

*Lili Unicez* 50¢

# THE HOMOSEXUAL CITIZEN

---

- NEWS OF CIVIL LIBERTIES
- AND SOCIAL RIGHTS
- FOR HOMOSEXUALS

MARCH 1966



# Table of Contents

VOL. 1 NO. 3

## WASHINGTON SECTION

Editorial	3
The Homosexual and the Psychoanalyst	4
Newsfronts	9
Straight from the Shoulder	10
Security Clearances for Homosexual Citizens	12
Viewpoints	13

## FLORIDA SECTION

Editorial	15
A Challenge to Hate Mongers	16
A Question of Values	17

Copyright © by The Homosexual Citizen, 1966.

All rights reserved. No part of the text in this publication may be used without the written permission of the organization under whose section heading it appears.

Published by:

THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

Post Office Box 1032  
Washington, D.C. 20013

### Editorial Staff

Lily Hansen, Editor  
William Denton, Circulation Mgr.  
Richard Clark, Distribution Mgr.



THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF FLORIDA, INC.

Post Office Box 301  
Miami, Florida 33101

### Editorial Staff

Robert C. Hayden, Editor  
Richard A. Inman

THE HOMOSEXUAL CITIZEN is published monthly. Subscriptions available at \$5 per year. Copies are mailed in plain sealed envelope. Send your subscription fee to the organization of your choice.

# WASHINGTON SECTION

## Editorial

### A Magnificent Impatience

It was the philosopher Voltaire who raised the battle cry: "Crush the Infamous Thing!" He meant, "Wipe out the horror of man's inhumanity to man! Strike down the slimy walls of false human divisions!" He meant this militant cry with every fiber of his being.

It was a cry of urgency, a cry which bespoke the lateness of the hour -- and the fierce impatience which he felt at the spectacle of injustice. It is a cry which surges through the soul of every man who is stirred to his depths at the sight of great human misery -- at the horrid, unnecessary, ceaseless erosion of human dignity and human happiness. It is a cry of empathy -- of identification with the sufferings of people who are in bondage and whose lives and livelihoods are threatened by the State, whose minds are thwarted by superstitious lies and taboos, and who must live under the sword of Damocles in constant fear.

Voltaire threw himself headlong into the battle for individuality, for justice and for equal rights. He was not an applauding spectator who poured the salve of talk-without-action on human problems. He was thoroughly INVOLVED in the sufferings of the people whom he protected. He identified with their sufferings as he worked tirelessly to ease their pain. This gave to him the magnificent gift of impatience and he plunged the dagger of his indignant wrath into the very heart of inhumanity and prejudice.

We need more Voltaires today. We need men who can transcend their identifications as heterosexuals or homosexuals and who can see, in all its myriad reflections, the damnable evil which lies curled in the midst of injustice and inequality. We need men who are not content to let time take care of problems. Time, if we let it, will take care of everything very effectively -- but not with kindness, not with humanity. We need men who refuse to throw the burden of injustice onto the so-called tides of history and who will not succumb to the tragic notion that things take care of themselves. They should be men who will not be content to let "authorities and officials" decide their fate and the fate of millions of others, and who are not cowed by high-sounding titles and by uniforms or official documents.

Prejudice and discrimination are not words. They are facts. They are hard, vicious, cruel, heartless realities. We need men, like Voltaire, who are not content to sit and study graphs, to read anthologies, to listen to research papers. Ah yes! We need these men too, and we need them badly. But we must never forget that while we sit at conference tables debating the nature of sexual orientation or listening to a discussion about various psychiatric opinions, that a young man is returning somewhere to his home, carrying with him an undesirable discharge which will blight the remainder of his life. And while we are spending years doing research, let us remember every minute that an otherwise kind mother has recoiled somewhere from her child, showing signs of horror and revulsion, brought on by her unquestioning acceptance of society's taboos. While we study graphs and compute percentages, let us not



4  
forget that all over America, in offices both large and small, there are millions of homosexual workers -- plain and kind people -- people who do good jobs and spend years in the service of their firms, and who fear every day the loss of their livelihoods through evil suspicion or unexpected exposure.

When men remember these facts; when they realize that honest human beings are forced into hypocrisy and neurotic fear, they too may cry: "Crush the Infamous Thing!" They should move with care, however. They should not rush forth blindly without strategy and without plan. But let them be blessed with a magnificent impatience!

Many will realize that we are in the midst of a vast liberal movement within our own country and throughout the world. But as the history of social change has shown, a period of deacceleration may set in. Now we are caught up in the sweep of movements to free oppressed people. But when the dust settles, we must be braced for a period of reaction to permit consolidation. The public, for the most part, can only endure so much stress and changing of values. If a reactionary period is on the distant horizon -- or even closer -- it is best that we "make hay while the sun shines." If we are to take advantage of the current enlightenment, the timing of our strategy will be crucial to the success of the homophile movement. We must move forward then, in responsible and firm resolve to equalize the status of the homosexual with that of his fellow citizens. We must see injustice for what it truly is: an "Infamous Thing." Then we will be filled with an increased determination and courage and will work without cease to improve the lot of an oppressed minority.

## THE HOMOSEXUAL AND THE PSYCHOANALYST

### Part One

BY DR. GEORGE WEINBERG

Dr. Weinberg is a New York psychotherapist in private practice. He has a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from Columbia University, has taught at Hunter College, and is a member of the American Psychological Association. This article is based on a speech he presented at the 1965 ECHO Conference in New York City.

When I was a graduate student in clinical psychology, in the early fifties, sex was hardly discussed at all. I don't remember being assigned a single reading from Kinsey's work, though he was already famous and ours was a research-oriented department. The attitude toward all sexual behavior was as embarrassed as in the average American home. Toward the homosexual it was the current "enlightened" one: Don't laugh at him but pity him because he is sick. This attitude has, by the way, begun to replace American-Gothic contempt, for the simple reason that it brings its own reward, the feeling of being considerate and sage, in contrast with some imaginary bigoted group, hostile to the homosexual because they themselves are troubled.

5  
The most talk about sex I heard while getting a doctorate at Columbia was behind locked doors, when a renowned psychology professor invited me to his office and insisted I stop living with a girl if I wanted my Ph.D. degree. He even offered to usher me in to treatment, and finished by confiding to me that he too had once "sowed his wild oats." To the credit of my clinical psychology department, when he did complain about me he met with a wall of disregard.

The homosexual, who was then more under cover and perhaps less numerous than he is nowadays, had the status of a prize clinical case. Someone so obviously disturbed, as in the main he would himself admit, was sorely in need of a therapist. Those who flaunted their homosexual preference, who were so far gone as not even to hide it, were viewed with fascination. To the students, they were embodiments of psychopathology, "from whom we learn much," as Freud was so fond of saying.

As a beginning therapist working under a supervisor, my implicit instructions were clear: to regard the homosexual's behavior as a symptom of lurking disease and not to consider him cured until his pathological taste was changed. To say the least, it is hard for anyone who is concerned about people to ask someone to give up what counts most to him, for no apparent reason except to escape public condemnation -- a price which every homosexual implicitly understands better than his therapist could ever explain it to him. The request is especially hard to make when, as with the homosexual, there is nothing even vaguely commensurate to promise him in return. Not wanting to alienate the faculty, I puzzled over how I would treat a homosexual patient if he were assigned to me in the clinic, but luckily for me none of them were.

In denying to the homosexual the possibility that he can achieve satisfaction in his way of life, the problem, I have since become convinced, is not that psychoanalysts refuse to sympathize with him. Most of them deeply care about the happiness of all their patients. Yet after listening to a desolate patient talk about his homosexual love affairs as the only high points in his life, nearly every one will blithely set about to strip him of this possibility for happiness. With the aid of pseudo-scientific literature, superadded to our early cultural bias to loathe the homosexual, too many of us are able to take his time and money while treating him as deranged, without any evidence that he is.

The vast majority of psychoanalysts take an attitude toward the homosexual which is party-line and clear cut. There is little illusion that the homosexual has been studied and found to be a freak. He is *prima facie* a freak. Look at him (if you can); just look at what he's doing, isn't this enough? The argument is basically no more subtle than this. Proof is not needed here, for as Irving Bieber put it succinctly, "All psychoanalytic theories assume that adult homosexuality is psychopathologic and assign differing weights to constitutional and experiential determinants."<sup>1</sup> And though this top expert may not have the unanimity he claims, what he says is surely not far from the mark.

For a time I thought I understood why the psychoanalyst felt as he did. He had never known a homosexual except those who went to him for help, so naturally he thought they were all incapacitated and wanted to change. As I went down the list, I saw that none of my psychoanalyst acquaintances had homosexuals as intimate friends. To convince a psychoanalyst that even one functioning

<sup>1</sup>Irving Bieber, Homosexuality, A Psychoanalytic Study (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962), p. 18.

homosexual existed, it seemed to me, would be to defeat any logical argument that the homosexual must be unable to make his adjustment and therefore be discontented with his lot. And so, naively, I arranged to juxtapose members of these two groups in the confines of my living room. Following the practice of Kinsey, who, I had heard, once tried a similar experiment, I picked educated and gracious homosexuals, whose professional and personal lives were above nearly any sort of reproach and whom I admire greatly.

But my experiment failed and badly at that. The psychoanalysts were for the most part unduly and inhumanely polite all evening. No matter how well the dinners went they either had specific complaints about the homosexual or said nothing and simply withdrew from the contact. Though I fought against the conclusion, since several of the homosexuals involved are very good friends of mine, I could not escape it: Once an attitude is formed, in some cases at least, it may not be dislodged by evidence alone. Or, since I am talking about professionals of the highest rank, here it is appropriate to say: You can lead an expert to the source of his fear and disgust, but you cannot make him drink of his observations; you cannot, as I have found, make him suspend his disbelief long enough to get him to learn from what he sees.

A main reason for our determined pessimism about the homosexual is the Victorian ethic which most of us hold. Judging him even in his own time, Freud was anything but permissive in his attitudes or in his life. If an adult sexual practice was found acceptable by his social class, Freud was more than likely to consider it healthy. On the other hand, many of the taboo practices of his day -- not just homosexuality, but what Freud pejoratively called the perversions, for example -- were, he concluded, manifestations of faulty character growth. The coinciding of what Freud considered healthy adult sexual behavior with what was socially accepted in his day is hardly a chance phenomenon. His Viennese culture manifestly and powerfully influenced Freud; what was unacceptable in his neighborhood became, in nearly every case, "neurotic" according to his theory of psychoanalysis. Had Freud lived in another neighborhood, his theory of sexuality -- codified and copied after him -- would not have been the same.

Then as now, in trying to establish themselves in the market place, psychoanalysts could hardly afford to take the position that homosexuality may be an instance of healthy behavior. The fact is, and everyone knows it, that condoning homosexuality benefits no one's status. It rather identifies the advocate with the homosexual himself, as a depraved and menacing character. To disparage the homosexual and to provide a clinical language that trounces him, on the other hand, commends the psychoanalyst as sober and as a friend; and among its rewards, this position helps convince the public at large that psychoanalytic principles and language are sensible.

Still another reason why many psychoanalysts insist that the homosexual is sick at first eluded my search. Scarcely better educated than the man in the street about the true nature of homosexual life, psychoanalysts often envy his existence as they envision it to be. The question arises of how anyone can covet the life of an outcast, who must hide to keep his job; who looks pitifully lonely walking down Central Park West; and who in too many cases has few if any friends because he himself doesn't think he deserves them. The answer is that despite their knowledge of the misery of their homosexual patients, they tend, as do heterosexuals in general, to perceive homosexuals as stealing pleasures for which others must sacrifice. Where good works are so often justified as payment for sex or family pleasures, where courtship is

considered the minimum cost of sex, and where sex itself is sanctioned as a means to propagate the race, it vexes us to see someone apparently matching our profits without having to pay as dearly as we do. The laws branding homosexuality as a crime restore the balance somewhat, but for some people apparently not enough.

The direction this envy takes is rather subtle, particularly in our urban middle-class culture where it is no longer easy to come across as a man. To succeed we must project an image of ourselves which in most cases is so far from the fact that it is hard to sustain. A respectable man is tall, to begin with, and he dresses well and appropriately; he makes a living and commands thorough respect from his wife; and he knows why and where he is going. Neither his boss nor the gangs that prowl the streets at night are supposed to frighten him and his bearing is expected to make all these facts instantly clear. Without respite, the would-be American man must toil to appear what he knows he is not; and since he himself often believes that lapses should disqualify him from enjoying the culture's rewards and even from love, he is particularly disturbed by the sight of someone who apparently feels no need to assert himself in the same ways. Puritanism was once defined by Mencken as "the lurking fear that someone somewhere is happy" -- and the psychoanalyst regarding the homosexual is often plagued by precisely this fear.

Infused with their other motives for insisting on changing the homosexual is the psychoanalysts' own desire to make everyone the same -- their social orthodoxist motive. This attempt to simplify life by simplifying their perceptions of life costs the psychoanalysts as well as their victims dearly, and is obviously related to the fact that therapists are under enormous social pressure to lead acceptable lives. The vague but widespread thesis that we are all really the same underneath is often affirmed by well-intentioned and democratic people. But the fact, of course, is that any truly humanistic orientation must not be guilty of obscuring differences where they actually do exist, and, in particular, where they manifest themselves in divergent needs. It is neither kind nor realistic to feed all men the same food when some are thriving on it and others find it inedible.

Peculiar to the field of psychology is its own inclination to discriminate, since the orientation of the discipline is always to look for problems. Reflecting an original intention of psychoanalysis and of nearly everyone in it, its language is everywhere weighted to regard people as disturbed. Rather than say this person is different, we describe him as "having a problem" thereby making him a subject worthy of our attention and in fact in need of it. So great is the tendency, among psychoanalysts and in the larger culture, to consider all individual difference as sick, and all unsolved sickness as psychological, that one can hardly fulfill his needs these days while dodging therapeutic assault. Things have gone from bad to worse, and the psychoanalyst is himself already at the edge of caricature. His explanations of why we act as we do nearly always make us look worse than if he weren't in the room. And with a glaringly distinct individual choice like a homosexual taste, one has hardly a chance to escape his diagnostic wrath.

Even granting his bias, the question remains: Does the psychoanalyst really harm homosexual patients who come to him? The answer is certainly that he does -- and his disservice is not just to homosexuals guilty about their acts who come to him for relief. When he operates from his prejudice, he does mischief even to those few homosexuals who accept and enjoy their sexual choice and come for other kinds of help.

Among the various ways he does harm (and I am speaking not just of Freudians but of psychoanalysts of other schools, and perhaps of most nonanalytic therapists, too), the more noteworthy include his failures to restore to patients a sense of their dignity. Nearly any adult who enters therapy is, from his own point of view at least, admitting personal weakness and degrading himself somewhat. Though a deft psychoanalyst could undo this sense of deficiency, intensified by the therapy encounter itself, the truth is that they seldom do.

The mode of most practitioners is nothing if not humiliating. To sit unobserved behind someone while he lies down; to demand that he say whatever he thinks while reserving the right not to answer his questions, or even to talk to him, can hardly increase the patient's confidence. To ring in "the unconscious," clinching each difficult argument; and worst of all, to even make taste judgments for the patient under the guise of science does not induce him to rely more heavily on what he feels.

Take the homosexual, uncertain as to whether he is diseased, and working on a job where he believes (often correctly) that he must hide the facts of his life or risk being fired or ridiculed. So far as he knows, he is the only homosexual in his office. For any of a variety of reasons he elects to go into treatment. Tuesdays and Thursdays are "analysis days," and he secures permission to take extra time for lunch or to leave a few minutes early. Though he hides from his fellow workers where he is going so regularly, it is easy for them to guess. But whether or not they do, he knows -- and this is the issue. Besides being unable to associate freely with his colleagues, he now must pay another price: being reminded by the extra time and money he spends that he is intrinsically different from "healthy" people. The very act of seeking help to rid himself of homosexual desires heightens his sense of differentness; it intensifies his estrangement.

Therapy should not be criticized for being unable to extinguish any sort of strong sexual want, since the process was not designed to erase personal preferences. That a good therapist can help a patient recognize his desires and free himself of repugnance is recommendation enough. From the homosexual's point of view the trouble is not that therapists succeed in effecting a change, but that they do so much damage in trying -- or, as Shakespeare put it, that "the attempt and not the deed confounds us."

To understand why this is so, we must realize that acting on any prejudice tends to heighten the prejudice. If one believes that Negroes are stupid and therefore rails against them, one reinforces this belief; if, on the other hand, one abstains from all such actions, contempt diminishes somewhat. In the same way, hiding one's Jewishness to get into a posh club increases a person's conviction that being Jewish is bad, and such acts of concealment make the Jew like himself less. The homosexual harms himself in a similar way when he sanctions the culture's assault on him. This is particularly true when he attempts to abandon his homosexuality. The decision to pay a therapist for removing his desire is an affirmation that the desire is bad, and repeated efforts to change make it harder and harder to accept himself as he is.

Many homosexuals entering psychoanalysis suffer the loss of what Alfred Adler called the patient's "guiding fiction." Each of us has some dream, some seldom if ever mentioned "airy ambition" which at best he accomplishes only in part. The sort of ambition I am discussing nearly always involves friends or a lover or people we want to impress. With the homosexual, unless the cultural fallout has filtered even his dreams, this guiding love-fiction involves another homosexual who will understand and gratify his needs.

A young man who had written successfully for television and wanted to be a playwright told me that during three years of psychoanalysis he was utterly unable to write. His dream was to turn out a Broadway hit, and to enjoy it on opening night with some imagined homosexual lover at his side. The magical moment would consist of his being called the most talented playwright on earth by his lover, and their leaving the theater together.

Many psychoanalysts believe that a homosexual orientation disables the would-be artist. There are famous cases of playwrights who have been told, in no uncertain terms, that unless they changed they could not succeed. This admonition was not given to the patient mentioned above, but it was impressed upon him that his homosexuality sprang from illness -- and this in itself was enough. Deprived of his guiding fiction, the poor man found little reason to write. In point of fact he had not entered treatment to change his homosexuality, but to see how and why he had stopped working at optimum capacity. What he met instead was an assault on his very goal, the dream for which he had often labored into the night. Because this goal now seemed polluted, he stopped writing entirely. My acceptance of what he cherished was absolutely essential in getting him back on the path.

A guiding fiction in one form or another is the fuel each of us needs to exist alone, to work late into the night. Without this fiction -- without our own idiosyncratic sense of what a hero is and what we must do to become one -- our motive force is depleted. The therapist's disapproval, therefore, in words or by implication, of what the homosexual wants does more than make him feel derelict. As with all people, so much of his everyday life is touched by his dream that in downgrading it the therapist inevitably short-circuits other incentives, too, depriving the patient of avenues of action open to him before he went for help.

(TO BE CONCLUDED IN THE NEXT ISSUE)



## NEWSFRONTS

by Warren D. Adkins

### SEX AND FAIRY TALES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A Congressman, Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher, has demanded a halt to invasions of privacy by the federal government. Rep. Gallagher, in a letter to Civil Service Commission Chairman, John W. Macy, Jr., strenuously objected to certain questions dealing with sexual inclinations found on tests to be administered to 20,000 FAA employees, who must take such tests or lose their jobs. One test question was: "Do you admire the beauty of a fairy tale more than that of a well-made gun?" Another question asked about the frequency of contact with the opposite sex at age 15 or 16.

### TIME MAGAZINE'S HACKNEYED CLICHES

Time (Jan. 21, 1966) printed what MSW President, John Marshall, called a two-page exercise in "fanciful subjectivity and pseudo-objectivity" as its first serious contribution to prejudiced attacks on the homosexual community. So-called authorities like the late Somerset Maugham were cited to

pronounce that homosexuals lack creative talents. The late Dr. Bergler (known among his colleagues as "irresponsible") accused homosexuals of sharing many nasty traits. The first critical response to appear in the January 28th issue of Time, MSW's letter stated: "Time's article did a disservice not only to its own readers but to a sizable portion of the American citizenry. It abounded in hackneyed cliches that have been seen many times in less respectable magazines."

#### DUTCH LAW DISCRIMINATES AGAINST HETEROSEXUALS

In the Netherlands, where homosexual relationships between consenting adults in private are not unlawful, a heterosexual couple may not marry without their parents' consent until they have reached the age of 30.

#### SENSATIONALISM AND BIGOTRY IN SOUTH AFRICA

The full glare of unnecessary publicity has attended the raiding of a wild party in the world capital of racial bigotry. Although there was no mention of public disorder (the party was held in a millionaire's mansion surrounded by spacious grounds) nor involvement with minors, papers throughout the world touted the arrest of a few guests. Attended by 350 men, the party was labeled an "all male orgy," and much ado was made of men dressed as women. Only two persons, however, were arrested for indecent acts and only five persons for masquerading as women. Eight vice-squad officers were planted at the party to dance with guests and to witness the goings-on. Thirty-eight policemen surrounded the mansion and arrested the millionaire-owner for selling liquor without a license. Photographs of the few guests dressed as women were printed in several newspapers and more sensationalism is expected to erupt in the near future. Among guests present were lawyers, doctors, directors of big companies, and well-known personalities in the theatrical and movie world. Fortunately, for the sake of those in attendance, the party was not racially mixed.

#### GOOD HOUSEKEEPING MAGAZINE ATTACKS HOMOSEXUALITY

Good Housekeeping (Jan. 1966) has allowed a sob story, guaranteed to frighten mothers and bolster false prejudices about homosexuals, to besmirch its otherwise clean pages. Freelance writer Lester David tells of the paralyzing horror striking an otherwise average household when it is found that a brilliant son, winning smile and all, is having an affair with one of his high school chums. Such a disclosure, says this tear-jerking, self-appointed authority, brings to most households the same desolate feeling of loss as a child's death. His article further provokes such feelings among parents of homosexuals.

## Straight From the Shoulder SPEAKING OUT

by Mrs. Gail Gonzalez

"Darling, I'd love to see you tonight, but I have a meeting."

"A meeting? What kind?"

"Ah, Love of My Life, just a meeting sort of a meeting."

"Tell me, Life's Fairest Flower, what kind of a meeting is a 'meeting sort of a meeting'?"

Well, that sort of conversation could not have gone on for ever. He had to be told. "He" was Ray, a boy I had met and with whom I had fallen in love. But he was curious about these "civil rights" meetings I attended, and I knew I had to tell him.

#### Can This Couple Find Happiness?

As it turned out, Ray already knew about the Mattachine Society, through conversations with a co-worker at his office. So the big shock I thought I'd have to spring on him--my work for civil rights for homosexuals--was no big shock at all. He was, of course, curious about how I had gotten into the group (I had heard a sermon on the subject at a Unitarian church and met MSW representatives there), but he didn't denounce me or exhort me to resign. No, Ray accepted the fact of my membership.

I was lucky, of course. I could have lost him. He might have assumed automatically that I was a Lesbian and therefore made a beeline for the nearest exit. But he didn't. Ray was intelligent and liberal and attractive and darling and charming (but that's got nothing to do with this column--that's only because I'm a prejudiced wife), and although he didn't wish to join MSW, he attended a few meetings; he was and remains interested in its various projects. In him, I have a sounding board and good listener for ideas, problems, snags, and successes of the MSW.

I will repeat: I was lucky. I could have been scorned and rejected and deeply hurt. That was a chance I took with all the men I dated before Ray and with the couples we've met since our marriage, for I do not remain silent on the subject of homosexuality. Nor should any of us -- especially if we are members of the Mattachine Society of Washington.

We must never skirt the issue when it confronts us. If a bad joke is told, if a derogatory remark is made about "queers," "fairies," "fags," "pansies," or "fruits," we must be ready to defend our beliefs. We do not have to go overboard and declaim: "You sir, are no Gentleman! I am a member of the Mattachine Society of Washington and take offense at your remarks." No, that type of defense is not what I have in mind...we need not mention affiliation with MSW to co-workers, acquaintances, or even friends, unless we can trust their liberality and know that they will not use this knowledge against us. Defending homosexuals, or any minority, is just and equitable.

Suppose a co-worker remarks that so and so in the office is a "queer." Your reply can be simply, "So what? He gets the job done." The reaction of the speaker or other listeners can be your guideline for further discussion. But something must be said!

Would a NAACP worker let a "nigger" remark pass? No!

Would a member of B'nai B'rith ignore a "kike" reference? Of course not!

Will we Mattachine members let a "pansy" phrase go unchallenged? Never!

Be prepared for some opposition. Be prepared, also, for some surprising reactions--favorable ones. For, generally speaking, many Americans have just plain never examined their attitude toward homosexuals. And being challenged on a chance derogatory remark may make them re-evaluate their thinking. Your carefully and judiciously phrased argument may divert scorners from their prejudice. And, if your reasoning is sound and is unemotionally stated, you will have much to gain.

If you, dear reader, doubt this, consider my case history. Ray was told about MSW at his office, after the co-worker had known him for some time and felt he could be trusted. Ray now has a wife who is a member of MSW. Could this have happened if either the co-worker or I had remained silent? No. And progress in our fight for equality for homosexuals will never be achieved until we all speak out and are willing to defend our beliefs.

Where civil liberties are at stake, silence is not golden...

# Security Clearances for Homosexual Citizens

MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

MEETS WITH JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

by Dr. Franklin E. Kameny

The question of security clearances for homosexual citizens has long been a "tough nut to crack" because of the decentralization of the federal government's security program. No one person or place (short of the President) seemed to hold responsibility for it, thus making attempts to negotiate impossible.

Last summer quite by accident, correspondence between the Society and the Vice-President and his office revealed that possibly the Justice Department was the appropriate government agency to contact on this issue. An exchange of letters ensued, first with Attorney General Katzenbach and then with Assistant Attorney General (Internal Security Division) J. Walter Yeagley. Finally a conference was arranged, on Tuesday, January 25, between members of the Justice Department's Internal Security Division and representatives of the Mattachine Society of Washington.

In simplified form, the position with which the Society entered the conference was (1) That homosexuality and the commission of homosexual acts are, per se, not relevant to qualification for access to classified information and are not proper ground for denial of security clearance; (2) That while some homosexual citizens may be poor security risks, every American citizen has the right to be considered upon his own personal merits and not to be placed under disadvantage because of possible faults and weaknesses of other individual citizens; that a group or class disqualification is fundamentally un-American; (3) That the government by its policies of denying clearances and employment to those known to be homosexual is, in major measure, creating the problem it allegedly solves; that there are far better, more effective and humane methods, less destructive both to individual citizens and to the national welfare, of dealing with problems arising from unorthodoxy and nonconformity; and that in any case the "problem" of homosexuals as security risks is actually almost nonexistent, being the creation of "armchair theoreticians" operating in ivory towers.

Except for editorials, approved by the Executive Board, the views presented in this section of The Homosexual Citizen are not necessarily those of the Mattachine Society of Washington.

Unfortunately, the 90-minute conference was inconclusive, and the basic issues were not explored (although it was indicated that the Department is aware of all Society letters to government officials, has seen all its literature, and knew of its picketing). The nonproductivity of the conference arose from the correctness of the original impression: The present security program is so chaotically decentralized, uncoordinated, and fragmented that apparently no single, meaningful, formal policy-making or administrative body exists. For federal employees, the administration of the program rests with the U.S. Civil Service Commission where (although not substantively) it is inextricably bound up with the Civil Service Commission's suitability standards. For employees in private industry, each separate contracting federal agency sets its own standards and (subject to certain guidelines) its own procedures, although the tone is set by the Defense Department, which has cognizance of virtually all the classified information for which access clearances are needed.

## Viewpoints

## BRIDGE TO UNDERSTANDING

by Lily Hansen

(Reprinted from EASTERN MATTACHINE MAGAZINE, Nov.-Dec., 1965)

Meeting people outside of one's own social sphere can be an educational experience -- for all involved.

I went alone to a gay bar the other night for a glass of beer and to people-watch. As I was contemplating the clientele, both straight and gay, one of two handsome young men at an adjacent table smiled at me. When I returned the smile, he and his friend came over to me. "Are you male or female?" were the first awkward words I heard. Since I had taken them for gay boys, I was amused. "Isn't it obvious that I am female?" I asked. "In this place one can't be sure," came the cautious reply.

"This is a weird place," commented one boy as he sat down next to me. "I don't find it so at all," was my appropriate answer. As I explained, when they came here, they had known it was a homosexual bar. Such an impartial reply was apparently suspect. "How come you fix your hair that way?" I was asked as they gave my no-longer-recognizable pixie cut the once-over. "One might mistake you for a Lesbian." Should I give myself away? "I am a Lesbian," I admitted and braced myself.

They hadn't expected candor. But they had always wanted to talk to a homosexual. A barrage of questions hit me from these two who didn't quite know what to make of me. I seemed harmless enough, but they weren't sure just how polite it was necessary to be. They confessed that homosexuals were a complete riddle to them; neither could imagine how anyone could find the same sex attractive. They wanted to know whether the entertainer was a girl or boy; why some boys like to dress up as girls; why some Lesbians wore such to them uncomplimentary clothes and haircuts. And which of the customers in the bar was gay--this one, that one, and what about that one? I tried to answer their questions discreetly--while discouraging them from pointing with their fingers. They were

quite young (one was celebrating his 21st birthday) and wavered between an eagerness to learn more about the subject, bewilderment, and contempt. One of them was tempted to call the waitress over with "Hey, butch"--but fortunately was stopped in time.

Their questions and comments demonstrated how confused they were. To a certain extent I could have sympathy with their incredulity, awkwardness, and embarrassment at not knowing how to react to a situation with no precedent. (After all, isn't it dampening to a straight man's ego to invite a girl over to his table, only to have her reply, "No, thank you, I'm waiting for a girl"? This had happened to one of my audience earlier.)

The contrast between heterosexual and homosexual attitudes stood out sharply in my mind as we talked. These uncomprehending persons in their effort to understand must have felt like astronauts floating in an inscrutable universe. Occasionally their sense of tact was definitely suspended--as if not applicable outside heterosexual respectability. Some people think "anything goes" when they are among what they consider social nonentities and outcasts--like homosexuals, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, etc. And yet, these boys would have thought twice about being loud-mouthed in even a Negro bar.

Sometimes they were coarse, but often they bent over backwards not to offend me with their questions and voiced surprise that they didn't embarrass me. How did I become a lesbian? Did I plan to be "cured"? I tried to explain that I didn't consider myself sick and that a change to heterosexuality was no longer an issue--since in my opinion the most important thing about an individual was not his sexual orientation but the kind of human being he was and the degree of self-fulfillment he had achieved. Was this bit of philosophy too complicated? They didn't know what to say and had to "think that over."

I listened to their experiences with homosexuals who had approached them. They listened to my distinctions between solicitors and molesters who happened to be homosexual and the average, decent homosexual, who doesn't infringe on the sensibilities of others any more than the average heterosexual person. Naturally I educated them about the Mattachine Society and described our pickets. They had never heard of the homophile movement and it seemed ludicrous to them at first that the concept of civil rights was applicable in this area. Yet they finally agreed that homosexuals were a minority just like Negroes.

By the end of the evening they had become quite enthusiastic about me and apparently wanted to show me off. They expressed their intentions to have me meet their friends. Apologetically they told me that none of them were homosexual--but that I wouldn't be made fun of. As a willing guinea pig I accepted the future offer, not without the ulterior motive of using this opportunity to advance the cause for a more enlightened approach to homosexuality. As a token of their esteem, they took me to a very nice restaurant and offered me "anything on the menu." When we finally parted, it seemed that through mutual recognition of our common humanity a glimmer of understanding had made communication between the heterosexual and homosexual view of life possible.

Will I ever see them again? Who knows--but one thing is certain: they will no longer be so ready to regard homosexuals as categories to be ridiculed. This is not to say that all their misunderstandings and fears had dissolved in an aura of benevolence and brotherhood. They did not lose their skepticism. But, through personal contact, they have begun to see the homosexual as other than a contemptible or dangerous outsider.

# FLORIDA SECTION

## Editorial

By Robert C. Hayden



All too often we have heard the cry, "police brutality" used indiscriminately by groups which have grievances against the practices of certain policemen. In many places, no doubt, such a cry has seemed justified, but recently there has been some valid criticism of those who use this characterization for all policemen.

Homosexuals, in many communities throughout the nation, have suffered frequent harassment, intimidation, denial of due process, and police refusal to protect their rights and property. Many homosexuals are rightfully resentful about such treatment. They must remember, however, that all policemen cannot be judged by the improper acts of some of their number. There are both kind and brutal policemen; both sensible and savage. It is not fair to charge all law enforcement officials with brutality and misconduct. If we make such sweeping charges, we become guilty of prejudice ourselves.

On December 16, 1965, the first meeting between a Florida Mattachine representative and the Sheriff's Office took place. In an atmosphere of careful cordiality, the aims of the Mattachine Society of Florida, Inc. were discussed, and the possibilities of mutual cooperation in such areas as Mattachine distribution of pamphlets on venereal disease were made clear. It was the hope of MSF's Board of Directors that this meeting would help to ease immoral police pressures which have plagued Miami's homosexual community for so long. Such a hope was shattered, however, when the

Sheriff's Office went on the radio January 17, 1966 and launched a vicious attack on the goals of Florida Mattachine. The fact that the Sheriff's Office used its first official contact with MSF to stab the Society in the back neither surprises us nor alarms us. Radio Station WKAT gave MSF President, Richard Inman, ample time on the air to reply to the hysterical falsehoods promulgated about homosexuality by the Sheriff's Office. The Mattachine President launched a vigorous attack against unjust police practices, bringing the facts of police misconduct to the attention of a wide listening audience.

The Mattachine Society of Florida, Inc. will not hesitate to direct full criticism against police practices when such criticism is due. It will use its fullest resources, in such cases, to make its criticism widely known. At the same time, MSF will not use such catch phrases as "police brutality", but will refer to the misconduct of certain policemen, and to the corrupt practices of certain law enforcement officials.

When Florida law enforcement officials show signs of reform, as has occurred in such cities as Washington, D.C. (where uniformed policemen have replaced the enticement-entrapment plainclothesmen, and where arrests of homosexuals have dropped 50% in one year as a result) the Mattachine Society of Florida will be first to give credit where credit is due, and to offer the police appropriate cooperation to insure justice for all citizens.



## A CHALLENGE TO HATE MONGERS

By Richard A. Inman

David Wilkerson (who occasionally calls himself "Reverend") is a self-appointed messiah to wayward youth. In 1958, from a small office in Staten Island, New York, he began a program of fundamentalist evangelism called "Teen Challenge", a movement which boasts him as its "Founder and Executive Director". Capitalizing on such issues as drug addiction and homosexuality, Wilkerson earned himself a certain notoriety, seemingly confident of his "ability" to make judgements about subjects which help to bring him the fame he apparently seeks. In advice to ministers, whom he would persuade to emulate him, Wilkerson says: "You need no special training." It seems that he has no special training of his own, except for a misguided religious zeal which has made him a truly tragic figure, a loud and ignorant fanatic.

Wilkerson's anti-homosexuality is a source of embarrassment to more seasoned enemies of the homosexual minority. They see at once that his untutored exuberance makes him a laughing stock. His booklet, "Help for Homosexuals" shows him to be a bull in a china shop, thrashing about with ignorant, unconnected statements which would be thoroughly amusing if they did not come from a man who purports to be a religious leader, and who is peddling hate and confusion among young people.

Wilkerson has dreamed up his own fundamentalist theories about what causes homosexuality: Rejection of God, rejection of revealed truth, and "worship of the flesh." The latter cause, he assures us, causes homosexuals to "feed their minds on filthy literature, dirty pictures, and lewd novels". He presents the homosexual as a person given over to "demons of lust".

Wilkerson is annoyed by clergymen who have the courage to say kind words about homosexuals. He is particularly annoyed by clergymen whom he suspects of being homosexuals. Heterosexual evangelists, he says, will never stay in the same hotel room when they travel on missions. They will always insist on separate rooms. Wilkerson points the finger of accusation at poor evangelists who stay in rooms together in order to save money. They should be exposed as homosexuals and expelled, he says.

The "cure" for homosexuality recommended by Wilkerson is a chilling example of the danger inherent in ignorant zeal passing for religion. While certain men are arrested for impersonating doctors and for recommending false cures, Wilkerson, using the title "Reverend", plays the role of psychiatrist and walks free. Any intelligent person will be aware how often beliefs of the following type reflect a twisted and warped mentality: "You must learn to look into a mirror," he counsels, "and honestly say 'My body, my flesh, is worthless, wormeaten, and full of decay and death.' Cultivate a shame for your nakedness," he cries. "You must learn to hate, despise, crucify and mortify your flesh."

Wilkerson has composed a list of 25 ways for recognizing homosexuals. Certain characteristics, he contends, are found in almost all homosexuals. If you know someone with broad swaying hips, a delicate physique and fluttering eyelids; someone who hustles around striking unusual poses, and who has "a tripping gait and swaggering shoulders," and who gets

excited over bright colors, you will realize, according to Wilkerson, that he is a homosexual.

The Mattachine Society of Florida, Inc. believes that citizens and taxpayers are fair-minded enough to reject such idiocy, and are sensible enough to be shocked when they discover that members of the Sheriff's Office have distributed Wilkerson's booklet to teen-agers in Miami.

The issue of homosexuality is important enough to be properly understood by the public. Such understanding is not increased when public officials distribute "hate literature" designed to cause mental upset and confusion. There can be little doubt that Wilkerson is emotionally disturbed and may be excused as a victim of twisted thought, but the office of the Sheriff in Miami should know better.

## a question of values

By Foster Gunnison, Jr.

The question is asked - how does the homosexual union stackup against the heterosexual family in a scale of social values? Not very well it would appear.

We are told that homosexuality offers no real or lasting reward for its adherents. We are told that it is a perverse, selfish, wasteful way of life; a life of compulsive and unending resort to physical pleasure without compensatory obligation or contribution; a life devoid of meaning or purpose. We are told that it is a corrupter of youth, a destroyer of families, a source of potential unhappiness for all who associate themselves with it or fail to guard against it.

These opinions, shared by many, are confirmed in the charged emotion which never ceases to surround the issue. We have only to broach the topic for rational discussion to unleash storms of violent protest.

Now it is time to ask just what is it that is being defended with so much fervor against purported threats of homosexuality? And is it indeed worth defending?

First, if we take a moment to look about us what do we find? We find ourselves - homosexual and heterosexual alike - struggling together in the same world each for our own personal happiness and self expression in many different ways, sometimes with and sometimes against ever present currents of conformity.

In time, each of us emerges as an end product of an endless process of socialization, one presumed characteristic of which is "progress" with each passing decade. By progress is meant living ever more comfortably with one



another, pursuing private aims while sharing common interests.

Obviously the evaluation of progress presents its own peculiar problems. Suffice it to say, for present purposes, that given the state of society today we can find abundant examples of things that are good and things that are bad; things of which we can be eminently proud, and things with which we ought to be seriously concerned. Among the latter may be cited: War, crime, civil disorder and dissatisfaction, prejudice and bigotry, mental illness, drug addiction, alcoholism, divorce, despair and suicide, and an endless display of lesser personal problems and sundry maladjustments.

Some, of course, would have us believe that the whole of society is in fact going completely to pot. I doubt that it is. I prefer to believe quite the opposite, but I think we can all agree that much does go on that cries out for attention, prevention, and reform.

And to the extent that these unfortunate happenings are evidence, somewhere, somehow, of personal unhappiness, we must conclude that among us today there are indeed very many unhappy people. We are also forced to admit that we are still very far from achieving that truly loving world envisioned by some as the ultimate utopian outcome of the social process.

Looking further we find that many, if not most, of these unpleasant features of life, and the unhappiness they signify, are traceable in some degree to the social process itself. And central in this process is the family unit as the basic socializing institution.

We are told that what a person is, or what he becomes, is substantially a consequence of his earliest experiences as a child, and hence a reflection on the character of the family in which he was reared.

If we are to accept the pronouncements of the social sciences, and their practitioners, we would say that happy people are products of happy families. We would say, in particular, that the abundance of love and affection genuinely felt and freely expressed, the consistency of application of discipline intelligently designed, and the maintenance of a delicate balance between, have a direct bearing not only on the happiness of children and their later adjustment as adults, but on the preservation of the family unit itself.

Considered in the light of the foregoing it might well appear that the family has not, to date proven overwhelmingly successful in meeting its obligations either to itself or to society in general.

Let us, then, ask these questions.

Is homosexuality really any greater threat to the family than the family is to itself? Is it really any worse that two men, or two women, should love one another and seek to share each other's happiness with at least some hope for enduring success, particularly if given half a chance, that for one fourth of all families to break apart with accompanying bitterness and rancor?

Is a homosexual union necessarily any greater source of unhappiness than a conventional marriage whose partners are simply unsuited to each other from the start, or unable to overcome developing differences?

Is it necessarily any greater source of waste?

Is homosexuality any greater threat to youth than the indiscriminate bearing of children by families which do not want children, or can not properly care for them, or are emotionally ill-equipped to rear them as happy, loving, civilized human beings?

Is it any more a problem for society that homosexuals do not bear children at all, than that heterosexuals with marked frequency bear children only to forfeit their care to impersonal state and welfare agencies, or their upbringing to the school, the church, and other overburdened institutions of society?

Is the bearing and rearing of children under virtually any circumstances short of bastardy and physical violence to be regarded as an unrestricted right, while at the same time are proscribed whole areas of potential love and affection through denial of the right to commit oneself to a partner of identical sex?

Indeed, how much of today's unhappiness is attributable to homosexuality and how much to the failure of family life to achieve its stated ends?

Most of us, to be sure, deplore this state of affairs. But do we view with the same horror, and the same disgust, and the same demands for protective action and reform these very real failings of the family that we express toward unproven dangers of homosexuality?

Does it make sense that the heterosexual should denounce homosexuality with a violence that obscures his own shortcomings and that of the family he claims to protect? Ought he not tend first to his own back yard?

Assuredly this in itself constitutes no positive argument for the homosexual way of life. Neither does it assert that all families are flops or even that some do not approach the ideal. Nor does it claim that all social problems are created by unhappy families, or deny that some of the best things in life are made possible by happy families. It is, nonetheless, a legitimate questioning of values and the relative emphasis we place on them.

On the other hand, if, in simple answer, it is indeed claimed that what is needed is merely an upgrading of the family as an institution - a collective effort toward salvage and rehabilitation, a refurbishing of ideals for improved guidance, or whatever else - then I submit as the central point of this essay that the same holds true for homosexuality as a potentially rewarding way of life.

Would it not be better to consider rehabilitation and upgrading, where needed, as constructive alternatives to punishment, condemnation, rejection, ridicule, and, above all, pity or false persuasion to seek "cures"? Would it not be more in keeping with Christian tradition to repair damage done and rebuild through love and understanding than to perpetuate a tragic situation and destroy through ignorance and fear? In truth, could we find any more reason to favor elimination of homosexuality as a way of life due to whatever shortcomings of the present, than to recommend on similar grounds elimination of the family as the basic social institution?

For it is also a mark of social progress that expanding diversity in human behavior strengthens the social order, enriches each of our lives, and promotes the happiness of everyone.



**WE ARE PROUD  
TO ANNOUNCE**



\*\*\*\*\*

THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

ANNOUNCES

THE OPENING OF ITS NEW OFFICE AT

Suite 801

1319 F Street, N.W.

Washington, D. C.

Mailing Address:

P. O. Box 1032

Washington, D. C. 20013

Telephone Number:

737-6949

Evening Hours

\*\*\*\*\*

## DOB Convention

The Rt. Rev. Bishop James A. Pike of the Episcopal Diocese of California heads a growing list of speakers for the Fourth National Convention of the Daughters of Bilitis, Inc. to be held at the Jack Tar Hotel in San Francisco, Calif., on Saturday, August 20, 1966.

Bishop Pike, who is known all over the world for his outspoken advocacy of civil rights and for his forward-thinking in the theological realm will be the luncheon speaker.

At this stage in the planning, the Convention program is scheduled to deal with problems encountered by the Lesbian and the male homosexual in relating to the larger community. Tentatively, the morning session will be devoted to discussion of how the homophile organizations have endeavored to relate. The afternoon will give representatives of the larger community a chance to indicate what the homophile movement has done right and/or wrong, and how it can better serve the goal of integrating the homosexual into society.

One of the speakers during the afternoon session will be Dr. Joel Fort, psychiatrist and head of the San Francisco Health Department's Center for Special Problems.

Cost of the one-day meeting, which includes lunch and the banquet, is \$15 per person. Reservations may be made for \$5 down, with the balance in two installments of \$5 each, to Daughters of Bilitis, Inc., 3470 Mission St., San Francisco, Calif. 94110.