

Letters

continued from page 3

Would it really have been better to simply change CGLA's name and hide all opposition? I don't think so. The principles of democracy rest on the theory that open debate of ideas results in the best decisions. We need to discuss what is best for our community.

In my original article, I explained why I did not believe that "bisexual" should be included in the name of CGLA. Several people have suggested that I was not supportive enough of bisexuals, and to those people I apologise. I tried to be kind and supportive, but if some felt insulted, then I wasn't supportive enough. I did say, among other things, that I thought that "CGLA's membership and services should continue to involve bisexuals," that I have many bisexual friends whom I love, and that I am making a point to educate myself more on bisexuality. I wish the writer of the above response had made the same effort to respect my feelings that I did to respect hers. I think that the above letter is unnecessarily harsh.

I want to remind readers that I was simply arguing against a name change, not to denigrate bisexuals. Some people do try to insult and hurt bisexuals. I am not one of them--please be careful not to attribute their arguments or prejudices to me.

I think the best way to respond to the substance of the above letter and other criticisms is by reiterating and clarifying my original argument. I feel that the author above seriously misunderstood my article. My argument rests on two principles which I think are indisputable: (1) That society oppresses Gays and Lesbians because of their homosexual relationships, and (2) That Bisexuals can be involved in either Gay/Lesbian or heterosexual relationships.

When bisexuals are involved in gay or lesbian relationships they are oppressed because of their sexuality; when bisexuals are involved in heterosexual relationships they are not. CGLA exists to support individuals who are condemned by society because they seek or participate in Lesbian or Gay relationships, hence the name CGLA. I am saying that the name CGLA by nature includes bisexuals.

When bisexuals are oppressed by society because of their homosexual relationships I will fight with all my strength to support them. However, I don't think that bisexuals' rights are denied by society because of their heterosexual relationships--only because of their Gay or Lesbian

relationships. Of course, I have and will continue to support individuals who are in heterosexual relationships. Like everyone, they have plenty of problems of their own--but these are problems that can not be solved by an organization like ours, because these problems do not come from the hatred of the dominant, heterosexual culture.

I'm not sure the above letter disputes any of this. I'm not implying that bisexuals are too weak to be gay--I'm just saying they have choices in their lives that lesbian and gay people do not have. Bisexuals can choose to act either on their heterosexual or on their homosexual side; this is what "bisexual" means and this is what bisexuals have told me. I don't dispute their rights to choose heterosexual relationships or question their integrity for doing so; some argue that only a fool would choose to be oppressed if she or he had other options. I am simply saying that the name of CGLA should reflect the reason we exist--to end hatred of homosexuality.

Finally, I would encourage the above writer and all others to get involved with CGLA. It's really easy to sit back and criticize the people who do all the work.

Editor's Note: Part of Kim Savage's letter addresses LAMBDA's editorial policy--so allow me to explain that policy. As a free speech organization, we solicit articles representing a variety of opinions, including those that are contrary to the views of the editorial staff. We edit for clarity, grammar, and (rarely) length, but we do not edit for tone or quality of argument. The tone of an article is often as important in communicating a viewpoint as is the article's literal content, and we expect readers to make their own decisions regarding the quality of the argument. LAMBDA presented Pippa Holloway's original article intact, with the hope that the reader would judge; in the same spirit, we now present Kim Savage's letter and Pippa Holloway's response.

Alan Berman, Attorney at Law

*Personal Relationships
Wills and Probate, Real
Estate, Business and
Commercial Law*

327 West Main Street
Durham, North Carolina

(919) 682-2111