

COLUMBIA SPECTATOR ARCHIVE

Columbia Daily Spectator, Volume CXIV, Number 15, 24 September 1990 — Sexual logic falls short in practice [ARTICLE]

Sexual logic falls short in practice

By Benjamin Delfin

Patrick Lannon's editorial on Friday, Sept. 14 ("Students must exercise self-control") is full of base and incorrect assumptions, and in one case engages in an outright lie, an example of total "illogic," as well as one "sorta" lie. That "sorta" lie made me "sorta" pissed. I'll take his points in rough order. There has not been much of an increase in promiscuity. Ask any person old enough, and they will tell you how in the old days, many pregnancies lasted only seven months! It is merely no longer as hidden, the same as with rape, incest, and physical abuse of wives and children (also, it used to be that a problem suffered largely by the poor wasn't a problem. More on snobbery later).

And none of the problems in the third paragraph are necessarily the fault of promiscuity. Single motherhood is more a result of a societal breakdown in values; just because someone has sex doesn't mean they grow irresponsible. People used to marry in such situations (unfortunately, such marriages often flamed out). As for abortion, AIDS, and other STD's (recent explosion of STD's, he says! Many famous people throughout history have died of syphilis, such as Toulouse Lautrec and King Henry VIII), as well as single motherhood--these are due to a lack of contraception. Lannon notes that we are using more contraception than ever before. But what does that mean? We do not use as much as Europe, nor is there an acceptable level below 100%; unless you believe in concepts like "acceptable losses" from nuclear war, like Ronald Reagan. Yet Lannon bluntly implies that "VD" (they're called STD's now), AIDS and crisis pregnancies result from more contraception. Similarly, it used to be believed that excessive washing (more than every three days or so) would result in disease. Too bad we're not superstitious peasants. This type of statement is known as

the Big Lie. It is an oratorical technique lauded by many, such as Hitler, Stalin, and Nixon. Present a blunt lie that taps a great wellspring of emotion, and run with it. Obviously, if everyone used condoms, these problems would be about as common as bubonic plague.

Now let's look at your "neutral" statement. Sex, like love, is what you make of it. Love can bind women into relationships with brutal men, as well as fulfill the soul. Lots of cheap sex may be able to tide someone over for a while, but it is cheap and fruitless, and people who say otherwise are fooling themselves and setting themselves up for a great disappointment. But between two people who care about each other, it can be a beautiful experience: another way to express the love between two people. But Lannon's use of the phrase "copulating like farm animals" and his assertion that sex "...destroys the respect needed for such a relationship." shows that he regards sex as a degrading experience. Maybe when some people have sex, it is only for animalistic pleasure, or for the "joy of conquering," placing another mark on a bedpost and then dumping a girl or a guy. Maybe Lannon believes that any girl with whom you have pre-marital sex is no longer worthy of your respect (WORTHY! the very concept! How barbaric!). This is sickness, not sanity. Intense self-loathing, fear of sexuality (people with such mindsets are often afraid of female sexuality; examples are Falwell and any Communist regime) and disrespect of women DOES NOT IMPRESS US. Since Lannon regards sex as disgusting, he says we are "being told that we are mere animals," "we can't control ourselves," and we must

“stop being victims [of sexual impulses].” If he regards sex as a Satanic temptation, then that’s what it is by definition--for him. Anything he does that he regards as evil is evil for him. But sex is something different for us.

Lannon’s language implies a measure of guilt attached to those who engage in sex, and that they bear “all responsibility” for their acts, including the “resulting” increase in rape. These statements are often heard from people who have problems being moral towards too many people. So they look for reasons to no longer have compassion for people. When someone has committed a sin, you now have an excuse to not care about them, or regard them as being outside of the ways in which you normally treat people, or even to treat them cruelly. Pregnant girls have been getting this moral hypocrisy in America ever since there were white people here. This rhetoric is the seed of evil; people who think that such treatment of others is the best way to make them good are engaging in a pathetic, self-deluding, and life-wrecking lie.

Also, Lannon’s statement (repeated from his editorial in *The Federalist* last year) that people who engage in promiscuity should expect “an increase in violent rape” is totally contrary to reality. By the way, is non-violent rape (whatever the hell that is) more acceptable? Rape is an act of violence, not sex. Get that through your head, Lannon, or stay out of the lives of women. Disproving his assertion, there are some case histories, perhaps known by the more colloquial name of ‘Europe.’ In every country in Europe that has relaxed or eliminated restrictions on pornography, the following has happened. The amount of pornography read increases, and then, as people’s curiosity is satisfied and they grow bored with pornography, the amount read decreases below its original level. Also, the incidence of rape declines. That’s right; as people find ways to relieve sexual tension, they become less likely to commit rape (I use people because I wouldn’t want anyone to think I forgot male rape). This is another place where Lannon has used reverse logic.

Even if one were to ignore the points raised in both our editorials, Lannon’s argument could be shot down on the basis of method alone. He presents his own reference frame as the only one, and he insults the reader by resorting to lies, twisting the truth, denigrating others, taking a position of moral snobbery (which, by definition, is never moral). He does not speak for good, but for sickness and hate. Like McCarthy, he may be able to capitalize on this in others, but no matter how popular his mindset gets, it will still contradict the very values he holds dear.

Benjamin Delfin is a Columbia College first-year student.