

# Letters

## Kids are safer with gay men

Editor,

I am responding to my respectful peer Mr. Ledbetter's letter in the Dec. 1 edition of The Daily Evergreen.

Mr. Ledbetter, Kurt Freund, et al, in the "Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy" 10 (1984): 193-200, conclude "that sex preference in pedophilia is etiologically different from the sex preference of males who prefer physically mature partners of either sex." In other words, pedophilia is a sexual orientation unto itself, not to be confused with either homosexuality or heterosexuality.

Furthermore, a study by Groth and Birnbaum, in "Archives of Sexual Behavior" 7 (1978): 178-81, found that child molesters were either pedophiles or heterosexuals who had "regressed." As a matter of fact, these researchers claimed the following: "(In over 12 years of clinical experience working with child molesters, we have yet to see an example of a regression from an adult homosexual orientation. The child offender who is also attracted to and engaged in adult sexual relationships is heterosexual. It appears, therefore, that the adult heterosexual male constitutes a greater sexual risk to underage children than does the adult homosexual male."

I regret that you ignorantly continue to obfuscate the issues of homosexuality, pedophilia and/or child molestation. I hope this is not done in order to make your rhetoric more inflammatory, because that would not only be incorrect, I believe it would be fraudulent and morally wrong.

Speaking of morals, I would also like to try and offer some moral distinction between "homosexuality and a fixation on gerbils and 7-year-old children." It seems you have classified these three very different orienta-

tions (homosexuality, bestiality and pedophilia) together because you perceive them all to be immoral examples of human desire gone awry. Likewise, it would appear you believe the heterosexual orientation to offer the only avenue by which human beings can "morally" enjoy their sexuality.

If "morality" were judged simply upon whether an act was homosexual or heterosexual, we would have to find a homosexual act between two consenting adults was immoral, while a heterosexual rape was to be, at least on some level, judged as moral.

A similar logic underlies any argument founded on the heterosexual union's capacity for procreation, which is seen as "natural." Just because rapist can "naturally" procreate, does not mean we find the heterosexual act of rape "natural" or "moral."

Furthermore, I respectfully submit that every single heterosexual with whom I have ever discussed sexuality had admitted to that he or she has engaged in sex for reasons other than procreation. Does this mean that a large percentage of heterosexual are actually "unnatural" and "immoral?" Or, are consensual sexual relations between two adults okay, even if it's not done for the purpose of procreation?

Ultimately, Mr. Ledbetter, I would like to argue that our country has politically and morally organized itself around the principles of the constitutional democracy — not theocracy. As Americans, we have historically strived to treat one another with fairness and dignity and I see no reason why we should not continue to pursue this ideal; reflecting upon the morality which has been America in its strident advocacy of the civil and human rights of its citizens.

Micki Archuleta

## Negroes never had the option to hide in the "closet"

Editor,

In the newspaper you have made efforts to inform the students of WSU and bridge the social gap between gays and lesbians and heterosexuals. I recognize your effort to get those on opposite sides to communicate. It will not go unnoticed, and should be commended.

However, I must question your classification of homosexuals that represent the student body, the GLBA, and others nationwide, as the '90s Negro ("Resurrection of the '90s Negro," in the Wednesday edition of The Daily Evergreen). I do not see the GLBA as anything that symbolizes or defines the lives of the Negro in this nation at

any time in history.

I do see a large group of people who are ridiculed and targeted for the lifestyle they choose to live, which is different from the majority.

Linking the situation of gays and lesbians has no comparison to the lives and struggles of Blacks. Gays and lesbians aren't necessarily visual homosexuals for the majority. They can live their lives and appear to be regular heterosexual citizens. They are only discriminated and targeted when they choose to reveal the true nature of their sexual preference as homosexual.


The Negro's situation is different because the "closet" is not an option

Seen as inferior and savage, the Negro has been lynched, persecuted, and treated inhumane. As people who were robbed of their history, and not considered to be a part of American history, Blacks have fought for 400 years to be considered equal.

The color of the Black man's skin is the reason he received this treatment, not because he chose to live a lifestyle different from the morals of the majority.


Though the struggles of gays should not go unnoticed, they cannot be seen as similar to the Negro of this nation. They are different and that distinction needs to be made.

Shadiff Hinson



One Love

Illustration by Damon Brown



## BACK TO SCHOOL SPECIAL!

It's that time of year again! Reach all new and returning students and faculty in our annual spring Back-to-School issues.

Advertise in our first issue at open rate, then pick up the same ad in our second issue at 25% off

Deadline: December 20  
Publish Date: January 16 & 17