

THE
MEREDITH



TWIG
COLLEGE

Demo, GOP platforms differ

Signs of the times

One of the nicest things about the Astro Used Book Sale is that it cut down on the endless signs on the doors of every self-employed book saleswoman-student. Breezeways were not papered over with signs like, "Come to 579 Barefoot for a Real Bargain." Thus it was that we enjoyed at least three days of relatively uncluttered walkways.

Now, however, the Siege has officially begun, and campus organizations are vying for the attention of students with signs, signs, signs. Already, students have been exposed to the lure of the Creative Posterboard, the Informative Mimeograph, and the Ubiquitous Construction Paper. Indeed, the buildup of posters on the Meredith campus well rivals the massive campaigns of Proctor and Gamble and Colgate to get us to buy their soap.

The analogy is not too extreme. Pause for a minute and think why it is that organizations put up so many signs. In a Madison Avenue mentality, many of us think that the more a certain event is advertised, the more students will be likely to come. Thus, publicity committees are likely to put up signs wherever there is space—sometimes on all floors of all dormitories, at all entrances to Joyner, Hunter, Jones, and Cate.

The result more often than not is attendance by a number of students who probably would have come anyway if they had seen only one sign rather than ten. The byproduct, of course, is clutter and the attitude that the signs are necessary.

It is time to propose a Strategic Signs Limitation Talk. Eliminating or merely restricting signs to certain areas of the campus would take a load off the publicity committees of campus organizations, teach us something about ecology, and greatly improve the appearance of the campus.

If campus organizations resolved to ban signs, they could find different kinds of ways to notify their members of upcoming meetings. Personal phone calls would enhance the congeniality of clubs. For public concerts, mixers, and movies, bulletin boards in the dining halls and dormitories could carry details on flyers of much smaller size than the ones we see now.

Benefits, as I have mentioned earlier, would accrue to the ecology and to beauty. The paper wasted on signs now would simply not be wasted. In these "last days" of dwindling resources, saving paper would be merely one way to simplify our lives and reduce our needs.

As for the beauty of the campus, all of us would agree that Meredith would look a heap sight better without so many heaps of trash distributed all around. The fluttering white signs remind me of so much underwear hanging out to dry. With Meredith trying to promote a "hip feminist" image we don't need to be embarrassed by sexist comments like, "Your slip is showing, my dear."

The alternatives are few—any change in publicity styles would require a change in mind-set. But the alternatives are worth a try. First, we could limit notices to the bulletin boards in the dormitories, the cafeteria, and Cate Center. Secondly, the TWIG could make an effort to run announcements of events on a consistent basis. Even if it were not possible for the TWIG to keep ahead of all events, the detailed weekly campus calendar coming from Dr. Mason's office would do the job.

It must be recognized that these alternatives would require a concerted effort on the part of all the students at Meredith to pay attention to posted signs on the boards. We would have to take personal responsibility to keep informed.

We talk many times of raising consciousness to include the poor of other nations, et cetera, ad nauseum, when such efforts can only be demonstrated by fund-raising or other such acts which hardly affect us personally. Banning posters on the Meredith campus would be a simple but amazingly radical way to train ourselves to save resources and free us from a bizarre advertising mentality. With a little bit of imagination and a whole lot of will power, Meredith can free herself from the Mad Ave. madness, save paper, and clean up her campus.

MSO

Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor:

As concerned citizens of the Meredith community, we would like to react to the article in the TWIG concerning the Cabaret cast. Although Beth Leavel's accomplishments are outstanding and should be recognized, there is more than one leading role in that play. Therefore, we feel that time and space should be devoted to discussing the past accomplishments of the other

cast members as well.

We also feel that the people behind the scenes are vitally important to the play and should be given due recognition, namely the director, Nancy Truesdale, her assistant Kim Hewlett, the set designer Sharon Holder, and costume and make up artists Terry and Denise Eckhart.

NAMES WITHHELD
On Request

by Phyllis Burnett

The final round of Presidential campaigning has begun. Both conventions have met and selected their nominees and adopted a platform. Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale will represent the Democratic effort to defeat Republican incumbent Gerald Ford and his running mate, Robert Dole.

It promises to be an exciting campaign, complete with the first debates since the Kennedy-Nixon debates in 1960. The first debate is scheduled for September 23.

Ford hopes the debates will help him close the ten point lead Carter currently holds in the polls, while Carter hopes to use the debate to pull away.

The issues are already fairly clear cut. A comparison in platforms reveals many differences.

The comparison shows the Republican platform to be moderately conservative and the Democratic platform to be basically liberal.

In the area of economics, the Republicans state: "If we are permanently to eliminate high unemployment, it is essential to protect the integrity of our money. That means putting an end to deficit spending."

The Republicans are also opposed to re-instating wage and price controls and the Humphrey-Hawkins full employment bill and the repealing of the section of the Taft-Hartley Act which protects right-to-work laws.

The Republican platform

supports the independence of the Federal Reserve System.

The Democratic platform states: "The Democratic party is committed to the right of all adult Americans willing, able, and seeking work to have opportunities for useful jobs at living wages."

The Democrats endorse the Humphrey-Hawkins bill which they hope would reduce unemployment to 3 percent within four years.

The platform also supports "direct government involvement in wages, and price decisions may be required to ensure price stability."

Regarding the Federal Reserve, the Democrats advocate making it a "full partner in national economic decisions."

In the area of taxes, the Republican platform states: "The best tax reform is tax reduction." The policies advocated by the platform are designed to ensure "job-producing expansion of our economy."

These include hastening capital recovery through new systems of accelerated depreciation, removing the tax burden on equity financing to encourage more capital investment, ending double taxation of dividends."

On the other hand, the Democratic platform states: "We pledge the Democratic Party to a complete overhaul of the present system, which will review all special tax provisions to ensure that they

are justified and distributed equitably."

The platform also supports strengthening the tax code "so that high-income citizens pay a reasonable tax on all economic income."

The Democrats oppose tax shelters.

In the aspect of energy, the Republicans are in favor of elimination of oil price controls and oppose "divestiture of oil companies."

One plank of the Republican platform calls for "accelerated use of nuclear energy through processes that have been proven safe."

The Democrats advocate breaking up the oil companies and barring them from owning competing kinds of energy. The Democrats want to minimize the use of nuclear energy.

In the area of welfare, the Republicans are opposed to a guaranteed annual income and a federalized welfare system. The Democrats are in favor of some form of both guaranteed annual income and federalized welfare.

Both parties support ERA, but the Republicans amend the amendment banning abortion while the Democrats oppose the prohibition of abortion.

The Republican party opposes a national health insurance. The Democrats state that: "We need a comprehensive national health insurance system with universal and mandatory coverage."

In the area of defense and foreign affairs, the Republican platform supports "superior national defense (and a) period of sustained growth in our defense effort." The Democrats are in favor of a cut in military spending.

The Republicans want to keep troops in Korea while the Democrats are in favor of gradually phasing out American troops there.

These are the basic issues which Ford and Carter will debate in September. The last time candidates debated, the majority of victory for John Kennedy was only 113,000 votes in a very exciting election. This year's contest has all the components of being equally exciting.

Beruh's Worms Squirm

by Darlene Smith

Joseph Beruh has put worms into motion pictures. Beruh is executive producer of the wormy new horror film, "Squirm."

Playing this week at Raleigh's Forest Drive-In, "Squirm" promises to be a thrilling, chilling success. Jeffrey Lieberman, writer and director, presents a real Hitchcock-inspired film.

The four million, seven hundred and fifty thousand dollar movie, says Beruh, "resembles, though not in class, 'The Birds,' an extravagant horror classic.

Working with what Beruh described as a low budget, the company shot two minutes of film a day at a cost of \$10,000 per day. However, only one of every ten feet shot was used in the finished movie.

Poor horror films of the past influenced Beruh to produce his first in an attempt to do better.

"All horror in film is organic," Beruh said when explaining his philosophy of horror movies.

The special effects involved in filming scenes such as worms crawling under human skin or a "sea of worms" into which a man sinks made the project interesting for Beruh.

These special effect techniques help to make "Squirm" what horror film fans rate as a "five-jump film." This means that the audience will jump in their seats at least five times.

"Squirm" has a plot that Beruh describes as "very

good, simple—and quite possible."

The story tells how 10- to 18-inch sandworms attack the people of a Georgia fishing village after the worms are stimulated by a ground surge of electricity from a storm.

Although "Squirm" is Beruh's first horror film, it will not be his first success in the entertainment field. The soft-spoken Kojak-with-hair-type man has been employed in several entertainment occupations.

A native of Pittsburgh, he received a degree in drama from Carnegie-Mellon Institute. He acted in New York for six years before he began producing.

Beruh has produced some successful plays including "Godspell" and "The Subject Was Roses," which won the New York Critics Circle Award, Tony awards, and a Pulitzer Prize in 1963.

THE
MEREDITH



TWIG
COLLEGE

Editor
Assistant Editor
Columnist
Reporters

Photographer
Advertising
Business Manager
Circulation Manager

Member Associated College Press. Published weekly except during holidays and exams. THE TWIG is served by the National Educational Advertising Service, 18 East Street, New York. Subscription rates: \$3.70.

Maggie Odell
Kim Farlow
Phyllis Burnett
Kristie Beattie, Rosie Bowers, Nancy Clendenin, Kim Dale, Debbie Doss
Nancy Newton, Darlene Smith, Miriam Victorian
Marty Hollinshed
Carol Fitch
Susan Moore
Emily Sockell