

Letters to the Editor

All letters should be addressed to the Editor and sent to Excalibur, Central Square, Ross Building, York University, Downsview, Ontario. Excalibur reserves the right to edit all letters more than 500 words long. Unsigned letters are the responsibility of the editors. All letters will be published however due to space limitations letters may not be published the week they are received.

CBC film on homophiles is inaccurate

By ROGER WILKES
York University
Homophile Association

On Nov. 30, 1971, the CBC aired a program at 10 pm on the Tuesday Night series called *Nothing to Hide*. The program was to have been on the subject of gay liberation. Not only does the program completely ignore that subject, but it shows a very narrow biased viewpoint. Below are a few points that show the ignorance of the director, the producer, and the participants of that show on the subject of gay life.

The program is dated. The program was filmed a year and a half ago and is completely irrelevant as to what is happening now in the gay liberation movement. The proliferation of gay organizations both in Canada and the United States as well as the diversity of social and political programs of these groups were in no way explained. The Mattachine Society is one of the oldest and most conservative of homophile associations (perhaps chosen for this very reason so as to be less disturbing for a heterosexual audience) and is in no way representative of the greater political awareness seen in other groups. Dick Leitsch himself has since been forced to resign from the Mattachine Society by its membership and can in no way be a spokesman for that group.

This was a Canadian production yet it was filmed in New York City even though there were, at the time of filming, many people involved in the Canadian gay liberation movement. The program in no way dealt with issues facing homosexuals in Canada e.g. the effects of the Criminal Code amendment, the relationship with the struggles of Canadian women, Indians and Quebecois nor the

struggle for civil rights in Canada.

The professional opinion in this program was entirely one sided. Dr. Hatterer's ideas were presented as the consensus of psychiatric opinion when in fact they merely represent one view (dated at that) of homosexuality in that field. No mention was made of the attitudes of other psychiatrists (Dr. Pomeroy, Dr. Gebhard, Dr. Szasz) who vehemently disagree with Dr. Hatterer's illness theory. Not all psychiatrists believe that homosexuality is an illness though it is to their economic advantage to propagandize such opinions.

The view of the gay community shown in this program was that of an outsider, concentrating on the external aspects e.g. the streets, steam baths, bars, etc. Apart from the interview with Dick Leitsch and his lover, who cannot be considered as representatives of the entire gay community, the viewer is lead to associate gay life with pronography, anonymous sexuality, sexual addiction and sadomasochism. The diversity of individuals in the gay community was in no way made clear. We were once again lumped into the one category of the homosexual.

The program gives the viewer the assumption that everything in the gay world is centered on sex. If there is a concern for sex in the gay community, it parallels the obsession with color in the black community. One is of course concerned with the source of one's oppression. This is not explained in the program. No mention was made of the many long-term relationships among homosexuals.

The program moreover shows no humanity among gays beyond the category of homosexual. It gives the assumption to the viewers that the gay life style is one of total irresponsibility and fun-seeking. It doesn't

show the serious soul-searching gays must undergo to have the courage to stand up to social prejudice. It doesn't show us in our jobs, families, and viable human relationships. This show was totally obsessed with our sexuality which is only one aspect of our total being.

The program, by concentrating solely on male homosexuality without any proportionate comparison with the problems of heterosexual relationships, isolated homosexuals. We are seen as being outside society, a separate group rather than as part of the totality of our pluralistic society. Moreover, homosexuality is seen as separate and different from heterosexuality rather than as merely one more aspect of our total sexuality.

The program was totally sexist. It makes no mention of female homosexuals and the double oppression they face being women and homosexual. As in most discussions of homosexuality, the impression is given that it is solely a male issue. Moreover the program reinforces strict conformity to sexual roles, denigrating so-called feminine qualities in men and applauding so-called feminine qualities in women.

The camera work and subjects filmed were sloppy and poorly chosen. The cameraman used bizarre camera angles portraying the homosexual like an animal in a cage. Misty shots of Times Square at night and pornography shops associated homosexuality with an extremely sordid aesthetic. This is especially insidious since the viewers retain far more of the visual impression than of the verbal content.

The most destructive aspect of the program was its concentration on the results of the oppression of homosexuality without in any

way dealing with the source of our problems, heterosexual prejudice. It did not expose the legal oppression we face, the discrimination in the courts, employment and housing, nor the hate propaganda put out by our schools, churches, government, so-called medical authorities and public media. It did not analyze our fight against bigotry and our struggle to attain self-respect and pride in the face of overt oppression. Putting the onus on homosexuals to justify themselves rather than heterosexuals justifying their prejudice and conformist sexual attitudes, the program once again reinforced the built and fear that society has inflicted on gays.

In summation, this program is an insult to all homosexual men and women. As Canadian taxpayers we object to the use of our tax dollars to produce slanderous and prejudicial propaganda. It seems that the Canadian media is following that of the United States by distorting the real progress made by the gay liberation movement. Even the title of the show was in error, it should have been called, *Dr. Hatterer's Hour*. This program insults the intelligence of the viewer and uses its influence to enforce the myths and untruths that the gay liberation movement is trying to eradicate.

George Hislop,
Community Homophile Association of Toronto

Charles Hill,
University of Toronto Homophile Association

Editorial Collective,
The Body Politic

Toronto Gay Action

York University Homophile Association

Radio York - everything hinges on the white paper

In the Thursday Dec. 2 edition of Excalibur, I read an article which dealt with a recent media survey. Andy Michalski reported:

"Radio York suffers from the fact that it cannot operate on the airwaves but must settle for Rogers cable on the York and Glendon campuses. Unless you're in a common room or in residence, you don't hear it. And you can forget about off-campus listening."

For the record, I would like to make some corrections to his report.

Some corrections

1) On campus, reception of our Radio York signals is achieved after our in-studio signal processing equipment by means of a closed-circuit amplifier-speaker distribution system which we lease from Noram Communications. They are in charge of servicing, and installation. When the Radio York signal leaves our equipment in Vanier 258, it is comparable to commercial-broadcast quality.

2) To serve the Glendon Campus, we transmit via telephone lines which we lease from Bell Telephone. At Glendon, the signal is fed into an amplification system which serves the Old Dining Hall, the Common Room, and the Boiler Room Coffee House. The signal quality at Glendon is very good.

3) We are also modulated on the Rogers Cable System in Toronto and other areas of Southern Ontario. By this means members of the University community, and other citizens may monitor Radio York's programs in their homes. Michalski's article read "And you can forget about off-campus listening." That is definitely not the case.

Students must have cable

To monitor us at home, you must however live in an area served by Rogers Cable Television. If you are a subscriber to the Rogers System, you merely hook the cable connection to the antenna input of your FM radio receiver and tune to 96.9 megacycles. There you will find Radio York broadcasting in Monophonic. Reception quality is almost the same as if you were listening to a conventionally transmitted FM signal. We are Frequency Modulated as far away as Oakville. I have received reports of reception

from York Students in various areas of the city and its environs. As a matter of interest, some of our regular cable-fm listeners have responded in past BBM ratings — the radio ratings conducted by the Board of Broadcast Measurement, a foundation to which almost all licensed Toronto broadcasters subscribe to, and rely upon for statistical listener information. Radio York does not subscribe to the BBM service, however other broadcasters have brought the matter of ballots cast for Radio York to our attention.

As you know, the cable tv industry is a monopoly. Some members of the York Community live in areas which are served by companies other than Rogers; companies which do not broadcast Radio York. We would welcome transmission of our signals over all the systems in Toronto, however the Canadian Radio and Television Commission (CRTC) which regulates cable systems, does not require uniformity of service. Any York people who are cable subscribers, and who would like Radio York in their homes, would do well to communicate with their own particular cable company. If the consumer voiced interest, there is a fair possibility that the powers that be might listen. In Toronto, with the exception of Rogers Cable, the consumer has had to yell before innovations and services were offered.

By the way, cable tv statistics reveal that 30 percent of all Torontonians are cable subscribers. I previously worked in the Cable industry in north-west Metro, near York where a great many commuters live. Thirty percent cable penetration in this portion of the wired City is a very conservative estimate in Downsview. If all the cable systems in Metro carried RYFM, we might have a potential audience of the 30 percent population subscribing to cable, plus the 20 percent York population in residence. In total, a potential audience of nearly 50 percent is not a totally gloomy figure.

CRTC must help

Ideally of course, a direct transmitter is the answer. However, the federal government's CRTC will not license — or even consider licensing campus stations for broadcast transmission by means of Hertzian Radio Waves until they formulate a White Paper on Campus Broadcasting. This paper is several years late. When will it be available? September at the latest was the report from Parliament Hill earlier this year. The leaves

have fallen, and so have the snow, but no White Paper — just a lot of red tape. John Tylton, Council for the Radio-TV commission told me at a public hearing at the Inn on the Park on Sept. 23, that the document would be available by December at the very latest.

Relying on past government performance, I use the old axiom "seeing is believing". When I see the White Paper on Campus Broadcasting, I will believe that the CRTC has a campus radio policy. At that time, we will be able to act accordingly in order to improve our signal service. Until then, Radio York will continue to serve the York Community, as best we can by means of closed-circuit transmission.

We're losing speakers

As a Post Script, I would like to make a statement regarding rip-offs of our speakers in common rooms and offices. This is partially a warning, and mostly a public service.

At this time of the year, we find that a few of the greedy members of the York community (— thank goodness they are few in number) steal speakers from various locations at York. If anyone thinks these speakers could be used for their stereo or car radio, they are

out of their mind. Electronically, these speakers are not designed for such use. They are matched in impedance and wattage to our Noram equipment.

Here is the dangerous part. The voltages which are run to these speakers in no way resemble the power which you might use in your home amplifier or car. For technical reasons, high voltages are transmitted along our Radio York lines. Any idiot who tampers with the equipment — in order to rip it off, or just to cause malicious damage is definitely tampering with death. May I warn that the voltages are high enough to electrocute a human, resulting in paralysis and possible death. Indeed it would be unfortunate if any student was electrocuted trying to rip-off a set of Radio York speakers for a Christmas present. For any would-be thieves, may I suggest that you stand in Central Square, take up a collection, and go to a radio store and buy a real set of speakers.

Marl L. Lewis
Technical director, Radio York.

(As Excalibur's media survey pointed out, only three percent of York students regularly listen to Radio York now. To dramatically change that, we believe a direct transmitter is needed. — ed.)

Can you really sell nationalism?

By RICHARD LISKEARD

Nationalism is one thing, but when you spray mediocrity with the sweet smell of the maple, something's gone wrong.

Perversions of nationalism have been as rife as perversions of the ecology movement — like when the corporations run slick ads in Time touting how they generously avoided sliming up a siver.

American corporate capitalism is bad, runs the argument, but Canadian corporate capitalism is OK, or at least better.

"Paul Bernard, psychiatrist" is only the latest in the spate of lousy-low-budget Canadian productions designed to make a mint off the Canadian Radio and Television Commission's Canadian content rulings. Bt Jesus, at least it's Canadian crap.

Anne Murray is "sweet, straight and

simple" — sure, she's a Glen Campbell with a hormone adjustment, but by Jesus, she's Canadian.

The Canadian Film Development Corporation, funding agency that gives you money to make a film if you can prove it's commercially viable, has been the major offending factor in perpetrating this perversion of the Canadian film industry.

So we blew it. We subsidized film production, but we didn't have the guts to nationalize film distribution. CBC radio is 97 percent Canadian production. At least we gave them a radio network. So we know it can be done.

But for our film industry, we gave Don Shebib a commercial pat on the back, and set up the CFDC, and brought John Bassett unto the scene.

We deserve everything we get.