

Gay activists do not speak for all

ZSD 4/21/88

22/7

by M. Robert Carr

Editor's Note: The following UP NEXT opinion essay is being printed again today. The author feels that certain points essential to the theme of the essay were edited out, so here it is in its entirety.

I have spread before me all the *Daily* clippings from the past year that deal with the subject of homosexuality. On top is Claire Hueholt's recent column. I take a special interest in it because I am one who helped distribute *Campus Review*, and laughed the loudest at the back page. If I had known soon enough, I would have even asked to write an article for it. But let me make very clear that not everyone writing *Campus Review* columns necessarily had anything to do with the back page. (For the sake of conciseness here, I will be making broad, unfair generalizations. I want to apologize now.)

Campus Review's main theme was the referendum on GSB funding of special issue groups like Progressive Action Coalition, Latin American Solidarity

M. Robert Carr is a senior in English from Prairie City, South Dakota.

Committee, the Socialist Collective, and Gay/Lesbian Student Outreach. If and when the students are ever allowed to vote on this, I am confident they will make the right decision. But first, there must be education, concerning the special interest groups that are presently supported with student funds. This education must come from both

UP NEXT

sides of the political spectrum, not only from the liberal left, but also from the conservative right. This was the purpose I had in helping distribute *Campus Review*.

Just as there are political cartoons in left-leaning papers, some were also included in *Campus Review*. The majority of these were aimed at PAC. But one happened to be aimed at GLSO and this seemed to enrage Claire Hueholt.

I was appalled at Claire's admitted double standard — freedom of speech only if you agree with me. I wondered if she thought I am never hurt by political cartoons. For instance, does she think I laughed at the coat

hanger with a cross for a hook that was featured in an article in the most recent "U" newspaper insert? I tried to remember back to a past issue of the *Daily*, when an editorial condemned the Rev. Jerry Falwell for his libel suit against Penthouse. I tried to remember, wasn't Claire's name included on the editorial board then?

As I read Claire's column, I knew I had to speak out, no matter the consequences. While I do not feel able to speak out against LASC for fear of being labeled racist, I do feel free to comment about GLSO without the danger of being called close-minded (a favorite term with the left), or homophobic.

Just as I'm certain there are many Hispanics who oppose LASC, I also know there are many students, like myself, with homosexual tendencies who disagree with the ideologies of GLSO. I have become very disillusioned with gay rights and I want to make it clear that they do not represent everyone they claim to.

First, I do not see any pro-life,

RESPONSE / to page 7 •

Thursday, April 21, 1988

'Right' needs representation, too

● from page 6 / **RESPONSE**

pro-family, or pro-American ideals coming from the agendas of gay rights activists. Instead, I see a lot of the exact opposite. I feel homosexual acts are destructive and demoralizing to a society. Even atheistic countries like the Soviet Union and Cuba realize this and severely punishes homosexuals living there with long prison sentences. (It is interesting to note, though, that homosexuality is promoted here, through the Communist party, Fabian Socialists, and Process Philosophy Egalitarian Liberal Establishment controlling the media and academia).

Secondly, sometimes I think it is outspoken people like Claire Hueholt and Heather Thompson, GLSO president, that make it so hard for people like myself to be accepted. For instance, one Sunday evening last semester I attended Metropolitan Community Church in Des Moines, which has an almost exclusively homosexual congregation. During the service it was announced that Allen, a member long ill with AIDS, had just died. Several of the women began crying, so naturally following the service, I expected friends to begin sorrowing or calling at the home of the deceased. Instead they went out for their weekly social night.

We "men" all went to Denny's and sat at a long table in the back. They began talking about gay bars and the short supply of new men, among other things, until a young heterosexual couple came in and sat nearby. Those I was with began staring, making rude remarks and laughing, until he and she had to get up and leave. Their meal had not even come yet. I cannot blame them if they hate gays.

However, let me point out that both gay and straight alike can go too far in attacking each other. Case in point, the blatant, pornographic letter posted as a rebuttal of Claire Hueholt's article. Though no one has claimed responsibility, it is safe to assume it may have come from the right, so on behalf of all conservatives, I would like to apologize publicly to Claire and the left. At the same time, please understand our frustration with the difficulty we have in publishing our views. Except for occasional letters to the editor and opinion pieces in the *Daily*, or *Campus Review*, which is expensive, difficult to dis-

tribute and open to attacks from the established press, we really don't feel that our views get equal voice.

Thirdly, I am disappointed with the attitudes of gay rights activists toward fundamental Biblical Christians. Fundamentalists (not to be confused with *Campus Review* and the Committee on Common Sense) have demonstrated some of the most unselfish devoted time and love to people who want a homosexual lifestyle that I have ever seen. Yet when they try to voice their concerns about sin, AIDS, etc., through letters to the editor, gay rights activists silence them with the label of homophobic. If activists had any idea of the quality of life behind the printed words as I do, they would truly regret their remarks.

Fourth, GLSO uses GSB funds for operating the information line. This "information" line is used chiefly to screen callers so that no student opposed to their ideologies is able to know the

location of meetings. For this reason mainly, I submit that GLSO classifies as a special interest group and I would like to see GSB funding allocated for more universally applicable purposes, for instance the *Daily*. The right does not request funding for its own special interest groups, and I feel that it is only fair that the left refrains also.

If I may quote Heather Thompson, "We are everywhere." Maybe the right is more aware of this fact than she is. We are everywhere. We are on the right, and we do not appreciate the way we are being represented.

Don't get me wrong. I am not in favor of denying anyone the right to meet. That freedom is indisputable, but funding is grounds for controversy. I want to make it very clear that if a person votes for the referendum, he is not discriminating against homosexuals. Many of us signed the petition to bring the referendum before the students, and we will be voting for it ourselves.