

Evans Witt, Editor
Monday, March 5, 1973



by Lana Starnes
and
Dr. Takey Crist

Question: How many sperm cells are necessary to make a man fertile? Can a low sperm count be increased?—Signed, Wondering.

Dear Wondering: There should be approximately 80 million sperm per cubic centimeter to insure fertility. If the fertility rate is under 60 million, the chances of impregnation are lessened, though even when the count is lower impregnation has been known to occur. In addition, if sperm do not move vigorously or if more than 25 percent are malformed there is usually sterility.

A low count is usually associated with illness, fatigue and poor health. Therefore, a low count can be increased by plenty of rest and relaxation, as well as proper diet and exercise.

Question: I would like to know exactly what the North Carolina laws governing cohabitation are, and how strictly these laws are enforced.—Signed, C.L.

Dear C.L.: The usual interpretation of cohabitation, or living together, has generally been held to open and notorious adultery or fornication, not a single, furtive act.

The law itself reads:
14-184. Fornication and adultery. If any man and woman, not being married

to each other, shall lewdly and lasciviously associate, bed and cohabit together, they shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Provided that the admissions or confessions of one shall not be received in evidence against the other. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be punishable by a fine not to exceed five hundred dollars, imprisonment for not more than six months, or both.

Nonenforcement is the general rule, especially where both parties are of full age and have freely consented. The chance of anyone's going to jail for either sexual offense is slim indeed. So, for that matter, are the chances of even paying a fine. Despite the fact that laws are on the

statute books, prosecuting attorneys are simply not interested in this type of prosecution.

Question: What are the chances of successful pregnancy if one has experienced one or more miscarriages?—Signed, Worried.

Dear Worried: After a single miscarriage the chances of having a term pregnancy are just about as good as if you had never miscarried. With two miscarriages in succession, chances of successful pregnancy are still good—considerably better than 50-50. If one has had three miscarriages, one after the other, chances of success even with the best care are perhaps less than 50-50.

Question: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using a cervical cap as a means of contraception? How does it compare to the diaphragm? What is its effectiveness?—Signed, Coed.

Dear Coed: The cervical cap is a small cap, or cup, made of metal or plastic, which fits securely over the cervix, or neck of the womb. If the cap fits snugly and remains undisturbed during intercourse, it acts as effectively as a diaphragm in preventing sperm from entering the womb.

A cap, like the diaphragm, must be fitted by a physician. Unlike the diaphragm, however, self-insertion and placement are a difficult procedure for some women because the cervix is located so deep in the vagina.

Women who can master placement technique find this is an ideal method of birth control. This is particularly true because the cap can be worn for days or even weeks at a time without being removed. Some physicians instruct their patients to insert the cap after menstruation and leave it in place for almost the whole cycle, removing it only a few days before the next period is due.

The effectiveness of the cap is extremely high—as high as the diaphragm or condom.

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

Budget to hurt N.C. health care

Governmental budgets often mean little to each of us, except that a slightly larger or smaller chunk will be withheld from our wages to pay income taxes.

But what if a governmental budget meant that you would not be able to get an appointment with a doctor when you are 35 years old and living in Wilmington because the doctor is overloaded with work?

Or that the case load for each nurse, nurse's aide and social worker in the state's mental hospitals and mental health clinics would be greatly increased?

Or that the pace of research and thus implementation in the field of environmental protection and prevention was slowed?

Or that health facilities across the state are either grossly inadequate or outrageously over-expanded and excessively expensive in ten years because no coordinated planning had been available?

These are but a few of the results predicted if President Nixon's budget cuts for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare are approved by Congress. The consequences spring from the dependence of many parts of the University on federal money, particularly in the form of research

grants and student aid money, money that Nixon proposes eliminating or slashing severely.

The most destructive cuts are in the health sciences, in money to train future faculty members to cope with the growing enrollments in medical, dental, nursing and auxiliary schools. While Nixon has claimed that the cuts are only in grants to those who are headed for lucrative private practice and who thus should support themselves, the deans and other officials in the Health Affairs Division here consistently deny that allegation. It is the research- and teaching-oriented students who will be hurt the most, they say.

And all these possible cuts in North Carolina, where there is undeniably a shortage of medical professionals and paraprofessionals. If all the talk about a medical school at ECU would subside a bit, maybe the state legislators would see that it may be necessary to put more state money into the med school here to replace lost federal funds before any new med school can be fully funded.

Nixon and his henchmen have promised the nation better health care, but his budget proposal could cripple health care and health care education in North Carolina for the next 20 years.

The administration and all its secrets

Even though comparisons are at best partially accurate and often misleading, the experiences of a DTH reporter last week make the UNC-CH administration resemble the Nixon Administration regarding obsessive secrecy.

DTH staffer Windy March spent many hours investigating the effects federal budget cuts may have on the University. He received excellent cooperation from department heads and faculty, but none from the administration in preparation for the stories that appeared in Friday's DTH. The administration had a report prepared by Thursday on the possible effects of cuts and presented it to the Chancellor Friday morning.

But the administration refused to release the report, citing "possible errors" in the document.

Perhaps the University did not think of errors when it released a statement two weeks ago claiming that UNC would lose at least \$3.5 million. Of course, the actual figure will be at least \$9 million, but that little inaccuracy didn't bother the administration then.

There are no laws requiring government agencies in this state to give the public access to all but certain classes of documents—but there should be. In the University community in particular, a free flow of the information is essential. (For example, what of the grad students who may be losing their grants? They can only make other plans if they know of the impending loss.)

This is not the first time the Administration has not released information to the community—it will, probably and unfortunately, not be the last.

Letters to the Editor

'Human Liberation' offered as possible topic

To the Editor:
The Carolina Symposium Interim Committee is currently considering eleven topics for the 1974 Symposium. One of these, submitted by Linda Pannill, concerns "Human Liberation," or the future orientation of sex roles in our society.

Such a topic would not only be timely, but also of interest to all students. In the past few years, the women's movement has raised a number of questions concerning relationships between men and women, the education and socialization of children, women's place in society, and the definition of acceptable work according to sex. The Symposium could center around these and other issues—not to rehash the past, but to explore possibilities for the future. Certainly such a topic would offer a wide variety of choices for speakers, films, and discussions.

The Executive Council of the Association of Women Students, and the Women's Forum have unanimously

endorsed this proposed topic. We hope that the committee will seriously consider this when it chooses a topic this evening. However, if this topic is not chosen, we ask that just consideration be given to women speakers for the Symposium, as the presence of women speakers in past Symposiums has been severely lacking.

Amelia Bellows
AWS Chairperson

Pitt sincere in ideas of reform

To the Students, in care of the Editor:
The election is over and you people showed your support for continuing Student Government. Given SG's record in the past, and its promise for improved change in the future from each succeeding candidate, I seriously and honestly doubt the new one will be any better.

There were those who tried to link

Surely the 106 lives lost in the downing of the Libyan airliner over the Sinai Peninsula last week will come to be known as one of the most tragic incidents in a generally tragic Arab-Israeli conflict. But the disturbing thing is that the event itself may be overshadowed by the blow local reaction to it has struck against the hope for the nations involved to find a peaceful solution to their problems. I would like to suggest that the sooner the incident is forgotten about, both in the Middle East and here, the better off everyone will be.

In retrospect, it is difficult for anyone to say that the Israelis were correct to shoot down an unarmed Arab passenger aircraft that happened to stray from its Cairo, Egypt, destination. But at the same time the situation was developing, the decision as to what action the Israeli Air Force should take must have been so difficult and so agonizing the worst they should be accused of is a human error of judgment.

Imagine, if you will, that it is 1962, at the height of the Cuban missile crisis. The Soviet Union has been moving offensive military rockets into Cuba only 90 miles across the Florida Strait from the United States itself. John Kennedy has announced a naval blockade of the island, and ordered the U.S. Navy to stop, by any means necessary, Soviet ships bound for Cuba. The outbreak of war seems a very real possibility.

And suddenly the North American Air Defense Command gets an unidentified

blip on one of its radar screens. Its speed indicates it is a jet aircraft, and its course is approximately toward Cape Canaveral. The U.S. Air Force is alerted, and a squadron of jet interceptors is scrambled. When they rendezvous with the unidentified aircraft, they radio back that it appears to be an airliner bearing the markings of Aeroflot, the Soviet Union's national airline. But it is still on a course for Cape Canaveral. Aeroflot does regularly fly to Cuba, and its normal flight path is not so very many miles away from its present position, but no plane has ever before been off course on its flight to Havana. And the aircraft is about to violate U.S. airspace. It does appear to be an ordinary airliner, but there is hardly an opportunity to inspect the passengers' baggage—the plane might have been modified to carry either reconnaissance cameras or nuclear bombs. And it is still headed for Cape Canaveral.

The pilots of the U.S. interceptors waggle their wings, the international warning to change course and to land. The "Aeroflot" plane ignores the warnings and flies onward. It now violates U.S. airspace and is over Florida itself. In minutes it will be over Cape Canaveral. The fighter squadron leader radios his Air Force general for instructions. The general thinks of the possible consequences if the plane is on a hostile mission, and of the consequences if it is simply an ordinary airliner off course. He radios back to his fighter pilots that they must...

You get the point, I think. The analogy is not perfect, but crisis atmosphere in which Israel continually exists, and the military importance of the Sinai Desert areas which the Libyan plane overflew, do strike some parallels.

And in retrospect, the Israeli decision to shoot the aircraft down was quite innocently off course. But the Israeli mistake was an understandable one under the circumstances.

Israel has expressed its regrets for the tragedy, has offered to give financial compensation to the victims of the crash, and has asked that a "hot line" be set up with Arab countries so that such a tragic mistake cannot recur. The Arabs rejected this last proposal, and instead called for vengeance for "the ugliest crime in history." The leader of Libya suggested he might order his air force to shoot down Israeli "El Al" airliners wherever they could be found. And, in short, such an outcry has been raised that any meaningful peace negotiations may have been pushed much farther into the future. Certainly therein lies the greatest tragedy.

Tuesday a letter from a Mr. Jim Blaimer appeared in the DTH. It referred to my previous column, in which I expressed the view that a student should not be forced, through compulsory student fee funding of the DTH, to support moral or political views to which

he might be unalterably opposed. Mr. Blaimer then stated that he was unalterably opposed to Dean Smith's use of the "four corners" offense in some of our basketball games. He hadn't thought of it before reading my column, but Blaimer wonders why he should have to pay his student fees "to perpetuate (Smith's) ideology."

First, I could argue that one's preference for some particular offense not to be used in a basketball game is not on the same level as being forced to support some moral or political values contrary to what one holds dear. I think most would agree with me on this point. But then this is, after all, Carolina, and I can't discount the possibility that there are some of us around to whom a winning basketball tactic may be more important than our political or moral beliefs. So to the better answer:

Mr. Blaimer, I completely agree with you—you should have the right to decide whether you want to financially support (i.e., by buying tickets) the UNC basketball team, with its infamous "four corners" offense. I see no justification whatever for requiring every single student to "buy" a "ticket" (that is, be issued an athletic pass to go to all events here in return for a fixed, compulsory student fee). Those having absolutely no interest in athletics are charged the same amount as those who would never miss a game in any sport. Those who hate the sight of a Carolina uniform must pay/as much as those who think Heaven itself should be re-tinted Carolina Blue. (And this is unfair (not even to mention the unfairness to those in the latter category who faithfully wait in line hours for their "paid for" tickets, and still can't get them).)

Those who want to support Carolina, those who want to go to the games should pay for their tickets directly (perhaps at half price) —not through compulsory student fees. Those who do not want to support our athletic teams should not be compelled to pay for doing so. And how long do you think we'd stay in "four corners", Mr. Blaimer, if everybody hated it so much they wouldn't even bother to pay for coming to a game?

Pitt's desire to abolish SG as a complete shaft of the students. That was ridiculous, and they know it. Pitt just wanted more and basic programs and improvements that students could get for their money. Where's the shaft in wanting more concerts, cutting the fees for things we pay for and don't necessarily get (i.e., athletic tickets), what's wrong with wanting the students to elect the president of the Union? Why should we continue to have friends appointing their friends—that's when you get the shaft.

The new president is gung-ho on consumerism and that's good. But what else did we hear from him? The Chapel Hill rip-off will not be everywhere, and you only go through college once. I think most of all you agreed with Pitt's ideas, but not with the way he wanted and chose to carry them out. Instead you chose the old system. (Even Mr. Epps has said he would help the new president.) Can it really help? Has it helped in the past? Did Epps help in the past? When this next year is over, step back

and objectively observe the situation; then ask yourself if the students' lot is any better. If you personally know Pitt, you know that he was sincere in what he wanted to accomplish. But, you the students, didn't even give him the chance. But you griped at SG, and you'll gripe next year. The joke will again be on you. But don't blame me or the rest of the Blue Sky Party—because we voted for Pitt. At least I'm glad I had the chance to drastically change things before I left Carolina.

Tom Ozment
Blue Sky Party
Rt. 5, Chapel Hill

ERA to squelch growth of truth

To the Editor:
The People should be able to see through the Equal Rights Amendment for

what it really is—a conspiracy of the coalition of New Deal Rooseveltians and Coolidgeites to squelch the growth of the true way. But the choice will be made clear—support Socialism, stop the ERA.

Sid Faith
Providence, Rhode Island
Class of '70

The Daily Tar Heel

Evans Witt, Editor

80 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
Scott Stewart, Head Photographer
Dean Gerdes, Night Editor
Bruce Mann, Feature Editor