

## Sex and Relationships

Sexual health begins with the statement: “*It’s none of your business!*”

Here, as with so many other aspects of life, the way to health lies in refusing to allow the activity to become a commodity. Reading manuals on sex technique, on what is “healthy” and what is not, on overcoming sex problems, puts sex in the same category as car repair, and therein lies a major part of the problem.

“An American has no sense of privacy. He does not know what it means. There is no such thing in the country.” — Shaw, George Bernard, speech reported in *The New York Times*, Apr. 11, 1933.

“Beautiful women go through life expecting and receiving homage. You would think they expected it only from their equals in physical appeal, but that isn’t so. I dare you to make this experiment: don’t smile at or even acknowledge a good-looking woman in your office whom you have not yet spoken to. When she approaches, lower your eyes. Do everything you can to make her think that, as far as you’re concerned, she doesn’t exist. Do this even when you sense a willingness on her part to make eye contact when you pass each other in the corridors. Sooner or later she will say hello to you. These bitches can’t stand being ignored, not even by us ugly ones.” — S. f.

“The same strong aversion which the great feel for ‘climbers’ who wish to attach themselves to them at any cost, is felt by the virile man toward the sexual invert and by the woman for a too devoted lover.” — Proust, Marcel, *The Past Recaptured*, tr. Frederick A. Blossom, vol 7. of *Remembrance of Things Past*, The Modern Library, N.Y., 1932, p. 137.

Sex is not a way of life, and, for the vast majority of us, our bodies are not a career.

“Is there anything more shameful than the way modern so-called thinkers have bought into the sexual revolution? Not a one of these gutless wonders has even bothered to *question* the whole enterprise of willingly, *eagerly*, selling ourselves to a passion which thinkers of the past have often regarded with the greatest suspicion. Was it only because they were ugly old men whose only companionship was their books? Or did some of them decide that maybe the first duty of a thinker was to learn now not to be a slave?” — S. f.

Every plain man or woman — in other words, most middle-aged people — should be able to understand why the clerics of the Middle Ages hated sex so much. Nothing breeds virulent hatred and contempt like being tormented with sexual frustration year after year.

Woody Allen, on being asked if he thought sex was dirty, “If it’s done right, it is.”

Not too many years ago, acts we now consider a normal part of lovemaking were only done with prostitutes. But even in these liberated times, there are sex acts which we consider abnormal. Maybe we have an impulse to make sure that at least *some* sex acts remain forbidden and very *unhealthy*.

“La volupté unique et supreme de l’amour git dans la certitude de faire le mal.” (The unique

and supreme pleasure of love lies in the certainty that one is doing evil.) — Baudelaire.

We don't expect each partner to be responsible for satisfying the intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic needs of the other, so why do we expect each partner to be responsible for satisfying the sexual needs of the other? Sex is the great destroyer of relationships.

“Women: you can't live with them, and you can't live with them.” (Modification, by a friend, of an old adage.)

### **Additional Thoughts**

“The gay phenomenon is an interesting one. If it's genetic, why hasn't evolution bred it out, since it obviously is a dead end reproductively? If it's not genetic, how come it generally appears so early without any conscious decision on the part of the individual?” — Jim Swan

What *is* homosexuality? Let us agree that most people have a given physical gender, male or female, and one or two sexual personalities — masculine, feminine, or both (we ignore hermaphrodites and persons with multiple personalities). Here, the term “sexual personality” means the personality which the person expresses during a sexual act. Normally we define homosexuality by the fact that both partners are of the same physical gender. But why not define homosexuality on the basis that both sexual *personalities* are of the same gender? Thus heterosexuals (normal definition) can in fact be homosexual (e.g., masculine sexual personality in both the man and the woman). Or homosexuals (normal definition) can in fact be heterosexual (e.g., masculine sexual personality in one partner, feminine sexual personality in the other). Why not go further and define “strong homosexuality” as the case where both partners are of the same physical gender and the sexual personalities of the partners are the same as this gender? Similarly, we can define “strong heterosexuality” as the case where the partners are of opposite physical gender and also of opposite sexual personality. Of course, there are two types of strong heterosexuality: (1) partner no. 1 is masculine both physically and in sexual personality, while partner no. 2 is feminine both physically and in sexual personality, and (2) partner no. 1 is masculine physically but feminine in sexual personality, while partner no. 2 is female physically with masculine sexual personality.

There are even more refinements, e.g., in the case where gender orientations change during a given sex act. Furthermore, we must consider the intensity of sexual personality. Thus, e.g., we make speak of “strong weak strong heterosexuality”, meaning that the masculine sexual personality is strong, but the female sexual personality is weak, in a given strong heterosexual sex act. Etc.

I know this is the naivest question of all, but why is it that some homosexuals who hate members of the opposite sex go to such lengths to look and act like them? This seems to be particularly true of lesbians who fall into this class. You would think that their desire would be exactly the opposite, namely, to look and act like some sort of ideal *female*. Or is it that they are attempting to portray to the world what men *should* be, namely, women who look and act like men (and the fact that men don't fulfill this requirement is why they are hated)? Until reliable information

on this subject is forthcoming, we confused heterosexual males can only assume that, underneath it all, imitation remains the sincerest form of flattery.

Does consumerism cause homosexuality? The whole purpose of a consumer society is to create a constant state of yearning, and some of the best artists of our time are employed to do just this. The average television viewer sees more physical beauty in a day than his forefathers saw in a year or more. Young boys at an impressionable age see women presented so irresistibly on TV and in the movies, see how they are desired by the world, see how they are always the center of attention — what could be more natural than to want to be like them? Now add to that the essential ingredient for sexual excitement at an early age, namely, that of being forbidden, or at least likely to make one an outcast, and the rest follows.

The same mechanism might also produce homosexuality through envy of the handsome males the young boy sees on TV and in the movies. From “wanting to be just like him” to “wanting to have physical contact with him.”

