



mattachine **REVIEW**

JUNE 1963

SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS

TOWARD A QUAKER VIEW OF SEX
PART III: HOMOSEXUALITY

NEW

MATTACHINE LECTURES IN CONTEMPORARY THOUGHT

Published by Pan-Graphic Press

FIRST IN THE SERIES:

CASTRAMETATION

living dangerously in freedom

By

WALLACE DE ORTEGA MAXEY, S.T.M., D.D.

Author of *Man Is a Sexual Being*

Publication, Summer 1963. Advance Sale Now On

Approx. 100 Pages, Standard Format, paperbound

PRICE 1.25. PRE-PUBLICATION PRICE (Until June 15) **1.00**
(tax and postage included)

Mattachine Lectures in Contemporary Thought is a series of expositions in printed form which will deal with many topics from law, religion, philosophy, and the behavioral sciences relating to problems of everyday living.

CASTRAMETATION, first in the series, deals with self-discovery. Many people in our day find it almost impossible to realize that Socrates in his precept, "know thyself," was urging upon the individual the most difficult challenge of all time. The Nazarene did likewise when he advised his listeners to look within. We can be prepared to meet the many crises of life only by knowing our own true self and trusting its value to us.

(Contemporary Thought Lecture Series will be published and distributed commercially as a benefit to Mattachine Society, Inc.)

Place orders by mail:

Dorian BOOK SERVICE

693 Mission Street

San Francisco 5, Calif.

JUNE 1963

SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS

TOWARD A QUAKER VIEW OF SEX
PART III: HOMOSEXUALITY

NEW

MATTACHINE LECTURES IN CONTEMPORARY THOUGHT

Published by Pan-Graphic Press

FIRST IN THE SERIES:

CASTRAMETATION

living dangerously in freedom

By

WALLACE DE ORTEGA MAXEY, S.T.M., D.D.

Author of *Man Is a Sexual Being*

Publication, Summer 1963. Advance Sale Now On

Approx. 100-Pages, Standard Format, paperbound

PRICE 1.25. PRE-PUBLICATION PRICE (Until June 15) **1.00**
(tax and postage included)

Mattachine Lectures in Contemporary Thought is a series of expositions in printed form which will deal with many topics from law, religion, philosophy, and the behavioral sciences relating to problems of everyday living.

CASTRAMETATION, first in the series, deals with self-discovery. Many people in our day find it almost impossible to realize that Socrates in his precept, "know thyself," was urging upon the individual the most difficult challenge of all time. The Nazarene did likewise when he advised his listeners to look within. We can be prepared to meet the many crises of life only by knowing our own true self and trusting its value to us.

(Contemporary Thought Lecture Series will be published and distributed commercially as a benefit to Mattachine Society, Inc.)

Place orders by mail:

Dorian BOOK SERVICE

693 Mission Street

San Francisco 5, Calif.



mattachine **REVIEW**

JUNE 1963

SEVENTY-FIVE CENTS

TOWARD A QUAKER VIEW OF SEX
PART III: HOMOSEXUALITY

LEGAL ACTION AGAINST HOLLYWOOD CITIZEN-NEWS

The Chairman of the Board of Directors of Los Angeles Mattachine Society, Inc., Dane Mohler, disclosed to the Board of Directors in a special meeting in May that he has filed a legal action against the Citizen-News Company of Hollywood and the 22 companies it controls. The object of the law suit is to enjoin the Citizen-News from publishing, distributing and/or causing to be distributed, advertising throw-aways throughout the Los Angeles area. Mr. Mohler, in his report to the board disclosed that this company throws into yards, plantings and upon lawns over 1,500,000 of these throw-aways without the consent or subscription of the person receiving same. Further, these throw-aways contain the editorials of editor and publisher Dave Heyler which are offensive to Chairman Mohler and many others. Mr. Mohler further disclosed to the Board that a special hearing was held in the

Law and Motion department of the California Superior Court at the instance of the defendant Citizen-News. At this hearing, Mohler won a decisive victory and the defendant Citizen-News Company was ordered to answer the complaint as filed by Mr. Mohler and to join issue for trial. It appears that this is the first time in the history of California that a suit of this nature—to enjoin a public nuisance against such a paper—has gone this far.

FREEDOM TO REMAIN UNMARRIED

Addressing the Class of 1963 at the University of Arizona in Tucson was a distinguished historian who pondered the future instead of the past and who warned of some near-coming developments.

Dr. Lynn Townsend White Jr. of the University of California shared with the graduating seniors his belief that the next two decades are going to produce a situation "in which the peril to all of us is going to require the surrender of a significant segment of national sovereignty to an international atomic energy authority."

Dealing philosophically with "The Uses of Freedom," Dr. White also somberly discussed such problems as the population explosion, birth control, and divorce.

Among other things, he said, "We must use our freedom to reexamine our own unconscious presupposi-

(Continued on page 32)



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 JUNE 1963 Number 6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 2 CALLING SHOTS
- 4 TOWARD A QUAKER VIEW OF SEX: PART III-HOMOSEXUALITY
- 21 VENEREAL DISEASE AND HOMOSEXUAL CONTACTS
- 29 LITERARY SCENE
- 31 BOOKS IN REVIEW
- 34 READERS WRITE

COVER BY BILL TIETERMANN

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.

Calling Shots

LEGAL ACTION AGAINST HOLLYWOOD CITIZEN-NEWS

The Chairman of the Board of Directors of Los Angeles Mattachine Society, Inc., Dane Mohler, disclosed to the Board of Directors in a special meeting in May that he has filed a legal action against the Citizen-News Company of Hollywood and the 22 companies it controls. The object of the law suit is to enjoin the Citizen-News from publishing, distributing and/or causing to be distributed, advertising throw-aways throughout the Los Angeles area. Mr. Mohler, in his report to the board disclosed that this company throws into yards, plantings and upon lawns over 1,500,000 of these throw-aways without the consent or subscription of the person receiving same. Further, these throw-aways contain the editorials of editor and publisher Dave Heyler which are offensive to Chairman Mohler and many others. Mr. Mohler further disclosed to the Board that a special hearing was held in the

Law and Motion department of the California Superior Court at the instance of the defendant Citizen-News. At this hearing, Mohler won a decisive victory and the defendant Citizen-News Company was ordered to answer the complaint as filed by Mr. Mohler and to join issue for trial. It appears that this is the first time in the history of California that a suit of this nature—to enjoin a public nuisance against such a paper—has gone this far.

FREEDOM TO REMAIN UNMARRIED

Addressing the Class of 1963 at the University of Arizona in Tucson was a distinguished historian who pondered the future instead of the past and who warned of some nearing developments.

Dr. Lynn Townsend White Jr. of the University of California shared with the graduating seniors his belief that the next two decades are going to produce a situation "in which the peril to all of us is going to require the surrender of a significant segment of national sovereignty to an international atomic energy authority."

Dealing philosophically with "The Uses of Freedom," Dr. White also somberly discussed such problems as the population explosion, birth control, and divorce.

Among other things, he said, "We must use our freedom to reexamine our own unconscious presupposi-

(Continued on page 32)



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 JUNE 1963 Number 6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 2 CALLING SHOTS
- 4 TOWARD A QUAKER VIEW OF SEX: PART III—HOMOSEXUALITY
- 21 VENEREAL DISEASE AND HOMOSEXUAL CONTACTS
- 29 LITERARY SCENE
- 31 BOOKS IN REVIEW
- 34 READERS WRITE

COVER BY BILL TIETERMANN

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.

The April and May Issues of the REVIEW presented the first and second sections of TOWARD A QUAKER VIEW OF SEX. This issue features the third section—on "Homosexuality."

TOWARDS A QUAKER VIEW OF SEX

An essay by a group of Friends

Edited by

ALASTAIR HERON

III. HOMOSEXUALITY

Introduction

The task of taking a fresh look at homosexuality is not one which is undertaken with alacrity. That is because homosexuality conjures up more passion and prejudice than possibly any other subject than that of colour. The two attitudes have much in common: it is the fear and ignorance behind them that give them their venom. The Southerner expects to lose his standards and daughters in a coffee-coloured society; the respectable suppose that, once homosexuality is "allowed", their sons will think of nothing else. This is all very curious; and before anything more useful or positive can be said we think it best to clear the ground.

Ground Clearance

The word "homosexuality" does not denote a course of conduct, but a state of affairs, the state of loving your own, not the opposite sex; it is a state of affairs in nature. One should no more deplore "homosexuality" than left-handedness. (One can condemn or prohibit acts of course; that is another matter. But one cannot condemn or prohibit homosexuality, as such.)

Secondly, the label of "homosexuality" is misleading. People are not either homosexual or heterosexual. Most people are *predominantly* one or the other; most in fact are predominantly heterosexual; many are predominantly homosexual; many are attracted to both sexes fairly equally and may be pushed one way or the other by circumstances, convenience, and social pressure. Before we assume that homosexuality is bad and heterosexuality is good, we should recognise that homosexuals are no more necessarily promiscuous than heterosexuals are necessarily chaste. They may be similar people (or even, it will be realised, *the same person*) and have similar moral values. But of course, where a heterosexual finds blessing in marriage, a homosexual cannot; and many of the pressures designed to hold lovers of the opposite sex together have the effect of tearing lovers of the same sex apart; it is hardly surprising then that most homosexual affairs (at least amongst men) are less durable than most heterosexual affairs.

Male Homosexuality

This section is concerned with that part of the male population to whom a happy sexual relationship with a woman is not possible. To these, homosexuality is natural; persecution will make them inhibited, mad, or suicidal, but it will not make heterosexuality any more natural for them, or increase the attractiveness of those who try and force them into it.

A homosexual orientation, as has been said previously, is actually usual among boys in the 11-17-year-old group, and may frequently find physical expression in such acts as mutual masturbation, more especially in all-male institutions. Many boys have countless rather

casual contacts. At the same time, in dealing with adolescents, one should remember that their involvements, whether they have physical expression or not, can be far from casual: "A boy's first love is a love apart, and never again may he hope to recapture the glory and the anguish of it. It is heavy with portent and fearful with beauty, terrible as an army with banners; yet withal so tender and selfless a thing as to touch the very hem of the garment of God. Only once in a life comes such loving as this..." (*Adam's Breed*, by Radcliffe Hall, page 134). That first love will often be for another boy. The shock and bitterness of a boy who is denounced for having such feelings may well make it harder for him to reach a satisfactory sexual adjustment later. And the denunciation will not remove the feelings.

A factor of this adolescent homosexuality is that it may be and commonly is extremely promiscuous, even in the most respectable boarding schools. These very physical "affairs" usually seem to leave little behind them; often a mere sharing of physical experience, they may have little connection with any real homosexuality. It is not uncommon to observe that a boy who has been the terror of the Lower Fourth becomes a respectable married man with a large family; whereas a class-mate who may have lived chastely, horrified by so-called indecent activities, and conscious not even of the faintest interest in joining them, later turns out to be the seemingly permanent homosexual. "The lack of psychological contact with woman-kind may well be a more important contributing factor than the experience of sexual play in dormitories". (Donald West, page 127). While we may say that in general the adolescent phase of homosexuality is usual and does no harm, we must not forget that it may be associated with activities causing acute suffering to sensitive boys. Mutual masturbation can become a gang activity at puberty, or even before, with severe cruelty shown on occasions towards the reluctant boy who through fear or distaste tries to stand out. Something like initiation rites may be established—again a source of terror to a sensitive boy. We cannot say that practices of this kind do no harm, however harmless the homosexuality itself may be; and it is clear that a continuing responsibility rests upon parents and teachers to be on the alert for all forms of bullying.

Seduction is probably a small or insignificant factor in forming homosexual inclination and early promiscuity (which is what shocks society most—especially with a much older person) probably affects the boy concerned less than experiences at say 20 or 30, let alone 60. A man of 60 does not commonly have a new sexual relationship without a considerable involvement and crisis. A boy of 13 may hardly even remember it, especially if there was no emotional involvement. Society has inverted the significance of these matters: worse, the discovery by a parent of homosexual behaviour in the son is still often attended by a major uproar in the home and even attempts, involving a great deal of publicity, to prosecute the partner. What would have been forgotten then becomes a vivid experience, aggravated by the fact that it is frequently the mother who is most worried. Since in relation to homosexuality people tend either to know everything or to know nothing (and it must be assumed that most readers

of this chapter fall in the latter category) it is necessary to stress how common homosexual experiences are in the young. Kinsey thought that about a third of all males have some homosexual experience at some point. This may well be an underestimate. What one can say definitely is that (on the physical side) a great many boys at school are involved at some time in sexual play with others; sometimes frequently, sometimes not; sometimes with only one boy, sometimes with many—or even with several at one time. Males are very phallic-centred and particularly in early adolescence the experiment and relief offered by homosexual interchanges are pursued without harm or emotional upset.

These affairs will most often be with boys of the same age, and mainly physical; less often but still commonly there may be an age gap of a few years, as between a 17-year-old boy and a 14-year-old boy; these latter may be far more emotionally charged, and physical satisfaction less routine; and because in general more tense and deeper, more lasting. A genuine protectiveness and caring may be felt by the older boy, a real admiration by the younger; these emotions are not readily damped-down or forgotten. The romantic homosexual school literature—even the occasional poems which seek entry in the columns of the school magazine—relates to this latter type of affair.

But both these sorts of homosexuality, that which is mainly physical and shared with contemporaries, and that (marked by passion more than lust) linking those of different ages, flow naturally into heterosexuality and even marriage. The process may not be rapid: there are many affairs among young men of university age, and a really intense homosexual involvement may not occur until the early twenties; but all this may still be and often is but a natural precursor of the heterosexual life that is to come. One reader of *The Spectator* wrote in to say that at school he had written sonnets to a younger boy; later he wrote them to his girl friend; the former was good practice for the latter. Even the mainly physical affairs explore, for the boys involved, their personalities and power, and make them sexually unafraid of later, heterosexual experiments.

Passing on now to the early twenties, we may find that a tenth to a twentieth of the young men of our acquaintance are still mainly homosexual in outlook. Some may still be working out the entanglements of adolescence: their path through earlier sexual experience was perhaps not smooth or uninterrupted. They will have affairs with other young men, usually not boys, though there may well be an age difference. (A "young looking" 19- or 20-year old may be the object of a great deal of affection and notice: but it is helpful to remember that a young looking girl of a given age usually attracts more attention than a more evidently ageing contemporary.) These affairs may still be very promiscuous—"one night stands"—or mainly emotional. But they are becoming more self-conscious: in the society of today those involved may be thinking of themselves as "homosexual"; and it is this age which knows real despair and may assume nothing else is ever to come. This is wrong; there is in society a small "hard core", but this is by no means necessarily the same group that had homosexual experiences at school or later. Many or

most of the youths still predominantly homosexual in the twenties become normally heterosexual. Of those now becoming permanent homosexuals, many would not do so did not the pressures of law and of public opinion drive them into the only society where they can find acceptance, sympathy and apparent security.

On the other hand, many men come to discover strong homosexual feelings only late in life. But whatever the situation—and this, again, must be stressed—there are very large numbers of happily married men who could still regard themselves as “homosexual” and very many more who have occasional homosexual impulses and feelings. In neither situation is the marriage likely to be much prejudiced unless there has been a failure of complete candour between husband and wife; on this as on so many other subjects, a failure of conjugal communication may lead to disaster. A wife who knows her husband has homosexual tendencies knows where she is; and it is quite remarkable how a problem of this kind can be carried. A wife who is ignorant is helpless to cope; she is likely to become suspicious and fearful, and disaster is always just round the corner. A husband in such a marriage is an easy prey to blackmailers; and when disaster comes it is not easily dealt with since all involved assume the damage irreparable. The wife feels deceived and humiliated; the husband, that the only thing left is to abandon attempts at heterosexual interest, and if necessary wife and family as well. Many girls know nothing about homosexuality on marriage; and for these it may be difficult to make useful and necessary explanations.

In later years the picture becomes more set as people become (on the whole) more set in their habits. Most males with some degree of homosexual inclination have nevertheless achieved a successful marriage but a substantial minority now think of themselves as definitely homosexual. These attempt long-term homosexual “marriages”, some with success; they settle down, for years or for ever, with some compatible spirit, and given the right qualities of temperament and character achieve quite impressive relationships.

But then of course there are the others: these are thought of by the public as “homosexuals”, because these alone are likely to attract public and police attention. These are the men who for a number of reasons, not excluding natural promiscuity, do not settle down with one another, but endure a lifetime of fragmented relationships and are always on the search for a partner. These may form the “queer” society; these will frequent “gay” bars, street corners, beaches and public lavatories. They tend to have an especially strong sense of persecution and, with it, they avoid being too responsible. By and large, they are not happy; although some, by demanding little of the emotions, are not dissatisfied.

This last group may well include the men who are effeminate. But it cannot be too strongly urged that not all effeminate men are homosexual, and few homosexual men can be really described as effeminate. But there are some who quite obviously can; and they come particularly to the notice of the public when they are in this last promiscuous category. That is why the conventional image of the homosexual is that of an effeminate, promiscuous man, especially likely to be interested in boys. Men of that kind are likely, one day,

to get publicity; the rest are unnoticed and pass—to acquaintances, friends and even relations—as heterosexual. Small wonder that most people are surprised at the extent of homosexuality; they do not know which of the people known to them are homosexual.

This necessarily dispassionate account may still fail to convey any particular problem. The reader is told that this happens and that happens; there seems nothing for him to do about it. But no account of homosexuality would be complete without reminding the normal reader that his sexual emotion is welcomed by society and encouraged by commerce and features in films. What would it be like if every time he fell in love—especially at school, say—he found he could not share or announce his love, and that if his affection were detected he would probably be written off as depraved by his fellows and expelled by his superiors? He learns guilt, secrecy and shame, which may follow him all the days of his life. And the odd thing is that the greater his love, the greater the fear and shame. A boy may masturbate while at school with other boys for whom he feels nothing; his similarly uninhibited and perhaps contemporaneous heterosexual career will however distract attention from this (it will be said with truth, “Oh, that didn’t mean anything to him”) and an inglorious unfeeling career of conventional seductions will attract nothing but mild admiration. But another will fall passionately in love, and stay in love for years, with another boy; his lack of girl friends will be noticed, and his affection deplored, or more likely, disbelieved. He will probably (when his interests are noticed) find that many of his comrades (and if at school all the common room) credit him with nothing but a desire to commit sodomy on the beloved. This may well not even have entered his mind and his mortification and disgust at this may well know no bounds.

Later in life it may be much the same; the promiscuous but discreet cannot expect acceptance, but if skilful they may avoid persecution. The chaste lover can expect no gratitude from society, which will only suppose, since he is chaste, that he is not homosexual. And, of course, two lovers, if both are male, can hardly expect to be urged together by the welcome pressure from society that a heterosexual engagement attracts. If they manage to set up house and stay together, they will not be favoured by praise in the local press on the silver anniversary of their union. This will seem absurd to most: but it is surprising how much the unrelenting and eternal hatred of society may eat into the soul; and man is a social animal.

What is the present position concerning male homosexuality in Britain? Is it for example on the increase? “It is widely believed that the prevalence of homosexuality in this country has greatly increased during the past fifty years and that homosexual behaviour is much more frequent than used to be the case. It is certainly true that the whole subject of homosexuality is much more freely discussed today than it was formerly; but this is not in itself evidence that homosexuality is today more prevalent, or homosexual behaviour more widespread, than it was when mention of it was less common.” (*Wolfenden Report*, page 19.) But although it is discussed more freely it is seldom that a public figure feels he can afford to disclose that he is in fact homosexually inclined. Consequently people do not realise

that they know intimately men who are predominantly homosexual, and who go to some trouble to conceal it.

"Oh, a deal of pains he's taken and a pretty price he's paid

To hide his poll or dye it of a mentionable shade;

But they've pulled the beggar's hat off for the world to see and stare,

And they're haling him to justice for the colour of his hair."*

It is commonly thought that homosexuals are found only, or mostly, in certain occupations. They in fact exist in every rank and activity of society. Homosexuals are by no means unknown even in those places where, above all, society makes efforts to keep its figures impeccable and personally unassailable. "It would never do for the British public to hear the 'Weather Report' from the lips of a co-respondent." (A. P. Herbert, *Holy Deadlock*). Similarly, it is thought even less tolerable that nations should be administered by those, however able, who love their own sex; a series of broken marriages is considered infinitely preferable by the arbiters of public morals.

Because of all this, homosexuals are at a loss to know how to meet each other; and consequently pubs and bars, even street corners or particular beaches, become homosexual meeting places until the police decide to have a purge. When people hear that a particular lavatory is a meeting place for homosexuals, they shudder, and wonder at the lack of taste. But who has driven them there? If homosexuals could meet more openly and with less persecution, they would no doubt choose more aesthetic surroundings. One of the ironies of the last Wolfenden debate in the House of Commons, 29th June 1960, was Mr. Shepherd, M.P. for Cheadle, deploring homosexual contacts in public conveniences† while the member for Billericay, Mr. Gardner, asked whether we were to be confronted with the spectacle of two males living together as lovers.‡ But surely from the point of view of public decency, the latter arrangement is preferable; and is indeed the alternative that those who urge reform of the law would candidly prefer to see.

Many people fear that a more permissive attitude to homosexuality would "open the floodgates" and result in unbridled licence. "It is true that a change of this sort would amount to a limited degree of such toleration, but we do not share the fears of our witnesses that the change would have the effect they expect. This expectation seems to us to exaggerate the effect of the law on human behaviour..." (*Wolfenden Report*, page 23.)

The Wolfenden Committee also rejected another common belief. Some people, they find, hold that "conduct of this kind is a cause of the demoralisation and decay of civilisations, and that therefore, unless we wish to see our nation degenerate and decay, such conduct must be stopped, by every possible means. We have found no evidence to support this view, and we cannot feel it right to frame the laws which should govern this country in the present age by reference

* A. E. Housman: *O who is that young Sinner?*

† Hansard, Volume 625, Column 1484.

‡ Hansard, Volume 625, Column 1504.

to hypothetical explanations of the history of other peoples in ages distant in time and different in circumstances from our own. In so far as the basis of this argument can be precisely formulated, it is often no more than the expression of revulsion against what is regarded as unnatural, sinful or disgusting. Many people feel this revulsion, for one or more of these reasons. But moral conviction or instinctive feeling, however strong, is not a valid basis for overriding the individual's privacy and for bringing within the ambit of the criminal law private sexual behaviour of this kind..." (*ibid.*, page 22). We should go further, and question whether a feeling of revulsion, however strongly felt, is an adequate ground for moral censure. And the situation is well painted by A. E. Housman in the poem from which we have quoted already:

"Tis a shame to human nature, such a head of hair as his;

In the good old time 'twas hanging for the colour that it is;

Though hanging isn't bad enough and flaying would be fair

For the nameless and abominable colour of his hair."

It has been left to professional writers to reveal as much as they dare, and urge as far as they can, in literature. Among the best fictional accounts of these matters is *The Heart in Exile* by Rodney Garland, which does a Baedeker's tour of homosexual society, *The City and the Pillar* by Gore Vidal, *Finisterre* by Fritz Peters, *The Charioteer* by Mary Renault, and *The Tortoiseshell Cat* by Elizabeth Thirkell. In non-fiction, Donald West's *Homosexuality* must be one of the best and most thorough books on this topic ever written; others are Gordon Westwood's *The Homosexual and Society*, Peter Wildeblood's *Against the Law*, Anomaly, *The Invert* (an impressive 1929 Catholic viewpoint), and *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* by Sherwin Bailey.

Male Homosexuality and the Law

There has never been, anywhere, so far as is known, a law against homosexuality as such in any secular legal code. A man's feelings, emotions or orientations have never been the subject of this kind of attack. It is only with what he *does* that the law is concerned. Hence it is misleading to say "homosexuality is illegal". It is not, and one might say it cannot be. It has been said, "One cannot try the mind of man, for the devil himself knoweth not the mind of man."

Canon and Ecclesiastical Law. The Church has always frowned on homosexual practices. The ancient Jews distrusted them—apparently because they cannot lead to the procreation of children. The Mosaic law, embodied in the Old Testament and inherited by the Christian Church, was clear (see *Leviticus* 18, v. 22; and 20, v. 13). St. Paul seems to have regarded homosexual behaviour itself with abhorrence, apparently because he was afraid women would be sexually neglected; and because such acts were "unnatural".* *Romans* 1, v. 27, "And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the women, burned in their lust one toward another," suggests that St. Paul shared what has been called "the prairie fire" view of homosexual conduct—that it is naturally more attractive than heterosexual satisfaction, and if it were allowed legally and morally everyone would turn to it. This is

* See Appendix B, p. 53.

plainly contrary to experience, although there may have been some historical reasons for this fear in St. Paul's day. It is to him, principally, that those wishing to attack homosexuals turn, for there can be no doubt as to his recorded views. (See I Cor., 6, v. 9.) His opinions may have been personal ones, however, or part of the accepted Jewish thought of his day. Equally strong prohibitions, for example, that women should not pray with their hats off (I Cor. 11, v. 5), nor speak in church (I Cor. 14, v. 34) tend to be disregarded by most modern Christians, so that St. Paul's views are not, in themselves, final.

Gibbon gives some account of these matters (*Decline and Fall*, v. 44), "I touch with reluctance, and despatch with impatience, a more odious vice, of which modesty rejects the name and nature abominates the idea": and, after discussing the laxities which abounded before Constantine, he goes on: "A new spirit of legislation, respectable even in its error, arose in the Empire with the religion of Constantine. The laws of Moses were revered as the divine original of justice... The lovers of their own sex were pursued by general and pious indignation." Justinian, after relaxing legislation concerning heterosexual matters, Gibbon goes on, "declared himself the implacable enemy of unmanly lust, and the cruelty of his persecutions can scarcely be excused by the purity of his motives."

Justinian viewed homosexuality with abhorrence, believing that homosexual practices caused the earthquakes which were especially troublesome in his reign. Painful death, preceded by mutilation and castration, was the punishment for homosexual intercourse and two bishops, among many others, suffered this fate, and their dying bodies were dragged through the streets. "Perhaps these prelates were innocent," Gibbon adds dispassionately.

The Christian Church later also incorporated the ancient Jewish sex codes into ecclesiastical laws which governed medieval Europe, and this provided the basis for the Common Law. In medieval times, when clerical preoccupation with the sins of the flesh was at its height, and sexual pleasure was almost damnable in the strict meaning of that word, many men and also a few women were sent to their deaths for homosexual offences. The Church in general still regards homosexual practices as unnatural and gravely sinful: e.g. "Let it be understood that homosexual indulgence is a shameful vice and a grievous sin from which deliverance is to be sought by every means." (Archbishop of Canterbury, *Diocesan Notes*, November 1953.)

Sodomy. Sodomy in England signifies sexual intercourse between two individuals involving penetration *per anum* by the penis. Nothing short of that is sodomy. (American State Legislatures sometimes give the word a wider meaning.) The two individuals concerned need not both be male although obviously one must be. Sodomy is punishable under the statutes concerning *buggery*: buggery denotes both sodomy and anal intercourse between an individual and an animal, commonly called bestiality. We are here concerned only with sodomy.

Sodomy has been punishable since a statute of Henry VIII passed

in 1553 (25 Henry VIII c. 6) by which it was punishable by death. It remained so punishable until Peel's reforms. The Offences against the Person Act 1861 provided, by Section 61: "Sodomy and Bestiality. Whosoever shall be convicted of the abominable crime of buggery, committed either with mankind or with an animal, shall be liable to be kept in penal servitude for life..." and Section 62 punished attempt, or assault with intent to commit buggery, with ten years imprisonment. These clauses were repealed by the Sexual Offences Act 1956 (Section 51, 4th Schedule) and replaced by Section 12 of that Act. "Buggery... (1) It is a felony for a person to commit buggery with another person or with an animal." The Second Schedule provides punishments of life imprisonment, again, for the offence, and ten years imprisonment, again, for the attempt. It should be emphasised that no matter what the age of the parties, consent is no defence. Also that a boy under 14 cannot be charged with sodomy, and a passive adult partner might under this provision be imprisoned for life for an offence suggested by the boy.

It is not widely understood, even among some lawyers, that sodomy, although widely thought not only to be a homosexual, but *the only* homosexual act, may be either heterosexual or homosexual; that is, it may be committed between persons of opposite sexes. It may well be in fact more common among married people than between homosexual partners: and there is no evidence that homosexuals are drawn to sodomy more than others. Needless to say there are very few prosecutions against married couples for so undetectable an offence, which usually only comes to light in divorce proceedings, but they do occur. (See Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin, *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*, page 370).

Homosexuals as such, therefore, are little more concerned with reform (which may well be needed) of the sodomy laws than others are; the chief legislation which affects them is that against "gross indecency between male persons". Ignorance about the nature and effect of this latter legislation is so widespread that, for instance, in the House of Commons debate on 29th June 1960, the Conservative Member for Cheadle, in attacking the changes in the law proposed by the Wolfenden Committee, said in passing that he would be happy to see the total repeal of the "Gross Indecency" section—which meant going further than was suggested by the Wolfenden Committee.

Gross Indecency. "Gross Indecency" means, in this part of English Law, any sexual acts between male persons (including between boys) other than sodomy. Any sexual conduct involving the genitals is consequently prohibited, and consent is no defence. The law against "gross indecency" is relatively new, and arose in an unusual way in 1885 when the Parliament appears to have created an entirely new offence unwittingly. It is thought desirable to give some account of the process of enactment as recorded in *Hansard*, to demonstrate this.

On 6th August 1885, the Criminal Law Amendment Bill was going through the Commons on its third reading, when Mr. Labouchère rose to move a fresh clause of which he had given notice on the Order Paper. Before he could say anything Mr. Walton rose on a point of

order. He asked whether the clause about to be moved, which dealt with a class of offence totally different from that against which the bill was directed (protection of women and girls, and suppression of brothels) was within the scope of the bill. The Speaker ruled that anything could be introduced at this stage by leave of the House. Mr. Labouchère then proposed his clause:

"Any male person who, in public or private, commits or is a party to the commission of, or procures or attempts to procure the commission by any male person of any act of gross indecency with another male person shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and being convicted thereof, shall be liable at the discretion of the Court to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding one year, with or without hard labour." *Hansard* continues, "That was his Amendment, and the meaning of it was that at present any person on whom an assault of this kind here dealt with was committed must be under the age of 13, and the object with which he had brought forward this clause was to make the law applicable to any person, whether under the age of 13 or over that age. He did not think it necessary to discuss the proposal at any length, as he understood Her Majesty's Government were willing to accept it. He therefore left it for the House and the Government to deal with as might be thought best." (Italics not in *Hansard*). Mr. Hopwood pointed out that under the existing law "the kind of offence indicated could not be an offence in the case of any person above the age of 13," but "he did not wish to say anything against the clause." Sir Henry James suggested two instead of one year's imprisonment. Mr. Labouchère had no objection. "Clause, as amended, agreed to." This clause was repealed and re-enacted in Clause 13 of the Sexual Offences Act 1956 which provides as follows: Clause 13: "Indecency between men—It is an offence for a man to commit an act of gross indecency with another man, whether in public or private, or to be a party to the commission by a man of an act of gross indecency with another man, or to procure the commission by a man of an act of gross indecency with another man."

Firstly it should be observed that consent and privacy are immaterial. Secondly, the Victorian legislature was so sure that *indecent* meant sexual behaviour that it was induced to prohibit "gross indecency" as such, without troubling to define it. So reluctant also have lawyers been to disturb this attitude that there is no recorded case of a defendant admitting acts as charged but denying their indecency. (It is hoped that it will not be thought frivolous if it is observed that Lord Curzon thought eating soup before lunch grossly indecent; it would have startled him if two men doing it together violated this Act.) It is not the least remarkable factor of this legislation that it is supremely vague. This has led to difficulties in its application: actual contact between the parties involved, for example, has been held unnecessary. Accordingly, under the law as it now stands, gross indecency is used to signify any sexual behaviour, including mutual exposure of the genitals, but more usually such acts as mutual masturbation. It was under the 1885 clause that Oscar Wilde was tried in 1894, and under which most of the celebrated homosexual convictions in the early 1950s

were obtained. It will be noticed that when Mr. Labouchère explained his clause, he seemed to be thinking in terms of *assaults*. The Rt. Hon. Sir Travers Humphreys, P.C., said in his preface to *The Trials of Oscar Wilde* by H. Montgomery Hyde: "It is doubtful whether the House fully appreciated that the words 'in public or private' in the new clause had completely altered the law... The reluctance of juries to convict in such cases is notorious, while no-one having experience in such matters would deny that the words 'in private' have naturally assisted the blackmailer in his loathsome trade."

Most men prosecuted under this clause are convicted on their own confession, or that of an accomplice turning Queen's evidence, and it has been suggested that no less than 90 per cent of cases of successful blackmail involve a threat to disclose such an offence.* There are even cases where a man has come forward to disclose blackmail by criminals, yet prosecution has followed against him for gross indecency. Thus a man cannot confidently expose a blackmailer without the possibility of incurring prosecution, perhaps for an entirely private act with the blackmailer himself.

Recent Developments. In the House of Commons debate on the *Wolfenden Report*, 29th June 1960, Mr. Anthony Greenwood drew attention to the fact that the Home Secretary holds meetings of Chief Constables in the course of his duties and that prosecutions are generally their responsibility. He hoped that it might be put to them that prosecutions in future would be confined to cases where public decency or the morals of minors were violated. Mr. Butler gave no such undertaking, but did not dissent from the suggestion.

It seems that the Government's present attitude to reform has been that the time is not yet ripe for legislation, the chief reasons being that:

1. (As is the case) the majority of M.P.s are not in favour of early legislation, and
2. The present Act is on the statute book (even if it would not now be passed in its present form) and to remove it might seem to give moral approval to the acts prohibited.

A private Member's bill to reform the law was introduced in March 1962 by Mr. Leo Abse, M.P. for Pontypool. It was talked out, but public comment was far more sympathetic than that which followed the 1960 debate.

Most English-speaking countries have followed England in having legislation similar to this "gross indecency" section. Continental and other countries have never had similar legislation. Austria has recently provided by statute for an age of consent of 18 years. The Wolfenden Committee, appointed by the Home Secretary, reported in 1957 as its principal recommendation on homosexuality that acts between consenting adults in private should no longer be a criminal offence. It also recommended *inter alia* that questions relating to "consent" and "in private" be decided by the same criteria as apply in the case of heterosexual acts between adults; that except for some

* (Medicine and the Law: *Journal of Mental Science*, 1954 100, 35: Rt. Hon. The Lord Jowitt.)

grave reason proceedings be not instituted in respect of homosexual offences incidentally revealed in the course of investigating allegations of blackmail; that the age of "adulthood" for the purposes of the proposed change is 21; and, finally, that "research be instituted into the aetiology of homosexuality and the effects of various forms of treatment". (Paragraph 355, *Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, Cmnd. 247, 1957.)

The offence of gross indecency finds no place in the common classification of crimes in text books, namely (1) offences against the State, (2) offences against property, and (3) offences against persons. It is perhaps the office of a logical system of criminal jurisprudence to exclude it, and leave private conduct to private morals and to pastoral and medical advice. All these are hindered by the present law, which also embarrasses frank consideration of moral standards, the examination of public welfare and much-needed research. Masturbation is not a crime, nor, in England, are fornication, adultery or sexual acts between women. Gross indecency with children of either sex under the age of 14 is prohibited by the Indecency with Children Act, 1960. Were the adult "gross indecency" legislation to be repealed, it would still remain an offence indecently to assault a male person, with a minimum age of consent of 16 (Sexual Offences Act, 1956, S.15). Many believe that a return to this state of affairs would deal satisfactorily with the difficulties raised by the present law.

Female Homosexuality

Homosexuality is probably as common in women as it is in men. Although with girls today heterosexual social relationships start early, the early adolescent phase may still be a time of passionate friendships and of an adoration of an older girl or woman. Close physical contact is common: girls will dance together, share a bed, or walk arm in arm, often without any strong emotional feelings. During this phase girls give tenderness to those outside their family and learn to receive tenderness from others; they experience loyalty and the pain of separation. As with men, many women continue to attach themselves to others of their own sex beyond the phase of adolescence, but owing to female nature and to society's different attitude, homosexuality in women takes forms differing from those in men. Female homosexuality is free from the legal, and to a large extent from the social sanctions which are so important in the problems of male homosexuals. Analysis of the two forms, their differences and similarities, may therefore suggest what might happen if these sanctions were to be modified.

Any personal relationship between two people carries a sexual element, the nature of which will depend upon the balance of the male and female in each of the two personalities. A friendship between two individuals, one predominantly male and the other predominantly female, as with the normal man and woman, is different from one between two men in whom maleness predominates or between two women in whom femaleness predominates. In the first case the relationship is enriched by the stimulus of two very different mental patterns, in the second and third the richness lies in

the freedom of a common background of thought process. A man, however, will sometimes enjoy in a woman a vigour of mind which he regards as masculine and the woman will equally welcome in a man an intuitive sympathy and tenderness which she regards as feminine. Similarly, at moments in a friendship between men, one may show "feminine" tenderness and care for the other and between women one may show "masculine dominance". (The latter is not always easily distinguished from maternal dominance.) These simple facts, though rarely formulated, are widely accepted and none would criticise a marriage, or a friendship between two persons of the same sex, in which they appear.

Society's criticism begins when the female element in a man or the male element in a woman is permanently and overtly dominant, a criticism which is almost as much directed against a married couple where the woman "wears the trousers", as in a relationship between two members of the same sex which has a homosexual element. Social structure has a further influence in this type of situation, however, since there is a strong feeling of condemnation of two persons of the same sex so linked that neither is likely to marry, a condemnation based on a conviction which is probably socially valuable that marriage and the procreation of children is a major responsibility of members of society.

Such criticism is far less violent against homosexual relations between women than those between men, and the reasons for this tolerance merit examination:

1. Maternal tenderness in a woman, expressing itself in kisses and embraces, is socially acceptable and it is probably for this reason that society is neither offended nor disturbed by seeing two women of any age or of very different ages kissing and embracing in public, nor by seeing two little girls or young women going about hand in hand, arm in arm, or with their arms round each others' waists.

2. The giving of maternal tenderness is so profound a need in a woman that much of the satisfaction from such caresses between women will be of this kind. Society values this need in a woman and calls upon it freely, and there is considerable tolerance of its expression.

3. A very large number of women involved in homosexual relationships would frankly admit that they would prefer or are looking forward to a heterosexual one. The adolescent girl whether adoring an older woman or more closely involved with an intimate would usually reject indignantly the idea that this precludes or replaces the male lover or husband and family to which she looks forward. The pair of middle-aged women which society on the whole views with such tolerance often have heterosexual experiences behind them or have been deprived of marriage, as by death or by an unhappy love affair, and thankfully find comfort, consolation and happiness in each other without in any way minimising the value of the experiences they have had or missed. Even pairs of younger women of marriageable age—the types of female homosexuality on which society looks more askance—are often at least apparently seeking male society with a view to finding husbands. This acceptance of heterosexuality as good

and desirable makes for tolerance of female homosexual pairs by society.

4. Tolerance of the pair of older women, in this country at least, probably developed when it was socially unacceptable for a single woman to live alone and it was therefore taken for granted that two single women should set up house together. This tolerance was probably reinforced in this century by the long period following World War I when there was a large surplus of women.

5. It should be emphasised that two women have often lived together in a companionship which replaces many aspects of the companionship of married life and yet in which few if any caresses are exchanged—probably true of some male partnerships as well. It is recognized that such partnerships between older women, with or without physical expression, can form a useful unit in society, each partner pursuing her avocations the better for the strength of the companionship and tenderness she finds at home, and the pair together able to offer a generous and welcome hospitality.

This is the positive side. Before considering the effect which a comparably more tolerant attitude in society would have on male homosexual relationships, it is necessary to examine the negative, and to see whether what is harmful and regrettable in female homosexuality has the same form or is similar in origin to what is harmful in homosexuality among men.

The first and most conspicuous feature is that female homosexuality is often associated with deep unhappiness. In the young girl unhappiness is probably at the minimum when the object of adoration is remote, but may even then become deeply disturbing if the emotion is so dominant that it throws life entirely out of proportion. An adolescent girl is probably more likely to be subject to this kind of disturbance than is a boy, since her emotions have often developed faster than her intellect, and she has no other dominant interest to distract her such as sport, engine-spotting or the constant care of a bicycle.

When in early adult life the relationship is more intimate, many of the features already noted as harmfully characteristic of male homosexuals may again be present: we find again the restless jealousy, possessiveness, and the torments of changing partnerships. These are often associated with an overt or unacknowledged sense of guilt or of resentment at being involved in what can never give true satisfaction. This fact is probably far more important than would ever be acknowledged by the partners and, while some homosexuals are accurate when they say they do not want heterosexual relationships, many more, in their determined proclamations of this, are in fact doing violence to fuller impulses, which they are unable to perceive. The sense of guilt may at times be stronger in a young girl than in a man because she cannot, if she is at all feminine, escape the feeling of frustration at thus avoiding motherhood.

The same tensions and frustrations occur in unhappy partnerships of later life. The emotional strains, the deep bitterness arising from a continued search to find in another woman the satisfaction that only a man could give, produce the twisted embittered woman, only too familiar to psychiatrists. The women involved may become cut off from society by their own self-absorption, for in such a partnership self-absorption is dominant. They are a menace to their friends and

colleagues and spread unhappiness wherever they go. Society is rightly critical and wrongly unsympathetic—yet sympathy is hard to give for it is demanded on false grounds and the truth on which it could be founded often fiercely rejected.

This is the picture, then, of the positive and negative in female homosexuality. What can be deduced from it as to the possible course of male homosexuality if legal restrictions were removed and moral ostracism diminished? The most conspicuous feature that appears to be missing altogether from female homosexuality, even with the freedom which society allows it, is the brief contact of a purely or almost purely physical nature which is so characteristic of a certain section of male homosexual society. This is probably inherent in the different nature of the physical sexual responses of a man and a woman. It seems easier for most men than for most women to have physical relations without emotional involvement with the partner. The experience is thus phallus-centred and produces excitement without deep commitment. In heterosexual life a man may have fleeting affairs with other women without of necessity betraying his emotional fidelity towards his wife; in homosexual relationships he may forever be changing the partner. Women, on the other hand, are more often committed with the whole of their being; they are less likely to be genital-centred in their physical experience, but can achieve sexual satisfaction from various parts of the body. They are more personally involved, and more dependent on the partnership apart from physical contact. Women, therefore, will often try to work towards a lasting partnership, whether in marriage, in extra-marital love or in homosexual friendship.

It is important for society to recognize that young men need tenderness and affection just as much as do young girls and that an expression of these is no more to be wondered at or deplored in the one than in the other. Were this recognized, above all by the young men themselves, then many could pass through a homosexual phase of affection without a sense of guilt, and without believing that their need for this affection was evidence that they could not have normal heterosexual relationships. An easier attitude towards relationships of affection between young men, however expressed, far from spreading permanent homosexuality, would help to make it more transient.

Unless the balance in numbers between the sexes becomes seriously upset, giving a preponderance of males, it is unlikely that pairs of older men will ever be as familiar a sight in society as pairs of older women will continue to be for several decades; but is there any reason to doubt that a permanent and loyal companionship, with the strength and security of mutual trust and affection, could be as tolerable and even valuable to society as the corresponding partnership between two women?

Constructive Thinking

There now comes the difficult matter of a Christian attitude to homosexual problems. On 16th September 1962, in his sermon in Canterbury Cathedral, the Bishop of Woolwich appealed for reform of "our utterly mediaeval treatment of homosexuals" and went on to say "as with capital punishment, one more determined push will see

reform of something that is a peculiarly odious piece of English hypocrisy."

It will be clear from all that has gone before that we do not regard the standards of judgment relevant here as being different from those that apply to other sexual problems. Surely it is the nature and quality of a relationship that matters: one must not judge it by its outward appearance but by its inner worth. Homosexual affection can be as selfless as heterosexual affection, and therefore we cannot see that it is in some way morally worse.

Homosexual affection may of course be an emotion which some find aesthetically disgusting, but one cannot base Christian morality on a capacity for such disgust. Neither are we happy with the thought that all homosexual behaviour is sinful: motive and circumstances degrade or ennoble any act, and we feel that to list sexual "sins" is to follow the letter rather than the spirit, to kill rather than to give life.

Further we see no reason why the physical nature of a sexual act should be the criterion by which the question whether or not it is moral should be decided. An act which (for example) expresses true affection between two individuals and gives pleasure to them both, does not seem to us to be sinful by reason *alone* of the fact that it is homosexual. The same criteria seem to us to apply whether a relationship is heterosexual or homosexual.

It is now necessary to emphasize that we are not saying that all homosexual acts or relationships are to be encouraged. It is difficult to suggest shortly circumstances which may give them a quality of sin. But obviously first of all any element of force or coercion, or abuse of some superior position, must take an act out of the pale we have suggested above—and leave it to be condemned. Members of this group have been depressed quite as much by the utter abandon of many homosexuals, especially those who live in homosexual circles as such; as by the absurdity of the condemnation rained down upon the well-behaved. One must disapprove the promiscuity and selfishness, the utter lack of any real affection, which is the stamp of so many adult relationships, heterosexual as well as homosexual. We see nothing in them often but thinly disguised lust, unredeemed by that real concern which has always been the essential Christian requirement in a human relationship.

But it is also obvious that the really promiscuous and degraded homosexual has not been helped by the total rejection he has had to face. Society has not said "if you do that, that is all right, but as to the other, we cannot approve of that". It has said "whatever you do must be wrong: indeed you *are* wrong". We must consider whether it is not the relationship that matters, rather than the acts that it may involve. Then homosexuals will be helped to face the moral implications of thin selfish relationships, and society will accept homosexuals as human beings.

"I seek only to apply to my own life the rules which govern the lives of all good men: freedom to choose a partner and, when that partner is found, to live with him discreetly and faithfully." (Peter Wildeblood, *Against the Law*, page 175.) Is the homosexual to have that freedom, or must he, in Housman's words, "curse the God that made him for the colour of his hair"?

VENEREAL DISEASE

and

HOMOSEXUAL CONTACTS

The following article resulted from an interview with public health officials conducted by William Lambert, associate editor of One magazine. Although the major portions have been printed in One, we reprint the entire article here because we believe it should have the widest circulation possible. Mr. Lambert's questions are in italics. The answers are supplied by W. A. Ketterer, M.D., Head of V.D. Section, California Department of Public Health.

Mattachine REVIEW would be grateful for any further questions from its readers, in order that we may compile a more comprehensive article for future publication.

How is venereal disease spread?

Venereal diseases are caught each year by millions of people in the United States. By definition, venereal diseases are spread through intimate sexual relations with an infected person. Because syphilis and gonorrhea are caused by germs that do not survive away from the body, they don't just "happen" to a person, and are not spread by water, air or food, nor by toilet seats, drinking glasses, eating utensils, or door knobs. Heavy lifting and straining *do not cause* venereal diseases. Since there is no immunity to venereal diseases, the infected person can be cured and quickly catch the same disease again if exposed to someone who has it, including the same sex-partner who may not have been treated.

Syphilis can be spread in another way—by direct blood transfusion, or more commonly from the blood of an untreated pregnant mother to her unborn child. This is why we have premarital and prenatal laws providing for blood tests before marriage and during pregnancy. There is no protection for the single man "built into" the law.

reform of something that is a peculiarly odious piece of English hypocrisy."

It will be clear from all that has gone before that we do not regard the standards of judgment relevant here as being different from those that apply to other sexual problems. Surely it is the nature and quality of a relationship that matters: one must not judge it by its outward appearance but by its inner worth. Homosexual affection can be as selfless as heterosexual affection, and therefore we cannot see that it is in some way morally worse.

Homosexual affection may of course be an emotion which some find aesthetically disgusting, but one cannot base Christian morality on a capacity for such disgust. Neither are we happy with the thought that all homosexual behaviour is sinful: motive and circumstances degrade or ennoble any act, and we feel that to list sexual "sins" is to follow the letter rather than the spirit, to kill rather than to give life.

Further we see no reason why the physical nature of a sexual act should be the criterion by which the question whether or not it is moral should be decided. An act which (for example) expresses true affection between two individuals and gives pleasure to them both, does not seem to us to be sinful by reason *alone* of the fact that it is homosexual. The same criteria seem to us to apply whether a relationship is heterosexual or homosexual.

It is now necessary to emphasize that we are not saying that all homosexual acts or relationships are to be encouraged. It is difficult to suggest shortly circumstances which may give them a quality of sin. But obviously first of all any element of force or coercion, or abuse of some superior position, must take an act out of the pale we have suggested above—and leave it to be condemned. Members of this group have been depressed quite as much by the utter abandon of many homosexuals, especially those who live in homosexual circles as such, as by the absurdity of the condemnation rained down upon the well-behaved. One must disapprove the promiscuity and selfishness, the utter lack of any real affection, which is the stamp of so many adult relationships, heterosexual as well as homosexual. We see nothing in them often but thinly disguised lust, unredeemed by that real concern which has always been the essential Christian requirement in a human relationship.

But it is also obvious that the really promiscuous and degraded homosexual has not been helped by the total rejection he has had to face. Society has not said "if you do that, that is all right, but as to the other, we cannot approve of that". It has said "whatever you do must be wrong: indeed you *are* wrong". We must consider whether it is not the relationship that matters, rather than the acts that it may involve. Then homosexuals will be helped to face the moral implications of thin selfish relationships, and society will accept homosexuals as human beings.

"I seek only to apply to my own life the rules which govern the lives of all good men: freedom to choose a partner and, when that partner is found, to live with him discreetly and faithfully." (Peter Wildeblood, *Against the Law*, page 175.) Is the homosexual to have that freedom, or must he, in Housman's words, "curse the God that made him for the colour of his hair"?

VENEREAL DISEASE and HOMOSEXUAL CONTACTS

The following article resulted from an interview with public health officials conducted by William Lambert, associate editor of One magazine. Although the major portions have been printed in One, we reprint the entire article here because we believe it should have the widest circulation possible. Mr. Lambert's questions are in italics. The answers are supplied by W. A. Ketterer, M.D., Head of V.D. Section, California Department of Public Health.

Mattachine REVIEW would be grateful for any further questions from its readers, in order that we may compile a more comprehensive article for future publication.

How is venereal disease spread?

Venereal diseases are caught each year by millions of people in the United States. By definition, venereal diseases are spread through intimate sexual relations with an infected person. Because syphilis and gonorrhea are caused by germs that do not survive away from the body, they don't just "happen" to a person, and are not spread by water, air or food, nor by toilet seats, drinking glasses, eating utensils, or door knobs. Heavy lifting and straining *do not cause* venereal diseases. Since there is no immunity to venereal diseases, the infected person can be cured and quickly catch the same disease again if exposed to someone who has it, including the same sex-partner who may not have been treated.

Syphilis can be spread in another way—by direct blood transfusion, or more commonly from the blood of an untreated pregnant mother to her unborn child. This is why we have premarital and prenatal laws providing for blood tests before marriage and during pregnancy. There is no protection for the single man "built into" the law.

What are the symptoms of venereal disease?

There are five separate venereal diseases, no two of which are alike, nor does one venereal disease "turn into" another. Two venereal diseases are most prevalent—syphilis and gonorrhea. Syphilis affects men and women very much the same way and medically has four stages. Usually the syphilis germ enters the body through the skin in or around the sex organs, the rectum, or the mouth. The "primary stage" or the first sign of syphilis is a "sore" called a chancre (pronounced "shanker"). This "sore" most frequently *does not hurt*, making "sore" an inappropriate word. If the chancre is seen, it usually shows up two to twelve weeks after the person has caught the disease at the site where the germ enters the body. Many times the chancre does not appear at all or it may be so small that it goes unnoticed. It may be hidden inside the rectum, the vagina or the mouth where it cannot be readily seen or even felt since it is painless. The chancre may look like a pimple, a blister or an open sore. This is full of syphilis germs, permitting the disease to be passed along very easily. The person with such a "sore" is dangerous to others exposed.

Soon after the appearance of the chancre, the germs begin to spread through the body and the blood "Wasserman" test starts to become positive. After a couple of weeks, the chancre disappears, *even without treatment, but this does not mean that syphilis has also disappeared.*

The germs are merely hiding inside the body and increasing in number through the whole body. From two to six months after the person catches syphilis, the rash of the "secondary stage" may show up. This rash may look like a heat rash, the hives or measles. It may cover the body, or may be just on the hands and feet. It may appear in the mouth, or at the rectum. Since the rash also contains syphilis germs, the disease can be spread in this stage by intimate contact such as kissing. Like the first chancre of syphilis, the secondary rash will disappear in a week or more *without* any treatment. It is important to know that only one person in four will develop the secondary rash of syphilis.

In the majority of syphilis cases, the chancre is not found and rash does not occur. So the disease goes undetected, except for blood tests, and yet has established itself inside the body. If not treated, within two to twenty years, syphilis may begin to attack the heart, brain and spinal cord (the late or "tertiary stage"). Until these signs occur, syphilis has no symptoms and is said to be quiet or in the "latent stage." During the latent period, a person may feel fine and go along for years thinking he is healthy. But sooner or later he may become

blind, insane or crippled, or he may develop heart trouble. Even in the later stages of syphilis, treatment will usually arrest the disease, but any damage to the body is not repaired—merely the progress stopped or slowed.

The symptoms of gonorrhea depend upon the parts of the body involved. Gonorrhea of the penis usually starts with a burning pain on urination and a "tear drop" of pus from the penis. This usually occurs 2 to 10 days after intercourse with an infected person and most times is relatively easy to detect and diagnose.

On the other hand, gonorrhea of the rectum and gonorrhea of the woman's reproductive organs usually have no symptoms until several months have gone by. Consequently a man or woman, without any knowledge of his infection, may spread the disease to his intimate sex partners.

When rectal gonorrhea does have symptoms it may merely be a moistness about the rectum, or some discomfort with bowel movements. Rather seldom, pus or bloody diarrhea may appear; or a person may experience constipation or much pain in or around the rectum, especially with bowel movements. Similarly, women sometimes have a discharge, but since many women have discharges anyway, it is not realized that gonorrhea is the cause. The disease ordinarily involves the cervix and has no specific signs other than discharge until it spreads up through her womb and into her tubes. Then she may have much pain and may have to be hospitalized for treatment. She may become sterile from scar tissue or may need an operation on her tubes which results in sterility.

What are the common names for syphilis and gonorrhea?

Syphilis is commonly called "bad blood," "siff," or "pox." Gonorrhea is commonly called "clap," "dose," or "strain."

What are the serious complications of venereal diseases?

Syphilis most frequently causes serious complications, such as insanity, paralysis, blindness, deafness, heart disease and death. It is noteworthy though, that syphilis is not a frequent killer but is a great incapacitator. Most of the victims linger on in a crippled condition or with mental illness until death occurs from some other cause. Gonorrhea can cause permanent damage to the sexual organs in men and women, sterility, arthritis and blindness.

What should a person do if he suspects he may have venereal disease?

Immediately seek medical attention—not wait and hope. Every person who is sexually active should have examinations compatible with the

frequency of sexual activity. Those with very frequent sexual contacts should be examined monthly, those with less frequent contacts, every few months.

If a person learns he has been exposed to another who has venereal disease, what should he do?

It is very important to go to a doctor or a health department clinic right away when known that a sex contact has a venereal disease. There the proper steps will be taken at once, the patient will be treated well and the information kept confidential. Self-treatment with pills or ointments is dangerous as is treatment by a friend who is not a doctor. Unlicensed "men's doctors" cannot be relied upon. In instances where a person has known contact to an infectious case, it is particularly important to have treatment immediately. This is necessary to prevent the disease from developing in the patient and to prevent the disease from spreading during the days, weeks or months before symptoms appear. Venereal diseases frequently have no symptoms until reasonably late in the infection. The examining doctor may need to verify the infection in the sex partner—*which* venereal disease—in order to manage the patient correctly.

What medical examination is necessary to reach a diagnosis?

I cannot stress too strongly that the early stages of syphilis are hard to detect, especially when the early signs are hidden within internal organs. It is often difficult even for a physician to find the signs unless he looks for them intently. For primary syphilis it is important to take a scraping from the chancre. By looking under a special microscope, called "the darkfield," the germ may actually be seen and treatment started. If the chancre does not appear or has gone away, the only way to tell is the blood test. It is important to remember that the blood test may not become positive until a month or longer after the disease is caught. In the secondary stage, germs may similarly be found by using the darkfield microscope. By this time the blood test is nearly always strongly positive. Later stages of syphilis can be determined by spinal tests, by fluoroscopic or X-ray examination and by a thorough physical examination to detect heart and nervous changes due to the disease.

Gonorrhea of the penis usually is easily determined by a "smear" test because the drop of pus from the penis is thick with germs. But, because the germs may be few and far between and symptoms rare, rectal and vaginal infections may be difficult even for the doctor to diagnose. In these cases, the doctor employs a laboratory "culture" test

using specimens from the cervix of a woman or the rectum of the man or woman. The germs from this specimen are grown and studied in the laboratory. Routine tests of this kind on patients who are sexually active is the only certain way to detect presence of the gonorrhea we so frequently encounter without symptoms. Early detection by this means avoids complications in the patient later on and also prevents spread to sex contacts. Blood tests are *not* used to detect gonorrhea.

What are the methods of treatment?

The methods of treatment are simple. For syphilis, penicillin is given so that it remains in the blood stream two weeks for the early stages or for four weeks in the late stages complicated by positive spinal, heart or other findings. For gonorrhea, one injection of a sufficient penicillin dosage frequently cures gonorrhea, though sometimes more injections are required, particularly when the disease has been undetected in the body for some length of time. For those who are allergic to penicillin, certain other antibiotics can be given effectively, though absolute cure is not quite as certain. Important in the cure of any venereal disease are follow-up examinations and tests to determine whether cure has actually been obtained. Such follow-up requires from one to three months for gonorrhea and one year to a life-time for syphilis. Besides determining whether a patient responds to treatment, follow-up tests can also detect re-infection.

How much hope can be offered from treatment?

In gonorrhea, the disease is quickly cured within a month or two. In syphilis, finding the disease early and treating it early results in close to 100% cure. After the disease has remained in the body for a year or more, the chances of cure are reduced. About 2% of treated syphilis will develop the serious late symptoms if they are not adequately followed by medical examination for the rest of their lives.

Is it true there is an increase in the spread of venereal disease?

There is no question that the actual incidence of venereal disease has dramatically risen throughout the country in almost every state and in almost every city since 1957. In general, the rates for infectious syphilis have increased by about 400% in the past four years, and continue to rise. In many areas it has been stated that gonorrhea is more common than measles. The reason that the public is not aware of the latter fact is that people with measles readily tell their friends about it, and people with gonorrhea do not.

How does the Public Health Venereal Disease Program function?

The main public health functions can be broadly classified as medical, epidemiologic and educational. In the medical phase, public health activities are geared to early case recognition and early treatment of known cases. Blood testing programs are carried out where experience has shown a good yield of unknown syphilis cases. Therefore many blood testing programs are to be found in certain industries, most general hospitals, jails, juvenile halls, migrant labor areas and in certain neighborhoods where venereal diseases appear to be near epidemic proportions. These blood testing programs are additional to the premarital and prenatal requirements. Another state law requiring drops to be put into the baby's eyes at birth helps prevent blindness from gonorrhea.

The most important function of Public Health, however, is what we call "epidemiology." In this phase of activity, through confidential means, we try to locate all known contacts of infectious cases of venereal disease and help them seek medical examination and treatment if necessary. When contacts to infectious cases are located, they are informed of their exposure, but the name of the person to whom they were exposed is not disclosed. Since in most instances persons who have been exposed are not aware of any symptoms, it is important that they obtain examination and treatment immediately, before the disease "takes hold" or can be spread to other intimate contacts. For this examination and treatment, either the person's personal physician or public health facilities are available.

The main educational activities of public health are directed at younger age groups who acquire the majority of VD infections, so they will know the facts of venereal disease and what to do when they may have been exposed.

How do the U.S. Public Health Service, the State Health Department and the local City and County Health Departments carry out venereal disease programs?

The Public Health Service mostly provides funds and workers to help local and State health departments with the activities outlined above. The State Health Departments generally provide consultation and coordinate activities. For example, in California, meetings of local health department venereal disease workers are held on a regional basis, so that ideas and programs can be shared. This is particularly important since venereal diseases often cross county, state and even international boundaries. A person can be exposed to syphilis in San Francisco by another person who goes to Los Angeles where the disease is discovered. In California, local city and county health departments carry

out the day-to-day personal activities of venereal disease work. This consists of work with physicians, hospitals, patients and contacts. Always their goal is finding as many cases and contacts as quickly as possible so they may be examined and treated. Confidentiality is essential in these activities. Educational programs are carried out by local health agencies who often request assistance from the State or Federal Public Health organizations.

Are public health facilities open to homosexuals?

They certainly are and it is important to realize that strictest confidence is not only provided but is necessary in our work. Every month in California at least a couple of thousand homosexuals avail themselves of public health facilities. Recently I attended the World Forum for Syphilis in Washington, D.C., and there I learned that this is not peculiar to California. Throughout the nation, many thousands of homosexuals are availing themselves of public health venereal disease facilities. As important as knowing your own doctor, we feel everyone should get acquainted with the local health department.

What is the general reaction of homosexuals to public facilities—are they satisfied with the service they receive?

The vast majority of homosexuals attending facilities are well satisfied—best illustrated by the many "satisfied customers" who return to clinics without hesitation. Many sexually active persons come in regularly for diagnostic check-ups. Naturally we occasionally have problems with homosexuals as well as with "straight" men and women who are unhappy when we find they have gonorrhea of the penis, rectum or cervix; or merely unhappy that we know they have been having sexual relations for which they need an examination. This, however, is the small minority of patients seen in clinics and I would guess are those who "complain" to One, Inc., Mattachine and other organizations. The fact that the vast majority are satisfied is illustrated not only by the many patients who intelligently come in every month or so but also tell their friends to come in.

Which is preferable, a public health clinic or a private physician?

Whichever is most convenient for the patient. If a patient has a personal physician, he should not hesitate to go to him and relate his problem to him. If money is a problem in visiting a private physician, most health departments have clinics available without charge or embarrassment and where the strictest confidence is kept.

Does the health department have any relationship to police agencies?

None, except the performance of jail screening examinations. In many places, as mentioned above, blood tests and gonorrhea examinations are routinely made on jail inmates since we find a considerable number of new cases through this endeavor. However, cases found in this manner are not subject to punitive measures but merely are treated and cured of the disease, strictly as a medical procedure.

There are rare instances of problems with uncooperative patients known to be infected with a venereal disease which they are spreading and they refuse to stop spreading. In these exceptional cases, sometimes we're forced to contact the District Attorney for assistance to require the patient to stop spreading the disease. This happens not only with the venereal diseases, but more commonly happens with tuberculosis, typhoid fever, diphtheria and other communicable diseases when the public must be protected from infected persons who refuse to be sensible. Plague and smallpox, like the venereal diseases, rarely are involved in this manner. It is important to point out that our only concern is to prevent disease. In VD work, our success in finding cases and contacts in getting examinations and treatment for these contacts hinges on confidential information. If we can't keep the information confidential we know we cannot succeed, for it is understandable that patients will not be willing to come in if our intent is to do more than to keep them well. Our information and program must not in any way threaten a patient's employment or marital relations, cause police action or contribute to legal action. As a result, there are several laws and regulations in California, as in most other states, which protect strict confidentiality of all venereal disease information. There are laws which protect the private physician and his patients as well as the health clinics. In addition, since health clinics are public agencies, there are additional laws to assure confidentiality on the part of public officials and public venereal disease clinics. These laws and regulations have highest priority and have been upheld by the courts.

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 Leszek Zirkel 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.

LITERARY scene

An informal column of reviews of fiction and non-fiction books on themes of sex variation

GENE DAMON

SEVERAL AUTHORS become quietly reliable inclusions of homosexual themes in their titles. I don't refer to the purveyors of newsstand tripe—but the serious authors such as Frederic Prokosch, Mary Renault, Iris Murdoch and our present subject, James Purdy.

Readers of gay fiction are familiar with his two short story collections, *The Color of Darkness* and *Children Is All* (New Directions, 1957 and New Directions, 1962). Both include excellent homosexual stories.

In 1959, Farrar published Purdy's first novel, *Malcolm*, which was reprinted by Avon, 1960. It contains explicit but relatively minor references. His really major contribution to homosexual fiction is *The Nephew*, Farrar, 1960, Avon, 1963.

Alma and Boyd Mason, unmarried aunt and uncle to the nephew, Cliff, have raised and cared for him. He is an orphan. When Alma receives a war department telegram announcing that Cliff is missing in action, her grief causes her to begin to write a memorial of his life.

She soon discovers that she knew him less well than almost anyone in their sleepy little town. Across the street lives Willard Baker, combination fop and slob and his "adopted" son, Vernon Miller. They are quite clearly a homosexual couple and we are treated to their quarrels and reconciliations on a shady elm tree, small town level.

The boy, Vernon, is a "captive," or is he? What about his affair (secret, of course) with a neighbor woman, is it really an affair? Alma stumbles along looking for clues to Cliff's life. Why were these two men his only friends?

Just as author Purdy has the reader convinced of one solution, he introduces another possibility. Then there is the fire in the, then vacant, room of Vernon Miller. The door is locked, and it must be broken down. What Alma finds in the room provides the book's major denouement and I won't reveal that here.

Summer is coming, and heat does strange things to the civilized mind. The hero of George Sklar's *The Identity of Dr. Frazier*, Knopf, 1961, Popular Library, 1963, feels the heat on a holiday business trip to Mexico. In the twenty-four hour drunk which introduces this novel, Dr. Frazier nearly

ruins his life, looking for his identity.

Dr. Frazier is a successful surgeon, married to a Jew. He is a gentile, but his colleagues and friends are mostly Jewish. During his drinking bout, reveals strong anti-Semitic emotions coupled with repressed homosexuality. Most of the novel deals with the reactions of his friends and his wife to his anti-Semitic outpourings. However, underneath this is the revulsion he has created by his sudden intense, sexual preoccupation with a group of homosexuals, particularly one young Mexican boy.

This is George Sklar's second book with a strong homosexual theme; the first was *Promising Young Men*, Crown, 1951, Signet, 1954.

Anger and revulsion are the aftermath of Dr. Frazier's "weak moment," partly because he is intelligent and much is expected of him.

On the other hand, we have the dumb brute kind of madness when the control of civilization and its accompanying cruelties force the unintelligent to react in the only way they understand. For this type of person, there should be nothing but pity. Theodora Keogh, another of the reliable authors who frequently include homosexuality in their books, has done a remarkable study of one of these people in *The Other Girl*, London, Neville Spearman, 1962.

The novel, in addition to being an excellent major treatment of Lesbianism, is also a *roman a clef*. Those who remember the yet unsolved and famous "Black Dahlia" murder case will enjoy this novel and its quite believable solution to the case.

Books on the theme can usually be loosely divided between serious studies about respectable people and tripe about the dregs of civilization. *The Other Girl* is a serious novel about the kind of lesbian most of us never meet; or, if we do, we turn away in shame. Yet she is here presented with the understanding needed, and her inarticulate love and agony are beautifully portrayed.

SHORT NOTES: The February, 1963, issue of *Show* magazine contains an excellent short story by Graham Greene entitled "May We Borrow Your Husband?" Both the "borrowers" and the just married husband are of interest to readers of gay fiction.

A recent study of the short story by Frank O'Connor, *The Lonely Voice*, cites three hitherto unrecorded male homosexual short stories. Two are by D. H. Lawrence: "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman" and "The Shades of Spring." The first is quite good and the second of debatable interest. Both have been widely anthologized and are easily available. The third story is called "An Encounter" and is in *The Dubliners*, by James Joyce. This is also easily located in your public library and is a rather chilling story of two boys who skip school, and the man they meet in a park.

BOOKS *in review*

MORE STARTLING THAN AMUSING

SMITH AND JONES by Nicholas Monsarrat. William Sloane, 1963. Reviewed by Larry Marvin.

Two novelists have told the Burgess-McLean story before: Rodney Garland in *The troubled Midnight* and Richard Llewellyn in *Mr. Hamish Gleave*. One was good, the other poor—both are inferior to this novel.

Nicholas Monsarrat has taken liberties with the facts and shaped a more articulate, artistic, and convincing book.

Deliberately, we are not told where Smith and Jones come from, nor to what country they transfer their allegiance. They defect suddenly and the security officer who has handled their personnel files in the past is detailed to watch them.

The narrator is the security officer, "Drill Pig," so called because he was an army drill master in the past.

Ivan Percival Smith is 46, married 8 years, has no children, and is homosexual. His wife hates him and leaves him in a public scene before the desertion. The reason given in the book is that diplomatic wives are dissatisfied for two reasons, either professional or sexual: in both cases she felt he was "not rising high enough."

Peter Paul Jones is 27, unmarried, a small elegant man with a tongue famous for outrageous and quotable sayings. Despite past scrapes with authority, including the murder (accidental) of a man, he has kept his job because of friends in high places. He is also, of course, gay.

Possibly intentionally we are first made to hate the "drill pig" but before the close of the novel we are forced to pity him.

Soon after separate but simultaneous postings to the same embassy, Smith and Jones become roommates. Both get into general trouble, and finally denounce their country and ask for asylum in the other country. They are used as propaganda tools in various ways until their usefulness evaporates. Doggedly "Drill Pig" follows their history. When the popular success wears off, he symbolically closes in for the kill.

Using the many devices invented to end personal privacy, "Drill Pig" listens to the blow by blow account of the disintegration of the homosex-

ual relationship between the two men. (This accompanies the end of their popularity in the new country.)

Snith and Jones both elude "Drill Pig" in the end—hollow though the victory is for all concerned. The denouement on the last page, announcing the city where the various events occur, is more startling than amusing—intentionally so, I am sure.

DORIAN BOOK QUARTERLY.
Published in January, April,
July, and October. Subscription
\$2 per year (\$5 for 3 years),
mailed sealed to any address.
Published by PAN-GRAPHIC
PRESS, 693 Mission Street,
San Francisco 5, California.
Telephone: EX 7-0773

Primarily concerned with cen-
sorship and the right to read
books relating to socio-sexual
themes, particularly fiction and
non-fiction works on homosex-
uality and sex-variation topics.

Write
for
Free
Sample
Copy



Dorian BOOK QUARTERLY

CALLING SHOTS

(Continued from page 2)

tions about sex and the family."

"One of the freedoms should be the freedom to be a citizen-first-class and still remain unmarried."

Before World War II patterns of social recreation made a secure and natural place for the bachelor or the mature unmarried woman, "and now quite suddenly," he said, "it has assumed a rigid choreography of twoness and togetherness."

"So constricting is this pattern of pairing up that today as any marriage counselor can tell you, great

numbers of people are getting married without really wanting to get married, and not particularly wanting to marry the people they marry, but simply because marrying is the thing you do for security in our society."

Expressing another conviction, Dr. White said, "Our high divorce rate is less a sign of the much proclaimed disintegration of the family, than a sad byproduct of social pressures to integrate everybody into the pattern of the family."

The fundamental use of freedom, he said, is to challenge inherited presuppositions.

Dr. White raised the question to the graduating seniors "whether you and I are using our freedom to think and to say things which must be thought and said in our time."

He told the graduates if they thought what he had been saying in

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.

his speech was inadequate, not to stop thinking there. "You are under obligation, personally and individually, to search the issues, to weigh your own presuppositions, and to come up with something better. Un-

less you use your freedom, you confirm your own bondage."

WHO WAS THAT "DOLL" ON THE APRIL COVER?

Someone asked us that question, so we thought we should explain. The April cover photo was of a Court Jester doll, shown just a fraction smaller than actual size. It was made with the actual plaster face as shown (some readers thought a photograph was superimposed). Close inspection of the photo reveals the texture of the ribbed cotton material and the stitching. The chain held in the hands is of braided fine wire. But didn't the face have realistic detail, to be no larger than a silver dollar in actual size?



MANHOOD ATTAINED

In this study of young men, by Herbert R. Stoltz, M.D., and Lois Stoltz, Ph.D., entitled Somatic Development of Adolescent Boys.

Statistics on dozens of young men include all physical developments — height, weight, shoulders, arms, legs, etc., during this period characterized by the maturation of the entire reproductive system and the onset of true manhood.

This rapid physical development is fully revealed by scores of photos taken at short intervals, capturing fully this unique transition from boyhood to manhood. Variations within age groups are also illustrated in a completely authentic, untouching manner.

We have purchased the remaining copies of this 556 page book and offer them for only \$7.50 each (originally published at \$9.00) on a money-back guarantee! Send \$1.00 with C.O.D. orders.

FUTURA BOOKS, Dept. 1, 4420 W. Imperial, Inglewood, Calif.

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 have noted in various published material, the mention of your society and its purposes.

It is nice to think that there is an organization looking at our problem from a realistic point and fighting for a few rights which should be ours.

In Toronto, unfortunately, your society is literally unheard of, and I must express doubt as to whether the crowd even care less. The gay life here presents a rather glamorous existence on the crust but for anyone who has been around in it for sometime, knows how difficult it is after the tinsel becomes tarnished; thus we find that alcoholic consumption forms much of the existence and the best source of contact.

To my way of thinking, it's about time that some of these A.A. candidates crawl out of their bottle, accept what they are and do something about it towards promoting understanding for our life and themselves.

To look at them at a dance, you would swear they were having the ball of their life, yet just sit down and talk to them for a while and you find most are squirrelled up like a rope. It would appear to me, that if these people could sit down and discuss these matters on an adult level, they could be one hell of a lot happier.

It took me seven years of sheer hell before I finally knew and was able to accept what I was. During that time, I drifted in and out of gay life, even marrying a female in the interval just to prove how straight I was, yet I wouldn't be writing to you if I had been able to make it or even could make it; therefore, one accepts what they cannot change. ... I don't wish to give you the idea that I'm some mighty crusader out to change the world. The fact is that I'm a fellow

that's gone through too much for too little a reason and if I could help some kid adjust one way or the other, then maybe I've been of some use to the world... —Mr. B.G., Ontario.

REVIEW EDITOR: I feel bad about Mattachine's financial distress and completely understand when you say "Freedom is not free." I know the only way I can help the Society is to send in my dollars. It is a shame to live in the richest country in the world and with millions of homosexuals or people so inclined and then to find Mattachine without funds to operate for such a great human cause.

As you may know, New York has so many charity organizations along with the churches and temples asking for money. When they approach me I always think of Mattachine. I never give a dime to them for they are not for me or those like me, so I am for you and Mattachine and those like me. I know your progress is slow, but it is only because you people don't have the millions to push ahead faster. Now is the time to push the issue into wider public view and then fight back. I am sincere when I say all this... —Mr. C.G., New York.

REVIEW EDITOR: ... In your country and in mine, people like me are regarded as those to be chased from pillar to post, as it is something that the public are trying to keep under the mat instead of facing facts in a sensible way. I was raised and educated in the Netherlands where everyone has a far different outlook on the subject, a very broad outlook, whereas in the U.S.A. and the U.K. bigotry and prudery are the master. Admittedly, we have the Wolfenden Report, which was merely a waste of time and

paper as it was a foregone conclusion that it would not be acted upon, so we are back where we started... —Mr. A.W., England.

REVIEW EDITOR: Who said we're getting more broadminded as time goes on?

My post office box has been "tapped" and I have been interrogated about mail received from San Francisco and other places.

Please hold forthcoming issues until I am in San Francisco this summer, when I can pick them up.

We never know such things can happen until they happen to us... —Mr. L.P., Fla.

REVIEW EDITOR: ... It is astonishing to me to hear that persons able to give \$35,000 to charity are unable to give \$500 without bothering to account for it on their income tax. Surely they can give \$500—\$10.00 a week and call it "tip" money. No, you should not buy those wealthy men's excuses. The honest fact is that they just don't want to give—since they obviously can spare \$10.00 weekly. Get 10 men to give you \$10 a and \$5000 is always assured... —Mr. T.R., California.

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

Los Angeles Mattachine Society, Inc., 806 South Robertson, Los Angeles 35, California. OL2-2287.

Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., 1232 Market St., San Francisco 2, Calif., UN3-8196.

One, Inc., 2256 Venice Blvd., Los Angeles 6, California, RE5-5252.

Mattachine Society of New York, 1133 Broadway, New York 10, N.Y., WA4-7743.

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

Janus Society, 34 South 17th Street, Room 229, Philadelphia 3, Penna.

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

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

League for Civil Education, Inc., 226 Embarcadero, San Francisco, Calif., SU1-8361.

George W. Henry Foundation, Inc., 49 West 29th St., New York 11, New York.

THERE'S MONEY AVAILABLE—FOR WOMEN ONLY

Applications close July 15 for the four \$75 awards which will be given this summer by the Daughters of Bilitis from the Blanche M. Baker Memorial Scholarship Fund.

Each of the four DOB Chapters will handle applicants in its area. Information may be obtained from the San Francisco Chapter, 1232 Market St., Suite 108, San Francisco, Calif.; Chicago Chapter, 5065 North Damen Ave., Chicago, Ill.; New York Chapter, P.O. Box 3629, Grand Central Station, New York 17, N.Y.; and Los Angeles Chapter, P.O. Box 472, Norwalk, California.

Scholarships are for women 21 years of age or over. The applicant must be a full-time student, attend an accredited college, university, or business or trade school, and must have a "B" average. Awards will be made on the basis of need.

The Scholarship Fund was established in memory of Dr. Baker to further the education of worthy students. Dr. Baker was one of the first professional people to recognize the organizations in the homosexual movement. She stressed the need for education—both of the public and the homosexual himself.