



mattachine **REVIEW**

FEBRUARY 1963

SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS



*A New
Sex Code
for Modern Americans*

Calling Shots

LEGAL ASPECTS VIEWED AT ONE INSTITUTE

"New Frontiers in the Law" was the theme of the annual Midwinter Institute of One, Inc., in Los Angeles, January 26-27. It was held in conjunction with the 11th annual business meeting of the corporation on January 25.

Aside from the well-known fact that male homosexuals still are victims of discriminatory law enforcement practices which include harassment, entrapment and sometimes shakedown, the assembly of about 100 persons heard these signs of progress:

1. A change of law in Illinois a year ago perhaps is too new to measure, but it does portend a greater non-judgmental attitude from the bench in that state and in others.

2. High courts in fields of freedom to read and right of privacy are making decisions which benefit the individual and serve to check heavy pressures from law enforcement agencies which hack away at these

and other constitutional guarantees, and

3. Voices are crying in the field of correction for less punitive action and a program of habilitation which has real meaning.

Father James G. Jones, Episcopal priest who is director of St. Leonard's House in Chicago and a chaplain for the Illinois prison system, movingly traced the difference between man's laws and God's laws, but left the impression that the way it works is that man everywhere seeks to invoke his laws as if they were God's. At a later session he told how a "half-way" house for prison parolees was made to work so that not more than 28 out of every 100 who passed through it had trouble with the law again.

A blue-chip roster of attorneys from California appeared on the program. Morris Lowenthal of San Francisco outlined the long, long legal battle to win for homosexuals the right to congregate peaceably in bars and restaurants, and further, not to be held to a higher standard of conduct than anyone else. His nemesis in this had a double edge: first, a California Supreme Court justice who loaded a favorable opinion with "dicta" which erased the value of the decision, and second, an Alcoholic Beverage Control Department administrative leadership which has announced in the press its intention to put special emphasis on closing "gay" bars because it believes it has a dictate

(Continued on page 32)

mattachine **REVIEW**



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 1963 by the Mattachine Society, Inc. Ninth 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 and informed opinion leading to solution of sex behavior problems, particularly those of the homosexual adult.

The REVIEW is available on many U.S. newsstands at 75¢ per copy, and by subscription (mailed in plain, sealed envelope). Rates in advance: \$7.50 per year.

mattachine **REVIEW**

Founded in 1954 - First Issue January 1955

Volume IX FEBRUARY 1963 Number 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 2 CALLING SHOTS
- 4 A NEW SEX CODE FOR MODERN AMERICANS, by Albert Ellis, Ph.D.
- 11 A MATTER OF SELF-ESTEEM
- 13 THE QUERY MAN INTERVIEWS THE DUKE OF FATTINGAME (Satire)
- 17 LES ARTS GAI by David Layne
- 21 BOOKS
- 25 READERS WRITE
- 29 UNDER THE ROCKS
- 30 NEWSSTAND DIRECTORY
- 34 A MATTER OF CIVIL LIBERTIES by Ursula von Eckardt

COVER BY CHUCK ARNET

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 or authors of books, magazines, periodicals; and book-sellers concerned with sexological subjects. Rates on request.

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.

ETHICS

Reprinted from PAGEANT with special permission from the author, the following article posits some principles of sexual behavior which are as pertinent to the homosexual as to the heterosexual.

Dr. Ellis is a noted psychologist who has practiced marriage counseling and psychotherapy in New York City for a number of years. Author of many scientific articles and books, including the best-selling *SEX WITHOUT GUILT*, Dr. Ellis has taught at Rutgers University and at New York University. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association and of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, among other scientific and learned societies.

A New Sex Code for Modern Americans

ALBERT ELLIS, Ph.D.

DOES THE AVERAGE American need a new sex code?

Not if he is content to be personally hypocritical, unhappy, and neurotic. Not if he wants to continue to be socially inconsiderate, exploitative, and hostile. Not if he thrives on legal inconsistencies, idiocies, and injustices.

But suppose that one of us *doesn't* like our incredibly contradictory and irrational sex standards? What would he be wise to do? Something which is so rare as to be almost non-existent in our ultraconformist society: he must think. Yes, T-H-I-N-K. And for himself.

A new and saner standard of any kind of human conduct does not arise, automatically and miraculously, out of the ashes of old hogwash. Such a standard must be painfully thought out. And worked out. And then reworked many times, until finally it "spontaneously" takes hold and becomes a normal part of behavior.

So with rules for a new "sex code." Wishing won't make them so; but thinking can and sometimes does. If we assume that many of our present standards are somewhat less than ideal—as the last century of psychological and sociological research would indicate—nevertheless we'd better think about them carefully, and with all the objectivity we can muster. For

we must not cavalierly discard present standards and replace them with what may possibly be an even more incoherent and inconsistent mess of mores and laws.

Fortunately, I would say, there is virtually no scientist who has done research into today's sexual standards who does not believe our current ideas and practices need to be changed. The problem narrows down to what we should do and how we should do it.

My own thinking about standards of sexual conduct, since I first started to do active research and clinical counseling in the field some 25 years ago, has been constant and deep; and I am still very far from having even half the wished-for answers.

But in this quarter century of seeing hundreds of people with minor or serious sex problems, and working on several intensive studies of Americans' sex-love attitudes and behavior, I have become convinced that there are feasible codes of personal, social, and legal sex participation that would be distinctly less destructive and more health- and joy-producing than our existing codes.

Let us consider, first, what some of the main elements of a sane code of personal sex conduct might be. By personal sex behavior I mean acts that are largely concerned with one's own feelings, even though they may be partly shared with one another. Sexual fantasies and masturbatory practices are clearly personal rather than social, since they exclusively concern oneself.

Other sex acts, even though they affect another individual, are also largely personal. Some are fully accepted socially and legally. Taking a girl on a date and lightly kissing her good night, for instance, or having intercourse with one's husband are normally considered perfectly "moral" by our civilization.

Yet these same acts are often subconsciously regarded, by the person considering them, as somehow dangerous, shameful, or wrong—as when a boy is afraid to try to kiss a girl goodnight for fear she may reject him, or when a wife is ashamed to ask her husband to have intercourse in a certain position because she thinks such a suggestion would be unfeminine of her.

My counseling experience has taught me, regarding all types of personal sex behavior, that a man (or woman) is most likely to be healthy and happy when he (or she) holds to something along the lines of the following code.

1. *Be perfectly shameless or "unguilty."* When a sex act does not involve others, or when it quite legally involves a willing partner, the person engaging in it cannot be immoral in the sense of needlessly harming

other human beings. At most, he can waste his time and energies and thereby harm himself.

Even then, his philosophy should be: "I am doing this senseless act. How can I stop doing it?" instead of "I am doing this horrible act. How can I punish myself for it?"

Purely personal sex acts can never be socially destructive or wicked, and they are almost invariably harmless.

Masturbation, for instance, although less desirable than interpersonal sex acts, can actually be beneficial when other outlets are not easily available. (And it can virtually never be practiced to excess, since the individual automatically loses desire when he engages in it beyond his capacities.) Sexual fantasies, no matter how bizarre, are in themselves harmless, unless the fantasizer actually carries them out.

When one of these acts is performed as a substitute for interpersonal sexuality, its performance is still not shameful. But it *may be* neurotic; if so, it should be objectively admitted as such, and should be fought (if necessary through psychotherapeutic treatment) rather than used as a basis for self-condemnation.

Similarly with frigidity or impotence with one's mate. Certainly it is wrong—meaning inefficient or self-defeating—if one fails to satisfy oneself or one's partner in marriage. But if a man or woman is thus ineffective, this indicates only that he or she is a fallible human being—as who isn't, on one score or another? Fallibility should be calmly combatted, not shamefully accepted.

As for one's engaging in any of the legally accepted "perversions,"—for example, having relations with one's husband or wife in other than the conventional ways—this is personal sex matter that our society has artificially and mistakenly made into an issue. There is nothing physically or psychologically "wrong" in such acts (assuming that they do not become exclusive or thoroughly fetishistic), and the mental health of mates who never get the urge to engage in them (rather than those who do) is seriously suspect. Feeling guilty on this count is absurd.

Even if one is a true sex deviate—for example, can enjoy *only* such non-traditional relations with one's mate—then the appropriate consequence should *not* be guilt or shame, but a quiet and collected trip to a psychologist or psychiatrist.

2. *Be active and adventurous.* Living is acting, moving, doing. And all we can count on is one pitifully short life. The more you attempt, the more you enjoy, in sex as in other areas.

So Susie may refuse you a kiss if you try for one. Or your husband may think you're a dud if you keep striving for a better kind of climax. So what?

Will *not* trying to kiss Susie get you anyplace? Will *avoiding* sex relations with your husband enhance your sex ability? Most unlikely!

If you must feel ashamed of anything sexually—and I still recommend that you don't—then you had far better be afraid of *not* trying something you think you'll like than of trying and (for the nonce) risking failure.

3. *Be yourself.* You—not Mrs. Grundy—are the only real judge of your sex proclivities and pleasures. If John Jones can't fantasize very well or Grace Smith is in a continual sexual reverie about every movie star she sees, that's his or her problem. What do *you* want?

Find out. Try whatever you like sexually, as long as you don't impinge on the rights of others. If your personal sex longings are not listed in Kinsey, so what? Nor should you be worried if what you really enjoy is so universal that your best confidant thinks you are a perfect clod. Who's feeling your feelings, anyway? You are, I hope—and will continue unabashedly to feel them, whatever the current "fashion" in sex may be.

4. *Be committed.* A halfhearted acceptance of your own sexuality (or any other aspects of your being) usually denotes neurotic fear. You are unsure of what you want because, perhaps, you are afraid to find out what it really is. Perhaps what you want (for example, a beautiful sex partner) is difficult to get. Perhaps if you got what you wanted, others would disapprove. Perhaps you might not want it so much once you did get it.

All right: But what's the problem? Certainly you may be rejected or become disillusioned if you strive for what you want sexually. But will you ever get anything you *really* want if you do not strive at all?

As the modern existentialists tell us, life is not a product, a result. Rather, it is a process, a being, a becoming. And without some kind of full-hearted commitment, the process lags, the becoming creeps. So with sex. Be your fully committed sexual self, so long as you do not harm others.

But what about the less personal, more social aspects of sex? What about such acts as premarital sex relations or adultery, which not only involve other people besides yourself but in the course of which you may easily exploit, abuse, or harm these others?

Granted that our present-day sex code in regard to these socio-sexual affairs hasn't worked out too well (especially since the supposed prohibition of such affairs has most obviously not stopped them but merely driven most of them underground). What better code could be devised to set up in its place?

1. **BE SEXUALLY INFORMED AND MATURE.** The road to hell is paved with good intentions—and bad information. Most of the evils of sex relations, such as unwanted pregnancies, venereal diseases, and illegal abor-

tions, result not because human beings engage in illicit activities (actually, millions of persons reap these evils in the course of perfectly legitimate marital relations), but because the victims are immature and uninformed. Modern contraceptive and prophylactic information could reduce undesired pregnancies and venereal diseases just about to zero—if we properly employed available knowledge.

No one but an arrant crackpot suggests that we save lives by bannishing the most lethal weapon ever invented—the automobile. Rather, it is frequently suggested, we had better re-educate drivers and build safer roads and cars. Similarly, instead of “banning” certain relationships—which, as we know, does not prevent them—we would do far better to educate those who may engage in them. Not only should such persons be taught safe methods of contraception and prophylactics—they should also be educated as to the emotional considerations involved.

In the meantime, for yourself and your loved ones, there is no reason whatever why you cannot be extremely well informed sexually and teach yourself and them to use sexual knowledge in a sufficiently mature way so as not to jeopardize yourself or any possible sex partners.

2. BE UNEXPLOITATIVE AND UNFORCING. The primary law of human morality is not, as the vast majority of moralists firmly believes, self-sacrifice. It is, instead, self-interest. The only sane reason, in the final analysis, why you should sacrifice yourself for others is that you enjoy doing so, or want to help make this the kind of world where you yourself can gain a fair degree of satisfaction.

Nonetheless, to help yourself, you invariably have to think of others, too. Being extremely inconsiderate of others or harming them will eventually create the kind of world that will not be comfortable for you to live in.

So with sex: Unless you are reasonably considerate of the preferences of others, you are most unlikely to gain maximum satisfaction yourself or to create the kind of a world that you would want to exist.

Be, then, sexually considerate. Do not (emotionally or physically) force anyone to have sex relations with you. Don't take advantage of minors or incompetents. Try, by all means, to convince potential sex partners that they will enjoy relations with you, and do your best to show them that this is true; but if they are too adamant, take yourself quickly to other pastures.

Voluntary sex acts between two informed adults, in my view, can virtually never be immoral (though under some conditions they may be inadvisable). Sexual exploitation or coercion, even when it takes place within the bonds of marriage, is essentially antisexual and antisocial.

3. BE UNSADISTIC AND NON-INJURING. The sadist enjoys his “sex” act largely because, by his cruelty to another, he has seemingly lowered the intrinsic value of this other, and thus aggrandized his own (pitifully weak) ego.

Sadists, moreover, usually emotionally blackmail their victims. The masochist—the sadist's exploited partner—does not particularly enjoy the physical aspects of being abused, but is willing to accept sexually physical torture in order to gain the emotional acceptance of his or her partner. The sadist, therefore, usually exploits a distinctly disturbed mate.

So even when technically he is having relations with a willing partner, this is not actually true; and he is needlessly, gratuitously harming another being, which is the essence of immorality.

Sexual sadism, contrary to popular belief, only very partially takes the form of a direct physical assault by one person against another. Mostly, it occurs in verbal rather than more overt ways, and consists of the sadist's denigrating his victim with words rather than deeds.

The victims of sexual sadists, moreover, are by no means always their sex partners, but can also be those of whom they are excessively jealous or afraid. Thus, the worst sexual sadists can be judges, police officials, censorship authorities, gossips—all those, in fact, who savagely try to devalue the sex acts of those more potent or interested than they or who may have what they themselves pitifully lack: a facility for guiltless sex enjoyment.

4. BE SEXUALLY ENLIGHTENED AND ENLIGHTENING. Rational sexual virtue not only consists in uprooting your own antisexual, self-destructive tendencies, but in helping others to do the same.

This act of sexually educating others—that is, encouraging them to enjoy themselves as much as they can, personally and socially, so long as they do not harm or coerce others—can of course be abused. Under the guise of helping a member of the other sex surmount his or her self-defeating puritanism, you can—unfairly—try for some side benefits of a wholly unaltruistic nature.

But the other side of the coin, as noted above, is even more dreadful. For under the guise of helping someone to remain “pure,” you may vent on him or her your own sadistic, semipsychotic philosophy of restraint.

If, moreover, you are sufficiently self-disciplined to follow the other rules of personal and social sex morality already outlined here, you will truly be in a position to be sexually helpful to others rather than exploitative. And the more you spread the gospel of true morality, the more moral (as any good religionist will tell you) you yourself will become.

THESE, SOMEWHAT BRIEFLY and perhaps inadequately stated, are what I consider might be some of the main principles of a new (and I hope refreshingly different!) code of sexual morality. Already, of course, such a new code is being partially practiced in these United States; and there are clear-cut indications that the future will see it even more extensively followed.

What kind of statutory changes would the consistent following of such a new sex code require? A good many drastic ones, I would say. As Kinsey and his associates have pointed out, under the rules still found on our statute books about 95 per cent of American males and a high percentage of our females should have been, at some time during their lives, arrested and jailed.

Under a sane sex code, however, husbands and wives would no longer be *required* to have relations with each other (as they now are in most of our states); divorce by mutual consent would be quickly and easily granted, once proper financial and child-custody arrangements had been made; premarital sex relations would not be illicit; sex deviates would be sent for psychotherapy rather than jailed and punished; and sex censorship would be virtually nonexistent.

No child, under a sane sex code, would be considered illegitimate; and, as now occurs in several Scandinavian countries, if children were born out of wedlock, both mother and children could be helped, rather than severely penalized.

Would abortion be legally permissible in a sexually sane society? I believe most certainly it would—not because of the great number of unmarried women's pregnancies that might take place, but because married couples in particular would not be required to bring into the world unwanted children, if somehow they slipped up on their contraceptive technique.

In many important ways, then, the legal sex codes would surely have to change in consonance with the regular sex customs of a sexually permissive, unpuritanical community. And so they would. The real issue is the open, unhypocritical acceptance of actual changes—changes in law would naturally follow.

Already, as every sex study shows, our sexual behavior has become enormously liberalized during the past several decades. Sex attitudes of today, as expressed in our most popular mass media, for instance, have become far freer than those of the 1950s. And the liberal trend seems to be continuing.

The facts are in. Our sexual behavior is almost as far removed from what it is legally supposed to be as we could possibly make it. When are we *honestly* going to admit and accept this? ■

A HOMOSEXUAL MEDICAL DOCTOR WRITES:

A Matter of Self-Esteem

MEN ARE BEAUTIFUL. Two men agreeing to share their lives as well as their sexual experiences are beautiful together. Why, then, do so many of these unions fail in weeks or months? The lure of promiscuity and fascination for the unknown or unexperienced are the reasons usually given, but let's examine our personality structures a little deeper.

From the time of our first sexual experiences "behind the barn" or our first masturbation experience the overwhelming reflex as well as learned emotional reaction has been one of shame. Our parents, wanting to avoid sexual excesses and many times because they themselves felt guilt and inadequacy in their sexual role, enforced these feelings of shame and degradation. As we grew older and heard the snickers and angry denunciations of "queers," we learned the attitude of society was to ostracize and punish the homosexual, and so the shame we felt was now official and legally enforced. We accepted society's concept of sexual aberration and made these concepts our standards. Most attempted to avoid falling into this category, but when it became evident to each of us that, if we were to be ourselves and reach any fulfillment of life's promises, we must be of a

THESE, SOMEWHAT BRIEFLY and perhaps inadequately stated, are what I consider might be some of the main principles of a new (and I hope refreshingly different!) code of sexual morality. Already, of course, such a new code is being partially practiced in these United States; and there are clear-cut indications that the future will see it even more extensively followed.

What kind of statutory changes would the consistent following of such a new sex code require? A good many drastic ones, I would say. As Kinsey and his associates have pointed out, under the rules still found on our statute books about 95 per cent of American males and a high percentage of our females should have been, at some time during their lives, arrested and jailed.

Under a sane sex code, however, husbands and wives would no longer be *required* to have relations with each other (as they now are in most of our states); divorce by mutual consent would be quickly and easily granted, once proper financial and child-custody arrangements had been made; premarital sex relations would not be illicit; sex deviates would be sent for psychotherapy rather than jailed and punished; and sex censorship would be virtually nonexistent.

No child, under a sane sex code, would be considered illegitimate; and, as now occurs in several Scandinavian countries, if children were born out of wedlock, both mother and children could be helped, rather than severely penalized.

Would abortion be legally permissible in a sexually sane society? I believe most certainly it would—not because of the great number of unmarried women's pregnancies that might take place, but because married couples in particular would not be required to bring into the world unwanted children, if somehow they slipped up on their contraceptive technique.

In many important ways, then, the legal sex codes would surely have to change in consonance with the regular sex customs of a sexually permissive, unpuritanical community. And so they would. The real issue is the open, unhypocritical acceptance of actual changes—changes in law would naturally follow.

Already, as every sex study shows, our sexual behavior has become enormously liberalized during the past several decades. Sex attitudes of today, as expressed in our most popular mass media, for instance, have become far freer than those of the 1950s. And the liberal trend seems to be continuing.

The facts are in. Our sexual behavior is almost as far removed from what it is legally supposed to be as we could possibly make it. When are we *honestly* going to admit and accept this? ■

A HOMOSEXUAL MEDICAL DOCTOR WRITES:

A Matter of Self-Esteem

MEN ARE BEAUTIFUL. Two men agreeing to share their lives as well as their sexual experiences are beautiful together. Why, then, do so many of these unions fail in weeks or months? The lure of promiscuity and fascination for the unknown or unexperienced are the reasons usually given, but let's examine our personality structures a little deeper.

From the time of our first sexual experiences "behind the barn" or our first masturbation experience the overwhelming reflex as well as learned emotional reaction has been one of shame. Our parents, wanting to avoid sexual excesses and many times because they themselves felt guilt and inadequacy in their sexual role, enforced these feelings of shame and degradation. As we grew older and heard the snickers and angry denunciations of "queers," we learned the attitude of society was to ostracize and punish the homosexual, and so the shame we felt was now official and legally enforced. We accepted society's concept of sexual aberration and made these concepts our standards. Most attempted to avoid falling into this category, but when it became evident to each of us that, if we were to be ourselves and reach any fulfillment of life's promises, we must be of a

secret, furtive group, we accepted shame and guilt as a part of our personality. It is easy to see why the "normal" man who, after a few clumsy experiments in sex, can marry and establish a satisfactory relationship with a woman, would be intolerant of those who cannot, since he sighed with relief when it "worked" for him. His own guilt feelings concerning that little episode with the boy next door, or the physical release with a "drinking buddy" in service, are still rankling, and he now joins society in condemning others who could not pass that hurdle.

Psychiatrists are very familiar with the "acting out" that guilt causes. When we feel guilty, we expect punishment, whether we are children or adults. Children are sometimes found standing in a corner after misbehaving, although the parent knows nothing of the misbehavior. If punishment is not forthcoming we seek it out, but more subtly as adults. We cruise the johns, expecting legal retribution; if there is no element of risk the experience is no longer satisfying. The more flamboyant act up on the streets, attracting attention so everyone can see that we are no damn good—degenerates, Mother's bad little boy. To some, being beaten as by a father is a sexual experience in itself. And when we attempt to establish a lasting emotional relationship with another homosexual our guilt stands in the way, both in the stability of the relationship which we feel we do not deserve, and in the pretense of a "marriage" which we can never really consummate. The shame we feel is never directed at us; instead we are given affection which we cannot accept. Society's barbs are diverted or softened, although we feel these are our due.

The term "society" is not synonymous with "the law." The law should be a reflection of society's attitudes—it fails when it tries to instruct. But the law is enforced by individuals with their own problems of sexual identification and guilt feelings from sexual experiences. Otherwise, why the lack of law enforcement against the fornicators in "lovers' lanes" (which is also illegal) and the complicated time-consuming traps set up for the homosexuals? And thus it can generally be said that the enforcement of the law more nearly approximates society's attitudes than the laws themselves. Changing existing laws to more reasonable, and scientifically correct concepts is a laudable goal, but the basic problem is the society which instills the guilt in all of us, and our reaction to this guilt, our lack of self-esteem.

We can hold our heads up and be ourselves without conscious effort, for we also make contributions to society as any other men. We need not flaunt the differences, but accentuate the similarities between us and the "normal" man. Society produces the shame we feel, we accept society's standards, and we condemn ourselves to a life of guilt.



THE QUERY MAN

INTERVIEWS

THE DUKE OF FATTINGAME

by Norman Anonymous

(Asked at the intersection of Turk, Greek, Taylor, & Mason Streets)

Q—Sir, may I detain you?

A—You know it!

Q—I'm The Query Man.

A—Don't fret, pet—the town's full of 'em!

Q—May I have your name, please?

A—I'm the Duke of Fattigame on my Daddy's side.

Q—And your Mother's?

A—Dear old Mother was Princess Flab of Cooch BeHooch. She married out of Wedlock in Cannes.

Q—What is your occupation?

A—I'm a Sex-Offender.

Q—Beg your pardon?

A—I offend the Female Sex every chance I get.

Q—Then you're a female sex-offender?

A—Watch that syntax!

Q—Where do you do most of your offending?

A—I write dicta and dogma to the many American women who are slobs and over-sublimated Lesbians!

Q—I see; and where can we find this dogma?

A—On WALLS.

Q—Eh?

A—I dip my quill on every wall I pass, all over town. Often I must wear a cunning little disguise to reach the right wall.

Q—Did your mother ever spank you?

A—Yes. Daily. With a little choker of pearls.

Q—Did you ever cheat at school?

A—NOBODY cheats at Smith.

Q—What shall we do with Alcatraz?

A—After launching my FAT CONVICT CONTEST, I plan to tear it down and build a Reducing Salon. All the winners get a free raft-ride to Angel Island.

Q—What is your primary reaction to Liz Taylor's shocking behavior?

A—ENVY!

Q—Do you believe America should preserve its sex-symbols?

A—Only in EUROPE do they know how to make sex out of symbols.

Q—Then you feel Europeans are more symbol-minded than their American cousins?

A—A European woman wouldn't DREAM of leaving the house with curlers in her hair.

Q—Why not?

A—Her husband has her hand-cuffed to the bed, and she can't move.

Q—How do you balance your budget?

A—I crash dinner parties every chance I get.

Q—What do you think of Telstar?

A—It would make a GORGEOUS tiarra!

Q—Do you feel American women are emasculating their men?

A—Certainly. Look at me!

Q—What is your all-time favorite love story?

A—“How to Succeed in Bed Without Really Moving,” by Elsa Maxwell.

Q—Do you believe we should save ‘The Fox’?

A—No—it's wolves we need more of in this country—WOLVES!

Q—What do you think of the proposal to tear down City Hall and build an Amphitheater?

A—It would make a cuter Reducing Salon.

Q—How do you feel about sending women to the Moon?

A—Let's get up a Group right now!

Q—Would you want your sister to be an Astronaut?

A—Everybody's sister! If they can squeeze all those bulges into a capsule, I can hear countdowns in breakfast nooks all over America!

Q—What is your opinion of The Powder Puff Derby?

A—All those girls look like Lindbergh to me. Nothing but saggy jowls, nasal voices and basic black. COVERALLS!

Q—Do you feel we Americans place too much emphasis on the Big Bosom?

A—Indeed I do!

Q—What remedial measures do you prescribe?

A—Amputation.

Q—Then you find more charm in the Flat Chest?

A—You said a mouthful!

Q—What do you think of the ‘Jackie Look’?

A—SOME fellows can get away with it.

Q—Do you think Mrs. Kennedy should do the Green Room over in Gold Lamé?

A—I feel MORE American Women should do their Green Rooms over. And they should scrub the floors and the ceilings and the washbasins and make old-fashioned stews and get out that ironing-board and press and press and keep those pots boiling for their men in their old-fashioned Green Rooms!

Q—What do you do when you are overtired?

A—I scrub the floors and the ceilings and the washbasins and make old-fashioned stews like the Founding Mothers...and I get out that old ironing board, and I press and PRESS!

Q—What is your opinion of the High Fashion Hairdos the girls are wearing?

A—Oh la! I think they're adorably feminine! But with my split-ends, that's a touchy subject.

Q—Do you agree that a skyscraper next to Old St. Mary's would be out of place?

A—Naturally.

Q—And what is your solution?

A—Tear down Old St. Mary's! Did you ever SEE those American SOWS walking up those steps in their tight stretch-pants? Tear it down, I say!

Q—Why are there so many suicides in this city?

A—Because San Francisco is just the END!

Q—What do you think of the new Digit-Dial system?

A—It's RUINING my nails!

Q—Are you in favor of the "Take an Alcoholic to Lunch This Week" movement?

A—Yes, if you're free. Where shall we eat?

Q—Well, there's this smart little bistro half way up the Tenderloin, where all the waiters are part-time corset models.

A—Ooh...sounds positively European! Do they have free Low-Cal hors-d'oeuvres?

Q—Yes, and after two drinks they let you take home a model and some bonus fish-paste.

A—But what about the WALLS? I MUST go on with my writing, or how else are we to desegregate all those Basic Black American Bosoms with their little chokers of fatty tissue—hmm? I MUST have my walls...I'm DEDICATED!

Q—Duke baby, their wallpaper is pure carbon.

A—Oh la! I can smell the printer's ink already! Let's AWAY!

Q—My arm?

A—You know it!

Les Arts Gai

by DAVID LAYNE

LAWRENCE OF ARABIA is still an enigma. The movie is a great multi-adventure story with much to commend it for general interest; but for those who want to understand the man T. E. Lawrence and for REVIEW readers the film lacks substance. Seen in isolation from other biographies or Lawrence's own PILARS OF WISDOM, Sam Spiegel's production offers only limited (albeit several) explanations of T. E. Lawrence's character. Matter'a fact, the problem isn't *really* presented. Little is asked, little need be stated.

Material is present to indicate that he was (1) disappointed in his inability to "become" an Arabian, (2) angry at British colonial policy, (3) obsessed with delusions (?) of grandeur, (4) an exhibitionist (with the slightest of tendencies toward transvestism), (5) a shy fellow who backed into unsought fame, (6) sadistic, (7) masochistic, (8) a "bit daft." Choose any or several, and the intelligent but uninformed film-goer will walk out shrugging, "so what?"

ROSS, last year's play titled after the name T. E. chose seeking obscurity, stated the total problem and gave a solution. Briefly: Lawrence, a minor officer in the Near East during the 1st W. W., based *all* on the strength of his naked will to conquer fear, force and fatigue. His goal was to unify the tribes of Arabia against Turkey (and Germany). He led attacks that made military history and made him a major; nothing could stop him, but something did. He was tortured by a sadistic Turkish commander, returned to England as soon as possible (by now a colonel), and disappeared—re-enlisting as "Aircraftman Röss." Terence Rattigan, author of ROSS, described the torture: *rape* and suggests that when T. E. was forced to see his own deeply repressed homosexuality, he ran into an enemy he could not conquer. Not that his homosexuality destroyed him, but that the conflict resulting from its repression did!

In the current film, the Turkish Bey (Jose Ferrer) is sadistic and lustful, even dropping a hint to Lawrence: "You don't know what I'm talking about; that would be too lucky." But there is no indication that Lawrence was sexually molested or that the experience shook him any more deeply than several other traumatic ones. (Including the necessity of shooting his dearest Arabian servant boy to prevent his torture. ROSS intimates and Lawrence's own book states that his two servant boys were lovers.) Thus

(Continued on page 20)

Back Issues - - $\frac{1}{2}$ Price!

Every Magazine is NEW until you have read it!

60 Assorted Back Issues (no two alike) from 1955 to 1961 (inclusive). . . \$30.00 value now

\$15.00

Of the 79 different issues published in 1955-1961, all but a very few are in stock for clearance in this first sale of Mattachine REVIEW at discounted prices. Sorry, no choice of specific issues in this assortment.

(Specific Back Issues where available, 50¢ each, January 1955 through December 1962)

BOUND VOLUMES: 1955, 56, 57, 58 at \$10.00 each;
1959, 60, 61, 62 at \$7.50 each.

All bound in matching blue fabrikoid, gold stamped.

Are You a Subscriber?

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATE IS \$7.50 PER YEAR, INCLUDING
INTERIM QUARTERLY

Effective January 1, 1963. Issues sent sealed.

SUPPORTING MEMBERSHIP—\$15 per year, includes Mattachine publications, and gives support desperately needed to continue Mattachine's educational, research and social service projects. ENROLL AS A SUPPORTING MEMBER TODAY!

COMPLETE YEARLY SETS

Some are missing one or two issues in 1955, 56 and 57; Complete sets of 12 issues available for 1958, 59, 60, 61, 62.

Per Yearly Set—\$3.75
(State Year)

More than 3000 pages of significant, informative reading available in Mattachine REVIEW back issues! Ideal for presentation to friends and associates to advance the understanding of human sex problems!

NOTE: Send cash with order. Shipments mailed postpaid as "Educational Materials."
No Sales Tax Applicable.

IN STERLING AREA COUNTRIES

Subscriptions to *Mattachine REVIEW* are expedited and simplified if they are mailed directly to our British Agent in London. Address

BCM/LALO, London, W.C. 1, England

Enclosing £ 3 remittance for full year.

(Continued from page 17)

we must conclude that Mr. Bolt's excellent screenplay and Mr. Lean's exciting direction merely neglected one important element of Lawrence's destruction—the reason! (Now for heaven's sake, don't run around shouting, "Well, my *dear*, you know he was a homosexual" in the way some say it of various movie stars. Lawrence was not a man to be so treated.)

In other respects the film is superb and defies categorization as a mere "spectacular." It is a work of art. Alec Guinness (Prince Feisal, leader of the Arab revolt), unfortunately does not have a role large enough to merit "the Supreme Academy Award for All Time" as best actor. Peter O'Toole (what can I say?) undoubtedly gives the finest performance ever given by a previously almost unknown actor. He has an intensity in one scene that matches that of Guinness!

Anthony Quinn is fine as Abu Tayi, a lesser prince than Guinness, but is a lesser actor also. Art Kennedy, Claude Rains, Jose Ferrer, Anthony Quayle are among our best actors and demand no other comment. The photography: the heat, the space, the action, all are caught. Several sequences—including a motorcycle accident and an attack on an Arab camp by bi-planes—are better portrayed than anything similar we've ever seen. Sound: the music is well integrated if a little repetitive; a desert theme is particularly effective. One amusing scene involves echoes in stereo (for which reason,

among purely visual ones, you'd be wise to see the film first-run rather than in neighborhood theatres).

Actually the film is great because it is about a great man, a disturbed, disturbing man, a man who nearly ranked with Alexander the Great, Hannibal, and Wellington as a great general. He will remain an enigma because we aren't sure, anymore than he was, exactly *who* he was, *why* he led so brilliantly, what caused him to falter. Even so: Winston Churchill dubbed him "one of the greatest beings alive in our time." If only he could have lived in Alexander's time...

THE CAMP COMMENT: *Lawrence* is particularly recommended for O'Toole. Besides his considerable talent, he's fun to watch. After all has been said about the script and director side-stepping the issue, there *is* some camping! Lawrence is honored by the tribesmen with a robe, saracen blade, and Arabic title (pronounced EL-LOronce?). Alone in the desert he glories in the exotic swirl of the robe and adjusts his head-dress in the mirrored blade. Several times, *coquettish* is the only word for his behavior—never more than while cavorting atop a derailed train as his picture is taken for the *Chicago Courier*. But there's something unsatisfying about a hero when he refuses to be one...when his grandness is a cover for hidden fear...when you want to love him and can't quite like him *because he doesn't like himself*. It contains a lesson for us all!

BOOKS

"ALL WE CAN DO IS TO SUGGEST THE PROBLEM"

STRANGERS IN OUR MIDST: PROBLEMS OF THE HOMOSEXUAL IN AMERICAN SOCIETY, by Alfred A. Gross. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1962. 182 pp. \$4.50. Reviewed by Rev. Robert W. Wood.

Rev. Wood is author of *Christ and the Homosexual* and of "Changing Religious Attitudes Toward the Homosexual." *Mattachine REVIEW*, Nov. & Dec., 1962.

If this book had been published ten years ago, or even five, it might have been considered a trail blazer. Appearing late in 1962, it offers little that is new or pioneering in thought or direction save for the person who is reading about homosexuality for the first time. However, the acknowledged accomplishments of the Rev. Dr. Alfred A. Gross, Executive Secretary of The George W. Henry Foundation, New York City, in helping many hundreds of homosexually disturbed individuals over the past score and more of years require serious consideration of whatever he has to say on the subject.

A selection of the "Pastoral Psychology" book club, this liberal approach to contemporary homosexuality views the matter primarily through the social and religious avenues with a minimum of psychological jargon. Like the magazine, however, it is more superficial than profound. It was written for the parish minister and general citizen rather than for the homosexual. It seems to follow the pattern of other books published by the same Press and one can only wonder how much the author had to bow to the demands of the publisher and to leave unsaid much that his experience would have prepared him to say.

While lamenting the absence of a bibliography, one is grateful for the footnotes and index in this over priced book (182 pages, \$4.50). The reader gets the impression that very little is being said or done in this sphere in America, and that all pioneering work generates from England. For instance, only passing mention is made of the work of the national homophile organizations in this country and there is no reference to the National Council of Churches' "Sex Ways in Fact and Faith."

Dr. Gross' verbose style, familiar to readers of the annual reports of the George W. Henry Foundation, is apparent here too. Such words as "domiliary," "desuetude," "tendentious," "luctic," "Maleficent," and fre-

quent Latin (italicized) give a pseudo-scholastic gloss to his effort.

The author makes many needed points, i.e.: "Few homosexuals are what they are because of their own choosing" (p. 79); or "But it is high time to discard the view that the homosexual's conduct excludes him from the protection of the community" (p. 67). He exposes police entrapment, politician's use of the homosexual as a whipping boy, the poor work of prison chaplains, and the role of the blackmailer. Yet he never quite gets the reader over the hump of the problem to where solutions or specific courses of action are forthcoming. Too often he concludes with "How this is to be brought about is another matter" (p. 35); or "All we can do is to suggest the problem" (p. 78).

We read sixteen pages under the title "What Is a Homosexual?" only to discover at the conclusion that the author offers no definition but is satisfied to let the reader draw his own conclusions from what has been said. While this is a valid form of writing, and I would favor it over a too narrow interpretation, it does seem the author has shirked his duty in not offering us his own answer. Likewise with the number of homosexuals. Nowhere does he suggest in actual figures the vastness of the homosexual community in this country. The best he can do is to write, "There are many more men of this bent than are commonly supposed" (p. 29). Only in the concluding chapter, "The Quest for Guiding Principles," do we get anything concrete and much of that has already been voiced in other publications.

I was especially interested in his two religious chapters but disappoint-

FOREIGN PUBLICATIONS

The Circle (Der Kreis)

Published monthly since 1932 in French, German, and English (no translation duplications). Contains photos, illustrations, and art reproductions. Rolf, editor. Annual subscription \$11 first class sealed. Bank draft or cash to Lesezirkel Der Kreis, Postfach 547, Fraumunster, Zurich 22, Switzerland.

Arcadie

Monthly literary and scientific review in French. A. Baudry, editor. Subscriptions \$9 per year. Address 74 Blvd. de Reuilly, Paris XII, France.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT—The *Review* is grateful for newspaper clippings and press cuttings received from all over the U. S. and England, sent in by subscribers regularly. These items help immeasurably in keeping the magazine abreast with what is going on in English speaking countries. All readers are invited to join in this service of providing clippings of newspaper items in the sex sphere for use in future issues of the magazine. Please be sure the publication, city and date are included with each clipping submitted.

to find he did little more than present a few of the homosexuals' problems and to challenge the Church to pay them heed. There is little here to suggest that the homosexual, himself, has obligations to society and Church. I feel the author errs when he writes, for instance, "We are called upon to take the steps that seem necessary to relieve him (the homosexual) of most, if not all, of the burden that should never have been his" (p. 171). In his liberal approach the author has painted too one sided a picture and thus is in danger of turning away the very people who need to hear his message. This book will do little to cause the homosexual to pause and re-think his own behavior pattern or his social-religious obligations.

Gross' use of case studies is indicative of his many years of association with Dr. Henry. This book is a positive contribution to better understanding of homosexuality and the homosexual, but the author has not done all that he is capable of doing.

INABILITY TO RECOGNIZE AND ACCEPT

THE OPEN SQUARE by Ford Clark. *Fawcett Gold Medal, 1962. Reviewed by Gene Damon.*

A good deal is said about the male homosexual who is unhappy and dissatisfied with being homosexual. Very little is said about the desperate plight of the man who cannot, or will not, accept the homosexuality which might well be his salvation. This unusually good paperback original handles this not uncommon dilemma very well. Keeler, the City Manager, is quite desperately in love with the Chief of Police, Ashton. His inability to recognize and accept this state of mind brings real destruction, not only to himself, but to the town, and nearly to Ashton. Unfortunately, many will read this as the story of a "nut," not seeing the meaning and need-less unhappiness.

RIGHTEOUS HOSTILITY

THE CUSTARD BOYS, by John Rae. New York: Farrar Straus & Cudahy, 1961. 219 pp. \$3.95. Reviewed by Noel I. Garde.

The "angry young bourgeois schoolboy" style pioneered by J. D. Salinger has by now cast its influence far and wide, and clearly beyond the Atlantic. This first novel by John Rae, a history teacher at Harrow, is a splendid example of the British version of the genre, which it will be difficult for other imitators to surpass.

The dust jacket blurb is so well written, and so thoroughly adequate, that we can do no better than quote it to give the general idea of the book:

This is the story of a group of thirteen- and fourteen-year-old boys living out the war in a remote corner of the English countryside. Middle class evacuees or farmers' sons, their one aim is to use the time well until they will be old enough to fight. The year is 1942 and even in this quiet corner of Norfolk the second-hand excitement of war reaches them through the cinema, the newspapers and the jingoistic talk of the adults. Stimulated by this, they play war games and live by a harsh military code.

At their school a new boy arrives; he is the son of a new master, Jewish-Austrian and a refugee from Nazi persecution. Because he is a stranger he is put under the charge of John Curlew, one of the gang. A friendship ripens between Curlew and the Jewish boy, Mark. Grudgingly, the other boys accept him into the gang.

Into this situation comes the news that one of the local boys has won the Victoria Cross for bravery in the field. The news gives impetus to the gang's need to prove that they too have courage. They challenge the group of working class village boys to fight. When the time comes, Mark runs away in the face of the enemy.

To the rest of the gang he is a coward and must be punished; cowardice is the one thing that they have been taught to despise. Only when their plan to punish Mark goes tragically wrong does his friend John Curlew begin to realize that the standards he has accepted so eagerly are in fact rotten.

Well, this covers plenty but omits mentioning that the "friendship" between John and Mark is far more, and is a rather well advanced precocious love affair. The rumble with the rival gang is precipitated when they come upon Mark and John in necking and mutual masturbation, and spread the word far and wide. John and Mark go everywhere together, hold hands furtively and act much like the two young lovers in *Special Friendships*, that classic in the field. Their gang talks about it openly. And just as in Peyrefitte's novel there is an adult whose righteous hostility turns out to mask his own homosexual jealousy, so is there here a latent homosexual headmaster who tries to con our little hero into taking down his pants after a whipping "to see if I hurt you."

Aside from the warm homosexual emotions (with the old "at-that-age-it's-really-all-normal" pitch), the book is also worth reading for its splendidly sardonic boys' eye portraits of adult phonies and also a number of brilliant quotable epigrams, a la Oscar Wilde.

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: I believe your January 1963 issue is one of the all-around best issues you've ever turned out, with a well-chosen selection of material from all the different areas with which *Mattachine REVIEW* should be concerned, and each selection of commendable quality. Certainly you should use this issue as your "sample copy" for potential subscribers and well-wishers for the indefinite future.—Noel L. Garde, New York.

REVIEW EDITOR: Until just recently, I only occasionally came across a copy of the *REVIEW*, usually given to us by a friend who is one of your most diligent boosters. I confess to not paying it any great amount of attention until the other day when he sent along your Jan. 63 issue. For some unaccountable reason, probably some subtle combination of items and opinions expressed in this issue, I for the first time actually took a good look at it and read it just about cover to cover and then started thinking about it. You are largely a voice crying in the wilderness... but the wilderness doubtless consists as much of apathy as of opposition... so let's have your answer to the come-on about forming a Chicago area organization... also any related material.

Don't forget a follow-up please on the Pentagon meeting news item. This sounds as interesting as it is surprising!

I'll restrain my impulse to give further opinions until I feel that I know more about your organization and become more familiar with your publications through reading further issues... with one definite exception, to wit: I could not disagree more strongly with your decision to publish the letter in the January issue signed "Mr. M. G., Ontario" Even

admitting the possibility that you are short publishable material, I feel that to print something like this letter is a disservice to the cause you foster. Before giving my reasons for this let-me-just say that I admit to being opinionated and prejudiced against Mr. M.G. but feel that nevertheless there is some reason on my side. The letter was ungrammatical and (to quote a friend who was with the Chicago Mattachine group before it disbanded) "quite frequently incoherent." The goals expressed by the writer were extremely fuzzy and poorly explained, not to mention almost ludicrously unlikely to be realized considering his present age and status. The religiosity that pervaded the letter was of the most guilt-ridden sort...

My argument? The Mattachine Society and the *REVIEW*, as I understand it, profess to speak for persons with deviant sex patterns... actually, in practice, for homosexuals in the U.S. In other words, a propaganda organ. The assumption is, I presume, that it will reach non-homosexuals, rather than those of us who are fairly familiar with the subject, including all the types of persons who are to be encountered. As a propaganda organ, rather than strictly a news medium or open forum, a great deal of control should be expressed over what opinions are expressed in the pages of the *REVIEW* and how they are stated. The negative aspects of Mr. M.G.'s letter seem, to me at least, to be obvious. Generalizing from this particular, the enquiring heterosexual might be tempted to conclude that all homosexuals are poorly educated, attracted to all other lunatic fringes, possessed of very guilty consciences, given to vain attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable, and incapable of letter writing.

Now, if you do not consider the *REVIEW* to be a propaganda organ, my objections are pointless. A letter such as Mr. M.G.'s would belong and rightly so in an open forum type of publication. On this point, however, I'd like to say that I think there is more of a need for propaganda, especially on a national scale, than for an exchange of ideas. The danger here is, of course, that following this line of thinking, I am tempted to go through the issue line for line pointing out every instance of creating a bad public image that I can find...

Please understand one thing: I did not write this in hopes of seeing anything in print, but rather to communicate with you.—Mr. C.H.I., Illinois.

EDITOR'S NOTE: In spite of its dictionary definition, propaganda has many unsavory connotations. Undoubtedly, it is because of these connotations that our disparagers have labeled us a "propaganda organ." However, we yet believe that an airing of the facts will produce the best and most lasting results. Other "propaganda organs" seem to have abandoned this principle as far as homosexuality is concerned—but they can't hold out much longer.

REVIEW EDITOR: It disturbs me to realize that perhaps the single most important aspect of the de Kaplany case has received no public recognition or consideration. It illustrates in cruel and tragic fashion that the traditional prejudice against homosexuality is so extreme and so violent that a large but undetermined number of men attempt to evade what is for them the natural expression of their emotional lives; to repress the natural expression of their sexuality, and to live in ways which outwardly are acceptable to the standards of society. Society does not recognize homosexuality and goes to extraordinary lengths to enforce its repression. The outcome in the de Kaplany case is so horrible that it is difficult to contemplate the case.

As of this date I have seen not one word that society has a share in this tragedy, in refusing to recognize, to tolerate and to channelize diversity in emotional lives. If homosexuality were a dignified and acceptable alternative, fewer people would attempt to evade the truth in their own lives.

Such a case as that of de Kaplany is both gruesome and spectacular; and there are untold numbers, hosts of others, who revenge themselves on an ungenerous

life, an ungenerous fate, unwittingly but destructively, in more subtle, sophisticated ways. There is an enormous spectrum of imbalance ranging from de Kaplany to Hitler which is a hideous monument to our traditional ignorance and fear and intolerance.—Mr. W.B., Calif.

REVIEW EDITOR: I've been a subscriber since the beginning in 1955, so I will have been receiving your magazine for over a decade (in 1965); therefore I must like it. However what I can't understand is why the magazine should not make money for those who run it and also subsidize the worthwhile work of Mattachine. After all, the muscle boy mags appeal to about the same people as does the *REVIEW*, and they make money. I travel quite a bit and observe that the *REVIEW* is sold increasingly openly but usually side by side with the muscle boy mags. Pictures, which would be appealing to most of the readers, especially on the front cover would help you to compete. Even semi-technical mags, in their field, make use of appealing (to most of their readers) pictures. Almost all of the potential buyers of the *REVIEW* are bored by learned articles in which the experts speculate as to the cause and cure of homosexuality. It is just a way of life and as to how or why it happened, even in the individual case, is of little importance, and generalizations about all the gay are of none, either. As for cures, if someone does come up with something that works, we won't need the *REVIEW* to find it out. Such a cure would make page one in all the papers. The fact of the matter is that most of the gay could not afford extensive psychotherapy even if they wanted it and there were enough practitioners to handle the case load. I feel most of the approach needs to be social and even political to obtain for a minority its rights. Good fiction, especially that about those of the age group of most of the readers and that does not reek of the clinic, is always good. Down to earth articles about sexual trouble areas for straight and gay alike, sadism and masochism, alcoholism, drug addiction, prostitution, extortion, and robbery. Also a lonely hearts section, not for my benefit but for that of many who are willing to take certain risks with those in the tabloids. By certain safe guards, you could minimize these risks and completely protect yourselves. Well do it your way; I'm sure you will and keep up the good work. I hope circulation in-

creases.—Mr. E.B.C., Penna.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Now how are you going to sell pears by hiding them under a pile of twigs? Muscle mags, tabloids, etc., are something else again.

THE ALBANY TRUST

REVIEW EDITOR: Thank you for your helpful notice of the Albany Trust in your January issue. It may interest your readers to know the precise relationship between the Trust and the Homosexual Law Reform Society.

The Society was set up in May, 1958 to work for enactment of the Wolfenden recommendations, chief of which was that homosexual acts between consenting adults in private should no longer be a crime. Its Honorary Committee of about a hundred distinguished people includes members of Parliament from all three political parties, eminent churchmen, doctors, lawyers, writers and other leaders of opinion.

While the Society concentrates on the objective of law reform and runs a continuous public campaign to this end, it quickly became apparent that a wider foundation was needed to promote public education in the broadest sense on sexual deviation and related problems, to encourage research, and to deal with the many cases of personal difficulty which began to reach us. Certain members of the Homosexual Law Reform Society's Executive Committee therefore founded the Albany Trust, which is a charitable body with a constitution allowing it to carry out these wider activities which are outside the province of a law reform society.

Thus your statement that "the Albany Trust seems to sponsor the Homosexual Law Reform Society" is not quite correct: they are in fact complementary* to one another.

We shall be pleased to send fuller details of our work to any of your readers who write to us.—Antony Grey, Secretary, Albany Trust, 32 Shaftesbury Avenue, London W.1, England.

REVIEW EDITOR: Your issue for February 1962 was duly received, and, of course, included the Act passed by the Illinois legislature. The copy arrived shortly before an important debate in the House of Commons on the Private Members Bill of Mr. Leo Abse. Our

Member of Parliament for Willesden-West, Laurie Pavitt, intended speaking in support of Leo Abse's Bill. So I sent to Mr. Pavitt my copy of the February *Mattachine REVIEW*. After the debate (unfortunately Mr. Pavitt was not called to speak) the *REVIEW* was returned through the post to me. It has never arrived. Wherever it is, I hope it is doing good!

May I draw your attention to the dreadful dilemma which now faces Mr. Macmillan, our Prime Minister? It is obviously undesirable to employ in our Foreign Office persons like John Vassall, who became the victim of an alleged homosexual incident with Soviet persons. Surely Mr. Macmillan must now feel it undesirable to employ persons with heterosexual tendencies following the revelations concerning the senior Foreign Office official, Miss Barbara Fell, who improperly gave information to a Yugoslavian, and who in consequence was sentenced to two years imprisonment!—Mr. D.P., England.

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, New York.

National League for Social Understanding, P.O. Box 29048, Hollywood 29, California

League for Civil Education, Inc., 1154 Kearny St., 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, 34 South 17th. Street, Room 229, Philadelphia 3, Penna.

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

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

HAVE YOU MISSED THESE?

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR, Deluxe 2-Vol. Set, Edited by Dr. Albert Ellis	30.00
EACH IN HIS DARKNESS, Julian Green	4.50
THE BULL FROM THE SEA, Mary Renault	4.95
THE AMERICAN SEXUAL TRAGEDY, Dr. Albert Ellis	5.00
A THIRSTY EVIL, Gore Vidal	3.00
TROPIC OF CAPRICORN, Henry Miller	7.50
ANOTHER COUNTRY, James Baldwin	5.95
SOMEWHERE BETWEEN THE TWO, Jay Little	4.50
NOT YET (Lesbian Novel), Tereska Torres	3.50

CURRENT POPULAR PAPERBACK TITLES

THE SIXTH MAN, Jess Stearn	.90
THE CROOKED COPS, W. T. Brannon	.75
SEX AND THE LAW, Judge Morris Ploscowe	.90
THE LESBIAN IN OUR SOCIETY, Dr. W. D. Sprague	.75
TORMENT, Richard Meeker	1.00
HALF WORLD, Joe D. Bowie	.75
THE HOMOSEXUAL, Benjamin Morse, M.D.	.75
SEX AND THE ARMED SERVICES, L. W. Woodward, M.D.	.50
STRANGE FRIENDS (Lesbian), Agnette Holk	.60
A MONTH AMONG THE MEN, Maryse Cholsy	.75
THE DEEP SIX, Martin Dibner	.50
THE TATTOOED ROOD, Kyle Onstott	.65
GIOVANNI'S ROOM, James Baldwin	.50
THE DAMNED ONE (Lesbian), Guy de Cars	.60
ALL THE SAD YOUNG MEN, Anonymous	.65

Cash with order—Add Sales Tax in Calif.—Postage 10¢ per book

Dorian BOOK SERVICE

693 Mission Street

San Francisco 5, Calif.

WOULD YOU LIKE TO HELP

Mattachine

WITHOUT GETTING

INVOLVED?

We need MONEY more than anything!

Send bills, checks, money orders, to:

MATTACHINE SOCIETY, INC.

693 Mission Street

San Francisco 5, California

Your Sex Life Is Your Own Business. Help Keep It That Way!



NOEL I. GARDE

May I use this section of the magazine for a "good deed" message to whom it may concern. I have noted an increasing number of homosexual organizations drawing upon classical terms to find a name, i.e. *Janus*, *Dionysus*, *Demophil*, all of them rather thoroughly inappropriate.

Meanwhile, the best of all possible words, completely appropriate, mellifluous and of unimpeachable credentials, goes a-begging. The word is *Uranian*, from the Greek word for heavenly, identified with the sky-god Uranus, first ruler of the universe and two genera-

tions prior to Zeus and his siblings. In Plato's *Symposium*, Pausanias advanced the proposition that there were really two goddesses of love called Aphrodite (Venus), the older and superior one, the daughter of Uranus (the Uranian Aphrodite) being identified with homosexual love and the younger, more vulgar one, the daughter of Zeus, being identified with heterosexual love.

From this, scholarly German homosexuals, during the great days of the German homosexual renaissance, derived the word *uranian* to refer to themselves (In colloquial German it came out *urning*). For many decades this word was used in the works of the great sexologists. In recent decades it has passed into oblivion.

It's about time *Uranian* was revived, certainly for organizational use and quite possibly, in addition, as a charming, stigma-free, confusion-free term for *homosexual*.

ONE INSTITUTE OF HOMOPHILE STUDIES

announcement and schedule of classes

1962-63 academic year

- HS-134 Drama Workshop. Reading and dramatic presentation of homophile poetry and plays. Coaching in self-expression. Thursday evenings, 8-10. Farley.
- HS-136 Writing for Publication. The special problems of writing for the American and European homophile press. Individual consultation and group discussions. Hours to be arranged. Slater.
- HS-137 Second semester continuation of HS-136. Slater.
- HS-140 Library Workshop. Classification and use of scientific works and fiction in the homophile field; cataloguing, bibliographical research. Tuesday evenings, 8-10. Slater.
- HS-212 Homosexuality in History. Speculative, scientific and philosophical trends; emergence of a world-wide social movement. Monday evenings, 8-10. Legg.
- HS-213 Homosexuality in History. Second semester continuation of HS-212. Analysis of programs and ideology of homophile organizations in U. S. and abroad. Monday evenings, 8-10. Legg.

FEES

The fee for each course per semester is \$15.00. Visitors are invited to attend single sessions if they wish. The fee for these is \$1.00.

2256 Venice Boulevard, Los Angeles 6, California

NEWS STAND DIRECTORY

Mattachine REVIEW

where to BUY it . . .

CALIFORNIA

Berkeley—U-C Corner, 2350 Telegraph Avenue

Hollywood—Universal News Agency, 1655 N. Las Palmas (at Hollywood Blvd.)

Los Angeles—Many outlets in Metropolitan Area through One, Inc., 2256 Venice Blvd., RE 5-5252 *

San Francisco—Many outlets through L-S Distributors*; also City Lights Books, 261 Columbus Ave.; R & W Cigars, Powell & Market; Broadway Cigar Shop, 550 Broadway; Mattachine Review, 693 Mission Street.

ILLINOIS

Chicago—P.O. News Co., 37 W. Monroe (Loop); Godair Book Store, 10 E. Division (Near North Side).

INDIANA

Indianapolis—Martin Boetigheimer, 141 S. Illinois Street.

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston—Demophil Center, 15 Lindall Place.

MICHIGAN

Detroit Metropolitan Area—Many outlets through Royal News Company, 12635 Miami, Detroit.

MISSOURI

Kansas City—Ted's News & Book Shop, 221 E. 12th.

NEBRASKA

Omaha—Ak-Sar-Ben Newsstand, 1600 Howard Street; United States Newsstand, 16th. & Farnum.

NEW YORK

New York City—Many outlets in Metropolitan Area through Liberty News Distributors.*

OHIO

Cleveland Metropolitan Area—Many outlets through Cuyahoga News Co., 2626 E. 51st., Cleveland.*

Toledo—Modern Book Store, 429 Superior Street.

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma City—A Points Northe, 117 S. Hudson

OREGON

Portland—Rich Cigar Store, 734 S. W. Alder.

PENNSYLVANIA

Philadelphia—Frank E. Elster News Agency, 1226 Filbert

TEXAS

Dallas—Commerce St. Newsstand, 1610 Commerce Street.

UTAH

Salt Lake City—By's Magazine Shop, 32 W. 2nd. South.

*Telephone these agencies for location of nearest retail newsdealer.

CALLING SHOTS

(Continued from page 2)

from the public to do so.

Attorney Frank C. Wood, Jr., and his assistant, Dane Mohler, Jr., discussed the meaning of the *Bielicke* decision which forbids police to spy upon citizens enclosed in facilities in public toilets for the purpose of catching someone who might break the law. With other attorneys, including Herbert Selwyn, Jr., a lively panel tore into aspects of private v. public rights.

In the matter of changes in the penal codes, it was plainly set forth that changes in sex laws in the various states would not be on the basis of changing the sex laws alone, but only by revamp of the entire penal codes of these jurisdictions. Further, in this connection, it would be necessary to ameliorate penalties on sexual behavior by omitting reference to private and consenting acts between adults as illegal.

GUIDED TOUR OF S.F. GAY BARS

The San Francisco *Examiner* reported that the outgoing Grand Jury expressed concern recently over "the increasing number of places catering to homosexuals" there.

"Discussion with law enforcement officials substantiates the jury's concern," Foreman William E. McDonnell wrote in a final report.

"It is my sincere hope that succeeding grand juries will carefully study this problem."

McDonnell and members of his grand jury were taken by the police on tours of bars catering to homosexuals, for a first-hand survey, it was learned.

Meanwhile Norbert Falvey, San Francisco supervisor for the State Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, termed such bars here "one of our major problems." He said that since Feb., 1961, 24 homosexual bars have been closed by his department, but that about 25 homosexual bars are still operating, with Department charges pending against sixteen.

For the benefit of our readers, we might add that these figures are subject to constant change. The tendency in the past has been toward an increase, but now the saturation point seems to have been reached. It has become a game of musical chairs with the A.B.C. spending vast sums of the taxpayers money in a pathetic effort to justify its expansion into the field of moralism.

Falvey and the Grand Jury should tour some of the "non-gay" bars, especially in the Mission.

And incidentally, among those bars closed were all of those of which the management helped to bring to justice a number of the bride-taking agents of the A.B.C.

But that was two years ago.

SEX DEVIATES STILL CONVENIENT SCAPEGOATS

The all-inclusive and usually ill-defined grouping of "sex deviates"

as a threat to women, children and the community comes up again and again. It is not so much a case of what is happening as where, it seems.

Rochester, New York, is a late example. There, Dist. Atty. John J. Conway, Jr. warned the public and parents in particular that gangs of young hoodlums are seeking out homosexuals as targets for robbery and assault.

The pattern is old: A young gang member acts as come-on or decoy, then once a victim has been pinpointed, the gang pounces.

Conway believes that newspapers, radio and TV should identify the victims as homosexual examples, and thus deter other gangs from such attacks. But Newspaperman Clifford E. Carpenter, editor of the Rochester *Democrat and Chronicle* countered with the fact that such identification would lead to libel suits.

Dr. Sidney Koret, director of a children's home, brought some sense to the discussion when he stated that "public attitudes toward sex deviance, including homosexuality, are influenced by the fact that people have the strongest kind of feelings about the subject. People are taught to consider homosexuality as revolting and repulsive. But many people engage in homosexual activity of some kind in the process of growing up. Haunted by this, many people fight back by not accepting homosexuality in anyone."

These are the attitudes which should be changed, it would seem.

VIRGIN ISLANDS TO BE SWEEPED CLEAN OF HOMOS

Gov. Ralph Paiewonsky of the U.S. Virgin Islands has declared steps will be taken to sweep the Caribbean territory under him clean of homosexuals. This announcement appeared in the *San Juan* (P.R.) *Star* after a 22-year-old Virgin Islander confessed to the knife murder of a 33-year-old Dept. of Commerce publicist early in January. The dying man, alleged to be homosexual and to have had an affair with the man who confessed, named his assailant and gave jealousy as the motive for the crime.

"Quite a few homosexuals come in regularly in the winter," the governor said. "I understand they hang around certain restaurants and bars in St. Thomas," he said.

The homosexual problem there is not a new one, it is reported. About five years ago the Women's League of St. Thomas complained about the incidence of "perversion" and tried to push the public safety department (police) into action. Nevertheless, this was dropped. It was dropped because after police went into various places to photograph patrons (in bars, hotels, restaurants, etc.) some prominent V.I. faces turned up, and one such person threatened to release a whole list of local resident homosexuals if the pictures were identified and used in a local harassment scheme.

But this view of threat and counter-threat faded in significance when

readers of the *Star* in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands saw the viewpoint of Columnist Ursula von Eckardt in which she brought out several issues conveniently skipped by an embarrassed and overly-pious

political appointee. While her statements include references to emotional disturbance that may not be universal, her plea nevertheless is most constructive, therefore it is published in full:

A Matter Of Civil Liberties

By URSULA VON ECKARDT

THE SAN JUAN STAR—Monday, January 14, 1963

WHILE HOMOSEXUALITY MAY BE distasteful to "normal" people, driving alleged homosexuals away from tourist resorts, restaurants, bars, and other public places through special laws and police action is infinitely more destructive to civil liberty, the principles of a democratic society, and an enlightened understanding of human and social problems than all the types and varieties of sexual deviation together. I am referring to the V.I. Governor Paiewonsky's pledge to "drive the homosexuals out of Saint Thomas" on the grounds that the recent murder of Sheldon Nulty was probably motivated by homosexual jealousy. The logic of this argument is similar to seeking to drive all married men out of town because occasionally a husband murders his wife, or to jailing everyone who may be tubercular because healthy people find sickness unpleasant.

A generation or two ago, the primitive belief was still prevalent that tuberculosis was God's punishment for sin and a shameful curse that made it necessary for a respectable family to keep the afflicted hidden from view even if this meant depriving him of treatment. Today, we are still fighting the same attitude toward

mental illness. Some families deprive their mentally ill relatives of adequate care because they are "ashamed" of the illness or refuse the recovering mental patient employment and respect in the community. The major social problems of alcoholism and narcotics addiction are aggravated in our community, because they, too, are considered by far too many people as sins and crimes to be hated and feared, and the addicts, who are sick and troubled, as criminals to be shunned, scorned, driven away, or even jailed and punished.

Yet many public officials and enlightened citizens who protest and fight the ignorance and bigotry that regards tuberculosis, schizophrenia, and addiction as crimes rather than as problems of public health, manifest the same ignorance and bigotry toward sexual deviations. Overt homosexuality is an increasing social problem. But it is aggravated, not resolved by sweeping it under the rug with moral indignation and heaping abuse upon those who are afflicted with such symptoms of emotional disturbance.

More, however, is involved in Governor Paiewonsky's pledge than his personal prejudices or psychiatric ignorance. This is the issue of civil liberty. If one person murders another, seduces a minor, molests a stranger, or creates a public nuisance such interference with the rights of others justifies his being fined, imprisoned or otherwise punished. But if a person who has committed no such explicit crime, as already clearly defined by existing laws in the Virgin Islands as elsewhere, is denied his right to use a public place, is bullied, jailed, or otherwise harassed by police because of the way he combs his hair, dresses, talks, and moves, his liberty as a citizen is flagrantly denied him in a fashion worthy of the most tyrannical of police states. Our entire political tradition prides itself on the premise that a person's private life, chaste or lecherous, normal or neurotic, temperate or dissolute—is his own responsibility. A person may think, feel, and do what he likes as long as he does not violate the equal rights of another. Some beliefs and ways of life are saner, healthier, and happier than others. Nevertheless, those who are neither sane, nor healthy, nor happy are equally citizens. They have exactly the same rights to their emotions, dispositions, and ways of talking, moving, and living as those who are normal, average, or inconspicuous. To deny civil rights to those whose sexual behavior is distasteful to their neighbors is the first step in denying the right of every person to his private morality and hence human dignity. Homosexuality is a symptom of emotional disturbance; its prevalence may require public health measures. But if it is made into a crime and its practitioners prosecuted, then our civil liberties are trampled under the foot of bigotry as primitive and destructive as racial and religious persecution or the hounding of the sick.

Defending YOUR PAID ADVERTISEMENT Freedom to Read

DORIAN BOOK QUARTERLY (now in its fourth year) serves two important functions—defending your freedom to read, together with information and reviews on current and forthcoming books of interest in the socio-sexual field, including works of fiction, reference, non-fiction, humor, art, biography, poetry, etc. TWELVE BACK ISSUES AVAILABLE, 1960-61 and 62 at .50 each; 4 assorted back issues (no choice) at 1.00.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION—2.00, mailed sealed.

DORIAN BOOK QUARTERLY PUBLISHES MORE NEWS
ON CENSORSHIP THAN ANY OTHER U.S. PERIODICAL.

Dorian

BOOK

QUARTERLY



693 Mission Street

San Francisco 5, Calif.

MORE THAN 400 TITLES IN STOCK!

"Most comprehensive listing of sex books ever in a single catalog," says Dr. Albert Ellis of New York. Send 25¢ for latest Dorian catalog, together with more recent Dorian Newsletters listing more than 400 different books available by mail. Future listings follow if requested.

Included are many volumes not available elsewhere!

Dorian **BOOK SERVICE**

693 Mission Street

San Francisco 5, Calif.