

Understanding Homosexuality in Postwar Kansas

Hugo Márquez

Introduction. In *U.S.A. Confidential*, a sensationalist book of immoral criminal activities published in 1952, the authors stated that “when Kansas does anything, it means the rest of the country did it years ago.”¹ This statement seems to apply to the way authorities and the general population viewed homosexuality in postwar Kansas, which was similar to the way homosexuality was viewed in the bigger cities of the United States at an earlier time of the century, and at odds with some of the changes that were occurring in other parts of the country.

The fifties are a time of paramount importance in the evolution of the conceptualization of homosexuality in the United States, resulting in a major shift with the way society saw homosexuality. Before World War II, homosexuality was an identity only for few very feminine men and masculine females. The act of having sex with a person of the same sex was deemed immoral and grotesque, and as such it was heavily penalized, but it did not determine a person's sexuality. By the fifties people became aware that there could be masculine gay men and feminine lesbians, and the number of homosexuals was thought to be larger than previously assumed. The increased postwar awareness was spurred by the war time experience of veterans as well as the Kinsey report. This awareness was detrimental for gays and lesbians in the short term; however, as it led authorities to focus their efforts to finding and arresting them. By this time the act of engaging in sex with a person of the same sex was enough to make the person a homosexual. The increased awareness about homosexuality was guided by the science of psychology, which had assumed a leading role in society after World War II. Psychologists held that homosexuality was a mental disorder that only a minority suffered, and they positioned themselves as the only ones capable of curing it through therapy. In doing so, psychologists were unconsciously planting the seeds of a homosexual identity, and the notion of an oppressed minority that came about decades later. According to psychologists homosexuals had no control over their affliction;

¹ Jack Lait and Lee Mortimer, *U.S.A. Confidential* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1952), 279.

they were victims who more than punished needed to be treated. This shift is what Beth Bailey refers to as the replacement of a moralistic model for a therapeutic one in the explanation of homosexuality.²

This article focuses on how homosexuality was viewed during the postwar in Kansas. My argument is that Kansas only partially followed the change of models in the understanding of homosexuality, with some changes occurring in the way homosexuals were punished that went along with the therapeutic model but with a general acceptance of the moralistic model by the general public. This discrepancy between one and the other could be explained by the state's lack of metropolitan centers, which could enable a higher number of gays and lesbians. The distance that Kansas had from the bigger cities where homosexuality was being discussed also produced a lack of awareness about gays and lesbians, and the way in which the view about them was changing. As a result of these elements most homosexuals lived in a condition of individual isolation in Kansas, as opposed to the collective secrecy that gays and lesbians could have in the bigger cities. Whereas in some parts of the nation homosexuals were beginning to be viewed as a minority of sick people, in Kansas there seemed to be a more ambiguous notion of what a homosexual was, which implied a gender non conformity and the "immoral" character of the sin that they committed.

Homosexuality in an earlier part of the century. Before WWII homosexuality was viewed as an identity only in the cases of very effeminate men and masculine women, and a sexual relationship with a person of the same sex was an immoral act that could be heavily penalized, but it did not determine a person's sexuality.³ The senate report on *Alleged Immoral Conditions at Newport (R.I.) Naval Training Station*, in which both Secretary Josephus Daniels and Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin Delano Roosevelt were accused of using young sailors as baits in an investigation of homosexuality in the Navy reflects this perception. The senators were appalled by the instructions that Daniels and Roosevelt gave to the detectives "allowing immoral acts to be performed upon them, if in their judgment it was necessary for the propose of...capturing certain specified alleged sexual perverts." The outcome of these instructions was that many sailors did indeed find it in their judgment to have "immoral" sex. In a statement that shows how homosexuality was thought of as a conscious immoral behavior that anyone could make, the report stated that:

² Beth Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999), 5.

³ George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Makings of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 13-21.

the 'discretion' or 'judgment' in a service of this revolting character that might be expected of boys fresh from high schools and colleges is questionable.⁴

Notwithstanding these cultural notions, a distinct gay subculture did exist in some of the bigger cities prior to the war, with New York having one of the most visible and active ones. New York's gay subculture intermixed with the mainstream culture at bars and speakeasies in the times of Prohibition, and had as its epicenters Greenwich Village, Time Square, and Harlem. By the onset of the Great Depression this gay subculture reached its apogee in visibility, becoming a fad in nightclubs with pansy shows and drag balls that drew large crowds, and made some of its protagonists famous in the New York scene.⁵

Three major distinctions existed in the gay community; the queers, fairies, and trade. Queers were those more masculine homosexual men who nonetheless frequently preferred their same sex, and they could go back and forth between mainstream society and the gay world without exerting much suspicion. The fairies on the other hand were more easily identified because of their effeminacy; they frequently lived their whole lives within the gay community, finding jobs in gay related businesses and spending most of their time in the gay areas of New York. The important group that marks the shift that later developed in the conceptualization of homosexuality was 'the trade.' Like some of the aforementioned sailors, the trade were predominantly heterosexual men as understood by their most frequent sexual behavior, who could on occasion engage in sex with other men. Trade were frequently paid or solicited by queers and fairies, and they usually worked in masculine jobs such as the military. In this early part of the century, trade could engage in sexual activity with persons of their same sex without seeing this as a threat to their own sexuality.

The repeal of Prohibition and the Great Depression contributed to the disappearance of this gay subculture from the visibility it once had in cities such as New York, where parameters of 'normalcy' were reinforced. Increasingly engaging in homosexual activity was seen in itself as a marker of homosexuality, and there was a decrease of heterosexual men who had sex with their same sex. Representations of homosexuality were banned in all public spheres, with the Motion Picture Association censoring all depictions of lewdness and obscenity in its code of 1934. If anything the etymology and evolution of the word gay is illustrative of this shift in conceptualization. Originally used to identify just the

⁴ Senate, *Alleged Immoral Conditions at New Port (R.I.) Naval Training Station*, 67th Cong., 1st sess., 1921, 4-7.

⁵ Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 1-4, 227-28, 302-314.

'fairies,' the word gay subsequently extended to include all people who had sex with the same sex, encompassing queers and trade as well. Not all gay people were happy about the changes, as a gay man from the thirties was heard to say:

Most of my crowd [in the 1930s and 1940s] wanted to have sex with a straight man. There was something very hot about a married man! And a lot of straight boys let us have sex with them. People don't believe it now. People say now that they must have been gay. But they weren't.

By the time gay historian Martin Duberman came of age in New York, the word gay was already used to identify people of all homosexual orientation.⁶

Postwar Awareness. By the postwar there was a resurgence in awareness of homosexual populations in the bigger cities of the nation; enabled by World War II experiences and the popularity of the publication of Kinsey's *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. This postwar awareness was dominated by the repressive political climate of the red scare, and the emerging leading voice of psychology as the last word in all social problems.

The Second World War had a profound effect on the United States in almost all aspects of its society, and homosexuals were not exempted from this. Gay men and lesbian women found in the environment of the military certain freedoms that they did not find before in the civilian society, as they also became more visible to their comrades in arms. Although the military had a policy of not allowing homosexuals to serve, the lack of awareness prior to the war about homosexual populations outside of the big metropolises, as well as the idea that homosexuals were only very effeminate men and manly women enabled many gays and lesbians to pass entry examinations undetected. Once inside the military provided a sex segregated environment in which sexual contact with the same sex was more possible. Moreover, the extreme battle conditions and the deep bonds of affection forged among troops enabled a relatively more tolerant position towards someone who was gay.⁷ After the war

⁶ Ibid., 15-23, 335-37 (quote taken from page 21); John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), 19; Martin Duberman, *Cures: A Gay Man's Odyssey* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2002), 22.

⁷ After World War II the raising awareness about homosexuality may have curtailed this relatively "tolerant" environment in the military. By the time Southwestern College graduate Dudley Taves joined in 1957, there seemed to have been a much more repressive environment against homosexuality. Dudley Taves (gay male and retired high

many gays and lesbians from rural backgrounds relocated to bigger cities in the United States as well as in Europe, in order to find a more accommodating environment for themselves. The war experience raised awareness that there were persons who liked their own sex, and that this was more prevalent than they may have once thought.⁸ In addition to the wartime experiences, more light was cast on the subject of homosexuality after the war, and this came from an emerging science of sex and a remarkable scientist named Alfred Kinsey.

The publication by Alfred Kinsey of *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* in 1948 became very popular, and the name of the former zoologist immediately became synonymous with sex.⁹ Possibly one of the most popular and controversial findings of the research dealt with the prevalence of homosexuality among adult males. Kinsey found that 37% of the adult population had had a homosexual experience at least once in their lifetime, and this number was thought to be an understatement as this was not an activity people were willing to confess.¹⁰ Based on these findings, the scientist proposed a continuum to explain the sexuality of people, with homosexuality at one end and heterosexuality at the other, and with people tending towards one or the other. Kinsey proposed that homosexuality was part of human nature and not abnormal, which was a radical statement to make in his time. Referring to this concept he stated that:

the homosexual has been a significant part of human sexual activity ever since the dawn of history, primarily because it is an expression of capacities that are basic in the human animal.¹¹

school teacher from Wichita), interview given and recorded by author, December 1, 2009.

⁸ D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 24, 31; Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 16. Gay author and former navy man James Barr referred to the navy as almost like paradise, with “fifty-cent Martinis” and “half-naked sailors” everywhere. For reference see Kennedy, “A Touch of Royalty Gay Author James Barr,” copy obtained from the James (Barr) Fugate Collection MS 2004-02, Wichita State University Libraries, Department of Special Collections and University Archives, 1-2.

⁹ Kinsey published *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* in 1948, and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* in 1953, for reference on Kinsey's report commercial success see D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 33-35.

¹⁰ Morris L. Ernst & David Loth, *American Sexual Behavior and The Kinsey Report* (New York: Educational Book Co., 1948), 24; D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 34; Alfred Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1948), 623.

¹¹ Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, 666.

Among other things the scientist expressed the radical ideas that many gay men and lesbian women were gender normative, and that the alleged abnormality of the homosexual was due to societal stigmas not stemming from his sexuality.¹²

Although Kinsey's report became widely distributed and talked about, the conclusions that the scientist made upon his findings were not shared but by a minority composed of sociologists and sexual scientists in academia. After the publication of *Sexual Behavior of the Human Male*, prominent people denounced the sexologist for his 'immoral' conclusions, with the president of Princeton University comparing Kinsey's findings to "the work of small boys writing dirty words on fences."¹³ Most importantly psychologists did not agree with the findings, since the fact that homosexuality was more "common" than assumed did not make it "normal" in their eyes.¹⁴

Psychology was the main voice on what were considered sexual disorders after the War, and psychologists deemed homosexuality a sexual disorder that had ramifications that could also affect the behavior of the affected person. Historian Martin Duberman referred to the reasons why psychology was so popular in postwar America, stating that:

In a culture that had grown apolitical and conservative, analyzing the inner life had become a primary, praiseworthy enterprise. For intellectuals and egotists especially, (therapy) was the elective choice of the moment, *the* certified path to self knowledge (emphasis as in the original).¹⁵

Following the Freudian tenet that sexual energy determined a person's behavior, psychoanalysts saw homosexuals as wholly dysfunctional people since their behavior stemmed from a defective sexuality. Frequently the explanation for the homosexuality of a man was rooted on environmental factors in the man's childhood, which would be characterized by the presence of a smothering mother and a non-existent father.¹⁶ For Freud homosexuality was a "sexual aberration," and he considered narcissism to be a characteristic trait of the homosexual, since according to the father of psychoanalysis, gay men:

¹² Ibid., 610, 615, 664.

¹³ D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 36.

¹⁴ Ernst & Loth, *American Sexual Behavior*, 180; Duberman, *Cures*, 11-12.

¹⁵ Ibid., 33.

¹⁶ D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 16-17; Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1963), 384.

take *themselves* as their sexual object. That is to say, they proceed from a narcissistic basis, and look for a young man who resembles themselves and whom *they* may love as their mother loved *them* (emphasis as in the original).

Nevertheless, Freud also stated that either consciously or subconsciously everyone had homosexual desires; thus believing that anyone could become homosexual if he followed these desires.¹⁷

Psychoanalysts of the fifties conveniently paid considerable more emphasis to the 'aberration' part of Freud's views, and less to the idea that everyone was unconsciously bisexual; however they did not deem homosexuality as something irreversible and thought that through proper therapy the "afflicted" person could be "cured." The American Psychiatric Association deemed homosexuality a mental disorder, notion that was supported by a long held popular belief that developed after homosexuals were pushed to invisibility in society, which considered gay men as psychopaths. This view was encouraged by the sensationalizing of few criminal stories involving homosexuals by the media, and some other popular films and literary works in which homosexuals were portrayed as either criminals or victims of a tragedy.¹⁸ With psychology having the leading voice in explaining homosexuality, new notions about the homosexual emerged which differed from the older view that it was just an abominable and immoral sexual act. Psychologists helped propagate the idea that homosexuality was a mental disease, and that even more than punishment the homosexual needed treatment.¹⁹ Summarizing the powerful voice that psychology had for gay men and lesbians of the postwar, the author of the gay novel *Quatrefoil* James Barr stated: "we were the generation that psychoanalysis tried to change."²⁰

This increased postwar awareness of homosexuality was produced in a political atmosphere of great anxiety and fear known as the "red scare." Within this context the negative views on homosexuality were enhanced, and unbiased contributions towards the understanding of homosexuality such as the Kinsey report were interpreted to serve the prejudices and misconceptions of the larger society. The idea that more than one third of the adult male population engaged in homosexual activity did not lead to the thinking that homosexuality was

¹⁷ Sigmund Freud, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (Basic Books, 2000), Footnote added 1910, 10-11.

¹⁸ D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 16-17; Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 359-60; Duberman, *Cures*, 11-12, 15.

¹⁹ Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland*, 54, 60.

²⁰ Kennedy, "Touch of Royalty," 9.

something natural; rather it led authorities to see the need for rooting out the problem since it was more serious than they thought. Accordingly, the notion that there could be masculine gay men and feminine lesbians alarmed the authorities, for them this meant that homosexuals, much like the communists, could not be identified by their appearance and moreover were not easy to detect.²¹ In a time of foreign espionage and cases of internal subversion that resulted in the Soviet Union gaining atomic secrets, it was thought that a homosexual would imperil the security of the nation because he could be blackmailed. This made homosexuals *security risks* (my emphasis), and it enabled the government to legalize the persecution of gays and lesbians to weed them out from the government departments.²² The increased persecution in governmental departments was also translated into police repression in many of the bigger cities of the nation, where homosexual arrests increased exponentially.²³

Although the increased awareness of the postwar worked in detriment of homosexual populations on the short term; it also helped create a gay identity and the concept of an oppressed minority, which was to develop in its fulness by the late sixties. Within months after the release of the Senate report on the *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, the first homophile political organization was formed in Los Angeles, the Mattachine Society. The organization started small and secretly; however within two years it had thousands of members throughout the Californian cities of the coast. By organizing social gatherings to talk about homosexuality, the Society was able to tap into the urban gay and lesbian populations that had been almost invisible hitherto. The communist background of the founders was also instrumental in their thoughts of even creating such an organization, since they already knew what it was like to be on the margins of what was acceptable, and did not have as much of a pressure to conform. Nevertheless, the founders soon saw just how difficult it was to pull together the distinct views and personalities of gays and lesbians into a cohesive group, since the only thing all of the members shared was their attraction to their same sex. The creation of a gay identity was barely in the works in the early fifties, and this seemed to be a great obstacle

²¹ D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 37; Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 360.

²² Senate, *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, 81st Cong., 2nd sess., 1950, S. Doc. 241; David Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 16-17.

²³ William Eskridge Jr., *DisHonorable Passions: Sodomy Laws in America 1861-2003* (New York: Viking, 2008), 95.

that the society ultimately could not overcome.²⁴

Isolation and lack of awareness in the Land of Oz. At the onset of the postwar, Kansas seemed to be far away from Kinsey's polemic and the influence of the psychologists, and even farther away from creating anything similar to the Mattachine Society. When comparing gay people living in bigger cities to Kansans, it becomes clear that the latter had a much harder time in getting to know other gay people or have any information about homosexuality. While Martin Duberman reflected with his gays friends from Boston about psychology and Kinsey in the early fifties, Dudley Taves spent years in Hutchinson, Winfield and Oklahoma without even knowing any information about homosexuality, or any other gay person.²⁵ Taves stated that "it was disgusting that there was nobody that was accessible to talk to," and that during the fifties he spent his time worrying about getting aroused because of other men, and even thought about castrating himself. The difference between Duberman and Taves seemed to have been what the former identified in his book *Cures* as one of collective secrecy versus individual isolation.²⁶ Whereas Duberman had a secret life of concealed friendships and sexual relationships while deeming himself sick, Taves had no homosexual life whatsoever and did not even know what to think of his orientation, besides that it was something wrong according to society. The difference of life paths between the two can not be more striking and illustrative of their geographic and cultural distance, with Duberman living a life of broken gay relationships and attempted psychiatric cures, and Taves marrying and having two daughters. In reference to his life choice Taves stated that:

It was assumed, you are a male, you will eventually find a female, you will get married, and you will have children, and you will spend the rest of your life with a female.

²⁴ D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 58, 65, 68, 74.

²⁵ The only mention about homosexuality that Taves remembers from this time was when he was a senior in High School, in a psychology class which had in its curriculum a section about homosexuality. Taves remembers that the professor was "moderate" in his stance, and that Kinsey might have been mentioned, although what he remembers from Kinsey is erroneous information. This lack of memory about the views on homosexuality at this time was recurrent among all of the people I interviewed, which is very telling of the fact that the postwar awareness of the bigger cities was not translated to Kansas. This and the following statements are from Taves, interview; Duberman, *Cures*, 22-24.

²⁶ Duberman, *Cures*, 22.

For gay males in Kansas the only option for living their homosexuality seemed to have been by getting married and having a partner on the side. Taves remembered having sex with his long time high school friend Richard the night before Richard's wedding.²⁷ Taves himself thought that if he had a male companion whom he could occasionally see, he would not have minded staying married to his wife. This feeling was echoed by another notorious gay Kansan and author of one of the main gay novels of the postwar, James Barr. In his letters the same as in his novel *Quatrefoil*, the author manifested his desire for a long term male companionship and did not object to getting married. Barr seemingly suggested marriage to a woman, who vigorously rejected him.²⁸

Rural gay people might have experienced a greater sense of individual isolationism than gay people living in more populated places in Kansas, since every step they made could be known, and they did not seem to have resources available in their town to lead a homosexual lifestyle. James Barr serves as a good example of the type of life that a gay man could have living in a rural area, notwithstanding his particular situation since he had previously served for four years during World War II, and had lived in New York from where he wrote his famous gay novel *Quatrefoil*. Unlike Taves, Barr was already well acquainted with the postwar ideas about homosexuality which are seen in *Quatrefoil*, a fictional/autobiographical gay love story between two navy men that made references to Freud and was written at the suggestion of Barr's psychologist.²⁹

Barr preferred the country to the city, and by 1950 he moved back to the Midwest-where he was originally from- to live with his family in a small

²⁷ Taves and Richard were lab partners in high school, and had a friendship with some mild sexual activity. They went to balconies in movie theaters and masturbated to depictions of males bare chested. This innocent sexual activity was something to be expected from teenagers and authorities seemed not to concern much about it in the postwar, as Duberman stated in referring to his own adolescent homosexual play "psychiatry in those days dismissed such boyish antics as altogether natural, an expected, even necessary prelude to achieving 'adult' (heterosexual) identity" (parenthesis as in the original), Duberman, *Cures*, 14.

²⁸ In his letter to Noel Cortes Barr wrote: "do you remember the young lady I mentioned that I might marry...when trying to express my thoughts to her, via correspondence, she has become furious with me, and behaved in an altogether unexpected manner. She has even hinted at a breach of promise suit to a friend of mine in Washington." Barr to Noel Cortes, Hollyrood, KS, 29 January 1951, James (Barr) Fugate Collection MS 2004-02, Wichita State University Libraries, Department of Special Collections and University Archives.

²⁹ Kennedy, "Touch of Royalty," 1-2; James Barr, *Quatrefoil*, (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1982, 1950).

farm in Holyrood, Kansas.³⁰ During his stay in Holyrood, he corresponded with a gay friend from Philadelphia named Noël Cortes, and in these letters the author of *Quatrefoil* wrote candidly about the struggles that a gay person faced in a small town.

Like Duberman and possibly other gay men of his time, Barr counted with the acceptance and awareness of part of his family, who knew about his homosexuality. This awareness was both a blessing and a curse to Barr, since on the one hand it allowed him not having the pressure of hiding his identity, on the other it limited what he could do and the guests he could have in his house. Although his family tolerated his homosexuality, they still expected Barr to marry and they did not want him to have sex with men. In referring to the negative connotations of his family's awareness the author stated that it was “the price you pay for honesty.”³¹ Nevertheless within his family Barr had a confidant in his sister, who had a great influence in the author's life. In one of the last letters that Barr wrote to Cortes, he mentioned his decision of stopping communication after his sister recommended it to him.³²

In referring to his life in town, Barr's perceptions changed as time went by. Whereas in one letter in January 1951 he referred to his community as a “utopia” of simple and kind people, by the next month Barr was lamenting his situation of loneliness since he did not have friends and had to live a “dual” and “dangerous” life.³³ The same as his family, the rest of the town seemed to know of Barr's “comings and goings” at “every hour of the day.” It is clear that a gay person in a small town did not enjoy the anonymity that the city could give to him; nevertheless being in a rural area did not stop Barr from having sexual relationships with men. In a detailed letter the author referred to the type of men he encountered in the countryside, with whom he engaged in emotional (meaning sexual) relationships. He stated:

the men one meets here are very gallant and satisfying emotionally...they are simple and wholesome, kind hearted, considerate and gregarious in offering themselves. Their naiveness is refreshing after New York, and their needs are easily satisfied. Their lack of intellectual companionship is often times compensated by a relationship that is deep and clean and appreciative...these relationships do not last as the men out here marry and yes, there is much to be said for some

³⁰ Barr to Cortes, 11 January 1951.

³¹ Barr to Cortes, 7 Feb. 1951.

³² Barr to Cortes, 2 Jan. 1951, 7 Feb. 1952.

³³ Barr to Cortes, 11 Jan. 1951, 7 Feb. 1951.

married men.³⁴

Barr's adventures were not limited to Holyrood, Kansas and its surroundings. In order to escape the pressures of his contexts Barr made frequent trips to the closer cities of Kansas City and Wichita. In these cities he met acquaintances "who understand the situation," and made contact with them in hotels. In one of his letters Barr indicated that he was going to meet Lee in Wichita, who was an old friend of his and happened to be "divorced, free, unattached, and very frank in his affection." In the following month Barr expected to see an air force sergeant whom he had met in the military, and the encounter was going to take place at a hotel in Kansas City. In both cases Barr lamented that he could not introduce these men to his family and show them his town, but he recognized that doing so was "risky" and could create discomfort for all sides involved.³⁵

Ultimately the impossibility of living his life as a gay man in a small town was one of the biggest sources of tension for Barr, and possibly many other gay men from rural backgrounds. Barr felt more comfortable as a person in a rural space, but as a gay man he felt more at ease in the city, since only in a city he could have the anonymity and the environment to meet other gay men like him. To complicate matters more, Barr did not always like the gay subculture that he found in some of the cities he visited. One of the last letters he wrote to Cortes is very telling in this respect. The author was writing Cortes to inform him that he was no longer going to keep corresponding with him, due to an unstated episode at a party thrown by Cortes in his apartment in Philadelphia. In citing the reasons why he no longer felt at ease with Cortes, Barr showed some of the conflicts that a gay person from a rural background could have with the gay subculture of the bigger cities. The author stated:

I had spent years working on my attitude to myself in relationship to the homosexual world I had made up my mind I was doomed to frequent. Then in a handful of words I was revealed as I must appear to those of my own nature. Normal people are kinder, even when they are deliberately cruel, for one realizes they can not completely understand.³⁶

Later in the letter he concluded that he was not "any happier in the homosexual world," as compared to the other worlds he was in. In seeing this one must

³⁴ Barr to Cortes, 11 Jan. 1951.

³⁵ Barr to Cortes, 7 Feb. 1951.

³⁶ Barr to Cortes, 7 Feb. 1952.

remember the troubles that the Mattachine Society had in keeping all of its members united, since the only thing in common between homosexual people was their sexuality, specially at a time when a gay identity was still not consolidated. Barr's letters indicate how difficult it was for a gay man living in a small town; however it is also important to take into account that Barr already knew the relative comforts of a collective secrecy from his experiences in New York and the Navy. Although the author took great pleasure from a life of quiet in the country, his situation of an emancipated gay man might have contributed to his eventual departure to the city.³⁷

This situation of isolation seemed to have also been true for lesbians living in Kansas; however the ignorance about lesbianism was even greater than about male homosexuality, and this enabled some of them to form relationships and pass undetected in society. Connie was having same sex relationships ever since she was living in Miami, Oklahoma in the late forties. She became acquainted with Marge, her second long term relationship, while playing for the same softball team.³⁸ By 1955 Connie was transferred to Wichita to work for the telephone company Southwestern Bell, and she brought Marge to live with her. Connie and Marge lived together for twenty one years, and Connie did not remember a single occasion when any of them were harassed or bothered because of their relationship. She explained that "if they knew they accepted it, and the rest didn't care, because we didn't flaunt it; we dressed nice...and nobody suspected it."³⁹

Lesbians also seemed to have had a difficult time understanding their sexual orientation. Sue Campbell, who is the current partner of Connie, did not even realize that she was attracted to women until after her mother died in 1958. Sometime after, Sue became involved in a long term relationship with another woman who was around twenty years her senior. Prior to being aware of her attraction to women, the only memory Sue had about homosexuality being

³⁷ Barr lived briefly in Los Angeles in 1951, and a year later he attempted to rejoin the Navy, but he was discharged for having written *Quatrefoil*. He lived most of his time in New York, but he also stayed in Kansas now and then for long periods of time. Throughout the fifties Barr wrote many works to the Mattachine Review, which was the Mattachine Society's magazine. Kennedy, "Touch of Royalty," 4-12.

³⁸ Before Marge, Connie had had a relationship with a coworker from the same telephone company in Miami, Oklahoma, named Betty. They were together for about four years before they broke up. This and the following statements are from Connie Condray and Sue Campbell (lesbian couple retired from the Southwestern Bell telephone company in Wichita, Kansas), interview given and recorded by author, November 27, 2009.

³⁹ Condray and Campbell, interview.

mentioned was one time when she took a ride from a married couple to work, and upon seeing a masculine attired woman the husband made an “insulting remark.” Although she does not remember now what the remark was, Sue remembered thinking to herself “do people do that?”

It becomes clear that the moralistic model was felt even stronger in the case of lesbians, when the ignorance about their orientation was so great that if the women looked gender appropriate, they could “get away” with almost anything.⁴⁰ Although this situation may have given women the freedom of discrete relationships, it also robbed them of an identity that was different to the mainstream culture and could have even hindered self awareness, as Sue's case shows.⁴¹

Informal homosexuality and its legal framework in Wichita, Kansas. Wichita seemed to have had some more resources for gay men and lesbians to live lives of “collective secrecy.” The authors of *U.S.A. Confidential* indicated that Wichita was not only the biggest city in Kansas, but also the fastest growing in the nation, and that the “tough and isolated Kansas” was finally “going homo,” implying how this had already happened to the rest of the nation. It was said that the cops calculated the male homosexual population of Wichita-referred to as fairies- to be around one thousand, but that they missed “ten for every one,” which according to the authors seemed to give credit to Kinsey.⁴²

By the early fifties Wichita seemed to have had three places where according to the authors of *Confidential* homosexuals “minced;” these being the “Blue Lantern,” “Curley's Round House” and “an apartment over a business building in the 1200 block of East Douglas,” where “you go through three doors” into an “inner sanctum where a fat old fairy in a Japanese kimono makes

⁴⁰ There was one instance in which Connie remembered a coworker from her time working in Woodward, Oklahoma who was being too “friendly” to another coworker to the point of bothering her. She was warned about it and that was the end of the trouble. Operators in the phone companies that Connie and Sue worked for were all women until the seventies, when men began being hired. Condray and Campbell, interview.

⁴¹ Connie and Sue have been together since the mid seventies, and both had previous long term relationships with other women. They are very well known in the gay community of Wichita, Kansas, and their long term relationship became almost mythical, to the point that they remember rumors about them having previous marriages with farmers, from which they escaped to Wichita to be together. These rumors stem from the fact that most gays and lesbians contemporaries to the couple married, and Connie and Sue's story seemed implausible to many people. Condray and Campbell, interview.

⁴² Lait and Mortimer, *Confidential*, 278-80.

like a geisha girl.”⁴³ Adding this information to Barr's, there is the impression that Wichita not only was a place where gay people from other parts of the state could meet, but also had its own small gay community. This evidence is reinforced by Robert Stout, currently the executive director of the Wichita Crime Commission, and a police officer for more than twenty years.⁴⁴ By the time Mr. Stout began patrolling the streets of Old Town in the late fifties, Wichita had a gay bar in West Douglas and Sycamore named the “Ringside Bar.” According to Mr. Stout, this bar was operated by two gay men named Robert Linsey and Jack Judd, with most of their clientele being gay men, since “lesbians were not as open.” Nevertheless, Stout's experience with Wichita's gay world increased when he joined the vice squad in 1960, since he began to be in charge of “moral offenses” such as drugs, alcohol and homosexuality. The vice squad was created only a few years before Stout joined it, showing that only by the mid fifties there was enough awareness about homosexuals that the police department saw the need of establishing a specialized squadron to deal with the problem. It is important to note that bigger cities had created vice squads several years earlier, and had been devoting their resources more intensely to the persecution of homosexuality since 1946.⁴⁵ The fact that Wichita's vice squad only dealt with moral crimes also shows the prevalence of the moralistic model, which dominated authorities understanding of homosexuality in Wichita during the fifties.

By the time Stout began working for the vice squad another gay bar opened in East Douglas named “Chances Are,” in honor of the allegedly gay African American jazz singer Johnny Mathis, and by 1963 “Jack by the Tracks” was already functioning. In “Chances Are” Mr. Stout observed a small gay community in which gay men felt comfortable “dancing together,” and “exchanging kisses and hugs.” Within this bar Stout saw “nothing more than any other bar,” with people dancing, drinking, and smoking, only that instead of couples being composed of a man and a woman, they were composed of two men or two women. These actions were not illegal *per se*, since according to Stout:

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Bob Stout is a well known personality in Wichita, with a reputation for being tough on crime. There is even a song about Mr. Stout titled “Captain Bobby Stout” by Jerry Hahn Brotherhood. The lyrics can be accessed at http://www.mylyricarchive.com/manfred_manns_earth_band_lyrics/captain_bobby_stout_lyrics.html; Bobby Stout (executive director of Wichita Crime Commission), interview given and recorded by author, November 4, 2009.

⁴⁵ Stout, interview; Eskridge, *Dishonorable Passions*, 96.

We weren't supposed to just arrest someone because they were gay; they had to be doing something...it wasn't illegal to be gay, but it was illegal to have gay sex.⁴⁶

More specifically, policemen seemed to have had an unofficial policy of containment towards these types of establishments, where they kept watch but did not do anything. On one occasion Mr. Stout remembered that there was a big concentration of gay men in "Chances Are," and that he overheard his boss asking them not to even go there. However, often times drunk heterosexual men did go to gay bars with the specific purpose of harassing "the queers."⁴⁷

Although these public establishments denote the existence of a small gay community in the fifties and through the early sixties, it is also important to note that this was not accessible to many gays and lesbians. The first time Connie went to a gay bar was to "Jack by the Tracks" in 1963 and because of the insistence of her partner's brother; she had not gone out before because she was not even aware that there were places to go to. Dudley Taves was living in Wichita by the late sixties, but he only became aware of the gay bars by the late seventies and early eighties, and Bruce McKinney had moved to Wichita from Coffeyville by 1969 because he knew of a functioning gay bar. It took Bruce almost one year to figure out how to enter to this establishment even when he already knew where it was located.⁴⁸

The "pick up" places seemed to have been where most of the gay action transpired in Wichita. These were places that were open the twenty four hours a day, and had a high public transit. Parks such as Oak Park close to Riverside, Herman Hill Park between Pawnee and Broadway, and Seneca Park in South Seneca were known to be cruising spots where gay men could engage in sex with other men. Homosexual men used certain codes to attract other men, one of which was sitting and waiting with their cars parked, until another car parked close by signaling the possibility of a casual encounter. There were also other public places of more constant traffic where gay men tried their chances; these being the bus station on South Broadway, and a railroad station. In these places there was great traffic from military personnel, such as young sailors and soldiers going back home. Gay men approached military men much in the same way fairies and queers approached the trade "to start a conversation," which according to how it went could develop into a sexual encounter. A last famous pick up place that Stout remembered was the "Rule Building," which was next

⁴⁶ Stout, interview.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Condray and Campbell, interview; Taves, interview; Bruce McKinney (gay historian, collector), interview given and recorded by author, October 24, 2009.

to a hotel. In the underground level of the building there were public restrooms where gay men hanged around the stalls expecting to make contact with another man, and police officers were expected to arrest them only if they were having sex there. Mr. Stout stated that in one occasion:

a fellow who was the president of a bank (had his car) parked literally at a non parking zone in front of the railroad station and his wife was sitting in the car...we got out to tell her (that) her husband had gone into the railroad station...he's in there having sex with a young sailor with his wife parked in the car up front...but his marriage was a marriage of convenience and I understood that...it was a different time.⁴⁹

According to Stout, gay men who engaged in this type of behavior faced the charge of “lewd and lascivious behavior,” stemming from a city ordinance which stipulated a penalty of “a maximum of one year in jail time,” and a “five hundred dollar fine.” However, most frequently gay men got a small fine and they did not have to register as sex offenders.⁵⁰

The laws of Kansas also demonstrate the lack of a postwar understanding and awareness about homosexuality. It is patently seen that not all homosexual sex was the same for the law, and circumstances such as the context were the act occurred as well as the act itself may have influenced the sentencing of the judge; nevertheless the language of the law is too ambiguous to draw any concrete conclusions about these differences. This ambiguity also seems to confirm the moralistic model; however by the mid fifties the sentences of the judges began to adjust to more modern notions of homosexuality following the therapeutic model, where gay men were sent to state hospitals for therapy and received a lower number of years in jail time.

The *General Statutes of Kansas* penalized same sex sexual behavior under the name of “Crime against nature,” which was included within Article 9 reading “Crimes against public morals and decency.” Section 21-907 of the *GSK* from 1949 stated that,

Every person who shall be convicted of the *detestable and abominable* crime against nature, committed with mankind or with beast, shall be punished by confinement and hard labor not exceeding ten years (emphasis not in the original).⁵¹

⁴⁹ Stout, interview.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ *General Statutes of Kansas (Annotated)*, sec. 21-907 (Corrick 1949).

As one of its sources the statute cited a law from the *Territory Statutes* of 1855, showing just how far back regulations against these types of behavior stretched. Furthermore a legal precedent to the statute established the “proof of actual lecherous penetration *per os sufficient*.” Court sentences stemming from charges of crimes against nature allow for the understanding of the specific behaviors that were punished by the law. From these it becomes clear that the term “crime against nature” was used as an umbrella encompassing all kinds of sexual “perversions,” including bestiality, pedophilia, homosexual and heterosexual sodomy.⁵² The strong condemnatory language of the statute and the name of the article within which the statute was included show its strict moralistic nature, and the extremely harsh penalty of up to ten years of imprisonment and hard labor denotes the graveness of the offense. However it is relevant to note that this statute did not condemn homosexuality but rather a specific sexual act within it, which was sodomy. Although originally meant to refer to the anal penetration of another male, female, minor or beast, by 1915 the Kansas Supreme Court expanded the term to include oral copulation.⁵³ Furthermore, a great number of the cases involving crimes against nature were cases of pedophilia of males having sex with children of either sex.⁵⁴ The ambiguity of the language of the statute and the types of crimes that it encompassed make it clear that homosexual behavior was not deemed an identity unique to a minority of people in Kansas, but rather an illicit sexual behavior that denoted perversion, not unlike others of its deemed kind. Different was the situation in the statutes of other states such as California and New York, with the first having an explicit language regarding what constituted sodomy, and with both differentiating between sodomy with minors and homosexual sodomy in their 1950 amendments.⁵⁵

The other statute that regulated homosexual practices in Kansas was the subsequent Section 21-908, which regulated “adultery; indecency; lewd

⁵² In *Kansas v. Spear*, Edward Spear was charged with a crime against nature committed upon an adult female named Charletta Roseann Row, *Kansas v. Spear*, Sedgwick Co. A-61931 (1957); an unusual case was that of Louanna Rhymes, an adult female charged with crime against nature committed against boys of 12 and 10 years of age, *Kansas v. Rhymes*, Sedgwick Co. A-45800 (1953).

⁵³ Eskridge, *DisHonorable Passions*, 32, 51.

⁵⁴ A few examples are *Kansas v. Levassour*, Sedgwick Co. B-4065 (1960), *Kansas v. Williamson*, Sedgwick Co. A-49342/3 (1954).

⁵⁵ They also previewed tougher sanctions, with even life imprisonment for recidivists in the state of California, Eskridge, *DisHonorable Passions*, 92.

cohabitation.” Homosexual behavior was understood to be included within indecency, and regarding this the statute stated that:

Every person married or unmarried who shall be guilty of *open*, gross *lewdness*, or *lascivious* behavior, or of any *open* and notorious act of *public* indecency, grossly scandalous, shall on conviction be adjudged guilty of a misdemeanor, and punished by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or by fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or by both such fine and imprisonment (emphasis not in the original.)⁵⁶

The key words from this text are “open” and “public.” A person had to commit an *open* sexual offense in order to be charged with this crime, which referred to “lewd and lascivious behavior.” In practical terms men who were having sex in parks, bus stations and railroads were under the threat of being charged with this offense, which unlike the crime against nature only amounted to a misdemeanor and a maximum penalty of six months of jail time. The records of the Sedgwick County Crime Index indicate no charges of lewd and lascivious behavior prior to 1958, which not coincidentally was around the time when the police department created the vice squad.⁵⁷

The sharp difference between the sentencing of these statutes is very puzzling, since the language of the law does not clarify concrete legal demarcations between one and the other. Whereas the crime against nature referred to a concrete sexual act involving anal penetration or oral copulation, not conditioned by any context; lewd and lascivious behavior referred to a vague “indecent” behavior that seemed to have been done “openly,” indicating a particular public context. In reality, these two statutes had a great deal of overlap, since a violator could be charged either by the context in which his act occurred, or by the act itself. Nevertheless, the practical application of the law as reflected in the charges brought about by police officers in their arrests, seemed to have favored charges of crime against nature before the late fifties, and the more relativistic lewd and lascivious behavior from then on. This change reflects the onset of the therapeutic model of understanding “sexual deviance” in the state of Kansas.

Toward the therapeutic model: The sentencing of the crimes against nature. The therapeutic model dominated the way national authorities

⁵⁶ *General Statutes of Kansas (Annotated)*, sec. 21-908 (Corrick 1949); the GSK of 1935 had the same wording concerning statutes 21-907 and 21-908. For further reference see *General Statutes of Kansas (Annotated)*, sec. 21-907 and 21-908 (Corrick 1935).

⁵⁷ Refer to Appendix.

dealt with “sexual deviants” from the onset of the postwar, when a quiet sexual revolution in the making was barely simmering. Sexual minorities such as gays, lesbians and transgender people were increasingly considered victims of their own “perversions” and a potential danger to their social environments; however as victims, they were treated as psychologically unstable more than punished as morally corrupt people.⁵⁸ In Kansas, this therapeutic model began to be observed in the sentences that judges gave to men guilty of crimes against nature and lewd and lascivious behavior, from the mid fifties onward. Whereas before the fifties men convicted of a crime against nature irrevocably faced up to ten years in prison with a possibility of being paroled before the entire term, by the sixties they faced shorter sentences and they were always referred to a psychiatric facility. A pre-postwar example is the case of Bert Davis, who was charged in August of 1944 with the “detestable and abominable crime against nature with one Lawrence W. Buckmaster, age 15,” for being “contrary to 21-907 of the General Statutes of the State of Kansas, 1935.” Mr. Davis was to be taken to “the State Penitentiary at Lansing, Kansas...to be confined at hard labor...for a term of not more than ten years,” from which he was paroled at five. In another similar case James Maynard, age 32, received from one to ten years jail time for having committed the crime against nature in 1948 “with and upon” Henry K. Jessie, age 14. After three years in jail, James was paroled.⁵⁹

By the mid fifties, Kansas courts began to impose different types of penalties on criminals against nature, and the courts prescribed psychological testing and treatment in their sentences. Robert Rhodes' case in 1948 may have foreshadowed the shift. The penalty Mr. Rhodes received for having committed “with and upon Fred L. McFadden...the detestable and abominable crime against nature” was not to exceed ten years of jail time; however the judge stipulated a sentence in which Mr. Rhodes was to be paroled “to Mrs. Edith Shipley, his mother, as patron” after three years and with the “said defendant...permitted to re-enter the Winter General Hospital, Topeka, Kansas, for necessary medical treatment.”⁶⁰ By the late fifties and early sixties virtually all

⁵⁸ Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland*, 42, 60-1.

⁵⁹ The fact that the other partner was a minor did not seem to be an aggravating element. Sometimes the sentences of perpetrators of pedophile acts were lower than other types of crimes against nature. Bruce Sharp was charged with a crime against nature against a seven year old girl. He pleaded guilty to simple assault and only got six months, *Kansas v. Sharp*, Sedgwick Co. A-14908 (1945). As a matter of fact, pedophilia seemed to be very prevalent among crimes against nature, see Appendix. For reference on Davis and Manyard cases see *Kansas v. Davis*, Sedgwick Co. A-12752 (1944); *Kansas v. Manyard*, Sedgwick Co. A-28047 (1949).

⁶⁰ *Kansas v. Robde*, Sedgwick Co. A-25510 (1948).

cases seen in the Sedgwick County Crime Index concerning homosexuality were deferred to the Larned State Hospital for psychological examination, and the sentence was not pronounced until the superintendent of Larned gave his verdict. This change was only formally included in the statutes with the 1955 supplement to the 1949 *General Statutes of Kansas*, under sections 62-1534, 35, 36, and 37.⁶¹ A good example of how courts usually carried out their sentences was the case of Lawrence Rowland vs. State of Kansas in the year 1957. For committing “an unnatural sex act upon Larry J. Henderson,” Mr. Rowland was “sent to the Larned State Hospital...for observation and treatment” from where he returned to court and was sentenced to the Kansas State Penitentiary for a period of “not less than three years.” Upon Rowland's application to a parole for the entire term of imprisonment, the court granted it to him.⁶² The psychological revision also applied to section 21-908. In a case of “lewd and lascivious behavior” that made it to the state records, Gardner Allaire Huber was charged for committing “acts of open, gross lewdness, lascivious behavior” as well as “notorious acts of public indecency, grossly scandalous at Seneca Park, 200 Block South Seneca, Wichita, Kansas,” thus violating “the peace and dignity of the State of Kansas.” The same as in the previous cases the sentence was “deferred until a report of a mental examination of the defendant” could be obtained “to guide the court in determining what disposition shall be made of the defendant.”⁶³

By the late fifties, this shift in the way homosexual people were treated by the law was echoed in the policies that universities adopted regarding their homosexual students. In *Sex in the Heartland*, Beth Bailey addressed the problem that the deans of the University of Kansas faced when they had a case of sodomy in the school. On the one hand deans were expected to uphold the moral integrity of their institution, which merited the expulsion of anyone who engaged in sodomy, yet on the other they had to listen to what psychologists prescribed in such cases, as they were deemed the experts on the matter. Frequently the opinions of psychologists and the general public did not coincide, since the former prioritized the well being of the patient while assessing the danger he posed to the school, while the latter only cared about eliminating the problem. In dealing with this conundrum, the deans tended to keep the matter contained and silent to the public so as not to compromise the reputation of the school, and usually followed the psychologist's advice. Such was the case of Fred, a University of Kansas student in 1959 who was allegedly

⁶¹ This information appears in the “Journal Entry” for the sentence of Huber Gardner in *Kansas v. Gardner*, Sedgwick Co. A-69036 (1957).

⁶² *Kansas v. Rowland*, Sedgwick Co. A-65830 (1957).

⁶³ *Kansas v. Gardner*, Sedgwick Co. A-69036 (1957).

raped by another male student at an apartment party. Upon hearing the testimony of both victim and victimizer, the dean decided to allow both students to stay under probation, and on the condition that they receive psychological treatment; nevertheless the case was not followed up by the police so as to keep it private.⁶⁴ Notwithstanding these examples, the shift toward the therapeutic model in the understanding of homosexuality seemed to have only occurred by the late fifties in these highly specialized academic and legal settings, while the moralistic view of homosexuality dominated the views of most Kansans at least well into the sixties. In this moralistic view religion may have had its share of influence in deeming homosexuality the “unpardonable sin.”⁶⁵

Conclusions. The sunflower state seemed to have been late in catching up to what the federal government and the populations of larger cities were “discovering” in the earlier years of the postwar. Kinsey's findings that masculine men and feminine women could be homosexuals, and that a high number of adult men engaged in homosexual behavior were not echoed in Kansas, where people assumed a heterosexual orientation for gays and lesbians who adopted normative gender roles. A lesbian couple could live together without raising any suspicions as long as they looked feminine, and most of the gay men seemed to have lived in isolation and usually married and followed the rules of their society while living a double life. Although Wichita had gay bars throughout the postwar era, they were few and most gays and lesbians seemed to have been unaware of them. The “pick up” places seemed to have been more popular than the bars, where single and married men could engage in sex without raising awareness. Nevertheless, this lack of awareness of homosexual populations proved to also be a blessing in disguise, since units such as the vice squad began to operate after the lavender scare waned, and seemingly without the massive and intrusive operations of other states such as California, D.C., and New York.⁶⁶ Kansas law illustrated this lack of understanding about homosexuality in the letter of the statutes that punished the “crime against nature.”

The influence of psychology and the following shift in the understanding of homosexuality began to be seen in the sentences that Kansas judges applied to homosexual behavior by the mid fifties, when gay men began to be prescribed psychological treatment. The deans at the University of Kansas also reflected this shift, delegating decisions concerning homosexual behavior to the school therapist. Nevertheless, the change seemed not to have been

⁶⁴ Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland*, 62-66, 71.

⁶⁵ Condray and Campbell, interview.

⁶⁶ Eskridge, *Dishonorable Passions*, 89-94.

transferred to the less specialized and non-academic circles in Kansas, which remained influenced by a moralistic model of viewing homosexual behavior. The lag may be explained by a lack of urban centers in Kansas, as well as its distance from places where homosexuality was an issue. As a consequence, gays and lesbians grew isolated from other people like them, and devoid of an identity that matched their sexual attraction. These elements may be seen as likely reasons for the slowing down of the progression towards the formation of a solid gay subculture, which seems to have begun to take place only by the early seventies.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ Bruce McKinney explained how by his time he could form the first homophile student organization in the “Free University,” which was part of Wichita State University; this had taken place by the early seventies. McKinney, interview.

APPENDIX

Charges related to homosexuality and their sentences according to the Sedgwick County Crime Index

Date	Accused	Charges	Sentence	District Court Case Number
30s				
1930 July 18	Stagdill, R. W.	Sodomy	10 years (not to exceed)	73194
1930 June 6	Nida, Dr. A.M.	Crime Against Nature	not convicted	72660
1931 April 15	Reed, Glenn A.	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 10 years	76130
1933 April 10	Earp, George	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 1-10 years	84023
1934	Turney, Ted	Crime Against Nature	26.65 \$ (plead guilty)	87964
1934 April 28	Lambert, Verling	Crime Against Nature	1-10 years (see Tourney)	87964
1935 May 21	Minters, Ernes	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 10 years	91487
1938 January 8	Jackson, Bruce	Crime Against Nature	10 years..paroled	99824
1938 August 18	Slates, George F.	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 10 years	101546
1938 September 15	Pierce, Floyd Allen	Crime Against Nature	10 years (paroled 5 and costs)	101745
1939 May 1	Howell, James	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 20-40 years	102680
40s				
1942 January 6	Hendricks, John	Crime Against Nature	dismissed	A-2648/9
1942 January 8	Haeth, Arthur	Crime Against Nature	convicted	A-2372/3
1943 November 1	Davis, Theodore	Sodomy first degree robbery 2 counts	sentenced for life	A-9225*
1944 April 3	Pierce, Sam	Crime Against Nature (on a 4 year old girl)	first dismissed (then convicted 5 years parole)	A-11205/6*
1944 April 4	Graham, Richard	Sodomy	dismissed	A-9833
1944 November 17	Davis, Bert	Sodomy (with 15 year old boy)	10years (paroled in 5)	A-12752*
1945 October 9	Sharp, Bruce	Crime Against Nature switched simple assault (7 year old girl)	6 months	A-14908*
1945 November 13	Peak, Victor	Crime Against Nature	convicted	A-15164
1946 April 29	Long, Roy	Crime Against Nature (and assault)	dismissed	A-15311
1946 September 14	Stewart, LeRoy	Indecent Exposure	100\$ and costs	A-20272

1947 June 10	Lindsey, Curtis	Crime Against Nature (with 14 year old boy)	10 years parole at 5	A-22662*
1948 March 24	McFadden, Fred	Crime Against Nature	10 years parole at 3 (hospital and mother's custody)	A-25370*
1948 April 6	Rohde, Robert	Crime Against Nature	paroled after 3 years referred to hospital and custody by mother	A-25510*
1948 September 14	Shelton, John	Crime Against Nature	dismissed	A-26467
1949 January 21	Maynard, James L.	Crime Against Nature (with 14 year old boy)	no more than 10 years paroled after 3	A-28047*
1949 April 25	Gray, James	Crime Against Nature (with 14 year older)	2 years no parole	A-28299*
50s				
1952 March 27	Greysiak, Robert	Crime Against Nature (with minor child)	Dale Clinton Ward	A-39786
1952 March 5	Sickler	Crime Against Nature	dismissed	A-38317
1952 May 5	Little, Charles E.	Crime Against Nature (with 14 year old boy)	guilty, penitentiary	A-40381*
1953 October 19	Rhymes, Louanna	Crime Against Nature switched simple assault (with 12 and 10 year old boys)	30 days	A-45800*
1954 April 9	Williamson, Carroll	Crime Against Nature (with 10 year old girl)	Committed to Larned for treatment	A-49342/3*
1955 March 4	Primm, Robert	Attempted CAN	paroled 5 years	A-52366
1955 October 3	Smith, Roland	Crime Against Nature	paroled at 5 years committed to Larned for treatment	A-52819*
1955 November 10	Reynolds, Charles	Crimes Against Nature (minor 16)	examination at Larned	A-57247*
1956 July 9	Doty, Frank et al. Aikman, Daniel	Crime Against Nature Crime Against Nature	dismissed convicted	A-60855
1957 September 16	Spear, Edward A.	Crime Against Nature	paroled 2 years referred to Larned	A-61931*
1958 January 8	Rawland, Lawrence	Crime Against Nature	3 years examination at Larned	A-65830*
1958 April 17	Huber, Gardner	Lewd and Lascivious Public indecency	dismissed dismissed (ct comm pleas) deferred to Larned	A-69036*

1958 September 17	Oakes, John Elmer	solicit minor under 12 to commit immoral act statutory rape	Larned hospital	A-71313
1959 March 2	Weems, Glenn	Forcible rape and CAN	5 and 3 years in Kansas Reformatory	A-75884
1959 June 2	Orme, Clyde	solicit minor of age 3 to commit immoral act	not less than 1 year	A-76366
1959 October 20	Neu, Walter	Solicit to minor	dismissed	A-77736
60s				
1960 June 30	Roady, Floyd	CAN and solicit minor	7 years probation	B-2838
1960 August 26	Levassour, Louis	Crime Against Nature (3 counts) (upon 9 year old boy)	Larned for reception, care, maintenance, and treatment	B-4065*
1960 September 1	Holland, Frank	licentious advances	dismissed 5/14/62	B-11060
1961 February 14	Gray, Wayne	incest	7 and 17 years	B-7245
		Crime Against Nature entice a minor to commit immoral act	10 years	
1961 September 8	Hayes, William	felonious assault solicit minor to commit act of gross indecency	committed to Larned 3 years probation	B-11171
1961 December 15	Winters, John Jr.	Licentious Advances		B-12879
1962 January 10	Lowe, Ethmer	entice and solicit minor	convicted Larned	B-13251
1962 October 10	Hedrick, Eval	forcible rape and CAN	dismissed in 8/11/64	B-18161
1962 October 23	Hughes, Harold	forcible rape & CAN	Larned for treatment	B-18388
1962 November 10	Dailey, Hart E.	solicit minor to commit immoral act	Larned Hospital for treatment	B-14781
1962 November 12	Churchil, John	Crime Against Nature	Larned Hospital for treatment	B-15240*
1962 November 20	Hawley, Melvin Max	Improper Conduct & Public Indecency	acquitted	B-15648
1962 November 23	Dvorak, Charles	Lascivious and public indecency	Larned Hospital for treatment	B-18909*
1963 April 17	Grube, Arvel	induced minor to commit immoral act (4 counts)	Larned Hospital	B-21331

* Cases reviewed by he author