

The envelope please?—the new VP

A new TV show premiered Friday night. "The President's Choice" had all the trappings of the Academy Awards presentation, minus only the classic "The envelope please."

But the stars were at hand and as the cameras zoomed in for closeups a discreet voice identified the celebrities.

Pretty soon in came the master of ceremonies, heralded by the sound of trumpets blaring "Hail to the Chief." He was in rare form, all smiles as he gave the big build-up. The audience responded with cheers and applause as the winner was announced—not by name but with a comment about his 25 years experience. As the audience cheered for the man who would replace Spiro T. Agnew, the discreet voice told the audience at home who the replacement was.

The winner himself was confident but humble as he made his acceptance speech.

The master of ceremonies was so overwhelmed by the spectre of cheering and clapping people, many of them from the Congress he has been political and real enemies with, that he burst into smiles larger than the public has ever seen on the face of President Richard Nixon.

He laughed—because his ploy of taking the minds of the public and Congress off of his credibility and the

Watergate scandals had worked far better than even he anticipated. The nomination of Gerald Ford was as well accepted as announcements of foreign policy adventures by former adviser, now Secretary of State Henry Kissinger.

President Nixon laughed because of the unbelievable sight before him—the sight of his enemies applauding, cheering, smiling and delighted. Meanwhile, the discreet voice of the tube was pointing out what Nixon did not—that his choice of the House's favorite son makes impeachment proceedings unlikely.

Surely "The President's Choice" should be nominated for an Emmy—a new one to be given to the greatest farce of the year. "The President's Choice" would set a high precedent for future awards, hard to top.

The presentation by the royalty of the White House, with those blaring trumpets, was in bad taste and gauche, considering that these same politicians were the ones, saying only the day before, what a terrible tragedy for the country was the Agnew resignation. You sure couldn't tell it by the flamboyant cheers of the crowd in the East Room of the White House. The whole atmosphere was reminiscent of the circus air of the political conventions, which are a normal part of the American political process.

But the resignation of a vice president because of wrongdoing is not a normal process, and the necessary aftermath—the choosing of his successor—should not be performed with jovial, sickening smiles by people who were probably cheering more for the nomination of Gerald Ford, R-Mich., than they would normally yell and cheer for the favorite Washington Redskins.

The American tragedy that has become an anguished twisting in the hearts of honest Americans is not cured or forgotten by pasting onto our faces ear-to-ear strained smiles and cheers. Agnew's forced resignation is "tragic," as Judge Walter Hoffman said Wednesday in accepting Agnew's nolo contendere plea to income tax evasion. The choice of his successor surely could have been conducted in an atmosphere of respect and dignity—respect and dignity that are befitting the leaders of our country.

Agnew's shame is not the only shame that besets the executive branch of government. There is still the unresolved shame of the Watergate break-in, the break-in of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office, the dirty tricks considered necessary to insure Nixon's victory against the paranoia-causing people who disagree with him. There is still the shame of Richard Nixon, whose popularity has plummeted to 32 per

cent. There is still the shame of millions of dollars spent in "security" improvements on Nixon's homes at Key Biscayne and San Clemente.

And there is still the shame that is best portrayed by the disillusioned young people, who, when polled, showed such a disgust with politics that they do not wish to enter political careers.

The nomination of Gerald Ford will not purge the shame from politics and Nixon's administration. Why cheer?

The atmosphere surrounding "The President's Choice" shows how willing everybody is to push the dishonesty of Watergate/Agnew/etc. aside and forget it ever happened. Of course the nation should look forward to a new start, but there's no reason to forget or ignore the lessons of the scandals.

Watergate *did* happen; Nixon's secret tape recordings *did* happen; Agnew was forced to resign or else face almost certain charges by the federal government of extortion, kickbacks and bribery. We can't pretend these never happened.

They did. It's not for smiles and cheers but for us to take to heart and pray that dishonesty cease being a norm but become, once again, a deviant in American government.

The Daily Tar Heel

81 Years Of Editorial Freedom

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinion of the editor. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Susan Miller, Editor

October 15, 1973

Register complaints for locator service

If you want to find out where fellow students live or what their phone numbers are, don't call the Union desk. The desk personnel won't help you. As of today the Union locator service is no more.

The decision to end the locator service was announced two weeks ago, shortly after the campuswide referendum on the election of the Union president was defeated. The Union Board of Directors claimed the operation of the service was too great a financial burden and the money could be better spent on other programs.

The Union also believes it is the University administration's responsibility to offer the locator service. We couldn't agree more.

To encourage the administration to begin the service by showing it how important the service is to all members of the University

community, including faculty and administration, we have a few suggestions.

Everyone who uses the locator service should call the office of the Dean of Student Affairs to register a complaint. If dialing 933-5597 brings a busy signal or a no concern signal, try writing to Dean Donald Boulton. Also call the Carolina Union office at 933-1161.

We are glad to receive letters to the editor on the subject and we will continue our policy of printing all letters for and against an issue provided they are within the guidelines in our letters policy.

Register your discontent and get a locator service started again. If you don't, the University community will be stuck with only the Chapel Hill Telephone Company to give out numbers.



by Lana Starnes and Dr. Takey Crist

Question: My partner and myself cannot engage in sexual intercourse for more than a short period of time before I reach my climax. (I am male). What could be the cause of this? What can be done, if anything so that we will both be satisfied? Am I doomed for life?—Signed, Worried Male.

Question: Please explain what causes premature ejaculation and what can be done to prolong it?—Signed, Early Comer.

Question: What causes premature ejaculation and what can be done to prevent it? This problem is ruining my girl's and my

love life.—Signed, Speedy.

Question: Whenever my girlfriend and I make love I am hampered by premature ejaculation, especially if I do not use a condom. My ejaculation will usually occur two minutes after I entered (often less).

Is there any solution for my problem, as my "quicksies" leave my girlfriend very unsatisfied and/or frustrated?—Signed, D.P.

Answer: Premature ejaculation, according to Masters and Johnson, is the inability to delay ejaculation long enough for the woman to have orgasm 50 per cent of the time. It is the most common dysfunction complained of by men and the easiest to treat.

There are many reasons for premature

ejaculation—physical as well as psychological. The most prominent cause is the early training and experience of men. A quick one in the back seat of a car, or under an Arboretum tree and the fear of getting caught puts an emphasis on speedy ejaculation. After a few such episodes a rapid ejaculation pattern may become a way of life.

Treatment is available based on the work done by Masters and Johnson using the principle of sensate focus and a maneuver called the "squeeze technique." It is proven to be a highly effective technique for learning ejaculatory control. It is not a do-it-yourself technique, but requires understanding and communication of both parties coupled with medical supervision.

Briefly, the "squeeze technique" is as follows: The couple assume the "ejaculatory control training position" as Masters and Johnson direct. The woman holds the erect penis between her thumb and first two fingers of the same hand. The thumb is placed on the frenulum (underside of penis, just where the shaft ends and the head of the penis begins), and the two fingers are placed on the opposite side from the thumb, one on each side of the ridge which separates the glans from the shaft. The woman then squeezes her thumb and first two fingers together with a fairly hard pressure for three to four seconds. The pressure makes the man lose his urge to ejaculate and may also make him lose some of his erection; why this happens is not known. After 15 to 30 seconds, the woman manipulates her partner to full erection once more and uses the squeeze technique again to prevent premature ejaculation. By repeating this procedure it is easy to have 15 to 20 minutes of continuous sex play and no ejaculation.

The next step after learning some control is to have the penis inserted into the vagina, without thrusting, to get used to the new penile containment without urge to ejaculate.

The next step is for the man to thrust enough to maintain his erection. (Employment of the female superior coital position is used in both steps.) After control increases, the couple is encouraged to move from the female superior position to the lateral coital position as the male superior position is the most difficult to gain ejaculatory control.

The treatment requires a great deal of understanding and communication between the man and woman. It takes time and patience and is not an overnight miracle. Professional help is required.

The results of such treatment have been quite impressive. Of the 186 men that were treated at the Masters and Johnson clinic there were only four failures.

(Questions should be addressed to Lana Starnes and Dr. Takey Crist, in care of The Daily Tar Heel, Student Union, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.)



"DO WE HAVE SOMETHING IN A DIFFERENT STYLE . . . ?"

Letters to the editor

Forum program praised, criticism 'unsubstantial'

To the editor:

As a senior at UNC, it is difficult for me to understand why the Carolina Forum has been subjected to such unsubstantial criticism. The Forum has chosen excellent speakers for the fall semester, and in my opinion the half hour wait for Erwin was not a monumental difficulty. Betty George and her committee should be congratulated.

Philip C. Williams

The Union will somehow function better with another elected student politician at its head.

As for the University administration's apparent bafflement as to where to find information about the locator service and its use, I suggest the SIN report, a copy of which was filed with South Building at least as early as April, 1972. That report, prepared by a number of graduate library science and other assorted students, discussed at length the problems that the Union was encountering with the locator service.

The report included the suggestion that the service be implemented by the Chapel Hill Telephone Co. That proposal was found to be contrary to legal provisions. A second proposal was never made.

Nevertheless, I reiterate that it is not as though the problem with the locator service is a new one, and before the *Tar Heel* next shoots off at the mouth in such a lackadaisical fashion it should take time to research the facts. Now that we are at last without the locator service, perhaps all parties concerned can cease the criticism and seek a solution. The Union has been trying for two years.

Fred Davenport
401 Northampton Plaza

Effron insulting to injured man

To the editor:

The resignation of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew was indeed a tragic day for America but the editorial b.s. of Seth Effron

concerning "Agnew's downfall" only adds insult to injury.

It doesn't take blind partisanship and political bigotry at a time like this, Mr. Effron. If Agnew had been guilty of that, he could have easily used the shield and power of his office to hold off whatever assaults may have been thrown at him for years.

Agnew was never indicted or accused of any wrongdoing. He was subjected to the greatest abuse of the American judicial system in this century when Justice Department officials leaked information concerning evidence against the vice president—an action illegal before or after any indictment.

Agnew's tax evasion cannot be condoned. It is a sin for which he alone can pay. But that conviction alone does not make him or his contribution in federal government automatically worthless. While certainly most Americans don't perpetrate the tax fraud to the extent Agnew did, how many of us in a lifetime could say we didn't also cheat on a return?

All of those people, including presumably yourself, Mr. Effron, who so piously claim you have only the interest of truth and justice at heart and the sake of our country are in most analysis revealed to be only small men who derive great pleasure from much misery.

I defend not Spiro T. Agnew but rather the idea that a true American would not maliciously or vindictively rejoice over a national tragedy simply because his own partisan advantage and prejudices had been served.

Spiro T. Agnew, even in his moment of disgrace, had the courage of a true American and the ability to sacrifice the highest prize he possessed—the office of the vice

president of the United States. By his action, he will always be a greater American than you will ever dream Mr. Effron.

Mike O'Neal
324 Avery

Bellows leaves questions open

To the editor:

After studying Amelia Bellows' "blast" in response to my recent letter about funding of *She*, I feel that my original criticisms and questions remain both unaltered and unanswered. In fact, a couple of more questions are brought to mind.

Concerning my "emotionalism" about some women wanting to be a little "more than equal" in their campaign against chauvinism, why was the headline for Amelia's letter so much bolder and heavier than for mine? More important, was there any connection between the length of Amelia's letter (over 600 words) and the omission, for the first time in months, of the 300-word limit requirement in the little box containing instructions for writing letters to the editor? Will this requirement ever reappear—like tomorrow, maybe? I wrote my letter according to the rules; evidently AWS doesn't have to.

Amelia's brief synopsis of the founding and purposes of AWS is irrelevant to the questions I raised; it merely begs the questions even further. She did not answer whether or how much money is received by *She* from SG exclusive of that given by AWS. (Is it in the neighborhood of \$2,700?)

With regard to AWS itself, Amelia, I am not "uninformed" about the basic facts of SG funding, which tends to favor groups that are most organized and scream the loudest for money. This is common knowledge. The fact that there is no organized AMS puts men at a disadvantage in this respect. I am not questioning whether AWS does exist; I am questioning whether it should exist.

It was founded at a time when women were a very small minority on this campus, just a few short years ago. It has no long tradition; it could easily be dissolved, and its money spent for the benefit of the entire student body. Now that the enrollment of women is almost equal to men, perhaps this idea should be seriously considered.

The basic point that for every dollar women students spend on themselves, an extra burden is placed upon the men whose fees must cover the shortage thus created. And as the percentage of women increases, so does the financial burden on the men.

On the other hand, yes, men could form their own AMS, student fees could be split proportionally between AWS and AMS, and the men and women on this

campus could go their own separate ways, polarized beyond repair. To carry this reasoning to its logical conclusion, we could return to a system of separate colleges for men and women, as in the days of yore.

My comments did not pertain to the legality or illegality of the University's funding practices for men's versus women's intramurals. I am simply saying that AWS has some nerve to be the one to raise the issue. It is a case of the pot calling the kettle black.

Is feminism a sacred cow (no pun intended) that cannot and must not be criticized? Why do the sponsors of *She* retreat to claims of an innocent non-feminist posture when criticized, while at the same time taking money, directly and indirectly, from the pockets of men students for use by women students? Perhaps *She* isn't as militant or obnoxious as some extreme feminist publications, and that's refreshing, but that doesn't mean that men should have to foot the bill to subsidize it.

Why can't it be sold on the open market where it could survive or fold according to its merits?

Charles Barton

The Daily Tar Heel

Susan Miller, Editor

Winston Cavin, Managing Editor
David Ekridge, News Editor
Mary Newsom, Associate Editor
Seth Effron, Associate Editor
Adrian Scott, Features Editor
Elliot Warnock, Sports Editor
Tad Stewart, Photo Editor
Ernie Pitt, Night Editor