

against law reform

After the heated discussion at last Thursday night's meeting on the question of law reform, I feel I would like to present the case against this supposed step toward liberation.

1. The Gay Liberation movement is by its very nature an anti-social movement, and is consequently revolutionary. A simple point arises: has there ever been a revolutionary movement which first begged the right to exist from those whom it supposedly aimed to overthrow? Let us make no mistake: avitiation for law reform is a servile recognition of the "right" of parliamentarians etc. to grant us a license to exist. It goes beyond the issue of homosexual acts to the issue of homosexuality itself. At present the existing laws, by banning an essential part of homosexual self expression - sexual intercourse - also by implication deny the right of homosexuals to exist. To demand that the law be changed is to ask to be legislated into existence. The most we should do in this respect is to demand the repeal of existing laws: nothing more.

2. Yet this does not seem to be at least a short-term possibility - as recent events in the Adelaide Upper House show. It is this sort of legislation which has apparently led to greater possibilities for the oppression of homosexual people in England: what do we want with this sort of thing? We want the wiping out of existing legislature: not the imposition of newer, more subtle forms of discrimination.

3. Beyond this, there is the whole issue of our relationship to society. To begin with, it is largely with the aim of achieving greater social acceptance that many homosexuals have pressed the issue of law reform. Yet I ask: what do we want to do with this stupid, mediocre, narrow minded, bourgeois society? Should not the issue be whether or not we are prepared to accept them? To talk of radicalizing society (which is essential for our acceptance) is

ridiculous anyway : we can't even radicalize other homosexuals. Surely we should concentrate on making ties with other anti-social groups, with those who want in fact to destroy this society? (In terms of our goals, that is quite definitely our aim). Instead of craving the approbation of mediocrities, should we not instead make further links with Womens Liberation, Black Power, the Communists (not necessarily in a political capacity) and anybody else who is dedicated to destroy, not engage in mealy-mouthed collaborations! (And, a final point, I feel that we should make stronger connections with Camp Inc, despite personal or ideological differences). Identification with society will lead to such bourgeois monstrosities as homosexual marriages - the very epitome of the acceptance of the fundamentals of society on its own ground. Remember - if you ask for ~~law~~ reform, you are begging to be recognized as a human being. What then becomes of self identity, when we hand the state the capacity to grant it? Let us condemn law reform movements as irrevocably retrograde, and aggressively confront society with the fact that its laws are a total non-possibility, leaving the obvious conclusion that they should be eradicated, not disguised.

by Warwick