

The Daily Tar Heel

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

Tom Gooding, Editor

It's Time To Court The Administration

Approximately 1,600 students signed a petition Thursday protesting the conviction and punishment of a student for a violation of the administration's visitation policy.

The petition points out the irrelevancy of a social policy regulating visiting hours in dorm rooms or an academic institution.

This petition will be presented to the Trustee Consultative Committee in an effort to show the Trustees the general mood on campus concerning the visitation issue.

We are confident that numerous additional signatures will be obtained for the petition before the Committee meets next week.

However, the organizers of the petition should remember that three years ago a petition calling for a self-determined visitation policy was presented to Dean of Student Affairs C.O. Cathey.

That petition contained 4,000 signatures but produced no results.

With proper respect to the principle of participatory

democracy, we feel the petition is a nice but politically empty gesture.

We find no reason to believe that the Trustees will be moved to act because a piece of paper containing student signatures.

The Trustees have never been known to change a policy because of the prevailing sentiments of the student body.

Consequently, the executive officers of this student body should begin serious preparation for carrying this issue beyond the University community.

The Speaker Ban Law of 1963, which stood throughout massive student protests, was finally removed from the law books by a federal court.

The administration's visitation policy places the University in a position to intimidate students by threatening their permanent academic record.

This is an unconstitutional limitation on the personal rights of students as the Speaker Ban Law was.

Thus, we are waiting to see the administration in court once again.

3 Cheers For Bernie

"I'm glad it's over."

That's what Bernie Oakley said Thursday afternoon after Athletic Director Homer Rice re-enstated him to the cheerleading squad.

We're glad it's over, too.

The whole hassle over the length of Oakley's hair got completely out of hand. Rice wisely stepped in to end it by overruling the decision of the two cheerleading coaches to remove Oakley from the squad.

A lot of problems and ill-feelings could have been avoided if Rice had spoken out sooner, but as the situation turned out one important fact was brought into the open:

The head cheerleader does little more than act as a puppet for the people who pull his pursestrings.

When the issue first began Gunnar Fromen made a point of not getting his name mentioned in the dispute. In neither the original story on the dispute nor the story on the vote of the cheerleader's Standards Board to accept the length of Oakley's hair are any comments from Fromen to be found.

The only time he was quoted was Thursday morning when he said, "It's their (the coaches) decision, and we have to do it. There's an image we have to try to uphold although the students and I might not agree with it."

"That's the image of the cheerleader," he said. "we're probably seen more than anyone else. We're representing the athletic department and the school."

Fromen refused to admit that the purpose of the cheerleaders is to lead the student body in cheers for the football and basketball teams.

If the cheerleaders are supposed to lead the students then it stands to reason that they should present an image that reflects the composition of the student body, not the athletic department.

If there is one thing that can be learned from the entire two weeks of bickering over the length of Oakley's hair it is that the students fell the cheerleaders should represent the student body. Look at the letters on this page on the subject of Oakley's hair.

Consider the fact that a march on Kenan Stadium was being planned before the organizers learned of Rice's actions.

Or maybe the 30-minute chant-in proposed by three students and a faculty member which would drown out all cheers Saturday except for one massive voice shouting, "We Want Bernie."

Those plans were cancelled Thursday, but they show that Bernie Oakley represents a spirit that the students on this campus feel is necessary to the cheerleading squad.

Fromen, by his comments, represents a position that students reject.

Maybe Fromen should lead the cheers in the end zone section of Kenan Stadium, and Bernie Oakley, who has the ability to excite the student body, should take over Fromen's position as head cheerleader.

Letters

Cheerleader Supports Oakley

To the Editor:

After having been a Carolina Cheerleader for the third year now, I am being completely drained of my enthusiasm due to the controversy over Bernie Oakley's hair.

To begin with I would like to let it be known that I hold Bernie in the highest esteem after working with him for the third year now. He was Head cheerleader of the freshman squad and did a most commendable job. He is truly dedicated to cheerleading and would work to his wits end (which he has) for the benefit of our squad. He thrives on being a part of generating goodwill and enthusiasm among our fellow students, as all of us do.

The controversy stems from a lack of verbal communication. Mr. Rice will not be directly responsible for Bernie's excommunication, he lets our "advisors" and/or Head Cheerleader do the dirty work. There seems to be a general feeling in the Athletic Department that states a person in the athletic association will be "clean-cut" or he will not represent UNC.

The fact of money has popped into the scene. Certain alumni have rumored to stop contributions unless Oakley is dealt with. Personally, we could do without their support. If they are going to support us through the CAA they should do it whole-heartedly.

Why don't they pay for the laundering of our uniforms and buy our footwear? Why don't they send all members of the squad to away games instead of a limited number? We do not eat at the training

table and, therefore, should not be expected to abide by their rules. We have a Standards Board which makes our rules and enforces them. Each member of our squad is willing to abide by our set of rules including our martyr, Bernie Oakley.

The CAA does pay for our food lodging and transportation during away games, but this is minor in comparison to the service we render. Aside from cheerleading, our girls help with the recruiting program every home game. We are used in commercials, without any notification, for the good of the CAA. In my mind their financial support is an even trade for our services. I feel that we are doing a fine job and are living up to our responsibilities as cheerleaders, but for our sake don't dictate how we should act or dress or wear our hair.

I want to dispell any thoughts of narrow-minded Alumni and/or parents that think that Bernie is trying to "prove something" by growing his hair long. His attitude toward hair could be likened to a \$50,000-a-year alumnus's decision to drink Cutty Sark Scotch or Jim Beam Bourbon—it's all a matter of taste. If the Alumni's tastes differ I would label it "unfortunate." I was elected by representatives of Student Government, faculty, Athletic Association, and senior members of the squad. We were supposed to be representatives of the student body. I feel that we are doing this.

One might ask why aren't there any Negroes on the squad, well—last year a Negro was elected and chose not to participate and this year none tried out.

In my mind we are representative of the student body WITH Bernie. Without him I don't feel that we are living up to our own expectations, and it is hindering my own ability to generate enthusiasm. We are doing our part, why can't they leave us alone. Without Bernie Oakley cheering with our squad I feel that we have been dealt a severe blow.

Robert E. Giles
UNC Varsity Cheerleader

OAKLEY FOR KING

To the Editor:

Two items in the Thursday Tar Heel have given me an idea. One is the shameful removal of Bernie Oakley from the cheerleading squad; the other, the announcement of the opening date for Homecoming Queen entries. Can you see it already?

The practice of entering males in Homecoming Queen contests has precedence in the last couple of years, and I believe that at least two male students have won such contests. I think it would be a fitting expression of protest for the Carolina student body to elect a willing Bernie Oakley as Homecoming King.

Stuart R. Lynn
42 Tarheel Trailer Ct.

STUDENTS UNITE

To the Student Body:

Students unite! Bernie Oakley is being prosecuted for his beliefs. About 2000 years ago people fought revolutions for this right. Before that people migrated to a country, left everything they had and

owned to come to a wilderness and started over again. These people wanted only one thing, that was to be free of the persecution they were receiving for what they believed in.

Today in North Carolina students in high school have boycotted classes to have more representative cheerleaders. I'm not suggesting boycotting classes, but something must be done. Maybe if we boycotted a ballgame or just refused to cheer. We HAVE to do something to give Bernie Oakley his rights back.

America is a free country, or is that just some line the alumni has been giving us?

Gary Miller
303 Mangum Hall

ALUMNI WRONG

To the Editor:

It is unfortunate indeed that the "Alumni" should have to establish controls for the present student body to follow in order for us to provide the proper atmosphere of enthusiasm and spirit at football games. It seems that the alumni have control of a large portion of the money in the athletic department, thereby feeling it unnecessary to dictate the actions of the "A.A." AND ITS Affiliates, by some right given to them by the monetary god.

The poor cheering squad, by virtue of its affiliation with the "A.A." falls under the jurisdiction of the alumni, who don't like Bernie Oakley at all, because they don't think he represents them properly at football games. His long hair and beard represent something completely alien to them, therefore he must be eliminated from the squad. But what the alumni don't see, is that Bernie is realizing the goals of the squad by representing the present student body!

Must one student be penalized for doing his best to represent us? I should hope that we have not become so apathetic as to allow this to happen to one of our best. We must stand up for what is right, and not be moved by that which we know is wrong!

Sincerely,

Jim Luxton, John Bohannon
104 Ruffin

UNC STARTING UNREST?

To the Editors:

This university is an educational institute, not a political arena. Is that why the administration capitulated to the politics of alumni and fired the long haired cheerleader?

This university is concerned about student rights. Is it more concerned about abiding by hypocritical standards?

This university has a strong, tough disruption policy. Why is this university trying hard to start unrest?

Tom Vass
317 Teague

MAJORITY RULES

To the Editor:

I would just like to express how terribly disappointed I am concerning the decision made about Bernie Oakley's hair. I don't see how anyone has the right to tell him how to cut his hair. Is he telling others how to keep their hair?

Because of just thirteen complaints from alumni, it has been decided that his hair should be cut. If we get together thirteen people in favor of it the way it is, would our opinions even be considered? Certainly not! The majority rules every other democratic situation, why not here?

Even though Bernie has been officially cut from the cheerleading squad, I hope it is not too late for this decision to be reconsidered and Bernie to be restored to his rightful position. I think that this terrible injustice should be corrected, and the time is now!

Sincerely,
Kathy Wolfe
345 W. Cobb

13 PLAYING GOD

To the Editor:

What kind of University is it that allows one of the best and hardest working cheerleaders to be removed from the squad for the trite reason that his hair is long. Since when can 13 people of unknown origin, govern and stereotype 17,567? Since when can 13 people who to decide to play God, tell 17,567 a man's entire being and worth depends on the length (or the lack of length) of his hair.

It is an insult to every individual who is a part of this University to accept this type of idiotic decision. The cheerleaders duty is to lead the student body in cheers. They are supposed to represent the student body—the entire student body, including guys with hair down to their ankles, if they wish. Oakley is a good cheerleader, and he does just that—leads cheers!

If we allow the railroading of Oakley off the cheerleading squad we might as well submit to stereotyping and uniformity ourselves. Who knows at the next ball game "the gods" may be peering through their binoculars and decide they don't like your looks either!

Judd Davidson
417 Granville East



Dane Hartgrove

People Aren't Themselves

Last Friday night I came back to my dormitory about 12:30, went to my room to relieve myself of my sweater, took one of my carefully hoarded cigarettes (I'm trying to quit) out of its pack, and went out on the balcony to think and replay a pleasant evening passed with some of my friends at the home of one of my professors.

I had just lit up and wedged myself comfortably against one of the balcony supports when I was distracted by a commotion of the sixth floor balcony. The sixth floor is assigned to women students, and there was some poor drunk up there trying to get to see a girl that lives in one of the sixth floor suites.

It struck me as kind of pathetic that a grown man should be standing up there on the sixth floor balcony crying and saying all sorts of emotional things to get the attention of a girl that, it turned out, had already gone to sleep. And I found myself wondering why things have to be that way in relations between people.

While I was thinking about these things, the drunk on the sixth floor either passed out or was led away to his room. Anyway, I stopped eavesdropping on his private life and went back to my room to write this article.

I wonder, really, if there is such a thing as an honest relationship between a

man and a woman, or between any two people in our society. Why, for instance, wasn't it possible for the guy on the sixth floor balcony just to say to this girl that he wanted to talk to her or go to bed with her or whatever, instead of getting drunk and banging on her door in the early hours of a Saturday morning?

Is there such a thing as simplicity in human relationships anymore? Is it possible to just be a human being, without being rich or poor and letting it show, or maybe without worrying about clothes or what model car you drive or what kind of toothpaste you use?

To some of you reading this, the whole problem may seem absurd. What have cars, clothes, and money got to do with being what you are? But I am convinced that most people don't think of themselves as just human beings, but as frat men, radicals, construction workers, lawyers or what have you.

I think people identify too much with the things they own or know or are a member of, to the detriment of any understanding of themselves or other people. Ours is a materialistic society: we place too much emphasis on the things we can buy with our money. And with money you can usually buy yourself a little position somewhere in the social spectrum.

After we have used our money to buy

ourselves a position, we set about thinking in terms of what things that position demands of us. For instance, the swift young lawyer position demands good looks, fashionable clothes (and almost invariably a necktie), a flashy car, sociability, and a glib tongue. The average bright young lawyer, following this model, would feel underprivileged if he had to drive an old second-hand Ford to the office every day, and would work until he dropped to be able to afford a nice new Porsche, or whatever bright young lawyers are driving this year.

Which is getting a long way from that drunk up on the sixth floor. I wonder, though: don't most people spend an awful lot of time making themselves what they think they want to be, and not enough worrying about what they really are?

Maybe this problem doesn't strike you as very important. Maybe people are really meant to be just the way they are after midnight on Fridays in UNC dormitories. But I can't help thinking that there is something wrong when people can be reduced to tears and alcohol over what should be a simple relationship between two human beings. And I wish we could set things right between people once and for all, even if a few Porsche dealers have to go out of business.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf Managing Ed.

Mike Parnell News Editor

Rick Gray Associate Ed.

Harry Bryan Associate Ed.

Chris Cobbs Sports Editor

Glenn Brank Feature Editor

Ken Ripley Nat. News Editor

Ken Smith Night Editor

Doug Jewell Business Mgr.

Frank Stewart Adv. Mgr.