

# R Q

*The tie me up edition*

Is there a straight gene?

Money matters

Leon Trotsky

Teacher Teacher

Trudies Sex Advice

Poetry



---

[www.geocities.com/radicalqueer](http://www.geocities.com/radicalqueer)  
[radicalqueer@hotmail.com](mailto:radicalqueer@hotmail.com)

## *RadicalQueer: The Tie me up edition*



### **Editorial**

The new Internet regulations that will come into effect from January 1 2000 need to be resisted. Supposedly they are intended to prevent children from coming into contact with hard-core porn. However many worthwhile educational resources will be blocked as well.

Slogans about freedom of speech and thought police will be raised. While all this is fine it's the central premise of the government's argument that should be challenged. The censorship rationale is this: That if an eleven year old girl [or boy] downloaded a picture of an erect penis or worse still a spread shot via the Internet she would be damaged forever more.

Supposedly such images are only 3 or 4 mouse clicks away and the Internet is awash with porn. This argument needs to be torn apart. I put forward the counter-argument that the biggest threat to a young adult's sexual development isn't the occasional exposure to erotic images.

It is society's puritanical reactions to healthy expressions of sexuality. If a child [now defined as anyone under 18] did see an erect penis or

moist vagina via the net nothing of any significance would happen. As I explained to a workmate it's all a part of growing up.

The rightwing have pushed the protect the children line as a lever to restrict the erotic expression of adults. Very few are game to take them on because who wants to be labelled a paedophile (or soft on paedophiles) in a context where paedophiles are more socially maligned than communists at the height of the cold war.

How dare conservative forces in this country claim to be the guardians of children. The same people who attack childcare, the welfare state, workers wages and women's rights have the cheek to claim they're motivated by paternal/maternal instincts. Yes many children may be neglected by overworked and stressed parents, have to wait in line when they're sick and get a poor education in overcrowded schools; but at least they're not looking at porn.

There is no evidence, no evidence that pornography has ever done anyone any damage, child or adult. I maintain that the best way to protect children is to give them a sense of their own worth. Children should be taught about sex from a young age. Telling kids about sex at 13 or 14 is like giving a push bike rider the keys to a Ducati.

Young adults should also be shown the techniques to become Multi-Orgasmic. A young population so confident about their own sexuality would probably be the less susceptible to the crass exploitation of sex than the current crop of adults.

Sexual repression = pornography = censorship = stupidity.

**Cheers Trudies**

## What ever happened to Leon Trotsky



Perhaps Leon Trotsky, the revolutionaries' revolutionary, didn't get killed in Mexico. After years of failed revolutions, world wars and pogroms he simply gave up, faked his own death and disappeared. Like Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid he spent his last years revealing in obscurity and the myth of his own death. Trotsky wasn't killed by Stalin's assassin. He took a young lover and escaped to the Caribbean becoming the occasional friend and drinking buddy of Earnest Hemmingway.

**Or** he retired on a Greek fishing island his fair Russian skin turning a leathery golden brown under the warm Mediterranean sun.

**Maybe** he was seen last hitch-hiking on route 66 being picked up by Jack Kerouac and Neil Cassidy on their way to San Francisco. Trotsky knew straight away that Cassidy was Bi for Trotsky had become a leather queen cruising Times Square in a flying jacket and his favourite fishing cap. A regular at the St Marks bathhouse he took a struggling Tom of Finland under his wing taught him how to draw. Sitting in the back seat of Cassidy's car the two beatniks made fun of the old man until they realised who he was. They

never published who would believe them.

**Perhaps** he spied on his followers like phantom. Disguised as a bum he sat at the back of Trotskyists meetings and made rude and incomprehensible interventions before being thrown out by the beefy cadre. Later in lonely hotel rooms he cried and laughed himself to sleep at the stupidity of it all and what his disciples had done to his name.



**It's possible that** in a Rudolf Hess like attempt to break out of his political isolation Trotsky flew a stolen plan to England, miscalculated and crashed somewhere, in the middle of nowhere, in Scotland. Dripping wet and suffering from hypothermia he stumbled onto a dying George Orwell's door. They both fell into a drunken stupor on Irish whisky and completed the first draft of *1984* in front of the fire. Trotsky abruptly got up saying he was going to the Hebrides and disappeared into the dark and foggy night singing in Gaelic "the end is nigh".

**Or** knowing the importance of the information revolution he digitised himself and entered cyber space in 1963. He transformed into a thousand comput-

er viruses each one being successfully killed off by computer geeks but having the last laugh by developing the millennium bug believing that overworked programmers would shut the system down in 2004.

**I'd like to think** that Trotsky become a secret mentor to the sexual revolution. Whispering hints in Kinsey's ear handing potent LSD cocktails to acid queen Augustus Stanley Owsley III before dying a happy man on a Californian sex commune leaving behind a crude version of Viagra bubbling and burning away in his backyard still, and recipes for perfumes and designs for exotic lingerie in the attic of the house that was later owned by Kelvin Cline.

Leon Trotsky is survived by countless books, several larger than life black and photographs, a couple of grainy film fragments and some poor quality audio. He left behind thousands of warring political groups, acres of fishing caps, several rabbits, tons of triangular beards and hundreds of illegitimate children. Long live the revolution.



# Money Matters

## *Is the classic gay scene dying?*



Maybe once upon a time setting up a club for gays and lesbians with a sensible business plan was a licence to print money, once but definitely not now. Look around today and you'll see the considerable road kill of deceased gay businesses. In this city [Melbourne] there have been spectacular examples of entrepreneurial dreams turning to dust.

Take for example *Precinct 3182* a vision of a gay pleasure palace that shone only briefly before the re-developers moved in. The *Precinct* could rightfully claim to be world class with a sauna, cinema, dance club, cruising area and hotel. In spite of the luxurious surroundings few gay and bi men indulged and the *Precent* was forced to close. In the last desperate months the owners relaxed the legal restriction barring women and turned the dance bar over to a lesbian night called *Girl Bar*.

During the late nighties other clubs in Melbourne closed or were forced to restructure their activities. Even the *Peel*, long

criticised as a bastion of male pride, set up a lesbian night. Meanwhile two other gay clubs obtained the legal right to posture as being "male only" and positioned themselves as the best venues in a declining market. For a brief time the confusion found an outlet in the gay press.

The owners' month piece [Hand in Hand Association] accused the punters of being disloyal for not spending hard-earned cash in gay nightclubs. Even the hapless scene workers were being charged with disloyalty for selling their labour to a higher bidder. Predicably some



of the punters replied with the wit of Oscar Wilde stating that the clubs had all the ambience of a boring dinner party.

It appears that the classic gay scene has been victim of its own success. When the scene surfaced from the underground it was viewed as a vehicle for profit. Slowly the number of clubs grew until the market couldn't sustain them all, boomed turned to bust. Spoilt for choice the

punters not only went to the wrong venues many didn't go out at all.

In the new openness about gayness the club owners repeated the mantra of youth and beauty. Dimwitted bouncers enforced the policy turning away many with "sorry members only". The problem with the policy was that the original gay fighters were aging and felt alienated from the scene they helped to build.

They were "over it sweetie" and many of the younger generation were tempted away by other clubs providing a different sort of openness. Not only was there too many clubs the market was/is actually shrinking.

Another factor effected the scene. In spite of the economy turning to boom in the mid-nighties most people identifying as lesbian and gay are actually doing it harder. The wages of most workers, and therefore most gays and lesbians, actually decreased in real terms. As a result of economic rationalism many now feel extremely insecure about their employment. Hard earned cash is even harder earned today and not to be thrown away lightly. The paradox is this: There has never been a better time to be out yet life is harder for most identifying



as gay or lesbian. In spite of a boom gay clubs hit the wall.

When the gay and lesbian clubs became increasing successfully in the eighties another process began. The increase in traffic to the ghetto areas saw "straight" businesses cashing in.

So another paradox presents itself, increased economic activity in gay areas makes the area appear less gay. Individuals identifying as "straight" started going to gay areas, perhaps to be cool, through curiosity or on their own journey of sexual discovery. Whatever the motivation tensions erupted between those who wanted to exploit "straights" and those who demanded a pure gay or lesbian experience.

Established clubs could choose to ignore the influx and accommodate solely to the wishes of their clientele. Other clubs tried to carve out a new niche. As homosexuality became more accepted a new trend began - "mixed clubbing" gays, straights, lesbians, bis, transies all partying in the same venue. To a new generation of

gays and lesbians mixed clubbing gave them the opportunity to party outside of the ghetto and many voted with their feet.

Maybe "mixed clubbing" is a more realistic expression of sexuality under capitalism. As Alfred Kinsey and many others have pointed out human sexuality is a continuum not a simple gay / straight division. Mixed clubbing also gives individuals the chance to express sexual ambiguity. Perhaps the physiological attraction of queer for a considerable number of people is its fuzziness. The chance to

there has never been a better time to be out yet life is harder for most identifying as gay or lesbian.

play on both sides of the fence without ever being pinned down.

Today individuals can retreat from or advance into the scene. From gay friendly to bent to queer to "full on gay" and back again. Notions about sexual identities can be challenged, changed or discarded on the way. Not only is sexual ambiguity supported but fluidity as well. Many people change their sexual behaviour throughout the course of their lives.

I'm not sure what all this means. Perhaps the liberationist view that as people

become more accepting the homo/hetero division will start to dissolve is correct. For a small section of the population in Western cities this appears to be the case. In spite of the pessimism and defensiveness expressed by sections of the Bisexual movement the worlds turning their way.

We should not confuse though the small space provided by capitalism with the real expression peoples desire. And we should never lose sight of the fact that these spaces are only available for a tiny minority of the population. We still have a whole world to win. Power to the people.

Daryl Croke.

For an excellent article about trends in venues read "From Gay to Queer", BrotherSister, [20 Aug 1998, Issue 165] pp 12-3. also letters pp 9.

About the demise of Precinct, "Lost treasure", MSO, [4 Sept 1998, Issue 434] pp 8.

- FINAL -  
men only nights

# Teacher Teacher

Earlier this year a teacher was forced to resign when a student “discovered” nude photos on a computer. The student downloaded the shots and for a few milliseconds was exposed to the sight of a naked science teacher. All hell broke loose. The scandal hit the papers [“gay photos”], parent groups were outraged and “for the good of the profession” the teacher in question took a drive. I wrote a letter to *The Age* in the teachers’ defence, they didn’t publish. I wonder why?

The recent resignation of a teacher over photo’s found on his personal computer raises serious questions privacy. While the attention of the media has been focused on students’ access to material deemed unsuitable little attention has been paid to the gross invasion of the teacher’s privacy. It should not be forgotten that while one of the students in question felt disgusted by said material the teacher, a good teacher by all accounts, is now out of a job.

The claim that the students stumbled on the nude photos have been refuted by Peter Allen [Department of Education Secretary]. According to Allen the students “had to go through seven levels of protection- four of which were meant to restrict access.” Mary Bluett president of the teachers union likened the student’s action to “flicking through his diary”.

Dig deep enough into any individuals personal life, rummage through garbage, break into filing cabinets or even hack into their personal computer and you will undoubtedly find enough evidence of sexual activities to embarrass them in public. I’m not a big fan of the bible but I can’t help quoting the following “let he without sin cast the first stone”. Moral campaigners would argue that children have to be shielded from the adult sexual world. But who is going to protect society at large from vindictive students and narrow-minded parents?

The disturbing prelude to the story breaking into *The Age* was an article in the Herald Sun sub titled “Teacher accused over gay photos”. Mr Allen, the follow day in *The Age*, seemed relieved to announce that “the images were not of gay sexual activity”. The implication is that the photos of the male teacher would be more offensive if the

teacher was in fact gay. Homophobic [anti-gay] baiting like this is disgraceful and the media should be above indulging in it.

Does anyone seriously believe that these students are going to be damaged because they saw pictures of one of their teachers in the buff? Surely students so skilled with the Internet have also been exposed to many other erotic images? In a year or two [if they haven’t already] the students in question are going to indulge in all kinds of sexual activities. The biggest danger to their sexual development will not be nudie shots their science teacher but the puritanical reaction of their parents and the Department of Education to a healthy sexual relationship.

I hear now that students are going to receive counselling, what an outrage. The only one who should receive counselling and compensation is the much-maligned teacher. In a truly caring society he should be given his job and dignity back.

And so *The Age* didn’t publish the letter. Was it my remark that society at large has to be protected from biggots? The implication that the students in question might of “set up” a teacher they didn’t like? Perhaps it was my criticism of how the media used homophobia to flush out the truth? [The teacher must have said at one stage “no I’m not gay the shots were intended for my very female internet lover.”]

Maybe it was my revolutionary and shocking idea that a 15 year old boy does in fact have a sexuality. That unless he’s led a very boring and sheltered life he has already seen plenty of naked people. I think what killed the letter was my ridiculing of the current sexual paranoia concerning so-called children. I put forward the idea that hysterically trying to protect young adults from sex is doing them more harm than good.

I am tempted at this stage to go on about “when I was 15...” but the truth is I didn’t have much of a sex life at 15. A late developer I was barely gett-

ting into masturbation. I desperately wanted a sex life tough. Once I heard my parents gossiping about a woman at a party who said it was her fantasy to “break in a 15 year old boy”. My heart arched, I desperately wanted some excuse to go round to her house. What a magical experience it would have been.

When I was 15 my school took the brave step of trying to talk to kids about sex. “Adolescent Relationships” was conceived and my year were the first guinea pigs. Parents hit the roof “Adolescents don’t have relationships” they replied. This was in spite of the high number of teen pregnancies and “shot gun weddings”.

The name of the course was revised to the safer “human relationships” and the supporting textbook was withdrawn. A textbook that showed graphic illustrations and used street slang was

bad enough but the biggest problem, as my father once sorted, was that “it was written from a woman’s point of view.”

The school offered to buy back the offending book and most took up the offer, I kept mine. I was grilled by my father, like many other students. “So what did they teach you at that school today”. That was Cobram 1980, not much has changed. Kids still long for and parents are still shit scared of sex.

Perhaps we should be thankful. Thankful that the *Herald Sun* reminds us that Homophobia is alive and well in the media. Thankful that moral groups will quickly alert us to any transgression from a “normal lifestyle”. Thankful that the Education Department will protect our children from any teacher who is cheeky enough to have a sex life.

**Daryl Croke**

## Poetry

**Journey on sweet sister  
Blessed with love & light  
Journey on in grace  
Journey into night**

**We journey through Eternity  
And through love’s endless flight**

**To brave the fear  
To break the spell  
To be a shining light**

**by Magic Happens© 1998.**



# Is there a straight gene?

Picture this, one-day in the not too distant future. Your gazing at the magazines in the newsagency and the headline from *New Scientist* screams out at you “Straight gene discovered”. In amazement you pick up the magazine and start reading about the latest startling discovery.

“Genetics scientist Harry Stonewall announced this week that after exhaustive DNA cross-referencing of 10,000 heterosexual twins the gene sequence or code believed responsible for causing heterosexuality has been isolated. ‘I believe that our research will prove once and for all that the cause of heterosexuality is genetic.’ Mr Stonewall refused to be drawn on the possible moral or ethical issues raised by his research.

“Civil libertarian Ms Worrysome did raise serious concerns. ‘Already there are reports of lesbian couples phoning sperm banks requesting information about Mr Stonewalls findings. With IVF breeding facilities due to open nationwide and current social prejudice it appears the that heterosexual is doomed.’

The usually outspoken Mary Whichway, convenor of BiNet, was short of words, she simply said ‘I’m shocked, I don’t know where this leaves us now.’”

Holding a mirror to heterosexual prejudice and reflecting it back onto the oppressor is an interesting exercise. It proves how illogical many assumptions of social oppression really are. All too often though queers haven’t sought to undermine the dominant ideology but instead celebrated and affirmed their right to a “deviant” status.

The acceptance of homosexuality as a minority experience deliberately emphasises the ghettoisation of homosexual experience and by implication fails to interrogate the inevitability of heterosexuality. [Jeffrey Weeks]

As Alfred C. Kinsey pointed out 50 years ago the degree to which “homosexuality” is practiced is dependent on the social mores of a particular society. There is nothing normal or abnormal, innate or fixed about either “homosexuality” or “heterosexuality”. Yet still today some 50 years



after Kinsey and 30 years after Stonewall there is an “inevitability of heterosexuality”. Why is this so? What makes heterosexuality the concept, the institution, the practice so popular?

In so far as heterosexuality is even discussed by the left the answer is usually “capitalism and the family”. The Trotskyist tradition that I’ve come from explains that “sexual deviancy is a threat to the family and the family is crucial for social oppression under capitalism. Therefore the ruling class oppress gays.” This seductive argument suggests that tearaway non-straight sexualities pose an alternative to heterosexual coupling in the family. If everyone were free to pursue a queer lifestyle who would raise the next generation of wage slaves for the bosses? Why would women slave at home for nothing if there were a viable alternative? Capitalism needs the family to keep the cost of the social wage down and to ensure stability.

As the nuclear family became increasingly important to capitalism, it became increasingly important to portray it as the only possible living arrangement and to ensure that the sexual divisions this entailed were passed on to future generations of workers. The family, in other words, became a means not only of social control over workers, but also of ideo-

logical control...Gay sexuality challenges the idea of the monogamous family as the only possible way of living-it also challenges the idea that sex is only for reproduction. [Noel Halifax]

Social constructionists tend to agree on the crucial period in capitalism's development when "Gay oppression" became systemised, the period from around 1860-1900. It was in this period that the "homosexual as a social type" was created. Oppression of "homosexuality", the argument goes, was not unique to capitalism. But under capitalism sexuality was now not a "private affair regulated by traditions and prejudices of the community" but became "a public matter for the state".

Heterosexuality in this argument is treated as an a-historical given, what changed during the Industrial Revolution was how society defined and dealt with deviancy. Capitalism, as it always does, presented a paradox. The breakdown of feudalism created "the conditions in which gay sexuality [could] develop and flourish." But simultaneously "gay oppression became systematised as a necessary defence of the nuclear family." Gays were oppressed but "for the first time in history it was possible to fight for gay liberation."

The implication of the Marxist argument is that although heterosexuality isn't particularly new it is absolutely necessary for capitalism's survival. This means that the full development of human sexuality can not take place under the present system. Heterosexuality therefore should be thoroughly analysed and criticised, but whenever sexuality is discussed we only seem to defend and explain the so-called "minority" activity. Only through mediation is heterosex-

uality present; it causes-capitalism/the family; and its effects-homophobia & women's oppression. How heterosexuality actually works in practice is rarely discussed.

One person who is prepared to tackle the heterosexual bull by the horns is Jonathan Ned Katz the author of The Invention of Heterosexuality. Katz argues that heterosexuality was actually invented in the late nineteenth century and has continued to develop throughout the twentieth century. Linking the nuclear family with the social dominance of heterosexuality is dubious. Other societies pre-dating industrial capitalism had an even greater stake in reproduction inside a stable family but those societies were not homophobic. Katz uses the example of New England settlers in colonial America to illustrate this point.

In these formative years, the New England organization of the sexes and their erotic activity was dominated by a reproductive imperative. These fragile, undeveloped agricultural economies were

desperate to increase their numbers, and their labor force. So the early mode of procreation was structured to optimize the production of New Englanders...The operative contrast in this society was between fruitfulness and barrenness, not between different-sex and same sex eroticism. Individuals might lust consistently toward one sex or another and be recognized, sometimes, as so lusting. But this society did not give rise to a subject defined essentially by an attraction to a same sex or an appetite for a different sex.

The defining feature of heterosexuality is the idea that there are two *types* of

sexual behaviour, normal and abnormal. Indeed that there are two *types* of people on earth, straight and gay. This idea has no basis in science. There is only one species of human roaming the earth today. I don't believe that Heterosexuality is about breeding. That "sex is



only for reproduction". It is the glorification of sex between men and women, sex for sex's sake.

The big problem with both Marxist and Postmodernist theories is that they view heterosexuality as both automatically repressive and static. It is as if heterosexuality was born fully formed, became the dominant ideology overnight remained unchanged throughout the 20th century and will be overthrown, hopefully, in the 21st century.

It should be remembered that when psychoanalysts first talked about heterosexuality it was viewed as a sickness, an individual who takes an unhealthy interest in sex! Only over time did it evolve into what we know today. It should also be remembered that throughout the 20th century there was an argument between science and the church over sex, thankfully science won! Science freed us from sin, our task today is to free ourselves from bad science.

I see heterosexuality as a dynamic system that is both progressive and repressive. Progressive because it validates sex outside the family, glorifies sex for sex sake and frees us from sin, a huge step forward. Repressive because it only validates sex between men and women and treats women as secondary in that union.

Jonathan Katz, sees Heterosexuality as being a product of class struggle in the 19th century. As capitalism came to dominate the world a new class, the urban middle class, became self-aware. They viewed themselves as modern and distinct from the decaying feudal ruling class. Also they believed themselves to be above the morally degenerate working class. The urban middle class desperately wanted an ideology to justify the new courtship rituals and possibilities that emerged under capitalism. They needed to free themselves from the church, enter Freud. Watch the latest film of Oscar Wilde's play *An Ideal Husband* it's all there.

There was considerable historical inertia though, over 3000 years of sexual repression, and the emergence of heterosexuality was a slow and painful process. It was not until the well into the 1960's and 70's that the battle was won.

In the last third of the 20th century there was considerable effort amongst progressive forces in promoting homosexuality. This was a correct and revolutionary task. The task of the new century is to bring the whole heterosexual edifice tumbling down.

Marxist's view Capitalism as a dynamic but unstable system. We point to its contradictions and seek to exploit its weakness in order to bring its fall. The same intellectual vigour needs to be applied to heterosexuality. What are its weaknesses, its contradictions, how does it fail to meet the expectations of most of the population.

In 1812 the great English poet Shelley wrote the following verse in his poem *The Mask of Anarchy*.

Tis to be a slave in soul  
And to hold no strong control  
Over your own wills, but be  
All that others make of ye.

We have to understand that we are engaged in a struggle far more profound than the fight over dollars and cents, the bitter allocation of resources. We are engaged in struggle over the meaning of life itself. The control of our own bodies the ability to act on desire. The task of the left is not only to fight for a better world but demonstrate how we can derive pleasure from that world as well.

**Daryl Croke.**

Some books used.

Jeffrey Weeks, *Sexuality and its Discontents*, Routledge, London [1991].

Noel Halifax, *Out Proud & Fighting*, Socialist Workers Party, London [1988].

Jonathan Ned Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality*, Plume, New York [1996].

## So you want to get into anal sex.



So you want to get into anal sex, now where to begin. Firstly to dispel a few myths. It doesn't matter whether you're a man or a woman; gay, straight, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, intersex or otherwise identified anal sex is highly enjoyable. To paraphrase a friend "the *anus* is second only to the clitoris in pleasurable nerve endings".

If you doubt this I simply say "don't knock it till you've tried it". But you wouldn't be reading this column if you weren't willing to at least give it a try.

Like any other physical activity it's best to have realistic expectations. You can't go from being a tight-arsed virgin to a fist fucking slut overnight. Along the way you'll need to warmup, stretch and condition. So for the 'anal sex workout' become your

own personal trainer develop a program and chart your own progress.

### **Warm-up**

With anal sex the warm-up is more of a mental approach than a physical activity. If it's your first time you're going to be nervous as hell, so relax. When being fucked for the first time choose someone you trust. "The anal opening is quite elastic, but until you've experienced that elasticity, you'll feel some tension."

Your partner can help you relax by gently inserting a well lubricated finger or two [short fingernails please!].

**you can't go from being a tight-arsed virgin to a fist fucking slut overnight**

### **Stretching**

The homework for this program is to explore your own anus. Buy a smallish gel dildo or butt-plug, it's best to avoid hard plastic sex toys for anal sex. Once your body has learned to accept a small size perhaps buy the next size up and slowly explore the next stage etc. There are two important reasons why this manual exploration is necessary. One your anus stretches and learns to anticipate penetration. Two

you'll learn which angle feels the best and then be able to guide your lover/s to achieve the most pleasurable results.

### **Working out**

Now that you've warmed up and stretched the workout can begin. For your own comfort go to the toilet before anal sex, you'll feel clean and more relaxed. "As your partner enters you, push out slightly, just as if you were having a bowel movement." This makes penetration easier for your partner.

At first try positions that you give a lot of control such as side by side and astride. As you become more experienced expand your repertoire. Always use condoms and water-based lube. Don't smear lube all over the penis/strap-on/dildo just on tip and anus entry is enough. So get out there, get into anal sex!

Quotes & bottom illustration Gay Sex, by Jack Hart, Alyson Publications, Inc. Boston [1991]



Bradley M. Look