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Certain statements in the majority opinion and the full weight of the dissenting opinion of the case Edelman v. California (344 U. S. 357), indicate that the Supreme Court of the United States may hold section 647 (5) of the California Penal Code invalid if the issue of constitutionality is reasonably presented. Doubts have been expressed with regard to the statute in the past; but the California State courts have consistently upheld its validity. Before an attempt is made to analyze the recent pronouncements of the Supreme Court, the history and interpretation of the statute will be traced from a critical viewpoint.

The History of the Statute

Vagrancy defined as a person's roaming from place to place without useful purpose was not originally a common law offense. It is based on English enactments dating back to the Statute of Labourers in 1349.

About This Article

Attorney Henry Silver of Los Angeles is a prominent member of the Bar of that city. The article published here with the special permission of the writer, first appeared in the Los Angeles Daily Journal, legal newspaper. Extensive research went into the preparation of this work, because the author views the operation of the California statute as a threat to civil liberties of all persons. Similar statutes are in force in most states.

3. Edward Abbot Parry: Vagabonds All.
usage of the statute immediately suggests that a certain character or character trait of a person is made a criminal offense. This is borne out by People v. Craig (1907), (152 C. 42, 91 P. 997), involving resistance to an arrest which was declared to be lawful because the misdemeanor was committed in the presence of the police officer. The only thing "committed" in the officer's presence was the arresting officer's knowledge that the defendant had frequented saloons and rented out premises for a house of prostitution—not at the time of arrest but within three months before the arrest.

From there the court went on to say: "And it makes no difference that such a species of vagrancy cannot be committed by a single act observable at one point of time, a series of acts extending over a considerable period of time and only constituting a criminal offense because of their continuance and repetition."

It is obvious then that the offending character constitutes the crime; but that the character has to be proved by a series of acts.

In People v. Scott (1931) (113 C. A. 778, 296 P. 601), inroads were made on the requirement of a multiplicity of acts to prove the character of the defendant. The case involved a woman dancing in the nude at a men's smoker and the court stated after a discussion of the Craig case: "There are however other acts which are of such nature as reasonably to justify an inference that no one not of lewd or dissolute character would do such an act even once." The final logical sequence was reached in People v. Lund (1934), (157 C. A. 781, 27 P. 2d 958). In this case the defendant had not committed any act with clear that the lewd character of a person is the only corpus delicti required by the section without any concern to specific acts.

The Human Character as a Crime

This would seem contrary to the well-established principle—not only in this country but in all Western jurisprudence—that only a voluntary act of commission or omission can be the basis of a criminal offense. Section 15 of the California Penal Code defines a public offense as "an act committed or omitted in violation of a law forbidding or commanding it." Clearly the statement that the "act" of being idle, lewd or dissolute constitutes the offense has no validity, because this is not an act in the common usage of the word nor is it always voluntary. It involves character which, at least in part, is molded by environmental factors completely outside the volition of the individual. To make a distinction between character and status in this case would be only a play with words since the section does not refer to relationships with other people or outside objects. If the endowment with a certain character or personality is the object of the crime and specific acts have lost even their secondary importance of evincing this type of character or personality, then any distinction between non-criminal opinion, behavior deviation and criminal disloyalty is obliterated. There is nothing to prevent the prosecution of a person for holding unpopular beliefs as long as such beliefs in somebody's opinion make the person lewd and dissolute. It would seem however that to punish a person for having a certain character is not a proper objective of legislative endeavor and that any such statute violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Conduct as to the Offense

Another objection to the lewd vagrancy statute, based on a different aspect of the Due Process Clause, is that the cited section is too vague and indefinite for equal and non-discriminatory enforcement. Little would therefore be gained from a different interpretation or amendment of the section to the effect that idle, lewd or dissolute conduct is required by the section. Only brief comment will be given to the first part of this subsection "idle" and last part "Associate of known thieves." In Re McCue (1908), (7 C. A. 765, 96 P. 893), the court stated: "We are inclined to view that while idleness, whether it be of the "idle rich" or "idle poor" is a prolific source of crime, still it is not competent for the legislature to pronounce mere inaction as a crime without some qualification."

While a mere dictum in that case, it was reluctantly distinguished and therefore recognized in Re Cutler (1934), (112 C. A. 2d, 273, 36 P. 441). In the same manner it can hardly be conceived how it would be competent for the legislature to embark on the enterprise of selecting associates for the citizens of this State. In Ex Parte Smith (135 Mo 223, 33 L. R. A. 606), the court struck down a mere definitive statute claiming it to be as "unjust and unreasonable for a legislative body to undertake to forbid certain associates as to command with whom one should associate." People v. Belcastro (1934), (356 Ill. 144, 190 N. E. 301), followed the same reasoning. If this part of the section is to remain on the statute book, guilt by association would become a fully accepted legal principle.

Lewdness and Dissoluteness

This then brings us to a discussion of the terms "lewd" and "dissolute," the piece de resistance of the section. Re McCue, supra, interprets the terms as follows: "Lewdness and dissoluteness—terms used interchangeably, but each of which applies to the unlawful indulgence of lust whether in public or private." The court then cites Ex Parte Tuttle, (91 C. 590, 127 P. 934), for a definition of unlawful lust: "Any practice the tendency of which, as shown by experience, is to weaken or corrupt the morals of those who follow it." The definition is thereby reduced to the tautology: lewd is what is against the morals. The dictionary definitions of the terms as lascivious, licentious and libidinous are not of much help either.
It is in the nature of such a sweeping prohibition that a judge or juror who is looking for objective standards is faced with insurmountable difficulties, while arbitrary tendencies are fostered by unlimited discretion. The concept of lewdness and dissoluteness is an omnibus wide enough to accommodate almost any violation of criminal law, and maybe of morals and religion as well; it makes the entire penal code superfluous except for the degree or punishment and procedural matters. The judge or juror failing to find objective standards to guide him through the immensity of socially disapproved conduct creates his own standards. The judicial function became legislative in each instance. And while the intellect of the judge or juror is so occupied, a strong appeal to his emotions is made by the highly charged words connoting sexuality to put the stamp of approbation on a socially harmless but different pattern.

The same lack of objectivity marks the singular defense of reform which is recognized in this crime and which is as vague as the crime of vagrancy itself. Again there are only individual standards or idiosyncrasies to judge when a person has abandoned lewdness and embraced decency. Until he reforms, the defendant is in constant jeopardy of being arrested, tried and convicted innumerable times for the same offense. Also, the customary distinctions between acts of preparation, attempt and completed crime lost their importance in the concept of dissolution.

One may wonder about the significance of a statute that first declares a "lewd" person to be a vagrant before it proceeds to give the penalty of the crime. Certainly the explanation that this type of offense is usually committed by persons who roam over the country is not true under present conditions if it was ever true in the past. Immoral acts are committed by the statutory as well as by the nomads, and such acts may be punished under the doctrine of Re McCue regardless whether they are done in public or private. It would seem that a statute that sets out to outlaw one type of crime and then punishes for another type has no real or substantial relation to its objective.

The apologists of the statute have pointed out what is summarized in Re McCue as follows: "To say that the legislature must specify the many civil and corrupt practices which might constitute one a lewd or dissolute person, would often render the enforcement of a police regulation in connection therewith impossible, and this without considering the indecency and impropriety of expression which would often be necessary." It would seem however that before a regulation can be enforced, one has to know how this regulation is violated at the risk that the disclosure would be indecent. Law deals with human conduct in its totality and not with only certain delicate phases, in the same manner as medicine does not distinguish between delicate parts of the human anatomy. And it is only fair to inform a person confronted with imprisonment of the specific act for which society exacts the drastic penalty.

Since a conviction under this subsection carries a verdict against the entire personality of the offender, it has the effect of ostracising him in the community, more than any felony conviction could accomplish. In addition, section 290 of the California Penal Code requires everybody convicted under this subsection to register with the sheriff or chief of police.

The uncertainty of acts and facts leaves the offense shrouded in mystery and arouses the curiosity and imagination. A business or professional career is easily destroyed if the conviction receives any publicity at all, because "vagilew"—as the parlance of the police station refers to it—looms in such sinister proportions. This may be one of the reasons why comparatively few cases reach appeal courts even when they involve persons of substantial means; another reason is the reluctance of many lawyers to represent clients in "messy" cases.

The Supreme Court's View

The recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Edelman v. California (344 U. S. 357), may lead to an entire reevaluation of the vagrancy law by the California State Courts. The facts underlying the decision are as follows: The defendant made political speeches of radical nature in a public park and solicited funds to carry on his work of propaganda. He was convicted and appealed. The constitutional issue was then raised for the first time. There was a substitution of attorneys and through inadvertance of the court clerks the new attorney was not notified of the time of appellate hearings and had no opportunity to present oral argument. The judgment was affirmed and defendant's subsequent petition for recall of the remittitur was denied. Certiorari was then taken to the U. S. Supreme Court apparently on the grounds: 1. Violation of the Due Process Clause because the defendant was denied an opportunity to present oral argument at appeal; 2. Violation of the Equal Protection Clause infringed by discrimination enforcement practices; 3. Denial of Due Process because of vagueness of the statute. The Supreme Court held the first two charges without foundation and then went on to say that the question of invalidity of the statute was not properly before the court because it was not seasonally presented in accordance with the requirements of State law and because the remedy of State corpus was still available under the doctrine of Re Bell (190 2n 488, 210 P. 2n 78, 80). There is a note of regret in the language of the decision for the "inability to decide petitioner's claims on the merits, whatever may be their appeal" and also in the statement: "We granted certiorari because of serious questions raised as to the validity of the vagrancy statute and its application to petitioner." The minority opinion is outspoken in its condemnation of the statute: "It would seem a matter of supererogation to argue that the provision of this vagrancy statute on its face and as enforced against petitioner is too vague to meet the safeguarding standards of due process of law in this country." The dissenting opinion also refers to Lamonn v. New Jersey (306 U. S. 431) where the court struck down as unconstitutional a statute which in many respects resembles the California vagrancy section.

The reading of the Supreme Court decision suggests the following methods and points of importance in order to obtain a final test of the validity of the cited subsection. First the jurisdiction of the trial court can be challenged since an unconstitutional statute is no statute at all and confers no jurisdiction, Ex Parte Siebold (100 U. S. 371). The defendant can independently from appeal proceed on habeas corpus under the doctrine of Re Bell, supra.
If habeas corpus is denied in the State courts, the writ can be brought in the federal courts. Since every person unlawfully restrained in his liberty may prosecute the writ, it would appear that a defendant on probation can also avail himself of the remedy. Re. Marzoe (1945), (256 2d 294 P. 2d 873) held that a prisoner on parole is not free from legal restraint and habeas corpus is the appropriate remedy to test its legality. There is no difference between parole and probation in the matter of restraint.

It would be very desirable to obtain a clear determination of the constitutionality of the California lewd vagrancy provision which in the opinion of the writer is anachronism of medieval law and a menace to civil liberties.


Hate, even of those who are hateful, is seldom a useful emotion. It is better to try to understand them, to see what has made them what they are, and what would make them better . . .

There are two ways of viewing human beings: The emotional and the scientific. The emotional view is right, if we can love and admire them. If we cannot, it is better to view them as products of circumstances, as the result of causes going, perhaps, far back into the past and as capable of being changed by other causes.

But among the causes that bring improvement, hatred and censure are not included. I doubt whether any criminal has ever become a better man because he knew that he was viewed with horror.

About This Article

The author of "Quatrefoil" and "Derricks," James Barr, lives in a small mid-Western town. With keen insight, he tells here in an article written especially for this issue of Mattachine Review how he faced the inevitable remarks and glances which he had to face when he resumed residence in his community after publication of a gay book.
instinctive desire to avoid unpleasantness for everybody. Thanks to gossipy postal employees, long distance operators and FBI men, checking me for naval security clearance, a previous visit of a few months duration, had made me an object of no small curiosity. My books were known and presumably my supposed sexual aberrations the source of lively speculation and the usual basic attempts at humor, though never in the hearing of the family, who, fortunately, have always preferred their own company in the privacy of their homes to considerable social intercourse with any group. Because my appearance on the scene did cause some family tension, my aloofness was approved and encouraged. The townspeople who had made up their minds about my stay among them seemed to be divided into two camps, neither very hostile to the other. On one hand, the charitable said, "Isn't it a shame! He might have been thus and so, but for this horrible disease." On the other, the more malicious chuckled, "You see! No matter who they are, they can sire freaks the same as anyone else!" Encounters were to be expected, and they happened, and because I felt rather like a mouse whose every action was being watched with hawklke ferocity, I knew I must make my defense cautiously, which probably saved me extreme embarrassment on many occasions.

The first attack, in the form of a vitriol, came from the local banker, a typical glad-hander, and hence the town's first citizen. Before some half dozen people one morning, he said to me, "I guess you had a pretty bad time before they let you out of the Navy this time, didn't you?"

I replied there had been some friction and went back to my business with the teller behind the grill.

Encouraged by the grins of the farmer folk about him, the banker moved in-closer. "Those FBI men asked some of the funniest questions," he winked at someone over my shoulder. "About your politics and how many girl friends you ever had around here."

I said nothing, but he continued, "Guess they're getting pretty choosy about their officers in the Navy anymore, aren't they?"

Usually I never think of proper retorts until they're too late, but luck must have been with me that day to cause me to say, "For a man whose son is only two years my junior and has yet to serve one day in the defense of his country, I think you're on a very risky subject, sir."

The man grew pale and for a few seconds I thought I had a fight on my hands, but he turned and walked back to his office and slammed the door. Americans still love to see a bully stopped, even if it is by a sexual deviate, it would seem.

There were a few other episodes in which I didn't fare so well, but as the months passed and my public behavior remained as exemplary as it usually is, I was accepted for there was nothing sensational for their curiosity to feed upon. I think the people had begun to realize that whatever I was, I was not some sort of tabloid monster that might prey on their school children or catapult the name of their town into infamy with an outbreak of a Jekyll-Hyde nature.

On the positive side of the ledger, I noticed increasing signs of friendliness. People nodded, then spoke, commented on the weather (of which Kansas always has too much) and at last asked me to share coffee or beer with them. I never refused, for it had suddenly occurred to me that I had before me an excellent laboratory in which to observe the social relations between homo and heterosexual individuals. I started keeping notebooks and as my interest in my fellow townspeople grew, their acceptance of me seemed to increase. In spite of being a kind of Puddinhead Wilson, I was one of them.

Last spring a candidate for county sheriff asked me to write him some publicity stories for the local papers. Later, the county commissioner asked me to serve as a judge on the local election board. About the same time, I was named for possible jury duty, until it was learned I do not believe in capital punishment.

But the most colorful indication of cordiality came from a seventy year-old lady. She called me one afternoon, identified herself and asked bluntly, "What do you know about Plato?"

I told her very little, other than his famous Republic had been successfully paralleled with both Fascism and Communism, and that he had practiced the vilest literary deceit by putting his own views into the mouth of Socrates to give them added credence.

"Can you prove that," she asked.

"I think so, if Russell and H. G. Wells are good enough for you."

She said they were, and asked me if I would like to become a member of a Great Books discussion group she attended in a small city fifty miles away. Having heard excellent reports of the work of this foundation, I accepted the invitation. During the drive to the first meeting, she told me, apropos of nothing and in her most casual manner, that she had seen Oscar Wilde here in the Midwest. (Checking later, I found his train had passed through a town in which she had lived as a girl and the citizenry had viewed him, flowing cape, flowing hair and all.) As if to relieve the personal implication of this bit of information, she told me she had also seen Sarah Bernhardt's Joan of Arc. (After the performance, she had been one of twenty or so young ladies who trouped across the stage, each to present to the divine Sarah, who leaned against a large white horse, a prairie flower, and Pavlova dance The Swan.

I asked her what Sarah Bernhardt was like. She replied, "Oh, she was dark, and very foreign looking." Inadequate as the answer was, for an instant the old lady, in trying to extend her understanding, had brought me very close to that age from which I am often accused of being a leftover. I was grateful.

Thus, I am rediscovering the mores of the American small town, but this time as an alien. In some ways I like the position better than being taken for granted as one of their group. Certainly I am proving in a small way theories of social toleration and respect that I would not have guessed possible ten years ago. It is a dangerous business, for where there is great ignorance there is a great potential violence, but who can say how close I am in this experience to that future time when the sexual deviate will be understood and integrated with equality into society throughout the land?

Just the other day, a wheat farmer stopped me on the street. He'd seen a television program about, "this fellow Freud" he said, "who believed everything we do is a result of sex!" He looked at me as if I might have looked at a flying saucer that
had been parked in my back yard for a month, and asked, "What do you think of that?"

I told him that I believed Freud had made one of the most important discoveries in our civilization, and that it was true that Freud had reduced some things to sex, and others to family.

The farmer nodded vaguely. "This television program said if we understood sex, we'd understand why we act like we do."

I agreed, and underwent another close scrutiny as he drawled, "It sure gives you something to think about, doesn't it?"

Keeping a straight face, I made a note to start watching more television. When men such as this publicly converse with known homosexuals and listen with interest to the teachings of Sigmund Freud, sexual tolerance is ready for its first great march, in spite of the many reactionary road blocks which will always impede all necessary progress. In the meantime, to quote my friend, "It sure gives you something to think about, doesn't it?"

...an open letter to SEN. DIRKSEN

TO: Senator Everett M. Dirksen
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Dirksen:

Because I have admired you and applauded your career as a great Republican from a State which has meant much to me, I trouble to write you this letter. I write, not only for myself however, but as a self-appointed spokesman for a large group of misunderstood and maligned people, a group to which you referred in your speech before the Republican women on September 22.

We are citizens of this country, we carry the blood and traditions of many great countries and races, and we share the American Dream; that is, we share it until it is discovered that we are homosexual.

Your reference to homosexuals, and the manner in which you classified us, does not perhaps distinguish you from other high Government authorities. But because your speech was made close to home, and was quoted in the local press, it is to you I write my words of protest.

Government employees are being fired as security risks when it is discovered that they are homosexual. Speaking for myself, while I am not a government employee, I cannot be bought, frightened, or blackmailed into revealing information the confidential nature of which I am morally charged with protecting. Speaking for the millions of other homosexuals, the same can be said for them as individuals in the same proportions that it can be said for heterosexuals.

In short, Senator, homosexuals are not homosexual 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. We are not distinguishable from heterosexuals.
people in any visible way. It has been established, by psychological research at the Langley-Porter Clinic in San Francisco, and at the University of California at Los Angeles that we are no more unreliable, unstable or dangerous than heterosexuals, except as individual products of our circumstances of birth, early training and youthful experiences in a worldy world would lead or cause us to be. The most prejudiced person must surely, if subconsciously realize that the same is true of heterosexual people.

I know of my own personal knowledge, Senator Dirksen, that the government of the United States, in the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches is heavily staffed with wonderful men and women who are homosexual. I know of my own personal knowledge that the United States Army, the Air Force, the Navy and the Marine Corps are heavily staffed, from Generals and Admirals to privates and ordinary seamen, with homosexual people. It was hinted at in the Army-McCarthy investigations, and I suspect suppressed for political reasons.

Thousands of graves in France, many many more graves on South Pacific Islands and beneath the seas, contain the sad remains of men who were brave soldiers, airmen, sailors and marines first and homosexuals second. They were no less brave, they did no less to win the war for democracy than did their heterosexual compatriots. But the democracy for which they did fight and die, and still fight and still die, and will yet fight and yet die, denying them and us our rights as individuals, and classifies us with "wreckers, destroyers, security risks, blabbermouths, drunks, traitors and saboteurs."

There are all of those things among us, true, but there are also all of those things among the heterosexual population of the wonderful United States. Our hearts do not beat less fast at the excitement of a political rally such as the one for Eisenhower at which you spoke so sonorously on September 22 because we are homosexual. Our tears do not flow less freely that yours at the loss of husbands, sons and brothers in warfare with Communism because we are homosexual. Our hearts are not less full of pride and honor at the sight of massed American flags because we are homosexual. We do not work less hard for America, or love her less, or support the Republican administration and policies less whole-heartedly because we are homosexual.

I personally have worked long and hard for good government generally and the Republican Party specifically. I am widely known as a devoted and dedicated Republican, and the fact that I am homosexual has nothing to do with it. Yet I cannot, by law, be employed by the government I serve and love if it is known that I am homosexual.

God has granted you a distinguished political career, for which He is to be thanked. But He has denied you the compassion which is the hallmark of a truly great man. Can not you and the many other intelligent men in high public office retain your prestige and serve your constituency without public reference to the private tragedies of millions of people? For make no mistake, Senator, homosexuality is a tragedy, not inherently, perhaps, but because the unenlightened have made it so. To earn a living we integrate with the heterosexual population by donning a false gar-

(Continued on page 19)
Lesbian Research Interviews Completed

Last of 30 interviews from female homosexuals has been taken at Los Angeles by Dr. Vita Sommers, research psychologist, and her 2 assistants. This special study into aspects of inversion among women is being conducted with aid of 2 advanced students at University of Southern California; Howard Russell and Mrs. Virginia Armond. Research department of Mattachine Society has cooperated with them in obtaining necessary interviews. Results when correlated and released by research team will be published in future issues of Mattachine Review.

Trans-Sexuals Speak at San Francisco

Highlights of personal experiences of 1 of 11 trans-sexuals in U. S. were told to recent discussion group at San Francisco with female speaker stating she was 1 of 3 adult persons whose sex had been legally changed by surgeons in this country (remaining 8 underwent surgery in foreign countries). Notes of her talk are being prepared for future article in this magazine.

Single Discussion Group Formed

In order to obtain greater interest with pooled effort, Mattachine Society chapters at Los Angeles last fall combined in sponsorship of monthly discussion group programs. At present, forums are held on 2nd Wednesdays each month; on other dates during month, individual chapters hold own regular business meetings.

Appeal in Progress in Siade Case

Hearing in higher court is being pushed at Los Angeles by attorneys in case of People v. Siade. Recently turned over to this cause was Society's special fund of almost $300, collected to help obtain appeal for defendant facing charges which were, in mind of Society's Legal department, unjust because they contained gross violations of civil rights and due process of law.

Two Long Beach Chapters Active

Public relations projects and lively discussion groups hold attention of chapters 102 and 103, which make up Long Beach Area Council. Listing of this area council in directory (page 30) was inadvertently omitted; however, reports from members there indicate activity and interest are high. Address of Long Beach Area Council is Post Office Box 1232, Long Beach, Calif.

Membership–At–Large Announcement Coming

In response to many inquiries from all over U. S., Board of Directors at Los Angeles will soon announce plan for admitting members–at–large to Mattachine Society. Story of this plan will appear in next issue of Mattachine Review.

Trend to Area Council Leadership

In Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco, trend toward centralization of Society activities on Area Council level has become evident during year just ended. This means that chapters in metropolitan areas have generally begun to specialize in 1 distinct phase of Society's program, working together under direction of Area Council, such as committees function in other organizations. Chief benefits from such cooperative effort are minimal aid on projects, more thorough grasp of ultimate Mattachine goals, less wasted effort and competition. For most part, chapters in each named area chose 1 of following fields for concentrated effort on area basis: Publications (including area newsletters); Research (including bibliography projects); Public Relations; Education; Legal, and Social.

Monthly Dinner Meetings Scheduled at San Francisco

Combined business meetings of Alpha, Beta and Gamma chapters at San Francisco, together with Oakland and Berkeley chapters, have become a monthly event beginning with dinner in 1 of the Bay area's fine restaurants. Increased interest and attendance from the area's 30-plus members, plus advisors and friends, has resulted. Monthly Area Council meetings, public discussion forums and special chapter work sessions will continue. Discussion groups meet at center of American Friends Service Committee on 1st Thursday evening each month at San Francisco.

Chicago Area Chapters Conduct Rorschach Test Project

In late 1954, research project No. 1 for Chicago area got under way with testing sessions for 37 male homosexuals who submitted to Rorschach's "ink blot" test, given by a doctor in that city. Due to its long and widespread use, this test is one of our most standardized methods of indirect psychological testing. Raw data (i.e., verbatim record of subject's responses) and interpretation of results will be presented upon request to professional persons when completed. However, research committee chairman at Chicago expects no findings will be complete for several months.

The First Great Gift We Can Bestow on Others Is a Good Example

--- Morell
OPEN LETTER
(Continued from page 14)

The day has come when we must make the choice of either adhering to our national ideology or to our nature. We may not deny the fact that we are what we are. We may not be otherwise. Is it American and democratic to cause a man to deny what God has made him? I am sure you'll agree it is not.

We know we cannot change or even materially influence public and political opinion about homosexuality. But within your lifetime, Senator, if it has not already done so, there will come to your attention a slow but steady trend toward public acceptance of a condition which is as old as mankind and has existed in all times and in all places.

As a politician, I suppose, carries a certain obligation to work for personal popularity by public denunciation of that which one believes to be publicly unpopular.

I have set before thee a door opened.—(Revelations 3:8.)

There are no closed doors between you and God. His love, forgiveness, and great tenderness. Always, ever, the door stands open—you need only to go forward in faith to enter into the good life. It is we who need to open the doors of our minds and souls, cleansed of evil and selfishness, to receive God's blessings.

Only keep this in mind—homosexuals vote too, in greater numbers than you can possibly know. Their homosexuality does not cause them to espouse any ideology or ism which is out of keeping with their individual training, growth and experiences. You cannot know, this, of course, if you are heterosexual.

Open your mind and heart, Senator, like the distinguished American you are, and if you truly believe in the principles of democracy and personal liberty, do not again, publicly or privately, class homosexuals as you did before the Republican women. Many of those women have homosexual sons and daughters. Some of them know it and some of them don't but one of God's noblest creatures is a mother who has been able to accept and understand the fact of her children's homosexuality.

If one whose heart is as close to it as the mother of a homosexual can understand it, our request that people in your position try to understand it does not seem unreasonable.

Special privilege we do not want and would not accept. Equal rights under the law we want and will fight for. Please don't make our fight, already a heart-breaking one, more difficult.

Sincerely yours,
(Name Withheld)
THE literature on homosexuality is filled with attempts to describe the homosexual as belonging to one or several types of personality structure. Most, if not all of these descriptions are based on clinical patients. In an effort to obtain a wide sample of homosexuals as possible—of non-clinical patients—the Mattachine Society assembled a group of 74 individuals, all males, in the summer of 1953, for the purpose of participating in a battery of psychological tests. One of these tests was the Chicago Inventory of Beliefs, which was designed to single out three major types of personality syndromes. It was used by permission of George G. Stern. The results reported here are the results of that test alone (out of the total battery administered).

The three major types of syndromes of personality, with their distribution in the group of 74 homosexuals, follows:

(1) The S type is characterized according to Stern by a rigid, conforming and orderly behavior, and by absolute acceptance of authority. For this individual, personal relations are depersonalized, that is, he seeks gratification of his needs in personal relations without regarding the needs of the other individual as a person. Other individuals become means to the exploitation of his own ends. One percent of the homosexuals tested belong to this type. This means that, if we can generalize from this group of 74 to the total homosexual group) homosexuals do not conform, do not accept authority, and do not depersonalize their relationships. Only a small percentage do.

(2) The second syndrome, the N, is the extreme opposite of the S group, and is characterized by "highly individualized and personalized social relationships, pervasive rejection of authority, rich and spontaneous impulse life, flexible, non-conforming and labile behavior" (Stern). Thirteen percent of the homosexual group do fall in this category.

(3) The R syndrome is independent of both the S and the N syndromes and includes individuals who are interested in ideas rather than persons, "maintain social relations which are distant and impersonal" and are "passive and restrained in impulse employing disinterested intellectualization and abstraction as a buffer and defense" (Stern). Sixteen percent fall in this category—the largest percentage of the three.

Thus, 30% of the total group can be classified in the three major categories described above. In addition, 30% do not fall in any category which is classifiable in the Stern system. The remaining 40% are found in borderline positions, mostly close to the N and R types. What conclusion can we draw from this?

Very tentatively, we may conclude that:

(1) Homosexuals vary widely in personality structure, and do not constitute a distinct group. Homosexuality is not a distinct clinical entity.

(2) The largest clustering of individuals is found in, or bordering on, the R type. What at first may seem surprising is that these individuals are interested in ideas rather than persons, maintain distant and impersonal relationships, and are restrained in impulse. I believe there are two ways of accounting for this picture. We must remember that this group may not be typical of the homosexual who appears in the clinical situation. These individuals are, for the most part, members of an organization which seeks to "develop a homosexual ethic" and to behave in ways acceptable to heterosexual society (except for sexual object choice). They have given considerable time and energy to the development of an organization—a fact which may make them atypical of the total homosexual group. Secondly, it may be that many homosexuals are not primarily interested in personal relationships, but are interested in ideas. I would hazard a guess that successful homosexuals who have
despite, or because of their homosexuality, been able to attain positions of eminence in scientific or artistic fields of endeavor, might tend to fall in this group.

(3) Although it is frequently taken for granted that the homosexual is a non-conformist, universally rejecting authority, these findings show that such non-conformity is not necessarily generalized. Non-conformity in sexual patterns may be accompanied by complete conformity in other attitudes and behaviors.

In conclusion, it should be stressed that the problem of male homosexual typology is a very difficult and perplexing one, and that its solution will not be found by the use of a single testing instrument such as the one used in this study. It may, and I hope it will be found by intensive clinical social studies of individuals and groups in the total homosexual culture.

in the next issue

In North Carolina, an attorney who has studied all aspects of statutes relating to the "crime against nature," has recommended that these laws be replaced by a modern, simplified code. Protection for society against those activities considered harmful and detention of persons capable of dangerous antisocial behavior are called for in the recommended new code. A critical review of the article has been written by another attorney in Washington, D. C., exclusively for the next issue of Mattachine Review.

From Pennsylvania, attention has been given to the circumstances and developments of the trial of John D. Provoo, whose conviction for treason and life sentence were reversed by the U. S. Court of Appeals in New York. An article in the next issue will bring into sharp focus the court's unanimous decision that the government had no right to cross-examine the former army sergeant on a collateral issue of homosexuality.

Aspects of the causes and conditions of sex variation related to medicine and religion will appear in other articles, together with the first installment of a challenging story of "Sex in the World of Tomorrow."

Flight from Masculinity....

IT'S PART OF THE PRICE OF CULTURAL PRESSURE

(By Frederick E. Kidder, M.A., Graduate Student, Department of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley.)

(Sex and Morality, by Abram Kardner. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1954. 266 pp. $3.00)

The distinguished clinical professor of psychiatry at Columbia University, Dr. Abram Kardiner, here extends the exploration of sex customs in two dimensions not studied by Freud or Kinsey: sex custom in relation to the total social context and—in terms of motion—how sex custom changes and why.

Since "the whole question of sex morality pivots about the behavior of the female, not the male," Kardiner looks at the changing role of women in Western society and points out the effect that the rise of feminism and the female quest for "self-fulfillment" have had on moral standards and sexual custom.

He analyzes in detail and with the perception characteristic of his five books and numerous articles, prostitution, homosexuality, and the "flight from masculinity." He considers Kinsey's work on the male "valuable because the unit of study was better standardized;" the one on the female is "wholly misleading."

In a concluding chapter he sets forth his own ideas on how to regulate sex custom so that it serves the ends of social expediency and does not jeopardize personal happiness. In so doing he does not duplicate in any way the analyses of Isabel Drummond (1) or Seward Hiltner (2),
although some of his suggestions parallel theirs.

Kardiner's views on homosexuality are only very incompletely indicated in the following quotations: "All homosexuality can come only through the developmental route... It is not contagious. It does not pass from person to person. It grows from a social condition that strikes those who have a developmental vulnerability and an acquired weakness in masculinity."

"Homosexuality is a perversion that for ages has been treated with penal measures. The fact is, that with a willing partner it is no more damaging socially than is coitus with a female. The case is different when the partner is unwilling, but, except in rare cases, homosexuals do not pursue unwilling partners. The only damage that might come to society from homosexuality would be a rise in its incidence so high as to endanger procreation. Notwithstanding a considerable increase in male homosexuality, there is little danger of its affecting the birth rate materially.

"The massive increase in homosexuality is a symptom of grave social dislocation... we know now that terrorism is not the implement to use, and tolerance for homosexuality is indifference and has nothing to contribute to the solution of the problem. Homosexuality is a part of the price exacted by the pressures of Western civilization today and it cannot be treated as a local excrescence; it is a systemic disease and requires systemic treatment."

Clearly Kardiner's views give little aid and comfort to two groups in our society. On the one hand, the complacent, asocial variant who often takes refuge in a supposed biological basis for his deviation is confronted with the fact that that deviation is largely the result of social and developmental forces which can be dealt with, if there is sufficient motivation, in a way in which biological factors could not be controlled. If the variant rejects modern knowledge and is unhappy or antisocial, it is pretty largely his own fault.

On the other hand, the self-appointed moral crusaders who would castigate, persecute and extirpate the sex variant like a weed in a social garden are told that their would-be victims are not evolutionary freaks, but products of family and social forces. Therefore, violence would not materially reduce the deviation and would only work gross injustice on

human beings.

For both groups and all of us, minority and majority, the only reasonable course lies in self- and social-understanding. "For our survival," says Kardiner, "depends on how willing we are to engage in a little self-knowledge and self-direction."

(2) Sex Ethics and the Kinsey Reports. Association Press, 1953.

As a national educational and research agency on behalf of the sex-variant, The Mattachine Society is faced with many problems not necessarily common to other organizations of this type that delve into less emotional and complex subjects. The Society must, therefore, govern its actions to fit the realities of this particular situation, knowing that even the truth if not crammed down peoples' throats.

Our problems arise from the problems of individuals—both those who, for explanatory purposes, might be termed the non-sex-variant and the others who might be termed the sex-variant. We must attempt to awaken both of these groups awareness of higher personal and social values. Reckless and unjust actions on the part of one individual in either group weakens both groups and is a danger to himself as well. All must condition themselves to act and react intelligently and with forethought of the consequences so that it becomes a habit.

The success of this conditioning depends on a long process of teaching oneself to live with others who are individuals just as yourself, with individual traits, habits, desires, drives, etc. We cannot cut ourselves off from our families or our friends, for we are dependent people. Similarly one group cannot organize itself to separate itself
from another and think that its problems are solved.

The further success of this process depends upon the attitude of the individual. If a person has a positive desire to help himself and his fellow man, his activity will be circumscribed by the activity of others. In other words, there is a socially-desirable standard by which we act. To adopt such a standard, one must have the desire to do so. This, then, is the problem, for, even though we may have the knowledge and the skill to apply that knowledge in the correct way, we have accomplished little.

Yes, education to develop constructive attitudes within individuals and thus within groups, can be a problem - but it can be done and it's worth it. What have you got to lose?

K. B.

The importance of you

Coast-to-Coast rumors about the Mattachine Society would lead you to believe some fantastic things.

"I read where the Mattachine organization is seeking $6 million to be used for lobbying and political pressure to change laws," said a youth in a mid-Western city to another recently.

"Yes, the Society has its headquarters in Los Angeles because some rich movie stars are backing it," said someone else to a friend.

Such conversations couldn't be farther from the truth!

Distorted "facts" in so-called "exposé" magazines to the contrary, the Mattachine Society is NOT a big organization; it is NOT endowed by anyone of wealth; it is NOT seeking to become a political pressure group of any sort.

On the other hand, the Mattachine organization IS made up of a handful of members, friends and advisors who recognize the need for spreading accurate information to American people about the problems and true conditions of sex variation. It is chartered as a non-profit corporation for the purpose of aiding research, conducting projects of education, and publication of information which will broaden understanding of these aspects of human behavior for the benefit of the American public.

That's where YOU come in. YOU are the important cog on the drive wheel of the machinery thus far set up by the Mattachine Organization.

This little magazine is the initial effort in creation of a publication which will, in the future, aid the understanding of the homosexual and the sex variant.

Its success, to be sure, first of all will depend on whether or not the material published serves a useful purpose. But secondly, and just as important (because it provides the means), is the support which only YOU can give.

No national publication such as Mattachine Review can long survive unless readers respond with subscriptions. The future of the magazine, therefore, depends entirely upon you, dear reader, and your friends and associates.

The publishers make no pretense this early in the venture of having any magic editorial formula which will please all readers. Such a formula may well be impossible. But the staff does hope that with criticism (which is invited) will come the vital subscription dollars upon which continued existence of the magazine depends.

If you have an interest in the problem, and if you wish to give a vote of confidence to the small but dedicated group of persons who comprise the Mattachine Society in aid of its solution, then subscribe to the Review without delay.

Without such support, the magazine cannot achieve goals set so far. That's how important YOU are in the life of the Mattachine Review!

Mattachine Review

(Rates: $2.50 per year, mailed first class sealed in U. S. and Canada; $3.50 elsewhere. Send subscriptions to the Mattachine Review, P. O. Box 1925, Los Angeles 53, Calif.)
Now that the flushed flesh of night has finished,
And we, subdued, lie in our single bed
Submissive to rest: with all our forces diminished
Except that prime urge, never quieted:
Our mutual cigarette glows to a butt-end of pleasure
And fills the silence
With little cloudy islands
Which in the room-dusk go unregistered...
Just as our communings are felt,
Without word, without measure.

This inhale-exhalation of
Nicotine soothes the fresh cut of love...

This white shaft's end, this scarlet glow
Hanging before us, seems a universe
As compact and inclusive (and no worse)
Than that we make...more real, I wonder
Than the one (O sweet exhaustion!)
We so recently tore asunder?

...and I wonder
If the spent fumes of our important business
So lately large in action, and now pushed under
By this retrospective wiseness...
I mean, how more important is the trace
Of our small conflict in this time and space,
Or how much less, than the brief defeat
Left by this grey ash or two
And its pungent memory of a one-time heat?

--Donal Norton
WHAT ARE DISCUSSION GROUPS?

These meetings, open to the public, are a public relations and educational project of the Society, sponsored for the purpose of accurately informing interested persons of the existence of the Society and its aims, and purposes, and for the public discussion of topics related to these aims and purposes.

WHAT ARE CHAPTERS?

Chapters are the basic membership organizational unit. Any group of four or more interested persons may apply for recognition as a chartered chapter, providing they subscribe to the constitution, by-laws and acknowledged aims and purposes for which the society was formed.

WHAT IS THE SOCIETY'S ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE?

In addition to Chapters and Discussion Groups, an Area Council is set up to coordinate activities of chapters in each principal locality. It is composed of representatives from each chapter concerned. Above this, a seven-member Board of Directors has been formed to guide and channel activities of the several areas of the Society. Its officers are the officers of the General Convention, and are democratically elected by direct vote of Chapter delegates. The number of delegates from each chapter is determined on the basis of chapter membership.

HOW MAY I OBTAIN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION?

For further information regarding the Society write to the Board of Directors or the Area Council nearest you. Their addresses are listed in the Directory on page 30 of this magazine. In the Los Angeles area, persons desiring information may call the Society's telephone answering service, WAndike 1221.

Mattachine Quiz

(Continued from outside back cover)
WHAT IS THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY, INC.?

It is an incorporated organization of persons who are interested in the problem of the sex variant—especially the homosexual—and its solution.

IS IT AN ORGANIZATION OF HOMOSEXUALS?

Emphatically NO. All persons—men and women alike—who are over 21 years of age and interested in the problem and its solution are invited to give cooperation and support. This is NOT an organization attempting to create a "homosexual society" but rather an organization seeking the integration of the homosexual as a responsible and acceptable citizen in the Community. The Society will not tolerate use of itself or its name for any subversive political activity or reprehensible conduct.

WHERE DID IT BEGIN?

Several years ago, a small group of people in Los Angeles formed the nucleus of the present Society. It was formally organized in April, 1953, with a constitution providing for national, area and local levels of the Organization. The Society was incorporated in California on March 23, 1954.

HOW MAY I PARTICIPATE?

Informally, through discussion groups, contributions of financial aid, and generally aiding the program by disseminating accurate information concerning the sex variant; and (Continued on inside back cover)