



# **mattachine**

# **REVIEW**

**DECEMBER 1957**

**50c**

***In This Issue . . .***



**Wolfenden Report Spurs Headlines**

**BRITISH PRESS REACTION**

**Varied But Short-Lived**



**From the Convention Rostrum**

**MATTACHINE SYMPOSIUM**



**Is There a Homosexual Personality Type?**

**EVELYN HOOKER, Ph.D.**

**BOOK REVIEWS**

**LETTERS**

**UNNUMBERED**

**PAGE [S]**

*illustrations*

*part of page*

*sequence in text.*

OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

# Mattachine Society, Inc.



## "MUST THE INDIVIDUAL HOMOSEXUAL BE REJECTED IN OUR TIME?"

Three addresses from the recent 4th Annual Convention of the Mattachine Society are published in this issue. Two of them are related to the theme above, and were among five addresses delivered at the afternoon symposium at which the theme was featured.

William A. Baker and Julia W. Coleman, master social workers from San Carlos, Calif., are authors of the papers in this issue. As a team, they counsel individuals and conduct group therapy projects in their community.

Those in attendance at the convention heard Mr. Baker and Miss Coleman, who appeared along with Harry Benjamin, M.D., Alfred Auerback, M.D., and Leo J. Zeff, therapist.

The Review is grateful, indeed to publish the papers of these speakers so that the good fortune of those attending the convention can be shared with readers of the magazine. Future issues will carry additional papers in this series.



# mattachine REVIEW

COPYRIGHT 1957 BY THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY, INC.

THIRD YEAR OF PUBLICATION • Founded January 1955  
Mattachine Foundation estab. 1950; Mattachine Society, Inc. chartered 1954

Volume III

December 1957

Number 12

## Contents

### ARTICLES

- FOUR F's ARE KEY TO PROGRESS, by D. Stewart Lucas — 6  
A STEP TOWARD ACCEPTANCE,  
by William A. Baker, M. S. W. — 14  
THE PRICE OF REJECTION, by Julia W. Coleman, M. S. W. — 17  
ADJUSTMENT OF THE MALE OVERT HOMOSEXUAL,  
by Evelyn Hooker, Ph.D. — 32

### DEPARTMENTS

- BOOK REVIEWS: Bigotry Has a Field Day, by Joseph A.  
Bigotry Has a Field Day, by Joseph A. Moore — 40  
Re-Created by Literary Magic, by Richard Mayer — 41  
READERS WRITE — 4  
MATTACHINE DIRECTORY — 43

MATTACHINE REVIEW is published monthly by the Mattachine Society, Inc., 693 Mission Street, San Francisco, San Francisco 5, Calif., a non-profit, non-partisan organization founded in the public interest for the purpose of providing true and accurate information toward the solution of problems of human sex behavior, particularly those of the homosexual adult. The REVIEW is available on many U.S. newsstands (six alternate-month issues per year).

Printed in U. S. A. 3

# READERS *write*

**REVIEW EDITOR:** I have long known that the two most prevalent venereal diseases were spread by sexual contact between men and women, but only recently did I learn that these two diseases are just as readily spread by sexual contact between members of the same sex. I contacted syphilis. Since then I have learned that this disease may be contracted from any mucous membrane or from any warm, moist agent or location in which the syphilis spirochete is present. Thus oral contact, kissing, or drying with an infected warm, moist towel used by someone infected can spread the disease. Air kills it; warm moisture does not. It is easy to see how syphilis can be spread in ways other than sexual contact, although any type of such contact spreads it most easily.

I wonder how many others—particularly practicing homosexuals—know this, and how very great the chances are that they may contact venereal diseases in most American cities through indiscriminate contacts?

This letter is not a sermon against—or for—any particular form of sexual behavior in private between consenting adults. Instead, this letter attempts to suggest a practical approach to a growing social and medical problem: Statistics from authorities like Dr. Kinsey unmistakably show that many persons of the same sex do engage in sexual relations with each other. Laws to the contrary and attempts to enforce them have failed to stem these contacts.

Isn't it about time we took the wraps off the disease angle and started an educational program to control venereal infection among homosexuals? Further, would it not be a good thing for the medical profession to require that all doctors habitually make a Wasserman test of every blood sample they receive, whether the sample were taken for a Wasserman or not? I think that much of the spread of syphilis would be halted in this way. I would like to hear professional persons speak out on this subject. As I said above, I contacted syphilis and also happened to have a blood sample taken by a doctor before syphilis was discovered. Had a Wasserman test been made then, I would have discovered that I had the disease before it reached the advanced stage.—Mr. D.G., California

\*

**REVIEW EDITOR:** Regarding articles by Marc Daniel (translated from *Arcadie* in October International issues of the Review), my friends and I have found them to be of extreme interest and look forward to seeing more of them.—Mr. A.R., Calif.

## *Subscribing Membership* (Non-Voting)



**SUBSCRIBING MEMBERSHIP (Non-Voting)** was created at the recent 4th Annual Convention of the Mattachine Society in response to many requests from persons living at a distance from established chapters, and from persons living near established chapters who prefer not to participate actively. Principal purpose of Subscribing Membership is to permit a greater number of persons over the nation to support Mattachine projects with annual donations of funds which are sorely needed to continue the work of the organization. At the same time this status provides evidence of this vital support.

**SUBSCRIBING MEMBERSHIP (Non-Voting)** is available to anyone over 21 years of age. Participation in activities of organized chapters is not required. Fee is \$10 per year (12 months from date received). Special offer to current subscribers of the Review: \$6 pays for subscribing membership status for remainder of subscription, up to 12 months from date received. Subscribing Members also receive four issues of **INTERIM**, national news quarterly of the Mattachine Society, Inc.

(Subscribing Members may attend meetings of the Society and its chapters, subject to local regulations, but may not vote. Payment of additional local area council dues is optional.)

Joining the Society as a Subscribing Member is simple: Write to the Board of Directors and enclose appropriate fee. Additional details and subscribing membership card will be mailed to you.

**Mattachine Society, Inc.**

*Office of the Board of Directors*

693 Mission Street

San Francisco 5, Calif.



## OPENING ADDRESS, FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

# four F's are key to progress

By D. Stewart Lucas

The title above has no relation whatever to an armed forces classification for persons considered unfit for military service. Instead, the four F's mentioned by President Lucas in the opening address of the 4th Annual Convention of the Mattachine Society, held at the Sheraton-Palace hotel, San Francisco, on August 31, embrace the key to growth and progress for the organization. They are Faith, Friendship, Fellowship and Funds. Near the end of the article they are discussed in detail.

With this issue, the Mattachine Review begins its report of that convention. Future is-

ssues will carry prepared talks presented to the delegates, members and friends who attended. At an afternoon symposium on the topic, "Must the Individual Homosexual Be Rejected in Our Time?" five speakers addressed the assemblage. Two of these papers are published in this issue; others will follow at a later date.

Mr. Lucas was President and acting Chairman of the Board of Directors last year. Two days after he delivered the address published here, he completed his term in those offices, and was elected Executive Secretary of the Society for the current year.

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Mattachine Society, Inc., and the San Francisco Area Council, I wish to welcome all of you to our fourth annual convention.

Every time that I get up to speak to a group I am bothered by the reminder of the time a gentleman was called upon to speak before a large and somewhat unruly audience. After several interruptions from the audience the speaker raised his voice and said, "We seem to have a great many fools here tonight. Wouldn't it be advisable to hear them one at a time?" Whereupon a man shouted from the audi-

ence, "Yes. Get on with your speech."

We know that there are no fools here today except for Les Mattachines—but don't become disturbed. All that I want to do is begin with a brief history of the Mattachine movement from its inception early in 1950 to the present date.

This story, however, has its inception with Les Mattachines, for that is where the name originated. Les Mattachines were a dedicated medieval society of fools who enacted the struggles of all the common people of their time against their oppressors, the lords and clerics. From

Les Mattachines, therefore, came Mattachine.

Early in 1950 a group of individuals met together in a private home in Los Angeles to discuss a topic which, even in the privacy of their home, seemed forbidden. That topic was homosexuality. Before that evening was over, they realized that here was a subject that was very close to them, a subject which they wished to discuss at greater length, to learn more about all its aspects. They decided to meet once every two weeks. From that beginning grew the Mattachine Foundation. The Foundation was in existence from November 1950 to April 1953. During its existence the Mattachine Foundation had many hundreds of people attend its discussion groups. It drew up a set of aims and purposes and a pledge which remain in part today in the Mattachine Society. The Foundation issued numerous brochures, bulletins and letters which were sent to city, state and federal officials in an attempt to influence them favorably. Late in 1952, however, there was much unrest among the members of this Foundation. No one knew who its leaders were, no one knew where all the directives came from. A majority of those who were truly interested in carrying on this work wanted to do so in a democratic fashion.

A constitutional convention was called on May 24, 1953. It was the unanimous opinion of those present that a democratic organization be formed. A constitution and by-laws were drawn up and adopted. It was agreed that this organization

would be known as the Mattachine Society. The old Mattachine Foundation concurred and agreed to disband, handing over its name, all its files and data to the new democratic Society. The final organizational meeting was held on November 15, 1953, so that it became in reality the first convention of the Mattachine Society.

A prominent Southern California psychiatrist spoke at the banquet held during that convention. The most memorable comment he made was that in which he drew an analogy between the Mattachine Society and a newborn baby. The baby must grow up properly if it is to be a strong and healthy adult. It must learn to crawl before it can walk. It will fall many times but each time it picks itself up, it will be on stronger and surer feet. I often think of the truth of that analogy and wonder how far the Society has grown up in the past four years. Has it learned to stand on its own two feet? Has it learned from its many tumbles and experiences? In many ways it seems that it has, but in many others, there is still a bit of doubt.

But to get on with my story.

On March 23, 1954, the Mattachine Society was granted its corporation papers by the state of California. Now it could really get down to business.

The first annual convention of the Mattachine Society, Inc., was held in San Francisco on May 15-16, 1954. Progress was being made.

From the Publication Chairman's report: "Most notably, the

committee produced the first fairly complete brochure for the Society, a pamphlet called 'The Mattachine Today.' Basically a sound policy has been followed in publications. This has resulted in the publication of newsletters each month in the Northern and Southern areas. In addition a plan for the publication of a monthly Mattachine magazine has been prepared."

From the Legislative report of that convention, I would like to quote a statement which has as much meaning and import as it did then and always will. "The need for us to register and vote in all elections is apparent. For us to assume this obligation of American citizenship cannot be overstressed. For, unless we vote, we, as individuals and as an organization, have no real right to criticize officials and the laws they enact."

Cooperation on two projects in the research field had also been implemented by this time. A group of individuals was furnished from the Los Angeles area to Evelyn Hooker, Ph.D., for a research project to determine whether or not there was a difference in the social adjustments or pathological personality structure of the homosexual in comparison with that of the heterosexual. Dr. Hooker's first preliminary report of her findings was subsequently given before the American Psychological Association convention in September 1956.

The other project was that of furnishing a great number of persons who had had a brush with the law to Dr. Alfred Kinsey and his staff. These case

histories will play a great part in a forthcoming work to be published by the Institute for Sex Research, "Sex and the Law." Dr. Kinsey, on his last visit here before his untimely death, again thanked us for the great number of histories we were able to furnish him. "Success to the work you are doing," he said. "I hope that our publication, when it is printed, will contribute continuously to helping your group."

It is interesting to note that at the time of the first convention of the Mattachine Society, Inc. there were active chapters of the Society located in San Diego, Long Beach, six in Los Angeles, Berkeley, Oakland, Emeryville, three in San Francisco, Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit. At the present time chapters are located in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago and New York. Application for chapters in Denver and Washington, D.C., are to be acted upon by this convention.

The second annual convention of the Mattachine Society, Inc., was held in Los Angeles May 14-15, 1955. The Chairman of the Board of Directors stated significantly, "The organization of people, the merging of individuals into group effort is a measure of our progress as a Society, for the team exerts a leverage upon human effort that enables us to do together things that would be far beyond the range of any of us working alone."

In the legal field, work was begun by the organization's Legal Committee in Chicago on a proposed legal brochure which would contain information which would be of guidance and help

to individuals not only in the State of Illinois, on whose laws it would be based, but to all individuals who were in ignorance of the law in general. That brochure has now been completed and is available.

Perhaps the most significant progress had been made in the publishing of the first issues of the Mattachine Review in January 1955. At last the Mattachine Society, Inc., would have an official publication in which, if the fullest and best uses were made of its pages, it could bring to the public truths where before only half-truths and hearsay existed. It might be able to bring enlightenment to a darkness of self-imposed ignorance. It would be a journal wherein the pros and cons of this great field of

sex behavior so blithely bunched together under the one term—Homosexuality, could be discussed without prejudice, fear or malice.

There is no doubt that a great deal has been accomplished in the pages of the Review since its first publication. But some believe that it is not being used to its fullest potential, that it is not enough of an official organ of the Mattachine Society. Perhaps they are right. (Editor's Note: The publication of this opening address to the 1957 annual convention, together with the papers read by invited participants at other sessions of that convention which will appear in current issues of the Review, are aimed—in part—to make the magazine a more integrated part of

## NOW OFF THE PRESS!

**gay bar**

By HELEN P. Branson—Non-Fiction that is more entertaining than a novel! **\$3.00**

### 1. MAYBE—TOMORROW 2. SOMEWHERE BETWEEN THE TWO

Two Entertaining novels by JAY LITTLE

Each 4.50

The God Within by Christina Valentine. Exposition Press .... 3.50

Sex Variant Women in Literature. Jeanette Foster. Vantage .... 5.00

Homosexuals Today. guide to organizations, publications.

Tells history of Mattachine Society and others. One, Inc. .... 3.00

Wind Woman by Carol Hales. Woodford Press 3.00

DERRICKS by James Barr (a new reprint) **\$3.00**

**PAN-Graphic PRESS**

693 Mission Street  
San Francisco 5

Book Service Dept. —Add 20c for Shipping; 4% Sales Tax in Calif.



the Mattachine Society, Inc.) The Review, however, is as much entitled to its growing pains, as is the Society itself. There is no doubt that it will continue to grow and evolve into an even more effective instrument of its original purpose.

At this meeting in 1955 it was discussed by the Research Director, and concurred in by professional researchers present, that the Mattachine Society could not itself pursue a line of research, but rather would have to make itself available to professional research organizations and individuals who in turn could profit from the Society's, and its membership's, availability.

The Public Relations Director discussed the advisability of the Society's making available lecturers and tape recorded discussions for general use by all public agencies and organizations to further the aims and purposes of the Society. Both of these proposals are still as applicable today as they were then, and represent an attitude which definitely would be helpful to the Society.

The third annual convention of the Mattachine Society, Inc., was held May 12-13, 1956, in San Francisco.

Quite a little progress had been noted over that of the previous year, but all was not easy. noted over that of the previous year.

The Chicago area which had been most active the year before was now practically dormant. It had run the usual cycle from feverish interest to great plans, to rather large membership, to a peak of "Where do we go from

here?"—and then complete loss of interest. This was nothing new. It was but the replaying of the role which all areas of the organization have gone through in the past and I dare say will continue to go through in the future. Again, these are the growing pains which an organization such as ours must suffer. However, it seems that a few have the persistence and dedication to stick to it and weather the storm, salvaging something of the ship afterward. Such is the case in Chicago, for once more the Chicago area is operating. Slowly to be sure. But sanely realizing its limitations and working on a long term rather than a "now or never" basis.

This is a common fault, not only of a whole area but of each individual member of our organization. We come to the Society as a new member with the idea of "How much can the Mattachine Society do for me here and now? After all, my problem is paramount. I want my \$10.00 worth of aid, enlightenment, encouragement and help." Unfortunately, that is not what the Mattachine Society was organized for nor can it give this kind of aid to its individual members. These individual members must make up a whole unit of interested persons which, in turn, may be able to work—as a unit—for a better understanding of "the problem," which in turn is in reality innumerable problems all thrown together under the one term, Homosexuality, but often, it would seem, without a common base. The members of the Mattachine Society cannot and do not come together on a

common ground with a common interest or problems. Its members must learn to work together as individuals, in a field of education and enlightenment which goes beyond the individual and reaches out to many groups and persons who find themselves confronted with this symptom called Homosexuality.

But, to get back to the convention of 1956, new interest had been shown in New York City. A group had formed there and applied for chapter status. This was given by the convention and the results of this dynamic group are in evidence today. They are in that feverish phase of the cycle I mentioned previously. We hope that they will prove to be the exception to the rule, and continue to grow with only minor knocks and tumbles in their growing period. Perhaps they can profit at least to some extent from the errors which others have made.

This then brings us to the present.

The past year has been a hectic period indeed for the organization, with the headquarters of the Society being moved to San Francisco from Los Angeles in January of this year. Some members of the Board of Directors have resigned for one reason or another. The load of the work of the organization has been left on the shoulders of a few. But, as it is said in show business, "the show must go on." And on it goes. It is hoped that out of this convention a working co-operation of individuals will come forth to transcend personalities and work as a unit for the betterment of the Mattachine Society.

chine Society.

As to the future of the Society—what can it expect to accomplish and how can it go about it? There is a little formula I would like to give you, which I believe pretty well sums it up. This is the formula of the four "F's."

To begin with we have Faith. That is a very small word but it means a great deal. Just what is faith? Does anyone here know a definition of Faith? What does faith mean to you? There are many excellent definitions of faith but it is believed that one of the best may be found in the Oxford dictionary—"The duty of fulfilling one's trust. The obligation of a promise or engagement." Then also faith is aptly described by J.M. Barrie in his "The Little White Bird"—"The reason why birds can fly and we cannot is simply that they have perfect faith. For to have faith is to have wings."

Now we might ask how faith can help us with our work in



## THE SHADOWS OF DESIRE

Words of human confirmation of special meaning to the homophile. Cloth bound, privately printed—a collector's item. \$1.75 postal m. o. to:

PRATT DICKSON  
Box 252, Berkeley, Calif.

the Mattachine Society. I believe that all the Mattachine stands for, its high ideals, its aims and purposes can be accomplished through the faith of those individuals who are entrusted with the carrying out of those ideals, aims, and purposes. That means every member of the Society. It is an unselfish faith that all of us must have. For it is a faith of principle and ideals which we may not see completely in our own lifetime. But we must remember that what we do here today and in the years to come will be of benefit not only to one person or a hundred persons but will benefit many, many thousands of individuals in generations to come. It can open up new avenues for them. It can make it possible for them to live in a world where they need not have uncalled-for fears or be subjected to undue prejudices. A world in which they need not feel it necessary to secrete themselves away from society in such a way as to destroy their potential usefulness to all society. There must be the faith that these things can be accomplished

And through faith we can have Fellowship and Friendship. Again, what is the definition of fellowship? The Oxford dictionary states that it is a "companionship, company. Participation in a community of interest, sentiment and nature. The spirit of comradeship." What better way can we go about accomplishing our ideals, aims and purposes than through the ties of fellowship and comradeship. Through working together in fellowship we can create Friendship. Friendship is, and again I quote from

the dictionary, "the association of persons as friends. A friendly feeling or disposition felt or shown." Friendship is a bond that can bring together all the members of the Mattachine Society in a cohesive and positive working unit that can accomplish a great deal. Emerson stated it simply in his "Conduct of Life":

He who has a thousand friends has not a friend to spare,

And he who has one enemy shall meet him everywhere.

But Faith, Fellowship, and Friendship are not enough. No; we must refer to the last "F", even though it makes our metabolism rise a little. That is Funds; for, without funds, we cannot expect to progress and be able to carry out our program.

I know that all of you have been asked to contribute a great deal, not only of your time and energy, but of your money as well. I also know that this is an old song that is sung many times and becomes sort of worn and tired. After all, we like to feel, there is a limit as to what we can give individually in the way of funds. But again, let us not only think of ourselves when we are asked to give, and give again. Let us also think of other persons and organizations who might be willing to give us their support if only they were to be asked. Many, many times I have heard the old story. "Ten dollars a year dues! But that's too much. I can't afford to give ten dollars a year." Absurd! You could give \$100.00 a year if you really wanted to. But that is not the point. The point is that the Mattachine Society can never

expect to grow unless it has the proper funds with which to grow. Does anyone think that any fraternal organization in this country has grown without funds? Well, none ever has and none ever will. How do you expect that such organizations as the Elks, the Lions or the Shriners have been able to carry on their great programs of community and social service? Without the funds to do so? They have had to call upon individuals and other organizations for support. They do a great deal of good, I might add. And so can the Mattachine Society do a great deal of good if it has the funds to do it with.

I believe that we all should

give just a little more effort to raising these funds. I am not saying give the funds; I am saying raise the funds. I do not want to dwell any longer on this point. But think about it. Think of the possibilities there are when our organization has funds.

This is what we can work for in the future—Faith, Fellowship, Friendship, and Funds.

In closing, let me once again welcome you to the fourth annual convention of the Mattachine Society, Inc. I feel sure that you will go away from here with a greater appreciation for and knowledge of the topics that you will hear discussed.

## GENERAL INFORMATION

Mattachine Society's yellow booklet of general information may be obtained from the national headquarters, 693 Mission Street, San Francisco 5, Calif., for 25 cents per copy. Included in its contents are: the Mattachine program, aims and principles and a brief history of the Society.

## LATEST AMERICAN AND ENGLISH BOOKS

We carry the latest American and English Books (Including the Wolfenden Report). From our current list: JUDGE NOT, the autobiographical examination of the problem of the homosexual by Aymere Roberts, a new English publication (\$3.95). IF I DIE, the important paper-bound reprint of Andre Gide's memoirs (95c). Please add 15c postage per book. We issue free lists of books on homosexual themes.

## VILLAGE THEATER CENTER

116 Christopher Street

New York 14, N.Y.



## View the Positive Aspects

# A STEP TOWARD ACCEPTANCE

By WILLIAM A. BAKER, M. S. W.

When we consider the question, "Must the homosexual be rejected in our time?", we are really asking "Must he **continue** to be rejected in our time?" For in general, he is rejected in our society. The question is clear-cut enough. The answer is so complex that it becomes an exceedingly ambitious undertaking.

To answer it, one must first ask the question, "Why is the homosexual rejected in the first place?" The attempt to answer this question has become a subject for research. The findings fill volumes already written, and no doubt will be the theme of endless theses in the future. The answers are there just as they are between the covers of the specialized novel. They are sometimes subtle—but always multi-causal and historically as old as time itself. This fact alone must contribute to the complacency of society and to the inertia against changing the **status quo** of any issue of controversy and the status of any minority group.

The fact remains, however, that great civilizations have existed in the past and certain contemporary societies exist in the present in which the homosexual is accepted. Without taking the time to consider here why this is possible, this fact at least suggests that eventually such acceptance may develop in our culture. To over-emphasize this point, however, would seem to me to result again in stalemate—a period of useless waiting in which society waits for the homosexual to disappear or become acceptable, and the homosexual waits for society to change its attitudes.

If something other than waiting is to be done, who is going to do it? Who is going to begin to break this neurotic relationship that exists between society and the homosexual? For centuries, society has tried to do something about it. Like a totally rejecting parent, society has tried to rid itself of its "problem child", the homosexual, by extremely imaginative means, all of which are barbaric and punitive. But this child of society appears particularly hardy, and it is only in the relative present that society has made some serious attempt to do something other than rid itself of the child of which it is ashamed. As yet this is probably only the result of society's acceptance of the fact that homosexual behavior exists wherever human beings exist and the methods which might effectively "stamp it

out" would be far more destructive to total human existence. So while the original motive may be questionable, yet the door to further understanding and a more genuine acceptance may thereby be opened.

Doing something, however, is as yet pretty well confined to that small minority of professionals who study and treat the emotionally ill. This is progress but it is a far cry from society's accepting the homosexual, for this gigantic parent is really saying to the psychiatrist, the social worker, and the psychologist, "Treat this sick child, make him well, and then I will accept him. In the meantime, don't bother me until it is all over. And, above all, keep him quiet and out of sight." And so the therapists and a relatively few homosexuals retreat to an ivory treatment tower and form a new minority in many ways as isolated as the entire homosexual minority was in the first place.

Out of this ivory tower come articles for other therapists to read and novels to be read mostly by other homosexuals and those heterosexuals who are for the most part already accepting. While this literary and technical effort is invaluable, it can at best contribute only to acceptance by society on an intellectual level. But the acceptance that the homosexual craves, like any rejected person, is a feeling of love, warmth, understanding, and equality. He can never feel this from someone who has mere intellectual understanding. This can only occur through the experience that is shared in interpersonal relationships between the minority and the majority group members.

It is in this area of interpersonal relationships between the homosexual and the rest of society that I think the individual homosexual can effect some change in the attitude of others toward him. Admitting to over-simplification for our purposes here, but in the interest of clarifying at least one approach to the problem, let us start with the fact that for whatever reason, society rejects the homosexual first and above all simply because he is homosexual. He is seen first and foremost as a homosexual and only secondarily, if at all, as anything else. The homosexual then becomes a victim of this same kind of thinking and thinks of himself primarily as a homosexual and then secondarily as something else. He presents himself to society as if that were the most important thing about himself. He does not usually do this by any overt pronouncement or behavior but perhaps even more effectively by whatever else he does not say, in one way or another, about himself. In other words, he does this directly by minimizing whatever else he has to contribute to the world about him, or he does this indirectly by overcompensating and overrating his talents and thinking of himself as if he were superior to those about him. Either of these presentations does little to enable him to feel wanted and needed.

Before change can be effected in others who know him, the homo-



sexual must accept himself first as a man or woman more alike than different from other men and woman— accept himself as a person, as a doctor, a truck-driver, or an artist—and then, secondarily, as having a sexual adjustment that is different than the majority. It seems to me that when he presents himself in this way to others that he stands the best chance of at least not being totally rejected. He will discover that he can be accepted by others, not all others, but even being accepted by one other is a highly satisfying and significant beginning.

You may make the obvious observation and criticism that he is not then really being accepted as a homosexual *per se*. That is exactly my point. He is not a homosexual *per se*. He is a person *per se*. Thus he is being accepted as a person and incidentally as making a homosexual adjustment. When the homosexual permits himself to be known in this way first and as a homosexual later, he does much to shatter society's stereotype of the homosexual. Out go the ideas that all or most homosexuals possess similar personalities and mannerism. The biased and uneducated mind that thinks that he can recognize all homosexuals by the way the cigarette is held, by his dress or jewelry, his speech or his gait, his sensitivity or his appreciation of the arts—this prejudiced mind is then going to have real difficulty in justifying his opinions. He is forced then to re-evaluate his former stereotype and once this is done, the old inaccurate stereotype cannot be readily restored. But if the homosexual does not allow the solid positive aspects of his personality to be viewed first, before the stereotype is reinforced, the unaccepting heterosexual will be blocked from ever seeing these at all.

Consider members of other minority groups of which he may or may not be a part. Is the fact that a Negro is a Negro his most important characteristic? Is this true also of the Jew, the Catholic, the "other" political group member, the amputee, the blind, or any other minority group? Yet, as long as the minority group member thinks of himself primarily as just that, then he can only be accepted or rejected on that basis. But if he is really something else—a person with drives, needs, and feelings like anyone else, with talents and limitations, with likes and dislikes, with faults and virtues, then he should seek to be accepted on that basis. I do not suggest that his homosexuality is not an important and significant part of his total personality and the homosexual himself very much wants this to be understood and accepted. But acceptance begins with what one can understand and identify, hence the emphasis on similarities rather than on differences. One must begin somewhere, if at all, and it is this beginning step that seems possible to me in our time.

A step which might be taken simultaneously with the first is one which I shall not fully develop here, but is one that I hope you will give your serious consideration and take appropriate action whenever the opportunity arises. Acceptance is most likely to occur when

one has something to offer—the more precious the gift, the more likely it is to be wanted and valued. What more valuable gift is the homosexual more likely to possess than his ability to understand the feelings of other minority groups who suffer from prejudice and injustice? An act which endangers the civil liberty of any individual is an act committed against oneself—whether or not the person immediately concerned is friend or foe. Although being accepted by society is a human right, it entails the assumption of certain responsibilities toward the interests of the other members of society. When this is accomplished the relationship between the society and the minority group member can be characterized by maturity instead of by immaturity and neurosis. The rewards and satisfactions to both can hardly be underestimated.

## Can Modern America Afford It?

# THE PRICE of REJECTION

By JULIA W. COLEMAN, M. S. W.

Any discussion on the topic "Must the individual homosexual be rejected in our time", must of necessity start with the assumption that the homosexual is being rejected. This seems so self evident that it is hardly worth elaborating. However, the effect on the individual of this rejection is a subject worthy of considerable elaboration. In many discussions, papers, books, and essays, the terrible price in terms of human suffering, measured in guilt, fear, seclusiveness, lack of confidence, interference with productive work and creativity, is being carefully detailed. Certainly, individual case histories tell the story of what rejection means in both its open, gross form and in its day to day implications that wear away the individual's ability to develop his native capacities and potentialities to their fullest extent.

The primary object of this discussion, however, is to deal with the reverse side of the coin: namely the hypothesis that society and its members pay a heavy price for the luxury of indulging in rejection of the homosexual. Society and its members obviously have the right and duty to reject those individuals who threaten life and property. Society has the right, too, to reject those individuals who threaten and impair the rights of others, either through violence or through trickery. But the evidence of science tells us that the homosexual

per se cannot be numbered within this group of the socially destructive. The homosexual then is being rejected basically because he is different. Over and above any humanitarian or ethical considerations that in themselves would outlaw the rejection of any human being on the grounds simply of his being different, there is the question of the price—the price of rejection. How high is the price? And how is it being paid off in terms of both daily and long range cultural and social loss?

One of the most pertinent considerations to be examined in computing the loss to society produced by discrimination is the loss in the productivity of the member of the discriminated minority. At the one extreme there is the cost of mental illness, alcoholism and severe and disabling neuroses. Certainly, all of these conditions can be precipitated, if not actually caused by a sense of being outcast. And ranging down, we clearly see a wide spectrum of other losses—individuals functioning far below their native and educational levels in both their occupations and their avocations. And discrimination causes disruptions in the development of meaningful interpersonal relations that weaken the entire fabric of human relations which make up society itself.

Another important factor to be considered is the discouraging effect, on individuals with special talents, of the frequent ridicule heaped on whole areas of the arts. Undoubtedly many gifted individuals turn away from the professional expression of their art interests because of the not unwarranted fears of parents, teachers and the individuals themselves that they will be laying themselves open, by implication, to the charge of being part of the rejected homosexual minority. And this may be a sufficiently deterring fear to lose to the arts, to the crafts, to music and the dance field numbers of gifted and potentially great producers.

In the process of stereotyping and then rejecting any group within society, society frequently fails completely to concern itself with understanding the causes, implications and cure of the condition found within the group. Probably nowhere has this been more clearly demonstrated than in the area of sexual deviation. Dozens of vitally important questions pertaining to psycho-sexual development and the influence of parental relations on the development of homosexuality have never been adequately studied. There is some work to be found in detailed and frequently exceedingly esoteric psycho-analytical case studies but any really scientific factual study is lacking. Not only is there an absence of scientific curiosity but, even when it exists, a reliable statistical sample of subjects is frequently impossible to come by. As is so often noted, most of the studies of the social and personal histories of homosexuals have been conducted in prisons and institutions—hardly a place to find data pertaining to the largest number of members of the group. The same substitution of persecution for scientific study pertains to the

# EDUCATIONAL GIFT SUGGESTIONS



*Mattachine Review makes  
an ideal gift at Christmas  
or any time of the year!*

Single Copies	of available Back Issues, each	.50
Annual Subscription		4.00
Complete Sets, per yr.		5.00
Bound Volumes, ea.		7.00

Add 4% tax in Calif. Vols. 1955-56-57 All 3 for \$30

**Read the details and resumé  
of contents on pages  
following...**



# ● Every Magazine Is NEW ...Until You've Read It!

**SINCE THE REVIEW** began in January 1955, the staff has habitually set aside copies of the magazine which are available to readers whose files may be incomplete, or who wish to preserve the magazine in permanent book form.

**Package units** of the magazine are available for each complete year at \$5.00 per set. They include copies of the Society's national news quarterly, *Interim*. Sets sold under this plan are not broken. Single copies of most issues are still available at 50c each, but "rare" issues are now sold only in complete sets.

**Bound volumes** of each year's issues, including *Interim*, are in stock and cost \$7.00 (plus 4% tax in California). The three matching volumes are permanently bound in navy blue fabricoid, stamped in gold. The 1955 volume totals 292 pages; 1956 volume has more than 440 pages; 1957 volume totals 536 pages.

## LISTING OF CONTENTS

Here is a listing of titles and subjects in the issues of the Review from the beginning:

### 1955—Volume One—Seven issues

**JANUARY — FEBRUARY**—California's Vag Lewd Statute Criticized; James Barr's Facing Friends in a Small Town; Study of Homosexuals as a Personality Type; Open Letter to Senator Dirksen.

**MARCH - APRIL** — Carl B. Harding's Deep Are the Roots; Sex Pervert, Age 7; Justice Scored in Provoo Case; North Carolina Sex Laws. Mattachine History; Danish Sex Offenders.

**MAY—JUNE** —James Barr's Under Honorable Conditions; Problem of Appearance; Treatment of California Sex Psychopaths; Minneapolis Father Discovers Homosexual Son; Coming Model Penal Code; Bridegroom Wore a Dress.

**JULY—AUGUST** —Mattachine Salutes Judge Learned Hand; Play Without a Stage; Handicap v. Talent; Why So Much Hysteria; Bi-Sexuality of Man; Must a Lesbian Be Different; Redemption of Oscar Wilde; Rights of the Homosexual Veteran.

**SEPTEMBER — OCTOBER** — Culture & Sexuality; Heterosexual v. Homosexual Attitudes; Sex Variants Search for Their Own Answer; Homosexuality and the Liberal Mind; Importance of Being Honest; Take My Name Off Your Mailing List.

**NOVEMBER - DECEMBER** — On the Cure of Homosexuality; Sex, Religion & Myth; Regulating the Sex Urge; Conditioning Factor in Homophiles; Hadrian & Antinous; Forgotten Commonplace; What Mattachine Means.

**CHRISTMAS ISSUE** —James Barr's Hold That Curtain—Juliet's Still Shaving; T.C. Jones Interviewed; Agreeable Disagreement; Sex Offenders at Work to Help Themselves; Christian & Greek Love Ideals; I Left No Orphan.

*mattachine* REVIEW



# LISTING OF CONTENTS

1956 — Volume Two — 12 Issues

**JANUARY**—Mattachine Salutes One Magazine; How the Review is Published, a "Do-It-Yourself" story.

**FEBRUARY** — Scandal in Boise; Churches Face Challenge of Kinsey; Myths About Sex Offenders; Sex, Morality & Religion; Psychotherapy Can Aid Homosexuals; New Deal for Deviates in Canada; Culture and the Introvert; Michigan's Gross Indecency Statutes.

**MARCH**—New Monthly Publication Policy; ACLU Looks into Mass Arrests; Prison—Rehabilitation v. Punishment; Toward a Higher Standard of Individual Behavior & Ethics.

**APRIL**—Homosexuals v. Child Molesters; Queen's Country Revisited; Argument for a Change of Law; Justice Carter on Searches, Seizures and Constitutional Rights; Problem of Hypocrisy; Fair Employment Practices and the Homosexual; Citizen's Rights in Case of Arrest; Bohemian Saturday Night.

**MAY**—3rd Annual Convention of the Mattachine Society; Official Reports & Program; Dr. Robert Lindner Foundation; Homosexuals & Society; Menninger Tells Need for More Psychiatrists.

**JUNE**—Constitutional Test of California's Vag Law; Twilight Marriage; Homosexuals in Prison; Homosexuality, Morality & Religion; Examining Our Sense of Values; You're Fired; Problem of Sympathy; Furor Among Guardians of British Morals.

**JULY**—Why Americans Are So Fearful of Sex; Church & Vice in England; Reform of Sex Laws Urged at Oxford; Bogus Police Officer Held; Supreme Court Curtails Security Firings; Loyalty Program Criticized; Willdeblood Book Reviews.

**AUGUST**—Toward a Clarification of Homosexual Terminology by Dr. Kinsey; Whom Should We Tell; Italian Penal Code; Homosexuality Faces a Challenge; Morality v. Mores; Awards of Merit; Daughters of Bilitis; License Unlimited.

**SEPTEMBER**—American Law Institute's Model Penal Code—Provisions and Comment; Dr. Kinsey Dies; Mattachine Salutes "Open Mind" Television Programs.

**OCTOBER**—First International Edition; Letter from a Homosexual; Morals and Pseudo-Morals; War Story of Kurt; Prince von Eulenberg—the Twelfth Man; Homosexuality in the Near East; Comment on Danish Law; Editor Showed Consideration; Viewpoints Will Vary; How Long Have You Been One; Awful In-Between.

**NOVEMBER**—Lift Secrecy on Homosexuality; Her Son, Her Son—by James Barr; Help Urged for Inverts; Clinic on Homosexuality; Tea Was Diluted; Science Wins Out; Time Is Real; Bourbon Case Watered Down.

**DECEMBER**—New Light on Masturbation by Albert Ellis; Empirical Study of Transvestism; Police May Not Incite Crime; Morality and Homosexuality; Bread Upon the Water; the Sex Crime Problem; Culture and the Introvert.

*mattachine* REVIEW





# LISTING OF CONTENTS

1957—Volume Three—12 Issues

**JANUARY**—Dark Night of the Soul; Did Dr. Bergler Bungle His Subject; Homosexual Orientation Not a Crime in Itself; Complete Index Section, 1955—56.

**FEBRUARY** — Mattachine Salutes Men; Values and Responsibilities; The Tender Trap; No Need to Despair; Bavarian Fantasy; Dogma and the Homosexual; Let's Face Psychotherapy; Nation Going Sex Mad.

**MARCH**—Obscenity Law v. Censorship by Courts; ACLU Stand on Homosexuality; Sex in History; Sex Offenders and Social Punishment, a Report from England.

**APRIL** — Many Mansions by Peter Wildeblood; What Does Mattachine Do; Big Price to Pay; More Studies of Sex Deviation Urged; Friendship (Poem); Continuation of Values and Responsibilities and Tender Trap.

**MAY**—Samples Twice Sifted, a Symposium on Edmund Bergler; Malady of Sexual Inversion; Homosexuals Reply; Insult Added to Injury; From One Degree to Another; If the Cat Can Look at the King; Quote Cure Unquote; Emotions That Destroy; Distinction Between Crime and Sin.

**JUNE**—Other Than Honorable Discharges, Proposals in Congress; Sex Offender Legislation in Oregon and New Jersey; Just Between Us Mothers; Open Letter to a Homosexual from a Catholic Priest; Research by Bri-

tish Social Biology Council; Twitter Over Lord Byron's Love Life.

**JULY**—American Civil Liberties Union v. National Organization for Decent Literature; Supreme Court's Obscenity Ruling; Vag-Lewd, a Catch-All for Police; Match to Fag; Rights Guard in U.S. Security Plan; Safeguard for Individual Freedom.

**AUGUST**—Progress to Barbarism: Sex Laws in Russia Today; They're Headin' This Way; Kinsey Institute Fights Censors; If This be Conformity; On the Cause of Homosexuality; Where to Buy Books on the Subject; Homosexual Bibliography (Beginning).

**SEPTEMBER** — 4th Annual Society: Reports and Program; Revival in Chicago; Status in Washington; Cast the First Stone; Four Newsletter Supplements.

**OCTOBER** — Second International Issue: Prejudice Against Homosexuality; How Churchill Became Marlborough; Let Us Be Proud; The Mutiny; On the Rack; Homosexual Literature, a Partial Picture; Peruvian Riders; Do We Need a World Center; Heard and Seen.

**NOVEMBER** — Sin v. Crime; What the Wolfenden Committee Recommended; Changing Public Opinion; Next Kinsey Book; Lust Over Lightly; Sins of the Father; Bibliography.

**DECEMBER** — Four F's Are Key to Progress; Dr. Evelyn Hooker's Research Report; Reports from Speakers at Mattachine Symposium.

*mattachine* REVIEW





## ORDER BLANK

Please Ship the following items to the address below:

**BOUND VOLUMES**—\$7 each, all three for \$20:

☐ 1955      ☐ 1956      ☐ 1957

(The 1957 volume will not be shipped until January 15, 1958; however, 1955 and 1956 volumes are in stock and will be shipped immediately.)

**COMPLETE SETS**—Unbound issues—\$5 per set:

☐ 1955      ☐ 1956      ☐ 1957

**SINGLE COPIES**—Back issues, as available—50 cents each:

**ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION**—\$4 per year by first class mail

If gift, send to:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

Is gift card to accompany any of above? \_\_\_\_\_

Amount Enclosed \$ \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Check ☐ Cash ☐ Money Order

Your Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_

*matachine* **REVIEW**

693 Mission Street

San Francisco 5, Calif.

area of laws relating to sexual behaviour. A few outstanding authorities have clearly pointed out the importance of a drastic revision of this legal code. But it is so much simpler to let a few policemen make a few arrests than it is to face the difficult task of revising an ancient and outmoded legal system. Unfortunately though it is so much more expensive! And all of the above considerations particularly apply to psychotherapy for the homosexual with problems in life adjustment. The extensive bibliographies of group therapy articles and books, to take one particular example, are conspicuously meager in any really detailed references to group therapy with sexual deviants. These and many other examples from the fields of sociology, psychology, counseling and anthropology could be adduced to prove that it is simpler to "scapegoat" than to study. But once more there is a loss—the loss of valuable knowledge that would extend its influence far beyond the group under study, adding valuable insights to many broader questions and fields.

In a broader, more sociological sense, the rejection of a minority group has further far-reaching implications. The fact of second-class citizenship for any group, be it the Negro people, the Jewish people, an unpopular religious or political group or the homosexual minority, weakens the fabric of all citizenship. We cannot practice discrimination while preaching equality before the law, without breeding cynicism and contempt, not only in the minority but in the majority itself. And contempt for law leads to its disintegration as a force in society.

So far this discussion has centered on the social and cultural effects of rejection. In addition, rejection undoubtedly has an effect on the personality and life adjustment of the rejector. One of these effects pertains to the results of hating, scorning or rejecting any individual or situation on the basis of a pre-formed stereotype. It is certainly clear that in so reacting, the individual exhibits a very poor ability to perceive and examine reality. Undoubtedly neurotic and immature personality patterns are the basic cause of poor grasp of reality but social stereotyping encourages a lack of any real examination and study. An example can be found in the loud bragging of an individual that he can recognize all homosexuals on sight. Society's concurrence in this absurdity has the effect of perpetuating his avoidance of looking at individuals and relationships as they really are—a habit that may well lead him to disaster in his own relationships with his wife, his children and his friends. Another effect on the personality of the rejector may well be that his rejection and hatred may be a defense against examining the true causes of the problem within himself. Just as society evades an examination of the tensions and conflicts within itself by selecting scapegoats, so also may the individual. It is almost axiomatic in dealing therapeutically with individual patients that emotionally charged reactions denote anxieties and fears within. But when society itself buttresses and encourages those reactions, self-examination is avoided and problems go unsolved.

Another area of effect on the individual who rejects can be found around the concept of conformity. Conformity and the rejection of differences in some areas leads to their suppression in many areas. And this suppression with its resulting monotonous greyness leads to impoverishment of the individual himself. Gradually he himself becomes a stereotype lacking the flavor, the originality, the variety that society so desperately needs to continue to grow and create. Much of therapy is devoted to helping individuals to develop their own unique and many-sided personalities. When society teaches them that differences are evil, it is no wonder that they find it difficult to cherish the differences within themselves.

Perhaps so obvious that it barely needs mentioning is the brutalizing effect of prejudice, scorn and hate. At a period in history when sensitive, concerned and flexible individuals are particularly needed for the family and for the community, we cannot afford to brutalize. And the act of rejecting another human being not for what he has done but for what he is, has a cancerous effect on the rejector.

The effects of society's rejection of the homosexual on society itself mentioned here are only a small part of the total effect. But even if there were no others, it is obvious that it is a too expensive luxury. We cannot afford it in our time. And the responsibility lies not alone with the homosexual himself and his organizations. Certainly, he needs to be and is vitally concerned and must act on that concern. But every other person has a responsibility too, perhaps an even greater responsibility devolving on the person who is not himself a member of this minority. Of course, in a sense every person is a member of some minority or other—the list is long. But society as a whole must act on the problem of rejection. And it must have facts and not myths to act on. We must stop relegating the subject to the police blotter or to smutty magazines and start encouraging social scientists to study and examine. We must stop subjecting the interested student to the raised eyebrow of suspicion about that interest, and we must make rejection move into the museum of ancient and primitive horrors.



### CHANGES OF ADDRESS

Notice of change of address should be sent not less than two weeks prior to the date change becomes effective. Send the address at which copies are now being received and the new address at which you wish to receive copies.

By GREGORY TROUT

# BRITISH PRESS REACTION to the Wolfenden Report

Although there have been innumerable headlines to the effect that the "Wolfenden Report Stirs Controversy in Britain," there is little evidence that anyone's basic attitudes have changed. There is little doubt, however, but that the expression of opinion has increased enormously. Nevertheless, by the time this article is being prepared—two months after the release of the Report—this outcry has been stilled to little more than a dull murmur. Since we have been dependent on the good offices of Mattachine Review's friends abroad for the receipt of pertinent clippings, however, it may be that their eyes are not as sharp at spotting news items as they were in September—it would be natural to expect that, once the initial excitement had passed, everyone's interest would wane, readers' as well as publishers'. But it is not difficult to return to the excitement and turmoil of mid-September. One merely has to steep oneself again in the sea of clippings that has accumulated.

Lord Beaverbrook's "Daily Express" raises its collective hands in horror at the thought that the law might be eased as regards homosexuality and predicts that the present Conservative government will not seek to translate the recommendations into law, lest the resultant revolt among its members threaten to topple the government.

At the other extreme, the "Daily Herald" (whose editorial policy is for strict support of the Trade Union and Labor Movements, from whose adherents most of its readers are drawn) hails the recommendations as long overdue and, with the intellectual liberalism that has always been a strong and clear thread throughout the long history of the British labor movement, particularly stresses its viewpoint that "private habits, however disgusting to the moralist, should not bring individuals within the criminal law."

In so far as these periodicals reflect political viewpoints, they lend credence to the supposition, reported to us by a number of private correspondents in the United Kingdom, that Parliament is not likely



to act on the homosexual aspect of the report until the Labor Party is again dominant. This may not occur until nearly 1960, by which time the present government must by law go before the country in another general election. Whatever the general attitude of the Labor M.P.s may be, it is not likely that they would force a vote of confidence on the present government over the issue of this section of the Wolfenden Report. All sides agree, however, that there is a possibility of law change as regards the recommendations about the handling of prostitutes. It would appear, therefore, to be justified to assume that, although the drive is for heavier penalties for prostitutes' offenses than are presently imposed, there is less emotional feeling against prostitution in the British public mind than there is against homosexual practices—or at least that there is a less wide divergence of feeling, with less consequent need of proclaiming one's stand and fighting for it. Nor is it possible, in this connection, to avoid wondering how the reaction might have differed if the Report had recommended that the prostitute's patron be given the same penalty that is doled out to her, perhaps on the same grounds by which both parties to a homosexual offense are prosecuted.

#### "THE TIMES"

As would be expected, "The Times" gave not only the fullest news coverage of the content of the Report the day following its release, but also commented on it in terms that can only be described as sober, clear-cut, and reasonable:

"Adult sexual behavior not involving minors, force, fraud, or public indecency belong to the realm of private conduct, not of criminal law. Nearly all civilized countries recognize the futility of making into crimes what are regarded as sins against morality. Britain recognizes this too in respect of fornication, adultery, prostitution, and lesbian practices, but not in respect of male homosexual practices. This differentiation has already been condemned by the Anglican and Roman churches. It is now as firmly condemned by the Wolfenden committee. The report is equally sound on its second big issue, the law of prostitution. It would be wrong to punish the prostitute for being a prostitute. The nuisance of her public behavior—street walking—must therefore be stopped by means which do not entail control of her private conduct. That conduct should be neither suppressed by law nor "tolerated" by law in "licensed houses."

The report finds no great fault with police methods of dealing with prostitutes, and less fault than might have been expected with their methods of catching male importuners. It trenchantly reviews the varying police procedures for cautioning street walkers and, notably, for obtaining evidence (particularly confessions) of homosexual offences. Yet its conclusion that the Judges' Rules must be strictly observed in such cases reads a little lamely after its plain indication that Scottish procedure shows a greater care for individual

rights. For homosexual acts which must necessarily remain punishable, it proposes various useful reforms of court procedures, chiefly suggested by Scottish practice.

The following Sunday, however, it devoted a long editorial to "Sin, Crime and Morals," in an attempt to unravel the boundaries of these three approaches to the problem, the theological, the legal, and the ethical. Staunchly British and generally pro-government, whether that government be Conservative, Liberal, or Labor, the newspaper fully endorses homosexuality's sinfulness—an entirely logical position so long as one supports the Established Church in England as part of the country's structural basis, however unreasonable and illogical it may appear to others who subscribe to no religious concepts of sin. Its stand on illegality and immorality is not so clear-cut, however, perhaps because traditionally we have tended to fuse and confuse our concepts of "legality" and "morality" to the same degree that we merge our concepts of "the law" and justice."

Common standards of morality condemn homosexual acts per se; because for a mother to have a son perverted is even more terrible than to have a daughter seduced. If it could be shown, or even if it were confidently believed, that legal condonation of acts between adult men would lower the general moral condemnation of this kind of conduct, and weaken the moral resistance of the young to its temptations, public opinion would undoubtedly be in arms against such a course.

The Committee in fact considered and rejected that contention, on the grounds largely that homosexuals are not proselytisers, and that men who go with boys are a different type from men who go with men. The argument from moral standards, indeed, cuts both ways: when quite a number of men in the public eye, respected in their professions, are known or at least reputed homosexuals, when scarcely anyone of wide acquaintance does not number among them some of the kind, it would be sheer hypocrisy to say that the public conscience could be appeased only by continuing to treat adult homosexuals on a par with burglars or forgers.

The Churches, as well as social workers and doctors, agree that the present law here does not stiffen morals or improve behavior, but brings both law and morality into contempt.

As a corollary to its acceptance of the Report's recommendation, "The Times" appends a final recommendation of its own:

Where the law steps out, it is all the more the duty of the moralist, the pastor and the social teacher to step in. There is a tremendous challenge here to the leaders of opinion. And not merely to those in high places. The challenge is to the pastoral clergy, to school-teachers, social workers, and above all to parents. For no law and no preaching can make good the shortcoming of the home. This

(Continued on Page 42)

*as a distinct personality type,  
are homophiles so different?*

# ADJUSTMENT

## of the male overt homosexual

By EVELYN HOOKER, Ph.D

### PART ONE

The following article is not easy to read. It is a monumental work, a presentation of "tentative" findings covering a period of more than four years of careful, painstaking research by the author. It is told in the technical language of the professional psychologist, thus its terms, abbreviations, formulas and supporting tables may not carry immediate significance to the average layman, even if within the scope of that reader's understanding.

However, a "trial reading" of this paper by a number of Mattachine officers and the editorial staff resulted in a vote to publish the article in full, and with the permission of Dr. Hooker. Some of these readers, not at all conversant with the psychological research terms in the paper declared that the work was nevertheless worthwhile reading for everyone, whether they comprehend Dr. Hooker's reference to "chi square" and "grand medians" or not.

First part of the article herewith contains most of the technical discussion of the research project dealing with adjustment of the overt male homosexual. Space requirements, however, do not permit the publication of the full article in this issue, so a concluding second installment will be presented in the January Review. In the last part, discussion will shift to the rough time Dr. Hooker's "judges" had in distinguishing homosexual case records from those of heterosexuals. And it is easier reading.

Several long-standing Mattachine members have had a personal interest in this research project, since they were among the volunteer subjects Dr. Hooker interviewed in the late summer of 1953 when this project got under way. They join other members of the Society expressing sincere gratitude to Dr. Hooker for the opportunity to learn her tentative findings after such a long, difficult and selfless task has been carried thus far.

(Reprinted from the Journal of Projective Techniques, Vol.21, No. 1, 1957 with permission.)

## The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual

EVELYN HOOKER<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>

Department of Psychology, University of California at Los Angeles

Current psychiatric and psychological opinion about the adjustment of the homosexual may be illustrated by a quotation from a report on homosexuality recently issued by the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (1, p. 2): "When such homosexual behavior persists in an adult, it is then a symptom of a severe emotional disorder." If one wishes to subject this opinion to experimental investigation, one is immediately confronted by problems of considerable magnitude. One problem is the attitude and theoretical position of the clinician who may be asked to examine the data. I quote again from the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry in the

same report (1, p. 4): "It is well known that many people, including physicians, react in an exaggerated way to sexual deviations and particularly to homosexuality with disgust, anger, and hostility. Such feelings often arise from the individual's own conflict centering about his unconscious homosexual impulses. These attitudes may interfere with an intelligent and objective handling of the problem." One hopes that the clinician does not react with "disgust, anger, and hostility." It is not realistic to hope that he will avoid theoretical preconceptions when looking at psychological material which he knows was obtained from a homosexual.

From a survey of the literature it seemed highly probable that few clinicians have ever had the opportunity to examine homosexual subjects who neither came for psychological help nor were found in mental hospitals, disciplinary barracks in the Armed Services, or in prison populations. It therefore seemed important, when I set out to investigate the adjustment of the homosexual, to obtain a sample of overt homosexuals who did not come from these sources; that is, who had a chance of being individuals who, on the surface at least, seemed to have an average adjustment, provided that (for the purpose of the investigation) homosexuality is not considered to be a symptom of maladjustment. It also seemed important to obtain a comparable control group of heterosexuals. This group would not only provide a standard of comparison but might also make it possible to avoid labels and thus assist the clinician in suspending theoretical preconceptions. This, I recognized, would be fraught with extreme difficulties. And so it was. Without re-

<sup>1</sup> This investigation was supported by a research grant, Grant M-839, from The National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service.

<sup>2</sup> Paper read at the American Psychological Association Convention, Chicago, August 30, 1956.

<sup>3</sup> I wish to acknowledge the invaluable assistance given by Dr. J. A. Gengerelli in acting as consultant on experimental design and statistical methodology. I wish also to gratefully acknowledge the contribution made to the project by Dr. Frederic G. Worden in his capacity of psychiatric consultant. Finally, there is no adequate way to express my gratitude to Dr. Karl Muenzinger for his assistance in thinking through the total project with me in its many phases.

*Editorial Note:* It is an uncommon event in these days of compulsive publication to discover an author who has worked diligently and with great detail and who hesitates to publish well-substantiated findings until proof is virtually incontrovertible. A study such as Dr. Hooker's challenges several widespread and emotional convictions. In view of the importance of her findings it seemed desirable to the editors that they be made public, even in their preliminary form. If some of Dr. Hooker's comments, as cautiously presented as they are, seem premature or incompletely documented, the blame must fall on the editors who exercised considerable pressure on her to publish now.—BRF



lating in detail the — in many ways — fascinating, frustrating, and gratifying aspects of the attempts to secure both of these groups, I shall describe the homosexual and heterosexual samples of thirty individuals each finally obtained.

Each homosexual man is matched for age, education, and IQ with a heterosexual man. It would have been desirable to match for other variables, also, including occupation, but this was manifestly impossible. It should also be stated at the outset that no assumptions are made about the random selection of either group. No one knows what a random sample of the homosexual population would be like; and even if one knew, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain one. The project would not have been possible without the invaluable assistance of the Mattachine Society, an organization which

has as its stated purpose the development of a homosexual ethic in order to better integrate the homosexual into society. The members of the Mattachine Society not only made themselves available as subjects but also persuaded their friends to become subjects. Because the heterosexuals were, for the most part, obtained from community organizations which must remain anonymous, I cannot describe further the way in which they were obtained.

Considerable effort was devoted to securing the 30 matched pairs of subjects, and the data in Table I indicate that in most instances the matching was unusually close.

The homosexuals, and thus the heterosexuals, ranged in age from 25 to 50, with an average age of 34.5 for the homosexual group and 36.6 for the heterosexual group. The IQ range, as measured by the Otis Self-Adminis-

tering Tests of Mental Ability, was from 90 to 135, with an average for the homosexual group of 115.4 and for the heterosexual group of 116.2. In education the range was from completion of grammar school to the equivalent of a master's degree, with an average for the homosexual group of 13.9 years and for the heterosexual group of 14.3.

In both groups subjects were eliminated who were in therapy at the time. If, in the preliminary screening, evidence of considerable disturbance appeared, the individual was eliminated (5 heterosexuals; 5 homosexuals). I attempted to secure homosexuals who would be pure for homosexuality; that is, without heterosexual experience. With three exceptions this is so. These three subjects had not had more than three heterosexual experiences, and they identified themselves as homosexual in their patterns of desire and behavior. The heterosexual group is exclusively heterosexual beyond the adolescent period, with three exceptions; these three had had a single homosexual experience each. In the effort to control the presence of homosexuality, latent or otherwise, in the heterosexual group, each potential subject was referred by a responsible leader of a community group, who described him as being a thorough-going heterosexual and well adjusted. This was an attempt to take precautions to eliminate as many men as possible with homosexual patterns of behavior. It did not do so, and some individuals came who had to be eliminated because, though married and functioning in the community as married men, they had had extensive homosexual experience (four subjects).

The heterosexual subjects came because they were told that this was an opportunity to contribute to our understanding of the way in which the average individual in the community functions, since we had little data on normal men. They were told nothing

beforehand about the homosexual aspects of the project. When an individual came to me, after describing to him the nature of the testing and the interview and securing his willingness to participate in the project, I then described very briefly the purpose of the study, including the homosexual group. It was impossible to avoid this explanation. The community leaders who referred these men were concerned about possible repercussions of a "sex study". They required that each man be informed that the total project involved a comparison of homosexual and heterosexual men. I had, therefore, to risk the effect of this information upon my subjects. So, having very briefly described the project to him, I then asked whether he had had any homosexual inclinations or experience. This question was put in a matter-of-fact way and only after a good relationship of cooperation had been established. If the individual seemed to be severely disturbed by the question, or responded in a bland way, or denied it vehemently, I did not include him in the sample of 30. It is possible, though I doubt it, that there are some heterosexuals in my group who have strong latent or concealed overt homosexuality.

The materials used for the comparative study of personality structure and adjustment of these two groups of men consisted of a battery of projective techniques, attitude scales, and intensive life history interviews. The material I am reporting on here is largely from an analysis of the Rorschach, TAT, and MAPS, with some references to life histories, the detailed analysis of which has not yet been completed.

I used the Rorschach because many clinicians believe it to be the best method of assessing total personality structure and, also, because it is one of the test instruments currently used for the diagnosis of homosexuality. The 60 Rorschach protocols were

TABLE I

Matched Pairs Number	Homosexual			Heterosexual		
	Age	IQ	Education	Age	IQ	Education
1.....	42	105	12	41	105	12
2.....	29	104	12	28	104	12
3.....	29	109	9	31	109	12
4.....	31	120	16	30	123	16
5.....	44	127	18	45	126	17
6.....	33	127	16	32	129	16
7.....	40	124	16	42	123	16
8.....	33	124	16	36	122	16
9.....	40	98	12	42	100	12
10.....	33	101	14	32	105	15
11.....	30	127	14	29	127	16
12.....	42	91	12	39	94	14
13.....	44	98	9	44	100	12
14.....	36	114	16	36	117	16
15.....	33	120	14	34	120	16
16.....	40	106	12	44	107	12
17.....	37	116	12	34	113	14
18.....	36	127	16	36	127	16
19.....	35	103	12	37	101	11
20.....	26	133	18	27	133	18
21.....	33	124	13	36	122	16
22.....	32	123	12	39	120	12
23.....	26	123	16	29	133	16
24.....	26	123	16	29	133	16
25.....	41	135	16	39	119	16
26.....	28	114	16	35	112	13
27.....	27	118	13	48	119	13
28.....	27	110	14	48	113	16
29.....	57	95	14	46	100	12
30.....	26	124	14	30	129	12



scored by me, the usual tabulations made, and the profiles constructed. With all identifying information except age eliminated, they were then arranged in random order. Two clinicians, who are also experts in Rorschach, analyzed each of the 60 protocols separately in this order. Because of the importance of knowing how, by what process, using what evidence in the Rorschach, a judge arrived at his rating or judgment in each of the categories, each judge was urged to describe as much as he could of the procedure he was using, the conclusions arrived at, and the evidence used; and the whole process was recorded by Audograph. Let it be said here that the task which the judges were asked to perform, that of analyzing 60 records in succession and of verbalizing the whole process, was a monumental one. It demanded not only a devotion to science "beyond the call of duty" but also an admirable willingness to expose one's fallibility. My success in persuading Dr. Klopfer and Dr. Mortimer Meyer, for the Rorschach, and Dr. Shneidman, for the TAT and MAPS, to give so generously of themselves in this project was primarily due to their belief in its importance and to their eagerness to see a unique body of material and to engage in what they anticipated to be a rewarding learning experience.

The purpose of the Rorschach analysis was two-fold: (1) to obtain an unbiased judgment (that is, without knowledge of homosexual or heterosexual identification of subjects and without life-history materials) of personality structure and overall adjustment of the subjects in both groups; (2) to determine the accuracy with which expert clinicians who are Rorschach workers can differentiate homosexual from heterosexual records. Each judge was asked, in addition to the overall adjustment rating, to analyze the Rorschach protocol in terms of a number of categories, such

as methods of handling aggression, affection and dependency needs, methods of impulse control, and clinical label, if any. These judgment categories were used because of their theoretical importance in current approaches to homosexuality. The adjustment rating was on a five-point scale: from 1, superior, to 5, maladjusted; with 3 representing average adjustment. The norm which the judges used was, of course, a subjective one, of average adjustment in the population at large, not just in this group. Assigning an adjustment rating to a Rorschach protocol is difficult, as all of us know. The meanings of the five points of the rating scale were defined as follows: (1) superior, or top adjustment; better than the average person in the total population; evidence of superior integration of capacities, both intellectual and emotional; ease and comfort in relation to the self and in functioning effectively in relation to the social environment; (3) as well-adjusted as the average person in the total population; nothing conspicuously good or bad; (5) bottom limit of normal group and/or maladjusted, with signs of pathology. Ratings 2 and 4 are self-evident, 2 being better-than-average but not quite superior, and 4 being worse-than-average, or the bottom limit of the average group. These ratings are very difficult to objectify, and it is very difficult to be sure that they were used in the same way by the two judges.

One further comment about procedure, before discussing the results of the judging on adjustment: each judge, before he began, knew that some records were homosexual and some were heterosexual. Most clinicians in the Los Angeles area are familiar with the project, and it would have been impossible to secure experts without some knowledge of it. The judge was told that the opportunity to distinguish homosexual from heterosexual records would

TABLE II—Ratings on Overall Adjustment—Rorschach

r	Group	Ratings				
		(Top)				(Bottom)
		1	2	3	4	5
Judge "A"	Homosexual.....	9	9	4	3	5
	Heterosexual.....	6	12	5	3	4
	Total.....	15	21	9	6	9
Judge "B"	Homosexual.....	2	15	5	4	4
	Heterosexual.....	2	8	9	8	3
	Total.....	4	23	14	12	7

come later and that the present task was that of telling me as much as he could about what he thought the subject to be like in personality structure and adjustment. If anything impressed him about the pattern of sexual adjustment, he should say it, but this was not the primary purpose of this stage of the analysis. The task of the judges was broken down into two steps: (1) The protocols were analyzed, with overall adjustment ratings given and summary judgments made, in the categories already described; and (2) each judge was then presented with 30 pairs of protocols, matched for age, education, and IQ, the task being to distinguish the homosexual record in each pair.

The results of the judging of adjustment from the Rorschach protocols are presented in Table II.

It will be noted that there are no significant differences between the number of homosexuals and heterosexuals having a rating of 3 and better for each judge; two-thirds of each group are assigned an adjustment rating of 3 or better. There are apparent differences between judges. For Judge "B" there is a greater unwillingness to assign a top rating. In fact, for Judge "B", there is a slight but insignificant trend in the direction of

superior adjustment for the homosexual group. By the method of "grand medians", chi square for Judge "A" is zero for the differences in adjustment between heterosexuals and homosexuals and for Judge "B" the difference is 2.31, which is insignificant.

The immediate question is the degree of agreement between the two judges. Although a Tschuprow coefficient between the ratings of Judge "A" and Judge "B" is only 0.33, it is important to point out that the situation is not as bad as this low coefficient would seem to indicate.

Table III shows that the two judges agreed exactly in 19 of the 60 cases, 8 being homosexual and 11 heterosexual. In 23 cases they disagreed by one rating step, 12 of these being homosexual and 11 heterosexual. This means that in 42 out of the 60 cases there was either exact agreement or disagreement by only one step. So it is safe to say that in two-thirds of the total distribution there is high agreement. An additional fact that may be pointed out is that 14, or approximately one-half, of the homosexuals were placed either in Adjustment Rating 1 or 2 by both judges.

How is one to interpret this finding? Is one to take it at face value and

TABLE III

Differences	Number of Subjects		
	Total	Homosexual	Heterosexual
0 (exact agreement).....	19	8	11
1 rating step.....	23	12	11
2 rating steps.....	14	7	7
3 rating steps.....	4	3	1
	60	30	30

assume that the Rorschach is a valid instrument for determining adjustment in the way in which we have defined it? If so, then clearly there is no inherent connection between pathology and homosexuality. But caution is needed. As clinicians, we are well aware, in daily practice, of the limitations of projective material analyzed "blind". Nevertheless, the quantitative results are striking, and they are confirmed in part by observations of the judges, as well as — and I say this with great caution — by life-history data.

But let us look at the results in the second task given the judges, that of distinguishing between matched pairs of homosexual and heterosexual records. This is a much easier task than that which the clinician ordinarily faces, of identifying homosexuality in one record out of many; and yet it proved to be a very difficult one. As a judge compared the matched protocols, he would frequently comment, "There are no clues;" or, "These are so similar that you are out to skin us alive;" or, "It is a forced choice;" or, "I just have to guess." The difficulty of the task was reflected not only in the comments of the judges but also in the results. Judge "A" correctly identified 17 of the 30 pairs, and Judge "B" 18 of the 30. Thus neither judge was able to do better than chance. In seven pairs both judges were incorrect, that is, identifying the homosexual as the heterosexual, and vice versa; in twelve pairs, correct; and in the remaining eleven they disagreed.

Let us look at the problems the judges faced. In some pairs of records none of the clues usually considered to be signs of homosexuality occurred. In some pairs the "homosexual clues" appeared in both records. These "homosexual clues" were primarily anality, open or disguised; avoidance of areas usually designated as vaginal areas; articles of feminine clothing, especially under-clothing, and/or art

objects elaborated with unusual detail; responses giving evidence of considerable sexual confusion, with castration anxiety, and/or hostile or fearful attitudes toward women; evidence of feminine cultural identification, and/or emotional involvement between males. When these clues appeared in neither or in both records, the judge was forced to look for other evidence, and most frequently depended upon peculiar verbalization, or responses with idiosyncratic meaning, or the "flavor" of the total record. When careful examination failed to reveal anything distinctive, the judge assumed that the more banal or typical record was that of the heterosexual, an assumption which was sometimes false.

After the judging was completed, and, indeed, even while it was in process, both judges commented on the fact that the records which they thought to be homosexual were unlike the ones they were familiar with in the clinic. They were not the disturbed records ordinarily seen. One judge, in the process of choosing, said, "It begins to look as if the homosexuals have all the good things: for example, M's and Fc." It may be pertinent to reiterate that I had made an effort to secure records of homosexuals who ordinarily would not be seen in a clinic. A discussion of the validity and reliability of homosexual signs is tangential to this symposium<sup>4</sup>, but I would point out in passing that my data indicate the need for a thorough-going reconsideration of this problem. At a minimum, healthy skepticism about many (but not all) so-called homosexual-content signs in the Rorschach is, I think, called for. The inability of the judges to distinguish the homosexual from the heterosexual records better than

<sup>4</sup> A paper on "Homosexuality in the Rorschach" is in process of preparation. It will contain a full discussion of homosexual signs, as well as other aspects of homosexuality in the Rorschach.

would be expected by chance fits, I think, the finding on adjustment of the two groups. Some of the records can be easily distinguished; the fact that the judges agreed in their identification of twelve pairs indicates this. These were records of individuals with strong emphasis on "femininity" and/or anality. But apart from these, which constitute about a third of the group, the remaining two-thirds cannot be easily distinguished. If the homosexual records had been similar to those frequently seen in the clinic, that is, severely disturbed, there might have been greater probability that they could have been correctly identified, although this cannot be said with certainty. I have now seen about two hundred homosexual records and would be skeptical about my ability to identify correctly records similar to many in this group.

Although it is not pertinent to this symposium<sup>5</sup> to present in detail the findings of the statistical comparisons of the two groups of Rorschach protocols, it is relevant to point out in summary form that most of these comparisons have failed to produce differences of sufficient magnitude to satisfy tests of significance. Several examples will suffice to make the point. Although most studies of homosexual protocols indicate greater productivity on the Rorschach, the difference between the two groups in the present study does not reach significance, though there is a trend in this direction ( $t=1.389$ ,  $df=29$ ,  $p>.10$ ). A detailed comparison of total M's and human figures was made. Of some 25 computations, of differences between means of M% in various categories (such as flexor or extensor), differences in form level, variation in form level, etc., the only ones which approached low significance were the sigma of form level ( $t=1.98$ ,  $df=29$ ,  $p>.05$ ), and O-minus percent ( $t=2.262$ ,  $df=29$ ,  $p<.02$ ).

Cronbach's warning about inflation

of probabilities deters me from drawing too many conclusions from these two findings, although there is good theoretical rationale for them. The details of the analysis will be discussed more appropriately in a later paper. I cite these general findings at this time in order to show that despite considerable effort and the pursuing of many alluring possibilities, the efforts thus far to establish clear-cut differences between the two groups as a whole have been relatively fruitless. This, too, is consistent with the lack of significant differences between the adjustments of the two groups.

In addition to the overall adjustment ratings, each judge gave summary statements about each subject in a number of categories, including methods of handling aggression, affectional and dependency needs, and form of impulse control. When these statements were tabulated and subjected to statistical analysis, again no clear-cut differences emerged.<sup>6</sup> For example, the statements about affectional and dependency needs have been tabulated in eleven categories, such as repressed or absent, ego-alien, integrates well, controlled by (that is, a dependent character). Four homosexuals were described as having affectional and dependency needs repressed or absent, while three heterosexuals were similarly described. Six homosexuals and six heterosexuals were described as integrating well these needs. It was said of one homosexual and one heterosexual that affectional and dependency needs were ego-alien. Chi square for differences between the number of heterosexuals and homosexuals assigned to all categories is 5.736,  $df=10$ , insignificant.

(Part Two of this article will appear in the January issue of *Mattachine Review*.)

<sup>6</sup> The complete data will be reported in the future publication previously referred to.

<sup>5</sup> See Footnote 4.



# BOOKS

## **BIGOTRY has a field day**

**IS HOMOSEXUALITY A MENACE?** by Dr. Arthur Guy Mathews:  
New York. Robert M. McBride Company, 1937. pp. 302. Reviewed  
by Joseph A. Moore.

"There must be a very good reason for spending many years researching and writing on such a subject as homosexuality," reads the first sentence of the author's introduction to this volume. His answer would seem to be that he considers it his mission in life to rescue the world from this "scourge" and that no holds are barred in his attempts to do so. But the mass of distortions, half-truths, and unsupported bias which make up the volume suggest that this "doctor" (his specific degree is nowhere mentioned in the book) probably has a serious personal problem of a psychiatric nature in the sexual area.

He ignores most recognized scientific literature in the field of homosexuality and attacks violently when he cannot logically do so, as for instance in the case of the Kinsey studies. His "case studies" are based exclusively on his own experiences, with no indication, for example, of the doctors, clinics or hospitals where his reported "cures" were effected. His arrogance and vituperativeness are carried to fantastic extremes. Broad generalizations are alternated with such ignorant specific statements as: "I know at least 15 top humorists who are having great difficulty in getting real down-to-earth humorous books published because a majority of editors in the good publishing houses are unhappy sexual deviates not inwardly disposed to enjoy a good belly laugh."

### INFORMATION FOLDERS

Two folders, designed to be used as companion mailing pieces, are available from national headquarters of the Mattachine Society and its branch offices. They are "In Case You Didn't Know" and "What Has Mattachine Done?" The first outlines the homosexual problem in the U.S. and describes the purpose of the Society; the second tells how the Society is dealing with the problem and what the organization is doing. Prices are: 100 for \$1.50; 50 for \$1.00; smaller quantities, 3 cents each. Unless specified otherwise, orders will be filled with equal quantities of each folder.

In general the book appears to be a sort of Lait-Mortimer "Confidential" volume completely emasculated by leaving out all famous names, except a few long-dead movie actors. But both the author and publisher are likely to find that the public which goes in for arrogantly moralistic pseudo-pornography of this kind are much less interested when the moderately salacious material is not connected with the names they are used to seeing in the gossip columns.

As a serious approach to an important problem in our society—the place of the homosexual within it—the volume is utterly useless, cheap, vulgar trash.

## **RE-CREATED by literary magic**

**COUP DE GRACE** by Marguerite Yourcenar. Translated by Grace Frick in collaboration with the author. Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, New York, 1957. 151 pages. \$3.00. Reviewed by Richard Mayer.

Marguerite Yourcenar is a literary magician. She doesn't just create characters; she becomes them. First she was the Emperor Hadrian writing his memoirs in second century Rome. Now she is Erick von Lhomond, cynical soldier of fortune, recalling two friends he lost during the campaign against the Bolsheviks on the Baltic front just after World War I.

But her magic goes further. She does not merely describe places; she transports us to them. While reading *Memoirs of Hadrian*, we lived in the rich, lush, technicolored Mediterranean world. In *Coup de Grace* we are in barren, gray northern lands. (Having now been taken both places, this reviewer must express a personal preference for Rome. The climate is better and the people, on the whole, are more interesting.)

Only the magician can understand fully the method of the magic, but certainly one aspect of it is an uncanny preciseness in the use of just the right word which will create the image or express the exact evocative overtone she wants.

*Coup de Grace* is primarily a fascinating self-portrait of an ambivalent homosexual, alternately attracted and repelled by the offer of a woman's love. When Sophie, suddenly grown out of childhood, fell in love with Erick, his love had long since been given to her brother, Conrad. "Why is it," wonders Erick, "that women fall in love with the very men who are destined otherwise, and who, accordingly, must repulse them or else deny their own nature?" The triangle was bound to end tragically in any circumstances; here war raised the stakes to life and death.

While the book is mainly an account of the anguished relationship between Erick and Sophie, the most poignant pages tell of the death

of Conrad. Many years later, Erick recalls his friend in these words:

"I have known happiness, the real thing, the inalterable gold piece exchangeable for whole handfuls of lesser coin . . . Whether that felicity emanated from Conrad or only from our youth itself, I cannot say, but it hardly matters, since youth for me died with Conrad."

Many readers may feel that the book also should have ended with Conrad's death. But one scene remains to be played. Sophie's horrifying revenge for Erick's rejection of her love (if revenge is really what it was) may seem unbelievable, even though we have been told this is a true story. If so, the villain is war which makes men do what in other circumstances would be unthinkable.

Perhaps the moral is expressed in Erick's concluding words, "One is always trapped somehow in dealings with women." But some readers who have followed Erick's story may suspect that he trapped himself.

#### PRESS REACTION TO THE WOLFENDEN REPORT

(Continued from Page 31)

is where homosexuality, prostitution, and all their associated evils begin, and it is here that there should begin the great war against them.

#### THE "SCANDAL SHEETS"

"News of the World" is a periodical that seems to exist primarily for the purpose of titillating its readers with news of sexual illegalities, particularly those in which a member of the clergy can be found to have seduced some little boys. Nevertheless its holier-than-thou editorial comment about such goings on was neatly summed up in the sub-head it used on its editorial attacking the Wolfenden recommendations: "Let's Leave Ill Alone."

At a superficial glance, "The People" would seem to be a sheet of the same type but its major interests are far more heterosexual than homosexual, with the result that it concerned itself almost entirely with the prostitution half of the Report. "The People" scolds the committee for not going far enough in its investigation of this "oldest profession's" current problems, claiming that girls ARE lured into it, and that the vice overlords keep it highly organized, with many importations of foreign workers to compete with the native laborers in the vineyards of vice. Their recorded interviews with working prostitutes were mild, however, compared with those the "Sunday Pictorial" managed to obtain.

Sales of all these publications must have been brisk—but that appears to be the sole purpose of such journalism.

(A third "Wolfenden Report" article in a future issue of the Review will tell how readers of British papers reacted to the press coverage of the Report. It is also from the pen of Gregory Trout.)

## *mattachine* REVIEW

**SUBSCRIPTIONS:** \$4 per year in the U.S., Canada and Mexico; single copies 50 cents. \$5 per year elsewhere. All copies mailed first class sealed in plain envelope.

**STAFF:** Publications Director and Editor, Hal Call; Business Manager, D. Stewart Lucas; Production Director, Henry Foster, Jr. Editorial Board: Richard Mayer, Gonzalo Segura, Jr., Carl B. Harding.

**MANUSCRIPTS:** Original articles, reviews of current books, letters and comment for publication are solicited on a no-fee basis. Where return of manuscript is desired, first class postage should be included.

**ADVERTISEMENTS:** Accepted only from publishers and/or authors of books, magazines and periodicals concerning homosexual and related sex behavior subjects, and from book stores or mail order book services in this field. Rates upon application. Publisher reserves right to reject any and all advertising.

**OFFICE OF PUBLICATION** (to which all communications should be addressed): 693 Mission Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. Telephone EXbrook 7-0773.

**COPYRIGHT 1957** by the Mattachine Society, Inc. All rights reserved to material not otherwise credited.

## *mattachine* DIRECTORY

### *National Headquarters*

MATTACHINE SOCIETY, INC., 693 Mission Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. Tel. EXbrook 7-0773

### *Branch Offices*

CHICAGO Chapter—Post Office Box 3513, Merchandise Mart Post Office, Chicago 54, Ill.

DENVER Chapter—Post Office Box 7035, Capitol Hill Station, Denver 6, Colo. Tel. FLorida 5-3438 (Sec.)

LOS ANGELES Area Council—Post Office Box 1925, Los Angeles 53, Calif. Tel. NORmandie 3-2616 (Chm.)

NEW YORK Area Council—1183 Avenue of the Americas (4th Fl.), New York 36, N.Y. Tel. CIRCLE 5-1868

SAN FRANCISCO Area Council—693 Mission St., San Francisco 5, Calif. Tel. EXbrook 7-0773

Communications to branch offices above should be addressed in all cases in care of Mattachine Society, Inc.

---

# **Worth Looking Into**

---

***Mattachine Review makes  
an ideal gift at Christmas  
or any time of the year!***

***By giving it to close  
friends, relatives or  
professional associates  
you will aid their  
understanding of the  
homophile problem,  
and help support  
Mattachine projects***



**Read the details about gift subscriptions,  
back issues and bound volumes in the  
green pages in the center of this issue . . .**

***mattachine*** **REVIEW**

---