



**Editor**

**HAROLD L. CALL**

**Associate Editor**

**LEWIS C. CHRISTIE**

**Business Manager**

**DONALD S. LUCAS**

**Treasurer**

**O. CONRAD BOWMAN, JR.**

**Editorial Board**

**ROLLAND HOWARD**

**WALLACE DE ORTEGA MAXEY**

**Trademark Registered**

**U.S. Patent Office**

*Published monthly by the Mattachine Society, Inc., 693 Mission Street, San Francisco 5, California. Telephone: DOuglas 2-3799.*

*Copyright 1962 by the Mattachine Society, Inc. Eighth year of publication. Mattachine Foundation, Inc., established in 1950 at Los Angeles; Mattachine Society formed in 1953 and chartered as non-profit, non-partisan educational, research and social service corporation in California. Founded in the public interest for the purpose of providing accurate information leading to solution of sex behavior problems, particularly those of the homosexual adult.*

*The REVIEW is available on many U.S. newsstands at 50¢ per copy, and by subscription (mailed in plain, sealed envelope). Rates in advance: \$5 in U.S. and possessions; \$6 foreign.*

# **mattachine REVIEW**

**Founded in 1954 - First Issue January 1955**

**Volume VIII      NOVEMBER 1962      Number 11**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- 2 CALLING SHOTS**
- 4 CHANGING RELIGIOUS ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALITY**, by Rev. Robert W. Wood. Part One.
- 13 HOMOSEXUALS IN GOVERNMENT: Can We Afford the Manpower Waste and Human Tragedy Resulting from Our Double Standard of Morals?** by Richard L. Schlegel.
- 26 THE EXISTENTIAL APPROACH TO HOMOSEXUALITY**, by Dennison W. Nichols. Part Three—Conclusion.
- 31 BOOKS**
- 33 READERS WRITE**

*Cover Drawing by John F. Scott*

## **SPECIAL NOTICE TO ALL SUBSCRIBERS**

*New Postal Regulations and rising costs make it imperative that you **MUST** notify the Mattachine REVIEW office of any change of address.*

*We **MUST** have all changes of address at least 30 days prior to moving. Please cooperate with the REVIEW and help us to save money in this important area.*

**ADVERTISEMENTS:** Accepted only from publishers and/or authors of books, magazines, periodicals and booksellers concerned with homosexual and other sexological subjects. Rates upon application.  
**MANUSCRIPTS:** Original articles, reviews, letters and significant opinion, and appropriate short stories solicited for publication on a no-fee basis. Please include first class postage for return.

# Changing Religious Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

REVEREND ROBERT W. WOOD

*Delivered via tape at 9th Annual Conference of the Mattachine Society, August 25, 1962 luncheon, Jack Tar Hotel, San Francisco, California.*

It is with extreme regret that I am unable to be present with you in person on this occasion. I had been looking forward to meeting so many of you whom I know only by correspondence and for the opportunity to become acquainted with the city of San Francisco. Your leaders know why it was necessary for me to alter my plans at this late date. I shall miss the opportunity of informal discussion which is so important a part of a meeting like this. May I take this opportunity to thank Mattachine for the Award of Merit it voted me in 1960 upon the publication of my book *Christ and the Homosexual*. Your Award came as a ray of encouragement amidst some dark reactions to the book.

For this Ninth Annual Conference I have been asked to speak on "Changing Religious Attitudes Toward Homosexuality." The casual observer might conclude that there has been no progress in the past ten years between organized religion, which I shall call the Church, and homosexuality. But a second look will reveal some positive dialogue resulting in mutual benefit. Let it be understood that I make my observations and conclusions as one Protestant clergyman and that I am not in a position to know all that has occurred in the past decade in the two areas under study. If I fail to mention some positive accomplishments of which you are aware I hope you will call them to my attention.

In my listing of positive changes in religious attitudes toward homosexuality in the past ten years I have placed them in order of over-all importance. In 1955 the late Rev. Dr. David E. Roberts, Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in Union Theological Seminary, New York City, wrote in his *Foreword* to Dr. George W. Henry's *All the Sexes*: "Suffice it to say in a sentence, that there are ample reasons in the Jewish-Christian tradition for developing a more effective understand-

ing of the role of sexuality in human misery and beatitude, and for developing more humane, life-saving, soul-saving attitudes on a firm religious footing." This was one of the first widely publicized statements by a respected churchman which was related directly to a ministry to the homosexually afflicted individual.

The comments by Rabbi Alvin Fine and Bishop James Pike on the now famous television program "The Rejected" were not very momentous in themselves. But the fact that two such spokesmen from the area of organized religion were willing to do this much causes me to list this one little event on the positive side. One hopes it will be repeated by other educational TV channels. I wonder if the Roman Catholic Church does not now regret that it failed to provide a spokesman for this program. Beyond the value of the comments by these two I see a greater value in the encouragement their actions will have for other clergy who may in the future have an opportunity to make a positive contribution.

Each year the six Presidents of the World Council of Churches issue a statement to be read in all their member churches on Pentecost. The one for Pentecost 1962, contained this significant sentence: "The Holy Spirit can never preside over a closed society for self-congratulation, but only over an outgoing society of forgiveness and service." More Church thinking expanded along this line will result in further positive changes in the dialogue between religion and homosexuality.

In 1955 the Anglican Church issued the pamphlet "Letter to a Homosexual." While it stops too abruptly in its solution it does show that one segment of Christendom is aware of the problem and is at least offering something in the way of understanding and direction. The Roman Catholic book, *Morality and the Homosexual*, ends at the same point; but again, it is a positive effort to bring religion and homosexuality in contact with each other. The Missouri Lutherans in "Sex and the Church" also attempt to confront the two areas constructively but failed to get as far as the Anglicans or Romans. But at least they tried. To my knowledge no other segment of the Church has published on either side of this dialogue. What these three have done is quite limited but is at least a step in the right direction.

It is gratifying to know that the national YMCA has at long last begun to concern itself in a redemptive way with the matter of homosexuality among its members and guests. Only a few years ago Sloane House in New York City was using paid informers and dividers in the shower stalls as its response to the presence of homosexuals in its rooms. Now it has begun seriously to examine the Christian approach to the entire matter.

Last February I was invited by the students and their faculty advisors at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, to address the Monday Noon Forum on "The Church's Ministry to the Homosexual." My 40-minute address to some 160 students and faculty was followed by searching questions. That a group of seminarians would be concerned enough on this matter of Church-homosexual relations and who also felt they were not finding direction in their regular courses to invite an outside speaker is, indeed, an encouraging note. It has come to my attention since the lecture that it was the most talked about Monday Noon Forum of the academic year and resulted in a special release seven weeks later from the President's office stating *his* position on homosexuality.

There are a few isolated denominational leaders who are concerning themselves with a ministry to the homosexual as it may relate to their specific sphere of concern. Such men as Tom Driver, drama critic of *The Christian Century* and assistant professor of Theology, Union Seminary, New York City; Roger Hazelton, Dean of the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College; Roger L. Shinn, Professor of Applied Christianity at Union Seminary and President of the United Church of Homeland Ministries of the United Church of Christ; Herman Reissig, Director of International Relations of the Council of Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ; Theodore Gill, formerly an editor of *The Christian Century* and now President of one of your west coast seminaries; Samuel McCrea Cavert, one of the architects of the World Council of Churches. While none of these men, to my knowledge, has blazed any new trails concerning religious attitudes towards homosexuality each has shown an awareness of the need for intelligent confrontation and called it to the attention of some limited segments of the Church. Listen to what these men are writing:

Dr. Shinn: "It's (Christianity's) heritage has recalled it repeatedly to a mission of protest and transformation... Social ethics requires continually both the enlarging of our minds and the purging of our spirits." pp. 65, 68.

Dr. Cavert: "It (the Church) has to be the defender of the oppressed, of the victims of injustice, and of the down-trodden whenever the dignity and rights of any children of God are denied by the forces of dominant authority and power." p. 205.

Roger Hazelton: "There is great need for the patient building of consensus, the frank encounter of traditions, the willing exposure to the unfamiliar and the hitherto suspected viewpoints." p. 242.

The preceding quotations are all found in *New Frontiers of Christianity*, published by Association Press, 1962.

Almost each month I learn of another clergyman who has been counselling, or who is willing to counsel, homosexuals. Some of these are unaware that there are other brothers of the cloth doing the same thing. Many are doing so without the knowledge of their superiors or their congregations. Last October eight such Protestant ministers met in New York City for a two day seminar and found the common sharing both educational and spiritual. Yet there are a growing number of isolated clergymen who are ready to counsel spiritually disturbed homosexuals. There is a need for a central clearing house where the names and addresses of such clergy can be made available to the homosexuals or their loved ones. We are not yet at the point where we can take for granted that every minister-priest-rabbi will counsel in this area. To date the Church has accomplished nothing as significant as the law reform group has done in the state of Illinois yet many personal sacrifices are being made by isolated and unknown clergy who seek to minister to homosexuals.

Just as there are individual and isolated clergy throughout the country giving direction to spiritually disturbed homosexuals and their loved ones so, too, there are some individual churches engaged in an effective ministry to the homosexual. Frequently such ministry is carried on openly by the pastor but goes unrecognized by the heterosexual members of the congregation. Other times the church gains a reputation for ministering to homosexuals but doesn't seek to flee from such reputation. The historic Judson Memorial Church on the south side of Washington Square in Greenwich Village is an example of the latter type. It is most difficult to measure the ramifications engendered by these isolated churches but one must be grateful for their ministry: silent, unheralded; but effective for individual lives.

The Church is becoming increasingly aware of the world wide problem of over population. The Rev. Thomas Malthus some 164 years ago called the world's attention to what was happening but no one listened seriously. Now in the past ten years we have witnessed a very dramatic turn-about by the Protestant community. A member of my own denomination, Richard Fagley, published "The Population Explosion and Christian Responsibility" in 1960. *The Christian Century* and other Protestant journals are giving increasing concern to the demographic revolution. This very month—August, 1962—the national Adult Church School lessons of the Methodist Church are spending all four Sundays on this specific problem. As the Church becomes increasingly aware of the social magnitude and theological implications of such rapid human reproduction as is now inundating the earth and searches for moral ways of abating such pending catastrophe it must eventually deal with the



role homosexuality plays in birth control. Thus the Church will be forced to re-examine its traditional attitude toward what appears to be an escape valve provided by an all wise Creator.

Within these years under study the centuries old position of the Church which maintained that procreation was the primary purpose of marriage has been cracked. There had been individual clergy who dared to say that procreation might not be *the* primary purpose of marriage and certainly there were tens of thousands of childless couples who felt no less Christian because they had no offspring. But an official voice was heard when the 1958 Lambeth Conference—a meeting of all the Bishops of the Church of England, the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, and all other Episcopal Churches in the world—in its statement on “Theology of Sexuality and Family” said: “The Biblical revelation, however, does not limit the function of sexuality and the family to the reproductive process.” It goes on to say, “...the procreation of children is not the only purpose of marriage...it is utterly wrong to urge that, unless children are specifically desired, sexual intercourse is of the nature of sin. It is also wrong to say that such intercourse ought not to be engaged in except with the willing intention to procreate children.” This ought now to refute Pitrim Sorokin’s dastardly statement in his book *The American Sex Revolution* when he wrote, “Childless marriages and families are truncated, semi-fulfilled unions.”

The more the Church comes to recognize that there might be other worthy reasons for marriage besides the begetting of siblings the sooner it will come to realize that homosexual marriages are as capable of becoming sacramental as are heterosexual marriages. Indeed, listen to this statement from the same Lambeth report and see how easily and how accurately it applies to homosexual marriages as well as to heterosexual marriages, which, of course, is all it had in mind. “Sexual intercourse is not by any means the only language of earthly love, but it is, in its full and right use, the most intimate and the most revealing; it has the depth of communication signified by the Biblical word so often used for it, ‘knowledge,’ it is a giving and receiving in the unity of two free spirits which is in itself good (within the marriage bond) and mediates good to those who share it.” (p. 13)

A noticeable movement within contemporary Protestant theological circles is to make the Gospel message more *non-religious*; in other words, an effort to make the Gospel message an existential message. Or, to put it another way: some Protestant theologians are giving less emphasis to the Word of God and instead elevating the Spirit of God as they relate to a given situation. This is still an infant in theological

circles and we all wait to see what might develop from it. But I see in this new movement a highly encouraging potential for a meaningful dialogue between Church and homosexuality.

The historic North American Conference on Church and Family Life held April 30–May 5, 1961, at Green Lake, Wisconsin, and the subsequent *Findings* report and publication of “Sex Ways—In Fact and Faith” is *the* major positive change in religious attitudes toward homosexuality in the past decade. Some 600 scientists, educators, and clergy from 28 Protestant denominations released their own inhibitions towards talking frankly and searchingly about sex and contributed constructive and challenging thinking to the very area we are considering in this address. Sponsored jointly by the Canadian Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches of Christ, this pioneering venture will be returning beneficent results for years to come. In evidence may I quote a few remarks from the official *Findings* of the various sub-groups present:

From the “Preamble”—“Is the satisfaction of the sexual urge to be considered an end in itself or the providential means by which a personal fellowship of the two individuals concerned is created?” *Note*...it did *not* say “two individuals of opposite sex”!

Under the heading “What problems and concerns do these topics raise for the Church?” we read statements asking what theology has to say, statements asking for a re-examination of the meaning of Christian marriage, and the over-all question “How can the churches become more effective in dealing with sex problems?”

Under “specific problems” in this *Findings* report of the Church’s study of sex we read, “Homosexuality—What revisions in attitude and treatment does new research data suggest?” and “Masturbation—In light of the data, should the churches continue to denounce masturbation?”

Under the sub-heading, “What the Church Should Do,” this trail-blazing report uses such phrases as “see itself as a redemptive fellowship”...“show concern for single persons”...“keep communication open with persons with sex problems”...“Include sex education in Christian education curriculum.” Its recommendations as far as homosexuality is concerned read as follows: “Education of parents and youth in sexual development of children and in nature of this problem. Work for positive legislation. Stop supplying out-dated moralism. Pastoral counseling and referral to rehabilitation facilities.” Each of these four is of paramount importance but I would place at the pinnacle the third one: “Stop supplying out-dated moralism.”



Less these *Findings* sound inconsequential or repetitious to you here, just remember that these were spoken to the Protestant churches of this country and Canada only a year ago and are still echoing in denominational offices, seminary classrooms, and individual parish offices. Many more ramifications are yet to be felt within organized religion because of this one conference and the subsequent *Findings* and book. The homosexual community can be grateful that it had so able a spokesman in Dr. Evelyn Hooker. Another friend of Mattachine, Wardell B. Pomeroy, also participated in this conference and subsequent book.

Having noted some positive efforts affecting the relationship between religion and homosexuality, let us now look at some of the negative acts in this same ten year period between 1951 and the present.

While we have just noted a few limited spots of dialogue we must recognize that the vast majority of the Church in America is not yet concerning itself in any but a negative way with homosexuality. The basic reason for this failure, I believe, is that for most of the Church—leaders and congregation—homosexuality is not yet a profoundly personal experience. This is not to say church leaders and members are not homosexuals, statistics belie that; but I am saying that the relationship between religion and homosexuality has not yet become acute enough for the Church to bestir itself. As it has in so many other areas, here too, the Church avoids the seriousness of existential participation. G. K. Chesterton is credited with having said, "Nothing is real unless it is local." For most of the Church homosexuality remains in the realm of the un-real because the Church continues to say, "No one in our parish or community is so involved."

The negative, almost hostile, reaction of the President of Union Seminary to my address to a segment of his students and faculty on "The Church's Ministry to the Homosexual" was, indeed, a sad experience. Not because I was personally involved but because Union is recognized as one of the foremost liberal seminaries in the country and if its students cannot enter into a dialogue between religion and homosexuality without incurring such presidential ire then what can we expect from the more conservative seminaries?

To bring the negative attitude of the Church right down to the present there is the illustration of the Rev. Dr. Stuart Bergsma's article in the June 8, 1962, *Christianity Today*, a conservative Protestant journal. Writing on "The Pastor and the Psychopath" he says that the homosexual who refuses to cease being a homosexual must be refused the privilege of coming to the Sacrament of Communion. This displays both an ignorance of homosexuality and a failure to plumb the depth of Chris-

tian ethics. But such men and their writings are still the predominant voice in contemporary American Protestantism.

The Church should long ago have formulated a position on its relationship to homosexuality. Now it is suddenly being brought face-to-face with the matter (through modern communication media if in no other way) and it still doesn't know what to do. On an insecure mixture of Sodom, cult prostitutes, and St. Paul the Church has historically been anti-homosexual. The penitentials offer some frightening reactions of the Church to confessions of homosexuality even to denying Communion at death and burying alive. Little wonder the spiritually lost homosexual passes the Church by, the one source where he could find redemption.

More seminaries are giving psychiatric examinations to determine that candidates for admission are not homosexuals. This, I understand, is a denomination-wide policy of the United Lutheran Church. One shudders when he reflects upon the alteration of Church history had all homosexuals been screened out before entering the roster of hymn writers, preachers, translators, colporteurs, missionaries, martyrs, and saints. In addition to screening out homosexuals before they enter the seminary there is the official position of expelling any student discovered to be one plus the examination by denominational boards of any candidate for the ministry who is suspect. Such behavior by Church leaders but broadcasts their ignorance of homosexuality and the shallowness of their own Christian ethics. I am not saying that any homosexual who applies for admission to a seminary or who seeks Ordination should be accepted. But I am saying that when an otherwise qualified and Called individual is denied admission to the clergy solely on the grounds of being a homosexual then the Church has reacted in a negative way in its confrontation with the matter.

The word "complacency" is the most dangerous word in anyone's lexicon. One of the negative acts of the Church in this area under examination is its complacency when homosexuals have come for help or where the civil liberties of homosexuals have been usurped by the State or some vigilante group. In this country the Church as a whole has kept shamefully quiet when the spirit of Christ waited to be uttered. In this area the Church continues to be a somnolent Church.

One who keeps abreast of current religious journals and books is aware of the repeated calls for "experimental ministries," "reaching out to the frontiers," "expanding opportunities of ministering," "need for pioneering clergy" and similar expressions. Yet, alas, denominational machinery, local congregations, and often the very authors themselves are really not ready nor even desirous for such confrontation. Many do

not fully appreciate the significance of their own high sounding phrases. When specifically challenged to translate their clarion calls into meaningful expressions of a Christian ministry to the homosexual community these liberal voices become silent or pre-occupied with other areas of the ministry. Again and again I have personally sought to follow-up the authors of such encouraging words asking concrete witness from them toward the homosexual. With the exceptions of the six men previously mentioned I have been sadly disillusioned by our current Protestant spokesmen crying out for a more liberal ministry. I must conclude that the majority do not intend that their high sounding words include the homosexual.

(CONTINUED IN NEXT ISSUE)

### AN IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

On January 1, 1963, subscription prices for the REVIEW will be advanced to \$7.50 per year in the U.S. and all other countries. Newsstand and single copy price will be 75¢.

In the meantime, here's a chance to renew your subscription or to order a new subscription at the present rate of \$5.00 per year.

All new and renewal subscriptions received on or before Dec. 31, 1962 will be accepted at the current rate of \$5.00 per year. Such subscriptions may be extended for a maximum period of three years hence.

All subscriptions received on or after January 1, 1963 will take the new rate of \$7.50 per year.

**NEW SUBSCRIBERS:** Let \$15.00 today buy what will otherwise cost \$22.50 if you don't subscribe before January 1, 1963.

Send your remittance today to:

**Mattachine Society, Inc.**

693 Mission Street - San Francisco 5, California

Richard L. Schlegel of Washington, D.C., delivered the "blast" of the Ninth Annual Mattachine Conference near the end of the afternoon program. His documented report printed below is aimed at a project to petition the Federal Government, particularly in the Department of Defense and in Civil Service, to re-examine and for the most part reverse a present policy of declaring all homosexuals per se to be security risks and otherwise unfit for government employment or service. Schlegel is seeking the aid of several established "homophile movement" organizations, plus the aid of many individuals in and out of government and the professions to organize and press his outlined plan. There is nothing secret or sinister about his project, but the very nature of it—because, frankly, it is one of our government's most "sacred cows" today—is such that intense interest has been shown about his proposal by law enforcement agencies on several levels.

## Homosexuals in Government:

### CAN WE AFFORD THE MANPOWER WASTE AND HUMAN TRAGEDY RESULTING FROM OUR DOUBLE STANDARD OF MORALS?

RICHARD L. SCHLEGEL

THE U.S. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT is the world's largest employer of manpower. And within that governmental complex, the Department of Defense is not only the largest single employer, but also the world's largest single consumer of goods and services. It exerts by and large the greatest impact upon employment policies of any agency in this Nation. There is hardly an industry or an industry subsidiary that is not touched in one way or another by the employment policies of this Department. Nor is there one American family that is not in some way affected by a mere handful of policy-makers at the apex of this establishment. I speak here not only of civilian employment, both within the Department of Defense itself and within the myriad of industries which service the military pipeline, but I speak also of the many millions of men and women who have in the past and present, and who will in the future, come under the control of the military services and, by so doing, subject themselves to the whims of that same handful of men.

I would speak with greater confidence if I myself had faith in that handful of men, faith that the policies they fashion would be based only upon the true national interest, without personal prejudice or malice. I cannot stand here before you today and say with any honesty that I have that conviction. I can only repeat, after studying these Departmental policies for a good many years now, and after talking directly with the men who make and administer the regulations, there is only one phrase which adequately

describes the impression I have: CONFUSION COMPOUNDED! Military administrators who can debate rationally any other subject, display utter confusion when the subject of Sex and what to do about it in the military establishment is raised.

You may ask, how is this confusion any different from anything we've been hearing about the Federal Government for years? Perhaps generally it is not, but in the case of military and civilian personnel policies—contrasted with taxation policies, or farm surplus policies—we are dealing with living, breathing human beings, whose whole future lives can be blighted by an action taken by an official administering the policies under discussion here. Consider for a minute the impact on a young soldier's life when he's drummed out the gate with nothing but a railroad ticket and an undesirable discharge in his pocket. Or consider the impact upon a professional man who is dismissed from government employment for "immoral conduct off-duty." Where do these people go from there? They either try their best to cover up the circumstances of their respective discharges, and get whatever menial jobs are available to them—for, keep in mind, all defense industry is closed to them—or they quietly starve. The right to starve seems to be the only constitutional right which the policy-makers of the Department of Defense have not yet seen fit to abridge.

How did this sorry business all start? We turn right back to Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, our modern-day Florence Nightengale, who used, instead of a lamp, the floor and committee rooms of the U.S. Senate to enlighten us on the ills that plagued the Nation. Dean Paul Appleby, one of America's foremost theoreticians of public administration, summed up McCarthy this way: "He damaged the government generally, and he damaged its ability to deal with this particular problem...Disloyalty to the government of the United States among its officials is no more of a real problem than are insanity and gross criminality, which occasionally are found."

It gives me greatest satisfaction to report that most of the desecration of McCarthyism has been put to rest in Washington by now, but the one vestige which hangs on, tenaciously, is the witchhunt for homosexuals. This has hardly abated an inch, and, in fact, has become more sophisticated as the years have rolled on. The repository of greatest organized bigotry is the Department of Defense. But, as is so true, for every action there must be a reaction, and the center of reaction—yea, even revolution—is the Department of Defense as well. Our friend Masters used a very apt phrase when he titled his book, "The Homosexual Revolution." Fortunately, his compass pointed away from the Bastille, and he went charging down the wrong avenue. Those of us who are precipitating the whirlpool in the Pentagon were just as happy that not a word of this revolution got into print.

Let us look at the facts. The Federal Government in general, and the Department of Defense in particular, have attempted to establish themselves as arbiters of morality for their employees. The regulations use such terms as "immoral conduct," "immoral and indecent conduct," "moral turpitude," "unsuitability due to immoral behavior," and so on, all variations on the same theme of immorality, *but without further definition*. In some hidden recess of the vast establishment somewhere is a classified document which says, in effect, that homosexual conduct *is* "immoral conduct," and on this basis, tens of thousands of men and women have been branded as unfit or undesirable for anything but to starve quietly. And the wonder of it all is that not one single voice has been raised to question the source of authority, if any, for the *Federal* Government to establish moral standards of any kind for anybody, and most especially for its own employees.

A bit of history. There have been splinter efforts in the recent past, all leading up to the point we've reached right now. I'll review them briefly:

1957—*Day v United States*. Gregory Day brought suit in the Court of Claims for dismissal from government employment for "immoral conduct" involving homosexual relationships. He had once been a seminary student, and prepared and defended his suit himself. He did introduce some religious arguments, but phrased them in a most obscure, almost unintelligible, way, and did not argue them before the court. The court found that he had been accorded his full procedural rights, paid no heed to the religious pleadings which, under the circumstances was understandable, and dismissed the claim.

1959—*Kameny v Brucker*. Brucker in this case was the Secretary of the Army. Dr. Frank Kameny was an astronomer employed under a temporary appointment by the U.S. Army Map Service. He was dismissed for "immoral conduct." The issue of homosexual conduct was somewhat cloudy in this case, although this did not deter Dr. Kameny from petitioning the U.S. Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari based squarely on arguments challenging whether homosexual persons could be dismissed from Government employment "for cause" solely on the basis of their sexual inclinations. The petition was denied—properly, I have to admit grudgingly—for Kameny's presentation, brilliant as it was, was long on emotion but short on law. The decision of the lower court had found that, as a temporary employee, he was not vested with Civil Service appeal rights, and this decision then stood.

1960—This was in a sense, a banner year, with two defeats and one victory. First came *Dew v Quesada*, with Quesada as Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. William L. Dew had initially applied for employment with the



Central Intelligence Agency and had been accepted. In the course of his security clearance, he had volunteered information that, in his teen years, he had participated in several homosexual adventures and had experimented briefly with mild narcotics. He was advised to resign, did so, and sought out employment with the Civil Aeronautics Administration. On the basis of the uncorroborated information he had supplied earlier to the CIA, he was dismissed from the Civil Aeronautics Administration for "immoral behavior." His case was heard before a single judge, who decided it strictly on procedural grounds, and Dew lost.

The second case was *Shields v Sharp*, Dudley Sharp being Secretary of the Air Force at the time. Joseph Shields was a civilian employee who headed one of the Air Force statistical units and, as such, occupied a highly professional position. This case was a miscarriage of simple justice. Shields was accused of having participated in several homosexual episodes with a Navy commander a full 12 years before the charges were brought. He denied all charges fully, demanded to face his accuser who was nowhere to be found, and offered a plethora of rebutting testimony, all to no avail. (Investigators did finally dig up the commander in Paris, but he "declined" to return to this country for the trial.) Shields went on to petition the Supreme Court as his final action, but again on procedural grounds, and the petition was denied.

Then came *Clackum v United States*. Fannie Mae Clackum was a WAF who felt she had not been done right by when the Air Force gave her a discharge "under conditions other than honorable" in 1952 for alleged homosexual activities. The Court of Claims agreed fully with the young lady, and generously awarded her claim. The action of the Air Force was notoriously lacking in even rudimentary elements of fair play in this case, and provoked the court to exclaim: "The Government defends the remarkable arrangement under its regulation and its operation in the instant case, on the ground that it is necessary in the interest of an efficient military establishment for our national defense. We see nothing in this argument... it is unthinkable that the Air Force should have the raw power, without respect for even the most elementary notions of due process of law, to load the plaintiff down with penalties. It is late in the day to argue that everything that the executives of the armed forces do in connection with the discharge of soldiers is beyond the reach of judicial scrutiny..."

1961—On the heels of the Clackum case came *Murray v United States*, also in the Court of Claims. Murray was an Air Force master sergeant who in 1954 was given a general discharge under honorable conditions for homosexual conduct. He admitted this conduct, but argued that since the episodes had taken place during previous enlistments, they had no bearing on

his current enlistment. To the great surprise of the Air Force, the Court agreed with him, and decided that "the type of discharge to be issued in this case was to be determined solely by plaintiff's military record during his current enlistment."

Then, toward the end of 1961 after the Clackum and Murray victories in the Court of Claims, in the U.S. Court of Appeals came a set-back in *Williams v Zuckert*. Zuckert was Secretary of the Air Force; Daniel Williams was an employee of the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs. Williams was entrapped while in the privacy of his own home into making homosexual advances toward an enlisted member of the Air Force Office of Special Intelligence who had won Williams' confidence. This case was very maladroitness handled in court, and would have been won in a different court, with different counsel.

1962—For evidence of pure perversity on the part of the Department of the Army, the case of *Robert L. Scott v United States* is hard to beat. It reminds one of the situation in an earlier Court of Claims decision where the Court fumed: "The picture which emerges seems to be that of a reckless and unjust decision, made by a subordinate officer, but having been made, stubbornly adhered to until the prospect of having to defend it in court loomed up. Only then did the more responsible officials of the Army and Government put their minds on the problem. They had had, in the meantime, other things to do, but, by contrast, the plaintiff had been deprived of his job and his pay." The Scott case is still pending, but from indications in the Trial Commissioner's Report filed in March, he's won it hands down. Scott was only one of a number of employees at an Army Ordnance Depot accused of sexual irregularities, centering mostly around the versatility of a certain female employee. Oddly enough, although dismissal charges were initially filed against her, they were later withdrawn for no discernible reason. Scott, along with others was dismissed for "unsuitability because of immoral conduct," and he was the only employee who contested his dismissal. The transcript of the testimony in the case offers vivid evidence of the extremes to which military investigators will go to try to prove their case. The record is rife with night-time, glaring-light kind of interrogation, profanity and personal indignity, mental coercion, and all the other tricks that the investigators keep in their kit bags for special Sex cases.

So much for history. That will give you a slight idea of the way the system is working. Please bear in mind that these cases represent only a minute fraction of the dismissals, forced resignations, and military discharges which took place during this period, for the great majority of these removals never see court action. But also bear in mind, that the charge has al-

ways been a variation of "immoral conduct" and, with the possible exception of the Day case in 1957, no one has challenged by what authority under the Constitution the *Federal* Government is in the business of arbitrating morality at all.

Let us set that question aside for the moment, and assume that the *Federal* Government is indeed acting in consonance with its grant of powers under the Constitution. How then, does the Department of Defense exhibit its high morality, since it holds itself forward as the ultimate guardian of all morality?

I spent the last several months in Hawaii. Just before I left there, a report came in to the Army headquarters from an Army combat support group in Thailand—a routine report—indicating that of 170 men assigned to the group, 168 had become infected with venereal disease. This was no "panic"-type message, merely a routine information-type one, to report that medical treatment had been started. The Army will treat these men, advise them to be more careful next time, and return them to duty. This is morality? What consternation would reign if the report had said that a nest of homosexuals had been exposed in Thailand! The Inspector General himself would have been on the next plane.

Perhaps there is a parallel. One entire Army battalion during World War II was reported as having an extremely high incidence of venereal disease. Even after being placed on restriction, with no access to outside sources, the rate continued to climb. It was then discovered that the disease was being transmitted through homosexual contacts, and this posed quite a problem for the commander of the division of which the battalion was a unit, a major general. He rose to the occasion, however, and decided that it would be unfortunate public relations to discharge an entire battalion for homosexual behavior, so he merely ordered the men to be spread around into other battalions, and got himself a fresh complement. The division integrity was salvaged, and whatever happened to the original complement was never recorded. Presumably they served nobly and well, and have long since disappeared into civilian life with honorable discharges.

But that was World War II—pre-McCarthy days. Let's see what is happening now. Barely two years ago, a grand total of 581 men who were accused of homosexual associations were discharged en masse from the Air Force Language School at Monterey, California. And last year, in March, a reader wrote to *One Magazine*, "I was discharged from the service because of being homosexual... I was one of 350 discharged at the same time, so there must be a lot of men with U.D. discharges running around." Also in 1961, a total of 138 men were reportedly discharged in one fell swoop from one of the Navy's large capital ships, a carrier. At a naval base recently in

one week 90 enlisted men were charged with homosexual orientation and/or association; already in custody at the time were 27 additional sailors facing the same charges. And I have it on good authority that at Treasure Island Naval Receiving Station, just across the bay from us here, an average of 35 men are held awaiting discharge for homosexual conduct at all times, and discharge processing takes place once or twice a week. Rough arithmetic develops a total of at least 140 and as many as 270 men released each month with undesirable discharges. And our information indicates that the situation at Great Lakes Naval Training Station is even more blatant.

These figures are by no means comprehensive. I'm not sure that even a Presidential order would have strength enough to force the Pentagon to divulge honest world-wide figures. Statistical distortion can easily turn into a favorite indoor sport for those so inclined.

But again back to the Department of Defense as the guardian of all morality. We'll branch out into other fields, using prostitution as our first target.

The Mamie Stover story of Hawaii is too well-known to need repeating. I can tell you that it was *not* exaggerated. Military policemen and shore-patrolmen were assigned regularly to police the lines waiting to enter the houses of prostitution, and these lines would extend for blocks, day and night. The inhabitants of those houses were skilled in delivering sex, on order, in any kind of package, just as they are in other parts of the world today, under the watchful and approving eye of the U.S. military authorities.

Let us take the Sanno Hotel in downtown Tokyo. This is the U.S. military billet reserved for field-grade officer personnel on duty in that area. There is, of course, a massage and steam bath establishment operated on the hotel premises. The services here are provided by masseuses, selected not only for their competence at massage, but also for their desirability as sexual partners. One need be in the hotel only a few minutes before learning from others which of the girls gave the best oral stimulation. In fact, high military officers—almost all of whom were married—made no secret of the enjoyment one masseuse or another, or perhaps all together, had provided during their stay, giving details in graphic style. And, I remind you, by the nature of the agreement with the Japanese Government, this hotel is an American military reservation.

Then we go to Korea. Until last year, a grandiose European-style hotel in downtown Seoul, the Chosan, had been commandeered by the U.S. forces to serve as the field-grade officers' billet. This was surrounded by a high wall, and could be entered only by displaying proper military identification to the security guard at the gate. There was a cocktail lounge, and on my



first visit I was more than mildly surprised that the lounge could boast so many attractive, and unaccompanied, young ladies of an evening, particularly since the entrance restrictions were so severe. It must have taken all of ten minutes to discover that the cocktail lounge was a "concession," with the Korean concessionaire paying a pretty price (to whom, I was never sure) for the privilege of having his "merchandise" entered and displayed for the exclusive enjoyment of the field-grade officers who were quartered there. There was a price list, depending on whether company was desired for a short-time or all night, in the rooms upstairs. I was tempted to request another type price list, but thought better of the idea and let it pass.

Now, lest you think the enlisted men were getting short shrift, we turn to the U.S. Army Aircraft Center at Ascom City, a large military supply complex in central Korea. The men there had worked long hours in building and equipping a clubhouse for themselves. And a rather nice job it was. Conveniently, it was located fairly near one of the gates to the base. After conferring with the proper base authorities, the club leaders were given permission to construct what later became affectionately known as the "moose-chute." (The word "moose" itself is anglicized from the Korean word for "girl.") The moose-chute consisted of a fenced-in walk-way from the reservation gate directly to the back entrance to the clubhouse. Young Korean ladies might present themselves unaccompanied to the outer gate, receive a metal identification tag, and proceed into the club through the chute. When in the club, each was fair game for any GI who took a liking for them, and the GIs would in turn escort them to the base theater, or to the barracks, depending on which suited their respective fancies at the time. Once the evening was over, the young lady left the base by the same route and returned her little metal tag, and security reigned once again. This proved an exceedingly popular device to get acquainted, and was in full swing when I saw it last.

An even-more direct technique for getting acquainted was authorized at the security gate leading into the main billeting area for the Eighth U.S. Army Headquarters, on the fringes of the city of Seoul. There of an evening, rain or shine, summer or winter, would cluster dozens of young Korean ladies. Those officers and men who were quartered inside and who wanted to "get acquainted" any particular evening, would come through the gate with flashlights, go down the ranks of the waiting ladies, use their flashlights to make their choice, and once decided, would escort their partners through the gate with a knowing glance at the military policemen on duty. My research does not cover whether they also escorted them back through the gate once the "getting-acquainted" was over, but presumably, since they were all American gentlemen, they did.

So much for casual acquaintances in Korea. I have given you only a few instances; these could be multiplied many times all over Korea. Let's turn for a moment now to mistresses. No self-respecting ranking U.S. Army officer in Korea would be without his mistress. Her appearance and youth were his status symbols within the American military community there. She was decked out in the finest finery which American mail-order houses or the Post Exchanges could provide, and was escorted to all officer social functions in grand style. It was humorous, at the very least, to witness these pompous, elderly, ranking officers, all, no doubt, with wives just as pompous somewhere back home, squiring their very young Korean mistresses, and clucking over them like mother hens. These mistresses lived, of course, in their masters' billets on the military reservation, and perhaps to be really useful, stirred up a plate of kim chee on occasion. If a mistress was especially well-recommended, and her present master was due to leave Korea for another assignment, she would be reserved for the field-grade or general officer who was his replacement, unless someone else of equal or superior rank put in his bid earlier. No doubt some of these very same ranking officers now sit in judgment on the "moral turpitude" discharge cases which are processed into the Washington military personnel bureaus.

Another Korean custom I found rather intriguing. Korean contractors who were bidding on expensive U.S. military contracts, many in the millions of dollars, were quick to provide incentives in the form of lavish entertainment. These were not only fine meals, but expensive gifts, and expensive girls as well. Any contracting officer and his cronies could count on a never-ending supply of the good things of life while his approval and signature were needed on the contract form. In justice, there were a few conscientious officers who made their awards based solely on contractor competence. But of the others?

Now if these were harmless peccadilloes, we might dismiss them with a "boys-will-be-boys" shrug. But the fact stands that the "professional" women in South Korea, and to a lesser extent in Japan and Okinawa, have been reportedly organized into a tightly integrated spy network which filters every tidbit of information into North Korea, and from there into Red China. My report indicates that these women are instructed to keep their ears open, particularly when their masters have overimbibed, and to report every scrap of information, no matter how trivial, to designated local intelligence points, from which it is correlated locally and fed into a master collecting point in North Korea, where all the pieces of the mosaic can be fitted together. It is certainly possible that classified information may have been discussed in the alcoholic fog surrounding the bar in the officers' club at Eighth Army Headquarters in South Korea, with the smiling Korean lad-



ies in attendance, always with a disarming no-brains-in-the-head kind of expression, and through this device, the Red Chinese had a direct pipeline to our defense plans for the Korean peninsula.

To expand upon this system just a bit, *Parade Magazine* of January 7, 1962 gave this summation: "But what of the old-fashioned Mata Hari? Does she still exchange kisses for secrets? The answer is yes. Sex is the same potent ploy it always has been in the dangerous game of international espionage.

"In South Korea, a languid beauty named Kim Soo became the mistress of an American colonel. She not only slipped secrets out, but smuggled her Communist husband into the colonel's home. In Germany, a striking brunette named Irmgard Schmidt managed to keep up a romance with an Air Force colonel and an American civilian at the same time with neither man knowing about the other. She succeeded in getting from them the Western plan for defending Berlin. Also in Germany, buxom blonde Margarethe Pfeiffer, a graduate of a Communist spy school in Thuringia, Czechoslovakia, used her woman's wiles to charm military secrets from American GIs. She was caught after she picked on the wrong GI: Private Robert Eicher, who turned her in. But the most celebrated case is of a girl with an alluring telephone voice, Ursula Discher, who caused the downfall of the first American foreign service officer ever caught in a treasonable act. For giving secret documents to the Polish Communists, Irvin Scarbeck was rushed to trial, convicted, and sentenced to 30 years in jail."

And to finish this particular train of thought, we have an exclusive interview published in *Man's Best Magazine* of March 1962, which has a ring of authenticity to it. Being interviewed in Milan, Italy is Madama Lena Agrinoff, purportedly the chief of the Western Sector of the Soviet worldwide female espionage organization. She is quoted as follows:

Q—How do you keep your girls in line?

A—That problem never arises. Our women are devoted to our causes. We have never had a single defection. (Note: This much we know to be true. All voluntary defectors from the Communist intelligence agencies have been male.)

Q—Is your operation successful?

A—Unquestionably. So long as men have repressions, we will continue to be successful. You men in the United States are among the most repressed in the world—we have had great success with you. Our experience has shown that American men are willing to do *anything* to satisfy their dreams of sex.

Q—Why are you so candid? Won't the knowledge of your operations limit your usefulness?

A—Quite to the contrary. If anything, it only points up your helplessness and the inevitability of ultimate Communist victory. The sex urge cannot be weakened or inhibited. Men especially must have sex satisfaction. And by making use of this relentless drive, we can ultimately control the universe. In a capitalist economy, you have artificial laws and hypocritical morals, but there are no such limiting factors for us. Communist women are trained to give themselves to anyone at any time the party commands...

Now for a slightly different perspective, let us zero in on Okinawa, that small island south of Japan, which was so costly in American lives toward the end of World War II and which is now administered by the U.S. military establishment. Reporter Brian Casey of the *Honolulu Advertiser* staff decided to take a look around, and made this report in September last year:

"Vice is big business on Okinawa...an estimated 15,000 to 20,000 girls actively peddle sex to servicemen...fees \$1 to \$10. The military looks the other way...the combination of low-cost sex and liquor figures prominently in the plans of entrepreneurs who would like to make Okinawa a tourist mecca...there is little organized vice on Okinawa—just thousands of independent operators. Venereal disease is fairly prevalent. "We're very concerned about VD," reports the military...gambling is another popular pastime on Okinawa. It centers primarily around the thousands of slot-machines that are found in the military clubs...While the military ducks official comment on prostitution and gambling, veteran servicemen vigorously defend the system. "If it weren't for the easy availability of sex,"... "our troops out here would go nuts."... "Gambling, gin and gals are the three Gs that keep lonesome American GIs occupied on Okinawa during their off-duty hours,"... "Little or no attempt is made to hide prostitution on the island. It has what amounts to 'unofficial official' recognition by the U.S. military..."

And now a brief report from Taiwan, given to me by a ranking U.S. military officer: The Chinese Nationalists are a very hospitable people, who have created a special resort hotel outside their capital city for the exclusive enjoyment of top-ranking U.S. military officers and members of the Chinese general staff. The resort is complete unto itself, with golf-course, swimming and other luxury accommodations. Here guests may choose their day- and night-time company from a rather large selection of desirable Chinese hostesses, be wined and feted in the grandest style, and all at practically no cost to themselves. As I remember, the price is something like \$1.75 a day. The deficit for this operation is no doubt budgeted under the

military aid program somewhere, and figures into the large monetary dole which the Nationalists have received annually from the U.S. Treasury for a good many years.

New subject: Pregnancy. The Honolulu newspapers in July carried a feature article: "Heartbreaking Legacy of War: Japan's Mixed-Blood Babies," indicating that some 10,000 GI babies of Eurasian or Afro-Asian parentage had been abandoned by their American military fathers. Being both illegitimate and "different," these children have now reached an age where the Japanese officials are forced to admit that they constitute a social problem, and face an uncertain future in Japan. Many live in poverty. No easy solution is suggested, although some few adoptions have been made. Since the Japanese girls are very knowledgeable about preventing conception usually, for 10,000 pregnancies to have taken place, a corresponding figure of 10,000,000 acts of fornication would not be extreme. This gives us a rough gauge to the extent of participation in sexual acts between Japanese girls and American military personnel. Apart from this incidence of activity, the fact that these children are now recognized as a tragic social problem in Japan, again raises the question: If the Department of Defense is to be the final arbiter of all morality, why has it not come forward with humane policies to counteract the misery perpetrated by its personnel? The simple explanation is, of course, that it is too confused on the whole subject to be able to do anything constructive, so it does nothing.

For pregnancy of another sort in another part of the world: It has been reported to me reliably that in one American military unit, at least, a minimum of 50% of the commissioned U.S. military nurses in Germany experience at least one pregnancy during their tour of duty there. These pregnancies are, of course, aborted by German physicians. Whether knowledge of these ever come to the attention of ranking military personnel I cannot say, but it is a topic of conversation among members of the Nurse Corps itself, one of whom was my informant.

So far, we have confined our attention pretty much to expressions of heterosexual conduct among members of the military forces, now let's look at the other side of the coin, to see what evidence of homosexual activity we can find.

Our first index will be lavatory hieroglyphics. These have been vastly under-rated, in my opinion, as indices of sociological change. Considering that they are *always* spontaneous expressions, unforced and uncoerced, of deeply felt personal urges and wants, I am inclined to put great emphasis upon them as valid barometers of prevailing sexual mores. At this point in my research, I can only report preliminary observations, with the hope that

more can be done in this field later. Taking selected male, exclusively military facilities in Hawaii, Japan, and Okinawa, and two male, combined military-civilian billeting facilities in Hawaii and California, here are the results:

#### Homosexual-Heterosexual Representations Depicted

Multi-service military facility	90% homosexual
Combined military-civilian billeting facility	100% homosexual
U.S. Army single-service facility	95% homosexual
U.S. Navy single-service shore facility	65% homosexual
U.S. Navy floating facility	0 (no hieroglyphics)
U.S. Marine Corps single-service facility	0 (no hieroglyphics)
U.S. Air Force single-service facility	90% homosexual

Now, compare the foregoing observations with the second index: composite estimates of percentage of participation by male military personnel in multiple homosexual experiences, by individual military branch. These estimates have been developed by interviewing approximately 1,000 non-military homosexual males who have had contact with male military personnel, and approximately 1,000 male military personnel as to the incidence of their own participation in homosexual experiences. The sample here was nation-wide, composed primarily of enlisted men in the lower three pay grades, with less than 5% of the sample representing higher non-commissioned and commissioned officer personnel. Note should be made also that the numerical weight of the sample tends heavily toward the Marine Corps and Navy subjects:

#### Percentage of Participation in Multiple Homosexual Experiences

U.S. Marine Corps	85%	U.S. Army	60%
U.S. Navy	70%	U.S. Air Force	50%

You will notice no immediate correlation between the incidence of lavatory depictions and the percentage of overt participation in homosexual activities, unless one concludes that personnel of the Marine Corps have no need to decorate lavatory walls since all sexual repressions are disposed of by overt participation. And in like vein, one could conclude that personnel of the Navy believe both in advertising *and* participating. These are very unscientific conclusions, as you will appreciate; the conclusion I hope you will draw from this particular presentation is that the incidence of homosexual activity (both fantasy and real) is significantly higher among lower-rank military personnel than has been before recognized in public.

And now, a final index, admittedly a limited one, but indicative of a trend, I believe. U.S. Army military facilities in Hawaii have suffered

through three major wars, the Korean conflict, and possibly the Boxer Rebellion as well. Throughout these years, the common male lavatory facilities on the military reservations afforded a measure of unsupervised privacy. Within the past eighteen months, the incidence of homosexual activity in the common lavatories evidently had become so great that structural modifications, removing all semblance of privacy, were thought to be required, by the Army authorities who are in charge of such things. These structural changes were made, and the lavatory facilities are now under regular military police patrol. The situation in Hawaii corresponds somewhat to a situation I observed in Japan in 1960. At the military base which serves as the collecting point for all Army personnel going to and from Korea, the common male lavatory facilities had been fitted with metal partitions, evidently as a final measure to discourage homosexual entreaties. But the American GI, resourceful in overcoming this, as well as other obstacles, found a ready alternative.

## *The Existential Approach to* THE CAUSATION AND MAINTENANCE OF MALE *Homosexuality*

DENNISON W. NICHOLS

In Three Parts

Part Three - DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS OF LOVE and  
CONCLUSION

### DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS OF LOVE

The phenomenon of love is described in this paper as being a psychosociological phenomenon which differs greatly from the way Freud and many other authorities describe it. Furthermore, both heterosexual love and homosexual love is shown to come about in the same manner and for the same purpose.

Aside from the visceral characteristics, there are two important elements in any "romantic" form of love: (1) a phenomenon of psychological communication between two people, enabling one of them (or both of them) to experience the other person's needs as being his own; and (2) the involvement of the other person into the center of one's conception of a meaningful life.

The appreciation of another person's body, just like the appreciation of a photograph which depicts a beautiful model, can be considered to be a support of an idealization which is necessary for the fulfillment of the existential goals prescribed by an individual's value system which is encompassed in his world view (one's conception of the universe and his purpose in it). Even though it brings satisfaction to the individual, it is, nevertheless, basically selfish and cannot be considered to be love; the heterosexualism or homosexualism is still more important in the maintenance of the individual's conception of meaningfulness than is the welfare of another individual. Where sex exists without love, individuals perceive each other as necessary objects in obtaining a nevertheless essential fulfillment of a meaningful life. In doing this, however, the individuals have not only made an object of their partner and themselves, but have also made the *ism* more important than their humanness.

The reason why people are generally selfish is apparently too obvious for many authorities to recognize or too obvious to be considered worth mentioning by these authorities. The basis of selfishness lies in the fact that there are no physiological connections between people, enabling their needs to be transmitted to and received from one another. Inasmuch as there are no nerves to transmit one individual's feeling of hunger, for example, to another individual, it cannot be expected that the other individual will desire to satisfy not only his own needs but also those of the other individual. Thus, he is selfish.

It is known that individuals are not always selfish, however. A psychological bridge exists in such phenomena as sympathy and empathy, in which the individual is able to put himself in the place of the other person because he has gone through similar experience which makes it possible for him to understand how the other person feels.

The same type of psychological communication is what makes it possible for one to develop feelings of love for others. The process can be called interplay. This is anything carried out between two or more individuals that is pleasant, social, and informal. In other words, it is a friendly interdependent relationship. Examples of interplay are dancing, conversing, and sexual intercourse. In such situations people share similar experiences, and hence, often come to know each other very well.



This makes it possible for their inner worlds to come much closer to each other, and as in the phenomena of sympathy and empathy, they will begin to feel each other's needs as being their own.

These individuals have not yet reached a state of love, however. This comes about only when one sees his partner as being *the* object which is necessary in his life if he is to achieve what he has been taught is essential in order to be fully living. It is no wonder that the other person may be valued so highly as a consequence, for without him there would be no special someone to build this special future with, share the most pleasant and meaningful experiences with, work and play with, and the like. It is this process of psychological communication enabling one to feel the needs of the other as being his own plus the feeling of gratitude for the other person (for without him, the one could not live the full meaningful life he has learned he must have) which causes one to love him.

In regard to the conception of meaningfulness the individual tries to live in accord with, he engages in interplay with another chosen individual in hopes that his goal will be realized. He may even go so far as to tell himself that he is falling in love.

It is probably possible for an individual to fall in love with another person or at least develop a feeling of caring for the other person's needs simply by imagining himself to be engaging in intimate relationships with the other person to the extent that the other person is incorporated into himself. Thus, the desire of a homosexually inclined adult to help an adolescent boy is not seen as sublimation. It is, instead, seen as a result of the psychological communication process. What occurs is that the man, consciously or unconsciously, thinks of having some type of romantic or sexual intimacy with the boy. This intimate relationship, even though it may exist only in fantasy, brings the two individuals so close to each other, at least in the man's mind, that the man thinks of the boy's needs as being his own; he develops the desire to satisfy the boy's needs as if they were his own. It is because of this that the adult may desire to take care of the youth. (This example is given because the more obvious examples will automatically occur to the reader.)

Obviously, additional elements are involved in love than in narcissism. So, when referring to homosexual love, it is quite inaccurate to speak of it as being a quality of love that is half way between narcissism and heterosexual love. An individual may appreciate himself, but he can only love others.

The various methods of eradicating one's existential anxiety through an attempt to live a meaningful existence have been considered in this

article. Of all the methods which accomplish this feat, love has been suggested as being the most potent. The individual's salvation is best accomplished by investing himself, his time, and his energy in other individuals. This is the essence of parental love. By investing the best part of one's self into another person, he is actually expanding himself. (In such situations, one is doing the opposite of expanding himself by, for example, making more of himself by taking knowledge out of books and putting it into his mind.) Consequently, the individual is actually more alive; he has more awareness and has less fear of the extinction of his personal life which will eventually come.

This makes it easier to understand why, among other things, the homosexual requires the existence of homosexuality in others. He wants others to be this way because he wants this kind of life to go on, thus extending the meaning of his own life beyond and after his own personal existence. It is likely that he will not admit this, however. This is another example of uncritical acceptance of the teachings of society. (It is just the same as uncritically accepting the belief that a portrayal of sex in photographs is somehow "bad." Such "common sense" freezes an individual's rational facilities.)

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The dynamics of homosexuality and heterosexuality are similar. The basic difference is derived from a difference in the content of the fantasy life of the two kinds of people. Thus, any desire to believe that one way of life is superior to the other can best be understood as an attempt on the part of an individual to maintain his own concept of a meaningful existence. Heterosexuals frequently accuse homosexuals of finding it necessary to argue that homosexuality is desirable, whereas the obvious naturalness of heterosexuality makes it unnecessary for the heterosexuals themselves to develop arguments for their way of life, so they believe. It is probably true that homosexuals do occasionally devise such arguments. The heterosexuals are not without their arguments, however.

The argument presented most frequently by heterosexuals is that homosexuals cannot achieve the ultimate pleasures in life because they are unable to have the natural genital union. Cleckley says, for example:

The obvious anatomical fact that homosexuals cannot have literal and complete sexual relations must not be overlooked. No genital intercourse in the true sense of the word can occur. Their final physical intimacies must necessarily be culminated in acts that are substitutive and biologically artificial. ...A basic unnatural-

ness, however vehemently it may be denied, is inevitable and seems inevitable to bring disillusionment and unhappiness. (Cleckley, 1957. p. 38.)

In reference to the above quote, there is no doubt that a homosexual union may not always be the harmoniously beautiful aspect of life the homosexual wishes it to be. What is important, however, is that neither are heterosexual relations always or usually as beautifully harmonious as heterosexuals would like, not to mention those heterosexual relations carried out short of actual genital union by adolescents, relations which are advocated by Albert Ellis and are not always too unlike those relationships engaged in by homosexuals. To say that the two sexes fit perfectly or to say that they have the same psychological and/or emotional responses appears to be in the light of modern knowledge unwise. To be really perfect, the bodies would have to be built differently, with certain anatomical features placed differently.

Heterosexuals find it just as necessary as homosexuals to be biased. Otherwise, they would not be able to live up to the ideas they have been taught by their earlier fantasies they must achieve in order to be fully existing in the most meaningful manner possible.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berg, Charles, and Clifford Allen, *The Problem of Homosexuality*, Citadel Press, New York, 1958.
- Beier, Ernst, "Homosexuality: Toward a Cultural Definition," University of Utah, an unpublished survey report, 1960.
- Benjamin, Harry, "In Time... We Must Accept," *Mattachine Review*, 4 (June, 1958), pp. 12-15.
- Bieber, Irving, & Associates, *Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study*, Basic Books, New York, 1962.
- Cleckley, Hervy Milton, *The Caricature of Love*, Ronald Press, New York, 1957.
- David, Henry P., and Helmut von Bracken, editors, *Perspective in Personality*, Basic Books, New York, 1957.
- Fromm, Eric, *The Meaning of Love*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1956.
- Kirkendall, Lester A., "Toward a Clarification of the Concept of Male Sex Drive," *Marriage & Family Living*, 22 (November, 1958), pp. 367-372.
- Progoff, Ira, *Depth Psychology & Modern Man*, Julian Press, New York, 1959.
- Sandor, Lorand, editor, *Perversions, Psycho-dynamics and Therapy*, Random House, 1956.
- Tillich, Paul, "Existentialism, Psychotherapy, and the Nature of Man," *Pastoral Psychology*, 11 (1960), pp. 10-11.

# BOOKS

## HOMOSEXUAL BLACKMAIL ?

**THE STRANGE DEATH OF LORD CASTLEREAGH**, by H. Montgomery Hyde. London: Heinemann, 1959. Reviewed by Noel I. Garde.

A torrent of blood gushing from the self-inflicted gash in his jugular, England's political leader slumped into the arms of his doctor, who'd reached the room too late. In a minute, he was dead. The fear that he was about to be arrested for a homosexual offense had made life unbearable for him.

A ridiculous, melodramatic fantasy? No, pure history. The dead man, perhaps history's most famous suicide-victim of homosexual blackmail, was Robert Stewart, at this time Marquess of Londonderry, but better known to history by his earlier title—Viscount Castlereagh. At the time Castlereagh cut his throat, he had been Foreign Minister for 10 years. He was also Leader of the House of Commons (his title being an Irish one) and Tory party leader. The Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool, being merely an ineffective figurehead, Castlereagh was considered generally as the real head of the government. Within a week, he had been scheduled to leave for a Big Four Conference, the Congress of Verona, where the fate of Spain, Greece and Latin America was to be decided.

Although the homosexual blackmail angle has generally been "hushed up" in historical accounts of Castlereagh's suicide, it was no mere scandalous rumor. The original source was Castlereagh himself, who reported receipt of a blackmail letter to many persons close to him, including even King George IV and his friend and colleague, the Duke of Wellington. The allusions did not allow for any ambiguity. As he told the King, "I am accused of the same crime as the Bishop of Clogher... Police officers are searching for me to arrest me."

The name of Clogher was on the lips of all London in the summer of 1822, and it is still associated with one of England's most notorious "cases." On the night of July 19, 1822, the Right Rev. Percy Jocelyn, Bishop of Clogher, and the son of an Earl, was caught right "in the act" with a private in the Guards named John Moverly. After their arrest and booking, the Bishop got out on bail and fled to Scotland, where he survived another 20 years under the name of Thomas Wilson, supposedly working

as a butler. Castlereagh's good friend, the Duke of Wellington, was among those favoring the sternest of punishment for the remaining culprit, Moverly.

H. Montgomery Hyde, an M.P. already well known to many readers for his *Three Trials of Oscar Wilde*, has produced a brilliantly-researched study of all the evidence in this strange suicide. While he makes clear that there can be no doubt whatever that Castlereagh's suicide was triggered by the homosexual blackmail letter he received and his conviction he was about to be arrested at any moment, his name to be forever coupled with Clogher's, Hyde also provides ample evidence in support of the official explanation—i.e., suicide in a fit of general depression and temporary insanity resulting from overwork. As Hyde sees it, the homosexual blackmail might have been dealt with effectively had not Castlereagh's mind started to become unbalanced in the summer of 1822, just when the Clogher scandal was on everybody's lips.

This brings Hyde to the \$64 question: Can a man become so distraught at the threat of homosexual blackmail if he's not really a homosexual or involved in a homosexual act? Hyde has found no evidence that either applies to Castlereagh. Can there be all that smoke without any fire at all? In the course of his diligent research, Hyde found what he is sure provides the real answer.

According to the account of an intimate friend of Castlereagh's, published in a privately printed work of 1855, Castlereagh's homosexual involvement arose as follows:

A gang of blackmailers, taking advantage of his propensity for getting himself picked up by prostitutes during late evening walks, pulled a remarkable "frame-up." One night he went home with an attractive young thing who, upon undressing, possibly with some assistance from His Lordship, turned out to be a young male hustler. At the crucial moment, the blackmailers burst into the room, announced that they knew Castlereagh's identity, made their accusation and told him he'd hear further from them in due course.

Curiously enough, Castlereagh never seems to have told this story to the king, to Wellington, or to any other of his friends in whose memoirs and papers are found references to the homosexual blackmail letter. Nor did he ever seem to come out with any statement to the effect that "of course, it's all a complete lie." In fact, Castlereagh's personal doctor, into whose arms he fell dying, subsequently claimed that Castlereagh had made a confession of guilt to him. However, Hyde attributes the doctor's statement to the vengeful falsehoods of an embittered man, ill-treated by Castlereagh's widow and friends.

The question remains: How could such a normally cool and self-possessed

individual as Castlereagh react as he did to such a relatively simple frame-up. Hyde believes that the concurrent mental collapse, not to mention the coincidence of the Clogher scandal, provides a satisfactory explanation. Does it? Psychologists and historians will probably have to argue this matter for many years.

## READERS *write*

*Letters from readers are solicited for publication in this regular monthly department. They should be short and all must be signed by the writer. Only initials of the writer and the state or country of residence will be published. Opinion expressed in published letters need not necessarily reflect that of the REVIEW or the Mattachine Society. No names of individuals will be exchanged for correspondence purposes.*

REVIEW EDITOR: Your letter of October 17 came to me this morning asking to know the reasons for my not having renewed my membership. It is fair that I should tell you; in fact, I want to tell you. First of all, let me assure you I am enthusiastic with the work and publications of the "Big Three" and would be hard-put to find fault with anything I have seen which they have done or said.

This break is deliberate but regarded to be temporary. However, the degree of my future participation in the movement depends upon the success of my efforts during the next few months.

An arrest three years ago put the kibosh on my career. Having no other prospect, I kept my secure student job which, plus frugal living, has now made it financially possible to try, at least, to expunge my university records and, hopefully, my civil records, as well; then, to move the hell out of here.

Besides with Mattachine, I have membership and subscriptions with so many do-good organizations that keeping up with them well amounts to tithing and a career in itself. I sincerely believe in them and each is worthy of more than I can do. Rather than to play favorites, I am allowing all to expire in order to conserve for pending needs.

Ironically, I may be soliciting advice from Mattachine or One ere long. Were it not for the encouraging articles in those publications, it is unlikely that I would consider initiating a stand for my rights.—Mr. R.B., Washington.

REVIEW EDITOR: I have recently moved to Detroit and have tried to locate a branch of your organization here. Up to date I have been unsuccessful. I am hoping that you can supply me with information that will enable me to reach someone here that is a member. Or if this is impossible give me information of another organization existing here in Detroit pertaining to homosexuality.

I have been a homosexual for a great number of years but have not been active at all. I now find it imperative to find answers to many questions that have arisen in my mind. I understand that there are many facets to this life and I would prefer to use a sensible and realistic approach to any further moves on my part. Having observed many creatures during the years laboring under the guise of homosexuality in a manner that is extremely distasteful to me, there are naturally many doubts and anxieties existing in my mind.—Mr. N.G., Michigan.

REVIEW EDITOR: I will not be sending in my dues nor my monthly donation any longer. The bisexual in whom I was interested (my reason for contacting you originally) has crossed over completely and is now living with another fellow, and they are buying a house together. So, of course, I will no longer be following the activities of this group. I do sincerely appreciate your efforts in my time of distress, but I'm sure you can realize that it is painful to even be



reminded of the situation.—Miss S.B., California.

REVIEW EDITOR: I am interested in becoming a member of your Society and will be glad to send you fifteen dollars by return mail if you will give me the address of either the New York or Philadelphia Chapter. I would like to attend lectures and discussion groups. I am a teacher in secondary schools with a university and a graduate degree. If you would like to know more about my background before granting my request, please indicate same... I have purchased your *Review* frequently and find it a very stimulating and well-written publication. You are rendering a splendid public service. More power to you.—Mr. P.S., Md.

REVIEW EDITOR: Enclosed please find my small contribution of \$15.00. Our Society is as vital as life itself and must survive always to save the people on this earth. I wish I was financially well off, and I know that Mattachine would not be in financial difficulty if I were.—Mr. H.B., New York.

GENTLEMEN: We are returning the last issue of your magazine received at this hospital, addressed to the "Emotional Maturity Society." As this group is no longer in existence, we suggest you cancel any remaining subscription, and remove the hospital from your mailing list. Very truly yours,—Harold A. Schmitz, Administrative Assistant, For: G. Lee Sandritter, M.D., Superintendent and Medical Director, Atascadero State Hospital, California.

REVIEW EDITOR: Enclosed is my personal check in the amount of \$15.00 for which please establish a Supporting Membership in my name. Permit me to thank you for your thoughtfulness in sending me copies last May of the "Articles of Incorporation," "What Does Mattachine Do?" "Publications Catalog," and the various membership blanks. At that time I had written to you requesting the then current last two issues of the *Mattachine REVIEW*. I wish that I had been able earlier to apply for membership in the Mattachine Society... —Mr. W.L., Texas.

REVIEW EDITOR: I have received your address and information of your Society from an intimate friend. Was wondering if some literature concerning the Society could be forwarded to me here in Vancouver... —Mr. J.S., British Columbia.

REVIEW EDITOR: A friend of mine has told me of your magazine. I would be much obliged if you could tell me something about it and how I might obtain it.—M.C.P., Southern Rhodesia.

REVIEW EDITOR: I newly read your advertisement and just want to know how to get a sample of your magazine and what the subscription fee is.—L.K., Sweden.

REVIEW EDITOR: WBAI is rebroadcasting your program of 1958. I am interested in your publication(s) on homosexuality and would like to receive them. Could you please let me know more about this and how I can receive them. Also would like to know more about the organization itself.—Miss B.C., N.Y.

REVIEW EDITOR: I am very much interested in the furthering of your aims and purpose and would appreciate it if you could please send me the names and subscription prices of your publications concerning sexual minorities in our society.—Mr. D.A., Ontario.

REVIEW EDITOR: Would you please forward to the above address any available information in regard to the Mattachine Society.—MR. K.C., British Columbia.

#### OTHER U.S. ORGANIZATIONS WORKING IN THE FIELD OF SEX VARIANCE

One, Inc., 2256 Venice Blvd., Los Angeles 6, California.

Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., 1232 Market St., San Francisco 2, California.

Mattachine Society of New York, 1133 Broadway, New York 10, N.Y.

Hollywood Assistance League, P.O. Box 29048, Hollywood 29, California

League for Civil Education, Inc., 1154 Kearny Street, San Francisco 11, Calif.

Demophil Center, 15 Lindall Place, Boston 14, Massachusetts.

Homosexual League of New York, P.O. Box 318, New York 9, New York.

Janus Society, P.O. Box 7824, Philadelphia 1, Pennsylvania.

Dionysus, P.O. Box 382, Fullerton, California.

Mattachine Society of Washington, P.O. Box 1032, Washington 1, D.C.

#### CALLING SHOTS

(Continued from page 2)

Simple: There's nothing left to try to shake down. There will be no more or no less homosexuality and sex deviation. But there will be infinitely greater use of human resources and spreading of happiness and trust.

One may disagree with some of Mr. Schlegel's conclusions, but after reading his article in this issue, one could hardly continue to believe that homosexuals are *unique* security risks.

#### "END THIS BLOT ON BRITISH JUSTICE"

Dr. John Robinson, 43-year-old Anglican Bishop of Woolwich in England recently called for a drive to end "a blot on our justice—an utterly medieval treatment of homosexuals."

These words and the following

comment were headlined on BBC newscasts and in the British press, because they came from a sermon delivered in Canterbury Cathedral.

"The Wolfenden Committee recommended, by a majority of 12 to 1 that homosexual behavior between consenting male adults in private should no longer be a criminal offense. Yet, after five years, nothing has been done about it. Even in cases involving minors, we go on imposing prison sentences unworthy of a civilized, let alone a Christian, country."

The Bishop, a father of four children, added: "The political parties are scared of espousing the cause for fear of losing votes. Yet I be-

CURRENT SALES LEADERS FROM DORIAN BOOK SERVICE: *Christ and the Homosexual*, 3.95; *Kama Sutra*, Richard Burton transl., Oriental sex handbook, 5.00; *Tarry a While*, four gay stories from *Der Kreis*, 1.75; *Circle of Sex*, 2.50; *Camel's Farewell*, 2.95. Send remittance with order, plus 20¢ postage and sales tax. Free catalog and sample copy of *Dorian Book Quarterly* upon request. 693 Mission St., San Francisco 5

TROPIC OF CAPRICORN (hardback), by mail	\$8.90
TROPIC OF CANCER (paper)	2.00
VALHALLA—Marines' Love-life	2.00
HARRY'S FARE—Gay Stories	2.40
DER MANN IN DER PHOTOGRAPHIE	10.36
DER MANN IN DER ZEICHNUNG—Drawings	12.09
FLAMING HEART—Gay Novel	4.15
THEY WALK IN SHADOW—Sex-Law Study	8.35
THE SIXTH MAN—Report on Gayety	4.35

Prices include postage. Add 4% tax in California.  
(Deduct \$1.00 on 3 titles or more.)

Mail 25¢ for rare Illustrated list of "Unusual Adult Books & ART PHOTOS!"

COSMO BOOK SALES, Dept. 25, Box 635, San Francisco 1, California.

lieve that—as with capital punishment—one more determined push will see reform of something that is a peculiarly odious piece of English hypocrisy.”

#### INTERSEX CATEGORY MORE THAN A RARITY

In Atlantic City recently, surgeons reported that perhaps thousands of men are really women, and thousands of women are actually men. These are the people with “intersex” characteristics—possessing attributes typical of both sexes. And they may actually be predominantly of the sex that is opposite from what they appear.

“Sex abnormalities are much more common than we used to think,” said Dr. John McLean Morris, professor of gynecology at Yale University. He discussed that some babies destined to be girls can be virilized, acquiring some male characteristics, if their mothers are given almost any kind of hormone during pregnancy. He believed that benefits from taking hormones were not worth the risk of virilization of unborn females. True sex, he said, could be determined by checking chromosome patterns from anyone, or by looking at the chromatin mass found in the nucleus of cells in the female. If sex abnormalities can be detected early, they can often be corrected surgically before a baby is two years old—and before the infant is conscious of whether it is one sex or another, Dr. Morris told the panel discussing intersexuality.

#### NEW FEATURES COMING IN FUTURE REVIEWS

New features which will appear regularly in Mattachine REVIEW will start appearing in the next (December) issue. In it readers will find “Les Artes Gaies,” by David Layne of New York, a commentary on stage and screen and the arts. Beginning in January, other features will be added, and some previous departments revived with a view to giving the REVIEW a wider reader interest for the general reader, and with some relaxation of emphasis on the ponderous articles which call for changes in law and attitude that have been stated so many times and in so many ways. More news reports, criticism and lay commentary will be published. If received, each issue will contain a fiction item, and greater attention will be paid to the selection of poetry items from time to time.

This improvement and expansion of REVIEW content coincides with an increase in subscription and newsstand price which takes effect on January 1, 1963. Increasing costs and limited revenues (the REVIEW has virtually no advertising income) forced the price raise, but along with it the material presented will be of greater value and interest to the reader. New rates will be 7.50 per year, .75 per copy in the U.S.; 10.00 per year foreign. In the meantime, anyone may renew for up to three years at the present rate—5.00 per year in the U.S., 6.00 foreign.