instance.

However, I want to caution my outspoken followers against thinking too harshly of the few critics of our viewpoint. We must keep in mind that, as misguided as they might be in certain particulars, we can nevertheless, profit from their comments. More often than not common points of agreement are more significant than slight differences in temperament and outlook.

We have only to look to Mr. Privette to see that this is true. Perhaps the most eloquent and coolly systematic of our critics, he nowhere questions our thesis that Governor Barnett is basically a threat to our Southern Way of Life. It is clearly evident to Mr. Privette—as it must be to any thinking Southerner—that Barnett's blundering in racial matters creates an intolerable situation.

Rather, Mr. Privette only questions the harshness of the solution of secession. He seems to feel that this would be a largely punitive measure—hardly in keeping with our other traditions of gentleness and positive thinking.

And—upon further reflection—I'm inclined to agree with him. We must look elsewhere for a solution. We must be consistent with the values of our "national purpose." Moreover, we must not lapse, as Mr. Arnold warns, into "narrow mindedness."

I therefore offer an alternative solution. To wit: that we negotiate with the Soviet Union with the purpose of swapping Mississippi for Cuba.

First, this move would score a propaganda

A Change of Heart

touchdown for the West. This open invitation to the USSR to stockpile armaments even closer to our border would vividly illustrate the sense of fair play inherent in liberal conservatism. It would say for all the world to hear that we think this only natural since we encircled the Russians with military bases long before the Cuban affair. Our cooperation would only be an affirmation of that ancient liberal tenet, "What's good for the goose is good for the gander."

Since we clearly have more to gain from this than do the Russians in terms of ridding ourselves of Mississippi and obtaining international good will, we might have to throw in another inducement or two—such as Fort Sumter off Charleston harbor.

Secondly, Fidel Castro's value to us in the United States Senate has unlimited possibilities. What better man could we have to stand with the Southern block in opposing northern interference with states rights. Think of his filibustering talents! Further, he would probably want to join with the socialistic liberals occasionally in their efforts to filibuster Telstar ownership bills and such.

Thirdly, since this move might make some conservatives unhappy and since it might be argued that Castro doesn't have enough popular support now in Cuba to win a race for the senate, I think we might solve both problems by returning Cuba's natural resources back to the exploitation by our capitalists. This should calm our conservatives and give back to Castro much of the popular support that he came to power on.

Well, there you are—simplicity itself. Probably all of you will not concur. Some of you will think it too "openminded." Alas! I suppose it always must be so when emotion rules reason. And I have no solution for that.