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"SD," according to the Hollywood Citizen-News (circ. about 35,000), stands for "sex deviate"; and "CN," any Hollywood sex deviate knows, now stands for "cyanide."

On or around February 1st, the Hollywood Citizen-News, aspiring to draw attention to itself following the demise of two Los Angeles metropolitan newspapers, launched the most vicious attack in our time against homosexuals.

A series of articles, announced in headlines for two straight days before being launched, ornamented Los Angeles streets with such headlines as "Dishonor, Disease, Death—Beware the SD," and anything its editors could dream up out of their disagreeably moist minds.

We agree with them on one point: It is a subject that needs public airing. But it needs a much more thorough airing than they have shown themselves capable of giving.

By using such terms as "pervert," "sex deviate," "homosexual," and others interchangeably, they failed to put the finger on anyone in particular.

For instance, perverts, as any man-of-the-world knows, are comparatively rare in our culture; and are much to be avoided. On the other hand, sex deviates (persons who engage in any other sexual activity than the "missionary position"—as Polynesians call it—in sexual congress) comprise a large majority of the population, both heterosexual and homosexual—even outside of Polynesia. So the CN tag, "SD," really doesn't mean very much; apparently having been concocted to incite the ignorant. In other days, this would have been called, "rabble-rousing."

Homosexuals (persons who are erotically attracted to other persons of the same sex—the term means nothing more, nothing less) most of whom actually are both heterosexual and homosexual—statistically, though not comprising a majority of persons in our culture, comprise a sizable minority.

By citing cases of extreme homosexual perversion while omitting any reference to the much more frequent (statistically) heterosexual perversions, and linking them in a confused and emotional way with simple homosexuality to make it appear that all homosexuals behave like their selected examples, the CN managed to solicit some emotional response from local bigots and frightened, ignorant mothers. This was not the public service which the editors deemed it. (Continued on page 31)
As the curtain of silence that has shrouded the subject of homosexuality for so many years begins to lift, more and more newspapers and magazines are beginning to express themselves regarding what, heretofore, they have considered unmentionable. Reporters, columnists, and even editors have found a new field in which they can spread their literary wings and soar to new heights of the imagination—or sink to depths of the subconscious—undreamed of a decade ago.

Few of them—there are notable exceptions—seem to have much knowledge of their subject before embarking. All too frequently, as in the case of the Hollywood Citizen-News, the baroque phrase and stereotyped reiteration are served up in lieu of sound reasoning and an unimpassioned survey of facts—which are readily at hand for those who would view both sides of the question before proceeding to "enlighten" others.

Such writing communicates little. Words like "sex deviate," "pervert," "homosexual," "child-molester," and even catchy abbreviations may be used interchangeably—the net result becoming a maze of misinformation and ill-founded suggestions for reform which generally serve no purpose but to incite already confirmed bigots into unwarranted emotional orgies.

Recently, a columnist for a large Chicago daily devoted two lengthy columns to this type of "enlightenment," complete with chilling headlines—only to refute himself—as inconspicuously as possible—several weeks later. We wish he had been better informed before he had started to write.

We are not reprinting these columns here, as they express nothing that we have not all read before—many times over; but we are presenting our reply which, actually could as well be directed to a great many of these well-intentioned but poorly informed informers.

Dear Sir:

Our attention has been called to the letter printed in your column for January 31, 1963. It occurs to us that it contains some rather unpleasant inconsistencies which might very easily pass unnoticed by persons unfamiliar with the context in which they are written.
To begin with, the writer states that he is "a former homosexual," and he considers that he has made this rather shocking confession with "complete honesty." Yet, as we read on, it becomes more than apparent that he is still quite as homosexual as he ever was, and that his "top medical aid at a famed clinic" has done nothing but instill within him an unusual dislike for all homosexuals, including himself. To some persons, this may seem quite an accomplishment, as the man has apparently ceased overt homosexual activity, and his thinking has been brought into line, apparently, with the persons who administered his therapy. Such a procedure seems to be gaining acceptance in the mass mind of today, but it is hardly suggestive of those freedoms which we think of as characteristically American—nor is it a "cure" for homosexuality. It would seem that something, even less desirable, has been substituted for it. The man has, at least, contemplated suicide: "For the last three days I've really had to fight it." And as we read further, we find that he is contemplating a number of things which may or may not be good, according to the point of view.

He intimates that, in order to keep his job and get ahead, it was necessary for him to engage in homosexual activity with his superiors (This is still called prostitution, homosexual though it may be), and that he continued such activity until his name "was important in the trade too." This is not the best way to get ahead in life, and it is unfortunate that this man had not, the integrity to see what he was letting himself and others in for. Then he states, and apparently with no misgivings that, "Even after marriage and family it went on." Thus we see that he had arrived at a degree of selfishness in which he did not even think it necessary to consider the welfare of those he brought into his own orbit. Is it not likely that his marriage was a front in which he sacrificed the welfare of his wife and family in order to conceal what he was?

We suggest that this man's great problem is not his homosexuality, but is rather a willingness to exploit anything and anyone which he believes may further the cause of his personal aggrandizement, including his trip to the clinic after "the world about me collapsed as my wife finally discovered it, and suddenly I was alone." He could have allowed her some choice before marrying her. But even now, he finds no fault with himself but pre-

It may have been better had this man accepted his homosexuality in the beginning, and avoided the deceptions to which he later succumbed, but our society does not make it easy to make such a choice. Hence, this man must be viewed with compassion. But I cannot agree with you that he "was trapped into homosexuality." If he were not homosexual in the first place, he would never have engaged in such activity. And had he known his own mind, he would never have trapped others in his own selfish motives.

I do not believe that he is capable of sincerity in his pleas "for schools and parents to warn youngsters," etc., however wise this may be. It is more likely that he has little comprehension of the situation, and is merely attempting to avoid taking his own inventory.

As a recent survey at San Francisco State College demonstrates, sex education for the young has positive benefits. But we should
know that in our schools there are also homosexual students, and it is unfair and unwise to deride their condition before their classmates or to call them nasty polysyllables to their faces while believing that we are administering sex education. Nearly all psychologists are in agreement that homosexuality is established at a much earlier age; and heterosexuals, as well as homosexuals, should be educated as to its nature if they are to understand and love their fellow man. Any attempt at sex education should include along with those things which we more readily admit, the fact that all persons do not react identically to the same stimuli.

Yet, there are persons who seem to believe that any knowledge of homosexuality is, in itself, uniquely contaminating. Is mankind’s urge toward homosexuality really that powerful? I think not.

In your column for February 1, you relay the opinions of several persons who are somewhat acquainted with the problem. These are excellent examples of what a little knowledge can do.

We are all taught that there are two sides to every question, but when it comes to the question of homosexuality, we are all too prone to overlook this. It seems that anyone who allows that homosexuals may retain some of the primary virtues lets himself in for a barrage of name-calling. Many a white man, raised in the South, has been called a “nigger-lover” merely because he did not share the prejudices of some of his neighbors.

The all important thing that we must realize about homosexuals is that there are good homosexuals and there are bad (or should I say “weak”) homosexuals, just as there are good and bad heterosexuals. If you had talked with as many homosexuals in the past twenty years as I have, you would be aware that those who are attracted to youngsters are a rare exception, and that their personality structure is quite different from that of the ordinary run-of-the-mill homosexual, of which there are millions in this country. Fortunately there are much fewer of these misfortunates than there are those homosexuals of good will who are trying against terrific odds to lead a good, useful, and constructive life.

There are child-molesters who molest little boys, and there are child-molesters who molest little girls. The gender of the molested determines whether the molester is called heterosexual or homosexual. Some molest either. There are undoubtedly more heterosexual child-molesters than there are homosexual child-molesters, but then this is as one would expect, as there are more heterosexuals than homosexuals; and this ratio, whatever it is, can hardly be considered a reflection on the run-of-the-mill heterosexual.

I do not understand the logic of the “Chicago policeman” who ascribes the indiscriminate murder of both male and female children to “homosexuals,” and I do not wonder that he asks that his name not be revealed. It is entirely possible that he has a homosexual problem himself, and that his unique occupation, “running down homosexuals,” is the only acceptable way that he can “get in on the act.”

If we are to face this problem squarely, we must ask ourselves: “How does the homosexual see the world?”

In all of our fifty states except yours, sir, all deviate sexual conduct (The term is very adequately defined in the Illinois Criminal Code of 1961) is illegal, and in your state it has only been legal since January 1, 1962. Under these conditions, the homosexual grows up to learn that he is considered to be a criminal—indeed a felon—no matter whatever else he may be that is good.

If he is recognizable as a homosexual (There are many misinterpretations involved, some heterosexuals being effeminate, also), he is the object of taunts, bullying, and sometimes beatings by every mean person with whom he comes in contact, and when he grows up, he is constantly scrutinized by zealous but misinformed peace officers.

If his homosexuality is less evident, as it is in the case of most homosexuals, he still must bear the knowledge that he is considered to be a criminal—first and foremost; and he must live in a world where the ignorant and misinformed take constant pleasure in deriding his kind, ostensibly to enhance their own heterosexual prowess.

But this is not all. He also discovers that crimes—blackmail, robbery, battery, and, sir, even murder—may be perpetrated against him with impunity. It is a wonder that there are as many decent homosexuals as there are.

If the authorities whom you have quoted are really interested in protecting our children from dangerous persons—as they profess to be, the very first thing they will do is to find out who those persons are! They will do this by making a clear distinction between the child-molester—heterosexual or homosexual—
and the simple sex deviate, who is quite harmless regardless of what we might call him. Deviation does not imply criminality. I might also add that under the new Illinois statutes, *most* heterosexuals, as well as all homosexuals (out of necessity), are sex deviates, so it is a good thing that, in your state at least, sex deviation is not illegal.

Deviate Sexual Assault, Indecent Liberties with a Child, Contributing to the Sexual Delinquency of a Child, Indecent Solicitation of a Child, and Public Indecency are still crimes in Illinois, as they have been and should be, but consenting sexual acts between adults of the same or other sex are not. It is to be hoped that more of our states will soon see the sense of this legislation, and it is to be hoped that law enforcement bodies in your state will come to understand the wisdom of your legislators in deciding upon such a course.

That is, if they are really interested in protecting the public, and not just grinding some personal axe.

The Illinois Criminal Code of 1961 seems to us the wisest set of laws, insofar as sexual behavior is concerned, of any of our fifty states. However, even here, these wise men found it a part of their wisdom to define "A lewd fondling or caress of the body of another person of the same sex (in a public place)" as Public Indecency, as though a lewd fondling or caress of the body of another person of the opposite sex were not. Such is the extent of our prejudice—or is it some kind of fear?

Sincerely,
Lewis C. Christie
Associate Editor
MATTACHINE REVIEW

P.S.—Since composing the above letter, my attention has been drawn to a later follow-up in which you state, "there is a vast range of personalities in both the homosexual and heterosexual societies. Both have a small percentage of morons and perverts and sadists, and both have a vast majority who are conservative and mind their own business and harm no one."

I am quite sure that any homosexual who happens to come across this statement—tucked away as it is at the bottom of your column—will be grateful for that small favor after reading your previous headline: "PARENTS TOLD: WARN AGAINST HOMOSEXUALS!"

The truth is worthy of better treatment.
25 WAYS TO WRECK AN OPPONENT WHO STRAYS FROM THE TRUTH

1. Neutralize his emotionally charged Red Flag Words by describing them in calm ways. Practice it yourself by redefining such terms as "slave labor law," "right to work law," "scab."

2. Show exceptions when he is generalizing, when he is saying "all" when "some" is nearer the truth. For example if the personnel manager says that all bachelors are unreliable, ask, "Such as J. Edgar Hoover and the Pope?"

3. Don't permit him the prejudice of label thinking. Force definitions of such labels as "Marxism," "John Birchism," being on guard against ugly terms for Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Negroes. Jumping to biased conclusions may cause the kind of awkwardness that George M. Cohan, the great songwriter, experienced many years ago when a hotel refused him a reservation saying, "We don't accept people of your faith." Cohan replied: "You thought I was Jewish and I thought you were a good American. We were both wrong."

4. Don't let anyone assume that, just because there is a similarity between ideas, that there is no difference between them. Is it true that "Socialism is just the same as Communism"? Though both are based on an all-powerful state, so is Spain, where Fascism is the governmental system. Remember the old story of the woman who eagerly said she'd marry a multi-millionaire she didn't love, but indignantly balked when asked if she'd spend the night with a man for $2? "What do you think I am?" she yipped. The reply was that she has already admitted what she was; now it was only a question of determining her price.

5. Keep your temper when he tries to anger you; in reality, it will make him furious, and you will think straighter. Man is like a piece of steel—when he loses his temper, he is worthless.

6. Remind him that constant repetition of a statement won't make it true. (But it is the secret of the success of TV commercials).

7. Don't let him put words into your mouth. Re-state your case, pointing out what you really did say.

8. When he tries to make a proof of special cases, show other special cases which prove just the opposite. An easy case would be the one of Burgess and McClean who defected to Russia with British and American secrets. When they were suspected of homosexuality, a "rule" adopted in both countries was to avoid trusting homosexuals with state secrets, for they might be influenced to be disloyal. Continuing with that odd reasoning, we would have to make a new rule not to trust normal people either, remembering the spy cases of the Soble(n)s and the Rosenberg.

9. Don't let him change the subject when he is losing. Force him to show what each new statement has to do with the topic under discussion. Stephen Potter likes to tell of those who, when losing, desperately quote from little-known books, or pop off with foreign phrases, expecting that no one will have the courage to admit ignorance by challenging them.

10. Don't let yourself become duped into falling for his argument because of your own bias. Remember how an unscrupulous politician likes to appeal to the prejudices, the pre-formed opinions of his audiences. A labor group might cheer when he talks about "excess profits," and a management audience might cheer him also when he speaks of the "abuse of labor."

11. Watch out for almost hypnotic, but "waking" suggestions, EASILY ACCEPTABLE ARGUMENTS WHICH ARE BUILDING UP TO ONE YOU SHOULD NOT ACCEPT. Counter them by meeting each statement head-on. Be careful of the clever and tireless Communist party worker who worms his way into your confidence. "I'll bet you work hard, don't you!" he begins. "Your hours are long. And nobody pays you what you're really worth. And what thanks do you get? The only time anybody says a word is to bawl you out. But that's the way it goes. Rich people don't care about us. The poor get poorer because they have to work for the rich. Oh, but some day we'll get even. We'll show 'em. There's going to be a revolt like you never saw before!" (When you hear anybody leading up to the doctrine of the "inevitable class struggle," remember to remind him that in America, nobody has to work for anybody else if he feels mistreated; that slavery in this country was abolished some years ago).

12. Prepare yourself in advance for tired old trite statements made to dodge your point of proof. Have your answers ready. If he says, "Well, that's the exception that proves the rule," point out that rules can't be proven that way. When he tells you that "You can't change human nature," remind him that you and a cannibal are both human, but your menu is different. If he bores you with, "If I do it for you, I'll have to do it for everybody else,"
Truth is the final victor in any argument. However, you must remember to bring it into play before it is overwhelmed by the illogical.

ask him if everybody else is asking him. If he feels secure in thinking that "the majority is always right," refresh his memory that the only one who votes against the lynching mob is the victim.

13. Make him define what he means when he speaks of averages. Three special definitions are helpful here, especially if you are deciding whether or not to move to Oklahoma City, where the mean temperature (365 daily readings are added up and divided by 365) is 60.2 degrees and the median (that temperature which is the mid-point) is 65 degrees, and the range (the amount of variation) is 113 degrees above down to 17 degrees below zero! People are said to have been tricked during the war when buying a blend of meat that was 50% horse meat and 50% rabbit—one horse to one rabbit.

14. Keep your opponent away from double talk pseudo technical jargon, or vagueness. A frequent pastime of people without new ideas is to give new terms to the old ideas. Many industrial leaders no longer "plan a conference program so people can think and talk," but instead "structure an agenda for ideation and verbalization," reminding us of the club president who once told his speaker, "We certainly got our money's worth from you. Nobody understood a word you said!"

15. Be ready to spike wrong conclusions from bad logic. In a good "syllogism" two true statements are followed by a true conclusion, building from a smaller to a larger classification, such as, "All dogs are animals, and all collies are dogs; therefore, all collies are animals." That truth is easy to follow, just as we can easily find the error in the cynic's belief that "All dogs are animals, and all people are animals; therefore, all people are dogs!"—But you have to think carefully to see through the statements of an extreme right-winger who said recently: "I don't like Communists and Communists don't like me; if you don't like me, you are a Communist!"

16. Don't accept the prestige of surveys without examining them carefully. At a recent strike vote, the labor leader cited a survey showing that the company had made twice as much money each year for the last two years without doubling the workers' pay each year—neglecting to mention that the company lost $18 million two years ago, last year only $9 million, and this year broke even!

17. When your opponent becomes angry, let his rage get hotter and he will argue less effectively. Fail to be insulting when your opponent wants all-out war. There is even a time to show pity for him, as did the driver of a small car when a bus driver nearly hit him, yelling the car was so little, he could hardly see it. In easy hearing of all the bus passengers, the near-victim answered the bus driver; "Oh, I'm so sorry. I'll bet you have an even harder time seeing children!"

18. Guard against imperfect examples, and demonstrate their flaws. Remember the prohibitionist who demonstrated to the high school kids what happened if a worm were dropped into a glass of whiskey? When it curled up and died, a student thought it proved that if you'd drink whiskey, you wouldn't have worms.

19. Answer, point for point, a loaded question, which is a series of questions tied together as one. An easy example of only two making a "load" occurs to many business people. "Should I quit my job and go to work for the XYZ Company?" First of all decide whether or not you should quit at all, and then determine whether it's the XYZ or another company that's best for you.

20. Insist on a clear definition of terms, when necessary. For instance, what do we mean by "Christian behavior?" Do we mean being able to eat pork or refraining from meat on Friday, or not drinking alcoholic beverages or not being circumcised, or not dancing, smoking, or playing cards? None of these are part of Christ's actual teachings, so can they really be called Christian or Christ-like behavior?

21. Be unimpressed by the theatrics of the scholarly manner.
The Rev. Henry Ward Beecher was needled during a debate when taunted by his opponent who had just got his doctor's degree: "Why don't you have a Ph.D.?" Mr. Beecher replied: "Maybe I'd rather people wondered why I didn't have it than why I did!"

22. Point out inconsistency whenever you hear it by showing that what is now being said doesn't agree with what was being said earlier. Watch for the labor foe of mechanization and automation who drives a car instead of a horse and buggy, or the ardent "Buy American" fan who drinks Scotch, or the politician who says our country should always have supported all anti-Communists (ask him if he thinks we should have helped, and and not fought Adolf Hitler, who was a staunch anti-Communist).

23. Don't get forced into a "Yes" or "No" answer on questions that aren't that simple. (Neither would we suggest your adopting the answer of a Hollywood movie executive who used to say: "My answer is 'maybe' and that's final!"")

24. Don't permit indecision, when your opponent says he doesn't want to take a stand at all. Remember, not to decide at all is to decide. The non-voter, for example, has actually taken a stand favorable to anarchy. It is said, a dying man once declined to renounce the Devil, on the grounds that, "In my position, I can't afford to antagonize anybody!"

25. Use a shattering last word or action whenever you can, providing it is honorable and apropos. Bernadette of Lourdes and Joan of Lorraine and Jesus of Nazareth were all good at this. When Jesus was criticized for healing the sick on the Sabbath, He asked, in effect, if one's ox falls into a ditch on Sunday, should the Sunday blue laws make him wait until Monday to pull it out? When He was told not to break the dietary laws, He explained that what came out of the mouth defiled a man (his words), not what went into it. He defended a prostitute against a storming mob by writing in the sand: "Let him who is without fault among you throw the first stone." Colored comedian Dick Gregory tells of being threatened by a white mob when he ordered chicken in a restaurant, as the mob said, "Whatever you do to that chicken is what we're going to do to you." So, Gregory kissed the chicken!

NOW, HERE ARE A FEW FINAL WORDS TO WOULD-BE WINNERS

Always speak from a position of strength: Physical strength (only a fool picks a fight with a boxing champ, or a nation with a tremendous arsenal); Intellectual Strength (there is no substitute for knowing what you are talking about, and if you don't, you, yourself, have betrayed your own cause); and Spiritual Strength (acting in harmony with universal natural law).

And remember to be patient if your triumph doesn't show as soon as you had hoped. Abraham Lincoln apparently lost in the famous debates with Stephen Douglas, but won the Presidency.

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.

A FOOTNOTE FOR WOLFENDEN: Homosexuality became legal in Czechoslovakia at the end of 1961. When I expressed my surprise that this is practiced by Slavonic people, my informant became quite indignant. "Are you not aware," he said, "that we are the most Western, the most civilized of the Communist states...?" -Anthony Rhodes in Encounter, London.
Les Arts Gai

by DAVID LAYNE

NATURAL AFFECTION, by William Inge (Picnic, Come Back Little Sheba, Bus Stop), concerns affections about as "natural" as those of the Marquis de Sade. Tennessee Williams is mentioned by a character in the second act: "Anyone who writes about such sick people has a diseased mind." This is tongue-in-cheek irony by Inge since these characters are as sick as many of Williams'.

Sue is living with Bernie when her teenage son comes home from reform school. The relationship between these two males is one of instant hatred. A third man, Vince, is the husband across the hall whose nympho wife is hot for every male on stage except him; he sporadically makes a big show of wanting her, but the rest of the time he's petting Bernie on the shoulder, praising their friendship, "It's hard like each other." Bernie is vaguely for two men to show how much they ally makes a big show of wanting

But don't laugh. It's a good play. It fits together well; each character is believable; the main theme (Will the mother send the boy back to the institution or give up the lover?) is served, rather than detracted from, by the minor themes, perversions, and incidents. The acting is magnificent.

Kim Stanley, the mother; Harry Guardino, her lover Bernie; and Tom Bosley, the husband Vince—are three excellent stars. Miss Stanley in a few short years has become one of our half dozen greatest actresses; Guardino is not so well known but is on his way and is already an exceptional young actor; Bosley proves that he is as entertaining and skillful in a dramatic role as he was in the musical comedy Fiorello.

But the actor who can steal scenes from Kim Stanley by merely opening and closing his eyelids, who turns a skeletal role into an unforgettable human being, who has the presence, charm, fire, and skill to turn a troubled teenager into a figure sympathetic even to middle-aged audiences—that actor is Gregory Rozakis who at seventeen had written an off-Broadway play and at twenty has made his Broadway debut, has another play ready for production, and will soon be seen in Kazan's movie, America, America. Brilliant!

THE COLLECTION is the two couple (M-F, M-M) one actor by Harold Pinter being presented with The Dumbwaiter at the Cherry Lane Theatre. The plays are as enigmatic as Pinter's other works (The Birthday Party, The Caretaker) but are not quite as absurd as some others by the "Theatre of the Absurd" (Ionesco, Beckett, Genet).

Example: The young man of the M-M couple may have had an affair with the woman of the M-F couple; it all depends on which set of lies you wish to believe at any particular moment. Maybe Pinter knew, but even my brother critics in the NYC papers disagreed. The boy says "no" and then "yes"; the woman confesses and then denies; the husband accepts, rejects, accepts; and the older man (whose name is not John) goes back and forth (literally, between apartments) changing everyone else's mind. Obviously what happened is less important than what happens.

The most interesting single facet of the complex characterizations is the attraction which the young man develops for the young single (?) man. The attraction is obvious even in the script, but the author makes no effort to "state" it or to explain its occurrence...which probably frustrates most of the audience but brings a relaxed truth to those who accept it.

Most valuable aspect; at no time, in any way, is there any attempt to "point out" the homosexuality of the MM couple; they exist as casually as do the heterosexuals. This is not a "problem" play; how refreshing!

ONE FINE MORNING IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT, the premier production at Renaissance House, the new arts center of Greenwich Village, is staged unconventionally on platforms, planks, scaffolds, steps, ramps, and ladders in a ten story courtyard. The actors number about 18, but all contribute varied characterizations totaling a wide view of much that is false, forced, and sick in our world. As might be expected there are some questions raised as to sexual identity. Two "faggots" appear from time to time, one ranting about a candlelight dinner "simply ruined" by the early closing of a super market—the other, more pleasant but just as "gay," in a constant state of skillful "camp." Obviously, both are stereotypes, but so are the housewives, business men, and teenagers in the play, so we have no cause to shout about "unfair representation of the homosexual." A more involved situation
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ONE FINE MORNING IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT, the premier production at Renaissance House, the new arts center of Greenwich Village, is staged unconventionally on platforms, planks, scaffolds, steps, ramps, and ladders in a ten story courtyard. The actors number about 18, but all contribute varied characterizations totaling a wide view of much that is false, forced, and sick in our world. As might be expected there are some questions raised as to sexual identity. Two "faggots" appear from time to time, one ranting about a candlelight dinner "simply ruined" by the early closing of a supermarket—the other, more pleasant but just as "gay," in a constant state of skillful "camp." Obviously, both are stereotypes, but so are the housewives, business men, and teenagers in the play, so we have no cause to shout about "unfair representation of the homosexual." A more involved situation
is that posed by two youngsters who confuse a nurse for their father and a doctor for their mother. One of the most poignant (and one of the best delivered) lines in the show is an anguished plea from one of these "youngsters" to a real child (a boy representing honest-to-goodness purity): "Honey, are you watching or waiting?"

The play is otherwise about everything—with the familiar theme "take warning" twisted into a variety of startling images, concepts, and theatrical electricity.

Renaissance House itself deserves mention. An old, but architecturally grand, hotel is being remodelled into residence and work rooms for students of all the arts. Included will be rehearsal space, two off-Broadway theatres, a bar and restaurant, and shops catering to the arts. The long wooden bar recently moved into the building is one that O'Neil used to drink at in another location.

THE THREE PLAYS mentioned this month make it clear that homosexuality is not a minor subject on the NY stage, but these plays will probably not be presented by local little theatre groups! There's no reason why you can't at least read them. (If you can't see plays you can at least read them.)

Would readers like more, movies and less plays? (If you can't see plays you can at least read them.) Interested in an occasional gay appraisal of current paintings...something about the purely homosexual aspects of Greek art...older novels with themes you might have overlooked...more comments on la vie gai in NYC...or what? Suggestions are solicited, c/o David Layne, Mattachine REVIEW.

LIKE IT OR NOT, the literate homosexual is in the minority among his fellows (as is the heterosexual). One division removed is the short story lover. He is a rare bird, whether hetero or homo.

It is to the rare, rare bird, or the literate homosexual short story addict that this article is directed—with some hope of converting the novel fans to the short story.

There are many fine homosexual short stories, a few well known, but most of them largely unknown. Beyond the few immortalized by Cory in 21 Variations on a Theme, and the collection, Derricks, by James Barr, most of the stories are unreviewed and unmentioned.

Here are several, briefly annotated, which fans will find worth searching out in their local libraries. (I have deliberately omitted those items indexed by Noel I. Garde in The Homosexual in Literature.)

Besides the two stories in Noel Coward's To Step Aside indexed by Garde, there is the minor theme in "The Wooden Madonna" in that collection.

"Stalies" by Terry Morris in Cross Section, 1947 is a macabre treatment of male prostitution on the lowest possible element of survival. (This same volume also contains a major story indexed oned by Garde.)

Colette, famous for her treatment of lesbianism, touched lightly on male homosexuality in "Rendezvous" in The Tender Shoot.

"Share Alike" by Jerry Bixby and Joe E. Dean has an element of horror which one can honestly say does not ordinarily happen to every male homosexual. It is in the paperback anthology Zachers' Midnight Snacks and is very worth the price of the book.

"The Wreck" and "The Elevator" by Maude Hutchins in The Elevator and Other Stories completely covers the subject in a style
which might be unmailable in plainer English.

Several of veteran writer John O'Hara's recent short stories are serious studies of male homosexuality; "Mrs. Stratton of Oak Knoll" and "The Sharks" both in Assembly and the very good "The Engineer" (nearly the length of a short novel and covering the history of a very fascinating homosexual man) in The Cape Cod Lighter.

H. E. Bates' last collection, The Enchantress and Other Stories, contains two very different and substantial stories, "Now Sleeps the Crimson Petal" and "The Snow Line."

Subtle humor (a rare element) in "But of Course" by Jean Boley in her posthumous collection, A Little More Time.

Unspoken, but unmistakable, portrayal in "Star Quality" by Noel Coward in the collection by that name.

Critic Leslie A. Fiedler who was so busy castigating most American writers for subtle homosexual content a few years ago, recently published a collection of short stories containing two "unsubtle" male homosexual stories, "An Expense of Spirit" and "Nobody Ever Died of It" in Call Down Vanity.

Unknown but talented Lin Gatty's story "Did He Touch You" in Writers for Tomorrow 2nd Series has a self explanatory title.

I am including a chapter from a recent novel called "Timothy Holt Baird" in The Voices of Glory by Davis Grubb. This chapter, like "Momma" in the Gallery by James Horne Burns stands by itself as a complete short story.

Although D. H. Lawrence's works are often listed in compilations of homosexual literature, one story has been consistently overlooked: "The Blind Man." It can be found in many collections of his works and in many anthologies.

Philip MacDonald's "Love Lies Bleeding" in Stories They Wouldn't Let Me Do on TV and several other anthologies, quite factually could not be done on TV in this country today.

Katherine Mansfield wrote one very major male homosexual story, "Je Ne Parle Pas Francais." It is in several anthologies. Humorously though, it is one of her least anthologized stories.

Those who found James Purdy's Color of Darkness caviar will welcome Children Is All, particularly the story "Everything Under the Sun" and also the more incidental "Encore."

The very well written "The White Kitten" by Diana Howe in American Vanguard 1952 is an important addition to any collection, but it should not be read by the tender hearted.

The subtle English touch in "Impatience" and "The Face at the Window" in A Touch of the Sun by William Sansom will appeal to many.

The forerunner of The Sergeant, the basis of the novel, can be found in Dennis Murphy's 1957 short story "A Camp in the Meadow" (Stanford Short Stories 1957).

The problem of acceptance in "Allan Franklin" by H. D. Rossiter in Writers for Tomorrow 2nd Series and "The Dancer" by Harvey Swados in Fiction of the Fifties and several other anthologies.

And finally, how the family reacts, the wife in "The Flaw" by Juanita K. Williams in Best College Writing 1961 and the sister in the sensitive and lovely "My Brother Writes Poetry for an Englishman" by Marris Murray in the 1953 issue of Saturday Book.

All of these, or at least most of them, should be available in a medium to large public library. Good Hunting.

---

Journalists Defend Quaker Sex Report

LONDON (UPI) — Two prominent British journalists today defended a Quaker pamphlet calling for a new, moral morality to govern sex.

The pamphlet, published here by the Society of Friends (Quakers), took the position that sex is "neither good nor evil—it is a fact of nature."

Monica Furlong, writing in the Daily Mail, rejected any idea that the 76-page report was a call to modern Britons to "indulge in orgy and promiscuity" and forget restraint.

"On the contrary, they are demanding a standard infinitely higher than the orthodox view demands," Miss Furlong said.

Cyril Aynsley of the Daily Express said the 11 men and women who compiled the report have sought for "the most rounded and wholesome solution" to normal and perplexing problems.

"IT IS REBELLION against what they consider hypocritical, falsely traditional, oppressive and out of date," he said.

The Quaker report has caused widespread controversy here in Britain, although there are only an estimated 21,000 Quakers in the nation.
Some of its points include:

—Love: It cannot be confined to rigid patterns. Waywardness “is part of its nature and this is both its glory and tragedy.”

—Homosexuality: “One should no more deplore homosexuality than left-handedness.”

—Virginity: “It has to be accepted that loss of virginity before marriage is not now necessarily regarded, either by the girl or her future husband, as a stigma.”

The report, which is not an official Quaker document but rather only the opinions of its compilers, is the result of a series of frequent meetings held since 1957.

It attacks current concepts of morality and says a distorted view of Christianity may be to blame for sexual disorders in society.

* * *

“IN SUBSCRIBING to a moral code, some of which it no longer accepts, society merits the charge of hypocrisy and its authority is weakened,” it said.

THE EXPRESS writer said this public image of the Quakers was a false one. “For the Quakers are the very people to challenge the status quo,” he said.

It said the problems faced often have only “tentative answers” and much research should be done on sexual conduct.

Miss Furlong, who often writes on religious matters, said the Quakers merely had given a faithful report of what they saw.

“Which is that, whether we like it or not, the citizens of this country, do not, for the most part, live by the traditional Christian ethic of absolute virginity before marriage and absolute fidelity afterwards,” she said.

SHE SAID the Quaker recommendations would change society’s views on sex, but for the better, and toward a position where love and courage were the real ingredients of sexual morality.

Aynsley said the report has “unleashed a furious national controversy” about accepted sexual values.

“And bang goes the image of a pious, diffident community shut off from the world outside, an image stretching over three centuries, but developed in recent times by a picture on a packet of porridge (Quaker oats),” he said.

THE EXPRESS writer said this present sex-pamphlet, which has become something of a storm center, is read in the context of the two words—concern and experiment — it will be better understood.” Aynsley said.

* * *


Like most young noblemen of 17th century France, Count de Raccon is a sower of wild oats with the women on his estate who are his by right and with young noblewomen whose virtue he virility easily subdues. One of the latter ladies bears him a son. But the count refuses to marry the young woman although he arranges for her marriage to another man. The son, the bastard, is unwanted in his mother’s new household and the count doesn’t want him either because he is soon getting married, so the boy is left at a convent. And the mother writes the count asking him to care for the boy financially. It happens that the count’s new bride, a young Huguenot, finds the letter and confronts the count with it—angry that he has abandoned a noble woman and his child to marry her. The count replies, “I hope that you will present me with a son. One does not enter illegitimate children on the family tree; one pays and forgets them. They disappear in the nameless mass of people, which they ennoble with their blood.” But he approves the payment of money to a schoolmaster for the boy’s keep. And thus the young bastard is supposedly forgotten, to be raised in a strange home, never to know who his father and mother are, to be lonely and a servant, instead of a count.

However, this is not the way it was to be. The young bastard, Martin by name, grows up to become a rugged young hellion and the schoolmaster insists that he can no longer keep him in his house, unless he is paid more money. Being a Huguenot in a land of Catholics, the countess knows the loneliness the boy feels. She has given the count two sons and one daughter whom she correctly suspects will not live long, plus three other children who have died at birth. She discovers that she has an almost maternal feeling for the unknown boy and wants to see him. She has Martin brought to the estate, where, the moment the older son sees him, he recognizes his resemblance to the count. It is then that Martin learns that the count is his father.
The count first sees Martin on a hunting trip around the estate, and he takes the boy on his horse and talks to him while Martin stares in reply. Although the boy performs well on the hunt, there is no closeness between the two, and, later on when Martin misbehaves, the count has him lashed. There is no indication that the count is not still the type of man people have always thought him—lecherous, treacherous, and brutal. For some reason the count takes Martin into his home as companion to his sons. There immediately arises an intense hatred and jealousy between Martin and the younger legitimate son and a close friendship between Martin and the older son. At the same time there also is seen a strange affinity between Martin and the count. The count decides to teach Martin fencing personally. When it appears, mistakenly, that Martin has fallen from grace, everyone ignores him. Yet the count upon learning of this, fires the fencing master and threatens to throw his cousin out of the castle. It becomes obvious that, where Martin is concerned, the count acts differently from his usual behavior and is, in fact, capable of the most tender feelings. Once, after having the boy beaten because he refused to confide in him, the count pointedly visits the boy and seeks forgiveness much to the consternation of his cousin and others. So it is not too surprising when Martin acts as he does when the count, set upon by bandits, appears to be dying from his wounds. All the others have run off to gain the friendship of the new count, and Martin enters his father’s room after the priest has heard final confession and the doctor has done all he can. He forces the count to take a bath, he makes him eat, makes him take poultices and sleeps by his bed until the count slowly begins to recover. When the count tries to give Martin a present afterwards, he refuses lest the rest of the family and servants feel he is trying to get a part of the inheritance which by custom belongs to the legitimate sons: "Martin burst into tears and flung himself at the feet of the count, who drew the boy towards him and held him between his knees. 'Rest your head against my knee and have a good howl.' Martin seized the count’s hand and covered it with tears and kisses. 'You look as if you’d like to fling your arms around my neck.’ "If only I could." Well, do it." At this, Martin rushed at him with such violence that he yelled: ’Donkey! Remember my wound! Be more gentle.’ This time Martin embraced him with great tenderness, and with such a burning expression of love in his eyes that the man was startled and offered his... cheek with a smile. 'Give me a kiss...’”

Thus we have spoken what has already been observed by most everyone including the reader: a strong love between the young boy and his father. This is the real story of *The Bastard*. Love, against their better judgment and against the wishes of the priest, the countess, and with the full knowledge of what the gossips will make of the love.

Throughout this remarkable book, it is always Martin who gives life to the count and to the story. And it is a story you won’t put down. There is plenty of action, plenty of life in a time of splendor and wretchedness. When I closed the book, I suddenly felt I had lost some close friends, and I sat hoping that somehow I would eventually make contact with them once more. I know of few friends that evoke this sense of loss and even fewer books.

**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: While reading the latest issue of *Interim* I was happy to see some recognition made of the potential role of the younger generation—and especially those of us in college—in the furthering of acceptance and understanding for the homosexual. You said that we are the "literate and articulate young adults who will turn more and more of the older hypocrites out to pasture for good," that we "know the facts, and want to live in terms with reality." Let's hope that this is true. I have been acquainted with the homophile movement for only a short time, but I feel that one of its weakest points is the failure to realize that colleges could prove to be the most fruitful area in which to work for the achievement of its goals. As far as I have been able to see, that area has been to a large degree neglected.

Yet we are the people who will profit most by the victory, and, perhaps in the end, we will be those who have contributed most. We, the young, are traditionally said to be fired by a crusading spirit, by a compelling urge which makes us want to rush out and reform the world. We have not yet become accustomed to simulation and pretense. Our lives lie ahead. We, least of all people, are inclined to accept a life of lies, painful pretense, and sham in which we must daily deny the things that are most vitally meaningful for us. Perhaps those of the older generation who have lived for years behind a mask have learned to accept it, but we have not. We refuse to be unequivocally rejected by a society which cannot justly, cannot reasonably or sanely reject us.

As college students we have a rather unique opportunity to aid in the ad-
vancement of understanding. Though the permissiveness of free inquiry and free thought in academic circles may be largely a myth as it is elsewhere, the fact that it is relatively less a myth should not be overlooked. My college is fairly small and more than fairly conservati

able, and is located in the middle of the deep South—an area not especially noted for broadmindedness. Nevertheless, it is possible to attack the standard myths on homosexuality without too much danger of unpleasant consequences. Recently I completed a research paper on homosexuality for an advanced sociology course. It consisted of the analysis of the homosexual movement, and it stressed the need for acceptance of the homosexual into respectable society. The paper was very favorably received. And then, on the informal level, the student hears some casual mention that the subject almost daily among friends and acquaintances. In these instances we should try to push the conversation as far as possible in the desired direction without making any risky personal commitment on the matter.

This is to say, in short, that the homosexual in college is in a position to contribute significantly to the progress of the homophile movement—provided, of course, that he is reached by organizations such as Mattachine. It is discouraging to think that a large portion of the potential of such an organization is unfortunately, perhaps unavoidably, missed. How read your publications are most often the ones who need them least. We have little need to be told that we are too busy and broke as ever. As a step toward remedying this situation I suggest that you begin a drive to provide gift subscriptions to be placed in the personal rooms of college libraries. I suggest also that you send information on the organization to deans and student counsellors, in the hope that they will make it available to students in need of it. The standards and methods of the Mattachine are so high and beyond reproach that few administrators, it would seem, could refuse to cooperate in the matter. And last, I suggest that you devise some way in which we, as individuals, can anonymously distribute organizational literature. One method might be to print small pamphlets (such as the What-Does Mattachine Do? folder, only much shorter and more direct) which we could obtain inexpensively and leave in public places on the take one basis. Other groups use this tactic extensively, so why shouldn't we?

These may not be useful suggestions. If not, then we will wait for more valid and practical ones on your part. But at least, help us so that our "crusading" of the shallow will not become sidetracked in naive and futile channels.—Mr. E.L., Alabama.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Another way that ALL might help is through the writing of personal letters. Printed forms have value, but perhaps there is nothing as effective as the individual typed letter from an intelligent citizen, preferably signed with his own name. Read "How to Win an Argument" and "Some Things Journalists Ought to Know About Homosexuals" in this issue.

REVIEW EDITOR: Thanks for the copy of Interim just received. This is the second copy of it that I have ever received. I received a copy of it about 4 years ago. I thought it very good and interesting.

With regard to reorganizing a Chicago affiliate, you may give my name and address to those interested, and they can contact me. I may go up there in a month or so.—Mr. B.H., Illinois.

REVIEW EDITOR: Please cancel my subscription forthwith. I wish to contribute in no way to your organization as long as it lends its name directly or indirectly to red-baiting.

As long as the witch hunt against political deviates your hands are unclem in pleading tolerance for moral deviates. I refer of course to the sections of your program referring to communism.—Mr. D.W., New York.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The above letter was written in red ink.

REVIEW EDITOR: Whatever the differences may be, and they seem not too great, in your position and mine respecting the rights of emotional minorities, I have decided that I very much prefer to be with you in the struggle, rather than exclude myself. Here is my check for one year's subscription.—Mr. W.D., California.

REVIEW EDITOR: I am enclosing a check for ten dollars as a gift to help your society.

Whenever I can I shall send more and will encourage others to do the same. It is time someone like you did something to inform the public and to help sensible gay people. Keep up your conservative good work.—Mr. C.G., N.Y.

REVIEW EDITOR: Here is a check for twenty-five dollars. This is to renew my subscription for three years plus a contribution. The Mattachine REVIEW is an important contribution to the development of mature thinking in the U.S.—perhaps the best even though it is small and not well known yet. Homosexuals need to do a lot of self analysis—in regard to behavior and assumed rights—in comparison with all other groups. But, of course, the major change needed is in the legislative halls. If our law makers had as much courage as they should have they would heed the factual articles and other information available, and produce fair and just laws. It may take a long time under our present over-burdened system of prejudice, misinformation, bigotry, and cowardice, but the REVIEW is on the right track.

Anyway, the REVIEW simply must go on, and I trust you'll let us know when we must dig deeper to help keep it in operation. I wish I could do more now.—Mr. R.E.

EDITOR'S NOTE: We appreciate your subscription and contribution. At the present time, when the need for an expansion of the Mattachine program is more urgent than ever, our debts are more pressing than ever before in the history of any organization. For over a decade, we have had to devote large amounts of energy and time to the solicitation of funds—energy and time that might better have been devoted to expanding our program. Yet, we feel that we are not progressing sufficiently. Our future course depends largely upon our readers and their contacts. Perhaps when we can no longer find credit—this situation is now eminent—to buy the paper the REVIEW is printed on, then who have been sleeping will wake up, and there won't be any REVIEW.

The TIME FOR EXPANSION is now, and we are as busy and broke as ever.

REVIEW EDITOR: I read about your Society recently, and so far as I know, there is no similar association in this country. I hope that you will not mind if I write to ask if I may subscribe to your publications, or otherwise be put in touch with your activities.—Mr. L.S., Australia.

REVIEW EDITOR: At the present time I am in Atascadero State Hospital (self-commitment for a homosexuality problem). I will be leaving the hospital in sixteen days, and through talking to my social worker, he suggests that I should write to you to find out some information about the nearest place in which your organization is established.—Mr. P.A., California.

REVIEW EDITOR: I do not intend to renew my subscription for 1963 for various reasons... On the other hand, of course, I quite realize that your publication tends to educate the public and does a great deal of good for our cause.—Mr. E.B., France.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Then why not send a subscription to someone who needs it.

BLOWING OFF STEAM DEPARTMENT

REVIEW EDITOR: That Homosexuality has become a subject or "problem" is as absurd as even the very thought of the rotation of Earth on its axis should be a "problem." Thara great (?) nation could possibly appoint ignorant sadists to make its laws is an index of its very Barbarity. Such a nation deserves the cure of hydrogen bombs de luxe, for it is not worth saving. Laws against any form or method of orgasm are contrary to the very Constitution of the U.S., for the Constitution business is 'tis limb, and hypocrisy ONLY.

Police decays are as much culpable as other citizens since solicitation is a sport with the police. And why can't the solicited respond with "yes" or "no" and that's all? No Commandment refers to any sexual expression excepting the one having to do with adultery. Since the Christo-Judeo code derived (notice the past tense) from the Commandments, one would expect the righteous conscience of laws to make a sport of decaying adulterers. Persecuting homosexuals is as childish as pulling the wings out from flies in order to enjoy the transformation from
SIR,—Critiquing the Quaker essay on morality, Father O'Leary is quoted in your columns as saying that the group had over-emphasised the importance of the personal relationship at the expense of the overall purpose of sex, which was procreation. This view must be challenged, not as an attack on this excellent man, but because it has been the major cause of controversy over sexual morality, and has led to misery and persecution.

It just is not true within marriage, let alone outside it, that the only objective of sex is reproduction. Human beings are capable of fellow-feeling of a type unknown in the animal world, and I suggest the machinery of reproduction is becoming adapted for expression of this new inter-relationship.

I hope Father O'Leary would not assert that my relationship with my wife has been any less pure since we decided to limit our family. Moreover, if we follow his contention, we shall find ourselves condemning premarital intercourse less vigorously if it leads to unwanted children than if it aims at avoiding this socially most undesirable situation! Similarly, some of the finest friendships of history were homosexual.

The paradox of sex is that it can be one of the most ennobling or the most degrading of human activities, and the determining factor is neither the marital status nor the sex of one's partner, but whether the physical relationship is accompanied by love and respect.

Reading. Kenneth Hassall

CALLING SHOTS

(Continued from page 2)

The terrible thing about the entire matter was that it had the endorsement of the local police department, Chief Parker, himself, leading the charge. Chief Parker has the chief distinction of making himself known for yipping for more laws "with teeth in them" while at the same time asking for more policemen to enforce the laws that they already have, and sometimes, some they don't have.

Obviously, there are persons in southern California who are very much disturbed by the presence in their midst of that phenomenon which, in the last century, was labeled "homosexuality." For, make no mistake about it, these are the people whom their barbs are intended to wound.

Said the Hollywood Citizen-News: "A sex deviate—SD—breaks the laws of God, nature and man." This is unmitigated tripe.

But police officials took it seriously. In fact, they may have thought it up themselves.

THE UNEXPECTED

Although CN apparently planned to continue the tirade ad infinitum ad nauseum, the well-known columnist, reporter, and television personality, Paul Coates—among others—sensed the nonsense. Declared Mr. Coates in the Los Angeles Times, "There is something very callous or, I would prefer to think, very ignorant, about putting a group label on these people as potential criminals and killers." Actually, it is much more than that, for it detracts from the real sources of danger.

Then Mattachine members and friends in the area began to act. Mr. Coates was contacted and Mattachine made arrangements for Attorney Morris Lowenthal of San Francisco to be flown to Los Angeles for a televised interview with Mr. Coates (who had the previous day interviewed a masked homosexual). Mr. Lowenthal, in a brief 17 minutes, made the Hollywood Citizen-News appear to be exactly what it is, merely by citing the truth in unequivocal terms. The program brought an amazing response—so much so, that it was rerun for the benefit of those who had missed it.

All this, in spite of the fact that Lowenthal had been frisked, figuratively, of his most lethal weapon—the subject of police entrapment (wherein the "crime" is instigated by the arresting officer). Mr. Lowenthal was informed by the sponsors that if he mentioned that, he might not even get on the air. (It is no longer a secret that we do not have the freedom of speech that we profess). Lowenthal still managed to correct a lot of the CN errors.

Dave Heyler, CN editor, who had shouted over the phone to Mattachine's attorney a few days previously, "For the last time, ... I don't want to talk to anybody on the other side of the question" and hung up the phone, contacted Coates and agreed to discontinue the attack if Coates would stop his TV programs. Coates agreed and silence reign-
ed over the weekend.

But CN couldn't resist a few more dribbles of drivel. That's when Coates and Lowenthal went back on TV. Now things have quieted down.

**CYANDE ISOLATED—**

HAROLD, HAROLD, & CAROL

Heyler changed his mind and agreed to have a talk with Mattachine President Harold L. Call. So the rapidly forming Los Angeles Mattachine took up another collection and Mr. Call was flown down from San Francisco.

But lo and behold, Heyler had changed his mind again and Call was shunted to Executive Editor Harold Herbert and to Miss Carol Collins, writer of most of the articles.

Said Mr. Call, "What is it that bugs you so much about this subject of homosexuality?"

Mr. Herbert replied that to him the very appearance of obvious homosexuals (Coates had referred to them in his column as "coveys of quaint young men") on the street was offensive.

"But this is a symptom—a reaction," Call replied. "What is the real thing in the background that makes you so hostile—so that you view the subject with such a closed mind?"

Herbert paused, then declared, "Well, it's evil—just plain evil."

"But this is still a reaction," Call pressed him. "What is the real cause of your hostility?"

"Well, it's my religion," Herbert finally admitted.

But this is not religion. It is prejudice, pure and simple. It is judgment without knowing the facts, and an open admission of an intense and unwarranted fear of the truth. It is psychotic.

**WHAT THE L. A. P. D. WANTS**

The Los Angeles Police Department has asked for two changes in the law. These changes seem rather minor at first glance. One is to change the legal code regarding prostitution so that male prostitutes are included in its scope. Without arguing the advantages or disadvantages of legal or illegal prostitution, most of us can find no reason for not equating the male prostitute with his female counterpart. It's just that when the laws against prostitution were made, male prostitution could not be mentioned.

As a result of this, a new personality has arisen in homosexual circles. He euphemistically refers to himself as a "hustler." He is a combination of prostitute, panhandler, and sometimes much worse. But this is a subject that a great deal is yet to be written about. He is the prostitute that the suggested change in law would seemingly deal with.

But will it? We doubt that it will under any legal system wherein homosexual acts, per se, are made criminal. In fact, he is already breaking the law in committing these acts, whether he collects or otherwise appropriates his fee, or not. In this, he is unlike his female counterpart who does not break the law unless she receives remuneration. The California Supreme Court has made it vividly clear to the Los Angeles Police Department that simple fornication is not illegal in California. The thing about the prostitute statute is that persons arrested under it, before being proven guilty, can be held for up to 72 hours (it has been reported to us that individuals have been held as long as eight days in some cities.) for a blood test—ostensibly to determine the presence of venereal disease. But it can work wonders in other respects.

What is there to prevent a biased police officer (now, don't tell me there aren't any.) from picking up anyone whom he considers to be "loitering," "soliciting," or what have you and charging him with prostitution, reserving for himself the benefit of the doubt—all of course in the interest of humanity! Seventy-two hours in the hands of the enemy (now, don't tell me they are not brutal.) can make a man confess to that which he is not guilty. And then the case is cinched. Or, if it is not, the victim has still been punished—by incarceration, payment of exorbitant legal fees, defamation, and, probably, loss of job. Even though he was not found guilty.

This is a great weapon against democracy.

By that process which we call "selective enforcement" (in which the law is only brought into action against certain persons—frequently suspected homosexuals) the California prostitution statute, if amended to cover males and in conjunction with present laws dealing with sex deviation which should have been stricken from the books long since, could become nothing more than a device for incarceraing anyone whom a puffed officer or ambitious official considers to be homosexual. (In the common street interrogations practiced intermittently in California and elsewhere, the questions usually run something like this: Where do you live? Where do you work? Are you married? Who do you live with? Do you like men? If the interrogated cannot produce sufficient evidence of heterosexuality, he may be detained longer, and there are many charges that can be brought against him arbitrarily. It's up to him to disprove them, at his own expense.) Its effectiveness, in this case, lies in the fact that anyone arrested under this particular statute can be held up to 72 hours.

The second change that the Los Angeles Police Department has requested is that the phrase, "in public," be deleted from the statute on "lewd acts." Thus we are to take it that "lewd" acts (a vague concept that can be interpreted to cover a multitude of sins) in private would be punishable under law.

Such a provision is certainly unconstitutional, but to have it stricken from the books would cost a great deal of money, time, and tears.

Should these changes, which the Los Angeles Police Department has proffered, be enacted into law; then law enforcement bodies in California would be the recipient of more power than has been given to any group outside Nazi Germany and the Communist world in this century. We can only recall the words of Lord Acton, "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

We, of course, do not believe that our legislature could view with anything but disdain such
The obvious aspect of the Citizen-News campaign against whom they chose to refer to as "sex deviates" is how readily they were extended the cooperation of the local police department. It is a well known fact among journalists that being kind to the police brings its rewards. Police departments are a source of information—news—that cannot be underestimated, and it can very easily be withheld; but we would suggest that never before have the press and police worked so closely together over so long a period of time in presenting to an already baffled public a thesis that literally makes a biological molehill into a sociological mountain.

The first step toward fascism is the subjugation of the press. The second is the persecution of a scapegoat. Nazi Germany, in our own time (have we forgotten?), realized this second stage to its fullest. But in America, we have laws that protect our minorities to some extent, because we are and always have been a nation of minorities.

The baiting of racial and religious minorities is becoming unfashionable, and the homosexual is left, as it were, perched on a peak. His predicament is complicated by antiquated statutes which, at the time of their enactment, were probably never meant to be enforced against any but those whose behavior was open and notorious. Nowadays homosexuals are actively sought out by special "vice" officers who may very well have sexual problems themselves, and the statutes serve as the basis for a vicious and expanding industry extending upward to the courts. It should not be encouraged by an ignorant press.

This is what our own ignorance and our law, founded in it, abet. The Citizen-News and other public media would better serve our nation and the rest of humanity by avoiding sensationalized journalism at the expense of research and enlightened exposition.

There is enough literature available on the subject today to better inform anyone who cares to know the truth. But to those who do not care to know, but still persist in promulgating archaic superstitions and personal dogma, what can be said?

This is of grave concern to others than the homosexual.

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 from 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.

The Los Angeles Mattachine Society, Inc., was formed at the Hotel Knickerbocker on February 16, 1963 at a special organizational meeting with almost 30 persons present. The new organization's charter is being prepared by Frank C. Wood, Jr., law firm of Los Angeles for submission to the office of the Secretary of State of the State of California. It will operate under a franchise from the Board of Directors of the Mattachine Society, Inc., San Francisco, and will include the proviso in its By-laws that the Los Angeles Mattachine must conduct its programs, select its membership, and embrace a program of public service, education and aid to research in accordance with the aims and principles of the parent organization. In all other respects the new organization will be completely autonomous, but will, of course, work in close cooperation with all "homophile movement" organizations presently operating in this area and elsewhere, and in addition, it will cooperate with any and all professional groups, public and civic agencies, and institutions concerned with the problems of human sex behavior, including those of the homosexual.

Named to an initial 3-man board were: James Kepner, Jr., chairman; John Eccles, vice chairman; and John T. Murphy, secretary-treasurer. This board may expand itself as necessary, probably to nine members who shall be the actual corporation. The new group has selected advisors and consultants in the fields of law, public relations, medicine, psychology and education.

Initial accomplishments of the group include:

1. Arrangements for Attorney Morris Lowenthal's appearance on the Feb. 12 Paul Coates show (re-telecast Feb. 24) on KTTV locally and on other television stations;
2. A 1½ hour interview with writers and the executive editor of Hollywood Citizen News;
3. Arrangements for KHJ-TV to present a private screening of the 1-hour National Educational Television show, "The Rejected," prior to a public presentation of the program. Members of Dist. Attorney McKesson's Select Committee to study sex deviation legislation and newsmen were invited to the showing;
4. A request has been received to furnish information on sex deviation to a Los Angeles civic body.

Positive public relations conducted with a view to educating the public on true aspects of human sex behavior will be a primary function of this new organization. Social service benefits to individuals—including referral services, employment assistance, etc., will also be offered. At an early date the group's telephone number and address will be publicized over various communications media in Los Angeles. Obtaining tax exemption status for this non-profit corporation is a project already under way by its legal advisor.

The group may be contacted at 806 South Robertson, Los Angeles 35 (Telephone: OL 5-9665).
DORIAN BOOK SERVICE has acquired the merchandise inventory and business interest of COSMO BOOK SALES of San Francisco and has combined the operation as of March 6, 1963.

DORIAN will continue to handle by mail and at local retail sale the book items listed and advertised by Cosmo Book Sales. Sculpture and photographic items advertised by Cosmo Book Sales will not be handled.

NOW IN PREPARATION.... A new Dorian Catalog which will list some 500 titles currently available... fiction, non-fiction, poetry, drama, biography and reference works in the socio-sexual field and related subjects. The largest such listing of specially selected titles available from a single source! Write for your free copy to be mailed as soon as it is off the press!

Dorian BOOK SERVICE
693 Mission Street
San Francisco 5, Calif.