

Lili Vincenz

50¢

THE HOMOSEXUAL CITIZEN

MARCH 1967

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



FEATURE

L.A. Bars
Harassed

Table of Contents

VOL. 2 NO. 3

SAD CELEBRATION IN L. A. GAY BARS	3
SEX IN THE SIXTIES	7
BOOK REVIEW: <u>ONE IN TWENTY</u>	9
THE HIDDEN BIAS	11
AN ANTIQUE ORIGINALITY	13
THE FILM AVANT-GARDE	16
EDITORIAL	19

Copyright 1967 by The Homosexual Citizen.

Published by THE MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON
Post Office Box 1032
Washington, D. C. 20013

Office Address: 1319 F Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Office Hours: Weekdays, 6:30-9:00 p. m.
737-4959

EDITORIAL STAFF

Lily Hansen, editor

Christopher Martin, assist. editor

Michael Fox, production editor

Ward Hudson, circulation mgr.

Michael Fox, distribution mgr.

THE HOMOSEXUAL CITIZEN is published monthly and sold on newsstands for 50¢ per copy. Back issues are available for 50¢ each from The Mattachine Society of Washington. One-year subscription: \$5.00, sent by first-class mail.

Sad Celebration in L.A. Gay Bars

by Franklin E. Kameny

On New Year's Eve, Los Angeles witnessed one of the most flagrant displays of police brutality of which we have heard in many a year in this country. A dozen police plainclothesmen, brandishing guns and clubs, and backed up by as many more uniformed policemen and five squad cars, marched into a gay bar, where patrons were celebrating in traditional convivial fashion. The offense involved: In bringing in the New Year, male customers had kissed each other for all of 5 to 12 seconds. A second bar was similarly raided that evening and one or more a week later.

It seems obvious from the eyewitness account printed below that a severe loss of perspective prevailed in this matter. To divert two dozen policemen and five police cars from their proper pursuit of crime, and to employ tactics appropriate -- if they ever are at all -- to dealing with hardened criminals actively engaged in crimes of violence, seems to indicate that someone has his priorities and values badly confused.

The raids apparently originated at the precinct level, at the initiative of a possibly politically over-ambitious and over-zealous police captain, perhaps seeking promotion to the position left vacant by the death of the late, unlamented Chief Parker. He was not successful. Someone else got the job.

The outrage received absolutely no newspaper publicity at all. Don Slater of Tangents, one of the Los Angeles homophile organizations, appeared twice on television to discuss the raids.

The case of several of the people arrested came to trial on January 26. Unfortunately the jury had seemingly decided the case beforehand on the basis of the defendants' homosexuality. All but one (who came into court with his wife on his arm) were convicted.

The case is being appealed, probably on the ground that it is not a lewd act for men to kiss in public. Apparently Los Angeles has something to learn from more civilized Washington, where male-male kissing, displays of affection, and dancing are all fully legal under circumstances in which identical acts would be permitted if performed by a man and a woman.

Future developments, both in regard to other defendants and in regard to the outcome of the appeals mentioned, will be reported in The Homosexual Citizen.

The following was issued by the Tavern Guild of Southern California and is reprinted in full.

January 5, 1967

Today marks the day that 17 citizens of the City of Los Angeles must enter our courts to plead guilty or not guilty to a variety of charges stemming from a raid by a new division of the LAPD: the Rampart Police Station.

On New Year's Eve for no obvious reason other than to establish the fact that they are tough and to be feared in the coming year, the new Rampart Police Station and their young new officers, set out seemingly to make a name for themselves overnight. They chose to deploy a force of approximately one dozen vice officers, five general duty black-and-white cars with at least two uniformed officers in each, waiting for the signal to join the vice officers already inside the bar playing pool, drinking and otherwise enjoying themselves. It seems hard to believe any one bar could pose such a severe police problem to justify this number of police officers on any given night -- especially New Year's Eve when the records clearly show that crime is rampant on the streets and an excessive number of drinking drivers are on the highways.

While the New Year was being brought in throughout L.A. and the rest of the nation with merrymaking and hope for a better year for all, the patrons and employees of this establishment were subject to one of the most vicious beatings ever brought to light or at least discovered in Los Angeles.

Plain-clothesmen, brandishing guns and fists as their only identification, at the stroke of midnight proceeded to knock anyone they could reach to the floor. Anyone fortunate enough to get up and ask who they were received a gun at their head and were told that was the only identification they would need. At this signal the uniformed officers appeared with clubs to assist. The bartenders were physically dragged from the bar and also beaten. It was then decided to throw 16 citizens face down on the sidewalk, including the three bartenders. They were booked on a variety of charges; as for the bartenders, they were booked on a morals offense for lack of anything else. This also seems hard to understand in that if it is immoral to serve alcoholic beverages then why are licenses issued by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of California to do just that? One citizen was arrested at midnight when he kissed his sister and wished her a Happy New Year. She is a lady, dressed as such -- but was beaten and taken to jail and then released when they decided she was a lady. The brother was still arrested -- for kissing his sister??

Meanwhile the vice officers, carried away with their power and in their obvious delirium, swept into their next nearest bar and with the same modus operandi -- showing the same identification (drawn guns), set about beating the lady who owned the bar to the floor. Her one mistake was to ask who they (these men in plain clothes) were. Two of her employees, upon seeing her being beaten, made another grave error and that was going to her aid. (This is a crime??) The act of chivalry nearly cost one of them his life.

After taking these men outside to "work them over" (in the language of the LAPD officers) one was left lying there to live or die as the case might be. This man was never arrested for violation of any law, but still took a beating that, among other injuries, required 16 stitches about his face. The other is the victim who nearly lost his life. For at least 22 hours, he was forced to lie on the cement floors of at least two police stations -- both of which refused to accept him because of the physical condition he was in. The police, in order to avoid the embarrassment of having him die on their hands, were forced to remove him to the prison ward of the county hospital. He underwent surgery there for the removal of the spleen which was ruptured during the beating

he received at the hands (and feet) of the LAPD. Once again finding themselves in an embarrassing position, they were forced to book this victim on a felony charge of assaulting an officer -- which carries with it a possible sentence of ten years in the state penitentiary. This man was on the critical list for quite some time. He still remains in the hospital with multiple injuries minus the spleen and facing this ridiculous charge, if and when he recovers.

Mr. Ray L. Smith, attorney at law, who has had a law practice in Los Angeles for nearly 40 years, has come to the defense of this group of 17 victims. His feelings run very strong that if these tactics continue to be tolerated in the city, especially by minority groups, who of course we all know feel most of it, that no one person is safe from possibly being mistaken for a member of any minority and therefore subjected to these atrocities at the mere whim of any LAPD officers.

Also, the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board counts the number of arrests -- not convictions -- against a license. This means that when the police decide they want to put a person out of business they have this power. They merely have to make several arrests with or without cause or convictions to force the ABC to revoke the license, denying the owner a right to make a living and jeopardizing the customers at the same time. For this reason alone, this harassment must be stopped, now. Can this be double jeopardy?

With this brief resume of how our L.A. finest like to spend New Year's Eve it is little wonder that instead of respect and pride, the public feels fear and, in some instances, even a little hate for them, and the reputation of the LAPD is now at a new low. It seems of little use to even consider fighting on foreign ground to preserve our way of life and society only to return with the help of God and once again risk our lives (especially at a tavern that has been issued an entertainment license) to sing "Auld Lang Syne."

► **join** ◀
► **ACLU** ◀



Sex in the Sixties

by John Marshall

At 10:00 p.m. on Thursday evening, January 12, the ABC Television network (WMAL, Channel 7) presented an exceptional public service program, entitled "Sex in the Sixties." As ABC's "Stage 67" selection for that week, it was carried nationwide.

There have been other equally well-produced TV specials which have dealt with one or more sexual themes, but generally they have been the work of an affiliate station and were broadcast to somewhat limited viewer service areas. As could be expected within the confines of a single-hour format, the program, which attempted to cover the entire spectrum of human sexuality, necessarily treated some areas hurriedly and perhaps superficially.

The liberal tone of "Sex in the Sixties" was fairly well set by the initial speaker, Mary S. Calderone, executive secretary of the relatively new Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS). She cited the freer use of nudity by the motion picture industry and the widely accepted portrayal of sexuality in contemporary literature as examples of a more tolerant attitude on the part of Americans. She was followed by Hugh Hefner of Playboy magazine, who discussed the artistic treatment of his "Playmates of the Month," placing it within the best tradition of portrayal of the nude -- exemplified by the works of Michaelangelo.

The third speaker was of most immediate interest to our readership: Dick Leitsch, president of The Mattachine Society, Inc. of New York. The first scenes showed Mr. Leitsch entering the Society's offices with the organization's name and office hours indicated on the outer door -- while the commentator briefly explained the nature of MSNY and its work. Once in his office,

Mr. Leitsch stated that the two most significant achievements with regard to homosexuality this decade were (1) the acceptance by the homosexual of his homosexuality as an entirely legitimate integral part of his existence, with no intrinsic need for shame or apology and (2) the growing acceptance of the homosexual as a homosexual by the public, with an awareness of his rights -- as typified by public reaction to the picketing demonstrations by many of the homosexual organizations. The camera switched from Mr. Leitsch to films of one of the White House demonstrations. It was an extremely brief but adequate treatment of both homosexuality and the movement from a most favorable viewpoint. One encouraging aspect of this program was that no rebuttal or dissenting voice was presented.

The program moved at a rapid pace, covering such areas as the "topless" clubs (nudity in entertainment), clothing fashions (miniskirt and bikini), the voyeuristic aspect of Playboy clubs, sex on the campus (filmed at the University of Michigan), the findings of science as influencing sexual reevaluation, the studies conducted on human sexual response at Washington University in St. Louis by Masters and Johnson, and sex education by the schools (the program at Flint, Michigan) as well as by the church in an effort to provide what the home is failing to.

Some of the ideas presented were as follows: college kids today aren't scared of sex the way their parents were; although there is an increase in student sexual activity, students are no less moral today; on many campuses, students participate in the formation of school decisions affecting them; only Catholic boys want to marry a virgin; the state of virginity is more mental than physical and today's student is less concerned with virginity than the reason a girl retains it; sexual activity can be regarded as one aspect of intensified communication; the university fosters a reflective attitude and students no longer see sex in terms of moral issues -- moral issues are the war in Vietnam and racial discrimination, etc.; sexual rules are passé -- today's student wants intelligent adults for advice and informal discussion, not for moral policemen; family planning advances have immeasurably contributed to sexual freedom; many people reject sexuality as a healthy component of their personality; we seem to be heading toward a Scandinavian attitude toward premarital inter-

course, which will result from a gradual increase in acceptance; the moral redefinition of sexuality is progressing away from the puritan ethic and its inherent guilt feelings.

In her final statement toward the program's end, Dr. Calderone implied disagreement with the concept of the acceptability of homosexuality as a natural way of life. She spoke in terms of man's sexuality as a health entity. "Sexuality is not basically genital, but what you are as a man or woman and how you relate to other men and women. Man is a sexual being, not a nonsexual entity."

At the close of the program, the danger was expressed of the rise of a new Victorianism, as stifling and problem-producing as the old. The present bandying around of sex can easily lead to the equation of sex = a sick noninvolvement (extraction of sexuality from its role as an integral part of being and transforming it into mechanical activity). It was felt that this possibility would be equally as crippling as the former hypocrisy and duplicity the present generation has exposed. In summary, the keynote of sex in the sixties is change -- in attitudes, beliefs, and even to a degree in practices.

ABC-TV and the program's sponsors -- Singer, American Home Products, and Brown & Williamson -- are to be commended for having conceived of and brought to fruition such a provocative, sane, and well-produced documentary. Hopefully, others will soon follow their lead.

BOOK REVIEW

ONE IN TWENTY

by David Wayne

How long will it be before lawmakers in the United States legalize homosexual acts in private between consenting adults? Many persons believe that we will never see the day in our lifetimes. They believe that public opinion will not tolerate this change in the law.

However, a most encouraging development is happening in England, where lawmakers are soon expected to legalize homosexual acts in private. This new development is remarkable if one realizes that only a few years ago when the subject of legalizing homosexual acts was first brought up in the British Parliament, it was soundly defeated; and many predicted it would never pass. Then, however, a vigorous educational campaign was launched.

The results were excellent, culminating in December of 1965 when the House of Commons gave a second reading (thereby virtually assuring final approval) of a bill that relaxes the law in several aspects. The major provisions are as follow:

- Homosexual acts in private between consenting adults will no longer be a criminal offense. Previously these acts had been punishable by two years in jail.

- The maximum sentence for homosexual offenses against a child under sixteen will be life imprisonment--the same as before.

- A homosexual act involving a youth between sixteen and twenty-one will be punishable with up to five years imprisonment, while public acts of indecency could bring a two-year sentence.

What brought about this change of thinking? The most important thing is that public opinion has changed considerably during the past decade. First the Church of England supported the cause, but equally important is the fact that many important writers also called for a change in the law.

One such writer is Bryan Magee, a respected television news commentator, who in 1965 wrote a book entitled One in Twenty. A Study of Homosexuality in Men and Women, recently published in this country at \$5.95 by Stein and Day. This book, suggesting that one in twenty persons is a homosexual, greatly expands the views Magee first televised in two very tolerant programs on male and female homosexuality for the BBC.

Mr. Magee believes that the homosexual has a right to his sexual wishes, just as does the heterosexual. The first part of his book concerns homosexuality in general -- what it is, when it arises, what sort of people homosexuals are, how they live, what their views of homosexuality and society are, and what society's view of them is.

Part two concerns the male and part three the female homosexual. Mr. Magee discusses the advantages and disadvantages of being a homosexual. The chief advantage he sees is that the homosexual can live for himself and is more free to function and to travel. The disadvantages, says Mr. Magee, concern emotional depression, guilt feelings, the need for concealment and living a double life. Mr. Magee concludes that "it is almost impossible for a heterosexual to imagine what life would be like if heterosexual activity were made illegal." He then goes on to compare the ban against homosexual acts to the American prohibition against drinking in the 1920's.

In his appeal for a change in the law, Mr. Magee points out that the essence of liberal democracy "is the belief that the rights of the individual should be protected against the society of which he is a member."

Although some homosexuals will disagree with some of Mr. Magee's thoughts, we should realize that he has greatly helped our cause with the masses of people. What is needed in the United States is a concentrated effort to change and enlighten public opinion towards homosexuality. We should attempt to find a leading American journalist or well-known television personality who would support our cause. If this happens, the favorable change in the law may occur sooner than we expect.

THE HIDDEN BIAS

THE HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT AND LAW REFORM

by Foster Gunnison, Jr.

That law reform need not prove an unmixed blessing has been demonstrated by the British bill currently toiling its way through Parliament. Other recent proposals for reform also display certain questionable features to which the homophile movement should be alert.

AGE LIMITS. While the age of consent for heterosexuals is 16 to 18, the age of consent for homosexuals may be set at 21 to 25. This is a built-in discrimination and might appear as a bare-

faced admission of prejudice. Such age differentials completely fail to take into account that in a society hostile to homosexuality, a youth should, for the sake of his potential adjustment and happiness, be given extended time in which to decide whether homosexuality is really what he wants in life.

STIFFER PENALTIES. As demonstrated by the British bill, the lessening of restrictions on homosexual acts among consenting adults may be accompanied by increased punishments for infractions of other taboos, such as relationships with minors, public indecency, and the like. A reluctant yielding on one issue spreads hellfire to others.

"IN PRIVATE." The danger of this phrase in reform laws is that "in private" can turn out to mean that what is enjoyed by the heterosexual couple in the cocktail lounge, on the station platform, or in the park may be classified as public indecency for the homosexual pair. The result may be that the homosexual could find himself and his partner confined to the bedroom -- period!

I trust that dedicated homophiles will not settle for this double standard. Nothing is more vital to the eventual public acceptance (not to mention dignity) of homosexuals than their confrontation with the world as they are -- loving human beings giving expression to their love under the same rules that apply to everyone else.

What is the homosexual's attitude toward law reform? Some may argue that reform is best taken one step at a time, that half a loaf is better than none. Others may hold that a defective reform is worse than no reform and that freedom is never truly won at someone else's expense.

How do you stand?

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

WATCH FOR THE CBS-TV DOCUMENTARY ON HOMOSEXUALITY
ON MARCH 7 OR SHORTLY THEREAFTER.

An Antique Originality

by Christopher Martin

A review of Miracle of the Rose. By Jean Genet. Translated by Bernard Frenchman. 344 pp. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1966. \$7.50

Written in La Sante Prison in 1943 (immediately following Our Lady of the Flowers), but not published in France until the Librairie Gallimard issued his Oeuvres Completes in 1951, Jean Genet's third and most recently translated "nonfiction novel" offers us another gutsy depiction of the criminal underworld of France two decades ago. No more surprisingly, Genet again paints a flagrantly graphic and calculatedly shocking portrait of the homosexual personality at its most perverse.

Miracle of the Rose, referred to by its American publisher -- and therefore presumably by M. Genet -- as a "novel," relates the experiences, mainly psychic, of one Jean Genet after being sentenced to Fontevrault Prison for theft. Most of the book is composed (in a musical fashion) in what has come to be considered the traditionally Gallic form of confession, that of Marcel Proust's Remembrance of Things Past: An experience in the active present stimulates the narrator to recall totally a past experience, which in turn stimulates another recall, which in turn stimulates still another, and so on until one has achieved a nonsequential, associative, phenomenological accumulation of knowledge about the subject; one may then reconstruct this knowledge into a classical chain of events-in-time and attempt to determine causal relationships.

The initial stimulation of Miracle of the Rose is Genet's reencountering at Fontevrault of three young men -- Bulkaen, Divers, and Harcamone -- whose adolescent years were spent with him at the Mettray Reformatory. All three radiate into Genet's dazzled eyes the "black light... the living, apparent synthesis of Evil and the Beautiful. Through Harcamone, Divers, and Bulkaen I shall relive Mettray, which was my childhood..."¹

The reappearance of these characters supplies Genet not only with memories of the past, but also with present-tense dramatis personae for a joyously sorrowful complicity (the word is one of Genet's favorites). Inverting traditional Judeo-Christian eschatology, Genet aims to achieve what he calls "saintliness": nurturing in the soul the Mystic Rose whose heart is primal evil.

Thus are set into motion the exercises of Genet's obsessed, depraved, and visionary mind, which fabricates a mythology and a religion leading with dizzying inevitability to the climactic titular Miracle, when Genet, embracing Divers and mourning the murder of Bulkaen, undergoes the metamorphosis of a beatific vision and becomes one with the condemned child-killer Harcamone. Through this union he becomes one with his God: Genet becomes a saint. "One is a saint by the force of circumstances which is the force of God!"²

To say that Genet is baffling, particularly in this most expository and "philosophical" of his novels, is like saying that the Pacific Ocean is deep. On the one hand we have a romantic poet's sensitivity to image and language, while on the other we have (or so it seems) an adolescent's sentimentalization of evil. At times we sense a complex and fecund reservoir of mystic vision, contradicted by the glimpses revealed at other times of a man with a child's pout on his face and a coward's baseness in his heart. And throughout all these impressions waft slight breezes of doubt, and the disturbing question recurs of whether Genet is not presenting us with a reality in which all of us are held prisoners, a "framework of the ridiculous,"³ which we possess and make our own, Genet tells us, "because you fill its space with your engrossed mind."⁴

In 1952 Jean-Paul Sartre published a 669-page analysis entitled Saint Genet: Actor and Martyr, a work which many consider the most thorough examination of a living author ever attempted. Sartre

1 Jean Genet, Miracle of the Rose, p. 11.

2 Ibid., p. 312.

3 Ibid., p. 236.

4 Ibid., p. 183.

bases his existential canonization primarily upon Genet's declaration, "I decided to be what crime made of me!"⁵ Branded a thief at the age of ten, the bastard-foundling Genet, through an act of existential will (Sartre supposes), rejected the bourgeois consumer society that had rejected him and dedicated himself with his whole heart and strength and conscience to be what he was: the Satanic Angel in the liturgical drama of existence. Similarly, according to M. Sartre's conjectures, Genet decided with equally religious dedication to be the homosexual he was.

Certainly this conscientious commitment to be wholeheartedly what one is, as detailed in Miracle of the Rose, moves the serious homosexual reader to question whether this might not be Genet's "message" to his fellow homosexuals. And yet any such speculation is immediately halted by the author himself, by his insistence that the ultimate purpose served by the decision to be a homosexual is his determination to be evil.

The sentiment one felt was not named, and all that was known there was the brutal expression of physical desire...I leaned toward him like a woman. I loved him with my usual violence. One makes love at first for the fun of it, as a friend, in order to "come." Then passion follows, with its vices, with its cults. I eventually drew the bewildered Divers into that disorder; he was lost in the shadow that I brought...⁶

Throughout Miracle Genet repeatedly avows that his homosexuality is "infamous," "disgusting," and "cruel." In his scheme of things, one man loves another with all his heart in order to betray and destroy him with all his heart. Homosexuality, like theft, is another way that the balance of evil in the world may be maintained (and for Genet this is absolutely necessary in order for his personal religion to exist in truth). Taken from this angle, Genet seems at best a pitiable and frightening demonstration of the basest form of self-acceptance available to the homosexual -- even more frightening when one considers that in a less severe but similar fashion countless other

5 Jean-Paul Sartre, Saint Genet: Actor and Martyr, pp. 71-85.

6 Genet, op. cit., pp. 83, 112-113.

homosexuals are "accepting" themselves as the condemned criminals a cruel and outdated morality has branded them.

For all his heralded originality, Jean Genet in Miracle of the Rose maintains a conception of homosexuality that ceased to be original about five thousand years ago.



The Film Avant-Garde, II

by John Marshall

The underground cinema and its creators have recently been the subject of publicity in such publications as Esquire and Newsweek, as well as in prominent newspapers like the Washington Post. As public interest and the medium's impact grow, similar commentary will increase. Already it is not uncommon for some of these films to be reviewed in periodicals where a short while ago they would have been shunned and ignored. These factors will influence my commentary on two such films: Un Chant d'Amour and My Hustler. Both films present problems to a reviewer operating from within a movement framework.

UN CHANT D'AMOUR

Jean Genet is the creator of Un Chant d'Amour, which was allegedly filmed by Jules Dassin. This brutally frank work deals with homosexual activity occurring in a prison. In part, the film seems to be almost a cinematic record of homosexual acts. We witness masturbation, fellatio, and sodomy as observed by a perverted prison guard, who finally, after his orgy of spying, symbolically engages in a sadistic act himself with a prisoner. Much of

the activity is realistic fantasy and is quite explicit in its portrayal. Once over their initial shock, many viewers might easily adjust to the candid treatment.

It is perhaps commendable that an aspect of homosexuality has been so unequivocally portrayed. However, the public, I am sure, is not quite ready for this kind of openness. The California District Court of Appeals has recently declared that Un Chant is "nothing more than hard-core pornography, and should be banned" (see Time, December 16, 1966). Admittedly, court decisions of this sort are often no criterion. I do not argue the film's artistic intent, merits, or worth -- I found it an excellent film in this regard. But I shudder to think of the consequences of greater public exposure to this work. The movement's task is difficult enough at best, and it would be extremely difficult to counter some of the attitudes which would be fostered by a viewing of this film on the part of all too many. This genre of film is fine for the sophisticated, liberal film society member or avant garde buff, for whom, I feel, it was originally intended. The danger lies in the potential commercial exploitation of such films if censorship considerations were not present.

MY HUSTLER

Andy Warhol (The Chelsea Girls) of pop art fame is responsible for My Hustler. My reservations here are somewhat less than with Un Chant. In many ways it seems almost innocuous by comparison. The film deals with a middle-aged homosexual summering on Fire Island and the question of who will end up in bed with the young man just sent to him by the Dial a Hustler Agency in Manhattan. Vying for the honors -- besides the afore-mentioned gentlemen -- are his "fag hag" next-door neighbor who specializes in stealing tricks and a former hustler who accidentally drops in and invites himself to stay.

The film is intended to be high camp. That it is. At times it degenerates into sheer bitchiness, which is supposed to be cute. At times it seems to be an exercise in voyeurism for the heterosexual: he is being treated to an "inside" show, cleverly staged. In addition there is one brief male frontal nude scene for titillation.

Double entendres abound, and everything seems delightfully naughty, although the action drags at times.

This work, like the former, obviously (to us) portrays atypical aspects of homosexual life. Both films definitely exhibit "the life" in a less than favorable view -- however accurate for a minority aspect. I don't mean to be alarmist in this commentary, for the inherent danger of these films will undoubtedly (we hope) never materialize. In summary, Un Chant and My Hustler can be interesting when viewed by a homosexual or a liberal, but are potentially harmful when viewed by others. I do not recommend bringing friends you are trying to convert to the cause to any of these showings.

**If you can,
send money**

The Mattachine Society of Washington depends to a large extent on your continued support and financial assistance in order to help further its work on behalf of the homosexual.

Contributions sent to: MATTACHINE SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON
P.O. BOX 1032, WASH., D.C. 20013

Editorial

U.S. Guardian Angel

by Michael Fox

A few days after the Washington newspapers announced the admission by a high official of the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI) that the ONI had cameras in Pentagon rest rooms, the Defense Department denied that admission. (This same department told us that it hadn't bombed any residential areas of Hanoi, North Vietnam, and then reversed itself when evidence to the contrary was turned up by non-federal government sources.)

It seems a bit perverse -- one might even say queer -- that the Defense Department can dismiss one of its employees on the basis of an alleged photograph of the defendant in a "compromising" situation, and then, upset at the public outcry, try to redeem itself by claiming that it didn't take the photograph. These techniques recall the strategy of a Mafia leader: hiring someone who knocks off his enemies and subsequently claiming he never killed anyone.

Even if the Defense Department didn't take the photograph, it obviously bought or otherwise obtained it from someone. God didn't hand it down himself -- although sanctimonious Defense may declare that next.

Sleep tight, your government is watching over you to-night -- literally.

Referral Service

The Mattachine Society of Washington can refer individuals in need of assistance to competent, reliable, and sympathetic professionals. This service includes physicians, psychiatrists, lawyers, and clergymen of various faiths. Stop in at the MSW office, 1319 F Street, N.W., or call 737-4959 weekdays from 6:30-9.00 p.m.

