

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

February 11, 1974

South falling behind times with refusal of the ERA

Scarlett O'Hara would be ashamed.

Last week the Georgia state legislature defeated the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution by a vote of 104-70.

Ms. O'Hara, who never thought much of southern belles, would be aghast to know that the image has perpetuated itself this far into the twentieth century.

Not that Georgia is any less progressive than the rest of her southern sister states. Only Texas and Tennessee are included in the 33 states which have ratified the ERA since it was passed by Congress two years ago. But the other Old South states—Virginia, N.C., S.C., Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas—have all either refused the amendment or are in the process of doing so.

The arguments in Georgia against the ERA were typical of those used by ERA opponents last year in N.C., Alabama and Arkansas.

"Don't vote for ERA because then

men and women will have to use the same bathroom."

"I didn't raise my daughter to be a soldier."

"ERA will destroy southern womanhood."

The statements above indicate that there is a basic misunderstanding of what the ERA will and will not do.

The proposed amendment reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

Simply, the ERA provides that nobody should be discriminated against because of sex. And the amendment is not limited to insuring women's rights, but men's also.

As for the specific arguments cited above, "equality under the law" does not mean that the sexes must be regarded as identical. Furthermore, the right to privacy under the Constitution would permit the separation of sexes with respect to such places as public toilets.

Congress now possesses the power to include women in any military conscription, but under the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 only male citizens must register for the draft. The ERA would require that this law be extended to women equally but under the same conditions. Therefore, ERA will not require that all women serve in the military any more than all men are now required to serve. The added fact that the administration is now depending on a volunteer military service makes the draft even more of

a moot issue.

Will ERA destroy southern womanhood?

The amendment applies only to government action and legal rights, not to social custom. Relationships between the sexes would be decided by the individuals involved. Thus, if a woman prefers, she can retain her status as a "southern belle." Or she can be a "liberated woman." Under the ERA she has a choice.

But as it now stands, and what southern states continue to reinforce by ERA refusal, is that a woman is still subject to legal discrimination because of her sex and thus has no real choice.

Enactment of the amendment would mean, among other things, that a bank could not deny credit to a woman nor could an employer pay her less than a man. It would mean that a married woman could engage in business as freely as her husband and that a woman would not have to serve a longer prison sentence than a man for the same offense (or vice-versa). Above all, the ERA would recognize the fundamental dignity and individuality of each human being.

Five more states are needed to ratify ERA. Four southern states—S.C., Virginia, Mississippi, Louisiana—will consider the amendment during 1974 legislative sessions. It can be brought back up in N.C. this year and should be.

It is time that the South acknowledge the need for the ERA. As a legal concept, at least, the southern belle should be gone with the wind.

Campaign issues traditional

The last installment of "Campus Affairs" raised a serious charge of back room politics in the Gary Phillips campaign for student body president. At the time of the last column Ford Runge, who was labeled as a backer of Phillips, could not be reached for comment. Over the weekend he was contacted and had this to say:

"Friday's 'Campus Affairs' column, in which Seth Effron accused me of 'giving candidate Gary Phillips information' that I have 'withheld from the press and other candidates to bolster Phillips' campaign platform' is so lacking in reason, thoughtfulness, or decency that I feel compelled to reply.

"I have given Phillips no information which I have not given to other candidates or the press.

"I do not support Gary Phillips for President. I support no one. I have no plans to join Phillips' staff.

"While I don't support anyone in particular, there is no reason why I might not show interest in, say Napoleon Byars if I want to. My right to speak to or about any candidate is guaranteed by the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States."

Mike Johnson, Phillips' campaign manager, responded to the charges saying he had not withheld any information about the "teacher-course evaluation" from anyone, noting that even the DTH had written an article about it earlier.

"I've talked to one particular candidate (besides Phillips)" about course evaluation, Johnson said. "I said it was fine if he used it as an issue. I don't care if everyone uses it as an issue."

"I wanted to work with a candidate who would push this (course evaluation) the strongest. Gary is that candidate, I feel," Johnson said.

Amelia Bellows, notorious radical feminist and head of the Association of Women Students is backing Murray Fogler for President.

Whatever Bellows or any other person believe about the candidates, it seems that most candidates, including Fogler, have almost identical platforms, and they have yet to address themselves to any of the pertinent issues.

Each platform—from Byars, to Fogler, to Hackney, to Wilmot-Smith, to Phillips, to Warren and so on—centers around the traditional issues Student Government has been



dealing with ineffectively since SG was founded. Getting dorms to be the way students want them, academic reform, town-gown relations, and the locator service are these traditional issues.

It cannot be denied that these are important issues and should be pursued. But what must be realized is that after years and years of hassling over these same things it should be obvious why there has been no significant change. All the platform changes have a catch to them—they need University administration approval.

The Student Consumer Action Union is the only issue I have ever seen in a candidate's platform that represents any significant change.

The idea of going outside the immediate University structure is a feasible idea. It does not necessarily have to be a direct part of Student Government, but Student Government's support, as in the case of SCAU, can certainly help.

Student Government can be the motivating force behind the establishment of student-owned (not student government owned) living cooperatives. These cooperatives can own buildings and house students in arrangements determined by the student members of the cooperative.

Meals, which for most dorm residents now is a drudgery rather than a time of relaxation could also be served in coops.

This can work and has worked. If any candidate wants to find out more, there is a booklet called, "How to make your own coop," by University Students' Cooperative Association 2424 Ridge Rd., Berkeley, Ca.

The Daily Tar Heel

Susan Miller, Editor

Cathy Farrell, Managing Editor
Bill Welch, News Editor
David Eskridge, Associate Editor
Nancy Pate, Associate Editor
Kevin McCarthy, Features Editor
Elliott Warnock, Sports Editor
Tom Randolph, Photo Editor
Ernie Pitt, Night Editor



by Lana Starnes and Dr. Takey Crist

(Editor's Note: Third in a series on contraception.)

The diaphragm method is an approach to contraception which has been used successfully by many for well over 80 years. It involves the use of a contraceptive cream or jelly in combination with a vaginal diaphragm.

The vaginal diaphragm is a circular metal spring covered with a fine latex rubber. The spring is flexible along one axis and the entire diaphragm can be compressed and easily passed into the vagina.

A woman using this method puts a small amount of contraceptive cream or jelly in the bowl or on the dome of the diaphragm and applies a little around the edge of the rim with her fingertip. She compresses the sides of the rim together and inserts it into the vagina. Insertion can be accomplished simply with the fingers or with a special plastic inserter designed for that purpose.

Properly placed the diaphragm fits securely and comfortably, covering the cervix completely. The diaphragm operates both by mechanically obstructing entry of sperm into the cervix and by inactivating sperm with chemicals contained in the cream or jelly.

Since the dimensions of the vagina from the area behind the cervix to the public bone varies, diaphragms are available in specific sizes. The distance may be measured by vaginal examination and the proper size prescribed.

There are several distinct advantages to this method. Women who use the diaphragm need concern themselves with protection only at those times when they expect intercourse.

A woman may insert the diaphragm one or two hours before intercourse and still be protected. Thus, foreplay need not be interrupted. If an additional act of intercourse is desired, however, an additional amount of cream or jelly should be inserted with the applicator.

After intercourse the diaphragm must be

left in place for at least six hours, usually until the next morning. Douching is not necessary at all, but if desired, a woman should wait until the diaphragm is removed.

Whether or not intercourse takes place, the diaphragm may be left in place for 24 hours. After it is removed, the diaphragm should be washed with soap and water and dried. It should be powdered and put back in its box or container.

The cost of the diaphragm is approximately \$5 and the cream or jelly approximately 11¢ to 15¢ for each use. If cared for properly, the diaphragm may be used for a year or longer.

This method has its disadvantages too. Women must first be "measured" by a physician to determine the proper size diaphragm. At the time of the fitting, if the woman has not used a diaphragm before, the doctor will instruct her in how to insert it properly and how to remove it. Some women have difficulty overcoming their embarrassment at the prospect of this rehearsal.

The woman who has an aversion to

inserting the diaphragm into the vagina would also be unhappy with this method.

The diaphragm is about 90 percent effective in preventing pregnancy. It ranks third in effectiveness behind the IUD and the pill.

Another appliance designed to cover the entrance to the womb is called the cervical cap. This is a small cap or cup made of plastic or rubber, which fits securely over the cervix, much like a tight thimble on the finger.

Like the diaphragm, a cap must be fitted carefully by a physician. But unlike the diaphragm, self-insertion and placement are a difficult procedure for women because the cervix is located so deep in the vagina.

Being much more difficult to use the cap is less acceptable than the diaphragm. However, for those who can master the technique or placement, it may be an ideal method.

One distinct advantage of the cap is that it can be left in place for up to one month at a time. Some doctors instruct the woman to insert the cap after menstruation and leave it in place for almost the entire cycle, removing it only a few days before the next period is due.

Like the diaphragm, if properly fitted the cap can not be felt by either partner and will not be displaced during intercourse.

Studies indicate the cap can be as effective in preventing pregnancy as the condom or the diaphragm.

(Next week: IUDs.)

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.)

COPYRIGHT © 1974 by Lana Starnes and Dr. Takey Crist. All rights reserved.

The Daily Tar Heel provides the opportunity for expression of opinions by readers through letters to the editor. This newspaper reserves the right to edit all letters for libelous statements and good taste.

Letters should be limited to 300 words and must include the name, address and phone number of the writer. Type letters on a 60-space line and address them to Editor, The Daily Tar Heel, in care of the Student Union.

of other controversial matters present their views, so do opponents, and both sides are discussed intensively in small groups.

Secondly, grades are based on objective knowledge tests graded according to distribution of scores, and on scholarly papers that are expected to present and document at least two opposing views on sexuality-related problems chosen by the individual students. Probably largely due to the fact that the subject matter of the course is of great personal interest and relevance to most students, a remarkable proportion of the papers submitted demonstrate a serious effort at a thorough and painstaking examination of facts and expert opinions and at achieving a rational, dispassionate summation. If, as is the case, the majority of papers are of a commendably high caliber, grades are awarded on this basis even if their distribution does not adhere strictly to an artificially imposed curve.

Mr. Morton intimates that the preponderance of good grades could be interpreted as a "cheap form of bribery to gain an audience in order to promote a controversial point of view." This statement is too absurd to need refutation. This course is designed, and we constantly try to improve it, to serve the needs of students—not to proselytize them to any particular view. Mr. Morton is however right on one point: that only an "overly-cynical observer" would arrive at the interpretation he offers. Had he but invested as much time in talking to the faculty and to some of the students who have taken the course recently, as he invested in copying and tabulating about 275 grades, I am sure his cynicism would have been cured.

Godfrey M. Hochbaum, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Health Education
School of Public Health

Forum should balance program

To the editor:

I really must commend the Union Forum and other campus organizations for the delightful variety of speakers they provide us, using mostly our own student fees, of course. Bobby Seale, I am sure, can be depended upon to give us a perspective on the state of the universe entirely removed from other speakers we've had this year.

Let's see, we've had, or have scheduled David Brinkley, Ron Dellums, Sam Ervin, Jane Fonda, George McGovern, Gloria Steinem, and Gore Vidal. Seale is sure to be a marked contrast to all these. He'll probably express confidence in the viability of the American system of government, tell us how the lot of minority groups has improved lately, and give us his reasons why Richard Nixon should fulfill his term in office.

There simply must be some kind of pathological fear at this 'liberal' university of bringing in any speaker to the right of the far left. (Sam Ervin's appearance is the exception, but then he was obviously not brought here when he was just to expound on his general political philosophy.) The weak and unsuccessful attempts which the Union Forum has thus far made to find a conservative speaker certainly are not yet significant enough to belie such a fear. The Forum shouldn't be content with just breathing a sigh of relief when it finds out that William Buckley can't come here.

While I admit there is a distinct chance that the minds of some impressionable freshmen might be forever warped if exposed to the thoughts of a conservative speaker, I

think that is just one of the dangers a university must suffer through, if it wants to make the pretense of providing its students with a varied educational experience. If the Union Forum doesn't realize and act on the need for a greater variety of perspectives, then it is abdicating its responsibilities and wasting our money.

Robert N. Putnam II
Rt. 1A, Chapel Hill

Men oppressed more than women

To the editor:

Bunky Flagler's article in Monday's DTH refers to the historical role of women as slaves. Since this is Women's Festival week, perhaps a rebuttal would be appropriate at this time.

No one would deny that the average woman has worked hard throughout history as housewife, mother, and homemaker. But then, hard work has always been the lot of the average man, too. I think the division of labor was rather fair, each sex doing what it could do best: men the heavy physical work; and women taking care of the home and family. After all, housework, as laborious as it was, still had to be done by someone, and a woman was not as physically well-suited to do a man's heavy labor, especially when she was pregnant a good deal of the time and with young children to keep her busy. Men and women both worked like slaves in those days because of the technology (or lack of it) under which they lived.

And don't blame men entirely for the predicament; I suspect that Historical Woman did not exactly have an aversion to sexual affection. Her resulting production of progeny made just as much work for her husband as for herself, since he had to provide for them.

Women's liberation was unfeasible until the advent of effective contraceptive devices (invented by men, incidentally). It was also aided by the development (by men) of home labor-saving appliances under the stimulus, not of harping verbal demands by women, but of the money they had to spend, most of which was earned by husbands for their wives' benefit.

If we must speak of slavery, I contend that men have historically been more oppressed, and that by men's work and inventions women have been given freedom to pursue love, life, and career in any context they chose—with or without marriage or family. Another fact supporting this idea of men's greater oppression is their higher mortality rates, especially in middle age from degenerative diseases; they wear themselves out faster working and competing to support their wives and families.

The Women's Festival wants to improve understanding between men and women, but seemingly only on women's terms. It is my hope that this letter will establish a better foundation for this understanding than some of the distorted historical interpretations under which the feminists have been operating—interpretations that can only serve to antagonize men, who, historically, deserve less contempt. Lynn Wesson's letter noting that men seem to resent lack of attention comes close to the point; what they really resent are the false accusations and the lack of appreciation.

And if some of the generalizations in this letter seem simplistic, then they are on a par with the ones they are opposing.

Mel Morton
106 North Street

'DEAR MR. SOLZHENITSYN — AS A MUCH-PERSECUTED FELLOW AUTHOR, I THOUGHT YOU WOULD WANT TO KNOW THAT LADIES HOME JOURNAL IS A HOT MARKET THIS YEAR . . .'