

THE
MEREDITH



TWIG
COLLEGE

ERA must be passed now

Since the Equal Rights Amendment will be under consideration in the North Carolina General Assembly this week and next, it is essential that we, as women in a modern society, understand the implications of ERA and the importance of our support of it. Ratification in North Carolina will be an uphill battle, but it must be fought now with determination if women are to have a voice in their own treatment.

The ERA states, in three parts, that there will be no federal or state discrimination of rights on the basis of sex, that Congress can enforce the amendment by "appropriate legislation," and that the amendment will take effect 2 years after ratification. In order to ensure equal rights of opportunity for women, this amendment must be passed, for any other action besides an amendment will not be strong enough to guarantee these rights.

Opposition to this amendment is involved mainly in five areas -- protective labor, criminal laws, divorce laws, rights of privacy and the draft. In the area of protective labor, the North Carolina laws now state that women can only work 48 hours a week, thereby prohibiting overtime work for women who are able. On the other hand, the ERA will allow equal protective legislation, so that a man 5 feet tall, 140 pounds, will no longer be required to lift more than a woman 6 feet tall. As far as criminal laws go, they will merely be reworded to include "single sex characteristics" (those distinguishing women), whereas the substance of protection from rape or assault will remain the same. The divorce laws in North Carolina are now - discriminatory, so that alimony depends on the "supporting" spouse, not especially the male or female, and child support is made in "the best interest of the child." One of the most pressing problems for much of the opposition has been that of the ERA's requiring men and women to use the same public facilities. This argument is totally absurd since Congress passed long ago rights of privacy for individuals and passage of the ERA cannot take away these rights. Finally, in the area of the draft, the ERA will make women responsible citizens eligible for the draft. However, it also makes available to women the draft exemption of parenthood as well as the military benefits (such as veteran's pay) which women do not receive for service. Most of the opposition does not realize that Congress has always had the power to draft women and that they almost took this action in WWII to draft nurses.

When we think of the future, we must plan for better benefits. Especially here at Meredith, where so many women follow careers in education, must we realize the importance of the ERA, particularly when we are faced with the facts that out of 160 top superintendent policy - making positions in the North Carolina public schools, not one woman is represented, and that out of 203 assistance positions only 6 are women. We are up against strong emotional opposition, but we MUST GET ORGANIZED in order to have the ERA passed. We must be visible; we must talk to legislators; we must, above all, write letters to our state congressmen.

The hearings on the ERA will be at 1:30, February 1 and 8. It is our responsibility as concerned women to care enough about our futures to urge passage of ERA, and we must act NOW.

JFS

It is ironical...

It is ironical that Lyndon Johnson had to die within a day of the peace agreement in Vietnam. It is ironical that we were crying instead of shouting for joy upon President Nixon's announcement. It is ironical that we, as Americans, were involved for nearly 10 years in a "selfless" war which has sapped us physically, morally, and economically. It is ironical that we have now reached an "honorable" peace agreement in which WE got all that WE wanted. It is ironical that peace has finally been agreed upon after 4 more years of senseless killing. It is ironical that U. S. forces are still stationed in Thailand, ready to "guard" South Vietnam's chance for democratic freedom. It is ironical that POW's may now return to their families, both factions changed through the 2-8 years distance. And it is ironical that business in America, just as it has for the past 8 years can go on as usual.

JFS

Christyle?

In a recent chapel program in which the women's liberation movement was viewed from a totally different perspective, there were several statements made which need to be examined further. First of all, the whole focus of women's liberation is not to condemn men, but rather is to give women's potentialities as human beings an equal chance as those of men. People, if liberated at all, need to be liberated to each other as people, not as one sex against another or as players in a big game of love.

Secondly, the point was made that love does not hurt if it is true Christlike love, and that all we, as "girls", need to do is "ask Christ into our hearts." This statement makes the idea of love such a simple one, one that can be accomplished by praying a certain prayer. It takes more than a prayer for a person to be Christlike. In fact, to play upon the REW theme of "Christyle," whatever may be "Christlike" is a full realization of human potential for love, not of one sex over or under domination of another. "Christyle" is a realization of what we, as human beings, can "be" with ourselves. It is not an "asking"; it is rather an acting, in fact, a becoming.

JFS

Carter speaks out

BY Carolyn Carter

Editor's note: This is the last in a series of articles by Carolyn Carter on student responsibility.

If we as women are to assume our rightful roles as citizens with full and equal rights, we must exercise a considerable amount of initiative. We, as students at a woman's college are in the position to develop our capacity as worthwhile human beings to the fullest. Although ideally there should be no reason for women to take a secondary role to a man in the classroom, it is nevertheless the unfortunate case that this can be an artificially restrictive factor in the development of full and free expression. At Meredith, the emphasis, since the founding days of the college, has been on encouraging women

through lessons and atmosphere to understand their roles as complete persons. Further, Meredith is endowed with the very serious responsibility to educate young women to come to understand their roles.

The young woman, Candi Love, who was in chapel on January 24, 1973, is an example of a truly unliberated woman. Quoted as saying, "A woman who loves Christ realizes that he means for her to be in the submissive role to men, and I am happy with my position," she serves as a blatant negation of the equality of women. Ms. Love's program was keyed on the assumption that a woman's fulfillment is dependent on finding male companionship. As

we affirm our belief in the worth and dignity of every individual, the views of Ms. Love are seen to be in direct contradiction to this affirmation. Ms. Love's fallacious statement that "women can be leaders like Ruth was in the Bible, but only over other women," indicates a rather limited view of women. We need to acutely be conscious of our unlimited potential rather than being bound by culturally inherent restraints. Indeed the future of the quality of human existence is dependent on our response to the creative development of our human resources. In light of this realization, we must do our utmost to work for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment and for the furtherance of our potential as women.

Letter to the editor

It appears to me the Meredith community has been experiencing a wide diversity of religious views -- from very fundamentalist beliefs to beliefs with a liberal theological basis. Really one is neither more "Christian" than the other. Evangelism on the campus has reached great proportions -- to save other souls is not the central meaning of the Christian faith to me. Yet as a community we do live together and share responsibility to each other. This in itself implies there must be a level of tolerance. Among members of the Meredith community, tolerance has reached a new low. To me tolerance does not mean that

I must compromise my religious beliefs. However, it does mean that I will not accuse others of being "non-Christians" just because their beliefs are not the same as mine. The spirit of Christian love is supposed to unite over and above different "Christ-styles."

As worship chairman, I have been in a position to hear diverse religious concerns. My concept of worship has NOT been expressed in the majority of the worship services. Apparently this is not known by people who do not know me; consequently, they have felt free to express approval to me with regard to the con-

tent of the services. At the same time many of my friends have expressed genuine concern that the majority of the worship services encompass the evangelistic emphasis. I have in a sense remained silent during the year expressing my concern about the nature of the worship services only to a few members of the community. I now realize that silence only added to a growing mood of intolerance among everyone, myself included.

Hopefully during REW all religious viewpoints will meet together with open minds and with the knowledge that the spirit of love does not depend on belief counts.

Dianne Beal

Dr. Grubbs on Vietnam

By Dr. Frank Grubbs

The recent agreement on the ceasefire and the further negotiations of the Vietnam war has been greeted with extreme caution by the American people. Indeed, to my knowledge, this agreement has been more mistrusted than any other in American history. The reason for this, I think, is because the American people are at long last maturing in the area of foreign relations. There was a time when our people trusted their foreign agreements, were generally optimistic about foreign policy and believed in morality in foreign affairs. But as the American people experienced frustration after frustration in dealing with the communist countries after World War Two, they developed, slowly it is true, a growing sense of caution about foreign relations. This caution seems to have reached a peak with the Vietnam agreement.

The reason for this growing caution has been the result of our realization that foreign affairs are run on a purely realistic basis most of the time. Morality and idealism are generally not a part of foreign policy decision making. Our people who have been largely moral in their outlook have suddenly realized that foreign relations are conducted on a different basis. Thus, in regard to the Vietnam agreement, the American people seem to feel that the agreement will be broken at some future date by the communists. They seem to feel, too, that our forces stationed in Thailand are there to re-enter the Vietnam War if the agreement is broken in the future. Both possibilities are very real. America, then, the people reason, has not really left the Vietnam War but is simply waiting to see if the communists will abide by the agreement or if they will shortly within a year or two reopen the conflict.

The American people have also been shocked by the act-

tions of their politicians in foreign relations. In 1950 Truman at first announced that no ground troops would be sent to Korea, but within three weeks the President had committed ground troops on a large scale, and by his own authority. In 1964 Lyndon Johnson ran for election on a moderate Vietnam War platform only to commit the nation to the War on a massive scale three months later. In 1968 Nixon promised to end the war shortly, only to continue it for four years. Based on the agreement announced, many Americans are not sure that the continuation was useful. Nor has Congress escaped its responsibility. This body of the people's representatives has continually

given American Presidents a blank check on the war.

It is little wonder, therefore, that the American people seem to feel at this moment that the Vietnam agreement is questionable. They seem to feel that at best the United States can hope to get back its prisoners within sixty days. Never has a war "ended" with so little hope that it will stay ended. Growing up is not always pleasant, but the American people at this moment seem to have learned many of the facts-of-life regarding foreign relations. Many experts believe that this realization is better for our nation than being too trusting and too optimistic about foreign relations.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. All letters to the editor must be signed in full when turned in to THE TWIG. This policy was stated in the October 11, 1972, issue. If requested, names will be withheld from publication and initials used. Before we can print any letter to the editor, this policy must be upheld. For this reason, we have not printed a letter received this week, but it will be published if a signature is submitted.

2. Due to a shortage in #50 white paper, this and the previous issue have been printed on newsprint. Until the shortage is alleviated, THE TWIG will appear as newsprint.

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 ManagersDeborah Phillips, Emily Johnson
Circulation Manager Elaine Williams
Staff ... Nancy Alvis, Lou Ann Roebuck, Candy Purvis
Faculty Adviser Dr. Lois Frazier
PhotographerSusan Berry

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.