



MRA PRAISED

Cornhuskin' is one time of the year that offers opportunity for creativity outside of the classroom. It is a time of competition, of high spirits, and of general "fun." This year's Cornhuskin' seemed to be much more in line with the traditional "fun" concept than some have been in years past.

When creativity must be supplemented by vulgarity and profanity, its whole purpose becomes distorted. Although vulgarity was not entirely lacking this year, Cornhuskin' 72 should be applauded as being much closer to the original concept than in years when the scripts and costumes have bordered on sheer repulsiveness.

Since the MRA was successful this year (in cleaning up Cornhuskin'), maybe next year's board could work on shortening the length of the entire activities. With a few gaps filled and true creativity present, Cornhuskin' could prove to be one of the most valuable aspects of student life.

This year the MRA has proved itself capable of producing the viable spirit necessary for a "fun" Cornhuskin'. It is to be hoped that future Cornhuskin's can continue to produce this spirit.
JFS and EEH

NO MANDATE HERE

This week Dr. Weems received a letter from a State student criticizing his recent "mandate" on the grading system here at Meredith and his call for a grading standard which would alleviate the increasing number of A's and B's. Needless to say, Dr. Weems was somewhat surprised to read of a "mandate" that had never occurred.

The student continued to say that he had heard from Meredith students that this type of "standard" was sure to stifle true intellectual endeavors which should take place in a classroom situation. If this sentiment is indicative of the Meredith student body, it is time to question our communications process. We must question whether or not we are trying to "cover up" for inability to make that A or B, or whether we truly feel that the academics are not challenging enough.

I personally have had little if any purpose to believe that there is a secret mandate floating around campus from Dr. Weems and requiring professors to grade by percentages rather than by merit. Apparently Dr. Weems has given no such word.

Indeed the question of grades has been discussed, but it has been in an atmosphere of creating challenging classroom situations rather than stifling them. Few, if any, professors are, I believe, compelled by a higher authority "to give out" grades. They are called, and rightly so, to present challenging classroom situations. These situations are the key to true learning, not false rumors of mandate grading systems which students may have to invent in order to overcome their own weaknesses.
JFS

NIXON'S INTEGRITY IS QUESTIONED ONCE AGAIN

As it approaches election time, I question more than ever the moral integrity of President Nixon. The recent peace agreement with North Vietnam seems to be another facet of his political bargaining pursued solely for his personal gain. The whole thrust of his withdrawal of troops seems to lie in his concern for American lives rather than human lives. Once again we question the length and timing of his peace agreement. Why, in withdrawing American troops, did he still allow more bombs to be dropped than in the two previous administrations combined? Why did he step up the electronic air war to such a degree that no longer are infantry troops necessary; rather, killing has become a mere matter of pushing a button to stop any movement -- women, children, animals -- anything.

Not only do we question Nixon's moral integrity on the Vietnam issue, we also question his stand on domestic affairs. What kind of honesty is it that forms its own secret investigating committee, as illustrated by the Watergate incident. And what kind of honesty is it that allows 9 MAJOR bills to be vetoed as inflationary, bills calling for funds for health, education and welfare. As Senator McGovern questions, why doesn't Nixon admit "that the \$60 billion he's blown up in the last 4 years in Vietnam is also inflationary." Particularly questionable is Nixon's veto of a bill designed to improve veteran hospitals and benefits. Nixon has brought the men home, yes, but they lack arms and legs or are addicted to drugs, and he still vetoes a bill to aid them.

Can we continue, as moral citizens, to support a government which seems to participate constantly in immoral acts? If we re-elect President Nixon on November 7, I shudder to think what other "secret" plans he may have for America as "Big Brother" continues to watch us.
JFS

Give \$1.00 to:

CONCERN FOR BANGLADESH
Bank of Stockton
Stockton, California 95201

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:
Re: The October 18 letter to the Editor from Cathy Rodenberg and Ann Wall concerning the illicit removal of McGovern speech signs, presumably by pro-Nixon supporters.

My first reaction to reading of the removal of the McGovern signs is, hum..even on a college campus, where people are supposedly learning to be tolerant of ideas and to listen to others, we see intolerance and the use of "right is might, and I am right, so my might is right"; and with a mighty tear, down come the "wrong" or "un-right" posters.

My second reaction is, hum.. Rodenberg and Wall have a moral point, but in the second part of their letter they turn political. They ask if the pro-Nixon supporters are afraid of the truth and honesty of the McGovern campaign. This implies that truth and honesty are on the side of McGovern, and, thereby, the pro-Nixon people are in the wrong and afraid of the truth.

We all have a right to truth.

But my truth may not be the same as your truth. And my right to express my truth is just as important as your right to express your truth.

If you tear down my signs then you are prohibiting me from freely expressing my truth. And if I think I have a corner on what is true, then I am not allowing you to know a truth.

The truth shall make us free, but we must ALL be able to express it. What we need is tolerance, the recognition of the right of all people to have truth, and the acceptance that there are as many roads to the truth as there are people.
Respectfully,
George Thomas Chrest
Department of Art.

Dear Editor:

According to the October 26 issue of the THE TWIG, 75% of the Meredith College faculty indicate support of the candidacy of Senator George McGovern. It also announced that another survey taken in a recent convocation showed that a relatively higher proportion of underclassmen support Pres-

ident Nixon than upperclassmen.

I am certain that more conclusions can be drawn from the student survey. Where are the percentages? I, for one, would like to know HOW MANY students of each class support Nixon as well as the number who support McGovern for the presidency. Chances are a majority support Nixon and thus the survey was not included on the "editorial" page of THE TWIG.

I request that this survey be printed in the next issue. Thank You.
NS

Editor's Note: The results of this survey were printed on the "editorial" page but were not given from the editorial staff. This survey was NOT made

by THE TWIG; rather, it was made by a group of students on campus. The numerical results were not turned in for report; the results were and are held to be correct until proven wrong. I will gladly publish any numerical results handed to me.
JFS

Foreign Policy Debated

By PAULA ROWE

Editor's Note: This is the reply of the Republican supporters to re-elect the President to the political debate begun in THE TWIG 2 weeks ago. The first installment covers the foreign policy issue.

When asked for the Nixon position on foreign policy and specifically Vietnam, I agreed to furnish whatever information I could. However it is my firm belief that no one should attempt to act as spokesman for the President. President Nixon's record of the last four years is the best source of information anyone can look to when discussing this important issue. Therefore the following editorial is taken directly from the "Talking Paper," a publication of the Republican National Committee.

"There is no doubt the Democrat opposition has chosen to make Vietnam an issue in this year's presidential campaign. But, for Republicans, there is no need to shy away from this issue.

While Senator George McGovern is spouting wild campaign promises that not even he has any reason to believe he can keep, President Nixon is going about the business of keeping his promises. He is bringing American fighting men out of Vietnam, and he is doing it in the only way that will leave the Vietnamese people with the precious right to choose their own government.

President Nixon has resisted both extremes of the Vietnam issue for nearly four years. One extreme demanded

immediate, unconditional withdrawal of men and aid, regardless of the consequences to the South Vietnamese, our prisoners of war, or world peace. That alternative was rejected.

The other extreme demanded an all-out offensive, barring nothing, to win a military victory over North Vietnam, regardless of the consequences to the helpless citizens of the unfortunate land. This alternative, too, was rejected.

In his 1968 campaign, President Nixon pledged a phased withdrawal of American troops in Vietnam, and he has done that. In his latest announcement, the President set a goal of just 27,000 Americans in Vietnam by December 1. That is a reduction of 522,500 men, or 95 percent of the authorized troop level under President Johnson.

But the President's 1968 promise to end American involvement went one step further. He promised that America would not leave its ally with no defense. He has kept that part of the bargain, too.

The men who now carry the burden of the fighting -- the men who face their enemies in the field -- are South Vietnamese. They have proven themselves capable of defending their country and they have proven it under the most difficult conditions possible -- the invasion of more than a

dozen enemy divisions from the North. Vietnamization has worked; Americans are coming home.

Richard Nixon has said many times that this nation -- for her own sake as well as the sake of world peace -- cannot afford to abandon an ally, no matter how small and how far away. It must be remembered -- especially at this time when we are asking the American people to choose between President Nixon and George McGovern, between a strong America and an America turned inward -- that Richard Nixon has removed our troops but he has left our Vietnamese ally with more than broken commitments with which to defend themselves.

And our American prisoners and those missing in action and their families have not been left alone with only Senator McGovern's shaky promises.

President Nixon has made his position clear to the American people, and he has made it clear to those who would seek to impose their system of government on others. He has told North Vietnam, and he has told us that peace is not secured by giving in to an aggressor. It is secured only by a cessation of the aggression itself.

Every reasonable offer for peace has been put on the negotiating table in Paris. Now it is up to Hanoi.

CONGRATULATIONS

JUNIORS!

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor Janice Sams
Copy Editor Eleanor Hill
Feature Editor Renee Lindsey
Reporting Staff Karen Britt, Claudia Denny, Joy Seaborn, Norma Heath, Catherine Stover, Susan Webster, Mary Owens, Barrie Walton, Gloria Smith
Typists Deborah Phillips, Suzanne Martin, Susan Webster
Faculty Advisers Dr. Norma Rose, Dr. Tom Parramore
Business Editor Libby Owen
Advertising Manager Emily Johnson
Circulation Manager Elaine Williams
Staff Nancy Alvis, Lou Ann Roebuck, Candy Purvis
Faculty Adviser Dr. Lois Frazier

Member Associated Collegiate Press, Entered as second-class matter at post office at Raleigh, N.C. 27611. Published weekly.except during holidays and exams.

THE TWIG is served by National Educational Advertising Service, 18 East 50th Street, New York. Subscription Rates: \$3.70 per year.