

## THE INSIDER

Editors

Eva Freund  
Richard Schaefers

Newsletter of The Mattachine Society of Washington  
P.O. Box 1032, Washington, D.C. 20013  
Telephone 363-3881

August 1969

NOW ITS HAPPENING AND YOU CAN'T  
STOP IT HAPPENING

—Marat/Sade

In June of 1969 two of the most significant events to occur in the history of the homosexual happened in New York City. Never before have homosexuals ever reacted to society's oppression with the militancy exhibited by the large crowd of youth who stormed the Stonewall Inn when it was closed in Manhattan. And in no time before in modern history have city residents formally organized themselves into a vigilante committee to harass homosexuals from their neighborhood as they did in Queens. The Insider prints below accounts of these two significant events, taken from the Village Voice and the New York Times, with added comment and opinion.

### GAY POWER EXPLODES

During the weekend of June 27-29, Sheridan Square in Greenwich Village was the scene of unprecedented rioting by young homosexuals against the New York City Police. In a show of militancy never before exhibited in such a way by homosexuals, youth took to the streets on three successive nights in open defiance of the police.

What began as a small police raid on the Stonewall Inn, a long-standing gay bar on Christopher Street, turned into an ugly riot. For the second time in a week, cops entered the Stonewall on Friday, June 27. There were only two patrolmen, two detectives and two policewomen. The police, armed with a warrant to search for the illegal sale of alcohol, released the 200 patrons from the bar one by one. Outside a festive mood stirred amongst the on-lookers as they waited for favorites to appear at the door. Then a paddywagon arrived, and the mood changed. Three drag queens, a bartender and the doorman were loaded inside. The crowd was incensed, and when a dyke put up a struggle with the police, the scene exploded with beer cans, bottles, coins, and even a parking meter being heaved at the bar and the police. Someone threw in lighter fluid and followed it with a lighted match. A firehose was used to scatter the rioters and police reinforcements arrived to disperse the remaining rioters. Thirteen people were arrested in Friday's melee, but the Stonewall announced it would reopen on Saturday night.

On Saturday night, the protest was more sharply defined as a "gay power" display. Revolutionary signs appeared on the boarded windows of the Stonewall. Gay power chants arose in streets. The Saturday night crowd came ready for action and grew restless when nothing seemed to be

happening. The publicity had brought more demonstrators to swell the crowd, and they were prepared for a confrontation. The group decided to move down the street, and when it did, it suddenly encountered the Tactical Patrol Force who had been called earlier to disperse the large crowd. The TPF swept the crowd back to the corner of Waverly Place and then a second sweep took them down Christopher to Seventh Avenue. The police held their positions, and around 3:30 A.M., the streets were cleared.

On Sunday evening the crowd returned. And so did the TPF. Most people just rapped with one another, but around 1:00 A.M., the TPF made another sweep of the area and cleared everyone out. Allen Ginsberg and Taylor Mead put in an appearance; Ginsberg called the crowd "beautiful."

**\*\*Ed. Note:** The Insider does not see this exhibition of militancy as a fluke. Militant open defiance has become the most characteristic mark of the sixties' protest movements. First used by the blacks in irrational riots, and later used more systematically by hippies and campus protesters who shut down their own universities, militancy has never been characteristic of the homophile movement. Militant protestors rationalize their destructive methods by pointing out that knocking on doors is useful only to a point. When it becomes clear that the doors are never going to open and that door knocking is only a pacifier for the masses, then it is time to knock the doors down. In these terms, the homophile movement is behind the times. It is quite possible that the homosexuals in the streets may well make obsolete much of what the present homophile movement is doing. For better or worse, militancy is here.

### TO HELL WITH DYING ON YOUR KNEES

Things won't ever be the same.

And why should they be? Why should the homosexual be among the last vestige of American citizenship to keep his neck under the heel of the oppressor? Why should the homosexual citizen forfeit his rights to governmental responsibility as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States? Why should a human being, who happens to be a homosexual, permit the denial of his human rights?

WHY SHOULD YOU continue to be oppressed? When the man has his foot on the back of your neck, you have several alternatives —you can wait for someone else to come along and move the man away from you—you can wait for the man to decide on his own to remove his foot from your neck—you can get up off your knees and "lay up side his head."

And that seems to be the thrust of the issue. Will the homosexual wait for the heterosexual middle-class society to magnanimously remove its value-weighted foot from the necks of those who do not conform or will the homosexual take it upon himself as an individual to remove the oppressor's foot?

It appears that the structured homophile groups have failed to motivate the homosexual community. Perhaps they have not wanted to deal with the homosexual masses.

This time something happened in the homosexual community that the homophile organizations not only can claim little credit for, but some of which refuse even to acknowledge.

#### VIGILANTES PROTECT QUEENS

No one seems to know for sure, or at least no one is saying, when the trees were cut down, who cut them down, or even how they were cut down. But the fact is that 15 dogwood trees, 11 London planes, several wild-cherry trees and other bushes are no longer growing in a small city park at 73th Avenue in Kew Gardens, a residential suburb of Queens. The trees were in a quarter-acre park bordered by sidewalks and frequented by the local residents of nearby high-rise apartments and by people who worked in the area.

According to local residents, the small park was also frequented by homosexuals who met there at night, presumably attracted by the cover of the trees and bushes. Enraged by these unwelcome guests who came even from out of state, according to residents, a group of men in the area organized a vigilante committee early in June to protect the women and children who used the park. Each night 30 or 40 of the men ventured into the park armed with highpower flashlights and walkie-talkies. When a homosexual appeared, the men would surround him, flash their lights in his face, and then order him out of the park. According to a spokesman of the group, the vigilantes had police consent for their admittedly unlawful activities.

The homosexuals were, at first, frightened by the hunting party, but later they began to insist on their right to be in the park. Apparently stronger action was needed, and according to a man who identified himself to the New York Times as Glen Winchell, a pseudonym, about June 19 and 20, local residents cut down the trees. Mr. Winchell said he telephoned the police when he saw what was being done. The police arrived an hour after his call, chatted with men who were cutting down the trees, and left without making any arrests.

The police remained silent when asked for information. However, on July 16, the New York Times reported that Deputy Chief Inspector John T. Downer said that none of the patrolmen who covered the area reported having seen any tree-cutting. August Hecksher, the city's Commissioner of Parks,

called the cutting down of the trees "a criminal act—an outrageous act of vandalism. It appears there is substantial information available and I have asked the District Attorney of Queens to take appropriate action." According to the Times, a concurrent investigation is being conducted by Queens District Attorney Thomas J. Mackell, but no progress is reported.

**\*\*Ed. Note:** The Insider is appalled at the spectacle of grown men commandeering a quarter-acre city park in guerilla operations against homosexuals, as though it were a Vietnamese jungle village. We are appalled at the supposed rationale behind such hooliganism, i.e., the righteous cause of expelling homosexuals from their midst in the name of protecting mothers and children. The fallacy is as obvious as the real rationale—basic insecurity in their own image which compels the vigilantes to seek out a scapegoat to ease their irrational, ignorant fears. Lastly, we are appalled, although not surprised, at the indifference of the police which amounts to tacit approval and cooperation with the lawbreakers. Added proof that in no instance can we look to the police for objectivism and the law when homosexuals are involved.

#### THE LAST PEACEFUL?? DEMONSTRATION

The Fifth Annual Reminder Day demonstration held on the Fourth of July at Independence Hall in Philadelphia was a success. There were many visitors in the city who had come to hear an astronaut deliver the key note address at the Independence Day celebration and to see Red Skelton lead the Pledge of Allegiance. Just before 2:00 P.M. people in the area could see that something was up, for about twenty uniformed policemen had suddenly appeared across the street from the home of the Liberty Bell. Nearby stood about as many plainclothesmen who were equally conspicuous to an experienced eye in their zoot suits and generally outmoded apparel. As the early arrivals began making preparations for the picket repairing signs and making new ones, the plainclothesmen and some of the uniformed police amused themselves with mimicry of the picketers. They were unaware that only their own self-image was being impaired.

Just after two o'clock the bus arrived from New York with about forty picketers. The recent riots in New York had already changed the face of the demonstration. Bell bottoms and scarves were in evidence as were short skirts and sandals. The picket began and continued for about two hours without major incident. Refreshments were handed out to the demonstrators, and the sun stayed behind the clouds but kept the open space comfortably warm.

There was some protest from bystanders, mostly of a fanatical nature. One elderly woman shouted, "Let them all go to Russia" until she tired of her own fundamentalism. At least one bystander was seen to take a sign and join the picket for a round or two. Of special interest were the homosexuals

who apparently just happened by the scene and stayed to watch, with some obvious discomfort, at what some of their own kind were doing to improve the situation for all. Pamphlet hander-outers engaged several of the onlookers and even some of the plain-clothesmen in discussions. Our own Frank Kameny talked with a few reporters who were covering the demonstration. Apparently there was no large press coverage.

A minor dispute did occur between Frank Kameny of MSW and Craig Rodwell of HYMN of New York who had organized the bus from New York. At one point in the picket Craig encouraged both a female couple and a male couple, including himself, to hold hands while walking in the picket. Dr. Kameny objected, saying that holding hands would only obscure the issues being dramatized by the picket, and he prohibited hand holding for the rest of the afternoon. Craig Rodwell, on the other hand, claimed that homosexual freedom was the issue and that hand holding could not obscure the issue. He protested Kameny's prohibition and claimed that "next year's demonstration is going to be very different."

The offices of the Homosexual Law Reform Society of Philadelphia were the scene of a reception held immediately following the demonstration. Members of the Homophile Action League of Philadelphia acted as hosts for the reception.

---

#### COURT RULES HOMOSEXUALITY NO BAR TO FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

The Washington Post, Wednesday, July 2, 1969. Federal civil service employees may not be fired solely on the grounds that they are homosexuals, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled yesterday.

In a 2-to-1 decision the Court ruled that homosexuality justifies dismissal only if it demonstrably affects the employee's performance on the job or the efficiency of his department.

The Court's opinion, written by Chief Judge David L. Bazelon and joined by Judge J. Skelly Wright, said the Civil Service Commission could not justify its dismissal of an employee "merely by turning its head and crying shame."

"The notion that it could be an appropriate function of the Federal bureaucracy to enforce the majority's conventional codes of conduct in the private lives of its employees is at war with elementary concepts of liberty, privacy and diversity," Judge Bazelon wrote.

The dissenting judge, Edward A. Tamm, said the Court majority "violates the judicial cloister" by substituting its own judgment for that of the Civil Service Commission."

The dispute arose in the case of Clifford L. Norton, a former GS-14 budget analyst at

the National Aeronautics and Space Administration who was fired in 1963 in the aftermath of a rendezvous with another man at Lafayette Square. NASA later informed Norton that his act amounted to "immoral, indecent and disgraceful conduct," and he was fired. Norton had been arrested by the morals squad, but he denied any homosexual act, and was only given a traffic fine.

Even assuming that Norton was a practicing homosexual in private life, Judge Bazelon said there was no proof that his dismissal on those grounds would promote the efficiency of the service.

The Washington Post, July 5, 1969, editorial: The decision in the Norton case "goes a long way toward establishing a rational policy devoid of the emotionalism that is usually associated with this issue."

"The Court recognized that there may be circumstances in which homosexual conduct may disqualify a Federal jobholder. Notorious overtures while on the job might impair his usefulness. The probability of blackmail might justify dismissal of an employee in a sensitive job connected with national security... The Court did not say that 'potential embarrassment from an employee's conduct' would in no circumstances be sufficient for a dismissal for the good of the service. It merely decided that the Commission cannot sit in moral judgment of Federal employees without any showing that their misconduct undermines efficiency. It insisted that the CSC must function as a personnel agency instead of a guardian of private morals."

---

#### HOMOSEXUALS AND THE LAW

##### Maryland Sodomy Statutes

Every once in a while there is talk about the possible revision of the Maryland penal code, which appears to have been written in the same antediluvian period as the Maryland Constitution.

Following is the text of the sodomy statutes of the State of Maryland, Art. 27-553 and Art. 27-554:

Art. 27, Sec. 553. SODOMY GENERALLY  
Every person convicted of the crime of sodomy will be sentenced to the penitentiary for not less than one year nor more than 10 years. (Buggery -or sodomy-can be committed upon a female.)

Art. 27, Sec. 554. UNNATURAL OR  
PERVERTED SEXUAL PRACTICES  
Every person who shall be convicted of taking into his or her mouth the sexual organ of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of placing his or her sexual organ

in the mouth of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of committing any other unnatural or perverted sexual practice with any other person or animal, shall be fined not more than \$1000, or be imprisoned in jail or in the house of correction or in the penitentiary for a period not exceeding ten years, or shall be both fined and imprisoned within the limits above prescribed in the discretion of the court.

And in any indictment for the commission of any of the acts, hereby declared to be offenses, it shall not be necessary to set forth the particular unnatural or perverted sexual practice with the commission of which the defendant may be charged nor to set forth the particular manner in which said unnatural or perverted sexual practice was committed, but it shall be sufficient if the indictment set forth that the defendant committed a certain unnatural and perverted sexual practice with a person or animal, as the case may be.

On the face of this statute, Section 553 refers ONLY to anal intercourse and there must be proof of penetration in order to gain a conviction. However, the illustrious legislators covered with Section 554 everything that Section 553 excluded. Although the first portion of Sec. 554 is specific against fellatio, the second portion, "any other unnatural..." not only leaves considerable doubt in the mind of the potential violator, but also places an enormous burden on the court to determine what acts or practices are outside of the norm of conventional behavior (will the judge decide based on his personal bias or values or will he decide based on the norms and values of the current society?). NO DISTINCTION is made between these known and unknown acts as committed by heterosexuals or by homosexuals, or between persons who are married and those who are not married.

In keeping with the high morality of the Maryland criminal codes, in general, it is only necessary for the police to cite the section allegedly violated. It is NOT necessary that a bill of particulars be presented NOR is there any provision for the defendant to get a statement of a bill of particulars. Imagine being arrested, charged, tried and possibly going to jail and never being told what you had done. That's like being charged with larceny and not being told which bank you allegedly robbed, or who your accomplices were supposed to be, or when the robbery supposedly took place

#### SEX PSYCH

Clinical psychiatrist Martin Hoffman, in a crisp no-nonsense style, devotes the first few paragraphs of his article "Homosexuality" (PSYCHOLOGY TODAY, July 1969) to exorcising the demons of traditional straight thinking; i.e., homosexuality is a sickness and that there is an inherent connection between a homosexual's orientation and clinical symptoms of mental illness.

Having dispensed with the obvious, he mentions a few "psychological factors" which may explain some homosexual behavior, but he is quick to add that "there exists no good evidence that they or any other psychoanalytic constructs explain all homosexual behavior." His next sentence is one of the most refreshingly honest and strikingly subtle description of theories. "In fact," he writes, "we do not know very much about the relation between sexual arousal and the symbolic triggers that act on the central nervous system leading to the complex sets of behavior that form the various stages or types of sexual arousal." In plain English—"heterosexual behavior is as much of a scientific puzzle as homosexual behavior."

The bulk of Dr. Hoffman's article deals an objective blow at society in general. Having admitted that male homosexuals as a group do tend to be more promiscuous than any other sexual group, he states that "his promiscuity results, in part, from the social attitudes that prevent him from living with another man in dignity and openness." The "self-condemnation" that many homosexuals feel is a direct reflection of society's "degrading view" and "makes stable relationships a terrible problem."

In summary, Dr. Hoffman's message seems to be: if society would stop viewing homosexuality as a problem, it would cease to be one.

#### IT'S WHAT'S UP FRONT THAT COUNTS Upcoming Events In Mattachine

- MSW members will offer nominations for the September Board Position, at the August, 1969 meeting.
- MSW members will, at the August meeting, discuss the sending of delegates to NACHO.

#### RAPPING WITH THE FUZZ

Several week-ends ago I was in Jo-Anna's in Southeast Washington. For the entire time I was there I watched a steady procession of uniformed police come in and out of the bar. Around midnight I walked outside and noticed a squad car parked at the corner with a patrolman sitting in the car.

Being a concerned citizen I walked over to the squad car and asked whether all the police I had seen were looking for someone or something special. As an occasional patron I was naturally interested in having a clean bar to patronize. The policeman said that there was no trouble at all, but that the precinct was just keeping an "eye on things." I stated that I was happy to know that, but if all the police in the precinct were keeping an eye on this bar (and perhaps others), then a lot of people living in the precinct were not getting adequate police protection. This comment was allowed to pass unanswered.

The friendly conversation on the curb was terminated after the policeman made the comment that the owner, "Johnny, knows how to take care of his friends in the precinct."

E.F.