


The Homosexual Magazine

one

**THE
IMPORTANCE
OF
BEING
DIFFERENT**



MARCH 1951
TWENTY-FIVE CENTS



one

does not claim that homosexuals are better or worse than anyone else, that they are special in any but one sense. And in that one sense ONE claims positively that homosexuals do not have the civil rights assured all other citizens. ONE is devoted to correcting this.

one

means to stimulate thought, criticism, research, literary and artistic production in an effort to bring the public to understand deviants and deviants to understand themselves as the two sides are brought together as one.

one


advocates in no way any illegal acts, condones none in the past, incites none in the future. This magazine is not and does not wish to be merely an erotic publication.

one

is frankly at odds with present unjust laws pertinent to deviation and with present authorities who abuse their offices in unjust treatment of deviants.

one

is backed by no political or social group, leans toward none, is wholly and completely unfinanced. ONE has no paid employees yet and its growth is dependent entirely upon its readers. Your manuscripts, contributions, and work are welcomed. ONE is entirely yours.



one

"... a mystic bond
of brotherhood
makes all men one."

Carlyle

Volume Two

Number Three

March 1954

CONTENTS



The Importance of Being Different

Lyn Pedersen

page 4

Take It From Me!

Damon Pythias

page 7

It Can Be Done

Ralph Wells Coulter

page 11

The Mattachine on Cooperation, a letter

page 13

Who Is This Man?

David L. Freeman

page 16

SPECIAL FEATURE:

GAY

page 19

Cover by

Carl Shaffritz

ONE Magazine is published monthly at twenty-five cents per copy (plus postage for mailing): subscriptions are two-fifty per year, two years for four dollars, one year first class sealed three-fifty, two years first class sealed six dollars in the United States and Canada: all other countries three-fifty per year. Single copies are twenty-seven cents by regular mail, thirty-one for first class. Publication offices: 232 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 12, California. Editorial Staff: Eve Ellore, Ann Carl Reid, Ben Tabor. Contributing Editors: James Barr, Donald Webster Cory, Donald Slater. Business Manager: William Lambert. Not responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Copyright 1954 by ONE, Inc., Los Angeles, California.

THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING DIFFERENT

"When in Rome, do as you damn please." John Arnold.

Homosexuals have some problems heterosexuals don't have. Agreed?

That's as far as we go. Once try to list or analyze the problems, or suggest remedies, and agreement vanishes. The Mattachine Society, nee Foundation, and ONE magazine hope to tackle said problems, but the means remain in dispute. And there is no little disagreement on the ends.

Are homosexuals in any important way different from other people? If so, ought that difference be cultivated, or hidden under a bushel, or extirpated altogether?

For myself, I must say with the French legislator, who had something quite different on his mind, "Vive la différence!"

While the magazine has been relatively clear in its policy, the Mattachine Society has become almost schizoid on the question of whether we're different, whether to admit it and what to do about it.

What can a Society accomplish if half of it feels its object is to convince the world we're just like everyone else and the other half feels homosexuals are variants in the full sense of the term and have every right to be? What can that Society do but tie itself in knots of protective coloration? What can it do but publish statements one day contradicting those it published the day before, and seldom even knowing a contradiction is involved?

Are homosexuals different?

That is, does the one difference which we all know about, make any other difference in their attitudes, habits, etc.? Is it possible to make any generalizations about homosexuals except that they are drawn to their own sex? Recalling that generalizations need only apply directly to *most* members of a group, I think several valid ones could be made, the sum and substance of which would be that homosexuals are different in more ways than they often know. But I am concerned with one particular point.

Homosexuals are natural rebels.

In our society, only freak conditions or cowardice or total ignorance of his own nature would permit a homosexual any alternative. A rare homosexual is protected by a thoroughly sympathetic family, which performs for him the function that the family performs for members of most other minority groups, that of providing, early in life when it counts, the spirit of group solidarity. Unfortunately for the rest of us, that "mystic bond . . ." of wishful thinking ". . . that makes all men one," is less cohesive than the family bond, which for us, is likely to be the first thing shattered.

Leaving ignorance aside, for overt homosexuals, their chief problem is whether to do as society demands or whether to follow their own inclinations. For most, this is a moral crisis. The homosexuals find themselves impelled by wild and mysterious desires to cross the

line which all the authorities have set between what they call Right and what they call Wrong.

In such crises, people react variously, and on different levels of consciousness. For many, the tabu will stifle the desire, and perhaps even disguise its nature. But for most, the rule must be broken, and the act must be given context. Either the sin must be repented, or the break somehow justified. The penitents need not concern us here, except to comment that repentance can only satisfy those who merely "go astray" occasionally.

Most homosexuals become inured to breaking the rules. They must somehow reject what they learned as children and still hear repeated about them. But when people break rules and know they have done so, and are not sorry, they usually are forced to decide that the rule is either irrelevant or wrong. Here, a new factor enters. They put their own judgement above the rules, which represent society's judgment, in short, they become rebels.

Therefore, homosexuals are natural rebels. Born or made, they are constitutionally incapable of being sincere conformists. They may try desperately, as many in fact do, to conform in little things, to put on the show of being just like everyone else; but in the basic "facts of life" they are inescapably different, and through all the veneer of normality with which they may seek to cover themselves, they must suspect that this one essential difference colors their outlook on all other matters.


Because he is clanless, set apart, a lone individual searching for others of his kind (if he even suspects their existence) he must come to judge the world, its morals, customs and beliefs by his own nature, or else, in contrition reject and despise his own nature.

Some make the judgments easily, unaware that they've done any such thing.

They'll drop their religion or its practice, casually, say the-hell-with-the-law, and go blindly on thinking of themselves as conformists.

Some will limit their non-conformity to sex and its most inescapable consequences, such as telling a "white lie" now and then, or on the other hand, shocking an acquaintance with the sudden truth.

But most people require a certain consistency, superficial at least, in their attitudes. The rejection of some of the rules leaves gaping holes in the concept of orderly society. Anyone much motivated by consistency must begin examining other parts of the social picture with a jaundiced eye. And if one reads any of history, he is likely to come by the opinion that the world owes as much to the rule-breakers as to the rule-keepers. He will then become a rebel in principle. He will seek his own standards of good and true and beautiful and just, or may even reject standards entirely. Liberty will become his aim and cause; conformity his enemy.



This, I say, is the natural course for homosexuals. But few follow it. Some become merely anti-social, flaunting the laws, hating the cops, flagrantly trying to shock people for the fun it gives, and likely quite intolerant of any variant habits they don't happen to be personally addicted to. This is, the homosexual

society sees, the stereotype. It is an unnatural course because it is primarily unconscious.

The more common, and more unnatural course, is motivated by protective coloration. These become so enwrapped in the desire to make the world believe they are no different that they succeed at least in making themselves believe it. This attitude provides, as I see it, the greatest pitfall for any group that would seek to help homosexuals.

It is this sort that would turn a homosexual organization into a refuge for cowards. It is this sort that would so fear the specter of non-conformity, and the red tag that goes with it these days, that they would bend backwards with dishonest but popular slogans about "upholding the law," "sanctity of home, church and state," "loyalty to the American way of life," and such, even though they may admit in private that they don't mean a word of it.

It is this sort who will Puritanically attack the "swishes and fairies" insisting that they wouldn't think of associating with such trash, except *perhaps* for the very noble purpose of reforming them, teaching them to behave decently.

This sort will view the job of a Mattachine Society or a ONE Magazine as primarily a "public relations" job, the object being nothing more or less than to convince society at large that homosexuals are not different at all.


And finally, this sort will attempt to excommunicate any homosexual who believes their thesis that we aren't different. Neither rebels nor swishes, nor any others who fall short of their slightly personalized standards of respectability will be welcome in their society.

Which brings us back to the starting point.

We are all agreed that homosexuals have problems. And some seem now convinced that such agencies as ONE and the Mattachine can do something. But agreement stops there.

Will we be called pollyannas or paranoids? Is our aim to pacify or to fight? Will we concentrate on activities that ignore the variance and demonstrate that we're just like any other civic group, putting the best face on things, with covert attempts to sidle up to judges and police chiefs?

Or will we leave room for disagreement, but with the basic group energies attacking the present laws and customs as unjust, developing ourselves as free individuals and joining a broad defense of liberty against the dead hand of conformity?



There is room in one organization for both views, but at the sacrifice of coordinated purpose. Only by allowing the free action of individual groups within the structure of an elastic society can such diverse philosophies work together. But such schizophrenia is hard to handle. With other minorities, racial and religious, similar dichotomies have forced into existence a variety of opposing organizations, each with its own clearcut program. For homosexuals as well, this must probably come, in time.

It should barely be necessary to state that I am interested in defending my right to be as different as I damn please. And somewhere, I've picked up the notion that I can't protect my own rights in that quarter without fighting for everyone else's.

Lyn Pedersen

The article that fused this firework appeared way back in September '53: "Formula" by M. F. The writer proposed that each homosexual and person interested in his own civil rights send in fifty cents a month to form a fund for lobbying. His conviction that it takes financial influence to change laws was accompanied by a second conviction that the first year would net us something up in the millions. By the following year we'd be free of persecution. It was a splendidly driving, gutty exhortation. The same can be said of this refutation. The editors, of course, believe that the "D. Pythias" who writes below is a case of arrested or bailed-out development. Maybe even silly.

Take It From Me!

Truisms From the Glossy Eye

I am one of those guys who took those advertisements on the covers of ONE seriously. A major part of this article is in answer to your September issue wherein I found an unusually large number of appeals for organizing; especially, I wish to make reply to the clarion call of M. F.

Dear M. F., you get A for Arithmetic today! Take a number—any number—and *voilà!* we have marching legions, eminent scientists on the barricades, and Fearless Fosdicks recruited for counter-espionage. I, too, have seen the Vision on the Mount. But "now the fancy passes by". What remains is a flea-bitten veteran with the taste of ashes in his mouth, and the smouldering conviction of a drudge who is determined to keep slugging even after the time when the gallery has packed up and gone home. Take it from me, there is more to this business of organizing homosexuals than meets the glassy eye.

Dare I disturb the incensed air by uttering truisms? Let us be sober for a moment, get our heads together, and see what happens when those numbers of yours become cruel fact.

Voting is Vulgar

TRUISM NO. 1: To start a mass movement, you need to stir up the innards of the plebs. But the plebs in this country are, by and large, a pretty contented lot. Talk to any organizer for mass movements—churchmen, blood bankers, paci-

fists, Red Crossers, union men, et. al. Mass movements are aroused by the blood and fury of fanatics, saints, and martyrs. Few of such ilk are to be found within the theoretical grouping of the population we shall call the American homosexual. The vast majority of such people firmly consider The Problem to be an individual, private matter. Homosexuality then is similar to the status of Christianity in this country today. The day of the Crusades is over. We no longer think in terms of, say, One Great Mother Church united to battle the infidel in the here-below. We have in this country come to consider a man's faith as more or less a personal, private matter—thanks to the Protestant Reformation and Thomas Jefferson.

The Unexplained Quoker

TRUISM NO. 2: To keep even the tiniest revolution active, we will have need of full-time professional revolutionaries. The Russian Revolution had Bakunin and Lenin. The Crusades had Peter the Hermit and Pope Urban. Our Revolution had Franklin and Thomas Paine. But consider again the stone-cold facts. How many of our number are willing to risk the perils of professional status in a homosexual movement, particularly when (as Cory points out again and again in his article) the majority of us are involved in elaborate measures to escape detection? Try it yourself sometime. Go to the editor of your hometown newspaper or to the minister of the

little church around the corner and say: "How do you do, sir. I am a representative of an organization fighting for the rights of homosexuals". Take it from me: see if you don't quake with fright. (*The editors don't for a very good reason.*)

The Hacking of a Million Typewriters!

TRUISM NO. 3: To get those legions you talk about marching, we will need a dogma and a faith which will be strong enough to command the individual sacrifice of six million. In simpler terms, this means sleepless nights, free-time spent hacking out reports on typewriters, endless perseverance combatting the indifference, the fear, and the hatred of the unbelieving, tired feet, and a thick-skulled counter-indifference to the counsels of defeat and despair. Now you, M. F., know as well as I that you can't get two homosexuals to agree 100% on the nature of their deviation, the remedies for the difficulties, or the future for our kind of person. Which brings up an interesting question: could one ever make a religion out of homosexuality?

Queers Just Ain't Sensitive

TRUISM NO. 4: Before this doughy mass of six million will rise to the level of work, or even passive, safe contribution, we shall need the sharp, stinging yeast of a Universal Wrong. Before the money starts rolling in—even at as low a rate as 50c per head—there must be an individual motivation all the way down the line. Each one of that six million has got to feel the sting of considering him—or herself a member of a despised, rejected minority. He must hate this stigmata, hate his fear of exposure, boil when he reads of a legal injustice, weep at the misery of the unfortunates in the fruit tank, be outraged at the sadism and hysteria of the Opposition. Now walk down Main Street, talk again with your gay friends, and seek hard for this depth of moral sensitivity, this superb compassion for the under-dog, these heights of saintly persuasion. No, they will tell you.

It isn't *that* bad. After all, there is always the license of Stockholm or Copenhagen. Maybe some day, we'll be able to save up enough to go to Gay Paree, the Vatican for American homosexuals.

Love the Nasty Creatures!

If homosexuals were automatons, M.F., your scheme would work, but I must remind you (and myself as well) that homosexuals are people. They are not part of a mathematical formula. They must not be considered as mere cogs in a wheel or privates in a crusading army. We must love them—and ourselves—more than that. They, and we, are people—limited, careless, busy, beautiful, ugly, profound, silly, imperfect, weak, strong, insipid, sentimental, and lazy. It would be wonderful if six million of us all agreed to be unselfish enough to shoulder each others burdens and responsibilities. Take it from me! Few homosexuals will do this, but the biggest problem is that those who do, possess the humility great enough to forgive those who don't.

I am a "professional homosexual." I have been working in the Mattachine Society for ten months. I have helped to organize a few homosexuals into discussion groups and chapters. Take it from me! It ain't easy.

Everybody's So Stupid!

They argue. They fight amongst themselves. They will refuse to come to meetings because "that one" will be there. They hate you because you have an opinion, seldom taking the time or effort to enlighten you where you are wrong. They come to meetings looking for some religionistic pap to swallow which will provide them with all the answers, instead of seeing it as an opportunity to find their *own* way, their *own* truth, their *own* responsibility. They will threaten to drop membership if their weird little schemes are not carried out immediately to their design. Then there are the new ones who come like little sheep, look at you as if you were a two-

headed communist (they might even call you one to your face), and then, in fright, flee back into their holes, never to be seen again. Then there are those who think of you as some sort of Salvation Army worker, prudish and ready to give a lecture on Thou-shalt-not at the drop of a hat. Then you start receiving letters calling you "a dirty swine". Your phone starts ringing in the middle of the night, and some weirdly at the other end of the line pours such a stream of psychopathic invective into your ear that you can't sleep for days. Then officialdom starts noseying around. You are asked again if you're a communist.

Then there are the reports and the reports and the reports. There is money to be begged for, newer arguments to

there would never be a Mattachine Society—or any other type of homosexual organization—if all you did were to chant angry hymns against persecution. You must offer those who are interested sufficient, positive benefits before they will risk coming into range of the open fire from the Opposition. You must ask of each prospective member that, in some way or another, he become a "professional" homosexual. No easy job, that! Take it from me!

Now, let's put down that pipe and be sensible about this business. Mass movements might appear to get things done—for a while—but what good can you do by getting those things started? Mass movements are ugly and monstrous. (*Hm? The editors*) They arise because of a

remember last september?

ONE, Inc. has now set up books to accommodate a fund to carry on any kind of a fight that will improve the legal lot of the homosexual. Hundreds of readers want this. It's now possible and the theme you'll hear in every issue from now on will run like this: A penny a day will buy history. Are your legal rights worth thirty cents a month? There will be a monthly accounting of how the bank account stands and the books will be open to all who want to see them.

A PENNY A DAY WILL BUY HISTORY. SEND IT?

sharpen your wits on, ministers to be interviewed, lawyers to be consulted, encouragements to the faint-hearted, letters to be answered. Then someone comes up to you and urbanely calls you a "damn fool". Why in hell do you do it anyway? This is when you stop and look back at all the trouble you've had, wondering why in hell they can't be "NICE" people. (Like a friend of mine once said: "What are we doing? We're just organizing people who are sick, sick sick!") Yes, why all the fuss? Why do I go on doing it? Am I a fanatic?

Damn good question!

Positive Benefits—Like Bail

You, M.F., would cite as reason the injustice perpetrated against a minority. Yes, that would be a good reason. But

multitude of little hates. They are an amalgamation of millions of tiny frustrations. (*Like those of Protestants, Puritans, Pioneers?*) Once started, they roll on, crushing the cautious, the doubters, the skeptics, the unbelieving. Like a cancer, they breed other hatreds, newer fears, retaliations, revenge and mistrust. We are a minority. We shall always be a minority. Let's not forget that. What benefits or advantages could we ever gain from swinging money and politics around? What worth is any position wrung from the powers-that-be by bribery and lobbying?

I'm Sane, Creative, Mature

No, the Mattachine Society (or any other prescribed homosexual organization) is not, and must not be, a religion,

or a mass movement, or a political party, and so must be without mighty legions of the dissatisfied, the guilt-ridden, the hungry, the oppressed. The Society must seek not the over-burdened (they might be helped eventually), but it must call to it the sane, the creative, the mature — those who have reached enough inner stability and maturity so that they can now take upon themselves the conscience and responsibility for their weaker fellows. No faith is to be found there, no dogma, no list of commandments on what the faithful should believe or discredit. The Society is nothing more and nothing less than a clearing hewn out of the forest. For the first time, the open light of the high sun can reach the dank, dark forest ground. There is at last an arena in the open where the conflicting arguments can be fought out. (And let the best man win!)

What's More, I Like to Swish

The Society offers the prospective member the glorious opportunity to have one's cherished prejudices shaken by the roots. Offering the chance to be disturbed, angered, and distressed, it offers on the other hand, through the medium of exchanging and sharing experiences, the chance to learn, to develop, to become a bigger person, because now one can embrace a larger humanity. No mean achievement, that, in a day when we are told more what we should hate than what we should love! I call to mind again all the talk in the September issue about our brothers who like to swish. Yes, they had stood at one time as a threat in my sub-conscious, but after a few meetings, I marveled to see develop my understanding and sympathy for their unique problem. I even started swishing more myself and found it to be rather fun. It's your trademark, part of our tribal lore. It answers an inner need, the vague anxiety all of us feel at sometime or another. (*Sorry, but the editors must challenge this. Take it from us, Buster, it ain't so.*)

What I'm talking about here is nothing more than old-fashioned fellowship, along with its companion virtues of trust and tolerance. This kind of fellowship which the Society is trying to build is something unique with homosexuals. It cuts across every previous grouping in gay life: the esoteric cliques who lock themselves up into musty corners, the gay bars with their transient clientele and their preoccupation with mating dances like dodo-birds, the haphazard group of the gay party, where, as Auden says so prettily, "Someone vomits; someone cries." It is a new kind of fellowship where we are no longer "sisters", competition for each other, or "tricks".

Suddenly Uncommon Sense

Through our Mattachine meetings, we have found that we are not so different after all, that what we have suffered has much in common with what most of our countrymen have suffered. We have come to see that ultimately, our problem is not the superficiality of gay life, say, but the shallowness of our entire society. If we fight promiscuity in our own ranks, we fight the neuroses which breed this sort of thing within all men, regardless of their sexual definition. We are not working for *our* sexual freedom as such, nor are we working just for bigger, better, happier homosexuals. We, along with many others (let's not forget the many others!) are working for a bigger, better, happier, more comprehensive society. No pressure group, no newer religious sect, stimulating newer resentments, shifting newer areas of conflict, will achieve this goal.

Yes, we are members of a minority, but rather let us work for the day when all men will stop thinking in the cramped categories of minorities when one can be defined as a human being first and foremost. Who gives a damn then for money or power or pressure groups or lobbyists when your nights are still haunted by the phantoms of ignorance and

fear? Laws then are not the most important things in the world. But people are. Laws have never given anyone the kind of deep and abiding satisfaction one gains from shaking hands with one's own soul.

Now, Think Pretty of that Cop!

Come down out of that ivory-tower, M.F.! We know who you are! Come down and put some flesh and blood on to those mathematical formulas of yours. You can't buy change. If you want to change the world, learn to do it in the best way mankind has ever effected yet. Learn to put your lofty ideals into practice through a willingness to endure long and drudgerous work. Come on down and

put your two cents in with the rest of us who are already working at this business of organizing homosexuals, trying to trust those we have disapproved of heretofore, hoping when despair has got us by the throat and won't let go, learning not to hate when the dazed and confused shout dirty swine at us, working for the day when homosexuals will stop hating themselves, their fellows, that abstract entity we call the general public. Hate has twisted some of us into ugly, misshapen Quasimodos, and only when we come to accept ourselves and everybody else for what we are, forgiving our faults and imperfections—even loving them—will we ever gain our poise, our confidence, our true freedom.

Damon Pythias



The Editors believe this little testament to be one of the most important to reach them. Its hypothesis is staggering and will send many or most of us screaming back under the bed. Actually it's a very sound idea and as challenging as any to appear in this magazine. It is presented to you with sincere pride.

It Can Be Done

In many a smoke-filled living room some statement such as this is made: "When people here understand the way they do in Europe, we'll be so much happier." While I realize as well as any one that there exists a general lack of understanding of deviants, their ways and problems, this need not always be the case. The following picture of my own situation may be agreeable to some.

Some fifteen years ago, I made my first social contacts in a small New England town, not far from New Haven. Through friends who had moved there, I came to know more and more people, and eventually bought a home in the town and took my place as one of the "newcomers." Coming to town with a

wife perhaps helped me find my way in civic affairs; my willingness soon loaded my time with various civic tasks. The fact that my marriage didn't work will surprise few of the readers of these columns; it is, however, beside the point as far as discussion of this particular subject goes. Suffice it to say that after our marriage broke up I became no less popular, but somewhat more of a social problem. (The settled, single man in a New England town is rather a curiosity.) My friends alternately queried me as to why the marriage fell apart, and tried to find new mates. Among the most persistent were a college classmate and his wife. After repeated attempts on their parts to marry me off,

and to pump an explanation from me, I decided something should be done. Having always nursed a theory that carefully made explanations would result in understanding, and having decided that this couple could be trusted, we embarked one evening on a discussion of the adjustments to be made by deviants, the other problems they faced, their numbers, and my own particular philosophy of life. Somewhat to their surprise, these two friends and others after them learned that they could come to me with direct questions without embarrassment, and receive equally direct, dispassionate answers. More of these experiences followed; each resulted, I'm sure, in a better understanding of our way of life; each resulted, I know, in making myself more articulate. Occasionally some member of a deviant's family came to me. Their worries varied; some wanted to know what to do; others, believe it or not, how they could be more helpful. In each case, incidentally, such families were sharply halted by the statement that I could enter into no discussion of their relative's problem—not even did I admit knowledge of the existence of a deviant in the family—without private discussion and agreement from the subject of their concern. My experiences to date bear out my own theory that gossip in a small town concerns only mystery; once facts are known, discussion seems to cease, except, for honest, open talk.

As comes to each of us, I suppose, came the time of an indiscreet remark, an ill-concealed mannerism, which tipped my hand where I would not have wished it tipped. And following that, a disgruntled employee of one of the municipal offices of whose board of commissioners I was chairman, tried to make trouble. Fired, for good and sufficient reason,

and given generous notice, he called personally on a few of my friends in an effort to convince them that their choice of friends, in so far as I was concerned, left something to be desired. As luck would have it, his first call was on my college classmate, who laughed, and said "You're not telling me anything I don't know." After becoming the butt of jokes rather than sympathy, my erstwhile employee took a long shot and sent a letter to the editor of our local weekly. Small town editors being notoriously busy, and concerned mostly with the obvious, the letter was published, to the subsequent embarrassment of the editor, dealing for the most part with summary firing of employees, the letter nevertheless carried references to "fairies in the bottom of the municipal garden" and pointed definitely in my direction, although no names were mentioned. As soon as the paper came out, I called personally on the other members of my board—who incidentally had taken no notice of the letter—and told them the substance of my story. I suggested that I would be glad to resign if they were embarrassed to work with me, but was urged to continue. Feeling that our First Selectman, who appointed me, might be uncomfortable, I talked with him, too, and my offer to resign fell on deaf ears.

Now, some months after this episode, I continue to live quietly, but my own way, and continue to serve the town, both by appointment and by election (non-salaried jobs, I assure you, as are most in these small towns!) Granted, there may be many communities in which such an approach may not be practical or advisable; there may be personalities unsuited to this means of getting along with ones fellows; my point remains: It can be done!

Ralph Wells Coulter

The following open letter from the Mattachine Society was stimulated by the two sentences on the back cover of ONE's December issue promising criticism of that organization. While its language may not seem to indicate it, the writer's impulse was almost certainly to conciliate and unify. The editor, having only limited space available for matter of such local interest, has relinquished his "right" to reply (as described in the last paragraph) and makes only a few footnotes when necessary. The reader is reminded that this letter was written and mailed prior to the appearance of the January issue.

The Mattachine on Cooperation

Editor-in-Chief
ONE, Inc.
232 S. Hill St.
Los Angeles, Calif.
Dear Sir:

In its December issue, ONE stated that a series of articles criticizing the Mattachine Society will be published in the magazine beginning with the January issue. Naturally, like other members of the Society, I look forward to what the series will contain. I know I speak for others as well as myself when I state that we hope the series will be informative, constructive—and FAIR. It ill behooves any group or element fighting the singularly peculiar battle that has been undertaken to be critical of another because one group believes in a different method for accomplishing the goal desired.

It is further short sighted to stress a schism which may or may not exist between two vastly different entities. A publication, in which the authors use pen names, and which enjoys a certain constitutional protection,¹ is not at all like an organization or society, which is made up of individual persons who must be certain its actions and utterances are legal and proper, and at the same time, be just as certain that the character of the group is such that individual welfare is not jeopardized.

ONE is the product of and at present the voice of a local fight.² The situation in Los Angeles is the key to its militant editorial policy. It assumes the same tactics should apply all over the nation. This attitude will attract little WORTHWHILE attention, or aid of real and lasting value, to the cause of a better deal for a social minority that has long been criticized for behavior not recognized as proper nor accepted as in good taste.³

The Society, while far from completely defined as to aims, principles, and, most of all, method of accomplishment, is attempting to establish itself as a serious organization tackling a delicate social problem in a manner that will win the respect and obtain the help from others which we must have if our program is to be achieved. We believe the principle of

COOPERATION will accomplish more for us than the technique of antagonism.

Already the Society has obtained encouragement, aid and semi-official endorsement from various public agencies, as well as from some recognized experts of science and the professions nationally. These agencies, institutions and individuals are stepping-stones to the accomplishment of our program. There are too few willing to assume the risk entailed in creating and maintaining the organization, raising the funds, and willing to withstand the searing spotlight of publicity that will surely come.⁴ These are reasons why the minority itself will never become an organization embracing even 2% of its potential membership. An additional great reason is this fact: the potential membership by and large doesn't give a damn.⁵

From the limited quantity of material thus far written about the Society, some things could have been published in the past by ONE if it chose.⁶ Certain information, especially, "Aims and Principles of the Mattachine Society," if printed in the magazine, would undoubtedly rally a great deal of favorable attitude toward the Society. But it was not published because apparently ONE's editor (who has authored much of the magazine's material thus far) personally disagreed with it.⁷ Others on the staff, including persons recently resigned from the Mattachine Society to devote time exclusively to ONE, also disagree in substance with an apparent overwhelming majority of the Society's dues-paying members who have endorsed the program and the plan for implementing it.

Facilities to circulate such a publication are being studied. It appears that no difficulty in placing the publication in the hands of about as many readers as ONE now enjoys would be encountered. More difficult would be the problem of collecting worthwhile material and producing the publication.

The Society has observed ONE closely enough for the past year to know the difficulties the magazine has faced and overcome. Therefore those members of the Society who have exten-

sive publications experience will urge that no similar publication be undertaken until there is a positive chance for its success.


Responsible persons in public life tell us they are interested in what ONE as well as the Society is doing to solve a pressing social problem. But they tell us that unless the magazine and the organization each grow up with good manners, an attitude of responsibility, and unless they develop an acceptable "code", call it ethics or whatever, and advocate acceptance of it, then we can only expect to fail.¹¹

For the Society, cooperation with existing institutions and public agencies to the extent

only ideas that will work?

No one in the Mattachine Society is attempting to undermine ONE nor the importance—or better, significance—of its beginning its second year of publication in an area which was previously a void.

To its staff, a great deal of praise must go, and members of the Society are proud to tender this deserved praise publicly. A great deal of personal sacrifice and many, many late hours of work without any pay whatever were spent by the staff to produce the past 12 issues. The staff believes in the magazine with whole heart. Its members want it to



they make the gains or advocate the change of laws which we seek is an ideal way to advance our program. A public official won to our side can do far more for us than we can accomplish with screams of cop-hating or so-called blasts at a vice squad (which may truly deserve such blasting in a particular locality.)

You on the magazine should know by this time that the attitude of a police force in any locality reflects the attitude of the public as a whole. Law enforcement is habitually tolerant in those areas where the population dictates it should be. This fact alone should point up the paramount importance of educating the public — including ourselves — as number one project. The public can do something about it. And it will amount to a lot more than the continual harping about the inability of a small circle of self-made martyrs to get away with all they'd like.¹²

This opposition is not surprising, nor is it a danger. Divergent opinions have always been present in a democracy. Voicing the opposition has made such institutions and organizations more vigorous.

But is it fair to assume that ONE alone has the single magic key? Do its editors have a monopoly on thought? Are their ideas the

achieve the recognition they believe it deserves. No little support — moral, at least — came from the Society in ONE's early days. Even though there was no official connection between the two.

On the other hand, many persons have put a lot of effort in the Mattachine Society with nothing but out-of-pocket expense to show for it. They, too, believe there is a good reason to do so, even if they happen not to share the same ideas about attitudes and techniques as the staff of ONE.

More than one important person who can render invaluable support and influence to our common cause has been critical of ONE, its apparent policy, and its method. Some of these people tell members of the Society not to be the least bit disappointed because ONE emphasizes that there is no connection between the magazine and the Society . . . "legally, secretly or ideologically." Because, they add, if ONE and the Society was the same, they would have nothing to do with either! Unfortunately, we can't name names to prove that some of these persons so critical of ONE could do more to help the plight of the homosexual in a day than a member of ONE's editorial board might do in a year.

Those statements give the Society no reason

for pride, nor should ONE be proud to read them either. There is so much to be done, and the task is obviously beset with supreme difficulties. Everyone concerned is called upon to contribute his best effort.

There is no reason to believe that ONE and the Society cannot go forward, each in its own way, but with maximum mutual support, trust and respect. Each needs the other, and God knows that the people for whom we are battling need both. Any broad view of the situation and its problems must reach this conclusion.

As a movement, the Mattachine Idea is evolving steadily. The editors of ONE have an obligation to explain these developments to readers of the magazine. Undoubtedly, ONE's first reaction is that those in the Society who think they know the answers about what's going on should write it and submit it for publication. That is fair and logical. There is a good chance it will be done if the character and tone of ONE becomes compatible with the principles of the Society.¹

At the present time, the Society is investigating the possibility of launching its own publication. It would be aimed chiefly at telling members, friends and the public the story of the Mattachine Movement and report its progress from month to month. While such a publication is not presently viewed as competitive to ONE, it naturally would to some extent invade ONE's field, with criticisms of newspaper and magazine articles, book reviews, letters and other such features which ONE now carries.¹⁰

ONE should advocate restraint, good manners, responsibility and decency in public. These things, when practiced, erase most of the barriers of acceptance faced by a majority of the minority.

Instead, ONE frequently is guilty of practicing the very things (witness the December issue) which it should criticize—if it expects to accomplish anything for the deviant. The present tone of the magazine will bring only the success that comes because of sensationalism rather than worthwhile accomplishment. There is lots of such sensational stuff on newsstands today, and it appears ONE is determined to join the pack.

In conclusion, let's not make inaccurate statements in ONE, such as the Mattachine Society "...does not appear to hold with any of the purposes which motivate this magazine" and so on. Be responsible enough to know the facts—a primary rule in journalism, homosexual or otherwise, which ONE's editor failed to observe. Look into the facts, and present them.¹²

Please—let's not criticize the Mattachine Society in the pages of ONE until your readers have been told exactly what the Society is—fairly and justly, without the color of personalities which have entered into an organizational split within the past few months.

If ONE is determined to tell its readers that which—in its opinion—is bad about the Mattachine Society, it should also be fair enough to tell its readers that which is good about the Society. To deny that there is anything good about the Society is the same as denying that ONE itself has embraced a worthwhile cause, **for the aim is the same.**


It is a cardinal principle of every fair organ of mass communication to present both sides of a controversy; to give equal space and consideration to opposing points of view.

Is the staff of ONE that mature?¹⁴

THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY

Sincerely yours,

KEN BURNS, Chairman

- 
1. The Editors suggest the writer consult an attorney on these points.
 2. See ONE Jan. '53, April '53, Nov. '53 and Jan. '54 and the letters in each issue for items of national and international interest regarding entrapment, corruption or prejudice.
 3. Those who get caught deserve it?
 4. The Editor must be forgiven for taking this description as a personal tribute.
 5. There must be incentive for withstanding "the searing spotlight". What does the Mattachine and ONE offer this potential membership in return for the "risk entailed"?
 6. ONE constantly asks for manuscripts and prints every word made available by the Mattachine.
 7. Inaccurate.
 8. Nor can we list the hundreds of great and near great who subscribe, endorse and laud ONE.
 9. Could this be construed to mean that if ONE suddenly develops good taste, gentlemanly mildness and wholehearted endorsement of the Mattachine, that it will again submit a manuscript with the "character and tone" of this one?
 10. The Editors not only welcome the Mattachine into the publishing business, we BEG you to join in!
 11. "Ethics" was dropped from the Mattachine preamble and the code mentioned has been given the full treatment in each issue of ONE. Be it noted that the article suggesting homosexual marriage as a concession to society was thoroughly damned by the leaders of the Mattachine.
 12. ONE never has and never will advocate sexual license for homosexual or heterosexual, for the editors of ONE or the leaders of the Mattachine.
 13. Read that sentence again, Buster. It's not a news item: it's an expression of editorial opinion such as you have been enjoying for several pages now.
 14. Must be. We printed it.

This month we return to further analysis of the Southern California Society which insists in its statement of purposes that all its members are merely academically interested in the subject of homosexuality. No one expects them to admit being homosexual—although there is no law against that state of being—nor should they expect anyone to believe them when they claim they're not. Their professed motive for all this is to avoid antagonizing the public which apparently doesn't mind a little white lie from a passel of perverts now and then. The following account of the Mattachine Convention does not pretend to be objective. It shouts furiously and isn't ashamed to admit it. And it, incidentally, tells the truth.

Who Is This Man?

The Elegant Debacle

The Convention in November, the first since the constitutional convention of last spring, was ostensibly convened to make minor, administrative alterations in the Constitution and to adopt by-laws. The first day, Saturday, was relatively uneventful, not to say dull—until the evening. At that time a banquet (\$3.00 per plate) was given for the delegates who could afford it. Various speeches were made and awards presented, one to Dale Jennings, Editor-in-Chief of ONE magazine. Mr. Jennings' acceptance speech for ONE, brilliantly delivered and embracing the highest principles of the original Mattachine, was greeted by something less than enthusiasm. The following day it was proposed from the floor of the Convention that the Society start another publication in competition to ONE and with a vastly different orientation.

And then (it's now Sunday, November 15th) the Mattachine-baiting began. The Preamble of the Society, democratically adopted by unanimous vote at the Constitutional Convention, contained the phrase:

"We, the members of the Mattachine Society, hold it necessary that a highly ethical, homosexual culture be integrated into" the dominant, heterosexual society.

After a bitter fight the wording was changed roughly to the following:

"We, the members of the Mattachine Society, believing in sexual equality . . ."

Nothing missing except the spirit, the drive, the meaning, the purpose, the essence of all that Mattachine has come to signify to thousands who have heard about it from friends or read about it even though they may never have attended a single meeting.

"I'll Turn You All In!"

This action, unprecedented in the annals of constitutional democracy (a preamble can never be changed unless the organization is dissolved), was forced through the Convention by as unsavory a tactic as has ever been used anywhere. Several delegates, after vicious and irrational attacks on the characters of the founders of the Mattachine, maintained that the Preamble reflected the ideals of those founders and had been railroaded through the Constitutional Convention. At this point one delegate rose to assert that he had been closely associated with the F.B.I. for many years and would consider it his duty to report the activities of the Convention to the police if these principles were reaffirmed. His point seemed to be that unless the Convention amended the Preamble he was going to call the cops to fulfill his

duty as an American. "I," he said at one point in his frenzy, "am an American." Exactly in what way he thought this characteristic distinguished him from the other delegates is not clear.

Wring Out The Old

To those who have worked during the past three years in the Mattachine Movement, the First Semi-Annual Convention of the Mattachine Society must have been a debacle. Meeting on Saturday and Sunday, November 14th and 15th, 1953, the delegates, misled by red-baiting and Mattachine-baiting from the State leadership, denounced and rejected the policies of the Movement's founders, scrapped the original preamble to the constitution and adopted a laissez-faire program for the coming period. To those of us who have observed the Mattachine from its early days (regretting, perhaps, that we haven't been able to participate more fully) developments at the convention seemed like a sell-out to the most conservative elements of the heterosexual world. We felt lost and defenseless as though something we loved and trusted had died.

It is impossible in the space available to give anything like a complete background of events leading up to the Convention, but a few words are necessary: The original Mattachine Society (founded in 1950) and the Mattachine Foundation with which it worked closely, believed a highly ethical homosexual culture should be integrated into the dominant, heterosexual society. Their program was one of militant, legal and legislative action on behalf of the homosexual minority. While convinced the homosexual minority must, through its own efforts, strive to accomplish necessary changes, the original Mattachine believed in working with enlightened elements in the heterosexual world. The original Mattachine believed in education both of the homosexual and heterosexual elements but was convinced the most important educative

factor among homosexuals was working and campaigning together for what they believed in. The original Mattachine absolutely rejected the idea that homosexuals were any more likely subjects for psychiatric "cure" than were heterosexuals. Dominant in early Mattachine thinking was action, and the Jennings trial afforded the Mattachine the opportunity to fight its first case through aggressive defense. "I am a homosexual," said Jennings on the stand, "but I am not lewd nor dissolute, and I am not guilty of the charges against me."

The original Mattachine, with its lodge-like structure, was turned over to the membership in the spring of 1953 for reorganization along more democratic lines. Members of the Foundation were nominated for offices in the new Society but declined, firm in the conviction that the time had come for a fully democratic organization in the original Mattachine spirit but without the paternal assistance of the Foundation or its members.

From the Convention floor came cries of "Mr. Chairman, I demand the expulsion of the delegate," "Outrageous," "I feel this delegate's presence endangers all of us," "The security of the Convention is in jeopardy," "Who is this man?" The Chairman, interested only in a smoothly running meeting and evidently unable to comprehend the issues involved, wrapped feebly for order, first threatened, then called an intermission in the hope it would "cool off" the delegates.

And Cool Off Hotly

If anything, the intermission had the opposite effect than the Chairman had hoped. Charges and counter-charges swept the corridors and ante-rooms of the convention hall. In one corner I heard two delegates, acting on emotion rather than reason, verbally attack an original founder of the Movement as a red. As soon as the body reconvened, a member rose formally to demand the expulsion of the delegate who had threatened to re-

port the Convention to various police agencies on the ground that he had tried to railroad a change in the Preamble by intimidation. Someone moved that the Convention dissolve and reconvene the better to change the Preamble. Another suggested that the Mattachine Society stood on the principles of the Preamble and that those who had joined had done so with full knowledge of the Preamble. "If there are those who now disagree with the Preamble — the basic principles of the Society —," he said, "it is for them to withdraw and form whatever organization they choose. The Mattachine stands on its Preamble."

The Screams of the Living

Parliamentary procedure was abandoned. The Chairman, unwilling to consider the original motion for expulsion, gladly used the opportunity to let everyone speak on any issue they chose and thus reinforce his reputation for "fairness." An honest and conscientious chapter chairman rose to protest the change in the Preamble, although he did not himself agree with it. "When I have admitted people to my chapter," he said, "I have read the Preamble and asked them if they believed in it. How can I now go back and say, 'I voted to change the principles in which YOU have affirmed your belief?'"

Delegates pointed out to the chair that the question of change in Preamble was something quite new—not presented for discussion in the chapters prior to the Convention—a matter which should go back to the membership as a recommendation for action at the next Convention. A duly constituted delegate rose to speak against the motion to change the Preamble, and his vote was challenged by the "informer" before-mentioned. The Chairman asked for an opinion from the delegate's chapter chairman.

It happened that elimination of this particular source of opposition had been planned between the Convention Chairman and the Chapter Chairman during

the intermission, and the delegate's own chairman denied that he was a delegate.

The delegate was not allowed to speak. A commotion arose, and the Chairman, weary of this unpleasantness, first threatened, then called for a long intermission.


"I Was Naughty"

But first a delegate from the Bay Area rose to plead for love and affection among the delegates. Exactly what love the conflicting economic and social interests were likely to engender was not explained. Then the Chairman asked for a prayer which was duly delivered.

The plea for affection (or was it the dinner, the lateness of the hour, the unpleasantness of the previous session or a complete lack of understanding of the issues involved?) did its work, for the delegates returned to hear an apology from "the informer." He failed to promise that he would give up the practice of squealing to the cops in the future and haughtily declined to answer when asked this question by one of the delegates. A motion to change the Preamble was immediately entered and passed by an overwhelming majority. Then it was also rapidly agreed to avoid aggressive legal action and to strive for assimilation into the dominant culture (assimilation even before integration!). Thus satiated the Convention adjourned with the determination to move forward to even greater achievements at its next gathering. As one unhappy delegate put it, "The Mattachine has gone militantly on record in favor of the *heterosexual* majority!"

To this writer things look bad for the organized homosexual in the coming period, but not hopeless. Happily, these scared, little people — these summer soldiers — presently leading the Mattachine do not represent the homosexual minority nor do they speak in the spirit of the Mattachine Movement. That minority and that spirit will presently find their own answers through other channels and in other directions than the "New Mattachine" is leading them.

David L. Freeman



This page begins a test,
offers a sample
and otherwise
dips its toe in a tempting lagoon
that makes mad
all who swim therein
GAY
will be light-hearted,
light-headed
and a bit off-and-on
whenever the space can be spared.
It will be pictorial, too,
(phabulous photos)
fictional and satirical
and just plain sabbatical.
Let us know if we should continue it?

Not long ago in This Week an aging man wrote something dire called, "The Case Against Sexual Freedom". He was simply agin this here new-fangled abandon (like Marriage after knowing the Beloved only a year) and even seemed to regret the activity requisite to generation. Herewith our favorite poet, GGG, answers this latter day Queen Victoria.



The Case Against Sexual Freedom

*Nicomedes who was a king,
Kissed Julius Caesar, so they tell.
And Caesar liked the girls they say,
And that, my dears, is why Rome fell.*

*The Greeks would love where love was found
And did not stop to count the cost.
They rated beauty more than wealth
And so the Greeks their glory lost.*

*The artists of the Renaissance
Found wealth and freedom, then unknown
But spent so many hours in bed
They woke to find their wealth had flown.*

*So let us shut the door on vice.
On fleshy freedom turn our backs.
We might so easily lose our deep
Freezers, minks and cadillacs.*

GGG

Written by Dale Jennings

Drawn by The Quinns


The story of **GAYLORD PEDESTRIAN**

a young man about whom there was nothing,
absolutely nothing, special


except that he did not ride a bicycle.*




* Had he lived anywhere but in Mimsey Downs,
this fact would not have set him apart.



In Mimsey Downs everyone rode a bicycle.



They all looked at Gaylord and said,
"Now, there's a queer one. He's really different!"



For years Gaylord ignored their ill-concealed contempt

then it began to prey upon his mind

his life became a nightmare

until one day he snarled,

"Let them think I'm different,

I'll show them just how different I can be!"


Executing a neat handspring,



he started walking on his hands.





At first people were shocked,




then intrigued,

and then they began to follow suit!





Soon everyone was walking on his hands,
all as happy as possoms.



And to Gaylord Pedestrian was revealed the folly of man.

Whereupon he cried, "Phah!"
and bought himself a bicycle.

And everyone in Mimsey Downs said,
"Now, there's a queer one.

He's
really
different!"

THE END



QUINN *Quinn*



Next month ONE introduces TWO, a news supplement featuring the Bureau of Public Information. TWO will blast and bless public statements on the subject of homosexuality, ferret out foolishness and corruption in high places, and set the stage with protest so that legal reform and housecleaning may follow. TWO (Truth Will Out) will begin with a startling exposé of Macfadden publishing policy as written by a member of Physical Culture's own editorial staff, Arthur Guy Mathews. You'll want this first copy of what will one day become the national homosexual newspaper.

TWO TWO

Coming

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Please notify circulation department of address changes. The post office does not forward or return third class matter.

The new mailing labels contain the expiration date of your subscription.

BACK COPIES AVAILABLE

Orders still being taken for January and February reprints @ 0.50 each; delivery when 500 orders received.

A very lucky break brings to light a few of the April, May, June and July copies; these rare issues @ 1.00 each, as long as they last.

New subscribers can still start their subscriptions with the August issue; for others this controversial number is priced @ 0.50.

October, November and December issues are still to be had at the regular price, 0.25 each, plus postage.

WINING

RENDEZVOUS CLUB

the bar with that continental atmosphere

5907 E. Second St.

Long Beach, Calif.

phone 909196

DINING

WINING

COUP de FREIN, BAR

3 Rue Constance

Paris 18, France

DINING



"WHY MALES WEAR FEMALE ATTIRE"
and
"SEX TRANSMUTATION - CAN ONE'S SEX BE CHANGED?"



Strange stories, weird confessions, historical data and scientific explanations.
Both books only \$1.25, sent sealed.
Unusual bulletin included.

URANUS BOOKS, Box 62, Gardiner 9, Maine

one

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER

ONE, Inc., 232 South Hill, Los Angeles 12

Name.....

Address.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

Send me ONE for.....years. I enclose \$.....

One year regular \$2.50, two years regular \$4.00, One year first class sealed \$3.50,
two years first class sealed \$6.00 in the United States and Canada. Elsewhere \$3.50
per year. Single copies 27 cents regular, 31 cents first class sealed.

And while you are at it, why not send a copy of ONE (anonymously, if you wish) to
your doctor, lawyer, minister, those friends or relatives to help further their under-
standing?

I inclose.....for.....copies.



**FOREIGN BOOKS AND MAGAZINES
THAT WILL INTEREST YOU:**

Arcadie, 162 Rue Jeanne d'Arc, Paris
13, France

Sesso e Libertà, Via Spartaco 17, Milan,
Italy

Die Gefährten, Arndstrasse 3, Frankfurt
am Main, Germany

Hellas, Neustadter Strasse 48, Hamburg
36, Germany

Der Weg, Colonnaden 5, Hamburg 36,
Germany



DER KREIS / LE CERCLE / THE CIRCLE

International monthly magazine
in three languages

(German, French and English)

with beautiful photos

published since 1936

regularly every month

Kindly write to: Der Kreis, Postfach 547,
Zürich 22, Fraumünster, Switzerland

Subscription: A years' subscription, sent
by printed matter \$7.00, by letter \$9.00

Bound volumes 1950-53 available at
\$7.00 each. Interesting articles and
beautiful pictures.

VENNEN (THE FRIEND)

Scandinavian Homosexual Magazine.
Appears monthly. Subscription rates per
year, \$4.50 (in sealed envelope). By
regular mail, \$3.50. Send orders to:
ONE, Inc., 232 South Hill St., Los
Angeles, Calif. or Vennen c/o D. F. T.,
P. O. Box 108, Copenhagen K, Denmark.

VRIENDSCHAP

Dutch Homosexual Magazine Illustrated
monthly. Send orders to ONE, Inc., 232
S. Hill Street, Los Angeles 12; or,
Vriendschap, P. O. Box 542 Amsterdam,
Holland.

WRITERS

ONE announces the first of a series of annual
competitions open to writers of short stories. The
first prize will be twenty-five dollars and a fea-
tured appearance in the December 1954 all-fiction
issue. With it will appear the four runners-up.

Manuscripts must be 5,000 words or under, typed
double-space on one side of the page and post-
marked on or before the first of September, 1954.

All manuscripts become the property of ONE,
Inc. and will be finally judged by the editors.
Please accompany with a self-addressed, stamped
envelope.

WIN \$25.

And by all means read the May issue of "Confidential". It contains a good many
straight facts, several foolishly vicious lies and some pedestrian lynch talk. It helps
make ONE'S editor the world's most widely publicized self-admitted deviate. His
name is a nasty word from coast-to-coast in normal homes and precinct stations,
and an encouragement to all deviates who have been "unmasked" by their
communities.

THE MATTACHINE AND MAGAZINE EYE TO EYE



In a legal move that can be actually historic, the Mattachine Society has taken on a case in California which challenges the notorious "vaglewd" laws. Most people are unaware that such laws which legislate against "lewdness" are completely unconstitutional because they make it possible to punish a person for a state of being rather than an act. This fact is vitally important to every citizen regardless of sexual preference.



The attorney for the Mattachine directly challenges this legislation with the unanswerable claim that these laws do not state a public offense and are in direct violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. "It is a denial of due process because of the vagueness of the statute and it also violates the equal protection clause because of discriminatory enforcement. It further violates due process in that it punishes a state of being rather than an act which is contrary to all concepts of law and justice."

He went on to point out how the winning of this case will have a national effect: "This extremely unjust law—which has counterparts in every State in the Union—is so loosely drawn that it can quite conceivably encompass every type of activity which might disturb a bigoted policeman. If we can prevail in this case and have the statute declared unconstitutional, similar statutes throughout the country would be open to attack and could also be declared invalid."



The Mattachine fully intends to take this case to the Supreme Court of the United States if necessary. Details of the boldly ambitious undertaking will be in the April issue of ONE. In the meantime, the collection of funds has begun with real success in Los Angeles. Deviants, near-deviants and those who have never thought of deviating but see the viciousness of this law, have come through to help in immense numbers. They know that this case will be just as big as homosexuals want to make it. To raise it from only local significance, will take money. To fight on up to the Supreme Court, will take lots of money.

However, many deviants look at it this way: "Perhaps five dollars now will save me five hundred if and when I'm arrested. It's worth the gamble." A dollar from every fifth homosexual in the U. S. would be enough to fight a hundred cases.

Send your share NOW to: THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY, POST OFFICE BOX 1925, MAIN POST OFFICE, LOS ANGELES 53, CALIFORNIA.

ONE is with the Mattachine unreservedly on this specific issue.

