

LGBTQ+ History in the Barometer, 1990

Page	Title and Date
1	Table of Contents
2	"A Man Like Eva" February 9, 1990
3	"Conservative sex lives" February 20, 1990
4	"Gay marines" February 21, 1990
5	"OSU lacking in education about gays" February 27, 1990
6	"Society paying high price" February 27, 1990
8	"Loving people for who they are" March 5, 1990
9	"Solution is open discussion" March 5, 1990
10	"Creation vs. homosexuals" March 28, 1990
11	"On Tidy Endings" April 6, 1990
12	"Militant homosexuals try to force gays out of the closet" April 19, 1990
14	"Dice Clay boosts SNL ratings by 8 points" May 14, 1990
15	"Activists against sexism boycott Clay billboard" May 17, 1990
16	"Homosexual groups mainstreaming Satanism" October 23, 1990
17	"Generations misled by patron saint of sex" October 25, 1990
18	"Buchanan disturbs reader" October 30, 1990
19	"Scurrilous journalism" October 30, 1990
21	"Shocked and disgusted" October 30, 1990
22	"Humans need grace" November 5, 1990
24	"Stop discrimination" November 6, 1990
25	"What is the world coming to and how can we stop it?" November 20, 1990
26	"Stanford gay couples fear religious backlash" November 29, 1990
27	"Atrocities pointed out" November 30, 1990

Int'l Film: 'A Man Like Eva'

By MARC A. WONDRA

of the Daily Barometer

This weekend the International Film Series is presenting "A Man Like Eva," a film based on the life of German film director Rainer Werner Fassbinder.

The film is directed by Radu Gabrea. In the starring role is the German actress Eva Mattes, who actually worked for Fassbinder. She dresses up as a male, glues on a fake beard and does a rather poor job hiding the fact that she is female. She seems to rely on the fact that she is portraying a bisexual to explain her obvious feminine qualities. We follow Eva as he is trying to finish a film that Gabrea unsuccessfully tries to incorporate into this film. The scenes from Eva's movie are dull and are totally out of place.

In the first scene we discover that Eva is a tyrant. He uses his reputation and his cast's dependency on him to manipulate them in very unsavory ways. He abandons his male lover who is obviously in love with him to go after his female lead, Gudan (Lisa Kreuzer.) Gudan is also addicted to Eva, but from the way he treats her one would wonder why. Gudan treats everyone as subhuman. He shows absolutely no remorse when his former lover hangs himself.

Walter, the male lead in Eva's film, soon becomes the object of Eva's desires. Walter is married and laughs off any mention that he might be gay. When he does decide to have an affair, he chooses Gudan. Eva discovers their affair and launches himself into a brand new tirade of abuses that eventually prompt Gudan to quit.

After her departure, Eva finally convinces Walter to become his lover. Their relationship is graphically followed, and these scenes are very uncomfortable. Gabrea does not provide a very positive picture of homosexuals. Gabrea doesn't provide a very positive picture of anyone. No one is able to exist without Eva, and even Gudan returns to regain her place in the cast.

When this film is finally over, nothing had been accomplished. Nothing Eva has done has made any sense and he gives no motivation to try and figure him out. Gabrea hasn't even seemed to have created an interesting work of art. There is nothing intriguing in Gabrea's visuals. His choice to shoot all of the sex scenes through mirrors creates mild attention, but they are not enough to carry the film past its unlikable characters and below average performances. When Gabrea finally pulls us out of Eva's world with a slow tracking shot I felt relieved.

The International Film Series will be showing this film Friday and Saturday at 7 p.m. and 9 p.m. at Wilkinson Auditorium. Admission is \$2.50

Conservative sex lives may protect Americans from AIDS

By REBECCA KOLBERG

United Press International

NEW ORLEANS — Most Americans' sex lives are far less free-wheeling than popular culture would suggest, a new study showed Sunday.

A nationwide survey of about 1,400 Americans over age 18 showed 98.5 percent of married people said they had remained sexually faithful to their spouse during 1989.

The average number of sex partners for an American adult was 1.2, ranging from a low of about 0.2 among widows and widowers to about two for single people.

About 98.5 percent of sexually active adults said they had been exclusively heterosexual during the preceding year. The 1.5 percent level of homosexual activity is substantially below the

10 percent rate turned up by the famed Kinsey Report of the 1940s, but is in keeping with a nationwide survey conducted in 1970.

The latest results show "that the sexual behavior of Americans is perhaps more circumspect and more traditional, and perhaps less permissive or libertine than the impression we get from popular media, fictional characters and so on," said Tom W. Smith, who directed the study.

Smith, a social scientist at the University of Chicago, said the average adult had sexual intercourse 57 times last year. But about 22 percent of adults abstained from sex for all of 1989.

One interesting finding was that the frequency of sex among married couples appears linked to their happiness, both as a couple and as individuals. Happily married couples had sex about 75 times a year, compared with 42 times for couples who

reported they were "not too happy."

"It may be that sexual intercourse makes people happier or that happy people engage in sexual intercourse more often. I suspect it is a little of both," Smith told a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The researcher said the relatively low reported rates of extramarital sex and male homosexuality may indicate the general population is at a lower risk for AIDS than previously thought.

"The window of opportunity for bisexual spread (of AIDS) seems to be smaller than what we feared it was," he said.

The AIDS virus is spread by sexual intercourse or blood-to-blood contact, including drug users sharing needles. It can also be passed on from an infected mother to her baby.

Gay Marines

Barbara Baum is gay. In our society, being gay is not considered acceptable by many people. Our society believes homosexuality is wrong; that it is perverse. This negative attitude creates a problem for gay people like Baum. But Baum has a much bigger problem — she is also a Marine.

Under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, homosexuality itself is not prohibited, but homosexual acts are forbidden. Baum was the first of five women charged in a 1988 crackdown of alleged lesbians at the Marine Corps Recruit Training Depot at Parris Island, S.C. She was convicted of sodomy, indecent acts and conspiring to obstruct justice. In that same year, 12 female drill instructors at Parris Island were discharged or imprisoned for homosexual behavior.

Last week, a military appeals court overturned the conviction of Baum because two members of the jury were biased and because the military judge had allowed uncorroborated testimony. However, Baum was still discharged for bad conduct and her rank was reduced from corporal to private.

Another disturbing aspect of this case is that even though our government has enacted many laws to protect gay rights, the official policy of the Defense Department is that homosexuality is incompatible with "military service."

When we asked people what they thought about gay people in the military, one response we received was that homosexuality is disgusting. When asked why, the individual said he didn't know: "It just is." The individual said he agreed that gay people should not be in the military and said if it was up to him, there wouldn't be any gays in the military. He also said he was glad Baum was put in the brig for 226 days. Another person said gay people in the military were less reliable.

Such responses show how narrow-minded we are. We live in an environment where we are conditioned that being gay is morally wrong, but we don't know why it is morally wrong. We live in an environment where we call people we do not like "fags," "dikes," and "hoosies." We live in a society where we make fun of gay people because we think gay people are disturbed.

If we stick to our narrow-minded view that homosexuality is morally wrong, aren't we also saying that men can't love other people unless they have breasts or that women can't love other people unless they have penises? Whatever happened to loving someone for their personality, their values, their beliefs and their compassion for life?

If it is acceptable for a man to love a woman for her mind, why isn't it acceptable for a man to love another man for his mind? If it is acceptable for a woman to love a man because he makes her laugh, why isn't it acceptable for a woman to love another woman because she makes her laugh?

The truth of the matter is, gay people are really no different than the rest of us. Gay people have just as much of a right to be in the military as heterosexuals. The only reason we believe homosexuality is morally wrong is because we have been conditioned that way. It's time we stop judging people based on their sexual preference. (KKC)

OSU lacking in education about gays

To the Editor:

WOW! At first I was amazed, then ecstatic, now I'm just grateful. After reading your editorial, "Gay Marines" on February 20th, I felt I had to thank you, KKC. OSU Gay and Lesbian Association is glad to see support from the media. Few national newspapers have the courage to address our issues, let alone show us in a positive light. As your editorial shows, OSU's general populace is lacking education about gay men and lesbians. This lack of education has generated very real name calling sessions on our own campus. I was the victim of one last week. There is, however, a resource to stop the ignorance. GALA is, and has been, providing a Speaker's Bureau which is available to any group, class, or gathering who wants to know more about gay men and lesbians. For further information contact the GALA desk at the Student Activities Center.

Karl Gahley

UESP Sophomore

GALA Speaker's Bureau chair

Society paying high price for broad-minded people

To the Editor:

Ken, I read your editorial concerning your views on homosexuality in Tuesday's *Barometer* and, as a disciple of Jesus Christ, I felt compelled to respond to several of your opinions.

In your article you accuse people who are opposed to homosexuality of being "narrow-minded." Was that not the cry of those broad-minded individuals at the genesis of the "sexual revolution?" For two decades now the people of this country have been paying a high price for rallying around these broad-minded people. Sexually transmitted diseases are now infecting people at the rate of 33,000 per day and costing the American government \$30 billion per year. These diseases are not only physically damaging but psychologically. Those who thought the opponents of the sexual revolution were narrow-minded must now admit their own short-sightedness as we retreat back to traditional sexual patterns.

The second opinion I wish to address comes from your rhetorical question: "aren't (those who oppose homosexuality) also saying that men can't love other people unless they have breasts or that women can't love other people unless they have

penises?" In using this extrapolation you betray a flawed view of love. It seems that you feel "love" is synonymous with sex. Love transcends sex and I find it disturbing that you feel one cannot express love to an individual unless one fondles their genitals. To say that opposing homosexuality is opposing love is absurd. I admit that some opponents of homosexuality do not express their objections in love; however, God does love homosexuals — He hates homosexuality. God wants to satisfy their hunger for love, intimacy, and security but an individual cannot find these inside a fleeting homosexual relationship. God's intention was for these needs to be met in a lifelong monogamous relationship in submission to Him. Homosexual relationships are neither lifelong nor monogamous and certainly not in submission to God (1 Corinthians 6:9-11).

In your closing arguments you stated, "The truth of the matter is, gay people are really no different than the rest of us." I wholly agree, Ken. We all desire love, intimacy, and security and we are all sinners. Homosexuals are no better and no worse than the rest of us; however, the physical

HOMOSEXUALS, from page 10

consequences of this sin are much greater than those of other sins (1 Corinthians 6:18). That is why God and I oppose homosexuality, not because we hate homosexuals but we hate what homosexuality does to the people involved in it. You see, sin is not bad because it is forbidden by God. Sin is forbidden by God because it is bad. Jesus Christ came to free us from our sins whatever they are. He can change the liar, the thief, the adulterer, and even the homosexual. I've seen Him do it. Give Jesus a chance in your life. He loves you.

Randy Doser

Senior in Mathematical Sciences

Loving people for who they are

To the Editor:

Mr. Doser spent much time Tuesday lecturing us about his God and his morality. Obviously, there are many systems of morality. Mr. Doser makes a mistake when he assumes his applies to all of us.

I believe that people are basically good, not "sinners" as Mr. Doser tells us. That religious dogma is so old, and so self-destructive, as to be worthless. By believing in one's own worth, we can live happy, useful lives in whatever way feels right to us. We all do things that we later regret having done, but as any good psychiatrist will tell us, only we can forgive ourselves.

What is at issue here is personal responsibil-

ity, not sin. Laws exist to enforce personal responsibility in many areas. If all people were responsible about their sex lives and used protection when appropriate, there would be no rampant disease.

Instead of basing our morality on the morality of slave-keeping, woman-oppressing barbarians from many millenniums ago, why not base it on responsibility, and critical intelligence? Instead of being rigid, narrow-minded, and dogmatic, why not try tolerance? Instead of hating ourselves and calling ourselves sinners, can't we love ourselves and others as they are?

Joel A. Oren

Senior in Computer Engineering

Solution is open discussion of sex and sexuality

To the Editor:

I am writing in response to Randy Doser's letter on Tuesday, Feb. 27. Mr. Doser, I was surprised you would include yourself in a select group and expand the Holy Trinity from three to four. But all sarcasm aside, the religious issues on homosexuality were bandied about rather exhaustively last term. Please come up with a more logical and pertinent argument other than a religious view which is open to as many interpretations as there are people to interpret it.

The only part of your letter which holds

water, but only a drop of it, is on diseases. What you fail to realize is that even in the times when traditional sexual patterns reigned, sexual diseases were present. So why retreat when what is needed is an offensive against them.

By changing the sexual ethics from abstinence and silence, which isn't working, to one where sex and sexuality can be openly discussed and safer sexual practices can be taught, the rising number of cases of sexually transmitted diseases can be reduced or halted.

Christopher Smith

Senior in Liberal Studies

Creation vs. homosexuals?

To the Editor:

For the past two terms I have gotten sick of seeing articles in the *Barometer* with titles like "Is Creation better than Evolution" or "Do Homosexuals have group visitation rights in Heaven or Hell." These philosophical arguments were probably first carried out by the prehistoric beasts and one might think that someone or something would have found "The Answer" by now. Don't those ten percent of you who unleash your pens frequently and fill in ninety percent of the Opinion section have any real issues to debate? It has been wisely written that pen is mightier than sword but in your hands pen has become one miniscule butter-knife. In my humble opinion these personal theological beliefs should be only discussed among close friends over a cold pitcher of Henry's. If your minds are incapable of seeing local, national, or international issues, here are a few that affect us all and can be resolved by pure exchange of thoughts.

Local Issues: Why are there only three parking spaces for students at the Health Center parking lot while a large section is devoted to the faculty? The faculty does not use the "Student" Health Center! Speaking of off the wall parking regulations on campus, why are the loading and unloading zones closed to students' use after the school hours are over? Do we expect deliveries by the "Midnight Express"? What about the issue of drug abuse on campus? Do we need a rehabilitation program since we are all affected by the drug problem directly or indirectly?

National Issue: If President Ronnie Kirk the captain of the National Security Council and his first officer George Spock were in outer space during the "Iran-Contra Funds Diversion"

talks, then why are those who didn't leave the Planet Earth during these discussions (Albert, Ollie & Fawn, Dick & John) getting only a slap on the wrist for their contributions?

International Issues: Was the "strong Manuel" indicted for drug trafficking and money laundering, or was the indictment for Manuel's attempt to take Panama Canal away from us? Will Manuel also be sentenced to two years probation and fifteen hours of plastic surgery because he is "The Man Who Knows Too Much"? Finally, is the "War on Drugs" an illusion? Does the drug trafficking continue to go on so that the third world nations can make their substantial interest payments on their home loans? And if these nations failed to satisfy the loan sharks could it mean "The Apocalypse Now"?

In conclusion I hope no one insults me by writing articles titled "Was Noriega created or evolved" or "How are the gay and lesbian communities in Panama and Nicaragua now that we elected democratic governments for them!?!"

Jafde Ghedessal
Doctoral Candidate
Forest Products Department

Campus police should patrol intersection

To the Editor:

This is addressed to the young lady in the red compact car who barreled through the red light at 15th & Jefferson West, March 7, at 2:50 p.m. If I had been another step into the north intersection, you would have had me all over the front of your car, because it was obvious that at about 40 mph, you were hellbent

On Tidy Endings

This weekend, the Studio Theatre in Education Hall Room 126 will host a production of Harvey Fierstein's "On Tidy Endings." Fierstein's play is one of his trilogy "Safe Sex."

"On Tidy Endings" is a play about AIDS, but most importantly it is a play about people. We are taken through an emotional confrontation between two people left behind by an AIDS victim. Fierstein treats this subject with a unique sensitivity. He combines laughter and tragedy and displays a wonderful ability to incorporate humor as a means of coping with pain.

Marion has lost her ex-husband, Collin, to AIDS. Although their marriage ended years earlier, she is still grieving. She is forced to find her true place in his life, in light of the fact that Collin's lover, Arthur, claims rights to Collin's memory.

Neither want to give up the part of Collin they both think they own. Together they attempt to work out their pain and anger at themselves and the society that will not allow them to share equally in the loss of a loved one.

There are also short improv scenes before the play in which everyday people work out their feelings about homosexuality and AIDS.

The cast includes Beth Peterson as Marion, Joe Conyard as Arthur, Barbara Ginsburg as Marion's lawyer and Jason Schmidt as Marion's young son, Jimmy.

The production is directed by student director Jerald Carr. Carr, an M.A.I.S. in theater, has been a cast member in several University Theatre plays. His most recent appearance was the lead in last year's production of "Beyond Therapy."

The play will run April 5-7. Curtain is at 8:15 p.m. and doors open at 7:30 p.m. There is no admission charge for OSU students with ID. Admission for the general public is \$1.00.

Militant homosexuals try to force gays out of the closet

Some militant homosexuals have come up with a new idea for improving their self-esteem, increasing political power, exaggerating their importance and getting themselves invited on TV shows that are in need of addle-brained guests.

These militants claim to know the identity of many homosexuals who go through life posing as heterosexuals. In other words, those who choose to stay in the closet.

MIKE ROYKO

But the militants want them to come out of the closet, whether they want to or not, and become visible members of what is known as the "gay community."

At this point, I have to say that I've never really understood the definition of the "gay community." Presumably, some unemployed gay drug addict would be a member of this community. So would a wealthy gay polo-playing socialite. But other than how they choose to use their sexual appendages, I don't see that they have much in common, and it's unlikely the socialite would invite the gay drug addict to cocktails. So how close-knit a community can it be?

That question aside, the homosexual militants are now using something called "outing." This means that if they have reason to believe, or even strongly suspect, that someone is a homosexual, they reveal it in one of their newspapers, picket his residence and make his sexual preferences public. That's where the word "outing" comes from. They drag him out of the closet.

This has created a controversy, which delights the militant

homosexuals. With bumbling Andy Rooney off the hook, things have been quiet on the gay front. There is always AIDS, of course. But it has slowly sunk into the consciousness of most Americans that far more people die of cancer, heart disease and other afflictions — and that few non-homosexuals or drug-needle users are in danger. But when the president makes a speech, you don't see many cancer victims showing up to screech that he is insensitive to their needs.

Those who practice or favor "outing" provide two motives. One group says it wants to punish secret homosexual politicians who are not sympathetic enough to homosexual causes. The other says it wants to expose prominent, successful homosexuals to provide ordinary homosexuals with "role models."

The opposing view is that under our system of law, an American's home is his castle. Even a cop has to obtain a search warrant before barging in. So if a secret homosexual's home is his castle, his closet is a nook in his castle, and if he doesn't want to be dragged out of his closet, that's his right.

But the "outing" practitioners say that closet homosexual politicians are hypocritical and have no right to privacy. And it is the duty of prominent gays to serve as "role models."

In other words, what they do might appear to be an invasion of privacy, but as the saying goes, you have to break a few eggs to make an omelet. Or, as Slat's Grobnik might put it, you have to peel a few fruits to make a fruit salad. (Look, don't accuse me of being insensitive. You're the ones who are poking into someone's closet.)

This controversy is stirring strong feelings and growing debate, but I can't make up my mind.

On the one hand, I believe that what a couple of consenting

males choose to do with their genitalia is their own concern, so long as they don't do it on my front porch, in the company lunchroom, in the middle of Michigan Avenue or at home plate during the singing of the National Anthem. In other words, they should be discreet and respect the sensibilities of those who are indifferent to their leering, panting and moaning. After all, the rest of the nation doesn't hold parades and cry: "Impotent pride" or "Premature ejaculation power."

On the other hand, it might be interesting — at least for Geraldo and Oprah — to see what happens if the militants pursue their policy of "outing."

I would guess that what we'll see is a show in which the proud militants are sitting there with a few of those who have been dragged from their closets, and the conversation will go something like this:

"Bill, you were a successful corporate executive and a pillar of your community and had a wife and three kids before it was disclosed in the Boys Will Be Boys News that you secretly stopped for drinks and other activities at the Swell Guys Lounge. How has your life been affected by being dragged out of the closet?"

See ROYKO, pg. 7

George Petreccione, Editor
Kerri Kaylandall, Business Manager
Phillip McCain, Production Manager
Frank A. Regan, Student Media Advisor

News editor: Lauri Ross Assignment editor: August Beauché Photo editor: Joe Miller Copy editor: Lisa Corrigan Sports editor: Rod Porsche Frontiers editor: Eric Larsen Wire editor: Andy Campanella

ROYKO, from page 6

"Well, my wife was very understanding and said she would have her lawyer take only the house, the summer home, the cars and 90 percent of our savings, as well as full custody of my children.

"The CEO at my company said he is very understanding and said he would write a glowing reference letter to the school of hair styling of my choice.

"All three of my children are now in therapy. The last time I saw them, they said that I have been replaced as their role model by Chuck Norris.

"Other than that, things are going OK. I'm

still a member of my golf club, although there is a debate whether my locker should be in the men's or women's locker room."

"But are you more at peace with yourself now that you are no longer living a life of deceit, duplicity and shame?"

"Not quite. But I'm approaching a feeling of tranquility and will be there after I make one more move."

"What's that?"

"When I shoot that little sumbitch that opened my closet door."

Mike Royko is a columnist for *The Chicago Tribune*

Dice' shines despite protests, hecklers, calls

Dice Clay boosts SNL ratings by 8 points

By ALEC D.B. McCABE

United Press International

NEW YORK — Raunchy comedian Andrew Dice Clay's controversial appearance on "Saturday Night Live" drew substantially higher ratings to go with the hecklers and protests it generated, NBC said Sunday.

Dice's presence on Saturday's late-night

broadcast had sparked protests from homosexual and women's groups and led cast member Nora Dunn and singer Sinead O'Connor to refuse to appear.

Preliminary ratings figures gave the show a market share of 31 percent, 8 percentage points higher than SNL's usual 25 share, said Rosemary Keenan, an NBC spokeswoman.

NBC logged 234 negative phone calls during

the broadcast, with only 13 calls supporting the appearance by the acid-tongued comic, known for his derogatory and graphic put-downs of women and minorities and explicit descriptions of violent sexual encounters.

One NBC affiliate, WETM-TV in Elmira, N.Y., declined to broadcast the show because station officials did not "trust (Clay) on the air."

NBC decided moments before the show to broadcast it with a five-second delay — as it had done in the past during appearances by Richard Pryor and Sam Kinison — and used it to edit out two potentially offensive words repeatedly used by Clay and other cast members during one sketch titled "Daddy, what's sex?"

Clay, smoking a cigarette and wearing a black and white leather jacket, lashed out at hecklers who began screaming "Go away!" during his show-opening monologue.

"All right, snapper head. Sit down, shut your mouth and pay attention," Clay said. "Relax, would you? That's the type of guy that hangs out in a men's room to smell other people's crap all day long. ... Just because I didn't want to go out with you, pal, don't mean I don't dig you."

The heckling subsided when a man and a woman were escorted out of the studio by NBC security. NBC declined to press charges against them.

Clay later commented on the controversy over his appearance, saying, "I couldn't get more (publicity) if I took out my penis and wrapped it around a microphone stand."

Clay bantered with a man sitting in the front row of the audience, asking him about his relationship with his girlfriend. When the man said he was going to marry her, Clay made fun of the woman wearing a white dress at her wedding, saying, "White dress? I broke the bitch when she was 15."

Many of the skits during the 90-minute show exploited Clay's swaggering stage demeanor and were laced with sexual references.

Clay said in a prepared statement after the show that "hosting Saturday Night Live was a phenomenal experience that I and the rest of the country will never forget.

"I appreciate the support of the cast and crew," he said, adding jokingly that he looked forward to becoming the show's permanent host.

Some of the skits Saturday included references to Dunn's and O'Connor's refusal to appear, including one that featured mock front pages of New York newspapers with screaming banner headlines about the controversy.

Activist groups Saturday afternoon had staged a protest outside the NBC studio.

About 40 people attended the rally, organized by Rock Against Racism, the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation and the National Organization for Women, to hear invited speakers and participate in an "open mike" session.

"We don't consider his jokes funny. We consider them hurtful," GLAAD deputy director Karin Schwartz said of Clay. "They (listeners) should be cringing at the racism and homophobia in Dice Clay's jokes."

Elect

CAL HENRY Benton County Commissioner

- Business Manager, Office of Secretary of State
- OSU Graduate, 1975
- Former OSU Instructor
- OSU Board of Visitors
- Oregon State Employees Association Affirmative Action Committee
- HONEST - EXPERIENCED - COMMITTED
- "CAL HENRY gets results!"

Vote CAL HENRY May 15th!

Paid for by the CAL HENRY FOR BENTON COUNTY COMMITTEE: PO Box 1696, Corvallis OR 97330
Treasurer Susan K Fairchild • Chair Carmen Nichols • 745-7466 • 745-5570

Activists against sexism 'boycott' Clay billboard

United Press International

WEST HOLLYWOOD, Calif. — The word "boycott" was scrawled across a Sunset Strip billboard early Tuesday for raunchy comedian Andrew Dice Clay and spatters of red paint obliterated most of the advertisement, authorities said.

"There was a vandalism of an Andrew Dice Clay billboard," sheriff's Lt. Ross Rudin said. The paint attack on the billboard along Sunset Boulevard apparently occurred about midnight.

A group identifying itself as Activists Against Sexist Pigs called news organizations to claim responsibility for the attack.

"He perpetuates a violent mindset against women in particular," said a woman caller who refused to give her name. "And we want to call attention to that and to show individuals such as himself and the people who promote him and that kind of violence that we're not going to take it anymore," the caller said.

Clay's appearance as guest host of "Saturday Night Live" last week triggered protests both inside and outside the studio. Clay has been particularly offensive to feminists because he often uses Brooklynese street talk laced with rough language and references to

violence against women.

The caller said Activists Against Sexist Pigs had also repeatedly vandalized billboards for comedian Sam Kinison.

"The true obscenity in this country is being presented to us in the guise of humor and the true obscenity is violence against women and homophobia.

"These are hate mongers in the guise of comedians," she said.

Clay's controversial appearance on SNL not only raised the ire of homosexual and women's groups; it also raised the show's ratings.

Preliminary ratings figures released Sunday gave the show a market share of 31 percent, 6 percentage points higher than SNL's usual 25 shares, said Rosemary Keenan, an NBC spokeswoman.

Clay's presence on Saturday's late-night broadcast had sparked protests from homosexual and women's groups and led cast member Nora Dunn and singer Sinéad O'Connor to refuse to appear.

NBC logged 234 negative phone calls during the broadcast, with only 13 calls supporting the appearance by the acid-tongued comic, known for his derogatory and graphic put-downs of women and minorities, and sexually explicit language.

Homosexual groups mainstreaming Satanism

"There is a new, valuable right in the land; the right to openly hate and insult all that Christians hold sacred."

I just finished reading that line, from Otto Scott's fine new newsletter, *Compass*, when a copy of the New York City Tribune arrived. John O. Edwards' page-one story, "At a Gay Night Club in Chelsea, Catholic Church is Enemy No. 1," calls for a strong stomach.

"It's the hottest place in gay night-clubbing," a taxi driver told Edwards of the Roxy, "probably the hottest place in town."

"Thursday nights are called 'Disco Interruptus.' 'Interruptus' refers to the interruptions by movies, solo singers, transvestite acts ... that break into the almost continuous music and disco dancing.

PATRICK BUCHANAN

This night's theme, 'Holy Chaos,' promises the revelers a night of side-splitting, biting ridicule directed at Christianity in general and the Roman Catholic Church in particular...

"Giant mocking mug murals of a Catholic cleric wearing glasses—seemingly resembling Cardinal John O'Connor—glare at patrons like medieval gargoyles ... Along both walls of the rink, naked women are pictured on crucifixes, some wearing only a nun's habit...

"For the 200 people packed into the VIP room, (singer) Amy performs the Dung Dance. This entails eating what resembles human excrement and throwing it at three contiguous posters of Sen. Jesse Helms ... Each throw brings loud cheers."

The next "interruptus" is a showing of the video, "Our Father."

"While the video shows no graphic sex, it opens with a priest engaging in sexual intercourse with another man's wife. This continues for five minutes and the priest ends by saying, love, honor and obey. The priest eventually chokes the woman to death as excrement flows from her mouth. He then descends into a

basement where a young Jesus is bound to steam pipes on the ceiling. The priest then engages the Jesus figure with simulated anal sodomy. Afterwards, in a jealous rage, the priest chases a child molester ... when the molester bothers a child the priest regularly molests."

"Many in the crowd smile and laugh as they watch the video."

"High point" of the evening "is the live 'crucifixion' of a pregnant 'nun.' On the stage a group of female performers dressed as nuns, along with a man dressed as a priest, escort the 'nun' to the wooden crucifix. She is dressed only in head garb, and gauze covers her genitalia. The woman portraying the nun is actually pregnant."

"The crowd of young patrons seems affable, witty, intelligent, and well-groomed ... clean-cut, all-American types: young lawyers, Wall Streeters, pre-med students. Some wore costumes. Many dressed as priests. Juxtaposed to this were the transvestites and others in leather jackets, complete with dangling handcuffs.

"The crowd's antipathy toward the church seemed universal. One young man has fake blood on his face emanating from his eye sockets. His T-shirt reads: 'FIGHT AIDS. Use a condom. Choke a priest.' Another yells with clenched fist, 'Kill O'Connor.'"

Other acts include a transvestite Virgin Mary in a Snow White outfit, a transvestite Mary Magdalene who selects a "young Jesus" from the audience and simulates having sex with him; and, "a San Francisco-imported act entitled *Sex in the Anus*."

Holy Chaos was a smash; thousands paid to see it.

"A sacrilegious nightmare which only proves the homosexual groups are attempting to mainstream Satanism," is how a member of a pro-family Catholic organization described it. He is right.

With 80,000 dead of AIDS, 3,000 more buried each month, our promiscuous homosexuals

appear literally hell-bent on Satanism and suicide. But, the Roxy raises other questions. What does freedom mean? What is it for? Does the First Amendment, which protects the free exercise of the Christian faith, also protect scatological and blasphemous assaults on that faith? If Holy Chaos is not a hate crime against Christianity and Catholicism, what is?

America has not gone so far as the French or Soviet revolutions that sought the "eradication of Christianity," but we have installed, Scott writes, the pagan system of Polytheism ... All Gods are equally honored; all religions equally accepted ... We have placed Satanism, Taoism, Buddhism, Judaism, Islam, Witchcraft, Christianity and a variety of cults and sects on the same level ... what does it matter that a famous photographer takes a picture of himself with a bullwhip in his anus. Art is sacralized; perversion is normal."

Our Founding Fathers—Washington, Jefferson, Adams—believed religion and morality to be inseparable and indispensable to a free society. What interest have we in defending such degraded assaults on what Washington called the twin "pillars of human happiness"?

If America is a sick society, it is because we drink daily of the polluted waters of a popular culture into which Hollywood and an artistic avant-garde continue to dump their filth? Cleanup time.

Conservatives failed to capture the culture, Scott writes. Now, "we are on the edge of the third millennium, and it is not our culture alone that is in peril, but our civilization. We cannot afford any more short views; we must engage on more significant levels. We are, after all, heirs of a triumphant Christian civilization that once reigned supreme throughout the world. We cannot recover from our fall from that high estate without first analyzing the defects of the modern world."

The enemy of what we believe, the threat to what we have, is, it would seem, somewhat closer at hand than Saddam Hussein.

Patrick Buchanan is a syndicated columnist.

Generations misled by patron saint of sex

For four decades, Alfred C. Kinsey has been hailed as a pioneer of human sexuality, the "Patron Saint of Sex," the "giant on whose shoulders all sex researchers since his time have stood."

Comes now a book that makes Dr. Kinsey out to be a Cardiff Giant, a fraud, the great scientific charlatan of the 20th century.

"Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Introduction of a People" suggests Kinsey's famous works, "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male" and "Sexual Behavior in the Human Female," are the "most egregious example of scientific deception in this country."

Authored by Dr. Judith Reisman and Edward W. Eichel, edited by Drs. John H. Court and J. Gordon Muir, "Kinsey, Sex and Fraud" stakes the reputations of all four researchers on the truth of that charge.

Kinsey had an impact on our society as great as the genuine geniuses to whom he is often compared: Newton, Galileo, Einstein. His findings have shaped our attitudes about sexuality, especially homosexuality and the sexuality of children; they are the basis of what is taught in sex education. Yet, his work, the authors allege, was sexual and moral propaganda masquerading as science; and Al Kinsey was himself a deceitful and unethical mountebank.

Example: Dr. Kinsey's most famous judgment was that 10 percent of the male population is "more or less exclusively homosexual for at least three years between the ages of 16 and 55." From that, it has become a cliché that fully 10 percent of the U.S. population is gay. (Time wrote recently that, "about 25 million Americans are gay.")

Where did Kinsey get his statistic? According to "Kinsey, Sex and Fraud," by interviewing a sample of the male populace, some 25 percent of which was prison inmates, ex-cons and sex offenders. Kinsey knowingly distorted his sample, to bring in the desired returns, while falsely implying he had a "carefully

planned population survey." Moreover, the authors charge, his "researchers" were chosen for their bias. (One applicant, who confessed he felt adultery harmful to marriage, homosexuality to be abnormal and bestiality ludicrous, was personally blackballed by Kinsey.)

Four percent of males are exclusively homosexual throughout their life, Kinsey claimed. By using Kinsey's bogus numbers, health officials have wildly overestimated the number of AIDS cases the nation could expect, and have been forced repeatedly, to reduce their projections. The authors conclude, using recent evidence, that the true figure for exclusive homosexuality among the male population is 1 to 2 percent, or 1 to 2 million adult males in the United States.

In 1964, Kinsey ex-associate, Gershon Legman, revealed his patron's hidden purpose was "propagandistic," to "respectabilize homosexuality and certain sexual perversions." Other Kinsey goals: Give social sanction to all forms of sexual expression, establish bisexuality as the norm, introduce cross-generational sex — i.e., sex between adults and children as legitimate. Legman's charge should have triggered a fraud investigation then; hopefully, this book, published by Huntington House, will produce it now.

Kinsey also claimed that children, from infancy, are sexual, that they benefit from sexual interaction with adults. Upon what did he base his conclusion? Illegal and inhumane experiments, it turns out, often done without informed parental consent, in many cases against the children's will. Children, as young as 2 months and up, were subjected to masturbation by sex offenders Kinsey described as "technically trained." The "results" of this criminal conduct went into Kinsey's famous book as scientific evidence for the nature of human sexuality.

The authors call this "research" comparable to some of the Nazi medical experiments condemned at Nuremberg. Yet, Kinsey's conclusions are taught as fact, written into college

texts, used to bolster the view that adult-child sexual interaction is harmless.

The intellectual validation of pedophilia has begun. At the 31st Annual Conference of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, an expert on sex offenders and child sex abuse argued that pedophilia may be an "orientation," not a perversion, and, not even a deviation; she suggested pedophiles, too, may have sexual rights.

Is this where America is headed? As Health and Human Services Secretary Louis Sullivan was being pelted with condoms at the San Francisco AIDS conference, the Big Apple's Mayor David Dinkins was marching in the 21st Annual Gay and Lesbian Pride March; its theme: "Family Friends and Lovers." Behind him strode the North American Man/Boy Love Association.

How could Kinsey get away with scientific fraud for 40 years? First, a vast industry has been erected on his "research" that will defend to the death its founding father. Second, most scientific frauds come to light when similar or identical research is done; but, no researcher can repeat Kinsey's experiments on children without facing indictment and a prison sentence for sexual abuse.

Two years ago, when I previewed a draft of this book, I said it was social dynamite. Looking at the final version, out this fall, my former assessment was an understatement. On the cultural Richter scale, the impact of "Kinsey, Sex and Fraud" could be close to a 10.

A mountain of research and detail, this book should lead to final demolition of the dreadful Dr. Kinsey. About time. For, today, America is living with the terrible social consequences, from AIDS to family collapse, of the "sexual revolution" he launched. It is past time we took a hard look at the character of the man we yet hail as a great revolutionary.

Patrick Buchanan is a syndicated columnist.

Buchanan disturbs reader

To the Editor:

The Buchanan column in the Oct. 23 Barometer disturbs me a great deal. While Mr. Buchanan is certainly entitled to his opinion, the Barometer also has a responsibility to the community it serves. That your newspaper published such an extreme view without also attempting to provide balance does a disservice to the many gay men and lesbians who are members of your community of readers. Among the gay or lesbian faculty, staff, and students I know, all are responsible, caring citizens and contributors who do not deserve the stereotypes, attitudes, or actions Mr. Buchanan urges. As a former Barometer editor myself, I hope balance and fairness are standard by which you judge the syndicated material you publish in the future.

Gwll Evans

Scurrilous journalism

To the Editor:

Patrick Buchanan's recent column in the Barometer entitled "Homosexual Groups Mainstreaming Satanism" was a classic example of gay-bashing, hate-mongering and scurrilous journalism. A darling of Far Right Neanderthals in this country, Buchanan takes the behavior (all viewed second-hand from his sources; he is never present at the events he comments on) of a certain group of gay people and, by extension, condemns all gays as responsible for the ills of modern society.

He accuses gays of "hate crimes" against the Catholic church

because they satirized some of the church's rituals; never mind the persecution that gays have endured at the hands of the church. Then, he lays into freedom of religion by claiming that there are too many non-Christian sects/beliefs — Islamic, Jewish, Buddhist, for example — undermining this Christian nation. If Mr. Buchanan were really a student of history, he would understand that the Founding Fathers made it very clear that there would be no civil religion — even if a preponderance of Americans were Christian — and that freedom of religion or no religion, for that matter, was to be a cornerstone of the Bill of Rights.

People like Buchanan cannot tolerate those that are different from them, cannot live in a world of ambiguity and difference, and insist that those who don't hew to their idea of morality are evil. When you start blaming a certain group of people for a society's problems, you are, like Hitler, asking for something to be done about them, and we know where that led Germany in World War II. Buchanan's rabid invective gives plenty of fuel in this already violence-prone society to those who go out and do some queer-bashing for the good of the country.

Craig Machado

English Language Institute

Shocked and disgusted

To the Editor:

During a break between classes I was reading the Tuesday, Oct. 23 Barometer. As usual, I noticed the neat and logical format of the paper. After reading, the news, I began to read the editorial page. On that page is the most disgusting assembly of words I have ever seen in my life.

The article is about the goings-on in a gay bar in New York City. It was written with a "Christian" point of view, and the Barometer was careful to point out that the author is a syndicated columnist. The intent of the article is to show how evil such practices are; the method is to shock the reader with the heinous perversions of the homosexuals who frequent the bar.

I was shocked all right, and also very disgusted. I am a Christian myself, a member of the LDS church. I am very aware of the hideous and abominable practice of homosexuality in our society. Such evils, in various degrees, have been among people throughout all ages of time. I am also aware that there is virtually no end to the evil that a person can choose to do. Therefore, I do not appreciate the Barometer reproducing a list, in gruesome detail, of the practices in a New York gay bar. It was not enlightening. It was so crude, I didn't even finish reading it. I don't care who writes it. Filth is filth, and I do not like to see it printed in our school paper.

I appreciate the fact that we have the freedom of speech. The editors of the Barometer can do as they choose. But I would like to remind them that indiscriminate use of this freedom does not make a good paper. The content of the articles in a paper determine that paper's quality. I recommend that the editors choose articles and editorials that are decent, noteworthy, respectable, and which will be worthy of the credible and honorable reputation of our school paper. Just as there is no end to the folly a person can choose, there is also no end to the dignity and integrity one can attain. Those who seek such dignity and integrity ought not to fill their minds with the trash of fools. Enlighten us.

Jonathan DeJong

Senior in electrical engineering

Humans need grace

To the Editor:

As a faculty member and a lesbian, I am uncomfortable with some of the implications of "zero toleration" for discrimination: the suggested policy which at its extreme would apparently mandate the summary expulsion of any member of the university who engaged in a discriminatory act.

I believe with many other people that there are certain acts that should not be tolerated: generally acts of physical violence against persons or (less importantly) property, and acts that represent the clearcut denial of opportunity to an individual on the basis of something other than her talents. But then we move into gray areas of human interaction, mostly involving verbal "acts." I could address the ideal of free speech, but that is not the issue that most compels me now.

Which of us is free of prejudice? Are we really prepared to pose as a pure community made up solely of individuals who have dumped the baggage of prejudgment foisted on us all by our parents, communities, peers, popular culture? We are human; we must ask much of ourselves, but then we must leave a margin of grace for struggling and stumbling. As a lesbian who came out to herself at 30, I am still hobbled by my own homophobia. What kind of a teacher or human being would I be if I

denied my students the chance to turn the darker places of their own hearts to the daylight of revelation and open discussion? "Bigots" are made, not born. "Bigots" may be unmade as well — or, more accurately, may unmake themselves. A still photo is not a moving picture; who I am was at 18 is not who I am today.

Universities are places for growth, struggle, honesty, change. They are rainbow communities of the soul as well as the skin. I don't advocate tolerating the psychic and physical violence of bigotry; but I do believe that the best policy is not to foreclose discussion by threatening to exclude the politically incorrect for our community, but to nurture discussion in an atmosphere of compassion and honesty. Do we want to change ourselves and each other? Then we must know each other's hearts. And we must not be afraid.

Miss Carson

Assistant Professor of History

Stop discrimination

To the Editor:

In the past few weeks there has been a lot of attention on the issue of discrimination on the Oregon State campus. It has come to my attention that as a white, heterosexual, fraternity member, physically and mentally sound, male I am in the majority here at OSU and in this nation. I am not discriminated against but I am AGAINST DISCRIMINATION. I feel, as a member of the majority of students on this campus, that it is important to stand up for the people being persecuted.

I do not see the sense or the humor in the "name calling" that occurs on campus. Whether it is directed at race, sex, looks or sexual orientation it is unnecessary and moronic. In my opinion anyone who has to resort to the "kindergarten name calling" or sexual and physical harassment has a serious psychological problem.

It should not matter what your skin color is or if you are male or female or what your sexual preference happens to be. In the United States you are free to be yourself. You are not free however to harass or discriminate against others. I thought we had grown out of our past history of discrimination. We, as a nation, are looked on by the whole world for leadership and human rights policies. How can we preach to these third world countries when we still do not believe in these right here in our own back yard.

Most of the people like myself are against discrimination but since we are not being persecuted we don't get involved. It is important for those, like me, and all those who say that they are against discrimination to let yourself be heard. I attended the ASOSU meeting and of all the people there I was probably one of three or four white, heterosexual males. To me that seems really pathetic. I sure hope that I am not the only one who is willing to join the fight and stop discrimination on this campus!

Kevin Bleckmann

Senior in Political Science

and Russian Studies

Column disturbing

To the Editor:

Patrick Buchanan's tirade in the Oct. 23 paper, "Homosexual Groups Mainstreaming Satanism," which lays the blame for America's moral squalor with gay people, was a deceitful, inflammatory, and offensive piece of hack journalism. I don't understand why the *Barometer* carries such right-wing clap-trap as that churned out by Buchanan.

The real threat to this country can be seen clearly in the likes of intolerant, bigoted people such as Buchanan who revel in National Enquirer propaganda. What Buchanan is calling for is nothing more than a military/theocratic state which would have no trouble getting rid of undesirable people who supposedly taint the national character. Buchanan fits nicely with another 20th century figure: Adolph Hitler.

Craig Machado

English Language Institute, OSU

What is the world coming to and how can we stop it?

I couldn't help but get caught up. My two year-old niece was brandishing that ear-to-ear grin. Her strawberry-blonde hair bounced freely atop her head while she dashed wrecklessly from Mummy to Pappy to Grammy, and to whoever else might share in her joy.

She is part of nature's untouched. The world is so simple, innocent and fun to her. It was the same when we were kids. That pristine, love-filled shelter was all we knew. But the world outside has changed since then, definitely for the worse. Today rapists, child molesters, crack dealers, terrorists, gun-slugging gangbangers, pimps and many more undesireables walk the streets of her neighborhood, waiting to sweep her up. What else will await my favorite blonde-bomber when she's old enough to know better?

Answering that question seems impossible. The future is the only thing we can't predict. But pity comes to my heart when I look in our newspapers and read the headlines. Our world is not getting better, folks. Take a step back, out of your ideological world for a bit. Open up your mind and use logic. What do you see?

President Bush is sending 456,000 of our nation's youth into the crushing jaws of the Middle East, to protect our greedy oil interests. Not only will we lose their lives and the lives of others deployed, but we are spending money our country doesn't have. Writing rubber checks to whom? Ourselves. When we were kids, Vietnam was closing its doors. We lost 58,000 troops (considered

a lot back then), but we were a better country for it, weren't we? Did we really learn our lesson?

Most highly-developed countries who have the nuclear bomb, for now, are sane enough not to use it. That Cold War scare has temporarily subsided. But nations like Iraq, Iran and other less-developed nations are finally getting their mail, too. They now have the technology, but not the means. How long can we suppress every nation in the world, like we do Iraq, from their boot with the bomb? How long will it be before one small country gets tired of bullies like the United States and finally starts World War III?

Our economy is comatose, bordering on brain dead. We have not made ground on our ballistic budget deficit in 10 years. We battle over creating our miracle, tax-laden budget, but go into Iraq and spend \$75 million a day. Foreigners are buying up the United States like cheap real estate, and then outperforming us in every market we are foolish enough to compete in. Our government says it's all OK. Go figure.

Crime and drug use in the United States is rampant. Our government is making symbolic attempts to satisfy scared taxpayers. Bust those mellow pot dealers, put it in the headlines and all is cool. Many have accused our government of dabbling in the cocaine import business. I believe it. How about you?

Nobody wants to admit it, but AIDS is uncontrollable, incurable and beyond everyone's means of financial reimbursement. It's spreading exponentially, and some have even accused the

government of creating the disease to lower population figures and indirectly lower the crime rate by killing I.V. drug users and homosexuals. How about that bit of neighborhood policing? But enter heterosexuals, 85 percent of the world. This a scary accusation, our government using us humans as pawns. What gives them the right?

The environment will never get better. We are writing checks the earth can't cash. Airborne pollutants, toxic waste, oil spills, landfills, deforestation, nuclear meltdowns, animal extinction, over-urbanization. All these we've scientifically labeled "detrimental" and are aware of all possible solutions. But are we making radical changes to alter this one-way course toward annihilation? Nope. We can't afford it. Too busy in Iraq.

You know, if WE AS HUMANS spent all the money we spend today on national defense around the world, toward developing our space program and inter-planet habitation, how long would it be before humans could move to another planet? Sooner than you think. But will we wait until it's too late to even try?

There are many more problems in the world WE AS HUMANS are too tied up in our comfortable life, status quo world to try to tackle. We can solve these problems if WE AS A WORLD work together. For now, world peace looks to be, oh, at least half a century off, so forget it until then. Right?

This niece of mine will undoubtedly be working to solve these problems when she is an adult. But will we let her even have that chance with the way things are going today? (KH)

Stanford gay couples fear religious backlash

By STEVE WILSTEIN

Associated Press

STANFORD, Calif. — Virginia Velez came to Stanford University seeking a safe place to live openly with her lesbian lover, but a policy expanding the rights of homosexual couples on campus leaves her feeling threatened.

Velez and others in the homosexual community fear a backlash, particularly from religious groups. The policy, which began this fall, guarantees unmarried couples the same housing, health care and campus privileges as married couples.

"I'm getting nervous about what's going on," said Velez, a graduate student in education. "What the administration has done is satisfying. But the fundamentalist groups — Islamic and Christian — are creating incredible tension, and they can erupt at any time."

Stanford's effort to build a tolerant, diverse body of international students has led to verbal clashes and occasional harassment over attitudes about race, religion and sexual orientation. The latest involves the backlash to the "domestic partners" policy.

"I think Stanford is probably one of the best places to be openly gay or lesbian or bisexual, and it's still scary," said Susan Mizner, a third-year law student and gay activist.

"It's still got a number of people who I would unabashedly call bigots, and even more people who would prefer not to deal with anyone they know is gay, lesbian or bisexual."

Two-thirds of the students said in an informal survey they support the new policy. Foreign students, particularly from the Middle East, Asia and Africa, are among the most vocal opponents.

Of Stanford's 12,600 graduate and undergraduate students, nearly 2,500 are foreigners. Foreigners comprise about a quarter of the 6,100 graduate-student population, which dominates the married student housing village.

University officials say they won't revoke the policy, which allows unwed couples with "long-term commitments" to rent low-cost campus apartments, and have "spouse" privileges,

such as subsidized medical care and access to the libraries and gyms.

The policy applies to six couples this term. Officials expect the number to rise to 20 to 30 during the next few years.

"We have a strong belief that what we did was the right thing to do," said Norm Robinson, dean of student affairs. "I think some of the (objections) that are based on religion also reflect quite a high degree of homophobia."

Stanford's policy is being studied by other schools. Harvard has a non-discrimination housing policy, while several other schools allow unwed couples to live together on a case-by-case basis.

The Stanford administration's staunch support brought praise from homosexuals, who now want unwed couples covered by health insurance.

"It is making a big difference in our lives," says David Bradfute, a graduate student in biological sciences and member of the Lesbian, Gay & Bisexual Community Center.

"The university is saying, 'We'll recognize you. We value you, who you are and the kinds of relationships you get into. No state is recognizing us, the federal government is far from recognizing us, and in many ways we're a target for official discrimination. It means a lot to us in this society.'"

Opponents, however, attack the policy on religious, moral and cultural grounds.

"It devalues the sanctity of marriage, and of the family unit, both of which Asians have traditionally taken very seriously," said Grace Tan, a chemistry graduate student from Singapore. "Also, this more open policy is susceptible to abuse by people seeking lower-cost university housing, with all its fringe benefits."

Abdullah Bature, president of the Stanford Islamic Society, said his group of about 100 students wants university trustees to revoke the policy. "The Koran says sex relations are allowed only between husband and wife, not between woman and woman, man and man or unmarried man and woman," Bature said.

"All the members of my society are fundamentalists," he added. "We cannot change the law of Islam, which does not permit acts of unnatural intercourse. But we are not terrorists. We want to live with everybody in peace."

Jon Osborne, who lives in student housing with Steve Mims, a senior in electrical engineering, argued homosexuals pay the same tuition as heterosexuals and should have the same rights.

DAY



Atrocities pointed out

To the Editor:

I, too, am writing to comment on Patrick Buchanan's editorial about mainstream homosexuals. Many people are condemning what Buchanan wrote about gays and the supposed "gay-bashing" he was doing. Maybe people don't want to admit what they're doing. I am glad this article was printed, because people should be aware of what these people are doing.

I am in no way saying that this is only happening in gay communities. Heterosexuals are doing things just as bad, and they, too, should be brought into the open so people are aware of the ugly atrocities in society. But his is another example of the gay coming out of the closet and announcing himself to society. What they did was more than satirize some of the church rituals. I, myself, have never crucified a pregnant nun on stage, nor do I throw excrement shaped food at congressmen.

Everyone has been saying, "Oh, well the church has been persecuting homosexuals." Think about it. God sees homosexuality as bad as bestiality. And, if people remember, the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah had roving bands of homosexuals that would visit weary travelers in the night. God dealt his wrath on them.

Martin Vavra

Sophomore in Fisheries/Wildlife