

editorials



Photo by Ted Kirk

Ford visit: next time, more time

Gerald Ford seems to be stuck in a rut, winning only part of the support wherever he goes.

First it was against Jimmy Carter. Now, some NU officials were displeased with Ford's visit to campus last week.

Generally the complaint seems to be that Ford's visit provided little insight into the Presidency.

Some officials were pleased. As Harry Haynie, NU Foundation president, noted, "the classroom is not the place for major political addresses."

But we can sympathize with those who complained about the visit. The problems were time and format.

As we noted before the visit, too few students had the chance to hear and question Ford. There was too little time allowed for interaction.

Ford spent much of his time here going through the obligatory formalities—a speech here

and there, dinners and meeting people. During what time he had for questions, good were mixed with bad.

We heard one complaint that he did not satisfactorily answer a question about the 18-year-old vote and why more young people weren't voting. Someone should have remembered: Ford's a politician, not a political scientist.

It would have been more interesting, for example, if he had been given time to discuss the hours and days of the Mayaguez incident.

We can't agree that Ford's visit was a waste. But his possible visit next spring will be if he cannot spend more time on campus.

And, now that he has had dinner with officials, maybe he can spend a few nights eating in residence halls and fraternities or sororities.

We welcome a spring visit from Ford and hope that next time, he has more time.



Warning, fans! Too much tube time and you'll never score another TD

Watching football on television causes sexual impotency in the human male, according to an eminent researcher in the field.

Dr. Homer T. Pettibone, D.V.M., reported that a study of 1,342 American men who watched a "moderate amount" of football last weekend showed that 94.2 per cent suffered "severe, if not total diminution of their sexual drive."

arthur hoppe innocent bystander

He defined a "moderate amount" as eight to twelve hours.

Dr. Pettibone blamed several factors for the results. Some of the subjects (6.4 per cent) were too emotionally exhausted, he said, to be interested in sex.

Another 12.3 per cent, after staring all that time at the swirling figures on a glass screen while consuming vast quantities of beer, entered a catatonic state.

But the vast majority (81.3 per cent) were emasculated, he said, by guilt.

"Take your average subject," Dr. Pettibone said grimly. "He deserts his wife and children to sit in front of his television set for hours on end, accomplishing absolutely nothing, totally mesmerized by the sight of grown men throwing their arms around each other, patting each other on the buttocks and piling on."

"Is it any wonder that his feelings of self worth are utterly destroyed, that he is filled with self loathing,

and that the very thought of romance subconsciously engenders only distaste?"

Fortunately, Dr. Pettibone believes this condition can be cured by an understanding wife. He cautions, however, against a too direct approach, citing the case of Helen M., who, three months into last season, entered the living room in a black negligee one Monday night and suggested halftime ceremonies.

"It's third and three on the four and shut up," explained her husband, Fred. Undaunted, Helen changed into a football uniform in hopes of piquing his interest. But, as luck would have it, she chose the silver-and-black jersey of the hated Oakland Raiders and subsequently won an uncontested divorce on charges of unnecessary roughness.

A more constructive example, Dr. Pettibone says, is that of Bert H., whose loyal wife, Cora, had brought him two martinis during every game last season. By the time of the Super Bowl, Bert had constructed an eight-foot replica of the Eiffel Tower out of the toothpicks.

Bolstered by a sense of accomplishment, he took her in his arms after the final replay. Unhappily, he had forgotten her name and in the ensuing altercation both the replica and their marriage were demolished.

Bert and Cora, however, have "shown the way," says Dr. Pettibone. It is up to every wife, he says, to interest her husband in a rewarding hobby he can undertake on his lap—such as knitting, tatting, needlepoint or Spanish lacework.

Under no circumstances, he warns, should she force him to give up watching football on television. Men who do not watch football on television, he explained, are considered by our society to be unmanly.

Copyright 1977, Chronicle Publishing Co.



letters to the editor

Once again our administration shows its lack of concern for students.

As if increasing parking and student fees aren't enough, administrators have adroitly planned the due date for tuition payments exactly two days before the closing of the third quarter after which bank savings interest is computed.

The budget-minded student seems continually thwarted in attempts to make ends meet, and those running the university frequently indicate they could care less whether or not the student does.

Stephen Bruce

Canal politics

In reply to Don Orton's (letter to the editor, Sept. 23), I would like to clear up certain points.

First, Gen. Torrijos has helped the people of Panama solve the crisis of identity.

This crisis of political development appears in developing societies. It revolves around the problem of achieving a common sense of identification. The sense of belonging is extremely important in any society.

Nationalism is often used to create cohesiveness among people in a nation, and Gen. Torrijos has used it well.

I agree that Hitler and Mussolini created nationalistic fervor to rally their people, but so did Gen. (George) Washington.

Second, Latin America is solidly behind the treaty. Heads of State and foreign ministers met in Washington to give Panama unanimous support in the treaty. Mexico, for one, complained that the neutrality pact allowing the United States to intervene in Panama after the year 2000 was a violation of Panamanian sovereignty.

Third, Chile and Nicaragua do not depend 80 per cent to 90 per cent on the canal for survival. I would urge Orton to verify the gross national product as well as other economic figures of these countries prior to making such statements.

I may add, our government intends to keep the canal open to all nations at all times after the year 2000 as specified in the treaty (and the United States guarantees this intention.)

Finally, Panama and the United States are friends. We intend to remain allies with the United States. We view the American people and government with great respect and admiration.

Panamians always have and always will welcome Americans in Panama with warmth. We do not oppose the United States, what we oppose is the colonial structure in Panama. Once that is ended, our relations will be even better.

Jaime E. Figueroa

