

THE LADDER

Adults Only / .50

Mar. 1966

a LESBIAN REVIEW





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

March 1966

Volume 10 Number 6

Published monthly by the Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., a non-profit corporation, 3470 Mission Street, San Francisco, California 94110.

NATIONAL OFFICERS, DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, INC.

PRESIDENT - Cleo Glenn
VICE-PRESIDENT - Kris Leuthold
RECORDING SECRETARY - Meredith Grey
CORRESPONDING SECRETARY - Marjorie McCann
PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR - Phyllis Lyon
TREASURER - Del Martin

THE LADDER STAFF

EDITOR - Barbara Gittings
ASSISTANT TO THE EDITOR; ART EDITOR - Kay Tobin
PRODUCTION MANAGER - Dona Manns
CIRCULATION MANAGER - Doris Hanson

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

ECHO 1965: The Homosexual Citizen in the Great Society - by Erika Hastings.....	4
Why Heterosexuals Get Cross	
The Pursuit of Private Happiness	
Madison Ave. Queens and the PTA	
The QUA's Have It	
Creeping Heterosexuality - America's Number One Social Problem - by Judith Rascoe.....	14
Cross-Currents.....	18
Security Clearances for Homosexuals.....	19
The Family and Money Injustice - by Dorothy Lyle.....	21
Lesbian Literature in 1965 - by Gene Damon (Part I).....	22
DOB Scholarships for Women.....	26

Cover: "Head of a Girl" by Chaim Gross, New York City. Carved in African walnut, 1929. Photo by courtesy of the sculptor.

Copyright 1966 by Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., San Francisco, California.

THE HOMOSEXUAL CITIZEN IN THE GREAT SOCIETY



"The Homosexual Citizen in the Great Society" was the theme for the third annual public conference of the informal alliance of East Coast Homophile Organizations (ECHO). This conference, held at New York's Barbizon Plaza Hotel on September 25-26, 1965, was sponsored by Mattachine Society of New York, Mattachine Society of Philadelphia, and Mattachine Society of Washington. THE LADDER's special coverage of the event (written by Erika Hastings) opened in the January issue, continued in February, and is concluded in this issue. Below are reports on the remaining four speeches given at the conference.

Several speakers gave opinions of the picketing demonstrations conducted by some homophile organizations during 1965. These opinions have been omitted from these reports, but will appear in a forthcoming issue along with opinions from other persons.

REPORTS IN BRIEF AND IN DEPTH

Why Heterosexuals Get Cross

"One of the strangest ways of categorizing people is to divide them according to their sexual behavior," said James Collier. Mr. Collier, free-lance writer and author of THE HYPOCRITICAL AMERICAN, a book about sex habits and attitudes in the U. S., explained he has many friends in a number of occupations who are homosexuals. Yet, he admitted, "I don't think of them first as editors, writers, business men - I think of them as my homosexual friends. This is a prejudice on my part, but it's a prejudice that goes all through the society. To speak of a "homosexual" is the most defining thing we can say about that person. Mr. Collier said he hoped to expose the arbitrariness of dividing people into heterosexual and homosexual.

Homosexuality is not anathematized everywhere as much as here, said Mr. Collier, giving examples. Most other Western countries have legal tolerance of homosexuality. In a majority of pre-literate cultures studied, "homosexuality is a commonplace." In early Jewish history, homosexuality was not viewed as particularly heinous; it was anathematized only after disasters began striking the Jewish people and the prophets arose. Among American Indians, homosexuals could become medicine men, witch doctors, important people in their societies. "This has never been made much of on 'Gunsmoke' - but perhaps 'Maverick' would have been a good program to deal with it," he commented.

Mr. Collier quoted from Ford and Beach's PATTERNS OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR, an important anthropological study: "Among all the societies in which adult homosexual activities are said to be very rare, definite and specific social pressure is directed against such behavior." This suggested to him that if people are left alone, there is bound to be some homosexual activity. Mr. Collier said it's hard to consider homosexuality deviant or abnormal. "It's simply part of the normal sexual potential of everybody." But this is not recognized in the U. S.

(In an aside about books, Mr. Collier said: "Important books on sex are very difficult to get in New York City. The more superficial books are very easily had." Important books get stolen from the public library, go out of print, are hard to locate, may be put out in paperback only by an inferior house. But "those that don't mean too much are always available.")

Taking up the main point of his talk on "The Law and the Place of the Homosexual," Mr. Collier stressed it is not homosexuality per se, but the means of consummating homosexual feeling, which is illegal in this country. Part of our sex laws deals which what he called "non-coital sex," including masturbation. These laws punish virtually everything except face-to-face genital intercourse between husband and wife - even though, according to Mr. Collier, "the largest part, on a statistical basis, of sexual activity in America is probably non-coital." He described these areas of sex law as "a complete mish-mash" and full of inconsistencies. "The law on sex is ridiculous."

Our sex laws, directed not against homosexuals but against a variety of sex acts, reveal that Americans are less concerned about homosexuality than about so-called "unnatural practices" no matter who is involved. Mr. Collier noted it is usually homosexuals who are arrested under these laws, but this is not because the law fits homosexuals better, for "it doesn't."

Mr. Collier summed up his view it is not homosexuality so much as non-coital sex that is anathematized. "We're afraid of all non-coital sex...and people don't want to hear about it, don't want to know it's going on. They get very cross when they find that somebody's doing it. That's the point about a homosexual...he's doing something that goes against the grain, and people know it.... This is what bothers people about homosexuals.... I think that's really what's behind a great deal of the legal opprobrium that homosexuality suffers from today."

The Pursuit of Private Happiness

Clarence Tripp, Ph.D., who was formerly closely associated with the Kinsey Research and is now a psychotherapist in private practice, said he had promised the ECHO program committee to make a connection between the Great Society and the title of his talk, "The Management of Affectional Relationships."

"What's so great about the Great Society?" he asked, calling it a political slogan. A society is no greater than the people who comprise it, nor can it exceed the ideals set for it. Our ideals "sound...mundane and disappointing," said Dr. Tripp. Of what value is a beautiful, rich, fully employed America, "if there is an underlying expectation of conventional conformity?" He spoke of the rich variety of behavior, including sexual, that exists within the ethical limits of what is harmless to others. "The truly great society will be the one that aims less for mass glory than for individual freedoms."

He suggested that Thomas Jefferson knew this in advancing the ideal of the individual's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Dr. Tripp said that his subject had a lot to do with the pursuit of happiness: "management of affection one feels toward and receives from another person."

He explained the tragic pain that may result when human relationships that combine sexual attraction and affection begin to disintegrate. This pain can push an individual to suicide, drink, or other self-assault; or, more quietly, it can create bitterness and avoidance of future emotional investments in people. Sometimes, said Dr. Tripp, it drives a primarily homosexual person into heterosexual marriage, which may become for both spouses a breeding-ground for new despairs.

Dr. Tripp sidestepped "the modern argument that intense love relationships are so painful and ill-fated that it is best to avoid them entirely!" His remarks, he said, would be aimed at that majority who find that pursuit of happiness includes romance. He then discussed ways of keeping a love relationship on-going, and specifically how to handle the complaints and hostilities that arise when the initial enchantment wears off.

Indifference, not hostility, is the enemy of love, he declared. Homosexual couples often have much hostility to contend with because the partners are too close to each other. Heterosexuals have an advantage here, Dr. Tripp said. "Men and Women don't really ever understand what makes each other tick," and their thinking lacks rapport. This "distance" between them helps prevent over-closeness in heterosexual relationships. In homosexual ones, which may "breed a certain kind of over-closeness," dealing with hostility that arises is important. Dr. Tripp illustrated how hostilities can be let out without damage. He concluded with the hope that his listeners would be able to translate his ideas into something useful for them.

Madison Ave. Queens and the PTA

Educator and psychotherapist Paul Goodman, author of *MAKING DO*, *GROWING UP ABSURD*, *COMPULSORY MIS-EDUCATION* and other books, waited patiently while a CBS-TV crew set up lights and camera for filming for a CBS documentary on homosexuality. Then he opened his after-banquet speech by saying he would be happier about the glare from TV lights if the producer from CBS hadn't called him up to say the documentary on homosexuals was mostly set, but he wanted to film Mr. Goodman's talk at ECHO "to show that 'they even have a convention.' This didn't strike me as a profoundly human or friendly expression," said Mr. Goodman. He added he was a bit unhappy about the ECHO conference theme because "the Great Society seems to me a little like CBS."

In explaining his choice of topic, "The Homosexual Citizen in a Decent Society," Mr. Goodman said: "I find it offensive when LBJ, a gentleman noted for throwing beer cans out of speeding cars, talks about a Great Society. I as a humanist am simply insulted. The fact is, in this country we do not in many respects have a decent society, and you all know this. I hardly need spell it out with regard to...our sexual mores and the treatment of so-called sexually deviant people."

As an example "just to tell the gruesome tale over," Mr. Goodman said he was in Washington at the time of the Jenkins case, and while "the President acted rather humanly" in the situation, "there was nowhere, nowhere any expression of revulsion at the idea of this damned cop peeping in men's rooms!"

Mr. Goodman said that this peeping is similar to certain kinds of federal government peeping. "The practice of creating a climate in which blackmailing is almost inevitable, and then firing people because they're blackmailable, isn't one that happens in a decent society."

"We really are not at the point to be talking about a Great Society," Mr. Goodman said. He charged that our society shows on every hand "a drive to a kind of petty conformity. We pride ourselves on our education, but as people like Edgar Friedenberg have shown, the chief function of the high schools of this country is to break spirit and create a petty conformity." The federal government may put 2 billion dollars into an education bill as part of a plan for a Great Society, "but if that's the kind of high-schooling they're interested in, which determines the dress and hairdo of kids who are just trying to be themselves and maybe imitate each other - and whose business is it? - then I think that 2 billion dollars is well wasted. ...Where people who have the 'wrong' morals or mores fit into that (kind of Great Society), you know well."

A decent society would "give up this whole nonsense of repressive laws," said Mr. Goodman, pointing out that legal history

proves that laws aimed at repressing so-called human vices "simply do not work, and create worse conditions than they are supposed to remedy." One characteristic of a decent society, according to Mr. Goodman, "is to be entirely negative about (so-called vices). Let be. This is almost the hardest thing for human beings to do: to let be. Unless you can show a clear and present danger to life and limb - let be."

As a psychotherapist, Mr. Goodman said, he holds that "homosexual acts as such are indifferent...that is, if they give pleasure, they are insofar good, because what gives pleasure is good for the health - it makes the cheeks red and the eyes bright. ...Pink-cheeks baby, that's what I'm always after! ...Because pleasure, medically speaking, is not a superficial thing. It means that deep, vital currents are moving. ...The feeling that occurs when functioning is going on is pleasure. ...If functioning is going on without pleasure, that means that something is wrong with the functioning."

He said that if homosexuality were completely acceptable, homosexual acts as acts would increase. "I trust they would increase with more pleasure attached to them - so much the better, so much more vitality and color." Anyone "with a large experience, especially with bisexual relations," will realize how "one kind of act tips off desire for the other kinds of acts." Mr. Goodman claimed "it's utterly inevitable" that bisexual activity will occur "if everything is taking place without guilt and under good conditions."

But whether one considers homosexual acts indifferent, or vice, or a source of new vitality in life, he said, one "must come to the conclusion that repressive laws do no good, and do a considerable amount of harm - to the total of the population."

Turning his attention to the homophile movement, Mr. Goodman declared: "Liberty is indivisible. Those who are oppressed find they have a good deal in common, if they think about it, with other groups that are oppressed." He advised organized homosexuals "to ally themselves with all groups that seek an extension of liberty (and) extension of civil rights, that seek to preserve individual expression as against conformity."

The homophile organizations should also ally themselves with groups that attack censorship or try to undermine prejudice, and with those people who are exposed to police brutality, and with those who suffer from deprivation. "they are suffering exactly the same way you are. ...They really are your brothers. ...They might not see you as brother or sister, but then it's all the more necessary for you to extend a hand to them."

Mr. Goodman said he probably would have more in common, politically, with organized homosexuals than with most homosexuals. "Repressed groups, and especially if they have some safeguards like money or so, tend to turn inward, become cliquish, begin to develop a conceit and snobbery. You know, for the simple reason you gotta be better than somebody!" But minority-group members who organize, reject this because they realize turning inward "is a complete sell, and a self-betrayal. ...Repressed

groups that do not claim their rights - as for instance when the Negroes were Uncle Tomming - they're exactly the same as Madison Avenue queens who are Madison Avenue queening!"

People of repressed groups who are organized, have realized they must break out of their withdrawn position and go forward aggressively to claim their rights, and they soon see they are in the same boat as other claiming their own rights, he said.

Mr. Goodman next raised an idea he granted might not be popular with some in the audience. He said people are powerless in modern society; they can exercise little initiative, make few important decisions about their lives. "Things are set out for them; they just have to go through the paces." They may decide to opt out of major responsibility - including family life - and get their kicks the easiest way. He suggested that the homosexual way, despite its difficulties, may be more satisfactory for someone in a powerless condition than taking on the responsibilities of domesticity. The kind of freedom homosexuals have tends to be empty, so they may "sell out to the very superficiality" of today's technological life.

The troubles, anxieties, and citizenly duties of family life - such as sick babies, and belonging to the PTA - "do have the advantage, these anxieties, of keeping one in touch with a kind of elemental reality," Mr. Goodman contended. The helplessness of a sick baby has an elemental reality, and "there's even a certain elemental reality to the PTA. I wouldn't want to have to pin that down, but there really is!"

Mr. Goodman went on to pose the question whether "people who decide to lead a life which is entirely homosexual...ought not to see that they have a special problem of getting back into elemental reality in the world. And if they're not going to do it as fathers and mothers of families, then whether they shouldn't think real hard of how to do it some other way."

Homosexuals who have made a choice which exempts them from the cares of family life "have the problem of how to take on responsibility in order to get back into reality." Whether this responsibility be political, or centered on a do-good cause, or whatever, would depend on a person's talents and desires, Mr. Goodman said. He then called for questions from the floor.

Q. Are you implying that heterosexual life is elemental in some sense compared with homosexual life? Can a homosexual love relationship be as elemental as a heterosexual one?

A. No, I mean that a sick baby is elemental in comparison to avoidance of problems of sick babies. There's something painful and elemental about having to take responsibility where no reward can be given you, except just doing it. If you avoid family life and its problems, then you have to be very careful not to become superficial. A homosexual love relationship is as elemental as a heterosexual one. But the relation between parents and children is elemental in a different sense.

Q. What could a homosexual do to match that in his own life?

A. That, each homosexual would have to decide for himself. Obviously there are some things that people with homosexual dispositions do better - for instance, being a YMCA secretary. Seriously! I mean the secretary who, when the guy comes in, notices that he doesn't have socks, and that his teeth need fixing - that's a good YMCA secretary. But you can't be that way, generally, unless you feel an animal need to pay attention. If you let yourself go with those animal needs to pay attention, and you're in the right milieu, you will get very deep into the elemental realities of life - which you're not going to get into in a Madison Avenue office. Right?

Q. Elemental responsibility is the thing each homosexual individual inherits automatically. As the unmarried ones in any family, homosexuals automatically inherit responsibility for their illegitimate nieces and nephews, their sick mothers and fathers, their sick sisters, the mentally ill members of the family. Why do you feel this is less elemental?

A. No, no, no, that's exactly the answer. If that's true, and when that's true - that's it, you've answered it.

Q. Have you as a psychotherapist ever analyzed bisexuality from the ground up? What makes it so complex? It seems bisexuals are leading a double life.

A. All life is complex. I'd guess that whatever walk or habit you look at, you'll find equal quantities of trouble. The view palmed off by some mental-hygienists, that homosexuality is perfectly all right etc., but it dooms you to unhappiness - that's true. But the same can be said about family life in Roslyn, N. Y. - it's great, but it dooms you to unhappiness! You could go through any suburb and you won't find one house without a problem. But why do you call bisexuality a double life rather than a single life? Which is Dr. Jekyll and which is Mr. Hyde?! The very question is socially conditioned.

Q. If there were a decent society, what would the homosexual's place be in it?

A. If there were a decent society, I don't think the word homosexual would be used.

Q. What is the greatest problem facing the homosexual?

A. I wouldn't know. Probably the atom bomb.

Q. Several years ago you told a Mattachine Society audience that unless organized homosexuals involved themselves with other problems of mankind, their cause would fail. Is this part of what you call the elemental responsibility?

A. Yes, certainly. But look, your homophile organizations are now using techniques picked up from the Negro civil rights movement. I hope therefore that you have the decency to support them on their picket lines.

Q. About the dilemma in Vietnam: as soon as one takes a stand, one loses much support from people one would agree with

in other ways. But if one doesn't take a stand, doesn't this make a mockery of everything one presumes oneself to be?

A. I take your point to be: if Mattachine Society says we're in cahoots with CORE, let's say, then they'll lose many possible friends who happen to be against CORE. Lots of people in the South could be friendly to Mattachine and against CORE. It's the same thing in the present civil rights movement, where Martin Luther King begins to feel he has to say something - after all he's a pacifist - about stopping the Vietnam war. Whereupon someone like Roy Wilkins will say: No, no, we have enough troubles as it is trying to solve Negro problems; if you once do that you'll alienate a lot of liberal support.

But that cannot be the answer. The answer has to be what is humanly right. And in the end, you'll go further that way.

The QUA's Have It!

"You should not combine your striving with other causes," advised Ernest van den Haag, educator, psychoanalyst, and author of EDUCATION AS AN INDUSTRY and other books, and articles.

He said Martin Luther King had made a mistake in combining the fight for Negro rights with certain views on the Vietnam war. "There is no reason to believe that qua Negroes, or qua people whose civil rights have been denied, (Negroes) have to take a particular position on the war in Vietnam." As citizens, some Negroes may be for the war and some against. Dr. van den Haag claimed it's a mistake for civil rights leaders, "instead of insisting simply on Negroes' having the right to participate in decision-making processes - to insist that Negroes have some particular views on the decisions to be made, as Negroes. They have views as citizens, and these views may diverge."

Similarly, it would be a mistake for the homophile movement to combine its aims with a variety of political views, he said. "It is foolish to insist that homosexuals, qua homosexuals, must share or have certain political views, or be interested as such in the rights of political minorities or majorities. There are homosexual Nazis, homosexual communists, homosexual Democrats, homosexual Negroes, homosexual members of the KKK. The question of whether homosexuality as such should or should not be permitted has nothing to do with whether the KKK should be permitted...and so on. These are separate questions. ... As homosexuals, you have one interest and one interest only: namely, that you should have the right to be homosexuals without being punished." A homosexual person's political stance is neither because of, nor despite, his homosexuality. Homosexuality has nothing to do with political leanings, he said.

Furthermore, argued Dr. van den Haag, other people may want to protect and foster homosexuals' rights to their own sexual

choice, without sharing any political views a homophile group might adopt. He urged the homophile movement to avoid losing the support of such people "by acting as though the cause for freedom for homosexual activities is necessarily combined with the cause of the right of Negroes to be employed, or of all people to achieve Medicare, or of people not to be drafted for the war in Vietnam, and so on. "All of these may be fine things," he said, "but I don't see the connection."

He said that his speech topic, "Will Society Meet the Homosexual Halfway?" implies that the homosexual has aims on which he wants society to meet him at least halfway. Dr. van den Haag named the two major goals as he sees them: (1) homosexuals want legal equality - they want to eliminate those laws which punish their preferred sexual activities; (2) homosexuals want to be accepted as individuals, despite and regardless of their sexual preferences, as other individuals are accepted.

Taking up the legal issue first, Dr. van den Haag said that homosexuals are entitled to want their preferred sexual activity regarded as their private business. "It seems to me, from the general principles of our Constitution, one could easily deduce that the state laws which prohibit homosexual activity ...are unconstitutional." He said he felt his view was reinforced by the Supreme Court decision which held anti-contraceptive laws to be unconstitutional because in a sense such laws violate constitutional guarantees of privacy.

Dr. van den Haag urged the homophile organizations to do what Negro groups have done successfully - they should get test cases in the courts and try to get the laws against homosexual acts invalidated as unconstitutional. While it might take 20 or 30 years to accomplish this, "it is not only worthwhile but also the only thing that can be done" to erase such laws.

He nonetheless had some other recommendations. Homophile groups should launch reasonable public discussion about the laws, in order to pick up public support for changing the laws. Even people who condemn homosexual activity on moral grounds may agree with the view put forth by the Archbishop of Canterbury, that such activity should not be punished by the state. Dr. van den Haag also recommended that homophile groups use the strategy of trying to convince legislators they will lose votes if they oppose reform of the law.

Dr. van den Haag pointed out that law reform has nothing to do with whether homosexuality is or is not regarded as sickness. He explained he himself does not feel that people are sick because they are homosexuals, that he considers homosexuality "a character trait, and not necessarily a sickness. ...It's of course illogical, even if you say homosexuality is a sickness, to say it should therefore be prohibited, for sickness is certainly not cured by making it legally punishable."

Whatever the nature of homosexuality, he told the ECHO audience, "it seems to me you too easily allow people to tell you that you are sick because (you are) homosexuals." He claimed that calling a person sick just because he is homosexual tends

to confuse "a rather unfounded moral judgement with a clinical judgement even more unfounded. The fact that too many of you allow yourselves too easily to be told that, does not help matters" for the homosexual, he commented.

The sickness question is especially relevant to social acceptance of the homosexual, according to Dr. van den Haag. He emphasize "there is a profound difference between the legal and social issues. The legal issues can be manipulated by organizational effort. The social issue cannot be." Yet the latter is equally important. Granting that chances for social acceptance are more hopeful now than before, Dr. van den Haag said he still is not very optimistic, "because fear of homosexuality is very widespread in our society. And the major effect of that fear is a display of contempt and a generally defensive attitude towards homosexuals, which in turn leads to their social rejection - and possibly also to approval of such (anti-homosexual) laws as we have just discussed."

Our society's aversion to homosexuals "is founded on irrational factors which are not likely to be removed in the near future," warned Dr. van den Haag. "Moreover, I do not know of any public means by which it could be combatted. I think you can publicly combat the legal disabilities that have been wrongly imposed on you - but as for the social disabilities, I think you will have to act on an individual basis."

He summed up that chances seem good for society's meeting the homosexual halfway on the legal issue, but it will be a long, hard road to acceptance of the homosexual in social context.

ERRATA

January issue, p. 14, line 14 and on under "Onward to Social Engineering?" should read:

the social system." Our disjointed society with its haphazard change is run by "business and military men," and social changes are unplanned or the result of piecemeal planning.

"If we are interested in the kinds of adults that will make up our society," he said, "we must be prepared to realize the complexity of the problem" of finding out what social conditions produce what kinds of adults. He discussed how social scientists work with cross-cultural studies in the effort to find out what in a society accounts for the personality patterns that predominate in that culture.

February issue, p. 10, 4th paragraph, 5th line on should read:

If one says, not that "this person is different" but instead that "this person has a problem," this statement almost means that this person is a potential customer for the analyst.

CREEPING HETEROSEXUALITY

America's Number One Social Problem

by Judith Rascoe

(Reprinted by permission from the December 1965 issue of GRUMP - "the publication for people who are nervous but not angry". Editor, Roger Price. 230 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 10017.)

According to a recent nation-wide survey, ONE MALE IN THREE IS A LATENT HETEROSEXUAL. Even if we assume that millions of these potential deviates will apparently conform to the sexual norms of our society, we are still left with thousands of heterosexuals who practice - and sometimes flaunt - their perversion.

This group is coming to exercise an ever-increasing influence on our lives as they gradually gain acceptance in business, in the professions, and even in the arts.

Yet, in the midst of nation-wide controversy, only one thing seems clear: not enough is known about heterosexuality.

"There are all sorts of rumors and half-truths told about us," says one prominent heterosexual who refuses to let his name be published. "Most people have the idea of this big, hairy, masculine-acting guy. They say they can tell us by the way we walk or dress. But listen, for every heterosexual who fits the stereotype, I can point out a dozen whom you'd never suspect. Some of them are dress designers, playwrights, actors, and even hairdressers."

But on the other hand, the heterosexual tendency to say that all successful bankers, longshoremen and steel workers are "grim" (the in-group slang for heterosexual) is an exaggeration in the opposite direction. "Thank heavens we're not all 'grim'," says Tad "Sugarfoot" Wilkins, one of America's most successful cattlemen. "My God, how infinitely dreary. But I will admit, darlings, that there are lots of them in the cattle trade - it's positively crawling with them, in fact. And I stay away from all those 'grim' parties - too yawn-making."

When the heterosexuals themselves describe their lives, they speak of a tragi-comic world of "grim" bars and bowling alleys, motel rooms and oil fields. Frequently the talk turns to that

brooding sense of dissatisfaction which seems the one common denominator of all heterosexuals.

One man said, "Buddy, I couldn't live without broads. I see one, and something happens inside...I got to look, I got to touch. If I'm alone, I'm thinking about broads. Looking at pictures at them. I ask you, could you live like that?"

"They can't live like that all the time," says a well-known New York psychiatrist who has treated many heterosexuals. "They realize that our society is against them. It has laws and social patterns, and it has the means of enforcing these. Sooner or later men ask themselves, 'Why am I like this? How did this happen?' and they want help."

"According to modern psychoanalytic theory, a man becomes a heterosexual because his development isn't arrested in time. Instead of identifying himself with his mother (and working out his ambivalences in terms of her), the potential heterosexual becomes fixated on his father...who is usually a dominating, success-oriented figure. Once the identification with the father is complete, the subject begins to look outside the family group for a female sexual partner. If he is lucky, the first female he approaches calls him a schlemiel, steps on his foot, and rides away on her motorcycle. But if he finds a female to act in complicity with his new urges, often a single experience will make him a confirmed heterosexual."

"However, we're making major advances in treatment. Meanwhile, the most important task of the psychiatrist is to gain the heterosexual's confidence - just as I've gained yours, sweetie."

A Park Avenue M. D. is concerned with the medical problems that follow heterosexuality. "Wherever you find heterosexuals," he says, "you're going to get a lot of pregnancies. These cases come in here all the time."

A San Francisco policeman says, "Well, we're a pretty tolerant town. Sure, there are a few heterosexual bars here. Even night clubs and dance halls. But we don't interfere unless a fight starts or the other customers complain."

But a bouncer at a private club on New York's Fire Island takes a different attitude. "You can't let 'em in, honey," he says. "First you get a few and then they bring their friends and pretty soon you've got a lot of heterosexual women too - and that's how the fights start. And once you get a reputation as a 'grim' bar - well, this town won't stand for a lot of bars 'turning grim', especially during the season."

And what of the heterosexuals themselves? How do they regard their own lives? Three representative heterosexuals talk about it.

FRED WHAMBO. Like other minority groups, heterosexuals have their own slang, and they have terms for several different

types of heterosexual. The stereotype heterosexual (and the subject of so many books, operas, and dirty jokes) is called a "stud," meaning that he affects all the regalia of exaggerated heterosexuality - masculine manners and appearance, untidy masculine clothing, smelly armpits, dirty fingernails, and open and unapologetic familiarity with women.

Fred Whambo is a self-proclaimed "stud." When approached by reporters, his first reaction was to turn to his companion and say, "You want I should paste this guy?" But when asked whether he was really a "stud," he replied easily that he was. He had been "that way" ever since he could remember, declared he liked being that way, and said he felt he'd made the best possible adjustment. "Christ," he said, "I was born that way. Grew up in Seattle. Married five times. The only thing that'll stop me is a heart attack." When asked whether he'd ever wondered if he might want to make a change, he grew thoughtful, finished his beer, and then struck the reporter.

TOM Y. Tom Y. is a successful New Jersey interior decorator. He has a roommate and an apartment on Christy Street in New York. ("It's my friends I want to protect," he said when asking that his name not be used.) Tom is what is called a "nice." Unlike Fred Whambo, Tom went through long, anxious years of wondering about his heterosexuality. "I had almost finished my senior year at the Larchmont College of Interior Design," he says, "when I had my first heterosexual experience. Afterwards I was ashamed and for several months I tried to convince myself that it was a momentary aberration. But then I got a letter from my heterosexual 'partner' asking me to spend a weekend in Florida. I remember I looked at the letter and then I looked at myself in the mirror and said, 'I am a heterosexual.' I knew from that moment I couldn't escape it. I went to Florida.

"My roommate knows and accepts my problem - as a matter of fact, he has made it possible for me to live with it. But I don't think anyone else suspects. And because of his understanding, I don't have to make sordid rendezvous in cheap motels or 'grim' bars. I'm one of the lucky ones."

NERVO CANTICAS. Senor Nervo "Cojones" Canticas, international yachtsman, scoutmaster, and playboy, is not the heterosexual of the popular stereotype - in America, at least. He enjoys puttering in the kitchen, tatting, Tiffany glass, pop art, and the ballet. But in certain international circles his heterosexual activities are well known, and Senor Canticas makes no effort to deny the rumors. "I was told it was how you say latent in me. This my governess she tell me. So I say, it is the will of Dios, and I follow the instincts. First with my governess. Then with the upstairs maid. Then with my cousin. Then with..."

Intimates of Senor Canticas say that his heterosexuality is obvious when he is among friends. "It is usually disguised behind his sensitive concern for women," says a Palm Beach matron. "But I've seen him flaunt it when he's been drinking.

It's not common in our set, but we've learned to tolerate Cojo's little idiosyncrasies."

Fred Whambo, Tom Y., and Nervo Canticas have one thing in common besides their heterosexuality: they've managed to stay out of trouble with the law. Many groups and individuals are willing to allow the heterosexual the right to lead his own life - as long as his "partners" are consenting adults. What worries the experts is the heterosexual's well-known inability to grasp the fine distinctions between consenting and non-consenting "partners" or between adult and underage "partners".

For example, take the case of Harold W., a first offender. Harold W. said that he'd never imagined himself capable of a heterosexual assault. "I'll never do it again," he said. "But now I've got a record for this, and word will get back to the agency. And what will I tell mother?"

His victim, a 22 year-old instructress at a local self-defense center, alleged that Mr. W. had lured her to his apartment with promises of coffee and a talk about her analysis. "I never figured Harold was that kind of guy. I mean like once in a while I suspected he might be 'nice' - but golly, that was because of the way he walked. I had just used his phone a couple of times and suddenly he was all over me. Frankly, it makes me sick to talk about it."

The terrifying truth is that this girl is one of the 15,500 innocent victims of heterosexual assaults committed within the past 18 months; perhaps twice as many such encounters go unreported. Already, "in large cities and small, there are bars, streets, and even hotel lobbies where a young woman alone is not safe after midnight. Those who would protect the heterosexual must recognize the danger of allowing unlimited freedom to these men. A wave of pregnancies, marriages, schoolchildren, fist fights and mixed dancing will follow.

Those apologists who point to primitive societies where heterosexual behavior is tolerated neglect the fact that our present society is built on a non-heterosexual basis. As these men infiltrate key positions in the communications industry, in government, and in business, they threaten to wield enormous power over all our lives. Many years ago, a dedicated minority of teetotalers were able to impose prohibition and all its attendant evils upon our nation. They succeeded because the majority "didn't see anything especially wrong in the idea" and thought "they might have a point" and "they're harmless anyway." In short, many people thought that the advocates of prohibition could not affect them.

Similarly, sexual deviates, given an atmosphere where they are tolerated, are capable of imposing their heterosexual tastes on the society which accepts their presence. No one is calling for a program against sexual deviates. But any approach to the problem must include a decent regard for the majority. Society must reward the men who struggle against this problem in themselves, instead of rewarding those who turn their own abnormality into a profitable way of life.

Cross-currents

TIME gets in a tizzy over homosexuality in a so-called essay in the Jan. 21 issue. The two-page spread rolls out all the hoary chestnuts about homosexuality, bristles with vilifications of a kind TIME wouldn't dare print about any other group of citizens. Items that are neutral or favorable to homosexuality are snidely put down or followed by counter-statements.

"TIME has really done itself proud," said psychologist Fritz Fluckiger during a lecture in New York. "They are famous for having a large research staff - and indeed, they have found every single cliché you can think of, to put in that essay."

In its final frenzied paragraph TIME shows its Catholic petti-coats. TIME rolls religious, psychiatric, and plain bourgeois prejudice into one big mudball which it slings about, hoping to blacken homosexuality forever. Homosexuality, TIME piously concludes, "deserves no encouragement, no glamorization, no rationalization, no fake status as minority martyrdom, no sophistry about simple differences in taste - and above all, no pretense that it is anything but a pernicious sickness."

Among the letters TIME printed criticizing its write-up was this one from Philip Gerard (who dissected The New York Times' "journalism" on homosexuality, in an article for THE LADDER's December 1964 issue): "That TIME is middlebrow, trivial and superficial is well known to all thoughtful, serious men; but that it is ignorant and banal is a fact pushed to the fore in such pieces as the cliché-ridden double page on homosexuality. It takes TIME to make such spinsterlike judgments as the last sentence in the article."

TIME calls homosexuality "a pathetic little second-rate substitute for reality." Ditto for TIME's essay on the subject.

+ + + + +

Coming at the reader with a bundle of good intentions as well as a passel of folklore is Robert K. Woetzel, author of a lead article in SATURDAY REVIEW (Oct. 9, 1965) titled "Do Our Homosexuality Laws Make Sense?" Mr. Woetzel is avidly in favor of law reform, and for this much the homosexual reader will be grateful. Furthermore, Mr. Woetzel sensibly avoids getting entangled in the morass of psychological theories about homosexuality. But instead of making his case for law reform on an abstract level (with pertinent references to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the philosophical underpinnings of our society), his arguments have all the flavor of courtroom melodrama as he pleads the homosexual's case.

What's his pitch? He is relentless in his description of the abject misery in which - so he would have the reader believe - the homosexual minority is almost totally immersed as a result of oppressive laws. He tells of alcoholism, criminality, drug addiction, furtive promiscuity, etc. - with not a word about the fact that very many American homosexuals live creditable and satisfying lives despite the patently unfair laws. His approach raises two questions: how much misery need be attributed to the homosexual minority before public interest in law reform can be aroused, and to what extent will a grossly overdrawn, negative picture of homosexuality get a response that is opposite to the sympathetic interest hoped for.

Mr. Woetzel nevertheless ends up very admirably, claiming that "the use of coercion to force (the homosexual's) conformity, except where it involves transgression of another's rights, should be abandoned." Better still, he tackles at the last minute the notion that homosexuals may be potential security risks. "If homosexuals were accepted in society, the reason for blackmail would disappear. Of course, a change of social attitude takes time; it might be argued, therefore, that until such a change is realized, homosexuals should be excluded from sensitive positions. This would not be just, however, in view of the fact that homosexuals are not ipso facto security risks." Mr. Woetzel, who is a staff member of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, ought to try getting this across to the government of our democracy.

SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR HOMOSEXUALS

MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON MEETS WITH JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

The question of security clearances for homosexuals has long seemed "a tough nut to crack" because of the decentralization of the Federal Government's security program, under which there seemed to be no one place in the Government (short of the President himself - if there) where it was possible to go in order to negotiate.

Last summer, as an unexpected by-product of a correspondence between the Mattachine Society of Washington and the Vice-President of the United States and his office, the possibility arose that the Justice Department might be the appropriate agency of the Government for the Society to contact on this question. Accordingly, a correspondence commenced, first with Attorney General Katzenbach, and then with Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley of the Internal Security Division.

The correspondence was a slow one because of the Justice Department's unfortunate habit of waiting precisely thirty days before answering a letter.

After several exchanges of letters, a conference was arranged, on Tuesday, January 25, 1966, between members of the Justice Department's Internal Security Division, and representatives of the Mattachine Society of Washington (two men, one woman).

In simplified form, the position with which the Society went into the conference was:

(1) That homosexuality and the commission of homosexual acts are, per se, not relevant to qualification for access to classified information and are not proper ground for denial of security clearances;

(2) That, while some homosexual citizens may be poor security risks, every American citizen has the right to be considered individually, upon his own personal merits, and not to be placed under disadvantage because of possible faults and weaknesses of other individual citizens; that disqualification of a group or class of citizens is fundamentally un-American;

(3) That the Government, by its policies of denying clearances and employment to those known to be homosexual is, in major measure, creating the problem it is allegedly solving; that there are far better, more effective and more humane methods, less destructive both of individual citizens and of the national welfare, of dealing with problems arising from unorthodoxy and non-conformity; and that, in any case, the "problem" of homosexuals as security risks is actually almost totally non-existent, and is the creation of armchair theoreticians operating in ivory towers.

Unfortunately, the 90-minute conference was inconclusive, and the basic issues were not explored - although it was indicated that the Justice Department is aware of all of the Society's letters to government officials, has seen all of its literature, and knew of its picketing demonstrations in Washington. The non-productivity of the conference arose from the correctness of the Society's original impression: the present security program is so chaotically decentralized, uncoordinated, and fragmented, that apparently no single, meaningful, formal policy-making or administrative body exists.

For Federal employees, the administration of the security program rests with the U. S. Civil Service Commission where (administratively, though not substantively) it is inextricably bound up with the Civil Service Commission's suitability standards. For employees in private industry, each separate Federal agency sets its own standards and (subject to certain guidelines) its own procedures (without formal criteria for denial of clearances), although the tone is set by the Defense Department, which has cognizance over virtually all of the classified information for which access clearances are needed.

Further action is being considered by the Mattachine Society of Washington.

THE FAMILY AND MONEY INJUSTICE _____ BY DOROTHY LYLE

In contrast to the heterosexual married couple whose union is afforded financial advantages by law, the lesbian couple faces such disadvantages as unequal property rights, taxation out of proportion, unequal insurance privileges. But in addition, each half of a lesbian couple may be tacitly expected to function as a single person from the family-and-money standpoint - that is, she is expected to carry the load traditionally dumped on the unmarried offspring, even though she is not actually "single."

Since my mother is elderly and has a very limited income, the money for any extra expense must come from another source. For years the only source of extra cash was myself, the oldest of her three children. Now, however, my two younger sisters are adults and are gainfully employed. The middle sister also is a lesbian and has entered a happy lesbian partnership. The youngest is 21 and is engaged to a fine boy she had been going steady with for two years.

Recently Mother's last close relative, except for us three daughters, died. During the flurry of activity to get Mother on a plane for the distant city to handle the details of the burial, there were, naturally, conversations about raising the money needed for Mother's long trip.

The money was raised, of course, with the three of us contributing equally. But at one point when I was speaking to my lesbian sister about the soon-to-be time when the three of us would have to provide Mother's support beyond her social security, this sister answered that she and I alone would have to do it. When I asked why just the two of us and not our youngest sister also, she replied: "Well, Sue says that when she is married to Bob she won't feel like asking him to help support Mother, and I can see her point. Marriage is different."

I protested: "Different, hell. Why? Aren't you taking from Donna to help Mother now? And aren't I in effect taking from Jerri? So Sue won't be able to ask Bob for help? Why not?"

Her immediate contention was that since our lesbian unions are not legally sanctioned, it was alright for us to be specially penalized this way - in effect, to be penalized as the single members of a family generally are. The rest of our family dispute doesn't matter, but the questions it raises do matter, to all homosexuals.

Everyone knows men and women, ostensibly single, one of whose major functions in life is the care and/or support of one or both aged parents. Often this is the case even when siblings who are married are equally able to carry part of the load.

This is a ridiculous injustice - to either an unmarried offspring, or a homosexual one whose commitment to a partner is being ignored. Certainly the argument my lesbian sister gave is untenable. That a person grows up heterosexual, and then gets married, doesn't relieve her or him of responsibility toward parents, even if there are "single" persons in the family.

Personally, I won't stand for this injustice! It's not lack of love or neglect of filial duty - just a sense of right and wrong. And I soon made my position clear to both my sisters.

In checking with my homosexual friends, I found such unequal apportionment of responsibility nearly universal. Possibly a few such cases of disadvantage may stem from an exaggerated sense of "debt" felt by the homosexual offspring towards parents. But most cases are due simply to the homosexual's inability or unwillingness to demand a fair deal in the family.

There are battlegrounds for us on every level of our daily life. Through sheer stubbornness I have managed to win equitable treatment within my family. Not privileged treatment - just the understanding that my lesbian partnership is to me as valid a responsibility as any marriage. This being so, what other tack is there for any honest person to take?

LESBIAN LITERATURE IN 1965 — by Gene Damon

Until recently, most lesbian literature was written by obscure authors. That day is clearly over. The past year's literature that is wholly or partly concerned with lesbianism, includes as many distinguished authors as it does new or previously unknown writers, and many of the latter have received noteworthy reviews in the general press.

In reading several hundred novels last year, I ran across some 20 references to lesbianism which were too minor to record. (And while they are not germane to this article, over 50 hardback titles of 1965 deal with male homosexuality.) The literate generation growing up today will hardly be able to avoid knowing about homosexuality, and this may in time prove an asset in our public relations. The large body which now exists of serious literature depicting lesbians and their lives from every aspect, is bound to reach many previously uninformed general readers. It is unfortunate that the special-pleading novels such as *THE WELL OF LONELINESS* are now extinct, since, despite critics' damnation, this kind of novel is a powerful propaganda tool. But in its place we have an acceptance, a taken-for-granted attitude, which has the same effect in the long run and is less likely to offend the intelligent reader.

There were 227 relevant titles in 1965: 187 paperbacks and an all-time record of 40 hardbacks. That 40 may not seem big in this age of giant everything, but it becomes a properly giant figure if we look back to the era, not so long ago, when there were only three titles a year. Following are brief reviews of the 40 titles which appeared in hardcover form last year. Note that some have already had a paperback printing as well. The year of publication is 1965 unless another date is given.

The outstanding novel of 1965, both in its subjective handling of lesbianism and from an artistic standpoint, is May Sarton's *MRS+ STEVENS HEARS THE MERMAIDS SINGING* (N. Y., Norton). This novel incorporates the whole spectrum of a poet's creativity, and lets the reader in on the working processes of the artist. Hilary Stevens reviews her life and art during an interview for a national magazine, and as the novel progresses the linking truth for Hilary is revealed: her talent, her work have depended for inspiration on her attachments to various women. Her muse, always feminine, has made possible the volumes of poetry and the novels of Hilary Stevens. The book is important because it kills that sacred-cow belief that lesbian liaisons are necessarily sterile.

For over 20 years the distinguished publisher, Scribner's, has cosseted novelist Marguerite Young as she worked to finish her enormous novel *MISS MACINTOSH, MY DARLING* (N. Y., Scribner's). It may be a few years before this novel is assigned a definitive place in literature - or perhaps wholly discarded. Today it seems overwritten, overlong, and a sad waste of 20 years' work for the author. The story is primarily of the narrator's obsessive love for her childhood nurse, Miss MacIntosh. Take warning: this one is hard, unrewarding reading.

Muriel Spark, one of the outstanding contemporary English novelists, includes a substantial lesbian portrait in her tale of intrigue in modern Jerusalem, *THE MANDELBAUM GATE* (N. Y., Knopf). The heroine's best friend and boss, Miss Ricky Rickward, is in love with her and tries to prevent her marriage to an archeologist. Ironically, Ricky's effort aids the marriage instead. Muriel Spark is well named: she always manages a few heated bits of satire in her books, a few nasty barbs.

A gentle voice from the past is heard in *NOT IN THE CALENDAR* by Margaret Kennedy (N. Y., Macmillan, 1964). This family-chronicle novel includes a nicely-handled lesbian pair in the long, involved plot line. The women conquer considerable handicaps to live together, and theirs is a most happy story.

A novel about insanity, *THE INNER ROOM* by Vera Randal (N. Y., Knopf, 1964), covers the lives of five women approaching or leaving emotional crises. Three of the five are lesbians. The author makes a clear effort to show the dangers of repression and to recommend a much less restrictive psychiatric attitude toward lesbians' fulfilling themselves: the women who are given a chance to express themselves get well or improve, the repressed remain ill or become more severely disturbed.

John Braine's *THE HEALOUS GOD* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1964, 1965) concerns the conflict between Catholic moral law and the

facts of life. There is a rather sad portrait of a lesbian. The author uses a male homosexual's death by suicide to solve the various protagonists' problems - a solution generally frowned on in literature. Mr. Braine is a poor writer, despite the praise he generally receives from the critics.

THE ORGY by Muriel Rukeyser (N. Y., Coward-McCann) has been reviewed both as fiction and as autobiography. It is probably a little of both. Miss Rukeyser is noted as one of our finest living poets. The lesbian element in her first novel is fairly substantial, but the writing is almost surrealistic, which may put off the reader looking for plot in meaty chunks. It is more beautifully done than many other examples of experimental writing, however, and is recommended for that reason.

A GREEN TREE IN GEDDE by Alan Sharp (N. Y., New American Library; London, Michael Joseph) is a vivid tale of that odyssey of the young: the search for self-realization. There are a few of these novels each year, and this one is unusually fresh and alive, with vigorous language and engaging protagonists. The lesbians portrayed are not a particularly exemplary lot. But the portions dealing with male homosexuals more than make up for this, and they also offer much general homosexual philosophy, similar in tone to Gide's CORYDON, given by an older, settled writer to one of the novel's young protagonists.

Beverley Gasner's NINA UPSTAIRS (N. Y., Knopf, 1964; London, Gollancz, 1964) is, like Mr. Sharp's novel, concerned with the young. Unlike Mr. Sharp, however, Miss Gasner is not a remarkable talent. She does have a good sense of humor, though, and her short chapters on a heterosexual girl's reaction to a rather wild lesbian household are wry and funny.

Another first novel, P. S. WILKINSON by C. D. B. Bryah (N. Y., Harper's) is recommended for its literary value. Mr. Bryah is that rare bird, an accomplished novelist on his first attempt. His handling of the hero's encounter with a lesbian couple is excellent (though it's sad for said hero). The sequences telling of P. S.'s interview with the Central Intelligence Agency, which ends with his being branded a homosexual and, of course, not being hired, sound an ominous note about our country today. Mr. Bryah uses humor to lighten his tale, with no little skill in the application.

THE UNMELTING POT by Michael Sheldon (London, Hutchinson) concerns a woman's pathetic efforts to escape her lesbianism, with disastrous personal consequences. Mr. Sheldon is uncommonly good at depicting women and their emotional patterns. An unhappy story, but a necessary title for the collector.

A minor but sympathetic portrait of unrequited lesbian love is included in THE SKIN DEALER by Miles Tripp (London, Macmillan; N. Y., Holt).

THE ROUND MOSAIC by Desmond Stewart (London, Chapman and Hall) is second in importance only to May Sarton's novel this year. This is volume one of a proposed trilogy about several inter-related families in England, Scotland, and Egypt during the

last two decades of the 19th century and the first years of the 20th. Over one-fifth of this book concerns a lesbian coterie. There are too many characters of interest, and the plot is too involved, for an outline here. It is excellent historical fiction, with the bonus that Mr. Stewart makes his characters seem like contemporaries and thus very believable. The era in which it is set corresponds to an era that teemed with male homosexuals of literary importance. Perhaps if one knew the key, the major figures in THE ROUND MOSAIC would be identifiable, particularly the lesbian painter, James Bouverie.

Audrey Laski's heroine in VENUS IN TRANSIT (London, Heinemann, 1964; N. Y., McGraw-Hill, 1965) wanders about looking for "meaningful" adventure. One of her stops is an art colony containing the human flora and fauna one would expect. Among the inhabitants is a lesbian pair, and the novel gives considerable space to exploring the complications in their private life. A bit beat for some tastes, but good of its kind.

Pamela Hansford Johnson delivers an ironic social blast in CORK STREET, NEXT TO THE HATTERS (London, Macmillan; N. Y., Scribner's). Her complaint is not directed at lesbians or lesbianism but at what she considers the "decadent" theater of today, wherein one can present plays about any kind of "undesirable" persons and use any kind of "undesirable" language. Unfortunately Miss Johnson is almost too square, and in trying to be sharp-tongued and funny at the same time, she bungles it. The plot concerns the writing of a play so SCHOCKING that no one will like it (predictably, it's a smash hit) and which includes some unpleasant lesbian incidents, along with incest, necrophilia, et al.

THE EDGE by Shirley Mezvinsky (Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday; London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson) is a painful re-creation of a wasted life. Lois has misused her talent, her husband, her child, and the lesbian drama coach who has tried in vain to help her. We are treated to a series of flashbacks showing the general etiology of the mess, and then a tragic final scene where Lois chooses to quit trying. The author writes well and next time she may pick a more appealing protagonist.

The Lesbian problems of newspaper editor Rhoda Winthrop get substantial space in Richard Powell's DAILY AND SUNDAY (N. Y., Scribner's, 1965; also Bantam, 1966). Unconvincing, albeit interesting reading on the mental level of a best-seller.

THE GRASS WON'T GROW TILL SPRING by David Lytton (London, The Bodley Head) is oversexed and underwritten, but slick enough to keep the reader going along. Several types of lesbian attachments are recorded, from repressed to really!

THE HOUR OF GIVING by Luis Zalamea (Boston, Houghton Mifflin) has a simply unbelievable portrait of a lesbian. Oddly, the author supplies his heroine with a credible etiology and then has her behave in a manner no one would believe. Very poor.

The bored (and boring) French scene is the theme of Christiane Rochefort's CATS DON'T CARE FOR MONEY (Garden City, N. Y.,

Doubleday). Miss Rochefort writes far too well to waste her time on such bloodless bitches as her heroine. Only for the dedicated who can stand the ennui.

Very minor, unimportant lesbian episodes occur in *THE MECHANICAL PIANOS* by Henri-Francois Rey (London, Secker and Warburg; N. Y., Farrar, Straus) and *THE TRAP* by John Knowler (N. Y., Knopf). Both books are mildly entertaining. Chas. Hamblett and Jane Deverson include a less-lousy-than-usual fictionalized interview with a call girl who also happens to be a lesbian, in their version of today's "lost youth", *GENERATION X* (London, Anthony Gibbs, 1964; N. Y., Fawcett Gold Medal, 1965).

1965 brought an increase in humorous lesbian novels. In addition to touches of humor in some of the above-mentioned titles, there were three novels entirely given to the comic approach.

BEWARE AU PAIR by Liselotte Durand (London, Heinemann) is the tongue-in-cheek tale of a naive girl faced with some sophisticated aspects of London, including a lesbian (who makes no passes) and a charming pair of gay boys. Fun and games.

Louise King, the top humorist in the homosexual literature field, continues the mad adventures of Miss Moppet, her lover Lillian Richardson, and their woebegone guardian and mentor Maurice Soule Calhoun, in *THE VELOCIPED HANDICAP* (London, Michael Joseph, 1965; N. Y., Doubleday, 1966). Those who loved *THE DAY WE WERE MOSTLY BUTTERFLIES* have no doubt already flown to their bookstores for this one.

THE GIRL FROM PARIS by Jessamy Morrison (London, W. H. Allen) was probably meant to be satire. But satire should not pack so many belly laughs, nor quite so much pathos. When you say your prayers tonight, ask God to deliver you from *THE GIRL FROM PARIS* - or any like her.

(Concluded next month)

DOB Scholarships for Women

Daughters of Bilitis, Inc. announces the fourth annual Blanche M. Baker Memorial Scholarships. For the 1966-67 school year, there are three scholarships of \$200.00 each, to be awarded one each by DOB's three chapters.

These scholarships are open to any woman over 21 who is attending or planning to attend a trade school, business school, university, or college, either full or part time. The deadline for filing applications is May 15, 1966. For application forms and further information, write to any of DOB's three chapters (see inside back cover for addresses).

Daughters of Bilitis welcomes contributions to the scholarship fund, for future awards.

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: 3470 Mission St., San Francisco, Calif.

New York Chapter: P. O. Box 3629
Grand Central Station
New York 17, New York

Chicago Chapter: P. O. Box 4497
Chicago, Illinois

DAUGHTERS OF BILITIS, INC.

3470 Mission St., San Francisco, Calif.

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) _____

DOB NATIONAL CONVENTION

The Rt. Rev. Bishop James A. Pike of the Episcopal Diocese of California heads the growing list of speakers for the Fourth National Convention of the Daughters of Bilitis, Inc. Bishop Pike, known all over the world for his outspoken advocacy of civil rights and for his forward-thinking in the theological realm, will be the luncheon speaker.

At this stage in planning, the convention program is scheduled to deal with problems encountered by the lesbian and the male homosexual in relating to the larger community. Tentatively, the morning session will be devoted to discussion of how the homophile organizations have endeavored to relate. The afternoon will give representatives of the larger community a chance to indicate what the homophile movement has done right and/or wrong, and how it can better serve the goal of integrating the homosexual into society.

Cost of the one-day meeting, which includes lunch and the banquet, is \$15.00 per person. Reservations may be made for \$5 down, with the balance in two installments of \$5 each, to Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., 3470 Mission St., San Francisco, Calif.

August 20, 1966

Jack Tar Hotel, San Francisco