NEWSPAPER HEADLINES:
The Church and Vice in England
Security Risks in Washington

3 REVIEWS OF PETER WILDEBLOOD'S "AGAINST THE LAW"
Why Americans
Are So Fearful of Sex

By ALBERT ELLIS, Ph.D.

In the whole wide world there is probably no large group of people who are so fearful of sex as are we Americans.

The southern Europeans, such as the French and the Italians, are notoriously freer about many of their sex ways than we are. The northern Europeans, especially the Scandinavians, are often so enlightened about sex that they tolerate illegitimacy on the one hand and homosexuality on the other. The North Africans tend to live in what we would consider a hotbed of sexual vice.

Most Central African and Southern African natives have many customs, including polygyny, which we would look upon with horror. Oriental and Middle East sex beliefs and practices are so much freer than ours in many ways that our modern sex manuals are beginning just recently to catch up with some of the knowledge which for centuries has been recorded in Persian, Hindu, and Chinese texts.

Even the English, from whom our Anglo-Saxon codes of sex conduct primarily stem, are in many ways less fearful of sex than are we. English newspapers and magazines publish details of sex crimes and happenings which would never be allowed in their American equivalents. English sex manuals are not only more outspoken than American sex books but have a proportionately wider sale. The premarital and extramarital behavior of the English girls, as many of our GIs discovered during the last war, is in many respects significantly less inhibited than that of our own girls.

(Cont'd on page 13)
Welfare Council released its report.

In it, sweeping changes of law regulating homosexual acts were recommended.

This issue of the Review is a compilation of significant newspaper clippings from the U. S. and Great Britain. They are presented in full, credited to their source, and given the briefest possible comment.

The Church and Vice

BIG CHANGES IN BRITAIN'S SEX LAWS ARE URGED

S U B S T A N T I A L changes in the laws relating to sex offences are recommended by the Church of England Moral Welfare Council.

These suggestions, published today as a report compiled by the council's study secretary, Dr. Derrick Sherwin Bailey, have been submitted to the Departmental Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution.

The principal suggested changes concerning homosexuality are:

1. Convicted persons should be given advice by clergymen and treatment by doctors and psychiatrists.
2. Women offenders, now outside the law, should be brought within it.
3. Private acts between consenting adults should not be an offence.
4. The law should penalise men and women guilty of offences with children under 17, or whose acts involve violence or a breach of public decency. Spiritual counsel and other treatment would follow conviction in these cases.

Injustice

Also recommended is the dropping of the terms "prostitute," "common prostitute," and "for the purposes of prostitution" from the laws on the grounds that they tend to prejudice court proceedings.

LET ADULTS PLEASE THEMSELVES BUT PROTECT THE CHILDREN AND PUNISH THE WOMEN TOO

The report strongly criticises the present law on homosexuality.

"As it stands it is not even equal in its injustice. While the male is heavily penalised the female is ignored. Yet socially she is just as much at risk. An older woman can dominate a younger and compel her to acquiesce in ways which may ruin her life."

"A thorough-going review is demanded of the principles according to which certain sexual acts are singled out for definitions as legal offences while others, equally harmful, are ignored.

Vital need

"If the law is to penalise sexual offences as crimes it should be done on a logical, equitable, and rational basis.

The council pleads for sympathy and help for the invert.

"This does not mean that anti-social conduct can be condoned or excused. The State must protect, by its laws and its police, the young, and the institution of marriage. But its provisions should be framed and executed equitably. "There is a vital need for further study of the factors which make for sexual maladjustment."

A distinction is drawn between private and public morality.

The State and the law should not be the guardians of private morals. They must punish offences against public morality.

To deal with sin as such is the province of the Church.

What are the causes of homosexuality?

The report quotes and agrees with one invert who said: "Society gets the homosexuals it deserves."

It adds: "By unhappy marriages and homes, by inept handling of youthful problems, by prolonged segregation of the sexes and by war and its consequences, society itself creates just those situations which cause inversion."

What is the cure?

"More than anything else the invert needs good friends. The so-called deterrent effect of the law cannot compare with the positive results likely to accrue from a circle of true friends and the entrance into happy homes."

"But law reform and education of the public cannot themselves solve the problem. It will remain until better marriages, happier family relationships and more settled and secure conditions of life eliminate some of its chief causes."
Reform of laws on homosexuality urged in Oxford

Mr. Peter Wildeblood, author of "Against the Law," urged reform of the British laws against homosexuality when he addressed the Oxford University Crime—a Challenge Club at All Souls College last night.

"I am against this law because I believe it to be hypocritical in conception and cruel in practice. I have suffered under it myself, but I know that thousands of others have suffered more," he said.

"It is for their sakes, for those who have been ruined and for those who have been hounded to their deaths, and for all those nameless ones who live in fear, that I shall continue to fight for its repeal."

The Old Library of All Souls was crowded with undergraduates, who applauded Mr. Wildeblood loud and long before and after his speech. When he began he seemed strongly moved.

Astonished

"I am grateful and astonished to be invited to speak in this University," he remarked. "This is a unique occasion. I ask you to try and think what it means to me."

He said that homosexual activities between consenting adults were illegal only in three countries of Western Europe—Britain, West Germany and Norway.

In West Germany the law was a Nazi survival introduced from political motives in Norway it was a dead letter.

The great majority of the societies and organisations consulted by the Government committee of inquiry into the laws on homosexuality appeared to have recommended changing the law for consenting adults, though opinions differed on what the age of consent should be.

Basis of proposals

These proposals were based on the following views:

That the law was wrong because it attempted to legislate people's private lives—an attempt long since abandoned in all other contexts.

It ignored the definition of a crime—that harm had been done to someone. It led to a great deal of blackmail and to corruption of the police.

It failed in its primary object of protecting youth, and might actually lead to further corruption.

It could never be fairly applied, since there could be prosecutions only in an infinitesimal proportion of homosexual acts. There were in 1953 a total of 1,908 convictions, against a minimum estimate of 650,000 "homos."

Lastly, imprisonment was in no sense a suitable treatment for homosexuals.

Encouraged

"One would think," said Mr. Wildeblood, "that there were quite enough homosexual activities going on without its being considered necessary for such offences to be deliberately encouraged by the police for the purpose of making a subsequent arrest—but that is what happens."

The use of agents-provocateurs was widespread. He quoted newspaper reports of two cases in which the police had been sued for wrongful arrest.

"When one reads of cases like these," he said, "one can't help wondering how many others there have been which have passed unnoticed.

"The reaction of most men wrongly arrested in such circumstances would be to remain silent, but fortunately there are from time to time people with the courage to fight back."

"I have found that in the ordinary way it is almost impossible to convince law-abiding people that such things do go on."

From the Oxford Mail, May 1956

Bogus Police Officer Held

A Honolulu fisherman has confessed he passed himself off as a vice-squad lieutenant to collect $27 "bail" money from a frightened restaurant worker, police said yesterday.

The accused man, Bernal Waiwaiolo, 28, of 1133 Maunakea St., is being held in custody until he puts up $50 bond for himself.

The 35-year-old restaurant worker told Detective Segundo Antonio he was resting on a bench in Waikiki shortly after midnight March 17 when Waiwaiolo accosted him.

He said Waiwaiolo flashed his wallet open and introduced himself as "Lt. Shaffer" of the vice squad.

Then, he said, Waiwaiolo demanded $25 "bail" money with the threat of locking him up.

The victim, frightened and with only $4.50 in his pocket, took a taxicab to his rooming house to borrow the balance of the money. Waiwaiolo, who accompanied the restaurant worker, then demanded another $2.

The victim forked it over.

Waiwaiolo was arrested Saturday morning after a friend of the restaurant worker told police about the incident.

From the Honolulu Advertiser, June 1, 1956:
In Washington

Loyalty Program Ruling

High Court Curtails 'Firing for Security'

WASHINGTON, June 11 (AP) — The United States Supreme Court today sharply restricted the Government's blanket authority to fire Federal Employees under President Eisenhower's three-year-old loyalty-security program.

The court, in its final session of this term, ruled 6 to 3 that an employee can be fired for security reasons only after there has been an official finding that his job affects the national security.


Harlan said the term "national security" as used in a 1950 Congressional act giving heads of certain departments dismissal powers over civilian employees "relates only to those activities which are directly concerned with the Nation's safety, as distinguished from the general welfare."

Clark's dissenting opinion said "the court would require not only a finding that a particular person is subversive but also that he occupies a sensitive job."

"Obviously," Clark protested, "this might leave the Government honeycombed with subversive employees."

The security program was challenged by Kendrick M. Cole, a former inspector in the New York district of the Federal Food and Drug Administration. He was fired on security grounds in January, 1954.

Harlan said in Cole's case no determination actually had been made that his job was affected with the national security as that term was used in the 1950 act. Harlan said Cole's dismissal therefore was not authorized.

From the San Francisco Chronicle, June 13, 1956:

'Security' More Secure

THE United States Supreme Court has held, in a 6-to-3 ruling, that the 1950 National Security Act may properly be invoked only where national security is in fact involved; it has said in effect that a Federal employee is not to be dismissed as a "security risk" unless he has some logical connection with security.

The ruling came in the case of Kendrick M. Cole, inspector in the food and drug administration, who was fired in January of 1954 because he declined to explain certain associations in his private life. There was no evidence or allegation of disloyalty against him—he merely informed his superiors that he intended to go right on associating with any persons or groups of persons he chose.

Cole was, of course, standing on a long-cherished privilege of his American citizenship, but one which was sorely threatened by the latter-day doctrine of guilt by association.

To a considerable extent, the Supreme Court ruling reaffirms the right of most Government employees to choose their friends and associates without endangering their jobs. It prohibits the application of the act to all Federal employees and limits it to those who are "sensitive" or concerned with policy making, or who otherwise directly bear upon the Nation's safety.

This is a sound and sensible reading of security requirements and will go far toward preventing the rash, unjust and arbitrary dismissals that some department heads have resorted to in the name of national security.
Cain Questions Need Of Loyalty Program

Harry P. Cain (R-Wash.) said today there is “serious question” whether a loyalty program is needed for government employees.

The Subversive Activities Control Board member told the Senate constitutional rights subcommittee that not “even a handful” of the 9,600 security risks listed in the last three years by the Eisenhower administration were disloyal.

Cain, a frequent critic of the administration’s security program, said the President showed “deep concern” over the lumping together of loyalty and other security cases.

Telling about his meeting with the chief executive last Thursday, Cain said:

“The President had thought that a clear distinction was being made between the two because although a disloyal person is a security risk, a security risk is seldom a disloyal person.”

He explained that the security tag is applied to persons who “should be fired” for over-drinking or indiscretion or other causes on grounds of “unsuitability” but not security.

Yet, he said, “anyone who leaves the government or related endeavors these days as being a security risk is thought by many to be, in one way or another, disloyal.”

Homosexuals Played With Dolls, Not Baseballs

MEN who became homosexuals played with dolls instead of playing baseball when they were little boys. Only 14 of 102 men studied by a group of New York psychoanalysts played baseball compared to 66 out of 100 other mentally sick patients and perhaps 100% of normal American men.

The psychiatrists, incidentally, could find no evidence that homosexuality existed in any major league ball player although such has appeared in other sports.

In addition to this tendency to stick to feminine games and pastimes as children, the homosexuals studied were sissies in other ways. Their mothers kept them close and had them wear girlish clothing and long curls as small children.

The mothers and fathers did not get along well together. Contrary to general impression, the homosexuals did not love their fathers so much that they tried to remain feminine. Actually the patients studied tended to hate their fathers who had been either hostile or detached.

These trends in the home situation and relations with the parent, the psychoanalysts believe, are significant in leading to homosexuality in men.

The doctors feel optimistic about the chances for homosexual men becoming normal in their sexuality. Of the 102 patients, 15 have recovered in the sense of becoming exclusively heterosexual. Others, the doctors feel, may also recover in this sense when they have had more treatment.

These findings were reported at the American Psychiatric Association meeting in Chicago by the research committee of the Society of Medical Psychoanalysts in New York City, Drs. Irving Bieber, Cornelia B. Wilbur, Alfred H. Rifkin, and Paul Zimmering, all of New York.

Peter Wildeblood’s “Against the Law” was briefly reviewed in the June issue of Mattachine Review. The comment was from a British newspaper, “Truth.”

Here are three more reviews of Wildeblood’s book, presented in trio form because they come from widely different English newspapers, and yet all carry praise for the author and the book.

“The Daily Telegraph,” Wildeblood wrote in a recent letter to the Review, “is extreme right wing; the New Statesman far to the left, and the Listener is an official organ of the BBC—so it’s a good cross-section of opinion.”

The reviews are presented in the order listed above.

The Homosexual and the Law

By Sir BASIL HENRIQUES

Against the Law. By Peter Wildeblood. (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 16s.)

Peter Wildeblood, a highly intelligent, experienced journalist who writes extremely well, has made it his purpose to explain the homosexual to the general public and to change the law. It is his further object to explain the police searching without warrant and to expose some of the evils of a prison sentence, especially between consenting adults.

The author admits that he belongs to no religious denomination. The sinfulness of sexual indulgence outside marriage is not stressed, nor is the power of religion to enable a man to remain continent.

Purpose of Prison

With regard to prison, Mr. Wildeblood says:

“The purpose of prison is not so much retribution as reform; not revenge but cure. It seems only sensible to try and fit a prisoner for a better life when he gets out. It is useless to put a man away for a long period, do nothing to change him, and simply hope that he will have magically transformed himself into a good citizen. Men do change in prison, but seldom for the better.”

The abominable sanitary and washing conditions in Wormwood Scrubs can only have a degrading influence on all the prisoners; it is between consenting adults in private does less harm than adultery or causing an unmarried girl to have an illegitimate child.

Fornication and adultery are sins, but they are not crimes, and sex relationship between consenting adults should, he urges, be treated in the same way. He wholeheartedly condemns those who corrupt youth.

The author admits that he belongs to no religious denomination. The sinfulness of sexual indulgence outside marriage is not stressed, nor is the power of religion to enable a man to remain continent.

Purpose of Prison

With regard to prison, Mr. Wildeblood says:

“arbitrary and unreasonable...”

It seems only sensible to try and fit a prisoner for a better life when he gets out. It is useless to put a man away for a long period, do nothing to change him, and simply hope that he will have magically transformed himself into a good citizen. Men do change in prison, but seldom for the better.”

The abominable sanitary and washing conditions in Wormwood Scrubs can only have a degrading influence on all the prisoners; it is
The Rage of Caliban

Against the Law. By Peter Wildblood. Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 16s. Thirty years ago they used to call prison “the living grave of crime.” When the Wests and C.R.B. wrote Prisoners of Local Government, they could justly say that prison was “a silent world, shrouded, so far as the public is concerned, in almost complete darkness.” Today Sir Lionel Fox, chairman of the Prison Commission, can as justly claim in his book, The English Prison and Probation Systems that the prisons are of little concern to the public. They have become a long list of names with a responsible interest in penal matters—hundreds of voluntary workers, prison visitors, social science and other students who, after a short or long period of work in the prisons, press and radio men and film companies. Prison Governors are required to receive and accommodate all these visitors and their written records. And how much do we know now?

It takes a writer of Mr. Wildblood’s quality, it takes a prisoner of his sensitive conscience, to explain how little a country or a civilization is concerned about the kind of persons it subjects to this contrived and hapless misery; and if they are to be a link in the chain of people who are saddened by the tragedy that is an inmate, the ground in which they are pacified, cranks, deviants or homosexuals there will, at intervals, emerge an account of the “Montagu Trial.”

Against the Law. By Peter Wildblood. Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 16s. By adopting, on his release, a precisely opposite course from the Governor of Winchester Prison as inevitable, Mr. Wildblood has earned the respect of every fair-minded person who reads his book. The author of this writing could easily dull the realisation that each step in the story is reported with what many readers are likely to accept as a painstaking regard for accuracy. The following colloquy, accordingly, is one of uncomfortable importance. One of the police officers who had loudly awakened him at five or six in the morning said that they were “going to search the house”: “He did not, however, produce a warrant. I tried to remember—were they to search a house without a warrant? My numb and frozen mind refused to give me an answer. ‘I must get in touch with my solicitor,’ I said. ‘That can wait. We’ve got plenty of time.’”

And he invites you to consider not merely the position of the suspect under this new revelation of English law but also the value of a “conspiring” charge against him. The inquisitor’s pratfall as they may say to the police in each other’s absence: “Look here, don’t you think you would feel better if you had made a clean breast of it?” “I must get in touch with my solicitor first.” “Well, it’s up to you to decide, not him.” And a few minutes later: “What are you going to do?” “Well, I make it a rule never to make promises: but as you haven’t been in trouble before I should think you’d probably get away with it. The best thing is for you to make a statement. You just clear yourself—don’t bother too much about the others.”

At the trial Mr. Justice Ormerod, having heard the police dismiss all this as lies, decided nevertheless that the long statement written by Mr. Wildblood in response to it might have been made in consequence of a promise of favour and was therefore inadmissible. “The account of the trial, naturally enough, is subjective and episodic, but it gives the high-lights of what must have been an agonising eight days for most of the people involved. The author could be forgiven, perhaps, for seeing the hand of oppression in every detail of court procedure and expedition. For example, the co-defendants, wanting to get women on to the jury (and in this their instinct was sound), found that every juror summoned for service that day was a man. This was almost certainly no accident, but the reason for it was that an all-male jury would be tougher; it was merely that the officials at Assize Courts still think of women as carefully insulated cooks.”

The Judge, unlike so many others, did not say that the convicted men should have been guilty of “professional guilt” but “the medical treatment that your condition is said to demand.” Eighteen months, he said. And Mr. Justice Ormerod interviews with prison psychiatrists, the first of which (on pages 101-2) is hereby commended to the Prison Commissioners for the horrifying possibility that it may be true, while the second (page 143) amounted to an assurance that there must have been a chance of “curing” him if only he hadn’t come to prison at all—while he read smuggled Press cuttings about his trial. They included a comment of Mr. Hannen Swaffer’s, unnoticed by “This England,” that all homosexuals should be treated by psychopaths. The pictures of prison life are unforgettable, their quality unmemorable by this its unaccustomed avoidance of self-pity. “I have believed all my life,” he thought on the way to prison, handcuffed with others in a motor coach, “that for the measure of our sinfulness, no matter how disagreeable, can be made to enrich and illuminate.” Clearly the belief is unshaken. This book is its deliberate, synoptical, and utmost truth.

C. H. ROLPH

Against the Law. By Peter Wildblood.

Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 16s.

BY DAVID MARTIN

We Americans have a deceptive free exterior attitude about sex; but underneath we are children. We pet, as the Kinsey reports show, almost universally. We engage, to a considerable degree, in masturbatory, fornicative, adulterous, homosexual, and other types of sex outlets. But we usually do so quiescantly, stealthily, guiltily. We cannot help our actions, as it were, but we can help our thoughts—and we do help. To the Governor’s
to help them drive us to anxiety, despair, neurosis. We have our sexual
cake, but we don’t really eat it—or we gulp it down in such a manner as to bring on acute indigestion.

The result is considerable frigidity on the part of our females, varying degrees of impotence on the part of our males, and enormous amounts of dissatisfaction, unappeased hunger, and continual sex fear on the part of both.

Why?

Why should I and other psycho-therapists have to spend so much of our time seeing a continuous
succession of disturbed people, most of whom have some serious degree of sexual anxiety?

There are several important answers to these why's:

1. **Americans are specifically taught to be fearful of sex.** During their childhood and adolescence, all the possible dangers, and virtually none of the pleasures, of human sexuality are drummed into their heads and hearts.

   Grim specters of loss of reputation, illegitimate pregnancy, illegal abortion, syphilis, gonorrhea, perversion, physical and emotional breakdown, etc., are ceaselessly thrown at them while they are growing up.

   The idea that sex is good, sex is fun, sex is one of the greatest and most repeatable of human joys is rarely unequivocally brought to their attention. In jokes, yes; in sly asides, of course; in under-the-counter pamphlets and books, certainly. In these indirect and backhanded ways the idea that sex is good, hot, and spicy is slanted across to the average American male and female. But directly and forthrightly? By parents, educators, clergy? Heavens, no! From these respectable sources come cavillings, quibbling, cautionings.

   The result, as I noted in my book *The Folklore of Sex*, is that the American boy and girl, and later the American man and woman, believes that sex is good—**and bad**; tasty—**and nasty**. They are, in a word, conflicted. And conflict means indecision, and doubt—which means fear.

2. **Americans are raised to be overly-competitive about sex.** Our boys and girls are made to feel that, above all else, they must succeed, achieve, win out in the social-sexual game. They must not merely enjoy themselves on their dates and eventually achieve good marriages—nay, they must date the best boy or girl in the neighborhood; be the finest lover for miles around; have the greatest home and family.

   Americans must do all these things, moreover, without any experience to speak of, sans any notable period of learning. If they study arithmetic, French, or engineering, they are of course expected to take awhile to get onto the subject, to learn it. But if they study what is perhaps the most complicated subject in the world—namely, that of getting along well with a member of the other sex—they are somehow supposed to be able to discover all the answers with no learning experience whatever and to make the best possible impression literally from scratch. This, of course, they usually cannot do. They naturally make a certain amount of blunders, errors, mistakes. But each error is considered to be an unforgivable crime. Each time when he misses her mouth and kisses her nose, or she goes a little too far or not far enough in petting, or either of them fails to say the right romantic word when the moon is full; each mistake is considered catastrophic, disastrous.

   This means that the boy and girl soon become afraid to try certain actions or chance certain words. Then, not acquiring any experience or familiarity with taking these actions or saying these words, they become afraid of taking or saying them in the future. Thus arises a vicious circle, where dire fear of making a social-sexual mistake leads to lack of learning, which in turn leads to further fear of ineptness, which in turn leads to further inhibition of learning, and so on to a hopeless eternity.

   This also means that when the boys and girls who keep fruitlessly merry-go-rounding in this manner finally do stumble into marriage, they still have learned relatively little about social-sexual relations, and carry their fears and restraints into their marital relationship.

3. **Americans are brought up to fear tenderness and love.**

   American males, in particular, are raised to be "regular guys" and to avoid "sissified" displays of emotionality. They do not kiss, like the French; throw their arms around, like the Italians; be very warm to their children, like many peoples of the world.

   Even American women are often raised so that they are ashamed to cry openly, to laugh uproariously, to let their hair down in public.

   This means that, in spite of our Hollywood films and romantic novels, we do not allow ourselves to be overly warm, affectionately loving. We often, in fact, try to use sex as a substitute for love: to throw ourselves into a wild necking session because it is easier to say with our lips what we would be embarrassed to say with our lips.

   But love inhibition breeds sex inhibition. As we inhibit and deaden our tender reactions, we also block some of our deepest sex sensations. Love, moreover, is an exceptionally good antidote for all kinds of fear; and to the extent that we have little love, we tend to have more fear—including sex fear.

4. **Americans are generally fearful and often neurotic.**

   We Americans tend to have unreasonable goals and ideals, especially in regard to worldly success and keeping up with the Joneses. We frequently are never weaned from our childhood ideas of grandiosity and refuse to face the harsh realities of life and accept the world as it is. We have seriously conflicting values and philosophies of life—such as the notion that we should be good and kind on the one hand, and ruthlessly make a million dollars on the other.

   Because of our general insecurities, immaturities, and conflicts, we tend to be beset with multitudinous feelings of doubt and inadequacy; and these often lap over into our sexual attitudes. Where general neurosis is epidemic, sexual disturbance cannot be too far away.

   Assuming that Americans, because of reasons like the foregoing, are probably the most sexually fearful of any large group of people in the world, the question arises: Can anything effective be done to make us less panicky in this respect? Certainly: but only if the problem is tackled in all its important ramifications, and not treated as if it were a simple sex problem alone.

   On an individual basis, this means that the sexually disturbed person must promptly seek professional psychological help and must be prepared to examine and understand the innermost layers of his personality before he can expect to solve his problem.

   On a social basis, this means that our sexually disturbed society must also seek, through scientific and clinical research and consultation, all possible professional help and must be prepared to tackle some of its most serious and widespread social issues before it can hope to solve what appears on the surface to be a relatively uncomplicated sex issue.
and now...

COAST to COAST

Area Councils and branch offices of the Mattachine Society are now located in 5 cities across the U. S.—from "Coast to Coast." Interested persons may write to the office listed below nearest to them for newsletters, information about local meetings, and obtain general information booklets and folders.
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