



by Lana Starnes  
and  
Dr. Takey Crist

**Question: Is it possible for a woman to have a satisfactory sex life after having a hysterectomy? What changes, if any, occur in a woman's response? — Signed, Curious.**

Dear Curious: Women who have hysterectomies do indeed have full and satisfactory sexual relations.

After a hysterectomy there is a period of imposed abstinence during which the wall of the vagina, where it was connected to the uterus, must heal. This usually takes about six weeks. After the healing is complete intercourse can be resumed without fear of harm or pain.

The removal of the uterus may mean a slight difference in sensation at the time of orgasm and, if the ovaries are removed, there may be a need for replacement hormone medication which can be taken

daily and which can completely make up for the absent hormone.

Perhaps more importantly, the source of aggravation is gone. The uterus can be the source of heavy bleeding, pain, tumors and infections. These are reasons that a hysterectomy is performed. After the operation is over the irregular bleeding is stopped. The pain is gone. Pregnancy and contraception are no longer a hassle. All these changes tend to bring about a sense of relief and freedom which in itself can lead to greater realization of sexual satisfaction.

**Question: Is the condom really effective as a birth control method? What are the pros and cons for this method? — Signed, Male.**

Dear Male: The condom ranks third in efficiency after birth control pills and IUD's. Pregnancy rates vary from five percent to 20 percent.

Of course, the condom must be properly used, which means in the

egg from which the Siamese twins originated divided into two parts quite absence of satisfactory lubrication the outside should be lubricated and it must be withdrawn from the vagina very cautiously, being careful that it does not break and that no sperm are allowed to escape.

One advantage of the method is that condoms are readily available in drugstores without prescription. The cost is low and it can be useful as a "back-up" method to provide extra protection (i.e. when a woman forgets to take her pill).

Women consider that one distinct advantage of this method is that it places the main responsibility for contraception on the male. On the other hand many find this method inconvenient and unattractive. And some men find a condom unpleasant to use and an interference with satisfaction.

**Question: What happens after fertilization that causes the formation of Siamese twins? — Signed, B.G.**

Dear B.G.: It is believed that the single

late, perhaps as late as 10 to 13 days after fertilization. By this relatively late date, the cells which are to form the embryo have grown into a sizeable clump, and when division occurs, it is just too much to cut through, as it were, and division is incomplete. Siamese twins are united by the common tissue which fails to divide completely.

**Question: Does the menstrual cycle affect a woman's capacity for orgasmic response? — Signed, Curious Male.**

Dear Curious Male: The phase of her menstrual cycle does influence a woman's orgasmic capacity. Studies indicate that women go through regular phases of being "turned on" and other phases when they are "turned off." The time of ovulation is a period when women are very "turned on."

(Questions should be addressed to The Daily Tar Heel, Student Union, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.)

COPYRIGHT (C) 1973 by Lana Starnes and Dr. Takey Crist. All rights reserved.

## Many changes in your tuitions

The UNC Board of Governors took three important actions Friday morning in relation to that subject dear to many students' hearts—money.

The board voted to raise tuition for in-state students over the next two years and to ask the General Assembly to abolish tuition deposits and to give the board the power to define residency for tuition purposes.

The rise in in-state tuition is actually a minor one—especially when compared to the almost 100 per cent jump out-of-state tuition has taken in the past two years. In-state rates will rise \$17 next year and \$14 more for 1974-75. This rise is an effort by the board to bring tuition rates for state institutions with similar programs into rough equality. Chapel Hill's tuition rates will be the same as N.C. State and UNC-G by 1974-75.

The Board's request to the General Assembly on tuition deposits is a most welcome one.

The legislature arbitrarily imposed the requirement that entering students deposit \$100 toward tuition upon acceptance and that returning students deposit \$50. Designed to help schools project their enrollments, all the deposits accomplished was increased red tape and actually poorer enrollment projections. It imposed a burden on students to come up with the cash that was totally unnecessary.

The legislators will, we hope, see

the absurdity in their action two years ago and repeal the tuition deposit requirement.

### But about 'domicile'

The single most significant action on tuition, however, was the board's request that they be given the power to determine the regulations regarding in-state and out-of-state residency for tuition purposes. In the past, the General Assembly has jealously guarded this power to try to keep "outside agitators" out of the universities.

In recent years, the legal tangle of residency has become complicated with various courts ruling variously on different cases. That many students are registered to vote in the state and yet pay out-of-state tuition is one of the injustices that demands solution.

With the rapidly developing area of case law on residency for tuition, the UNC system needs to be more flexible in setting its regulations than rules set by legislation will permit. UNC also must be able to recognize that students often choose to become residents of this state while still in school.

While the board would be able to recognize this fine point of law, the legislature probably lacks appreciation of the situation so to do.

In short, the board would probably relax the residency regulations. The legislature is not likely ever to take such a step.

Gerry Cohen

## Bus system is vital for Chapel Hill

Chapel Hill voters will go to the polls a week from tomorrow to decide the fate of a proposed public bus system for the town.

Why should the referendum pass? Why should people who have reservations about the solution to the parking problem cast a vote yes?

The reasons, I think, are very important. Unless the proposal is approved, there will be no bus system. As one commentator has said, we will be back to the beginning in the traffic situation, but with two more years of increased traffic.

Unless voters approve the referendum, the town will not be able to obtain the 66 per cent grant from the Federal Government for purchase of the buses to be used in the system. Without this funding, the system will be doomed.

To run the system without the federal money would mean an additional cost of about \$40,000 per year to pay off the

buses—which averages to about \$4 m. per car permit. If the system is run by parking fees, or a property tax averaging about \$2 for every person in town.

What will the bus system mean? The bus system means a way of increased mobility for the poor and the elderly, and a corresponding decrease in traffic to work. Many poor people, unable to afford their own cars, are forced to take taxis to work and to friends houses.

The buses will also allow increased mobility for those with and without cars.

It will enable students without cars to escape the Franklin Street rip-off. With Eastgate and University Mall shopping centers, Franklin Street won't have its captive freshman and sophomore audience.

An increased use of buses will help solve the traffic and parking problems. It is no cure-all, but for each person riding the bus to work, there is one less car driving to campus. This will make it safer

for pedestrians and bicyclists. The one-car one-driver syndrome is a mistake.

There will be two questions on the referendum ballot for the 14,000 voters of Chapel Hill to decide on. The first authorizes the city to buy the buses (bond issue), and the second authorizes a tax levy to pay for an operating subsidy, estimated at about \$80,000 per year.

Many citizens have complained about a system that is designed to run at a loss. Yet, if we are to avoid coercive measures that these same people oppose (such as banning driving during certain hours), it is economically necessary to make the act of bus riding as cheap as possible (through low fares and cheap bus passes) and make up the difference through a tax levy at the end of the year. If our goal is to encourage non-use of cars, we must provide an alternative that is not paid fully at the fare box.

No one worries that the police and fire departments run at a deficit—yet if we

look closely, we can put some sort of value on the property and lives protected by these municipal services, and show a net plus on a social ledger book.

While taxpayers immediately see red about a \$60,000 subsidy, I am sure that the amount of gas, oil, tire wear, aggravation, and car depreciation saved by the bus system will be well in excess of this figure.

So you don't like the parking plan that will require a hefty increase in parking fees? A vote no on the referendum will not affect parking restrictions. The University is going to put these into effect—although the exact nature remains to be seen. But we will wind up paying even more if the referendum fails.

Public transportation has to be seen as a vital and necessary public function in any large city and in towns such as Chapel Hill with one central employer.

It is one thing to talk about the environment, but it is another to take action to help. We must realize that there is no absolute freedom to drive a car, and that those who do drive bear the responsibility for helping solve the problem. If this is through increased parking fees, then it is a cost we must bear.

The fringe lot proposal sounds absurd, but it is quite obvious that there are more cars than parking spaces. There are two, and only two solutions to the problem. One is to extend the freshman ban on cars to sophomores. The other is to provide fringe parking with rapid shuttles so that all who want to have cars will be allowed to do so, while paying the true cost of traffic control and parking lots.

Shuttles could also be used on football and basketball afternoons and evenings, to cut down on the incredible traffic jams that develop as 20,000 fans try to occupy the same parking space at the same time.

A vote yes on February 20 is vitally necessary. There are 5,000 students registered in Chapel Hill, about 35 per cent of the electorate—we should express our voice for a sane solution to the transportation problem.

The polls will be open from 6:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m., at the same place you voted on November 7.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Ford Runge offers serious solutions to economic problems (e.g. business ripoffs) in the Chapel Hill-Carrboro area. Only by consumer and tenant information and organizing can the weight of the consumer be brought to bear. Don't just complain.

## UNC 'corporation' to buy the utilities?

Early last fall, the University had us all believing it was going to sell the utilities. The governor's study Commission recommended it and the Board of Trustees and Board of Governors apparently agreed.

But in Friday's UNC-CH Board of Trustees' meeting, the decision was made to look into the possibility that a University-owned corporation might own and operate the electric, water, and telephone services. This means that commercial companies, a

corporation set up by area governments and this University corporation might all be bidding for the right to "serve" the people of Chapel Hill.

Last fall we applauded the University's decision to get out of the utilities business.

The situation now is the same: the University should stick to education and stay out of the utilities business, whether directly or through a dummy "corporation."



## Windy March

# Campus politicos involved for sake of 'ego trip'

What's a politico? Whatever it is, it gets a lot of bad press.

It was the subject of the following conversation, overheard in the Union:

"Djou vote 'nat shit?"

"Oh helyeh. Every concerned student should vote."

"Whoodja vote for?"

"Johnson. I think he's in my psych class. Or some dude who looks like him is."

"Yeah, I saw him at the Golden West one night. Long as you didn't vote for one of those dam politico crazies."

Whoever they were, they had about the standard opinion of the "politicos," whoever they are. It is, of course, difficult to pin down a politico and get him to admit what he is.

He will deny it, even if you use thumbscrews. Still, we all know they are there, somewhere — if not, who fouls up SG so bad? Ask Pitt. He will tell you they are there, just like the goldfish who said to the other goldfish, "OK, if there is no God, who changes the water?"

One should obviously vote for a non-politico, or someone much like you and me and our friends, who are not, and never would be, politicos. Natch.

We may accept as a definition of "politico" the phrase "one who is involved in student politics."

There are, however, a couple of objections. One is that some of us have friends who are involved in SG, and all the saints may witness that none of us would ever be friends with a politico.

Another objection is that, if we accept this definition, the only way to get rid of the politicos is to abolish student government.

Where have I heard that before? Unfortunately, to abolish it, you'd have to get involved in it a little bit, at least, and with our definition, that's like getting sort of involved with leprosy, or getting a little bit pregnant.

Our definition, therefore, is inadequate. Let us augment it. A "politico" is one who is involved in student politics, and who is bad. Now we're getting somewhere.

The next question, obviously, is "bad how?"

Well, bad because they act dumb. They get all excited over things that are thoroughly unimportant. But that's only the outward sign, it doesn't really tell what they are. We all get excited over things some people think aren't

important, like setting fire to ping-pong balls and counting the number of times the letters "u," "c," and "k" appear in that order on the wall in the can on fourth floor Wilson.

What they do is, these politicos, they get on an odd sort of power trip connected with being where "it" is at, "it" being the decision process of the student government.

Boy, I mean, if that's your idea of a power trip, boy, yugotta be really a weird, hyuk, hyuk, gimme that "Oui," that this month's?

I think we have it now. The politico likes to be in groups where some sort of "big" decision is being made, and likes to throw his opinion into the group. This constitutes being where "it" is at, and "it" is in some places more than in others.

Unfortunately, unless there is a lot of work done beforehand, "it" never gets to be anywhere. And work is a thing the politico is not wild about.

Suppose, for example, that the UNC tree-climbing club wants money from student government. Not only does somebody have to listen for hours to some avid arboreal extol the comparative merits of pine and dutch elm, but they

have to be fitted into a budget, which has to balance, etc., etc.

If the tree-climbing club request gets to be controversial, then the politico wants to be around when the decision is made, and get his name in the DTH. But he doesn't want to do the work.

Well, there are some people in SG who are willing to do the work and are relatively unconcerned about the perverse ego trip aspects. And some do both.

So the problem is insoluble. It's impossible to weed out the bads from the goods by voting, because nobody votes. So the only way is to abolish student government.

We're back to that again. The guys who want to do this make a virtue of not taking student government seriously — they think it's stupid to get involved with the work. But they dig running for president. Who are they beginning to sound like?

At any rate, you agree with them — you voted for them, most of you. They don't even take it seriously enough to abolish it, despite what they say, and neither do you. If you did, it would have been abolished long ago.

If you think you had to wait around for Pitt Dickey to do that, you're

incredibly naive.

And if you don't really want to abolish it, you just voted for a "non-politico" so as to "show the politicos what we think of them," then apparently your ego-perversity knows no bounds.

I got news for you. They already know what you think of them, and they couldn't care less. They only care about their ego-trip, be it running for president or whatever. Otherwise, they wouldn't scream that they're not politicos.

So who are the politicos? The ones who, like you, don't take it seriously; the ones who, like you, think it's stupid to get involved with the work; the ones who, like you, involved with it only for the sake of a perverse ego trip; you still want to get rid of the politicos?

So slash your wrists. They are you. And what about the guys who promised you they'd get rid of the politicos? Pitt? Boone?

Put them in office and give them a little time.

## The Daily Tar Heel

Evans Witt, Editor

79 Years  
of  
Editorial Freedom

The Daily Tar Heel strives to provide meaningful news interpretations and opinions on its editorial page. Unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor, while letters and columns represent only the views of individual contributors.

David Woodall, Managing Editor  
Mary Newsom, News Editor  
Howie Carr, Associate Editor  
Lynn Lloyd, Associate Editor  
Winston Cavin, Sports Editor  
Bruce Mann, Feature Editor  
Scott Stewart, Head Photographer  
Dean Gerdes, Night Editor