

Quality time

by Joan Dale

Ever wonder why women want to spend more time with their boyfriends than their boyfriends want to spend with them? I have. My boyfriend and I are constantly having this "thing" about how much time we spend together. In my opinion we barely meet the minimum, and in his opinion we're spending too much time together. So, my question is how much time is enough and how much is too much?

Some people like to have people around them all the time. I guess I'm one of those people. Could this need of having people around all the time be some deeply rooted childhood trauma, related to being left alone by my parents, so that I feel abandonment whenever I'm alone? Probably not; I don't remember my parents leaving me alone--although, since I've reached puberty, they have threatened it a couple of times.

I have a friend who spends all of her free time with her boyfriend, so much time in fact that she doesn't go out at all without him. She can't understand why on a Friday night we would want to have a girls' night out instead of going out with our boyfriends. I don't want to spend every waking moment with my boyfriend, but I do want a regular night out (I hope you're reading this, Stephen), to the movies or a pub or renting a movie.

A girl needs security, she needs (or at least I need) to know that on, say, Friday night, she's going to be cuddled up in her boyfriend's arms. It gives you something to look forward to after a long week, and it can be fun to plan ahead. I want to keep the spontaneous rendezvous during the week at each other's place to watch T.V., but it's that security thing again. Am I asking too much?? How about a guy's opinion on

this? Come on guys, I'm asking, o.k., begging you to help solve my problem. Please write back and help me solve this dilemma or I may have to start looking for a new boyfriend.

Waiting for Mrs. Right

by Bill Hickox

Recent issues of the X-Press have given advice on the use of condoms and stressed the need for their availability to and use by students. In light of the fact that condoms are perceived as necessary for high schools as well, I wish to present another perspective on the issue of birth control, VD protection, and sex.

It is assumed by the promoters of condoms that if only we could successfully prevent both venereal disease (including AIDS) and pregnancy, then there would be no more problems with sex. Sex could then be enjoyed by everyone whenever, wherever, however, and with whomever they wanted--with no fear of any risk. This assumption totally ignores the fact that sex is at its best only in a mature, committed relationship--one only found in marriage, though many married couples have not yet developed their relationship to a stage of such maturity. Any other kind of relationship is distorted or destroyed by sex. Promoters of condoms are running roughshod over thousands of broken hearts and ruined lives by denying the hurt and pain and shame felt by those who have been damaged by their premature sexual activity. The solution is not a campaign for SAFE sex, but a campaign for MARRIAGE-- the ONLY PLACE where the BEST and SAFEST sex can be found (some articles about such sex are included in this issue). Why should we be told to settle for any less? Condom promoters are ripping us off by insisting that we

forget the best in favor of the cheap and easy! Determined to wait for the best,

Sex and love

by Beth Chapel

Most of us have been told at some point that sex is best when it is shared between two people that love each other. At least, this is what I was taught. But sex is sex, right? Is there a difference between sex while you are not in love and sex while you are in love? Many people may not believe so, but when you take some time to weigh the facts and think back to your past experiences, you'll probably see variations in your sex life; differences in sexual enjoyment with someone you don't love and with someone you do love. If you've never been in love, you can still see the difference when you compare a one-night-stand to sex in some sort of relationship. Whatever the level of caring, sex is usually better when you care for your partner. This may be obvious to many people, but I have also talked to many people who find unattached, spontaneous sex to be best. It's not that you can't have spontaneous sex while you are in love (often that is when it is the best), but sometimes people like the "no strings attached" approach to sex. I find this kind of sex to be a purely physical thing. When you have sex with someone solely to satisfy your animal instinct, is it truly satisfying? It may be for the next few hours, or in some cases days, but how do you really feel the next morning? Is the person you're in bed with one that you would like to roll over and caress, or get up and make breakfast for? Or is this person someone you're embarrassed to be naked in front of? Are these things you wished you had thought of last night? What