

# THE TWIG

meredith college

RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27611

Editor-in-chief	Lori Howell
Senior Reporters	Lisa Sorrels, Linda Sellers,
Staff Reporters	Shirene Hritzko, Emily Craig, Lauren Starboard
Columnist	Kathleen McKeel
Business Manager	Carolyn Dunn
Layout Editor	Kathleen McKeel
Layout Staff	Fran Little, Yvonne Sjamaar, Faith Wells
Advertising Manager	Cinda Bodford
Advertising Staff	Sarah Walker, Beth Knox
Circulation Managers	Catherine McLeod, Stephanie Prevatte
Faculty Advisors	Mr. Bill Norton, Dr. Thomas Parramore, Dr. Donald Samson

The TWIG welcomes comment and will give prompt consideration to any criticisms submitted in writing and signed by the writer.

## Does college prepare you for life?

With seniors looking towards spring and graduation and reflecting back on the past three and one-half years here at Meredith, one may begin to wonder whether or not Meredith really prepares us for the "outside world". Among the all important plans to be made for graduation and weddings, most seniors will also be graveling their way into the eight to five work world -- maybe not a pleasant thought but one that must be considered. All at once the world has completely changed from the comfort of close (close quarter) friends and the checks mailed by Mom and Dad at the first of each month to the stark reality of surviving on a fixed income and cooking one's own meals. After coping with these immediate changes one will probably settle down thinking, "life now is all downhill," but one is soon to realize the hill is still upward and now twice as steep. Can you cope with what is out "there"? Does college prepare us for the life beyond?

Academically, some. College exposes us to sitting in class, learning theories and histories of theories, but somehow these theories never seem to relate or apply to the real world. Maybe that is why so many new employees are put through training programs where their background may help but it is not crucial. Other people are given jobs that have no direct relation to their field of study. So maybe all of that directed study is worthless? Not hardly. It gives one confidence and competence in their field of study. But the directed study is not the main purpose of college.

Socially does college prepare us? Again, some. Here at Meredith one is not allowed to cope with all of the real world problems. This makes the atmosphere more conducive to studying and learning, but although one is not faced with these factors on campus one is faced with them off campus. Slowly one learns how to discipline themselves so that when one does face the real world one will be better able to cope with these issues. Slow exposure is often better than total exposure. But again the social life at Meredith is not the most important thing to be learned in college.

What is then?

College teaches one to function under pressure. College is a good time to learn how much pressure we are able to handle and how to handle it properly. In college we also learn to make choices; how to stick by them once they are made, whether they are right or wrong, but also knowing when to admit when one is wrong. These choices and decisions one makes are usually the first to be made on one's own and in making these choices on one's own, one also is the person to win praise for good choices and suffer the consequences for bad choices.

College has a way of opening the mind to the world. It's a learning environment and learning seems to be easier in college because everyone else around you is learning too. Hopefully this learning experience is good and it keeps our minds seeking knowledge throughout our lives.

All considered, I think maybe the most important piece of knowledge that college teaches is patience. Good things in life can not be rushed and college is no exception. This is good advice to all those seniors seeking to make millions by 1983; take time to enjoy the extras of life and remember -- all things come with time and hard work.

LAH

# Adventures in New York

by Ann Stringfield

Would you believe I'm working for the American Bible Society? The H. W. Wilson Company is an interesting place to work; however, the pay is low and the advancement opportunities even lower. So I'm an editorial assistant with ABS now. One block from Lincoln Center. Ah, me....

Edward Vilella is doing well. He's currently producing and directing a television special. No - I haven't met Warren Beatty yet.

New York grocery stores are interesting animals. Generally they are small, crowded and dirty. There isn't enough room in the aisles for more than one cart and there are rarely any bagboys.

I'm staying with some wonderful people who were referred to me by Anna Bess Brown. A.B. - I owe you one. Jon and Lola Meek are a "neat" couple who enjoy word

games, wine and their poodle, Koko. They live a block from ABS, near Columbus Circle. I'm really getting quite spoiled.

New York is great fun when the snow melts -- you, too, can step into knee-deep puddles. Saturday I bought a pair of boots at Bloomingdale's -- what a great store.

New Yorkers are not friendly.

Roberta Flack goes to the Meek's church and Nipsey Russell lives nearby.

Talk about fun things to do -- try waiting 20 minutes for a bus when the temperature is 14 degrees below zero with the wind chill factor.

It's a great city -- imagine walking down Broadway on a Friday night in search of cheesecake. I'd like to apologize to everyone for my lack of communication. You just wouldn't believe the things I've experienced in two

weeks.

There is magic in a snowfall in New York City. I can't adequately describe the beauty of Columbus Circle in the quiet of the falling snow.

I miss Meredith a great deal. Meredith is a good place to get spoiled. I miss popcorn and pizza. Group soap opera watching (Liz and Luke - heh, heh). The warmth and laughter. Friends. I do not miss studying.

Now for hellos - hello to Dr. Rose who missed her 8:00 the other day - tsk, tsk. Hello to Dr. Samson - wish I'd taken Advanced Grammar and Composition, for it would come in handy at ABS. Hello to Dr. Parramore - give 'em hell. Hello to Dr. Lindsey - sorry Jon, they just don't pay enough. To my suitemates, roommates, friends - miss you all.

And a word of advice - cherish these times. Being an adult isn't always easy.

## Political, Not Military: The Flaw of Western Deterrence

by Harold W. Rood

Dr. Rood is a Professor of International Relations, Claremont McKenna College, and Executive Editor of *Grand Strategy: Countercurrents*. (c) Public Research, Syndicated, 1981

The enormous destructive power of nuclear weapons has increased the tendency of the West to rely on political rather than military deterrence. The United States and NATO have come to believe that the very existence of nuclear weapons will, if they are properly located, make certain courses of action impossible for the Soviets, just as the development of the Fleet to Pearl Harbor prior to WW II was believed to inhibit the Japanese.

Because of this preoccupation with political deterrence the current debate over theater nuclear modernization in Europe, prompted by the Soviet deployment of 600 intermediate range ballistic missiles, including some 250 modern SS-20 missiles in the last five years, has had virtually no connection with reality.

One side argues that NATO's plan to deploy 572 U.S.-made Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles to match the Soviet deployment will not increase the security of the West. Nuclear war, some on this side argue, is impossible, and therefore the new weapons are superfluous. Others on this side argue that these new weapons will only make nuclear war more likely. The other side contends that the new deployment is needed to signal NATO's continued resolve to resist the U.S.S.R.

Neither position, however, fully considers what military application these new weapons might have. That is, can they, in combination with other Western forces and arms, defeat the Soviet Union in war? If they can, then they may have some deterrent value. If they render the possibility of Soviet victory significantly less likely than otherwise, then, too, they may have some deterrent value.

But if they are intended as a political signal to the Soviet

Union, then they are probably useless.

In the past month, there has been considerable controversy over whether or not NATO would detonate a nuclear device over the Baltic as a warning in the event of a Soviet attack. This explosion would, presumably, remind the Soviets of the existence of NATO's nuclear force, perhaps deterring a further Soviet advance before full-scale theater or strategic nuclear war began. Again, this option might relieve some pressure on certain Western European leaders, but it has no connection with reality. The Soviets are well aware of the existence of the West's nuclear weapons. If NATO wished to deter the Soviets at such a point, and if it believed that the Alliance's resolve must be shown, then it should target the leading elements of the Soviet invasion force, or some other military important targets.

This is not to say that the U.S.S.R. does not take into account the presence of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the United States and NATO, even if the West is uncertain as to their military application. Soviet Frontal Aviation, for instance, has as one of its principal missions the destruction of "the enemy's nuclear resources." One of the tasks that Soviet tactical writings assigns to reinforced tank battalions, following a breakthrough operation, is the destruction of "enemy nuclear delivery means."

Deterrence is a laudable goal but, like peace, it can never be achieved directly. When the United States enjoyed a nuclear monopoly-- or later nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union--the military objective was to be able to defeat the U.S.S.R.,

limit damage to the United States, and win the war. Because of its nuclear arsenal, that goal was not out of line with American military capabilities. As a result, the political objective of American policy (to deter a Soviet invasion of Western Europe), was achieved. We cannot know if the Soviets were in fact deterred, only that they did not attack. Had they attacked, the United States and the West would have stood a good chance of militarily preventing Soviet victory.

Today, we cannot know if the U.S.S.R. will ever feel compelled to invade Western Europe. One can only judge that the Soviets have not been deterred from systematically developing the means to do so. The West has, over the same period, gradually neglected many of those political and military steps that might offer a reasonable chance of success if the Soviet Union forces the issue.

Deterrence, it seems, works both ways. In 1935, Adolf Hitler was not deterred from occupying the Rhineland, despite the overwhelming superiority of the British, the French and others. The Reichswehr's generals were frightened by this enormous gamble, and strongly opposed it. Hitler gave strict orders to the small occupying force that it withdrew at the least sign of opposition. But free Europe, tired and fearful from the last war, stayed its hand, because it could not bear to contemplate the renewal of the struggle, and the consequences that might befall it as a result. Hitler, himself a product of the Great War, drew somewhat different conclusions about the nature of deterrence.

**ID CARDS  
must accompany all  
checks to be cashed by the  
Business Office  
or Supply Store.**