

# THE LADDER

Adults Only .50

Oct. 1965

**a LESBIAN review**



**HOMOPHILE  
GROUPS PICKET  
IN NATION'S CAPITAL**



**purpose of the**

## *Daughters of* **BILITIS**

A WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROMOTING  
THE INTEGRATION OF THE HOMOSEXUAL INTO SOCIETY BY:

- ① Education of the variant, with particular emphasis on the psychological, physiological and sociological aspects, to enable her to understand herself and make her adjustment to society in all its social, civic and economic implications—this to be accomplished by establishing and maintaining as complete a library as possible of both fiction and non-fiction literature on the sex deviant theme; by sponsoring public discussions on pertinent subjects to be conducted by leading members of the legal, psychiatric, religious and other professions; by advocating a mode of behavior and dress acceptable to society.
- ② Education of the public at large through acceptance first of the individual, leading to an eventual breakdown of erroneous taboos and prejudices; through public discussion meetings aforementioned; through dissemination of educational literature on the homosexual theme.
- ③ Participation in research projects by duly authorized and responsible psychologists, sociologists and other such experts directed towards further knowledge of the homosexual.
- ④ Investigation of the penal code as it pertains to the homosexual, proposal of changes to provide an equitable handling of cases involving this minority group, and promotion of these changes through due process of law in the state legislatures.

# the Ladder

October 1965

Volume 10 Number 1

Published monthly by the Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., a non-profit corporation, 1232 Market Street, Suite 108, San Francisco 2, California. Telephone: UNDERhill 3 - 8196.

### NATIONAL OFFICERS, DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, INC.

PRESIDENT - Cleo Glenn  
VICE-PRESIDENT - Del Shearer  
RECORDING SECRETARY - Agatha Mathys  
CORRESPONDING SECRETARY - Marjorie McCann  
PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR - Phyllis Leon  
TREASURER - Del Martin

### THE LADDER STAFF

Editor— Barbara Gittings  
Fiction and Poetry Editor—Agatha Mathys

Production—Joan Oliver, V. Pigrom  
Circulation Manager—Cleo Glenn

THE LADDER is regarded as a sounding board for various points of view on the homophile and related subjects and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the organization.

## CONTENTS

Beat Alice - by Leo Ebreo.....	4
Allen Ginsberg Comments.....	6
Emphasis on Research Has Had Its Day - by Dr. Franklin E. Kameny.....	10
Radio Series on Homosexuality.....	14
Erotic Minorities Unite!.....	15
Rusk Probed on Picketing.....	18
Cross-Currents.....	19
Lesbiana - by Gene Damon.....	22

Front cover photo by Eva. Taken at the picketing at Civil Service Commission Building, Washington, D. C., on June 26, 1965. This picture shows four of the 18 men and 7 women who took part in the march to protest the Civil Service Commission's policies on homosexuals.

Back cover photos by Kay Tobin. Taken at the picketing at the Pentagon on July 31, 1965. These pictures show some of those participating in this demonstration.

Copyright 1965 by Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., San Francisco, California

# Beat ALICE

by  
Leo Ebreo

I first met her before there were any beatniks, when people were still reds and Zionists.

I was a Zionist. It was at a Zionist training farm in Poughkeepsie. She was not a Zionist. She was some sort of leftist, the folk-song, guitar-singing type. I argued with her. It was fall, the Thanksgiving holiday, school vacation.

"What is your future in America?" I said. "What will become of you here? In Israel you can settle on the land, become part of it."

I looked out the window at some of our people. A cart moved through the fields, the workers taking out manure, fresh from the cow-shed, still steaming in the cold air.

"I don't know," said Alice. "I don't know what awaits me in America. But it's here, not in Israel."

I did not see her for three years. In those three years I had been to Israel, returned. I had grown older, discovered I was homosexual, decided not to live in the kibbutz, which is a community of married couples. They had socialism, property was shared, but love coveted. I could not bear to be alone in that isolate community. To me the kibbutz had been the reason for going to Israel. So I was no longer a Zionist. Indeed I felt I was nothing.

Then one day, I met her again. I was a junior in Columbia College. She was a freshman at Barnard.

It was in the house of a friend of mine, a rich young boy from Pittsburgh, a psychology major, an orthodox Freudian. He was

.....

About the Author: LEO EBREO was born in 1932 in Brooklyn, left when he was 18 to go to college (Columbia) in Manhattan, and has stayed in Manhattan ever since except for a summer in Israel in 1951. He now lives in a small furnished room on the upper west side with a large electric typewriter - and writes. He says, along with Leigh Hunt's Abou Ben Adhem: "Write me as one that loves his fellow men."

out of the apartment. I was waiting for him. The bell rang. I answered. It was Alice.

She was not like the Alice in Wonderland. Long-haired like her, but dark dark hair, so dark it seemed to have secrets no other hair could hold.

She remembered me, told me about the Zionist training farm. She did not ask me why I was no longer in the Zionist movement, but looked at me sadly, as if with mutual shame.

Je pense aux matelots oubliés dans une île,  
Aux captifs, aux vaincus....

(I think of sailors on some isle, forgotten,  
Of captives, of vanquished....)

She was sleeping with John, the rich young boy psychologist-to-be. So was I. If she knew it she did not mention it.

The three of us went out often together, I saying goodnight to them at the evening's end. John's father, rich in Pittsburgh munitions, gave us money for many a happy evening.

But the happy evenings ended. John, on some holiday back to Pittsburgh, took up again with a proper Pittsburgh gentile girl. Middle-class, non-communist, high-Episcopal, and virgin, she quickly married John.

And Alice of the long dark hair? Went to pieces, very quickly and all at once. And many pieces. I saw her, the evening it happened.

"Please stay with me," she said.

She took me up to her room, small, bare. I thought of the richness of John's apartment, the phonograph records playing orgasm music from Tristram and Isolde when they made love.

She had a few books, the Oxford Greek anthology, Dylan Thomas (she quoted to me his poem with the line: "A girl mad as birds"). Few books, much grief, overhead a bare electric bulb, unfrosted, cutting into our eyes.

She had tried to cut her wrists. I saw the scratches. She had also turned on the gas for a minute or two.

Now she turned out the light and somehow made her way through the night, like a rowboat on a choppy sea....

That day she had left Barnard. A leave of absence, she said. She told them she was having a breakdown.

(It was during that night that she told me that she had been attracted to a girl at Barnard, sexually attracted. She was studying psychology. She told it to me in clinical language. I was repelled, not by the emotion, but by the language, this clinging of flesh to flesh handled by steel-cold Latin clinical words.)

She left Barnard and did not try to get in touch with me for years. I cannot remember the grounds for our reunion, but this time our friendship "took." The other meetings, at the Zionist training camp, at Columbia, had not held.

Now we met somehow as equals. Equals but not adults. She and I both still alone and unformed.

And both enamored: I with my best friend, David, a blue-eyed, red-haired, husky straightnik from the midwest, a cross between a Blakeian angel and the pobble who had no toes. He in Japan on Navy duty.

And Alice: Alice was now and was to be, the Beat Alice. She had met, slept with, was the follower of Allen, high priest of beatniks and a homosexual. (Editor's note: see below)

He gave Alice all he could, and among these things a gift she was never to use freely - the gift of homosexuality.

Allen and his friend Peter had moved in with Alice and Alice's roommate Joyce.

Allen tried to teach the girls how to love, love not only himself and Peter (for such love, like the Pharisees' morality, is for return), but the love which is more general and outward, free...the love for one's own sex.

But it was no use. Joyce's thoughts always returned to Allen's friend Peter. She begrudged Peter every minute he spent with Allen.

Joyce would say viciously, "When I go to work in the morning I hear Allen's little feet padding into Peter's room."

Her bad humor spoiled all their loves, and when Allen and Peter left, going to Europe, Alice moved out of the apartment.

Searching for love as Allen had taught her to, setting her on this road as patiently as he had introduced her to the new poetry, to Chassidism, to Hindu mythology.

But she was not agile, not quick.

---

## ALLEN GINSBERG COMMENTS

Allen Ginsberg wrote to THE LADDER's editor suggesting that this comment be published as a footnote with "Beat Alice":

"I am ME, not 'high priest', that's too pompous. A stereotype. I sleep with boys and girls; the word homosexual is also a stereotype word. I'm not 'a homosexual' - I'm me, not a label." - Allen Ginsberg, c/o City Lights Bookshop, San Francisco, July 30, 1965.

Peter had returned. He had a girl now, Jeanette, Polish-French stock from New Jersey, tall and blonde and very young and beautiful.

Alice loved her, loved her as she had Allen and Peter.

"Why don't you tell her?" I said.

"No," she said, "I'm not worthy. If I was she would come to me."

When Allen came back to New York, Jeanette moved in with Alice. They were sleeping in the same bed now, still not lovers.

"Tell her!" I said.

"No," said Alice. "If it is to be, she would know."

I could not accept this fatalism. I cannot now. I wondered if I should speak to Allen, to Peter, even to Jeanette. They all loved Alice. They would have begrudged her nothing, certainly not a share in their love for each other.

I did not speak.

Alice, selfless, continued in her work for Allen. She typed his poems, wrote letters for him, had her telephone used for his business so he would not be disturbed while he wrote.

Of her own writing - for she wrote both a journal and poems - Allen himself knew nothing. She felt them so unimportant she never showed them to him.

Then Allen and Peter were to go to India. I waited for their leaving, wondering what would happen to Jeanette, left now, perhaps, to look full upon Alice, see her wonder and her virtues.

Allen and Peter left. And the world they had created on the Lower East Side fell to pieces.

Waves of paranoia seemed to fall over the group. Friendships broke. The few who had jobs lost their jobs. People lost apartments.

Alice lost her apartment. Like a stray she wandered into the apartments of friends.

For a week she was staying at my house, but she was making the H scene and we quarrelled over it. I felt heroin was dangerous, destructive.

And Jeanette? Jeanette who should have loved Alice, stayed with her, helped her, been helped by her, took up with a mean and insane man who was constructed of paranoia and illicit drugs.



The man had once struck Alice. She had gone to the police, obtained a warrant of desistment from them. And of course kept out of his way after that...and this in turn meant a rupture with her beloved Jeanette.

Then Alice was staying at the home of a poet, Sheepier.

He was leaving for Cuba. They had a party for him, shooting up on heroin. The next morning he went to Cuba where he became sick from serum hepatitis. The needle had been dirty.

And Alice, back in New York City, came down with hepatitis the same day. She was taken to Bellevue.

The hepatitis led to a nervous breakdown. She was in the psychiatric ward. Her parents had her transferred to an expensive mental hospital.

Her father spoke to me on the phone: "I've gotten some of Alice's notebooks and poems," he said. "I'm shocked. They're filthy."

"Oh," I said, "I'd like to read them."

"No," he said, "I wouldn't want anyone to read them."

They took her out of the mental hospital, against doctor's orders. It had been expensive, too expensive.

Now, at home, I met the Beat Alice, these to be our last meetings. Her hair no longer long, cut short, still black with mystery, more beautiful than ever.

"Have you heard from Allen, Peter, Jeanette?" I said.

She motioned me to be quiet.

"The machines will hear you," she said. "They have machines outside the window. I know."

She was mad, quite mad. All the demons in her which had kept her from the world of hope, love, trust, that had kept her from telling her love, now ranged themselves around her, like illustrations of devils in a medieval manuscript, only assuming the guise of modern instruments. Recording devices outside the window.

(: "A girl mad as birds")

Always shy, she was now afraid to go out of the house. Twice a week her father took her to the psychiatrist. But he could not cast out the devils.

She had always been afraid of riding in planes, had never ridden in one. Her parents now arranged a vacation, a plane trip to Florida.

"I would like to see the flamingos," she said to me over the phone, but her voice quavered with fear.

Then, the day before the trip, she told her parents she could not go. She sat at the table biting her cheek with fear and shame.

"Why don't you bite your head off?" her father said.

That night, a February night, she jumped out the window, or fell from it. It was in the early dawn. No one saw. Had she jumped, or fallen, reaching out to take one of the listening devices from the window?

No hand to hold her back. Could I, Allen, Peter, Jeanette, have held her with our love?

All the manuscripts her parents had were destroyed by them and their friends. Ashamed, as she had been.

But the ones left - some 80 poems, in the house of the friend who went to Cuba - were preserved. They have appeared in four magazines. That love she was too selfless to speak of lives on. Sheepier wrote: "With her death she almost seems to have freed us from a bad, evil spell." And freed herself as well.

Her words come across the years freely, clear as footprints in new-fallen snow, full of the pain that only comes with youth, love pure as the best wine, precious and delicious. "Easy to love" she had written, "the ANGELS, their splendor falling into your lap."

Freed now, her flight from the Enchanter successful, the boys and girls she loved forever young, she holds their breasts in poet's hands, moves quickly towards a completion without the sadness of respite. The shroud has become a wedding garment.

She told her love on paper, but its message is for warmer words. You who read this story, know its truth. This is a tale for true lovers, or those who would be true.

Speak now.

## CONTRIBUTORS!

THE LADDER wants articles, book reviews, news clippings, stories, humor, poetry, and other pertinent materials. Send to Editor Barbara Gittings, c/o DOB National. All submissions will be acknowledged promptly.

# EMPHASIS on research has had its day

by DR. FRANKLIN E. KAMENY

Editor's Note: This is a rejoinder to "Research Is Here to Stay" by Florence Conrad (July/August), who wrote in reply to Dr. Kameny's original article in our May issue entitled "Does Research Into Homosexuality Matter?" Dr. Franklin Kameny is on the Executive Board of Mattachine Society of Washington.

+ + + + +

## I. ON TAKING A POSITION ON HOMOSEXUALITY AS A SICKNESS

Miss Conrad seems to take the strange position that unless our views are going to be heard and accepted, we must not express them. Carried to its ultimate, her argument would lead to a complete cessation of all expression of original, unorthodox, or unpopular ideas by anyone not "officially" competent. It would mean that each of us abdicate his right to engage in productive intellectual activity and to voice the results of his thought, except by channelling those results through the conventional "authorities."

Quite aside from the fact I do not agree we will go as unheard as Miss Conrad claims, even if we did, I see that as no reason for not voicing what we know to be true. Where would civilization be today if men like Galileo and Copernicus - who were NOT the authorities of their day - had remained mute, as they would have done had they followed Miss Conrad's precepts? We would still be living (intellectually) on a flat earth at the center of the universe with sun and stars revolving around us.

To put my view in the most negative way: taking a position on the question of homosexuality as sickness can do us no harm, may do us good, and at least gives us a basis from which to proceed. Actually, the benefits are far greater.

From experience in public address and discussion on homosexuality, I know that whether it is with a church group, a radio or TV interviewer, a civil liberties organization, or a Congressional committee, the question of homosexuality as a sickness almost invariably arises - and usually quite pointedly. As the representative of an organization, I am forced to respond in line with the organization's policies, or else make an evasive disavowal of the organization and express a personal view labelled as such.

The impression made, when such evasions must be resorted to and when one is finally forced to state that we take no position on this question, is damaging beyond repair, particularly for a group like the Washington Mattachine which considers itself a civil liberties organization in major part. An admission like that virtually destroys the effect of all other discussion and arguments. As a pure practical necessity, we MUST have a formal position on the question of sickness. (1)

If instead we do go in with a firm position, easily justified (and we always do justify it; we do not just make a flat statement, except perhaps by way of introduction), then we can and DO proceed constructively. Miss Conrad wants dialogue. Apparently she wants us to start from the middle ground, ostensibly uncommitted, to engage in discussion with others who are far from uncommitted. This is not going to lead to constructive results. A dialogue should start from two platforms, not just one. Her way is the way of defeat in any dialogue.

A dialogue with thoughtful laymen and professionals, such as Miss Conrad suggests, would probably be useful. But they (the professionals more than the laymen, but the laymen too) will come in with a position already formulated and taken. It behooves us to do the same, lest we enter the dialogue from a position of clear disadvantage. Without a policy statement, we do not go into the dialogue (in terms of pure logic and strategy) from positions of equality. They are not starting from a no-position neutrality. I am not about to do so either.

Miss Conrad accuses me of anti-intellectuality. I fear that she had misinterpreted my approach. I distinguish between my roles as a scientist and as an intellectual on the one hand, and as a worker in the homophile movement on the other. This is not to imply that these roles conflict (on the contrary, one often supplements the other) but to say that the emphasis in each role are necessarily different.

I have worked hard to create for a movement badly in need of it, an up-to-date working philosophy which is self-consistent and logical, which is not self-defeating, and which is useful in actual practice in terms of a civil liberties approach to solution of the problems of the homosexual in our culture.

In fundamental logic, a position on sickness is not a necessary part of such a philosophy - if that philosophy be a purely abstract one, detached from the real world around us. However, when we start to apply this philosophy in actual situations - discussions, debates, public appearances, action - we find that a position on sickness becomes a cornerstone without which our entire logical structure, our entire presentation to the public (as the public and its mind now exist), collapses.

(1) "Mattachine Society of Washington takes the position that in the absence of valid evidence to the contrary, homosexuality is not a sickness, disturbance, or other pathology in any sense, but is merely a preference, orientation, or propensity, on par with and not different in kind from heterosexuality."

There is one other important consideration in this question: the homosexual who is not part of the movement. He is exposed to a veritable barrage of propaganda designed to convince him that he is sick (and in part thereby, inferior). Unfortunately many homosexuals accept this propagandistic suggestion. Those who do not accept it often feel pathetically alone and insecure in their belief that they just are NOT sick and NOT inferior (the two do go together, Miss Conrad notwithstanding).

The extent to which these homosexuals are heartened by knowing that someone, anyone, is actually getting up before the public and standing up to the "experts" and trying to counter this propaganda - as they cannot do - is almost indescribable, and it is deeply gratifying to those who take such positions publicly. If there are no other reasons for our taking the position on sickness which Washington does, than bolstering the morale of our own people, we would have justification enough!

Miss Conrad nowhere refers explicitly (except to quote it without remark) to the second part of MSW's policy statement: "...homosexuality...is merely a preference, orientation, or propensity, on par with and not different in kind from heterosexuality." Therein lies the entire rationale for the homosexual movement! Therein lies our fundamental statement of equality, the basis for our civil liberties approach, our sine qua non. Without this we might as well quit, except to help hapless homosexuals - endless, never-ceasing lines of them.

As a moment's thought will show, that entire assertion of equality falls to the ground without the statement of non-pathology which precedes it (given the existent situation that the label of pathology is almost universally applied).

To sum up this far: First, I cannot see (and Miss Conrad does not support) the validity of the argument that we must be silent because we will not be listened to, and I reject this view as being intellectually destructive and as denying our own intellectual existence. Second, I assert that in terms of practical necessity when going before the public, a definite position MUST be taken lest we be discounted totally by any thinking person listening to us. Third, I maintain that in terms of the morale of the homosexual community and of our proper role as spokesmen for that community, the taking of a position on the question of sickness is not only highly desirable, but necessary.

Miss Conrad shows an inconsistency when she asks where the Negro movement would be today without research support for the Negro's claim to equality, and then refuses to take a public position upon homosexuality as a sickness. Whatever definitions of sickness one may use, sick people are NOT EQUAL to well people in any practical, meaningful sense, regardless of the semantic or the research arguments which may be advanced.

(The Negro's claim to equality - which incidentally I accept wholeheartedly - is not nearly as well bolstered by research findings as Miss Conrad implies. This is not to say that research findings show inequality, just that not nearly as much

research has been done to show equality as most people believe. What has been done is a superb job of "selling".)

Miss Conrad maintains that statistical findings are not predictive for the individual and that therefore it is imperative (her emphasis) to work for judgement of each person as an individual. With the second half of that, her imperative, I could not agree more fully. Although Miss Conrad claims that I reject the use of this argument of "individual treatment" as "ivory tower," it has long been one of my major arguments - particularly (but not only) in opposing the denial of security clearances to homosexuals as a group or class.

However, if homosexuality PER SE is a sickness (regardless of the definition of sickness adopted), this is not a statistical finding: it then applies to ALL homosexuals, and NO homosexual is then equal to a heterosexual, regardless of his merits as an individual, and he is just not going to be so considered - and properly. (This is a condensed, simplistic form of a larger argument, but it is valid in essence as here presented.) Thus if we are faced with an allegation of sickness that looms large in people's minds - as it does - then both logically and practically, we MUST respond to it in a positive way as a necessary condition to any request for equality or for individual treatment. We cannot evade it, as Miss Conrad would have us do.

Miss Conrad does me an injustice in her somewhat snide remarks about my never referring to meanings in discussing "sickness." First, I was not really discussing sickness per se in my article, but instead the rather different matter of whether or not to take a position on it. Second, this was an article, not a book; condensation was unavoidable. Third, I have raised this issue of definition time and time again, both in public (for example to Dr. Hadden) and in private correspondence and discussion with psychiatrists and others, without getting satisfaction. I have stated repeatedly, on just this basis, that homosexuals have been defined into sickness.

I feel however that Miss Conrad's discussion of definitions of types of "sickness" is, for the purposes of her rebuttal, a lengthy semantic quibble which is quite irrelevant.

Sickness by ANY definition is undesirable. If homosexuality per se is a sickness, then (again I am summarizing) homosexuals are undesirable - ALL of them, without regard to considerations of individual merit. Or at least, ALL are surrounded by an aura of undesirability. If in fact (and this is the fact) homosexuality is not a sickness by ANY definition, then for God's sake let us say so! If no one at all listens, we have lost nothing. If anyone at all listens, we have gained.

I will dispose of Miss Conrad's entire argument on definitions by pointing out that it is the government's practice in many instances to disqualify for sensitive positions and for security clearances, individuals who have ever visited a psychiatrist for consultation or treatment for ANYTHING at all - neurosis, anxiety, other problems of any sort whatever. All the fine distinctions in which Miss Conrad revels are thrown away



here, as they largely are in practice by the public, when (1) any disorder of any variety is at issue, if it is "mental," and (2) when the homosexual is called "sick" by ANY definition and by ANY usage of the word. One just does NOT get consideration as an individual if one is psychologically "sick," and in general one WILL not.

I will not go here into the matter of "forced cure." It is a controversial question in which the arguments are subtle and not clear cut. Certainly the Moral pressures are very great for forced treatment of any condition, if it is a sickness or disorder, even if it is quite harmless. (And the question of who is to judge harmlessness and by what standards enters here too, and critically. Try selling a rural Midwest judge that a homosexual is sick but harmless and see how far you get.) If homosexuality is not a sickness, and if by saying so we relieve some homosexuals of self-doubts and guilt feelings for not seeking change, we have accomplished something worthwhile.

Miss Conrad notwithstanding, I can say that MSW's position on sickness, when coupled with a simple presentation of two or three basic arguments in opposition to the "authorities," has turned out to be very strong and extremely effective, both in substance and as tactic, in actual dealings with the public.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 23

## Radio Series on Homosexuality

A precedent-setting series of ten radio shows on homosexuality will be heard in several major cities in the next few months. The series is entitled THE HOMOSEXUAL: A NEW MINORITY. It originated in San Francisco and was made in cooperation with the pioneer Council on Religion and the Homosexual. Members of the Bay Area's homosexual community are featured in six of the ten shows, which also present clergymen, lawyers, psychologists, theologians, and other professional persons.

In New York, the series can be heard on WRVR-FM, 106.7 on the FM dial, beginning Sept. 9. Each show is scheduled for 8 p.m. Thursday, with a repeat the following Monday night at 10:30.

In Philadelphia, the programs will be carried by station WFLN-FM, 95.7 on the FM band, once a week on Wednesday at 11:30 in the evening, starting October 6. This broadcasting is being sponsored by the Council of Churches of Greater Philadelphia, "with a view toward educating ourselves and the world about the genuine problems of homosexuals, and the church's concern that it has a ministry here and its desire to exercise that ministry in non-judgmental and reconciling terms."

The series is also slated for Washington and Boston (details not yet available at press time for this LADDER issue).

# EROTIC MINORITIES

## UNITE!

LES MINORITES EROTIQUES (THE EROTIC MINORITIES)

by Dr. Lars Ullerstam  
(Paris, J. J. Pauvert)

Translation by Hadley Richards

of portions of a review by Andre Clair  
in the French-language homophile magazine ARCADIE, April 1965

Translator's Introduction: This book by Swedish psychiatrist Lars Ullerstam may come as a surprise to those who have heard so much about the spirit of sexual freedom in Sweden. While the book is not yet available in English, it has had wide publicity in many countries, including France and the U. S. In an interview in Stockholm last May 22, Dr. Ullerstam described as "moral hooligans" those who "go out of their way to persecute people who have a different sex life from the majority." He declared that "governments should go out of their way to educate citizens about their right to make a personal choice in sexual enjoyment. They should protect the erotic minorities' sexual rights in much the same way a good government protects a minority's civil rights." I feel that a glimpse of Dr. Ullerstam's ideas will be of positive value to those of us working in the American homophile movement. - H. R.

+ + + + +

This book looks like a challenge. What's more, it IS a challenge. Ullerstam doesn't hesitate to state, right from the preface: "Here is a plea in behalf of the erotic minorities. It makes an attack on three kinds of preconceived ideas." Which ones? First, that the person who does not love like the majority of his fellows is humanly inferior to them. Second, that sexual eccentricity is a psychopathological phenomenon. Third, that unconventional eroticism shouldn't be countenanced.

Why these prejudices, especially among people as broad-minded as the Swedes? There are multiple reasons, but they all follow a religious standard (well camouflaged though it is behind "science" and utilitarian ethics). For none of the explanations put forth by biologists, anthropologists, psychologists, and psychiatrists to justify their systematic opposition to sexual satisfaction for these minorities is wholly convincing.



...On what philosophical base rests the censure of the erotic minorities? The answer is always the same: Judeo-Christian thinking. Voyeurs, exhibitionists, sado-masochists, zoophiles (the CRIME of bestiality), lovers of old people, etc., are by their very nature anomalies. But the language of those who pass judgement betrays the religious origin of their certainty and their disgust. ...The penal code itself contains words which have come from the Christian vocabulary: chastity, purity (especially with respect to childhood), etc.

To be sure, a whole series of "scientific" explanations regarding the origin of "divergent drives" has been thrown out of date. Physical defects and disorders no longer figure in the new textbooks of psychiatry. Doctors no longer believe in the efficacy of male hormones to "cure" a homosexual - proof of the contrary has been established!

In retaliation, the homosexual and his erotic cohorts are now styled mentally unhealthy, often suffering from "psychic immaturity" (according to the psychoanalysts). Ullerstam rejects this explanation. It exudes a strange odor: "To be healthy," he writes, "has nothing to do with mental hygiene, which is an idea that seems to us to come from America and comprises a curious mixture that exalts the tanned sportsman, brutality, and prudishness all at the same time."

In reality, this notion of psychic health, this last embodiment of Judeo-Christian prudery, demonstrates the tenacity of our prejudices, nothing more. (Madame de Maintenon, today, would be a psychoanalyst or psychologist.... She would still be no less what she always was: an Arsinoe, preoccupied with making people unhappy.)

...How can we be done once and for all with these oppressions? How can we cast out from every Western man that villain - the sexual prejudices derived from Christian influence? By knowledge about the DIFFERENT? Yes, certainly. But "knowledge does not suffice by itself to destroy prejudices. One must understand, and impress on oneself, the fact that deviates are fulfilling needs of the same nature as our own needs, and that circumstances we don't know about, in their upbringing perhaps, have linked the satisfaction of their desires to certain external stimuli."

To understand what it's like from the inside, one would need to endure the condition of the sexually oppressed. Genet said somewhere that only a juvenile delinquent can understand juvenile delinquency. Ullerstam isn't a homosexual himself. So what did he do? He copied a White American, a novelist concerned about knowing the Negro problem thoroughly, who disguised himself as a Negro. Ullerstam announced all around that he had turned homosexual. "The reaction was dreadful. I had the impression of being the victim of a ruthless racism." Indignant, he wrote his book.

THE EROTIC MINORITIES is a try at a popular treatise, written in a deliberately provocative style. The author openly challenges his opponents to find a serious argument with which to

oppose him. While his book is a plea in our behalf, it is also the outcome of a quest for resolution of all erotic problems.

How can one help society's sexual victims find happiness? The author is convinced that "divergent drives offer great possibilities for happiness. This is why divergent drives are good in themselves and why they must be encouraged."

To tell the truth, the solutions advocated here appear to us rather fanciful. But France is not Sweden. And if a doctor there - Sweden since 1933 has been teaching schoolchildren the art of love! - can venture to advise the opening of licensed brothels for exhibitionists and voyeurs, even the creation of itinerant brothels ("erotic Samaritans" would take care of satisfying the sexual desires of invalids and paralytics, for example), if he wishes the establishment of a variety of erotic clubs and of agencies run by doctors and psychiatrists for the purpose of facilitating meetings between the sexually "handicapped" - speaking for ourselves, we can only be pretty skeptical on this point. Doubtless the author is right in asserting that sexual charity must be established on both the individual and the collective levels. But it is also necessary - and this above all - to prepare public opinion for such AUDACITIES.

...(These) major reservations nevertheless must not let the book's scope and originality be underestimated. The reader will also find particulars on the penal codes of Sweden, Germany, and America and on the repression of homosexuality in Sweden, as well as observations about prisons and mental institutions. Finally, the publisher of this French edition wrote a postscript about the legal freedom accorded the French. Today, he concludes, "these fundamental liberties are at stake in a fierce battle, and legions of rules and regulations have been chipping away at them" during the last twenty-five years (this, publisher Pauvert has found out at his own expense).

But the main impact of THE EROTIC MINORITIES derives most of all from the courage - I would almost say the audacity - of a physician who asserts that all men are equal on the sexual level. This Swedish doctor dares to proclaim that heterosexuals have made of homosexuals - and of all other erotically unconventional persons - sub-humans. Now it's up to heterosexuals to assist their revolt: "Erotic minorities of the world, unite!" Some of the "sexually privileged" will help you in this. Well if that's the case - Bravo!

\*\*\*\*\*

Editor's note: We acknowledge the assistance of Monique N. Gamet in connection with this book review. We wish to thank M. Andre Clair and ARCADIE for permission to use this material. ARCADIE, now in its twelfth year of publication, is a monthly homophile review in French, featuring critiques, book reviews, articles, fiction and some poetry. Foreign subscription is 50 Francs a year, 25 Francs a half year. Address: ARCADIE, 19 rue Beranger, Paris 3, France.

# RUSK PROBED ON PICKETING

Secretary of State Dean Rusk was queried in his press conference August 27 about the impending picketing of his Department by "a self-described 'minority group'." The reporter asked if he would care to comment on "the personnel policies at issue."

Rusk replied: "Well, you have been very gentle. I understand that we are being picketed by a group of homosexuals. The policy of the Department is that we do not employ homosexuals knowingly, and that if we discover homosexuals in our department we discharge them. This does not have to do with medical or humane considerations. It has to do with the fact that the Department of State is a department that is concerned with the security of the United States, and that we have to exact standards of conduct that are far higher than the conduct of the general society in which we operate. This has to do with problems of blackmail and problems of personal instability and all sorts of things. So that I don't think that we can give any comfort to those who might be tempted to picket us tomorrow."

The picketers turned out as planned on August 28. Rusk's statement had given an extra boost to advance publicity on the event, which was covered by CBS-TV, French News Agency, Kansas City Star, Washington Post, and numerous other news media.

Specifically, this picketing protested total exclusion of homosexuals from State Dept. employment, classification by the State Dept. of all homosexuals as security risks, and refusal of the State Dept. to discuss these policies with spokesmen for the homosexual community. As has been the rule, the picketing was held as a last recourse; it would have been called off, up to the starting moment, had officials agreed to confer.

In their leaflet, the picketers charge that the State Dept. excludes homosexuals regardless of their abilities and training, for reasons not properly relevant to employment. They maintain that a citizen has the right to be judged on his individual merit and not to be disqualified on a group or class basis. Such disqualification of homosexuals they term "profoundly immoral." They say a brainwashing job has been done by the government in persuading Americans that homosexuals are potential blackmail victims, whereas the government's policy itself creates security risks. They call for review of the security-loyalty program which needlessly makes pariahs of homosexuals and prevents competent ones from serving the nation.

Is this traditional method of protest useful and appropriate for the disadvantaged homosexual minority? It is a controversial question, on which THE LADDER invites responsible opinions. Earlier picketings are described in our July/Aug. and Sept. issues. This month's front and back covers give glimpses of the Civil Service Commission and Pentagon demonstrations.

# Cross-Currents

DOB, SIR (Society for Individual Rights) and other homophile groups in San Francisco are working hard to establish a HOMO-SEXUAL VOTING BLOC as a political factor to be reckoned with. The effort is well organized, and homosexuals in the city have responded to the call to register to vote. The local candidate or candidates of choice have not yet been determined. The homophile organizations hope that a candidate will emerge in the forthcoming municipal election who will call for reform of the city's police department. (See "After the Ball" in the February/March LADDER, also page 16 in June.) SIR's Political Action Committee announced that it would invite candidates "to address a full meeting - and if they refuse, we will interpret this." LADDER readers and their friends in San Francisco are urged to support the campaign for direct political action by homosexuals. Help your community - AND help your minority!

+ + + + +

Terry Southern, author of CANDY, remarked in an interview in THE REALIST for May 1964: "...I would certainly say that persons who are quite openly and freely gay have more in common, or believe they have, than persons who say they are Catholic or Jewish have. In fact, if you were to compile a list of group-identifications which have internal strength left, I would say the gay rank fairly high."

+ + + + +

Syndicated columnist Robert Sylvester recently quoted OSCAR LEVANT saying about ROSALIND RUSSELL: "Wanted her for my life story but decided she's too masculine."

+ + + + +

"Why not call a spade a spade?" asks Women's Wear Daily (July 7, 1965). "All modern women's clothes, beginning with Chanel, are in some way adaptations of men's wear. Dietrich had the right idea...to use men's clothes without letting them dominate you." Women's Wear Daily goes on to note that designer John Weitz, calling a spade a spade, has raided the racks of Whitehouse and Hardy, chic New York men's wear store, "...because you can't get that look or make in women's clothes." Among the outfits he borrowed for the girls are a plaid sports jacket with pink shirt and grey flannel trousers belted in bright yellow; shaped houndstooth checked coat over corduroy pants and turtleneck sweater; tucked formal shirt with jet buttons and cuff links, and dinner trousers with embroidered suspenders. Doesn't sound like a very butch men's store!

+ + + + +

THE RUGGED SEX? TRENDS IN MALE STYLES, GROOMING TOUCH OFF 'FEMINIZATION' DEBATE. CIGARS UNDER THE HAIRDRYER - ran the headline on a Wall Street Journal article (August 5, 1965) about the male fashion market. It comes as no surprise that "most firms that make and sell men's clothing and cosmetics would prefer to have the feminization discussion die," so the staff writer got an it's-nothing-to-worry-about statement from famed Margaret Mead which should give heart to manufacturers.

To find out whether homosexuals are behind the new trend, the WSJ writer contacted the New York Mattachine Society and got a judicious answer from president J. C. Hodges: "You'll find many of them wearing the stodgiest Brooks Brothers clothing - for them it's protective coloration," he said. He did concede that some homosexuals are partial to extreme fashions and that their tastes have an impact on men's wear designs. "Some men of this type," he pointed out, "are more willing to make a statement in dress, and to this extent they influence styles."

New York Times movie critic Bosley Crowther, describing the British movie DARLING (Aug. 8, 1965), notes that the film wittily satirizes many parts of society one wouldn't find in a Hollywood film, and "if it would seem to make too much of the homosexuals, that is probably because this is an element that is rampant in London today." The staid Times is slowly if squeamishly admitting homosexuality into the realm of All The News That's Fit To Print. But, as it does every year during the slow summer months when copy is scarce, in the same August 8 edition it warmed up that old chestnut about homosexuals dominating the theater, this time in an inconsistent, almost incoherent article by scene designer Mordecai Gorelik.

The Episcopal Diocese of California now has a group working on a policy on homosexuality for possible adoption by the diocese. BISHOP JAMES A. PIKE has invited the following to participate in his Joint Committee on Homosexuality: Rev. Ted McIlvenna, Pres. of the Council on Religion and the Homosexual; Don Lucas of the Mattachine Society; Del Martin of Daughters of Bilitis.

MADMOISELLE Magazine has a long article in June on the girls of Greenwich Village, in the course of which it dishes out some wildly imaginative nonsense on the lesbians in the area. "The Village has always had its lesbians, and Villagers have long since grown accustomed to the sight of two girls kissing each other passionately in a dark doorway. In the main these girls are a rancorous lot, openly aggressive toward any male who looks at a pretty girl in their company, sometimes brawling among themselves over possession of a strange girl in their midst who, having little knowledge of sexual perversion, doesn't know what she's letting herself in for when she accepts an invitation to dinner or a drink from the nice young woman next door." If this drivel is supposed to be fact, what's left for the magazine's fiction pages?

After more description of vicious lesbian street brawls, the authors, Ann Geracimos and John Ferris, descend from fantasy to realism and add: "Truculence and jealousy are not characteristic of all Village lesbians. Many of them frown on promiscuity and prefer a quiet domesticity. Such 'marriages' may last for months or even years, while the girls outwardly retain their femininity and avoid entanglements, social or sexual, with others of their kind." (But why social?)

Everything's up to date in Kansas City now, despite the fact that a network TV show on homosexuality was censored there only last year. The Sunday, August 29 Kansas City Star ran a 14-inch-column factual report on the August 28 picketing by homophile groups at the State Department in Washington. (See page 18 of this LADDER issue.) TV in Kansas City had already shown newsreel scenes of picketings held earlier in summer.

A group called Canadian Council on Religion and the Homosexual has been formed (P.O. Box 741, Station B, Ottawa 4, Ontario). Some of the purposes of the new group are: "To help the development of a continuing dialogue between the Church and homosexuals.... To support educational research projects on homosexuality so that homosexuals will know the possible causes as they are presently known and published by recognized authorities.... To sponsor and support medical, sociological and therapeutic research related to sexual variance.... To propose and support reform of the laws dealing with sexual variants to the end that the laws protect the integrity of the individual and the community, and are in harmony with the accepted findings of professions related to sexual variation."

Gay Graffiti Dept.: On a men's-room wall someone wrote: "My mother made me a homosexual." Below this, someone else scribbled: "If I give her the yarn, will she make me one, too?"

## The Homosexual Citizen in the Great Society

Future LADDER issues will report extensively on the ECHO (East Coast Homophile Organizations) conference on the above theme, "The Homosexual Citizen in the Great Society," on September 25 and 26 at the Hotel Biltmore in New York - including the talk by the featured banquet speaker, author-educator Paul Goodman:

"The Homosexual Citizen in a DECENT Society"



# Lesbiana

by Gene Damon

318. NINA UPSTAIRS - by Beverley Gasner. London, Gollancz, 1964; New York, Knopf, 1964.

How does the sophisticated young heterosexual female view the sophisticated young lesbian who's busy courting the heterosexual's straight girlfriend on a wild summer vacation party? Read this and find out, a laugh a page. The overall story is of an impossible heterosexual romance, relieved from being trite by the young author's undeniable talent and wit. Lesbian episodes occur in only a few chapters but lend spice to the package.

319. THE ROAD TO HELL - by Hubert Montheilet. N. Y., Simon and Schuster, 1964; London, Chapman and Hall, 1965.

There is unrest in a little French village which is plagued by a curiously knowing, anonymous society seemingly bent on personal vengeance for each "sexual" delinquency. Among the "sinners" to whom odd penances are assigned is a charming pair of lesbians compelled to keep pet weasels in their garden. A book hard to categorize, since it combines psychological suspense of a high order and wild humor.

## WOODLOVE

We walk among trees in the forest we paid  
dearly to know;  
smiling to see in the pockets of shade,  
cleanness of snow.

We sleep in the shimmering tickle of grass,  
limber as fawns;  
shaking our heads at the geese as they pass  
into the dawn.

We hide in dappled moonlight to snatch  
glimpses of elves;  
kneel over water reflections and watch,  
wondering--ourselves.

- Christine Cummings

## continued from page 14

### II. ON THE FUNCTION OF WASH. MATTACHINE'S POLICY STATEMENT

Miss Conrad misinterprets the statement's intended use when she says it will be taken by any who read it as a simple declaration of non-sickness. If it is so taken, or if at worst it is simply rejected, no harm will be done. And in many cases, even such a simple declaration will do a world of good.

However, the statement was intended as a policy statement of the organization, enabling representatives of the organization to go forth with a position which they could, and in practice do, elaborate with reasons appropriate to the circumstances. It permits the Mattachine representative to take a starting point (as he otherwise could not do) from which he can point out to "the literate citizen who reads a few books and respects the scientific Establishment where that Establishment has gone wrong, where he (the literate citizen) should turn his questions and skepticism, where the Establishment is on weaker ground than it at first appears to be, etc. - and then follow through from all this with a presentation in a specific fashion of the position the literate citizen should then take. (Or does Miss Conrad object too to our suggesting this to the literate citizen?" Miss Conrad notwithstanding, it works!)

I fully agree that "empty propaganda" cannot take the place of "serious, solid discussion of issues." But again Miss Conrad misinterprets our position and tactics if she terms them merely empty propaganda. In any "solid discussion of issues," the stage must be set ahead of time. A policy statement like Washington's does this. One usually enters a solid discussion of issues with a position prepared and stated in advance.

Remember that policy statements per se are always propagandistic by nature, when taken superficially. Ours is just a policy statement, not the lengthy set of policy papers which lies behind it. Einstein's  $E = MC^2$  is just empty propaganda, too, until one goes behind it. When one does go behind, our position is no less well substantiated in its way than was his.

While I agree that empty propaganda cannot take the place of serious, solid discussion, I do not agree that "empty propaganda" is valueless. The number of people who will indeed be affected by propaganda, who will believe something simply because someone has gotten up in front of them and said it or has gotten himself into print, even if that something is totally without substantiation, is (depressingly) not small.

I disagree mildly with Miss Conrad's view that "the homophile movement is not like a new brand of toothpaste which may be 'sold' to the public by superficial promotion techniques." It is disillusioning (unless one is a calloused cynic) that anything, even toothpaste, can be sold thus. Unfortunately it is so. While I believe most of us in the movement shy away from such techniques, which can quickly become demagoguery, to a significant degree the homophile movement too can be "sold" by

such techniques - more so than I myself would ever try to do or be capable of, and more, I think, than Miss Conrad believes.

Despite fears to the contrary, I feel - I know - that to a meaningful degree we can make opinion on our own, even in flat opposition to those who deal in psychological matters professionally, if we go about it properly. At least I am willing to go out and try (and have done so) rather than give up by default. And I find that Washington Mattachine's policy statement is an absolutely essential tool for the effort.

### III. ON THE QUESTION, DOES RESEARCH INTO HOMOSEXUALITY MATTER?

Miss Conrad claims she knows of no homophile groups which designate themselves "research organizations." I suggest she see the purpose-statements of Mattachine Society (S.F.), ONE Inc., and Mattachine Society Inc. of New York, to start. Nominally, at least, these have indeed been research organizations.

She terms short-sighted my view that research (such as that into causation) which is merely of academic or scientific interest, is NOT of use, interest, or significance to our movement. Aside from research which is relevant to the question of sickness (here we are forced to take an interest in order to counteract prevailing propaganda), I stand my ground. The homophile organizations are not cultural groups out to support and assist in that which is "merely of 'academic, intellectual, or scientific interest'." They are out to accomplish one main purpose and should concentrate their activities on this purpose: improvement of the status of the homosexual in society.

Except again for research relating to homosexuality as a sickness (and that only because we have been forced to take an interest), I do question the great potential value of all "here and now" investigations of homosexuals. Some such research could be of value, as I indicated in my first article, but most research (be it sociological or psychological) into the homosexual's present status will be of no value in helping us to improve the status of the homosexual in our society.

I am not, as Miss Conrad claims, inclined to believe all research into causation is motivated by a desire to change homosexuals into heterosexuals. I did not say it was. My position is simply (and again we get back to the question of sickness and the necessity, out of sheer logic, to have a position on it) that as long as homosexuality is not sickness, research on causation is of no more relevance or interest to the homophile movement than is research into whether black skin is caused by (say) gene 743 on chromosome 18, or gene 327 on chromosome 17, of interest to the NAACP, CORE, SNCC, or Martin Luther King.

The homosexual's problems are political and social - not in essence psychological. They are problems of discrimination and prejudice, of law and of custom. In these areas, research is not, for us any more than it is for the Negro, a tool of any PRIMARY importance, as long as we choose certain philosophical starting-points from which to operate - a position of non-sickness, for one.

I did not deny the value of research in the abstract. This I would never do, as a scientist. I did and I do deny the major importance of research to the homophile movement. And I questioned and still question the propriety of diverting effort (except in a few rare instances) into research projects which serve only to add to general knowledge but do not serve to advance the movement or the cause of the homosexual. Research projects should be given careful consideration on their individual merits in terms of direct assistance to the movement and not in terms of their belonging to that magic class "research." If the project seems likely to be of assistance to us in attaining our goal of improving the status of the homosexual, give whole-hearted support. If not, then give it what support our resources permit after everything else is done.

Note, I have not advocated expectation of favorable results as the basis for selection of research to be supported by us, but only relevancy and immediacy to the purpose of our movement. In any case, I do not believe reputable scientific research can or would be as easily "killed" by our selective support as Miss Conrad thinks, be the basis of the selection what it may.

Miss Conrad puts the cart before the horse when she says that "even research into causes can be specifically useful to us, by bringing researchers into informative personal contact with a broader cross-section of homosexuals than they could otherwise meet." This might be of use to the researchers, but not to us! I do not think that it is the purpose of the homophile movement to teach professional scientists the basic principles of good sampling technique - although we have every right (and the duty) to point out to them when their sampling techniques are incredibly bad, as they rather consistently have been. I find the argument circular as well, since there is little inherent good for us in such broader contact per se, which only produces more research, then more contact for more research.

I certainly agree we should not erect or heighten barriers between us and the scientific community - quite the contrary. I have never objected to the supplying by the homophile groups of "guinea pigs" to researchers; this is a fine function. In fact, I feel that the average researcher in this field who did use proper sampling techniques would find the organizations to be virtually the unique source of supply for his guinea pigs. But since the results of research seldom help us in improving the status of the homosexual, supplying subjects for research should not be a primary or even secondary function of the homophile organizations, only a tertiary or lesser function.

Miss Conrad's comments about the importance of future studies by the Kinsey group, by Gundlach, and by others are another semantic quibble. ANY research MIGHT be important. I am not even going to attempt to assume the role of a prophet. However, with no reflections intended upon the researchers and the quality of their research, and with no judgement implied as to their projects' value to pure science and to mankind's fund of knowledge, I will venture to say the probabilities are very high that only a tiny percentage, if any, of the results of any of the projects to which Miss Conrad refers, will be of help to the homophile movement in the achievement of its goals.

Miss Conrad substantiates my view that no homophile groups or the members thereof are devoting any significant effort to research. Yet she must be strangely out of touch with the movement if she does not realize how much it is permeated with at least an attitude of lip-service to the primacy of this non-existent research as not merely a purpose but a *raison d'etre*.

I have pointed to the purpose-statements of certain major homophile organizations. The fact that many people considered my LADDER article important is further evidence of the weight given in our movement to research. Finally, surely Miss Conrad is aware of the attitudes of those outside the movement: to many of them, research into homosexuality is the first and only approach, and the very idea that a group might be working to better the lot of homosexuals AS HOMOSEXUALS is truly novel.

In summary, I agree with Miss Conrad that research has never played and need not play a primary role in the activities of the homophile organizations. However it has long been claimed that it does play such a role, because of an assumed need for it. Only lately are we getting away from that assumption. Hence this discussion. While I do not derogate research to a position of total unimportance, I do not at all grant it the basic importance to the ultimate achievement of our goals which Miss Conrad attributes to it. In short: research into homosexuality does not really matter!

Before the American homophile movement's evolution into its present form, a homosexual was looked upon as one who had gone astray: astray morally, when homosexuality in earlier times was viewed as evil, vice, sin; astray medically, when homosexuality later on was viewed as sickness. It was reasonable in those times, particularly the latter, to think of research into homosexuality as important.

Therefore, in the formative years of our movement, when it was an extraordinary achievement even to have such a movement and when the taking of strong positions in opposition to the Establishment was almost unthinkable, research into homosexuality, including the possibility of its being or not being a sickness, was regarded as a major area into which to direct the attention and efforts of the homophile organizations.

But recently our movement has gone forward into the fight for civil liberties. It is working in a context in which most of the basic questions, such as equality and non-sickness, that were so controversial in earlier days are considered settled. Nevertheless much of the earlier approach has remained, giving the movement a superficial self-image that it has in reality outgrown. It was in an attempt to alter this outmoded self-image that my original article was written.

The differences between Miss Conrad and me on research (as they often are when people acting in good faith have a common goal) are basically ones of emphasis. But I do recommend that Miss Conrad do some re-thinking about a formal position on homosexuality as sickness. There we do differ strongly, on a question I consider of fundamental importance to our movement.

# DAUGHTERS of BILITIS

INCORPORATED

**MEMBERSHIP** in Daughters of Bilitis is limited to women 21 years of age or older. If in San Francisco, New York, or Chicago area, direct inquiry to chapter concerned. Otherwise write to National Office in San Francisco for a membership application form.

**THE LADDER** is a monthly magazine published by Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., mailed in a plain sealed envelope for \$5.00 a year. Anyone over 21 may subscribe to The Ladder.

**CONTRIBUTIONS** are gratefully accepted from anyone who wants to support our work. We are a non-profit corporation depending entirely on volunteer labor. While men may not become members of Daughters of Bilitis, many have expressed interest in our efforts and have made contributions to further our work.

**NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS** and San Francisco Chapter: 1232 Market St., Suite 108, San Francisco 2, California.

**New York Chapter:** 441 West 28th St.,  
New York 1, N. Y.

**Chicago Chapter:** P. O. Box 4497,  
Chicago, Ill.

## DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, INC.

1232 Market Street, Suite 108, San Francisco 2, California.

Please send **THE LADDER** for \_\_\_\_\_ year(s) in a plain sealed envelope to the address below. I enclose \$\_\_\_\_\_ at the rate of \$5.00 for each year ordered.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ ZONE \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_

I am over 21 years of age (Signed) \_\_\_\_\_



FRONT COVER:

Picket line  
begins  
at the  
Civil Service  
Commission

LEFT:

Several  
participants  
remain for  
a group  
picture  
after  
picketing  
two hours  
at the  
Pentagon



RIGHT:

This view  
of the  
Pentagon  
picket line  
was being  
filmed  
at the same  
time by  
CBS-TV.  
First  
marcher  
later  
carried  
a sign with  
his own  
honorable  
discharge  
from the  
Air Police

