

As for me...

Dear Editor,

Once again ONE's editor has touched on a matter of tremendous significance to the homosexual community; namely, the importance of a positive attitude toward oneself and other homosexuals.

While we may find the homosexual disgusting who discriminates against his own people, he should be dismissed with the thought that his sole accomplishment is to detract from the lives of himself and others of his kind.

For maximum personal satisfaction homosexuals should regard their peculiarity in the same way they regard their left-handedness, or their brown or black hair as the case may be. Neither as something to be ashamed or proud of, merely as one of many personality traits.

Once that degree of maturity is achieved, the homosexual may become aware that he has something in common with others of his inclination which is not shared by the majority. He may find that when he meets another homosexual they need not be strangers for they share a way of life, even a whole world which outsiders scarcely know exists. He shares a strong sub-culture with all of its rewards and advantages, yet is able to "pass" unnoticed in the dominant society. In a sense he can "have his cake and eat it too."

But what are the rewards and advantages of the homosexual way of life? For one thing, a guy can stop for a beer or two and quickly get to know a handful of people; with any luck he can pick up an interesting bed partner at no expense whom he can forget about in the

morning if he wishes. He can "shack up" with a lover who may pay half of the expenses, and with whom he can part company any time he wishes without further obligation.

Is this not more satisfactory to many people than committing one's self for life and being forced to feed two or more mouths, being forced to live with and confine one's sexual contacts to one person "for better or worse." Men are naturally promiscuous and the "fidelity" demanded of husbands is often very frustrating.

Again, the homosexual can "have his cake and eat it too." He can, if he is mature and lucky, enjoy a relationship as rich and meaningful as any. And he can do so without the harsh restrictions, commitments, and responsibilities heterosexuals usually submit to.

The homosexual is all too prone to dwell on the ostracism, discrimination, and prosecution he is often subjected to. But here again let's take another look. The discreet homosexual rarely if ever is subjected to unpleasantness if for no other reason than the fact that he is not usually "obvious." It is not good judgment to manifest one's sexual proclivities, whatever they are, in situations where the consequences are undesirable. It is usually apeing women, propositioning heterosexuals, indulging in sex in public places or similar foolish acts which cause trouble and not the condition of homosexuality itself.

It is the responsible homosexual who earns and demands respect and who selects his friends wisely who respects the rights of others not to associate with him if they choose. He knows that the acceptance or approval which is offered heterosexuals

only is unhealthy and he does not value it.

We all hear disparaging or contemptuous remarks about "fairies," "Niggers," and Jews, etc. which are offensive. But we should consider the source and nature of these expressions of hostility. If people really feel that minorities are inferior to them would they have any motive for repeatedly asserting their beliefs without provocation? No, they would not. Actually superior people do not call it to other's attention because they have no motive for doing so. Unprovoked hostility is a symptom of inadequacy or more specifically frustration. The person who "looks down" on others does so because he wants to; he is trying to prove something. When another person is condescending or hostile without adequate justification the mature person merely views him as an offensive person with a problem but does not learn to dislike himself as a result.

While the lot of the minority person has traditionally been hard, is the position of the members of the dom-

inant group always enviable? When a man faces a woman in court isn't she usually right and he usually wrong? Isn't he usually guilty of whatever she wishes to accuse him of? Is there something wrong with feeling lucky when reading about the millions of guys who pay alimony and child support, and the thousands who go to jail or prison for non-support or desertion. Is the guy so bad off who never has to worry about unwanted pregnancies, divorce courts, or stifling family responsibilities? Discrimination: What about the thousands of guys who get 5 years for statutory rape because of being seduced by minor girls, even prostitutes? What about the guy who gets 20 years for crossing the state line with a woman who was willing and may have even suggested the idea.

Finally, homosexual, think of your host of happy memories, of the joys shared, and the priceless friendships you have and hold. Would you have all of these if you were not what you are?

Aubrey Bailey

tangents

news & views

SEX IN THE MAGAZINES

Harper's Magazine has had several issues lately in which noteworthy articles have appeared. The October issue contained an important article on how much "news" is reported by the "news" magazines. We already knew how much they mishandled articles concerning homosexuality, but it seems that this inaccuracy is typical of most of their reporting. And

Harper's for Dec. has done what no scientific journal has been brave enough to do in reporting the results of a scientific investigation into the sex knowledge and attitudes of medical students. No wonder the general public is so misinformed! The January issue of **Harper's** has an article titled "Sex and the Law" by Harriet F. Pilpel, who has spoken for ONE and writes for **Publishers' Weekly**.

Playboy continues its series on sex with the printing of the radio show on which Hugh Hefner, Editor, appeared with 3 religious spokesmen. December **Playboy** also has a science fiction story in which homosexuality plays a part,

