

The Daily Tar Heel

91st year of editorial freedom

KERRY DEROCHI, Editor

ALISON DAVIS, Managing Editor

CHARLES ELLMAKER, Associate Editor FRANK BRUNI, Associate Editor

KELLY SIMMONS, University Editor
KYLE MARSHALL, State and National Editor
MICHAEL DESISTI, Sports Editor
MELISSA MOORE, News Editor

JOHN CONWAY, City Editor
KAREN FISHER, Features Editor
JEFF GROVE, Arts Editor
CHARLES W. LEDFORD, Photography Editor

Suppress

The press is not often liked; less often is it trusted. So when the Pentagon forbade press coverage during the first days of the U.S. invasion of Grenada, the public cheered the Reagan administration for stifling the meddling press. With no reporters and cameramen to interfere, the military could single-mindedly pursue its task of expelling Marxist and communist elements from the Caribbean nation. The press, receiving only official dispatches from the Pentagon and the White House, attempted any methods to relay uncensored information back to the United States. Newspapers and television networks attempted to sneak reporters onto the island. They failed. The most they could offer was muffled ham radio broadcasts that shed little light on the situation in Grenada. And while the press squirmed in frustration, the people smiled. The constant bearers of bad tidings and criticism had been silenced.

With good reason, the public is distrustful of the American press. Time after time, the press criticizes the actions of our leaders. Most often the detrimental remarks are made with the benefit of (or the unfair advantage of) hindsight, leading reporters and columnists to come off as cocky and belligerent, hell-bent on bringing down those in power. Never a word of praise.

Other times, the press seems insensitive to the plight of the innocent. The bombing of the U.S. military headquarters in Beirut was a tragedy. Reporters felt that loss, too, but they could not divorce themselves from the fact that it made a great story. TV cameras accompanied military personnel as they told families of their sons' deaths. Again, it made a great "human interest" story for the networks. Much of the public felt it disgusting and a cold-hearted invasion of privacy.

But while the people are chortling, perhaps they should open their eyes to a more serious situation. For the first time, our press was absolutely forbidden to do its job during a crisis, during a war. Information released was censored. Americans constantly condemn the Soviet government for never telling the whole story to its people. Yet, now they are subjected to the same treatment. And still they praise the government.

Reagan gave two reasons for the exclusion of the press in Grenada: The operation required absolute secrecy during its execution, and the press needed protection from the battle. Neither of these considerations has ever been entertained before. Even during crucial phases of both world wars, the press was informed and invited to accompany the military on its operations. When secrecy has been asked for by the Pentagon, the press has, except on rare occasions, obliged the leaders. But never have they been denied access to a situation. In the end, a civilian force has always been able to carry forward the truth. The safety of reporters has always been left up to the reporters themselves, and few reporters would not take that risk.

This time, the first few days of the Grenada invasion may remain obscure forever. Only the rosy picture presented by the government survives. The obvious problems are already surfacing, such as the first-day shelling of the civilian mental hospital. Even that information was not released until days later. But the bloodshed and destruction of the first few days was recorded only by the military press corps. That story may never unfold.

The propagandist films released early by the White House may seem little to get upset over, but this censoring of information may have set a precedent. The positive reaction of the American people toward information suppression has given President Reagan all but *carte blanche* to continue the practice in the future. Democracy survives only with a free flow of information to the people. Our democracy has been put on a leash.

Secrets that shouldn't be

By ROBERT RAGLAND

During the nearly 18 years of my association with colleges and universities, including four years at UNC as student, intern, resident or junior faculty member, I was never aware of a student or faculty member who voluntarily made evident his homosexuality. My own anxiety connected with this subject has abated over many years and along with it the horror of a "crime against nature." I have come to realize that the real crime against nature is the attempt by both society and many individuals to encapsulate the subject of homosexuality, to keep it hidden, to force those with a same-gender affinity to remain secretive about their true sexuality or even to practice a sexuality foreign to their nature.

The real crime is to segregate these persons from the mainstream of society and to deform their emotional lives.

By-products of coerced secrecy have been many ill-advised marriages, many painful divorces and continued ignorance and prejudice toward homosexuality.

In the natural course of events, the vast majority of us quite naturally and spontaneously make manifest our affinities, affectional or sexual, through our behavior in showing love and affection to another. Those who do not happen to find themselves attracted to the opposite sex have been and still are taught that same gender affinities are an abomination. They are unable to accept their own feelings, or, if able to do so, are coerced into concealing these affinities. They live lies and cooperate in their own emotional destructions. Those rare persons who do openly exhibit their same-gender affinities are accused of flaunting their sexuality.

Hoping to stimulate awareness and discussion of coerced sexual secrecy and its destructive effects on gay people, their families and society in general, I offered a small sum of money to Stanford University, where I had first become aware of the meaning of my

own feelings, to be given to a male medical student in his last three years who had "already openly and publicly made manifest a same-gender preference." It was required that he be "doing creditable work, be deemed by the faculty to be of good character and should show a financial need." Also, he must have applied for this scholarship award.

When this offer was publicized in newspapers throughout California, I then made the same offer to five other colleges and universities with which I had been associated, including UNC. Two men have invited me to discuss the matter with them in person, one dean and one superintendent have rejected the offer summarily, and two medical school deans rejected it initially because it was felt to discriminate "with respect to sex."

I amended the offer to include women, and when new objections were raised, I waited until the fall semester to resubmit the same offer to the presidents of those two universities. I was refused again. No institution other than Stanford even gave copies of the offer to the student press.

Unfortunately every newspaper and institution appeared to ignore the issue of coerced secrecy and all its ramifications and spoke only to the matter of the scholarship, which has become a dead issue. It seems that there is no male medical student at any of the six medical schools who is both openly gay and qualified to receive the scholarship.

My purpose was not to help a gay student pay his way but to raise society's awareness of homosexuality and the evils of coerced secrecy — to help stimulate discussion of the gay experience in hopes of reducing the coercive pressures. Copies of the scholarship proposal sent to organizations of gay people on campuses have resulted in silence or interest only in getting scholarship money, except in the case of the Gay and Lesbian Alliance at Stanford. GLAS raised more than \$2,000 for a scholarship "with preference to be given to a medical student who has shown a commitment to serving the gay community." An example of the selective inattention to the gay experience and to coerced secrecy and its effects is shown in the re-

action to my letters written to the University of Florida faculty, president and local and student press. When a professor was killed there last year by three jailed male prostitutes who threatened to say that he was homosexual if he prosecuted them for forged checks, I asserted that he would not have been killed had he prosecuted, secure in the support from faculty and president. He had no such support, and my claim went unanswered.

Another reaction I have gotten from faculty is concern about community pressures, the Moral Majority or a negative alumni response. The suggestion that openly gay faculty be hired elicited the fear that departmental funds might be cut.

Since I came out openly eight years ago I have had personal experience with silence that cannot be denied. Often I have been told I've overestimated the secrecy and silence, and the pain I speak of has been denied. It is a rare friend who can speak of it. Quite understandably, we all tend to deny the pain of others. Yet it is destructive here, just as it is no help to one in pain or bereft of a loved one to be told "it doesn't hurt" or "it happened for the best."

What is needed is open discussion by both gay and non-gay people: a dialogue. Obviously doing this is fraught with danger for gay people, especially for those in the professions and in high places in industry, who might carry the most weight. It also arouses anxiety among most heterosexual persons. Where are the men and women of good will in my generation who will help make it possible for their gay peers and for gay professional people to discuss this sensitive subject? Who among gay people can come out enough to foster a beginning dialogue so that gay people can be seen as human beings not much different from others?

Robert B. Ragland, M.D., a graduate of the University of Florida and Duke University, a former psychiatric fellow at UNC and a graduate of the seminary at the University of the South, is a retired physician living in Jacksonville, Fla.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Misinformed 'DTH' amazes again

To the editor:

The Daily Tar Heel never ceases to amaze me. For the last decade the newspaper has supported ardently those in Carrboro who have sought to bring students into politics. Now we find that the DTH is supporting, of all people, those who have done their best to keep them out. For those who may not be well-versed in the arcane politics of Carrboro, let me provide a little background.

Until the early '70s, Carrboro politics were dominated by a group of long-time conservative residents. But about a decade ago, a coalition of professors, students and blacks put together the Carr-

boro Community Coalition, now dormant, to bring change to the town. By 1974 the Board of Aldermen was in coalition hands, with immediate results: Over-bitter opposition, public transportation was introduced, bike paths were built, a new community park system constructed, and the town itself was thoroughly desegregated at the administrative level.

In opposition to the coalition, a group of the displaced conservatives organized, first to fight the bus system, and then, when it became clear that with student backing the buses would roll, to fight against student registration to vote. The founders of this conservative reaction —

the Riggsbees, the Granthams, the Oakes (the apartment owner and personal friend of Jesse Helms) — transformed this movement into the Alliance for a Better Carrboro (known to its detractors as Always Be Conservative), three of whose candidates, White, Boone and Anderson, the DTH has just endorsed.

It seems to me that there are two possible explanations for this endorsement. First, although improbable, the politics of the ABC mirror those of the editors of the DTH. More likely, the editors simply ventured into waters over their heads, passing judgments without the requisite knowledge of Carrboro politics. Did they realize that the ABC members of the Board of Aldermen have consistently voted against progress? On a straight faction-line vote, for example, the ABC-dominated board this summer turned down a Greenways proposal that would not even have required the condemnation of land. Only under extreme pressure did

it provide any protection for University Lake's watershed. ABC members have consistently voted against any form of town planning: When asked last spring about the necessity to plan for the next 10 years, one ABC member on the board responded, "I will worry about that in 10 years." Did the editors know that the person they endorsed for mayor (White) had not even paid his local taxes until a week before the last election, when the newspapers pointed this out? Did the editors know that, if elected, the ABC slate (remember, politics are by slate in Carrboro) will control all six board seats and the mayor's office? Did the editors know that, if elected, White, a conservative Methodist preacher, will have on his board three of his former parishioners? Think of the possibilities. How far the DTH has come in these last 10 years.

David M. Griffiths
Department of History



PERSONALLY... I LIKED THE WAY AIRLINES WERE BEFORE DEREGULATION.

Write your representative

To the editor:

Upon my acceptance into Phi Eta Sigma, I became aware of the problem discussed in the Nov. 1 issue of the DTH, and I feel that it affects the entire student body.

For eight years now, Phi Eta Sigma at UNC has compiled and published the Phi Eta Sigma Course Description, growing from just a mimeographed sheet the first year to the polished publication now available. The Course Description offers an objective view of the courses listed, offering students an opportunity to hear about a particular course directly from the professor who teaches it. The Phi Eta Sigma Course Description has served the entire student body for several years now, but because of lack of funds, this may be its last year published.

As each member is inducted into Phi Eta Sigma, all of his \$5 local chapter fee goes toward the publication of the Course Description, leaving no funds for other projects of the club. Is it fair for such a small group of students to pay for something that benefits the entire student body? In the past, the College of Arts and Sciences has donated money, but it is unlikely that the college will continue the funding next year. There is also the very real possibility that funds from the Campus Governing Council will cease as well. The CGC would prefer that the Course

Description combine with the Carolina Course Review rather than remain a separate publication. However, the Carolina Course Review is a completely subjective publication based on students' ratings of different courses. In contrast, the Phi Eta Sigma Course Description is an objective view of the courses by professors who teach them. A combination of the two publications would involve the combination of two completely divergent opinions and would involve the possible loss of Phi Eta Sigma's involvement in its publication. Who would do the work for such a publication, those involved with the Course Review, or Phi Eta Sigma — or would the combination involve each group working separately and then trying to organize one publication?

As I've said before, the Phi Eta Sigma Course Description has served the entire student body for several years now, and I'm sure many of you have used this publication to choose the classes you now attend. That is why it is so important to continue the publication of this most important student aid. I urge anyone who has benefited from this course description to write their CGC representative and urge continued support and funding of such a worthwhile publication.

Amy A. DeStefano
Ruffin

Pay scale unfair

To the editor:

One aspect of UNC President William C. Friday's remarks on salaries in the Oct. 26 DTH was depressingly familiar — in making them, he ignored the vast majority of University employees.

SPA staff members (those subject to the provisions of the State Personnel Act) outnumber faculty by more than 2 to 1, and these 4,400 people must try to survive on salaries that are between one-half and one-fifth of those enjoyed by many faculty members. Far too many staff members find that they must supplement their salaries with food stamps, subsidized child care and other forms of public assistance.

This has happened because state pay raises run far behind increases in the cost of living. As of Jan. 1, staff salaries retained only 70-72 percent of the buying power of the same pay grades in 1973. Considering that North Carolina salaries were low to begin with, this has put many staff members into an intolerable financial squeeze.

The situation is made worse by the immobility of most of the staff. Facul-

ty can (and do) find jobs in other states, because those jobs are nationally advertised and the hiring institution will often pay travel expenses for an interview. Staff must take on all the expenses of finding and applying for another job — and this on a lower salary. Since the state is by far the largest employer of workers in education, it effectively sets salary levels statewide. Thus, staff members must either change careers or resign themselves to being paid far less than they are worth. The effect on morale and turnover is plain to see.

People should not be penalized for choosing any job in the University system. Staff members house, register, admit, hire and pay students; they provide the library and the other services on which students and faculty depend. The University can no more do without staff than it can without faculty. So as I congratulate President Friday on his 27 years with UNC, I urge him to work for fair salaries and benefits for all University employees.

Peter J. Schledorn
Serials Department
Wilson Library

Is there no justice?

To the editor:

Granted, parking is a major problem in Chapel Hill. Limited parking facilities just have to be accepted. There is, however, no excuse for the inconsistency with which the Chapel Hill Police Department enforces parking violations.

Saturday, I was fined \$25 and forced to move my car from a "traffic lane" in front of Whitehead Residence Hall. This being the day of the Clemson game, all the parking lots in Scott Residence College were reserved for the Rams Club. Not only was I barred from the parking lots, but I was also forced to spend a half hour searching for a virtually nonexistent parking space.

At approximately 3:10 p.m., I returned from the game, only to find several cars parked in the illegal "traffic lane" from which I was previously forbidden. I am incensed at the fact that I was fined \$25 for

the privilege of allowing someone else to park in the space that I had vacated under the threat of being towed. I realize that the Chapel Hill Police Department is undermanned, but in this case, however, it is irrelevant. At approximately 3:40 p.m. I saw two officers, one from whom I received the ticket, walking past Whitehead. The violations of the "traffic lane" were clearly obvious. Why should I pay a fine when the consistency of enforcement is blatantly disregarded? Parking is difficult enough. The public should not be subjected to the police department's whimsical method of random selection for violators. It is unjust and unforgivable. Do it right or don't do it at all!

Anne Yates
Whitehead

BLOOM COUNTY

by Berke Breathed



THE Daily Crossword by N.E. Campbell

- | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| ACROSS | 34 Canary food | 68 TNT word | 30 Aunt: Sp. |
| 1 Chameleon | 38 O.T. book | 69 Espies | 31 High school |
| 6 Soft drink | 39 Military | 70 Clutter | students: |
| 10 Oasile | 42 Numerical | 71 Appoint- | abbr. |
| 14 Adamite | 43 Very loyal | prefix | 33 Writing |
| 15 Entranceway | 45 Inebriated | 47 Long and | pad |
| 16 Consumer | 47 Long and | thin | 35 Case for |
| 17 Common | 50 River to | the Seine | small |
| 18 Film spool | 51 Subside | 54 Paper | articles |
| 19 Latvian | 54 Paper | quantity | 36 Sea eagles |
| seaport | 56 Addict? | 63 Trumpeter | 37 Embankment |
| 20 Get into | 64 Ointment | 65 Soul | 40 — de |
| trouble | 66 Ms. Adams | 67 Exhort | 41 Operate |
| 23 A Slaughter | 67 Exhort | | 44 Landed |
| 24 Wrathlike | | | properties |
| 25 Impover- | | | 46 Balkan |
| ished | | | country |
| 28 Sleeping | | | 48 Wears away |
| sickness | | | 49 Game |
| carriers | | | official, |
| 32 Stop! | | | for short |
| | | | 51 Years |
| | | | 52 Groom's |
| | | | partner |
| | | | 53 High nest |
| | | | 55 Lend — |
| | | | (help) |
| | | | 57 E plur- |
| | | | bus — |
| | | | 58 Hard to |
| | | | find |
| | | | 59 Work units |
| | | | 60 Deck post |
| | | | 61 Former |
| | | | Hungarian |
| | | | premier, |
| | | | Nagy |
| | | | 62 N. Mex. art |
| | | | colony |

