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Cigar, anti-gay hit

3/13/78

To the Cigar:
I never thought that I’d see the day that the Cigar would have to reprint old material. I know that you’ve gone to four issues a week, but that’s no excuse for reprinting Singewald’s letter, (Feb 2, 1978) entitled “Homosexuality Hit” which was originally printed on Sept. 6, 1977 in a slightly different version.

I will not waste our valuable time by reiterating my original rebuttal to Singewald’s letter. My rebuttal may be found in the Cigar of Sept. 14, 1977. I think that this letter lets its own bigotry, hatred, and stupidity shine through like a ray of sunshine through Anita’s Florida Sunshine Tree.

I sincerely hope that Singewald has better things to do while here at URI than to recycle his old material to attack a group of people who merely “have the capability to love other people.” (Loving Someone Gay, Don Clark, Ph.D.) I would most assuredly prefer to love (all) people than to hate any one or any one group of people merely because they don’t measure up to my personal standards.

If, indeed, Singewald would like to pursue this matter further, I would be most interested in engaging in a public debate on a one-to-one basis with him. I may be contacted through the Gay Students’ Coalition, Memorial Union.

Further, to the Cigar staff I suggest that you be more mindful of your journalistic responsibilities. It certainly demonstrates a lack of this journalistic responsibility when material such as Mr. Singewald’s gets printed more than once. If the Cigar is incapable of finding enough material to fill four issues weekly, then I move that the Cigar reverts to two issues weekly.

Carl Swanson
President, Gay Students’ Coalition

Singewald questioned

2/13/78

To the Cigar:

As a gay woman at URI, I was mildly amused by Frank Singewald’s recent letter to the Cigar concerning homosexuality. It is inappropriate to react to his scribblings with anything but a healthy sense of humor.

In one noxious set of paragraphs, he managed to associate gay people with pornography, teenage prostitution, venereal disease, utility poles, parades, and the orgies on the walls of temples in north Central India. I have to ask, “Who is this man, and why is he saying all these terrible things about me?”

It is interesting to note how he uses the word “unhealthy” in the phrase “unhealthy state of mind”. His use of the word is questionable. If unhealthy could mean not being accepted by the dominant society in which one lives, many may be labeled as such.

According to Singewald’s definition Jewish people in Nazi Germany can be considered unhealthy. American colonists, in their pursuit of religious freedom could be considered unhealthy. In this misguided contest I can understand his application of the word to homosexuality.

It seems that Singewald has been self-appointed to the dutiful task of deciding who is healthy and who is not. We must sympathize with him for the sheer magnitude of this responsibility must be overwhelming.

The American Psychological Association and the American Psychiatric Association have also undertaken this endeavor. In January 1975, statement of public policy they urged, “...all mental health professionals to take the lead in removing the stigma of mental illness that has long been associated with homosexual orientation.” I would rather accept these professional judgements that rate ratings.

I am a homosexual and I am not unhealthy. Some of my friends are also homosexuals and are not unhealthy.

Perhaps one of the most unhealthy aspects of being gay and studying at URI manifested itself in your letter to the Cigar. I suggest that you re-examine your position concerning homosexuality, and especially your definition of the word “unhealthy”.

Constance McGrane