

## VRIENDSCHAP

Monthly magazine in Dutch; photos and drawings,  
also articles about women. \$4. yearly.

Postbox 542, Amsterdam, Holland.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY  
NOW IN ITS THIRD YEAR...

*authoritative  
information  
on*

**HOMOSEXUALITY...**

Interesting articles by experts and laymen  
on this pressing social problem explored  
from religious, legal, scientific and social  
points of view...for thinking adults. Will  
NOT appeal to readers seeking sensationalism.



**Mattachine REVIEW**

699 MISSION STREET SAN FRANCISCO 5, CALIF.

PER YEAR IN THE  
UNITED STATES,  
CANADA AND MEXICO:

4.00

ELSEWHERE: 5.00

(All copies mailed  
first class sealed  
in plain envelope.  
Published by Mat-  
tachine Society, a  
chartered educa-  
tional - research  
corporation.)

## ARCADIE

Monthly magazine in French; literary and scientific,  
infrequent photos and drawings. \$9. yearly.

162 Rue Jeanne d'Arc, Paris XIII, France.

one

24

# one

25¢

**YOU AND  
THE LAW**  
by aclu attorney

*He's got neurotic eyes*



*by Ruth M. Friedman*

**The Homosexual Magazine**

## ICSE NEWSLETTER

Published every month by the International Committee for Sexual Equality. Available in English, French or German. \$5. yearly.

Postbox 1564, Amsterdam, Holland.



ICSE NEWSLETTER (in English)  
Copies available from ONE, Inc. @ .50

## ACE - HI Moving & Storage Co.

BRUCE D. ROSS, Owner

A Complete Personalized Service at Minimum Rates  
5154 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles 27, California  
NOrmandy 1-3183 & NOrmandy 4-4026, 24 hrs. a day.

## BOOK MANUSCRIPTS INVITED

Reputable book publisher is willing to consider for publication, on subsidy basis, book manuscripts on controversial themes PROVIDED THEY POSSESS LITERARY MERIT. Query, or mail your manuscript directly for editorial evaluation to:

GREENWICH BOOK PUBLISHERS, INC.  
489 Fifth Ave., New York 17, N.Y.

Atten. Mr. Oberon

## BULLETIN!

Write to us for important news concerning

DERRICKS - by James Barr

We issue regular catalogues of novels, plays and poetry on homosexual themes, both recently published and out-of-print.

## Village Theater Center Bookshop

116 Christopher Street, New York 14, N. Y.

one

# one

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

—THOMAS CARLYLE

## The Homosexual Magazine

Volume V

Number 4

April 1957

Editorial . . . . .	4
YOU & THE LAW, by J. B. Tietz . . . . .	5
TANGENTS, News & Views by Dal McIntire . . . . .	11
"He's Got Neurotic Eyes," a story . . . . .	14
by Ruth M. Friedman	
AS FOR ME . . . . .	18
Book Reviews . . . . .	20
LETTERS . . . . .	21
COVER — Dawn Frederic	



TAFF:

EDITOR

ANN CARLL REID

MANAGING EDITOR

ROBERT GREGORY

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LYN PEDERSEN news & research  
ALISON HUNTER women's dept.  
ARMANDO QUEZON international

ART DIRECTOR

EVE ELLOREE

CIRCULATION MANAGER

SCOTTI WILLIAMS

ONE, INCORPORATED

Founded 1952

*A non-profit corporation formed to publish a magazine dealing primarily with homosexuality from the scientific, historical and critical point of view . . . books, magazines, pamphlets . . . to sponsor educational programs, lectures and concerts for the aid and benefit of social variants, and to promote among the general public an interest, knowledge and understanding of the problems of variation . . . to sponsor research and promote the integration into society of such persons whose behavior and inclinations vary from current moral and social standards.*

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. Air Mail, one year, five dollars. Single copies are thirty-five cents. Publication offices: 232 South Hill Street, Los Angeles 12, California.  
Not responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Copyright 1957 by ONE, Inc., Los Angeles, California.

# Editorial

At the last of April, 1957, Columnist Drew Pearson reported certain facts concerning the U. S. State Department's Security Officer, Scott McLeod, who was appointed by our current Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. The report hinged on the possibility of a new appointment for McLeod, that of Ambassador to Ireland.

Apparently, in the course of his fervent career as Security Officer, McLeod (a friend of the late Senator McCarthy) ordered a former writer for TIME "to prepare a special report on homosexuality and what it had done to bring about the collapse of other civilizations."

According to Columnist Pearson, this report "found there were fewer perverts in the State Department than in the Army, Navy and Air Force; that this had had no effect on the fall of Greece or Rome. McLeod was annoyed by the report, buried it."

This was no doubt newsworthy material for the readers of Pearson's column for April 30, but hardly news for the Staff and Readers of ONE. Newsworthy by implication, however, is the continuing official effort to pin on homosexuals the label of "pervert" and "degenerate," and to hold them responsible for the ruin of national and other cultural groups. Homosexual-baiters who bother to get the facts are invariably disappointed, as was McLeod, to find that there is no historical support for such a superstition.

History does, however, show a definite tendency for totalitarian thinkers - those who try to regiment society by "thought control" or by other and cruder measures - to make scapegoats out of homosexuals. This is equally true whether we are considering religious or political totalitarianism. During the Medieval Inquisitions, homosexuality and heresy (religious non-conformism) were almost invariably identified. Now, homosexuality and political "heresy" are similarly linked, especially in governments which show a totalitarian trend. It seems that the homosexual, being a sexual non-conformist, is automatically suspected of non-conformity in all other respects.

ONE Institute, devoted to discovering and teaching the facts about homosexuality, is especially interested in history, and alert to any interpretation which can shed some light on the changing status of homosexuals in history. The Classic, Early Christian, Medieval, Renaissance and Modern periods each show rather distinct socio-sexual attitudes on this subject. Some modern interpreters venture to explain these distinctions on psychological grounds. Doubtless other explanations can also be attempted on different grounds.

The fact remains that homosexuality has been neither persecuted nor encouraged in any truly democratic and liberal social group. Such groups regard sexual behavior, which does not injure others or create public disorder, as a matter of personal and private concern.

— ROBERT GREGORY

## YOU & the LAW

by J. B. Tietz



The following article reproduces in full a paper delivered at ONE's Annual Midwinter Institute, during the morning session, January 26, 1957. The author, a heterosexual Los Angeles attorney, has for the past ten years been treasurer of the Southern California Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union.

The original version of this paper was read to an open staff meeting of the Cedars of Lebanon Psychiatric Clinic. I shared the platform with a psychiatrist and, since I believe you will be interested in the two opening paragraphs of his paper, and because I have plans for an expanded revision of my own paper, I am prefacing my discussion by his opening comments.

Homosexuality is as ancient as man. It has been noted among earliest primitive cultures. The Tahitians, the Negroes of Zanzibar, the Indians from the Eskimos of Alaska to the coastal regions of Brazil, the Papuans of New Guinea, and the primitive Australians have had homosexual customs that were frequently related to their religious practices. Many ancient cultures accepted homosexual practices for methods of birth control, during military activity, and religious rites. The Egyptians, Greeks, Carthaginians, Scythians, Normans, Celts, and Tartars openly practiced homosexuality. The Hindu and Judaic-Christian cultures, however, have always looked with abhorrence on these methods of sexual expression and have forged severe taboos and severer penalties against it. But in spite of edicts, exorcism, excommunication and over-zealous punishment, homosexuality has survived. And it has remained, as it has always been, ubiquitous, involving about two percent of the population of the world, hurdling over geographical, racial, social, legal, economic, intellectual, national and occupational barriers, and remaining an immutable constant.

While society made pious attempts to stamp our homosexuality with fire, sword, imprisonment, intimidation and social opprobrium, a small group of philosophers, artists, writers and scientists speculated concerning its nature. These incredible Greeks again evolved a conception that is the basis of our modern scientific theory. The sculpture, literature, mythology, philosophy and ethics of the Greeks revealed man's nature as organically bisexual. Over 2,000 years later, the theory of organic bisexuality was revived by the philosophers Hossli, Ulrichs, and Schopenhauer. Darwin and other evolutionists were able to postulate latent bisexuality and gave a firm scientific base for the previous speculations. Krafft-Ebing, Moll, Westphall, and Hirschfeld, working in the field of clinical psychiatry, were able to collect clinical evidence for this hypothesis. Finally embryologists, physiologists, and biologists confirmed the organic bisexuality of man and were able to demonstrate experimentally that this may account for man's homosexuality.

The term homosexuality was originated by a medical writer in 1869.<sup>(1)</sup> Although it is presently a commonly accepted and precisely defined term

among the medical profession, this is not yet true in the legal profession.

A search of the index to the entire statutory law of California failed to disclose a single use of this term. A search of the penal code provisions of several other states, applicable to sex offenses, likewise failed to disclose an instance of its use.

The law, however, is and always has been very much aware of homosexuality, that is, sexual practices between two human parties of the same sex.

The state statutes on our subject are generally a single, short paragraph. They prohibit all unnatural sexual practices, a prohibition that, by reason of the definitions used by American courts, includes certain heterosexual acts and bestiality. This naturally has led to some confusion of thought and terminology. Some time ago a city prosecutor stated to me that he had just had one of the most interesting homosexual cases of his career and then proceeded to relate a case of bestiality, that is, a situation that involved an animal.

In this paper, I have used the phrase "unnatural sexual practices" chiefly because it is the ordinarily found expression in the opinions of the judges. I trust it will stir up no quibbling discussion, for it can be said that it is unnatural for man to fly and when so used, the expression arouses no argument.

The wide scope of the statutes is revealed by their very titles: The applicable Ohio statute is headed "Sodomy"; the Utah statute is headed "Sodomy - unnatural and detestable practices;" the Virginia statute is headed "Crimes against nature;" the California statutes (for we, uniquely, have two separate statutes) are headed "Crime Against Nature," and "Sex perversions."

In this discussion we are concerned only with sexual practices between human parties of the same sex. Pedication, fellatio and cummilingus are, of course, embraced in this definition. Many forms of masturbation and use of various surfaces of the body, such as the armpits, are not; for an essential element of this crime, like the crime of rape, is penetration.

The enforcement of the law, in actual practice, is concerned almost solely with male offenders; one medical legal writer, Herzog, in a book written in 1931, says he never heard of a prosecution of female homosexuality but he points out that the statutes are broad enough to cover at least one form, namely cummilingus.<sup>(2)</sup> Henry, in his two-volume work, has an illustration by Dickenson showing the use of a contrivance labelled a Double Dildo. The use of this device undoubtedly brings both participants within the definition of the crime. Actually, in Los Angeles city, there are a dozen arrests a year of female homosexuals. They generally plead guilty and I have therefore been unable to find a single instance of a female homosexual appeal from the many score of homosexual cases that are reported in the Appellate records.

The legal history of homosexuality is very old.

In Leviticus XX;13 we find, "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them shall have committed an abomination; they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them."

Leviticus makes a clear distinction, in definition, between homosexuality and bestiality and does it very succinctly. Two verses after the above quoted one, we find: "And if a man lie with a beast he shall surely be put to death, and ye shall slay the beast," and the following one: "And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman, and slay the beast."

The ancient origin of our legal concept is emphasized by some of the words used. Sodomy, or male homosexual love, is derived from one of the Scriptural twin cities of Sodom and Gomorrah; Lesbianism, or female homosexual love, is named after Lesbos, the ancient name for the Greek island of Mitiline; the Greeks also have given us a synonym for pederasty, "Socratic" love.<sup>(3)</sup>

The more modern legal handling of the problem was just as harsh as that of the ancients and has the following history:

Early in the Christian era the Roman Emperors legislated against homosexuality and Justinian's Code, in 538, condemned offenders to the sword; this became the foundation of social opinion and legal enactment for the next 1,300 years.

During the Middle Ages the problem of sex variants was dealt with in the same manner as that of heresy and witchcraft. Havelock Ellis states that in 1750 two pederasts were burned in France and that only a few years before the Revolution a Capuchin monk was also burned.

All during these 1,300 years the sin and sacrilege of sodomy was the ground for the imposition of punishment. The Church had a maxim, "Sodomy is high treason against the King of Heaven." The fact that it was considered a religious offense is most likely the reason the Code Napoleon omitted punishment for it.

The modern French law makes a clear and logical distinction between crime on the one hand and vice and irreligion on the other, only concerning itself with crime. Homosexual practices in private, between two consenting adult parties, whether men or women, are absolutely unpunished by the Code Napoleon and by French law of today. Only under three conditions does the homosexual act come under the cognizance of the French law as a crime: (1) When there is public outrage, i.e. when the act is performed in public or with a possibility of witnesses; (2) When there is violence or absence of consent, in whatever degree the act may have been consummated; and (3) when one of the parties is underage, or unable to give valid consent.

This method of dealing with unnatural offenses has spread widely, at first because of the political influence of France, and more recently because such an attitude has commended itself on its merits. In Belgium the law is similar to that of the Code, as it is also in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Roumania, Japan and numerous South American lands.

English speaking authorities on the subject are in general agreement with this philosophy, and, although our statutes lag behind, our law enforcement officers, as I will later show, generally try to observe these logical distinctions.

As Havelock Ellis points out,<sup>(4)</sup> the question of homosexuality is a social problem. Within certain limits, the gratification of the normal sexual impulse, even outside marriage, arouses no general or profound indignation and is regarded as a private matter; rightly or wrongly, the law regards the gratification of the homosexual impulse as a public matter. The law is in accord with what seems to be public opinion. Thus it happens that whenever a man is detected in a homosexual act - however exemplary his life may previously have been, however admirable it may still be in all other relations - nearly every ordinary normal citizen, however licentious and pleasure-loving his own life may be, feels it a moral duty to regard the offender as hopelessly damned and to help in hounding him out of society.

Alfred W. Herzog, when editor of the Medico-Legal Journal, said:

"Whether indulgence in a certain act of homosexual intercourse was an irresistible or controllable impulse may be difficult to determine.

"We should, however, say that every homosexual is mentally abnormal by nature and should not be held responsible for his sexual inclinations and an occasional indulgence therein, except he thereby offends common decency or induces children to submit to his sexual practices."<sup>(5)</sup>

Ellis expresses the opinion<sup>(6)</sup> that legislation against homosexuality "has no clear effect either in diminishing or increasing its prevalence."

In England the law is exceptionally severe; yet, to again use Ellis as an authority, according to the evidence "of those who have an international acquaintance with these matters, homosexuality is fully as prevalent as on the Continent; some would say that it is more so. Much the same is true of the United States, though there is less to be seen on the surface. It cannot, there-

fore, be said that legislative enactments have very much influence on the prevalence of homosexuality. The chief effect seems to be that the attempt at suppression arouses the finer minds among the sexual inverts to undertake the enthusiastic defense of homosexuality, while coarser minds are stimulated to cynical bravado.

But, while the law probably has had no more influence in repressing abnormal sexuality than, whenever it has tried to do so, it has had in repressing or making unpopular the normal sexual instinct, it has served to foster another offense. What is called blackmailing in England, chantage in France, and Erpressung in Germany - in other words, the extortion of money by threats of exposing some real or fictitious offense - finds its chief field of activity in connection with male homosexuality.

Hirschfeld states in an interesting study of blackmailing<sup>(7)</sup> that his experience shows that among 10,000 homosexual persons, hardly one falls a victim to the law, but over 3,000 are victimized by blackmailers.

If Hirschfeld is correct, it is apparent a very small proportion of homosexuals are prosecuted. This undoubtedly is so. Yet there are over 200 arrests in the city of Los Angeles each year on P.C. 288 A, the most serious of the sections, and there are several score reported cases. Since my audience is composed of non-lawyers, I will explain how a case comes to be "reported."

There are four steps: First, the legislature enacts a statute. Next, the law enforcement officers, that is, police and prosecutors, make arrests and prosecute - often exercising considerable judgment, that is, they themselves decide whether or not to arrest or to prosecute. The case is brought to the trial court, that is, the court that tries those who are prosecuted and sentences those who are convicted. The decisions of trial courts are rarely "reported," that is, embalmed in books for posterity to read. Of course, statistics may be kept but individual decisions are rarely written up. Should the losing party in the trial court have the interest and the means to further contest the matter, he perfects an appeal, that is, he takes the case to the appropriate appellate court. The decisions of the appellate courts are almost uniformly set forth at length in consecutively numbered and dated books which are called "Reports." The facts are reviewed and reasons for the appellate court's conclusions are given. Appellate court decisions are binding on all lower courts in the particular jurisdiction.

We will now consider in more detail the four steps above outlined. First, the applicable statutes:

"California Penal Code Section 286. (Crime against nature: punishment.) Every person who is guilty of the infamous crime against nature, committed with mankind or with any animal, is punishable by imprisonment in the State prison not less than one nor more than ten years."

Since the sections are short, I will also read two definitive, in-between ones that are pertinent to our subject:

"Section 287: Penetration sufficient to complete the crime. Any sexual penetration, however slight, is sufficient to complete the crime against nature.

"Section 288: (Crimes against children: Lewd or lascivious acts: Punishment.) Any person who shall wilfully and lewdly commit any lewd or lascivious act including any of the acts constituting other crimes provided for in part one of this code upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of a child under the age of fourteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires of such person or of such child, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be imprisoned in the State prison for a term of one year to life.

"Section 288a: (Sex perversions: Punishment.) Any person participating in the act of copulating the mouth of one person with the sexual organ of ano-

ther is punishable by imprisonment in the State prison for not exceeding fifteen years." This section read, as just quoted, until the last several sessions of the legislature, when to the above was added the following:

"... or by imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed one year; provided, however, whenever any person is found guilty of the offense specified herein, and it is charged and admitted or found to be true that he is more than 10 years older than his coparticipant in such an act, which coparticipant is under the age of 14, or that he has compelled the other's participation in such an act by force, violence, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily harm, he shall be punished by imprisonment in the State prison for not less than three years. The order of commitment shall expressly state whether a person convicted hereunder is more than 10 years older than his coparticipant and whether such coparticipant is under the age of 14. The order shall also state whether a person convicted hereunder has compelled coparticipation in his act by force, violence, duress, menace, or threat of great bodily harm. (Am. Stats, 1st Ex. Sess. 1950, ch. 56, Section 1; Stats. 1st Ex. Sess. 1952, ch. 23, Section 3; Stats. 1955, ch. 274, Section 1.)"

Section 288a was enacted by the legislature because one of our Supreme Court decisions<sup>(8)</sup> held that Section 286 covered only acts of pedication (both human and bestial) but did not cover fellatio.

When the first version of Section 288a was enacted in 1915, declaring fellatio and cunnilingus felonies, it was declared unconstitutional on two grounds: one, because our constitution requires all statutes be in the English language and, second, because it lacked a definite technical meaning, that is, it sometimes was used to refer to both the passive and the active party.<sup>(9)</sup>

Thus we have the present Section 288a, passed in 1921, which I just read. Its constitutionality has been upheld against the attack of vagueness and uncertainty.<sup>(10)</sup>

There are a few other code sections I should at least mention, for you should know of their existence. The legislature ten years ago added a provision<sup>(11)</sup> that all persons ever convicted of any type of sex offense must register with either the county sheriff or the local chief of police.

There are also the Welfare and Institution Code Sections<sup>(12)</sup> providing for the determination of sexual psychopaths and for their incarceration in State mental hospitals.

Next, we will look at enforcement of the penal statutes. After a police officer arrests the suspect the problem becomes one for the District Attorney, the county law officer having the responsibility of prosecuting violations of State statutes. If he thinks a prosecution under one of the felony sections I have just read is not indicated, for any one of several reasons, he still might issue a felony complaint on the reasoning that the defendant will thereby be induced to plead guilty to a misdemeanor, that is, a lesser charge. For example, prosecuting attorneys are generally willing to accept a plea of vagrancy (lewd vagrancy) when the act and circumstances do not involve children, public outrage or violence. The District Attorney's office often anticipates such an outcome and where the offenders are both mature men and the offense not too public, they will not file a felony complaint but will turn the matter over to the city prosecutor where a misdemeanor complaint or vagrancy complaint is issued.

Next we come to the trial courts. The philosophies of the trial judges are varied and they range all the way from ignorant leniency and ignorant savagery to the same views on punishment entertained by psychiatrists.

The final phase of judicial procedure is the appellate court. The California homosexual cases reported are surprisingly many. Not all questions, however, have been decided. For example, there is not a single reported female homosexual case.

Although the appellate courts have not construed the statutes with respect to female homosexuals, the prosecutors and the trial judges entertain no doubts on the equal applicability of the statutes and so apply it in the comparatively few female cases that arise.

Time limitations forbid more than a few glances at the considerable body of law on our subject that has been written by our reviewing courts:

First, proof of the act. In the absence of eye witnesses, it has been held that foreign substances such as sperm or fecal matter are proofs that support a judgment of conviction. Anal lacerations and foreign lubricants are not infrequently used as corroborative evidence.

Where eyewitnesses are used the usual criminal law rules with respect to accomplices apply. That is, the uncorroborated testimony of an unwilling partner will support a conviction, but the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice will not, as in all criminal cases, testimony of an accomplice must be corroborated to sustain a conviction. Who is an accomplice is a question for the jury under proper instruction from the court. A few years ago there were three important decisions on this point. Briefly, the cases held that ordinarily a child under 14 is not regarded as an accomplice.<sup>(13)</sup>

There is an appellate decision you may find interesting. It was a case involving three physicians, a case, I hasten to add, where the role of each physician was confined to that of expert witness. The defendant pleaded guilty and made an application for determination of sexual psychopathy. The court appointed a panel of three experts and they gave him a 2-1 decision. The trial court reached a conclusion opposite to that of the majority of the experts and the trial court's right to go counter to the experts was upheld by the reviewing court.<sup>(14)</sup>

We will look at one more phase of the subject before concluding. What is a violation? In a prosecution against the active party it is of course no defense<sup>(15)</sup> to show the passive party consented because the act itself is a crime. It is a crime like adultery, rather than rape or battery. However, it has some resemblances to rape, for neither requires proof of emission and in both there must be some proof of penetration, no matter how slight.

The problem of proof of penetration can perhaps best be illustrated by two recent cummilingus cases although each of these cases was based on a heterosexual incident. In one known as the Angier case<sup>(16)</sup> the court held: "The word copulation has never had the meaning of a mere contact. A mere contact, either by a licking or a kissing cannot be construed to mean a copulation." In the later, Coleman case<sup>(17)</sup> the conviction was upheld and the Angier case distinguished for the reason that in the Coleman case there was testimony that the act was continuous for a period of five to ten minutes. Logically, of course, the time element shouldn't be so important, but since these are the only reported cases in California, we should be grateful for at least this much guidance.

In concluding, I desire to point out that the courts generally try to give defendants in such cases, at least those who have no records on the particular or related sexual offenses, careful consideration. This is particularly true of the appellate courts who have stated on more than one occasion that they believe they should look very closely into the stenographic record of the trial, since the crime is an offense easily charged and difficult to defend, and because the proof is often based on testimony of accomplices, a type of testimony always to be regarded with suspicion.<sup>(18)</sup>

(Turn to Page 17 for Footnotes)

#### NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS:

All material (including art work) becomes the property of ONE and shall not be returned unless accompanied by a self-addressed return envelope bearing sufficient return postage.

# tangents

news & views

by dal mcintire

Pity the poor police of Pittsburgh. Their troubles are the mostest! Back in 1951, the whole Vice Squad was arrested (and disbanded) and 11 officers charged with perjury and obstructing justice when the grand jury uncovered their neat little racket of framing men on "morals charges" then arranging, through "cooperative" attorneys, to drop charges after "payments" were made.

Vice Squad boss Louis Morgan got a 3-1/2-to-7 year sentence in the County Workhouse, but served less than a year. His "right hand man," Patrolman Jack Soloff, served only 6 months for his 26 counts. Five were cleared, 1 after first being convicted. Three, Alan Tanser, Guy Russo and Martin Scanlon, were convicted, but began a long process of appeals, and meanwhile, showed up back on the force, despite public protests. Tanser was later also convicted of beating up a motorist, but even this didn't seem to affect his "fitness" for the force. After all, most of the original eleven were back.

This year, while Tanser, Russo and Scanlon were getting a rehearing before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, another Vice officer put the Department in hot water . . . . .

At six A.M. of a recent Sunday, Lt. Carnahan, head of the Vice-Dope Squad, was found shot in the thighs in a downtown club. Officials earlier had ordered the club closed at 3 A.M. despite the fact that "Police Superintendent James Slusser sometimes stopped in," as the POST-GAZETTE phrased it. Carnahan said he'd come in at 6 for coffee while bartenders and waiters were cleaning up — "I was working on something" — and accidentally shot himself while changing his gun from one pocket to the other. POST-GAZETTE described one of six persons said to be present as club's reputed part-owner, Frank Valenti, "widely known

racket figure." But soon the story began to get fuzzy. Some said there were twenty persons in the club at the time of the shooting. Officer Ted Walsh, who handled the "investigation" — in which no witnesses were questioned, no evidence taken, no report made — said he just happened by the club and looked in to see why it was open when he heard the shot. Another witness said scores of persons in the club saw the shooting, including a couple Ward politicians, and at least five police, including Officer Walsh. "When the shot was fired, it looked like the end of the Army-Notre Dame football game as the crowd scattered."

Carnahan finally named a girl (who'd already been seen by reporters), Shirley Cavanaugh, an alias-loaded, much-arrested prostitute, as having shot him. Her records had been removed from police files the day before. Harried police officials began to say, yes, they would consider bringing action for obstruction of justice. And Miss Cavanaugh came into headquarters for a cup of coffee — gave herself up. Carnahan, waiting for operation to remove the bullet, still didn't know how Shirley got hold of his gun. She said he'd been drunkenly waving it at her, she hit his hand, causing the shot. "He was my world," she said, "though he may not have treated me nice, I would never have harmed him." She admitted having had "more than business relations" with Carnahan. Her call-girl roommate also sang, saying Shirley gave regular tips on vice to Carnahan, and adding, "Shirley was always jealous of me if I talked to men too long."

The POST-GAZETTE editorialized, "TOO HOT TO HUSH UP . . . how come police officers — and allegedly there were several — were frequenting a private club which was violating the law by operating hours after it should have been closed? Why didn't the officers question wit-

nesses and arrest the woman who admits she was involved in the shooting? Why did police wait until newspapermen had found and questioned the woman before taking her into custody? The answer is, of course, that the police dread a scandal within the fraternity and will go to stupid lengths in an attempt to hush it up."

Next the cops had bookkeeping troubles when it was found some officers were on the payroll when they shouldn't have been - one, for instance, while accompanying Steelworker-boss David McDonald to Florida.

Carnahan was suspended, retroactive to the time of the shooting. The Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board threatened to examine the club's books.

Under pressure from the press, Police Supt. Slusser admitted that Carnahan had been frequently warned to stop chasing the Cavanaugh girl, and also admitted other Vice Squadders have frequently been seen in "expensive automobiles with well-known prostitutes." Veteran police said Shirley (and several other professional girls) had been threatening for months to "blow the lid off the vice squad."

Next, a woman charged Patrolman Louis Chiarelli with attacking her in a parking lot, while Patrolman George Smith sat in the patrol car with them. She also charged Lt. Stipanovich with attempting to "persuade" her not to bring charges and with attempting to influence the testimony of hospital officials who examined her for evidence of rape.

Meanwhile, back on the Carnahan case, charges flew in all directions. Who got a court order to get Shirley's roommate out of town? Who got Carnahan's clothes before they could be checked for bullet holes? Why was Shirley's apartment searched and her letters seized without a warrant? Who was responsible for the cover-up?

The State Supreme Court upheld the convictions of Tanser, Scanlon and

Russo - but the court also discovered that of the eleven policemen indicted in 1952, one Robert Leiner had never been brought to trial, and like most of the eleven, was still on the force. Another, also still on the force, had been convicted but never sentenced. Two days after the court upheld the five-year-old conviction (sentencing Tanser and Russo to 6-to-12 months each and Scanlan to 4) a Police Trial Board got around to considering the case - so the boys gracefully resigned from the force. A week later Attorney Albert Martin was disbarred by judges of the Common Pleas Court for "unprofessional, unethical and reprehensible conduct" in handling 138 of the morals cases with the old Vice Squad. Martin was charged with promising to "fix" cases, with bribing officers to change their testimony, and with influencing defendants to give false testimony. Action on the disbarment had been pending for well over a year, and when it came, Lawyer Martin had long since suffered a heart attack and returned to Miami.

In passing, we wonder how soon Tanser, Russo and Scanlon will be back on the force? As for Vice-cop Carnahan and his girl Shirley, well, they still have a long way to run . . . . .

#### COMMENTS

In a speech to Child Study Assn of America, Dr. Janey Rioch warned of dangers in changing family relations, predicted, "We are drifting toward a social structure made up of he-women and she-men." . . . Anthropologist Margaret Mead said recently family-conscious American men have so lost the spirit of adventure, that they would turn down better jobs to avoid minor dislocations for their children. But their concern does not extend to community's needs. "The idea seems to be to have four to eight children, preferably as close together as possible, and then to spend considerable time wiping their noses, changing their diapers and so on." . . . . . Professor Dr. Donald McNassor of Claremont Graduate School, interviewing high schoolers, found most

American adolescents feel art is "feminine," and wouldn't be caught dead "drawing flowers on a vase." He said America is the only country where art is felt to be unmasculine. A Milwaukee bachelor sued Frommes Method Hair & Scalp Specialists for \$1,000,000 damages because of extreme & embarrassing enlargement of his breasts, which specialists told him came from estrogen hormones rubbed into his scalp, in hopes of reducing a bald spot. Ridicule of fellow workers had forced him to quit his job. Frommes spokesmen said they hadn't heard of any other case reacting that way to their treatments. . . . . 31 men arrested in raid of St. Mark's Baths in New York. Charged with disorderly conduct for sex acts. Four, pleading guilty, fined \$10 to \$25. Others to trial. NY POST reports, "Cops Padlock Baths After Vice Raid." Reader tells us place open next day.

#### THE LAWS

A recent resolution from the American Civil Liberties Union on HOMOSEXUALITY & CIVIL LIBERTIES, read, in part: "It is not within the province of the Union to evaluate the social validity of laws aimed at the suppression or elimination of homosexuals . . . however . . . homosexuals, like members of other socially heretical or deviant groups, are more vulnerable than others to official persecution, denial of due process in prosecution, and ENTRAPMENT . . . We will support the defense of such cases that come to our attention. Some local laws require registration when they enter the community of persons who have been convicted of a homosexual act. Such . . . laws . . . are in our opinion unconstitutional. We will support efforts for their repeal or proper legal challenge of them.

The A.C.L.U. has previously decided that homosexuality is a valid consideration in evaluating the security risk factor in sensitive positions . . . . "One question: Would it be within the province of the Union to evaluate the social validity of laws aimed at the suppression or elimination of Negroes, Jews, or Jehovah's Witnesses? Of course it would. Then why not homosexuals?"

From the NY POST (courtesy NY Public Relations Chapter of the Mattachine Society) an item on workings of New Jersey's Sex Offenders Law since its passage 6 years ago: Dr. Paul Tappan, former chairman of Fed. Parole Bd., criticized the strict and hysterical sex laws enacted in 20 other states since 1935 and praised the N. J. plan allowing parole in most cases. Sex offenders are examined by psychiatrists, then recommended either for parole, or for commitment to a mental institution for a period not to exceed the prison term they might otherwise have received. Commitment comes in cases where the offense is likely to be repeated, or where it is marked by violence, or involves a person under 15. Sodomy being one of the included "offenses," it still remains questionable whether the mental institution can generally cure those judged likely to repeat the "offense." . . . . .

American Law Institute's 34th Annual Meeting in Wash., May 22-25 expected to consider Tentative Draft #6 of their Model Penal Code which will ultimately be submitted to Congress and State Legislatures. Copies of Drafts #1-4 available from Institute at \$6.50. This contains their historic recommendations on relaxation of law on sodomy.

#### ABOUT OUR AUTHORS -

RUTH M. FRIEDMAN was born in a little white house on a hill, the year Lindbergh made his famous flight. "Which may account, somewhat," she says, "for my being usually in the clouds." She writes us that "life" has educated her and "it is NOT a parochial school. I invent stories," says she, "that reveal the various ghettos of it (life), in hopes to have them abolished like slums."

He's got neurotic eyes



D.F.

by Ruth M. Friedman

"But I'm not ABOUT to undermine the propriety of the old school, Dad. All I said was . . ."

"No!" Swanson held up the protest like a shield. "Who do you keep company with that you use words like this in your mother's house! What . . ."

"Nonsense!" Ken sprang from his chair at the same time pushing his hands into his hip pockets. "We're living in a modern world, Dad, in a . . ."

"Aren't you letting the word get away from you, Kendall? Using it as an excuse to strip decency bare?"

"If decency is decency, it cannot be stripped bare! And on the contrary we're learning how not to grovel in our thoughts; how not to sneak behind the phony morals we call prudery. We're learning . . ."

"Where in hell are you learning all this . . . who teaches you?"

"Look! Dad!" Each word was divisible; a plea and a command. Ken began to pace. "That's what psych is, a ground in which we've yet to explore and discover. Homosexuality is just another . . ."

"I say don't use that . . . that PHRASE in my house!"

"That's what I mean," Ken said, "you get on this discussion kick, then you stop me when we've hardly started. You've asked me what my thesis was to be and I told you. If you really want me to be a doctor you'll just have to let me go about it in my own way."

"All right, Kendall, all right." Swanson put his match to a cigar and puffed rapidly as though he feared the boy would leave the room before he'd had it lit. When he had the cigar going Swanson watched the burning tip for a moment, biding his time.

He grated his throat and cleared his nose; an obscenely impressive gesture characteristic of him. It was a potential spitting out or a thing preparatory to it; a pronounced masculinity among the boys.

"Kendall, it's not only our father-son relationship. We've been friends and I'm sincerely interested in what you do and your progress."

"Yeh, Dad, then let's not put it on your lawyer-client basis." He approached his Dad, put his hand on the round, obese shoulder that had begun to sag in the last few months. "There's more to it than meets the eye." Ken began to pace slowly once more, like thought circling an idea, searching for the right word.

"It's just that I don't get it," Swanson said. "I don't understand."

"Of course! Why didn't I think of it before?" Ken swooped the ottoman from the floor; brought it close to his dad's chair and straddled it. "There's no way for me to introduce you to this thing I'm studying without cramming you with the three years I've had of it. But, . . . look," Ken leaned forward anxiously pointing to his index finger. Swanson glanced at the finger heedlessly for a moment. "Why don't I have you meet Tom?" The question was half speculation.

"Tom?"

"Sure. One of the fellows in my class; an A-1 psych major and an admitted homo . . ." he stopped, smiled, " . . . homophile."

"You mean here?"

"Where else? I'm meeting him and a couple other fellows tomorrow night. We're going to a lecture up town. I could have Tom meet me here. You may have a few questions to ask him."

Swanson rose quickly from his chair; rolled the cigar in his mouth.

"Kendall, I'm expecting the Hamilton boy in town sometime this week, the son of one of my best clients. A Yale boy."

"So?"

"Well, I . . . I just don't want to have them meeting, that's all."

"Eeee-gad!" Ken slipped off the stool frontways, turned, flopped into the chair still warm by his father. "Tom is quite human, I'm going to school, Dad. There are people in school. They're going to be my business, Dad."

"Hog wash," Swanson thrust the slang at him. "What do you think being a lawyer is, a dog keeper?"

"Then let's put it this way, people are not only my business, they're my art, too. And, Dad, if you can't understand . . ."

"All right, all RIGHT!" Swanson lunged at an ashtray and stabbed the cigar into it. Ken's half-uttered ultimatum sounded too final. "When is this lecture, you say?"

Ken grinned; it was a visible sigh. "Tomorrow night," he said.

After dinner the following evening, Swanson sat down in the living room, awaiting his visitor. Sometimes being a father seemed too much, he reflected moodily. Though affirming to himself that he would never go the side of modernism, he was resolved to keep his close-knit ties with Kendall so far as possible, and determined to meet him half-way. But this was becoming more and more difficult, he thought, what with the beginning of his boy's college career, and his own increasing preoccupation with his profession.

"Dear," his wife's voice, though soft, plunged into the midst of these musings like a stone thrown into quiet waters.

"Yes? Mrs. Swanson?"

"You needn't look so far away. It will all be right. After all, you wanted to know this thing better."

"I don't see how meeting one of these . . . these BOOBS can give me the knowledge . . ."

"Understanding, perhaps, is what Kendall means, dear."

"But I know too well what they're like! Every school has its character. Why, the one we had . . ."

"I don't approve any more than you do, dear," said Mrs. Swanson, "about this new schooling . . . but perhaps . . ."

The chimes arrested the thought. She looked apprehensively at her husband while the maid answered the door.

"Mr. Tom," the maid said, laconically.

Mr. Swanson rose quickly, a little too quickly, he thought, and made slower his approach. He held out his hand. "Good to see you, my boy," said he, and was immediately sorry for the tone that may have sounded too affectionate. At the same time he felt aware of the too gentle clasp of the hand in his. He released the hand quickly. "Ah, we were expecting you," he said.

"Yes, I know," said Tom, a bit nervously, it seemed. He wore glasses as though he had elected to wear them. Nevertheless, Swanson had to admit to himself the boy was good looking. But they all are, he thought, and even as he thought it he wondered exactly who "they" were.

"Kendall should . . . ah . . . be along any minute now." He glanced at his watch. "Confound that boy . . . went out for cigarettes more than half an hour ago. You modern college people, always on the move . . . ah . . . oblivious of everything." He grated his throat, cleared his nose.

"Plenty of time for grim reality," Tom laughed.

Swanson's antennae were out and though he had to strain for that part of the laughter that betrayed the homosexual, he felt sure he was able to when the laughter subsided and that part of it managed to ring clear in Swanson's mind. "This is . . . ah . . . Mrs. Swanson, Tom. You should . . . ah . . . get along famously."

After the usual exchange of greetings, Mrs. Swanson asked Tom if he had eaten.

"Yes, ma'am, indeed I have."

Indeed I have! mocked the words in Swanson's mind, like thumb to nose.

"Tell me," Swanson said, "ah . . . how do you like college?"

"A fine place for learning, sir," Tom said and laughed so hard at his joke that Swanson could FEEL the innuendo.

"It's nothing like the good old days," Swanson said, watching the boy relentlessly. "Used to have a hell of a time." (He thought he'd rough it up a little, shock the little delicate.) "Take those damned crazy racoon coats we used to wear. Everybody wore them. Today most of the boys wouldn't be caught dead in one." He watched the boy shift from one foot to the other. His hands were clasped before him. "Ah . . . sit down, sit down, Tom."

"Racoon coats would be a panic," Tom said as he took to Swanson's suggestion. "They'll come back again, no doubt about it. After all, look at all the female fads that've come back from the gay twenties."

Swanson wondered if the boy thought him a fool. He poured himself a drink. It was NOT to steady his nerves, he told himself. "Ah . . . drink?" Swanson said, suppressing the urge to throw it at the boy, decanter and all.

"Never touch it, thanks," Tom said, "only at parties, and THEN only as a mouth wash to smell like the others."

"Yes, like the others," Swanson muttered, "Too . . . ah . . . strong for you?" Swanson hoped his affront had not gone unnoticed.

"Not that, sir," Tom said. "That is, not exactly. You see, I've got a kidney condition, and . . ."

"Confound . . . where IS that boy!" And confound this pretty-boy-floy.

He knew it wasn't Kendall by the sound of the chimes that followed this thought, because Ken carried his own key.

"Mr. Tom, Mr. Swanson," said the maid presently, leaving to their bewilderment a tall, bronze-looking fellow with a boyish grin.

"Hi," he said, "I'm Tom."

Good God, thought Swanson as he approached the boy, hand outstretched, a smile artfully hiding his distress. He was not comforted by the friendly hand pressure vigorously given him. "Of course, of course, we've been expecting you, son." Thomas Hamilton II, he thought, but why NOW? "Delighted to have you. This is Mrs. Swanson. Mrs. Swanson, this is Tom. You know." There was a pause where a wink might have fitted if none but Mrs. Swanson would have seen. "The young fellow I told you about," he said.

"Ah . . . drink, Tom?"

"Could use one, Mr. Swanson, pretty chilly outside."

"Sure," Swanson said, "do you good . . . put hair on your chest." He hoped as he said it that the other boy got the implication.

"Dear . . ." Mrs. Swanson called from the vestibule to which she'd retired a moment before. Swanson mixed the drink carefully, excused himself and went out to Mrs. Swanson. "Yes?"

"Where do you think that boy of ours is?" she whispered nervously. "He's been gone almost an hour now."

"I don't know, but wherever he is I've got to get back in there with THEM. Something might be said . . . might . . . might go wrong!"

"Dear, aren't you making too much of this . . . this thing?"

"Too MUCH, you say! Why, my whole reputation hinges on it! I've got to get back in there and . . ."

She clutched his coat-sleeve. "But he doesn't LOOK that type," she said.

"Type? TYPE!" he said. "Who said there was a type? All I know is he's got neurotic eyes. Even if he'd taken a drink I could still tell. He's got those blasted neurotic . . ."

"Hi, Dad," Ken bounded into the vestibule. "Tom here yet?"

"You!" Swanson turned to him. "Of COURSE he's here and so's the Hamilton boy."

"Sorry, Dad, had car trouble. If I'd stopped to call you I'd have been delayed that much longer."

"Well, come on, let's get in there." Swanson led the way hurriedly.

"Hello, Tom, Sorry I'm late." Ken was standing by the tall, bronzed fellow with the boyish grin, and was apparently addressing him, as far as Swanson could tell. The two boys shook hands.

"Wha . . . ? I . . . but . . ." Swanson turned to the earlier, bespectacled guest. "Mr. Hamilton?" he said, tentatively. "You Mr. Hamilton?"

"Yes, sir, Tom Hamilton II. Sorry I didn't make it more clear when I came in. But I thought you knew. My dad . . ."

"Yes, yes I know, boy," Swanson said, hurried with irritation.

"Dad, I hate to make it short like this," Ken said, "but that lecture's almost started and Tom and I've . . ."

"Certainly, yes, certainly," Swanson said. "You just go right ahead."

Excusing themselves to Thomas Hamilton II, the Swansons accompanied the boys to the door. When the door was closed behind them, Swanson turned to his wife. "Doesn't seem like a bad chap. Reminds me of our boy somewhat. I mean . . . Bah." It was a mental shrug. "What's it to us."

"Come on, Mrs. Swanson, let's get back and entertain that young man in there who's queer for racoon coats." He grated his throat, cleared his nose, and stalked impressively into the room.

#### References: (Continued from Page 10)

- (1) G. Legman, in his Glossary to Henry's SEX VARIANTS, Vol. II, ascribes the origination to Binkert.
- (2) Dr. A. W. Herzog, "Medical Jurisprudence", p. 570
- (3) Herzog, Ibid p. 565
- (4) "Studies in the Psychology of Sex," Vol. on Sexual Inversion, p. 343
- (5) "Studies in the Psychology of Sex," Vol. on Sexual Inversion, p. 343
- (6) Ellis, Ibid, p. 350
- (7) Jahrbuch fur sexuelle Zwischenstufen, April, 1913
- (8) 116 Cal. 658
- (9) 129 Cal. 581
- (10) 82 C.A. 17
- (11) P.C. Sec. 290
- (12) W. & I. Sec. 5500, 5502, 5512
- (13) 74 C.A. (2) 270  
(Cf. 103 Cal. 508)
- (14) 75 C.A. (2) 907
- (15) 164 Cal. 143 (people v. Dong Pok Yip.)
- (16) 44 C.A. (2) 417
- (17) 53 C.A. (2) 18
- (18) 103 Cal. 508

## one Bound Volumes

With Index, in Red Buckram, Gold Lettering  
VOLUME III (1955) & VOLUME IV (1956).  
NOW AVAILABLE AT \$5.50 EACH

For special side-stitch binding, allowing pages to open flat, add \$1.00 per volume

## As for me . . .

Few "As For Me" items have evoked as much response as the letter to "Dear Joe . . ." printed in the February, 1957 issue. Following are two of the replies: —

### To Joe's Advising Friend

"But love held me back," you wrote. Love has held us all back at one time or another, whatever our opinions of homosexuality. The more we love the more reluctant we are to offend the beloved. I wonder how well you knew the "Joes" you passed in restaurants, bars, etc., or was this a manner of speaking? If you got no closer than that, you didn't get very close, did you? In effect, you advised "Joe" to try to change his sexual inclinations. You gave the usual reasons except that you left out God and morality. I grant that there is much truth and force in your argument: Yes, it is a heterosexual world, and homosexuals will meet with ostracism in some form and some degree. This ostracism gives them the opportunity to become true individuals; but few would deny that if something is gained, something is also lost. Those on the borderline would do better to step across on the heterosexual side, if they could. If this can be accomplished by the power of will — then good.

But you, "adviser," who also have the "disease" and who, very likely, HAVE seen a doctor, brought to your argument a concept familiar but of doubtful validity. No, I don't mean the one about what is natural and what is freakish, although that one is doubtful too. I mean the one about homosexuality being a stop this side of maturity. If you had written, "this side of conformity," you would have made a true statement. We would generally agree what "conformity" means and would agree that in certain essentials the homosexual does not conform. But you cannot equate "maturity" with "conformity." If the word, "maturity," has any meaning, it has such within the terms of an individual life. That peach, or you, or I, reach or do not reach maturity. It is not the orchard or the community that reaches maturity. And who knows what is maturity for another? Sure, our bodies reach maturity; but what about our minds, spirits, and souls? When and how do they reach maturity?

It is my opinion that no one knows this, about himself or about others. All we can say is, "I think Joe is more mature than he used to be," or "I think I am more mature than I used to be." Suppose that homosexuality is a fixation that occurs in adolescence, it might be sexual maturity for some. And I hardly need to add that sexuality, except the most gross, is not merely a matter of the physical.

No, "adviser," do not pity your lost brothers; for, if they know their own souls, they are not wholly lost, even though they stumble into blind alleys. And I think, "adviser," that you know your soul but you have denied it.

Ric

P. S. If, advising friend, YOU are the doctor "Joe" should see, good luck with your patients. But if you are, as you allege, one faltering between the worlds, have courage — whichever road you take, it will not be as bad as you think.

Dear Anonymous:

Yes, I bought ONE.

I bought it for the same reason I buy the trade journals of my occupation. It stimulates my thoughts; it prevents my thinking from crystallizing in the same old grooves; it balances the preponderantly heterosexual attitudes of my

friends and associates.

A thousand forces have had a part in shaping me — not only in regard to my homosexuality but also in respect to others of my qualities. Society is undoubtedly one of these forces. But society is not something apart from and opposed to my hopes, strivings and desperations — or yours. We each have a part, unidentifiable perhaps, but a part nevertheless, in shaping our society. If I refrain from casting my vote against what I believe is untenable in our Society, I am doing it and myself a great injustice. The vote is in and the administration is heterosexual. But the other parties are not going to sit back and wait to be elected, nor will they abandon their ideals.

Science understands some of the forces you mention. Science also misunderstands some of them. Many truths masquerade as superstitions, and some "superstitions" are true. Science is NOT infallible, and just because a scientist asserts a fact it is not necessarily true. Don't misunderstand me. I have a hearty respect for science. I am, indeed, a scientist in my work. But I am also aware of the limitations of science.

The doctor I went to knows a lot of unhappy heterosexuals, too. I am homosexual and reasonably happy. I know other happy homosexuals. We are not ALL unhappy, although most of us have been at some time or another. Our unhappiness was our misunderstanding about ourselves and our loneliness, our alienation from ourselves. Many of us have learned to accept ourselves without feelings of shame, degradation and guilt. Like one reader of this magazine, we are willing to "stand up and be counted." Only, however, when it is not going to hurt those who are dear to us. It was only after this happened to me that I was able to sustain sincere friendships with those of the opposite sex. You can't accept others lovingly until you accept yourself with love.

I am glad you refrained from allowing your passion to drive you toward me in public rest rooms, theaters and on the street. I should have sharply rejected you and, perhaps, hurt you; I don't spell my life "s-e-x"; I spell it "l-o-v-e." I love my work. I love my friends. I love my companion. I love my parents. I love to eat. I love to sleep. I love to be awake. I love to think things out my own way. I love all these things and one is as important as the other.

Our search is difficult. But I refuse to admit that it is futile.

A Friend of Joe.

"When love beckons to you, follow him,  
Though his ways are hard and steep.  
And when his wings enfold you yield to him,  
Though the sword hidden among his pinions may wound you.  
And when he speaks to you believe in him,  
Though his voice may shatter your dreams as the  
north wind lays waste the garden.

"For even as love crowns you so shall he crucify you.  
Even as he is for your growth, so is he for your pruning.  
Even as he ascends to your height and caresses your  
tenderest branches that quiver in the sun,  
So shall he descend to your roots and shake them in  
their clinging to the earth.

"All these things shall love do unto you that you may  
know the secrets of your heart, and in that knowledge  
become a fragment of Life's heart."

(An excerpt from "The Prophet," by Kahlil Gibran, appended to the above letter, and here quoted in part by request.)

BANNED BOOKS - - - - - Anne Lyon Haight  
R. R. Bowker Co., 1955 - - Paper covered, \$75, Cloth covered, \$4.00

While many people who know the value of literature (authors, teachers, librarians & booksellers) have been trying to lead the rest of us to an appreciation of books, there has been at the same time another group of people, the censors, who are trying to limit our access to knowledge.

In the past, books have been censored largely on the grounds of heresy, treason, or obscenity. This has placed under forfeit such books as the Bible, Shakespeare's THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, Paine's THE RIGHTS OF MAN, Mrs. Stowe's UNCLE TOM'S CABIN, Marx's DAS KAPITAL, Joyce's ULYSSES, Caldwell's TOBACCO ROAD, and Kathleen Winsor's FOREVER AMBER, to name only a very few.

Mrs. Haight has gathered in this revised edition of BANNED BOOKS a discussion of censorship, statements on the Freedom of the Press, Court decisions, Postal Laws, and finally a bibliographic check list.

Mrs. Haight does not discuss homosexuality as a separate issue and yet implicit in everything said about censorship is the right to study, discuss, and write books on this subject, a right which would certainly be drastically curtailed if the censors had their way.

This book should be owned by everyone who writes or reads.

J. F. W.

ROAD OF NO REGRETS - - - - - Joseph de Pelissero  
Greenwich Book Publishers, NYC, 1956 - \$3.00

Out of a short bookful of highly-romanticized characters, the most unbelievable of all is "Jeffy," the hero himself. A middle-aged, homosexual ex-butler, left with affluent means by a deceased employer, he bounces from pinnacle to pinnacle of effervescent bliss as his young beloved, Adrian, plunges in and out of far-flung romances. "Jeffy" sits at home, for the most part, nourishing grand schemes for his lover's business and domestic career, apparently content with vicarious pleasures derived from the latter's adventures. The plot ends on a high note of felicity, as Jeffy watches his Adrian getting happily married to the daughter of a business associate.

The writer's style is florid, tiresome, incredibly refined, and oozing with Victorian sentimentalism. The book is subtitled, "A Novel of the Homosexual in our Culture." If this is an accurate description, then may every budding homosexual read ROAD OF NO REGRETS and be advised

Robert Gregory

THE SPANISH GARDENER - - - - - A. J. Cronin  
Little, Brown & Co., 1950 - \$3.00

The boy, Nicholas, is the central figure of this tender and beautiful story, but his vain, tyrannical father, and the warm, smiling youth, Jose, are jewels of characterization. Subtle homophile overtones permeate this triangle of personalities, as Nicholas is torn between filial obedience and affection, and his blossoming devotion to "the Spanish gardener."

Much pathos is woven into the intricate turns of the plot, and no reader could fail to be deeply touched by the tragedy which finally overtakes Jose at the hands of the jealous father. THE SPANISH GARDENER is a book of deep and delicate insight, a "must" for all readers who know how to treasure a gem of character portrayal.

Robert Gregory

(See listings elsewhere for titles available through ONE Book Service.)

LETTERS

The views expressed here are those of the writers. ONE's readers cover a wide range of geographical, economic, age, and educational status. This department aims to express this diversity.



Gentlemen:

I think that your organization . . . is doing a fine work in the field of education. Your publications are most interesting and instructive. I have no doubt that your research department is developing properly. The idea of social service to the homophile minority is also a most important thing. I can think of no group more in need of such service.

I enjoyed your latest book, HOMOSEXUALS TODAY - 1956, very much. It was most informative. All the material I receive from your organization . . . I pass on to parties which may be interested in behalf of spreading education concerning the entire problem of the homophile.

MR. B.  
Portland, Ore.

Friends:

Having read your magazine many times while living in NYC, I have been thankful for the light you bring to the dark truth of serious relationships within the same sex.

ONE has done a remarkable work. Literature and courageous reporting can pave the way for a new and better man. It may be a long time, but I believe he will arrive. Good luck.

MR. W.  
Columbus, Ohio

Gentlemen:

When certain homosexuals are sick people, it is because they live in a society which does not recognize their particular type. They are innocent victims of a society just emer-

ging from the dark ages as regards sex.

The Swiss magazine, The Circle, handled the question of so-called 'cures' claimed by two doctors not so many months ago. The matter was brought before an international medical conference of one sort or another, if I remember correctly, but other doctors discussed the question also, & the general conclusion seemed to be that the 'cured' individuals were not bona fide homosexuals in the first place.

I can understand how an individual with both homosexual and heterosexual tendencies fairly evenly developed could be induced under suggestion to suppress the homosexual & stress the heterosexual, thus evolving a 'cure.'

But let us see that doctor take an adult whose heterosexual rudiments are vestigial and effect said cure. I know of at least one individual who wasted five years and lots of money in psychoanalysis trying to do much as described, and he remains,

Yours truly,

MR. J.  
Waterbury, Conn.

Dear Sirs:

I admire the apparently open frankness associated with your work, especially in the face of what is most certainly strong outside pressures. Establishing a unified 'place under the sun' may not prove to be possible in the present culture; that is, we accept the 'right' to organize for common ideals in occupation, religion, education, recreation, and a thousand others. But the right, so-called, to unify for the expression of a common sexual drive is both foreign and dangerous on many sides.

I do hope that at least a representative part of the contacts that you have obviously established do not go unknown to those persons, both private and institutional, interested in this field and its multiphasic problems. It is highly probable that you sit on a wealth of useful and desirable material.

DR. C.  
Memphis, Tenn.

Dear Sir:

A propos of the review of the Spanish translation of FABRIZIO LUPO by one Carlo Coccioli. It is not very reassuring about Mr. Coccioli's general educational and cultural level to find him concluding that a book whose original title is "Fabrizio Lupo" was originally written in French!! Good God, didn't any of you people on the route from his typewriter to your printing press catch such an absurd mistake?

MR. G.  
New York City

EDITOR'S NOTE:

Good God indeed!!

Mr. Coccioli is the AUTHOR, not the translator of the book in question. Translation was by Aurelio Garzon del Camino, and all circumstances were stated plainly in our review.

In the preface to the Spanish Edition, which is the only one available right now, Mr. Coccioli himself says that the original and first printing of FABRIZIO LUPO was in French. Our reviewer made no mention of the language in which the manuscript was written; but the name, Fabrizio Lupo, could be written the same in practically any Western language - at least in those under discussion.

D. S.

Dear Editors of ONE:

Regarding your Dec. 1956 issue: I don't know about Mr. "H" of Los Angeles, but I do not wish to be known as a capital "H" homosexual or a capital "L" lesbian. While I am not ashamed of being either of these sometimes-epithets - a small "h" or "l" will do, thank you.

I do not consider my sexual activity or preference to be the most important single aspect of by being. I should think being a PERSON and a RESPONSIBLE CITIZEN would come first on any man's list of idealistic objectives.

In closing - would suggest that I am suspicious of any who consider themselves capital-anythings except for the personal pronoun "I" or their personal names. All else is adjectival to that.

MISS S.  
Los Angeles, Calif.

Dear Madame:

Recently the June, 1954 copy of your publication came into my hands, and I noted with interest that your magazine was tackling an issue, long overdue.

I suppose it goes without saying that the general public, still heavily weighted with ignorance and prejudice, is not yet prepared to enter into any really objective consideration of the so-called "problem" of homosexuality. I find, however, for my own sake as well as for those in my parish who require sympathetic and enlightened guidance, that I must face this issue squarely and honestly, recognizing a situation or condition that does exist and which cannot be happily ignored any longer.

From casual yet careful examination I find that there is a tendency for the "Gay" world to seek for an existence of its own. This, no doubt, has been the natural result of the development of a sense of persecution and must be sympathetically understood. But something tells me that this cannot be allowed to become an end in itself. I am hoping to find some basis upon which the homosexual can live a full and respected existence; indeed life, and the articles in your publication, lead me to believe that my hopes are by no means in isolation, but on the contrary are dreams shared by many others.

REV. A.  
Ontario, Canada

Dear Friends:

The name of Prince Eulenburg was spelled wrong in your last two issues (for 1956). Hirschfeld quotes an author on homosexual themes "Eulenburg", but the friend of the Kaiser is "Eulenburg."

MR. H.  
Washington, D. C.

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The reader is entirely correct.

Lyn Pedersen



Notices and reviews of books, articles, plays and poetry dealing with homosexuality and the sex variant. Readers are invited to send in reviews or printed matter for review.

NEW TITLES

- ROAD OF NO REGRETS - by Joseph de Pelissero, Greenwich Book Publishers, NYC ..... \$3.00  
A must for the sentimentalists. The middle-aged homosexual hero rejoices in the eventual marriage of his young lover, Adrian, to the beautiful daughter of a business associate.
- THE LAST OF THE WINE - by Mary Renault, Pantheon ..... \$4.50  
A remarkable recreation of ancient Greece by the author of THE CHARIOTEER. "It is remarkable that a woman is able to write with such intensity and . . . wealth of intimate detail about the lives and loves of homosexual men." - Luther Allen
- GIOVANNI'S ROOM, by James Baldwin, Dial ..... \$3.00  
An example of elegant & sound workmanship by the author of last year's success, GO TELL IT ON THE MOUNTAIN.
- SOMEWHERE BETWEEN THE TWO, by Jay Little, Pageant Press ..... \$4.50  
This new novel does not fulfill the expectations aroused by Mr. Little's first book, MAYBE TOMORROW. However, it is completely daring and spicy.
- THIN ICE, by Compton Mackenzie, Chatto & Windus, London ..... \$3.00  
A psychological novel of greatest interest - a brilliant political and social study - should be read by everyone.
- HOMOSEXUALS TODAY - Organizations and Publications, ONE, Inc., \$3.00  
A guide to more than twenty organizations and publications for homosexuals - an unprecedented volume giving names, addresses, memberships, fields of emphasis, and biographical data (where available). This unique venture in the history of homosexual publishing includes information never before presented in any systematic compilation.

ACTIVE BACK TITLES

- THE SPANISH GARDENER - by A. J. Cronin, Little Brown ..... \$3.00  
In this novel, Dr. Cronin has portrayed a man at the mercy of his own vanity. This man's son is the victim of his doting parent until the Spanish gardener opens for the boy vistas of a freer, healthier, happier life.
- WIND WOMAN - by Carol Hales, Woodford Press ..... \$3.00  
This novel tells the story of beautiful Laurel Dean. Laurel was "different."

REMITTANCE MUST ACCOMPANY ALL ORDERS

Add 20 cents for shipping costs, tax in California.

ADDRESS: ONE, Inc., Book Department, 232 S. Hill St., Los Angeles 12.

THE COHAN COLLECTION ENRICHES THE LIBRARY

A large collection of several thousand books and newspaper/magazine clippings from the library of the home of David Cohan has been received.

The cataloging of this library will take months of work. Included among the items are known to be a set of the works of Wilde, some old volumes of Whitman, a complete set of KEYHOLE, and many recent novels, hardback and paperback.

