

1952

## Considerations Bearing on the Problems of Sexual Offenses

Benjamin Karpman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Benjamin Karpman, Considerations Bearing on the Problems of Sexual Offenses, 43 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 13 (1952-1953)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

## CONSIDERATIONS BEARING ON THE PROBLEMS OF SEXUAL OFFENSES

Benjamin Karpman

The author is Chief Psychotherapist in Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C. He is a frequent contributor to this *Journal*. Dr. Karpman read the following article in New York City on November 17, 1951, at a meeting of the Association for Psychiatric Treatment of Offenders (A.P.T.O.), which had been arranged in honor of Dr. Robert H. Gault's forty years as Editor of this *Journal*. Other papers and digests of contributions which were made on the same occasion will be published in future numbers.—EDITOR.

### MEDICO-LEGAL INADEQUACIES

There is, I think, a slowly increasing realization among both lawyers and psychiatrists of the wide and regrettable gulf between the concepts of law and psychiatry, with respect to crime and the criminal, particularly in that realm of crime represented by what we broadly term sexual offenses. Law is arbitrarily concerned with crime and punishment; with what the offender has done and the penalty he must pay for having done it. Psychiatry is concerned with the question of *why* he did it, and how he may be prevented from doing it again. Law says that punishment will prevent him from doing it again; but experience has demonstrated repeatedly that this idea is a sad fallacy, for we know by this time that a large percentage of criminals will do it over and over and over again; that punishment has no deterrent effect, but frequently only increases the intensity of the emotional reactions which impelled them toward crime in the first place.

This is particularly true of the criminal whose offense against society is of a sexual character. With respect to this type of offender, the law is often singularly impractical, making but little distinction between offenses which constitute an actual social menace and those which merely represent what we may describe as a public nuisance. Let us consider, for example, the crime commonly known as Indecent Exposure. The important and practical factor is the question of the type of individual before whom the offender exposed himself. In the case of indecent exposure before children, we have an actual social menace. Any sexual offense involving children is an actual social menace because of its potentially dangerous effect on the immature mind. In the case of indecent exposure before an adult, however, we have a public nuisance. There is no potential danger involved. Mrs. Grundy knows what a man's sex organs look like; and she should know, if she has any sense at all, that any man who chooses to exhibit them on a street, in a park, or before an open window is a victim of mental aberration and belongs

in a mental hospital rather than a jail. It is true that she may not like having her sensibilities shocked in such manner; but she suffers no harm, nor is she in any danger of harm. She is a grown woman who knows "the facts of life," and she is not going to be mentally injured by such an exhibition, as might a child be to whom it represents something which the child does not understand. There should be a complete separation of cases of indecent exposure into those which utilize children as their object and those which are confined to exhibition before adults. It is not what the man does which is important, but the potential effect of what he does on the individual before whom he does it.

Cases of indecent exposure also represent one of the commonest examples of repeated sexual offenses, for which punishment offers no solution whatever. I am basing my present observations on a survey of over 200 cases of sexual offenders admitted to Saint Elizabeths Hospital, a majority of them from prisons or jails where they were serving sentences of varying duration. In one such case, the patient estimates that he has exposed himself "about 300 times." Does anyone believe that a prison sentence will have any effect on such a case? We are dealing with a compelling irresistible urge which all the prisons between here and Hades cannot remedy. In another case the only complainant was a policeman, and the patient was sent to jail for six months. Was the policeman mentally corrupted or emotionally endangered by this man's infantile exhibition? We learn that the patient had been arrested once before on the same charge; and he would have been arrested many times again if his mental reaction in jail had not resulted in his being sent to the hospital. In still another case, the patient exposed himself to a milkman. Was the milkman mentally corrupted or emotionally endangered? In still another case there were two previous arrests for indecent exposure and one for voyeurism. In another there had been numerous previous arrests for exposure. The same thing is true in at least ten other cases where there had been anywhere from one to eleven previous arrests for the same offense.

No man arrested a dozen times for the same thing is going to derive any benefit from being sent to jail for a period of months or even years. Nor will society derive any benefit from such an abortive procedure. It may revenge itself upon the unfortunate victim of a compelling drive but it will not save itself from multiple repetitions of his objectionable behavior. The only effective remedy is a psychiatric one, designed to destroy the root of the aberration responsible for the repeated offense.

With respect to voyeurism, we have a situation comparable to that in

the cases of indecent exposure. The voyeur does even less actual harm than the exhibitionists, for his activity is invariably carried out with secrecy. When his presence is detected by his victims, of course he subjects them to fright, for their first thought is that his intentions are predatory, which, however, they rarely are. The same thing applies to him as to the exhibitionist with respect to the futility of punishment. Like the exhibitionist, he is the victim of a compelling, irresistible urge and no amount of imprisonment is going to effect any change in his psychological condition.

I recall a recent case of a young man who represented the complex combination of fetichism, voyeurism, transvestism, housebreaking (or unlawful entry), and what the law called assault with attempt to rape. This individual first stole female underclothing (usually from clothes-lines, etc.); he then dressed himself in it, under his outer clothing, and would thereafter proceed to some vantage point from which he could watch women in the act of undressing. (Incidentally, why don't women undressing pull down their shades?) He next removed his outer clothing and, clad only in the female underwear, proceeded to enter houses, either through an unlocked door or an open window, go to the women's bedrooms and request them to allow him to have intercourse with them, apparently under the impression that they should gladly and willingly accede to such a suggestion. There was no "attempt to rape," nor any threat of rape, legal terminology to the contrary notwithstanding. Usually the women screamed and he fled; returned to the place where he had left his own clothes, he masturbated in the female underwear, donned his outer clothing and went home. Here is a case for psychiatric treatment if there ever was one. Yet this young man was sent to prison, from which he will probably emerge with his neurosis fully structuralized and set, unless—which is most unlikely—that particular prison possesses psychiatric facilities for treating his complex neurosis. This man was a sexual offender; perhaps a potentially dangerous individual; certainly not a person who should be allowed at large; but not a criminal in any true and practical sense of the word, except in the eyes of a short-sighted, ignorant, and holier-than-thou jurist.

When we come to consider sodomy, the law is archaic and goes back almost to Deuteronomy. In the light of psychiatric knowledge of the past forty years, it seems to embody little else than ecclesiastical fury. The average psychiatrist can see no reason why any law should prohibit

any two adult persons from engaging in any form of sexual activity in private and by mutual consent. The recent furor over homosexuality was baseless, stupid, political and productive of nothing except glorious encouragement of blackmail which, in the light of abstract morality, is the worst and most contemptible of all possible crimes.

The penal codes of the various states present the most absurd discrepancy with respect to the penalties for sodomy. The sentences vary all the way from thirty days to life, the most prevalent sentence being for a maximum of ten years, some for fifteen, some for twenty, one for thirty and one for sixty. The minimum sentence is one to five years, except in the case of one state where it is from thirty days to two years. In one state the crime carries a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment, and in another it is from five years to life.

The law takes little cognizance of mental disorder unless it is so obvious that even a blind man can see it. If a man writes obscene letters because "the voices" told him to, as one of these patients did, and if that fact comes to the attention of the Court, the probability is that he will be sent to a mental hospital rather than to prison. When a man has a record of previous incarceration in a mental hospital, the chances are, if this fact is known, that he will be sent to another rather than to prison. If a man commits a murder at the command of God or the Virgin Mary or the Holy Ghost, the likelihood is that he will be recognized as a mental case. But there are a great many forms of mental disorder which do not ever come to the attention of the law, or which, if they do come to its attention, are generally disregarded. In one of these cases the patient was sent to the penitentiary for fifteen years on a charge of murder; and he was an epileptic. That fact should have been discovered before he was sentenced. Epilepsy is a profound mental disease, and in some cases the epileptic commits murder during an attack. No such man should be convicted of murder; he is clearly a case for a mental institution. In the light of my experience, the number sent to a mental institution is much smaller than it should be. Some of these patients were suffering from cerebral arteriosclerosis; some of them were suffering from cerebral syphilis, some from encephalitis. What measures, if any, are taken to discover these facts before they were hustled off to prison for a sexual offense? Certainly they were a social menace; they should have been taken out of circulation; but they called for hospital treatment, not imprisonment.

In the field of sexual offenses particularly, the law appears to take

the position that a man commits an objectionable act out of pure cussedness or depravity. But the average man is not an example of pure cussedness, and he is not depraved. The average man does not expose himself in public; he does not go around peeping in windows in the hope of seeing women undressing; he does not commit rape; he does not have incestuous relations with his mother or his sister or his niece; he does not select children as objects of sexual attraction. To the psychiatrist, it seems almost obvious that the men who do such things are mentally abnormal; that they suffer from long-standing emotional maladjustments; that they are representative of what psychiatry calls the paraphilias; and that sending them to prison is the wrong thing to do, both from a moral, professional and a practical standpoint. Every one of them comes out of prison as bad as he went in, if not worse, except in the comparatively few cases where the prison is equipped to offer psychotherapeutic treatment—and how many prisons are so equipped? The law, which offers “the protection of society” as an excuse for its attitude, fails to accomplish the very thing with which it professes to be most concerned; for society is *not* protected, except temporarily, so long as the sexual offender carries within himself the same emotional reactions that were the cause of his arrest and which, upon his release, will continue to operate precisely as they did before. The sexual offender must either be sent to prison for life or he must be placed in an institution where his warped emotional pattern can be corrected by psychiatric means. A prison sentence of so many months or so many years does not solve the fundamental problem. From a psychiatric point of view, there is no more sense in sending a man to prison for exhibitionism or voyeurism than there is for sending him to prison for tuberculosis. In both cases the man is sick and one is just as sick as the other.

— 3 —

Of the cases covered by this survey, forty-six have a record of previous arrests, of which number forty-three were for sexual offenses. The number of previous arrests ranges from one to twelve. Occasionally it is merely stated that there have been “repeated arrests” or “many arrests.” In a few cases there were previous arrests for both sexual and non-sexual offenses. These figures simply support and confirm the contention that the paraphiliac pattern is repetitive, and that repeated sentences for the same type of offense accomplish nothing beyond the removal of the individual from circulation for a limited

time and that as soon as he is released the pattern is resumed. What is needed is to break the pattern. Imprisonment won't do it.

The statistics derived from those cases which involve paedophilia (sexual interest in children) are generally confusing. We find, naturally, that sexual offenses against girls are far more numerous than those against boys, because heterosexual interest prevails among men, while homosexual interests is the exception. There are fifty-nine cases involving sexual offenses of various kinds against children of varying ages. The ages of the victims range from five to seventeen. Forty-four cases involve girls; twelve involve boys; and three involve both boys and girls. The recorded charges include: incest, rape, attempted rape, carnal knowledge, assault with intent to commit sodomy, indecent assault, sodomy, attempted sodomy, indecent exposure, contributing to the delinquency of a minor, molesting minors, improper advances, mailing obscene letters, soliciting for lewd purposes, and violation of the Mann Act. There are in addition a small number of cases in which the data merely describes what the patient did and does not record the actual charge placed against him. This great variety of charges is bewildering, and there are some cases in which the description of the offense does not appear to be in accordance with the description of the charge. The psychiatrist does not pretend to understand law, but he cannot help but feel, particularly with respect to these offenses involving children, that there should be a simpler and more comprehensive category of charges covering such offenses. To him, the important thing is the potential effect of premature and ugly sexual stimulation and initiation upon a child. He is not primarily interested in the precise form it took or exactly what the offender did or tried to do. Any sexual approach to a child constitutes a social menace, whether it be that of indecent exposure, an attempt to commit carnal knowledge, the actual commission of carnal knowledge, or rape or sodomy. He knows only that children should be free from sexual approaches by adults. Insofar as he is concerned, attempted rape is as bad as rape; attempted carnal knowledge is as bad as carnal knowledge; assault with intent to commit sodomy is as bad as the actual commission of sodomy. To him, the law seems to be impractical in its concern with the precise *modus operandi* of the individual who takes sexual liberties with a child, rather than with the fact that a sexual liberty of any kind was taken. He cannot see where this infinite variety of charges is necessary, or what purpose it serves.

In very few of these sexual cases do we find a combination of sexual psychopathy and predatory psychopathy. In one case where the charge

was Assault with Intent to Rob we find a history of homosexuality developed in prison, but no mention of any previous sexual offense. In one case the individual was charged with rape and robbery, and it appears that this man first robbed his victims and then raped them. (Incidentally, he had cerebral syphilis.) In another case the individual was charged with false pretenses and his repeated offenses involved the passing of bad checks; but it was found that his predatory activities were carried on in order to finance homosexual pursuits. However, there is no record of his ever having been arrested for a sexual offense. In one case where the crime is described as carnal knowledge, the patient has a record of previous arrests for petty larceny. In one case of indecent exposure there is a record of "many previous arrests for larceny." In one case of rape, there is also the charge of robbery and housebreaking. The patient entered a building through a window, raped a woman who was employed there and stole her pocketbook. Here are only a few cases out of more than 200 which combine predatory psychopathy with sexual psychopathy. One may say perhaps that the white slavery cases involve predatory psychopath in a certain sense, for there the offender forces a woman into prostitution for financial reasons but this is an indirect form of predatory activity differing in character from outright theft, robbery or embezzlement.

— 4 —

Many misconceptions and preconceptions exist among people with reference to the relationship between various paraphilias. There is an impression current that if one is guilty of one kind of perversion, though it may be a very innocent one, he may run amuck and indulge readily in others which are much more, and even extremely, dangerous. My material, though relatively small and limited, offers little support for this contention. Only about six percent of the cases charged with rape and related reactions, have in them a component of homosexuality; only about five percent of exhibitionism and even a much smaller percentage, 1.5 percent, of voyeurism. Certainly not very large proportions, which means that rape and related reactions are relatively pure reactions involving but little of other paraphilias. About ten percent were cases of incest but it must be borne in mind that incest here, for the most part, involves children which, in any event, would be considered rape. In all my cases of homosexuality I found only one case of rape which oddly enough was that of a man, a reaction therefore not regarded legally as rape. It was the case of a man who forced another man at the point of

a knife to perform perversions on him. Exhibitionism, for the most part, is heterosexual but I have encountered about six percent of male exhibitionism before males. Also connected with exhibitionism one may sometimes encounter obscene letter-writing, about three percent. The relationship is understandable and one is surprised that there isn't more of it. In the misuse of males which includes obscene letter-writing, we have a reaction which may spread itself into related fields like exhibitionism, molesting over the telephone and so on, but nothing like ramifying itself in such extreme reactions as rape. In this offense there are a great many variations that one also finds in other conditions. One man will write vulgar and obscene letters to prominent society women while another will address the same kind of material to a maternal type of woman. One will write letters to older women; another will write to young women as when the man writes obscene letters to a former girl friend who married another man. Sadism, unconscious homosexuality, mother attachments, jealousy, revenge all go here. One cannot fail to observe the great variety of descriptions of the charges of the crime here. Certainly there must be a uniform charge to cover the Federal statute against the mailing of obscene letters.

The most dangerous form of sexual psychopathy is represented by paedophilia. Here we find the greatest variety of charges. We cannot be sure that all of these are accurate transcriptions of the exact legal charge. We find among them the following: Perverted assault on little girl (Why not carnal knowledge?). In one case we find the charge, "Feeling a woman's leg while attending a movie," but discover that the patient was actually arrested for mutual fondling with a girl in a theatre. And so on and so on: indecent assault; taking immoral, improper and indecent liberties; molesting a twelve-year-old girl on a bus, etc. Reading these confused charges, we can only conclude that the law is woefully lacking in clarity and system with respect to the various types of sexual offenses, particularly those which involve children.

## II. PERVERTS MUST LIVE

Some years ago, there lived a wise and humane physician who was a superintendent of a hospital for the insane. He gave his wards more than custodial care; he looked upon each individual case as a deep personal tragedy and did his best to lighten the tragedy not only for the patient himself but also for others related to him.

One day it developed that a young woman nurse was a homosexual and her presence was creating a problem among the nurses. Her imme-

diate superior had decided that such a person was unfit to be connected with a hospital and they were ready to dismiss her with the stigma attached that would prevent her from receiving a like position in another hospital. When the matter was brought to the attention of the superintendent, he stated that if she were not allowed to work here, it would be harder for her to work elsewhere. With the stigma attached to the situation, she would probably have to drop her profession of nursing and be obliged to make an adjustment at a much lower social and emotional level. While the hospital as such, would be rid of the problem, the problem, he thought, would not be solved by dismissing her. "Perverts have to live," he said. He felt that if she remained at the hospital, the situation could be kept under control and the behavior reduced to a minimum. With so much ignorance and prejudice existing with reference to the problem, it was most courageous for the man to act as he did.

It is entirely in the spirit of the profession to take up for causes not popular, and suffer the consequences therefrom. Nineteen hundred years ago Saint Paul spoke of the three great Christian virtues: Faith, Hope and Charity, and the greatest of these is Charity. There is, however, one virtue which he did not mention and which was not mentioned until seventeen centuries later. Boswell asked Dr. Johnson what he considered the greatest of virtues, to which Dr. Johnson replied: "Courage; for, if one has courage he can practice other virtues."

Perhaps it has required courage on the part of psychiatry to take up for the pervert, as did originally the above mentioned physician: courage not only against the popular idea of it but even against the prejudices of the medical profession itself. But psychiatry has already taken up the cudgels for many other minorities; the insane, the criminal, the under-privileged and neglected child; and so it may well take up for the pervert who, certainly, is the most abused and most vilified of all neglected minorities.

That a homosexual is not a "pervert" but the victim of a constitutional or psychological development which gives him a sexual orientation that is different from the established social pattern, has been a matter of scientific and clinical knowledge for many years, but such knowledge has not affected the popular view which is guided more by unreasoning emotions than by rational thinking. From a scientific point of view, there is very little which differentiates a homosexual from any other individual except his peculiar sexual orientation. He may be a wise and cultivated gentleman or he may be a fool, just as any heterosexual

may be either one. He may be the highest representative of honesty and integrity or he may be a crook, just as any heterosexual may be either one. Strength of character cannot be totally determined by the existence of a sexual aberration. The fact that an individual is homosexual does not of itself invest him with any other specific character traits that are of social import.

The position recently taken by certain vociferous gentlemen and echoed by the newspapers, that homosexuals represent a serious threat to national security can only be applicable to a very small percentage of such persons who occupy positions in which they have access to secret information of a definitely diplomatic character. It cannot possibly apply to the average government employee engaged in routine work that has no relation to policy-making issues. The crux of the argument revolves around the "particular susceptibility of homosexuals to blackmail." The proponents of this argument do not seem to realize that they are placing a premium on blackmail—the most despicable of all activities—and are deliberately inviting every unscrupulous policeman (and there are many such, I understand) and every vindictive and sadistic individual with a grudge, to engage in the very activity they are claiming as the basis for their discrimination against homosexuality. The easiest way to prevent the blackmailing of homosexuals is to recognize homosexuality as a fact and to remove the unreasonable laws which discriminate against it—laws which have created far more mischief than they started out to eradicate. If a homosexual is a bad security risk because he is susceptible to blackmail, that is the result of an anomalous legal situation which plays into the hands of blackmailers (including the police). Homosexual relations between adults should not be classified as criminal, and it should be impossible to blackmail such persons. It must further be borne in mind that those being discharged now are the ones on whom there is a record, and the remaining are those whose record is clear. But it is the former who could be easily controlled. The latter would be most susceptible to approach.

The term "homosexual" in any social sense is meaningless, for there is as great a variety of homosexual persons as there is of heterosexual persons. In common with most other conditions which represent a departure from the so-called normal (actually there is no such thing as "normal"; it is merely a synonym for "socially acceptable"), homosexuality is like a long ribbon which is jet black at one end and pure white at the other, while in between there may be found every imag-

inable variety of shade or tint. There is as much divergence and variety among homosexuals as there is among politicians, or workingmen. The estimate, as given by Hirschfield, that homosexuals constitute five percent of the population, is at best only a broad approximation. Midway between the homosexual and the heterosexual, there is a large group of men and women whose sexual adjustment, though technically heterosexual, is basically homosexual. Such unconscious homosexual adjustments are much greater in extent than open homosexuality and pervades our life to a much greater extent than is commonly appreciated.

Because of the great complexity of the problem in any consideration of homosexuality, it is, therefore, necessary to know the type of homosexual under discussion. There are, of course, many homosexuals of a certain type who, however, unfortunate they may be, are objectionable individuals because of their flagrant promiscuity, their shallow silliness, and their general tendency to make public nuisances of themselves. But this type cannot possibly constitute a menace to security of Government because none of them has brains enough to hold a responsible position. To designate this type of homosexual as a "bad security risk," is not reasonable, because in such a case, there is nothing to risk. Such a type of homosexual cannot possibly occupy a position in which he becomes a depository of state secrets. The sober, quiet type of homosexual, on the other hand, is rarely found in such a position, because he lacks the aggression necessary to push himself into one. The type of homosexual who is capable of becoming a bad security risk, because of his accessibility to highly confidential and secret information, is a rare and unusual figure. There can be very few such persons in such sensitive positions in the Government service. With respect to those few—and with respect to them only—there is, in the face of the existing social and legal situation, some basis for the fears voiced by these hysterical agitators but the danger ends there. The excited and confused gentlemen who maintain that homosexuals should not be Government employees at all, cannot possibly base this contention on the theory that they may be poor security risks in an agency dedicated to safeguarding national security. They have strayed far from the original issue, viz., the prevention of espionage activities. What security risk is involved, for example, at the Library of Congress where all the information is available to the public anyway? And there are numerous other agencies which have little or no connection with matters affecting national security. The idea of declaring all homosexuals *persona non grata* in all Government agencies is predicated on prejudice, and on prejudice only. It would be just

as logical to exclude from Federal employment all Negroes, all Jews or Catholics, or all persons with red hair.

A man who is homosexual (nothing seems to have been said about women who are homosexual) is hardly more susceptible to blackmail than one who is promiscuously heterosexual. A man who is a typical Don Juan and who is romantically and/or sexually involved with first one woman and then another, may become as bad a security risk as any homosexual.

— 2 —

This whole problem has become hopelessly confused with social prejudices that have little or no relation to scientific facts. Every human being is bisexual. There is some homosexuality in every so-called normal man—just as there is some potential sadism, exhibitionism, voyeurism, or other paraphiliac (perverse) manifestation. Students of sex psychology have long accepted the view that during adolescence, all of us go through a homosexual stage of development and there are many youths who have had a few homosexual experiences here and there, yet later developing into perfectly healthy, normal, men and women. Because of such experiences, it is quite possible for any so-called normal man to regress to a homosexual level under certain conditions. There is no positive guarantee against the development of homosexuality in any human being, just as there is no positive guarantee against the development of any other form of mental or emotional disturbance.

The repeated linking of homosexuality with communism is an absurdity. The average homosexual is far less likely to develop communistic ideas than an individual of some other type. The silly, shallow, homosexual is not interested in politics of any description. The intelligent, serious-minded homosexual is usually an introvert with more or less artistic inclinations of one sort or another, and possesses comparatively little political interest. Indeed, if he is politically active, he is far more likely to be a conservative, in order to compensate for the single unconventional and non-conformist aspect of his personality make-up represented by his unorthodox sexual outlook.

Homosexuality is a condition for which the individual is no more responsible than he would be for tuberculosis or high blood pressure. It is sometimes responsive to psychotherapeutic treatment especially if it is earnestly and sincerely desired. All too often, it is so deeply rooted in the individual's development that treatment should have begun much earlier, for by early adulthood, little more can be done than to ameliorate or modify the existing pattern. Until such time as science can

eradicate or cure homosexuality in the human animal, excited and ignorant demagogues should not be permitted to launch any such wholesale persecution of homosexuals as they contemplate doing at the present time. They have inaugurated a witch-hunt which is reminiscent of Old Salem. Then, in ignorance of natural law and inspired by leaders of a sadistic and diabolical religion, the population hunted "witches"; now, in ignorance of natural and psychological law, and inspired by leaders whose motives are questionable, they propose to hunt "perverts."

If they persist in their present policy, the aftermath will be an incalculable increase in human misery, including an increasing wave of suicides. A man who has given the best years of his life to Civil Service cannot readily secure other employment after being ignominiously dismissed because his temperament does not conform to the standards of the Babbits. He can only echo Shylock:

"Nay, take my life and all; pardon not that;  
You take my house when you do take the prop  
That doth sustain my house; you take my life,  
When you do take the means whereby I live."

If the policy recently inaugurated is followed through to its logical conclusion, it may be confidently predicted that the newspapers for the next year or so will have a fine crop of stories of "mysterious" suicides with which to entertain their readers. There may be murders too.

But if the so holy and self-righteous and fanatical "patriotic" leaders (whose holiness and righteousness we question, but whose fanaticism is fairly obvious) want to "go the whole hog," why not revert to medieval practices and revive the *auto da fe*? They might have all the homosexuals publicly burned at the stake on Pennsylvania Avenue; or they can borrow some ideas from Hitler and Stalin and create some nice concentration camps to which these offensive individuals can be sent to be beaten to death by their holy, righteous and fanatical heterosexual betters. Perhaps that would be more in keeping with the enlightened state of our present "civilization." Social discrimination against homosexuals is no different from social discrimination against Negroes and Jews; is no different from the discrimination exercised by a community which is preponderantly representative of one religious sect against the members of other religious sects. It is a lamentable habit of the human race to discriminate against any minority, whether that minority represents race, color, religion or sexual orientation. It is this sort of dis-

crimination which certain amendments to the Constitution were calculated to forestall and offset. How far they have succeeded in doing so may be open to question.

— 3 —

There have been homosexuals whom the world today honors, although it doesn't usually mention their homosexuality. Tschaikovsky was a homosexual, as all of his later biographers admit; Michael Angelo was a homosexual, and so was Leonardo Da Vinci. Julius Caesar had a homosexual phase in early life; Christopher Marlowe and William Shakespeare have both been mentioned more than once in a homosexual connection. Oscar Wilde was homosexual as everybody knows. No one can read the word of Walt Whitman without realizing that he was at least bisexual, although his exact status is a matter of dispute among his many biographers. Marcel Proust was presumably homosexual, while Andre Gide is admittedly so. Paul Verlaine was undoubtedly homosexual. The list could run to the point of becoming tiresome.

They are neither moral weaklings nor degenerates. There was nothing weak or degenerate about Frederick the Great, as courageous a warrior as there ever was, and better than a match for Richard, the Lion-Hearted. He was a highly cultured man, as much interested in the political administration as he was in science, philosophy and culture.

Homosexuality has existed in all ages, in all countries, and in all civilizations. Everyone knows that "the glory that was Greece" was intimately associated with homosexuality which had social recognition. The why and wherefore of homosexuality still remains an unanswered question. The answer, when found, will probably be multiple rather than single. Whether homosexuality is an inevitable factor in human life or whether it can one day be eradicated, remains to be seen. But the present hysteria on the subject is wholly disproportionate to the issue which is alleged to have occasioned it, and is suggestive of nothing so much as an orgy of intolerant and sadistic hatred which is closely allied to the mechanisms associated with paranoia.

The witch-hunt is as old as the history of hate. The early Christians under the Roman Emperors were its victims, and after Christianity became far more powerful than Christian, it proceeded to repeat the performance with its fanatical persecution of each sect or group that represented a minority opinion and could be made an excuse for the discharge of sadistic hatred. Catholics hunted Protestants, or Protestants hunted Catholics, according to the ecclesiastical persuasion of the ruling power. Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Arians, Quakers, to say nothing of

the Jews, were all, at one time or another, the chosen targets for ecclesiastical fury. "Witches," as such, were hunted in Europe long before they were heard of in America, being conspicuously associated in England with the zeal of the Puritans under the Commonwealth; but Salem, as everybody knows, made up for lost time, once it got started. Nowadays we do not believe in witches, but we still thoroughly enjoy hunting them in the person of whatever minority group can be made the subject of hysterical prejudice and mob psychology.

In the early days of Virginia, while it wasn't quite as bad to be a Quaker as it was in Massachusetts to be a "witch," it was cause for the strongest discrimination and persecution; and in New York, around the same time, any Catholic was subject to similar treatment. The passing of time brings changes in method, but not in principle; and intolerance and hatred are as rampant today in the human animal as they have ever been. New sets of circumstances are created, or disproportionately exaggerated, to bring into operation the same hysterical reaction that prevailed in past times and in communities which we now call "ignorant."

— 4 —

Since this is so universal a reaction, it must, presumably, have quite universal psychological reasons behind it. It is in the nature of human instincts that they never reach complete realization. Thus, the human being, forever beset with unsatisfied cravings and emotions and an unending chain of frustrations which give him no rest, is prodded on and on to seek further release and gratification. To be properly discharged, an emotion must attach itself to some object through which it eventually obtains release. An emotion that has not been able to attach itself to the proper object is spoken of as free-floating and remains thus free-floating until it has properly discharged itself. A free-floating emotion creates in the individual a state of tension and anxiety. A young man waiting for a date, his heart beating fast, is temporarily beset by free-floating anxiety, which anxiety expresses a state of restlessness and dissatisfaction. It disappears when the object of his interest shows up.

Hostility is an emotion that is experienced by every human being, virtually from the day of his birth until his death. Our culture, any culture, provides numerous ways which help to discharge or otherwise dispose of the accumulated tension, frustrations, anxieties and hostilities. Withal, there is a large residuum left that has not been sublimated or disposed of and which, pressing for release, allows itself to be discharged on any situation that represents a danger or a threat. In the

manner of anxiety, hostility too, may be free-floating if it has not found an opportunity to discharge itself on an object of hate.

It is on this basis of free-floating hostility that one may explain the readiness with which human beings plunge into situations that provide opportunity for the discharge of their hostility, and it does not matter whether the object is the same as originally intended or some other object. This free-floating hostility explains the many hostile acts that human beings carry on daily in their lives, the open and subtle knifing that men do to each other. It explains the reaction of social aggression against particular individuals who happen to incur the enmity of the group. It explains internecine assaults, as in the case of the Hatfields and McCoys whose children have long forgotten the cause of the original difference, but go on fighting just the same. It explains much of the witch-hunting to which the world has been a witness from times immemorial. It also explains our readiness for war.

In the manner of the jailer who asked St. Paul (Acts 16:30), the sexual offender asks, "What shall I do to be saved?"