

Assemblyman Leroy F. Greene
State Capitol - Room 5159
Sacramento, California 95814

PROSTITUTES AND PIOUS SINNERS

By

Assemblyman Leroy F. Greene

*"I believe you are a psychopathic liar....
Because you prefer the stench of the sewer
rather than a rose, don't think the rest of
the millions of Californians do...."*

I can guarantee it. When I run for re-election to the California Legislature next year, my proposal to legalize prostitution in California will be the campaign issue.

The best one-liner on my efforts came from Assemblywoman March Fong of Oakland. A member of the House asked: "March, what do you think of Greene's prostitution bill?" March gazed into space a moment, nodded thoughtfully and replied: "I think he should pay it."

Back in August of 1970, the District Attorney of Sacramento County, California, made the following statement to the press:

"Conditions in that area have become intolerable. At times cars are bumper-to-bumper with horns honking. People are shouting obscenities."

The District Attorney was not talking about traffic congestion at a new shopping center but was referring to the red light district of California's Capitol City. The D.A. noted, "The acts of prostitution are being performed in backyards, garages, laundry rooms and parked cars."

After his verbal attack on the "sex-for-sale" girls, the District Attorney together with the Sacramento police launched an intensive crackdown on prostitution in Sacramento. In seven months the police arrested 244 women. Trial dates were set, bail posted and back on the streets they went. How else could they raise the money if fined?

As one of the area's representatives in the State Legislature, I took special note of this crackdown on prostitution in the Capitol City of the Golden State, recalling that in 1965 the San Francisco Chronicle published a questionnaire asking its readers how they felt about legalizing and controlling prostitution. Some 84 percent of the readers responding favored the idea. But gay San Francisco is the wicked witch of the West. Never mind Haight-Ashbury. How would the people of Emerald City, Capitol of Oz feel?

The D.A. and the police had done their thing. It was my turn to do mine. My unholy crusade started with a newspaper headline, "Tarts Run Out of Sacramento." Fascinating. One wonders

how many can still relate tarts to prostitutes as well as bakery products? But there it was, a newspaper headline informing the world that prostitutes had been run out of town.

The Wall Street Journal in a recent article reported on what it described as an average day for crime in New York City. Two murders, 60 beatings, 210 robberies, 550 burglaries and 460 other major thefts constituted the typical day. While this routine mayhem and pillage was taking place, the Wall Street Journal informs us, squads of New York police swooped down on 10 Manhattan movie houses and decided that dirty pictures were being shown at three of them. Across the nation in Sacramento, the prostitutes had been run out of town. Do the people of New York and Sacramento now live in better and safer cities? Have the Legislature, the courts and the police made good use of the taxpayers' money in combating these victimless crimes? Are there no longer movie houses in New York City showing dirty pictures? Are there no longer prostitutes in Sacramento? There were yesterday when I checked. Right smack on the same corner of ^{the Emerald City, Capital of the} ~~the~~ wonderful world of Oz they were run out of last year.

No one would suggest for a moment that we quit arresting murderers, robbers, arsonists and rapists. But, dirty movies and prostitution? Cher chez la victim?

What with X-rated movies and the equivalent in plays, literature, speeches, deeds and thoughts it occurred to me to question my constituency. In this era of promiscuity, wife swapping and communal living, how would my voters react to legalizing prostitution?

The City of Sacramento and the surrounding suburbia is only noted for one thing -- it is the home of the capitol of the nation's most populace state. Sacramento area residents rarely go to extremes for any cause. Its two campuses of higher education were virtually free of any disturbances, riots or otherwise. Sacramento was a sleepy community located about halfway between San Francisco -- the fun city of California and Nevada -- the fun capitol of the nation.

In either place, a man could hire a prostitute -- illegally in San Francisco, legally in Nevada. After a two hours' drive in either direction from Sacramento, a man could enjoy any form of sexual activity he desired, as long as he was willing to pay the price. ^{At Mustang Ranch 2} ~~In Mustang, Nevada,~~ ^{\$20} a ~~mobile home~~ brothel, just outside of Reno, a trick might cost him ~~\$10~~ ^{\$30} or ~~\$20~~, depending on the extent and time involved in the sexual gambit.

In San Francisco, the price was about the same but the man might also subject himself to police arrest, a good dose of venereal disease and just might get rolled by the girl or girls who were willing to roll with the guy.

None of it made any sense at all. If it were wrong to purchase sexual intercourse in California, why wasn't it wrong in Nevada? And why was it really wrong to purchase an outlet to one of man's strongest drives?

Man has three strong drives -- survival, shelter and sex -- the three "S". Nobody had outlawed homes or food but somebody, somewhere along the line, had morally decided that it was wrong for a person to have sex outside of marriage -- hence the law against prostitution went on the books.

It also struck me strange that while it was illegal to have sex with ^{Someone else's wife} another ~~married woman~~, this law became less and less important until today, ^{virtually extinct,} arrests for adultery are ~~few and far between~~. It also became apparent that two unmarried persons could legally indulge in copious amounts of free sexual love. Money was the only thing that made prostitution illegal. A girl could walk down the street ^{carry my} ~~with~~ a sign ~~around her~~ advertising "Love for Free" and she could not be arrested. Yet if she were to charge one

dime for her services between the sheets, the law would step in and put her behind bars.

Early in 1971, I addressed a questionnaire to ^{the} ~~my~~ 65,000 ^{votes of my 100,000 voters} fairly conservative ^{voters.} ~~constituents~~. Among other questions relating to tax increases and new drug treatment programs, I asked them if they were in favor of legalizing prostitution and houses of prostitution under the jurisdiction of the public health department.

~~Within two weeks,~~ ^{Approx 25} ~~nearly 30~~ percent ~~had~~ responded to the questionnaire and one answer stood above all else -- nearly 70 percent of my constituents were in favor of legalizing the world's oldest profession.

Quite frankly, I was shocked. I did not really believe the people of the Sacramento area would be in favor of such a controversial idea. One man answered the questionnaire by stating:

"Perhaps legalizing prostitution would help to keep venereal disease under control, keep some of the rape off the streets."

Another man saw a way to lower taxes in this idea. He said:

"If gambling was permitted and prostitution run by the State, we would have loads of money but the people we have in charge is afraid of this. Why? I hope you are a man of action."

On April 14, 1971, I became that man of action when I entered two measures before the California State Assembly, one which would legalize prostitutes and houses of prostitution under the jurisdiction of the public health department and the other measure which would give the counties in California the right to permit or reject the profession within their limits.

A man of the cloth was the first to react. He wanted to know if my bill offered discounts to the clergy. The reaction among my fellow legislators was mixed. A few praised my guts but questioned my brains. Others felt I had just done the most courageous thing possible and I immediately ought to announce my candidacy for governor. Still others wondered how I

even got to be an Assemblyman in the first place and they were wondering if there wasn't some way that I could be impeached.

The press jumped into the game and went to Governor ~~Ronald~~ Reagan's office ^{A spokesman replied} for his view of my idea. ~~Reagan's answer was typical.~~ I was "frittering away the taxpayer's time and money."

His view was mild, however, to what I was about to receive within the next couple of weeks. I was to be called everything from sewer vermin to a courageous leader of civil and moral rights.

The initial reaction among residents of California was that of outrage as letters began pouring in from all the righteous souls who felt that ~~since~~ prostitution was a sin ^{and} it was therefore illegal ^{lev or no lev.} ~~faulty reasoning at best.~~ A ^{former member of the Dept} ~~professor~~ in physics, from the University of California at Los Angeles told me,

"You have proved yourself to be lower than the vermin that crawl in the sewers."

An anonymous writer - always the bravest ^{of writers} ~~in their writings~~ - told me:

"I suppose your mother is proud of you, you rat. I hope all your female relatives become prostitutes. How did you get elected to the Assembly anyway."

One of the most original pieces of literary license came from a man in Oroville:

"After reading of your proposal to legalize prostitution in the state, I came to the conclusion that you are a bastard son of a professional whore and that you are motivated by a sincere desire to bring as many Californians as possible down to your level. The only motivation I can see is a possibility that you want to be known as the biggest pimp in California. If this is the case, I think you'll be successful."

One Southern California lady made an interesting observation, although somewhat questionable, regarding morality, the space program and sex when she wrote:

"What this country needs now is to get its mind off sex, per se, so that minds and hands can be productively directed to the God given tasks our people can and must do in space projects, the space shuttle, orbiting labs, vehicles to Mars and other planets."

After receiving that letter, I did some further research into the Bible, but frankly have not yet found any references that the space program was dictated by the Supreme Being.

Group letters were another new facet against the campaign to legalize prostitution. Several times I received a communication

concerning the bills, signed by several members of the same family or the people in an area. These were not to be confused with petitions, which were to come in later.

One group of people wrote:

"We have learned from reliable sources that some 65 hippies have written you, naturally, approving your unbelievably obnoxious bill. Let us congratulate the fact that all your family females - mothers, aunts, sisters, nieces, wife and cousins are to be the first ones to peddle their wares via prostitution. Greenie's girls of Sacto is the way they'll be billed in glaring headlights. Vile scum you."

What became most obvious in all this initial barrage of verbage was that people were reacting from their emotions. None of the original letters ever brought out good objective reasons why the ~~girls~~ of the love for hire ^{girls} should or should not be legalized. One man said I was a "sickening person." Another said I was a "psychopathic liar."

And those that wrote in favor of the proposal also reeled off their views from an emotional standpoint. A former police officer said he "felt" legalizing prostitution would result in a decrease in unwanted pregnancies and venereal disease and sex offenders. One older gentleman, age unlisted, told me that he still wanted to have "a few active whores around." I did not, ~~and never did, for that~~ ~~matter,~~ receive any good scientific evidence of the value of legalizing whorehouses and whores.

In Nevada, in the absence of any State laws to the contrary, some of the counties had passed ordinances allowing prostitution. One such county was Storey County - located just outside Reno. Joe Conforte opened the Mustang Bridge Ranch and because of the license fee he paid to the county, every deputy in the county was able to receive a \$50 a month pay raise.

Conforte pays the county \$18,000 a year to operate in the county. ~~It is interesting to note that~~ ^{Nevada's} Storey County was ~~the~~ ^{one of the few} ~~only county~~ to make prostitution legal, even though prostitutes flourished in a variety of bordellos throughout the State of Nevada, either existing under a host of state and county laws, or lack of same.

One such county is Humboldt, located about 150 miles east of Reno. I requested some information regarding the operation of prostitution in that county and was informed that that county and Nevada had no meaningful statistics as to the incidence of sex crimes or venereal disease before and after houses of prostitution were declared legal. The District Attorney of Humboldt County told me:

"As far as sex crimes are concerned, again I can't give you much help. They are virtually nonexistent in these small counties. But I suspect it would be the same without houses ... The incidence of VD seems highest in the large cities and lowest in the sticks (where the houses are.) I doubt that any conclusion should be drawn on that basis -- I am sure that there are other explanations for that. I suspect the VD rate is always higher in the cities... As to the fiscal implications to the state or county, I know of none -- at least none detrimental. If VD and crime increased because of them it would be detrimental of course. But I doubt such is the case. Locally, the cities or counties generally regulated the houses, license them, collect license fees, ranging from modest, comparable to other businesses..."

The operation of whorehouses in Nevada proved to be most interesting. A writer from the Sacramento Union did a three-part series on the operation of some of those brothels, after I introduced my measures. It became apparent that the residents of Nevada were quite happy with the way things were and nobody was going to rock the bed of sin.

Houses of prostitution were so well thought of in Nevada that in one eastern Nevada city some of the towns people felt the brothel and the school were too close together for good moral character building. So the people in that city did what they deemed correct -- they moved the school.

After looking into the situation in Nevada, it became apparent that championing legal prostitution as a way to eliminate sex crimes, venereal disease, etc., was just not the way to go. Nobody could prove anything one way or the other.

That only left one avenue open -- prostitution must be legal for amoral reasons, that is, the State had no right to legislate one's individual view of morality. Morality was the job of the church and if the church couldn't effectively do its job, it shouldn't look to the State to finish the task. At best, it was a politically dangerous argument to pursue because I was striking at the very heart of middle class morality.

If prostitution were to be legalized as a new revenue source or as a way to provide some under-nourished and over-sexed men with a new legal outlet for their sexual fantasies, I could be considered the ^h champion of the liberals. I had struck out at those hypocrites who refused to believe a woman would lie down to sell her uniquely feminine merchandise. But now, in a sense, I was questioning what we had been taught by the church for hundreds of years -- that man should not lie down with the wanton woman. What I wanted to know now, was when we were going to learn that morality is the business of the home, the school and the church -- but not the state.

Immediate reaction soon gave way to speculation and second guessing. From throughout the State, newspapermen had a heyday with the idea of legal prostitutes. Probably one of the most original extensions of my measures came from Tom Horton, columnist for the Sacramento Union.

Horton penned my plan as nothing more than "a clever attempt to destroy prostitution." The columnist saw my bills as allowing the world's oldest profession to live with government regulations just like every other small businessman. He then predicted the consequences of legal prostitution in California, naming state minimum wage laws, street lighting districts, landscaping requirements, unfair labor practices and finally unionization of the prostitutes. He quotes Mamie -- the State's first legal madam: "I've hardly got any business left now, but look at this stack of unpaid bills. The employees demand a cost-of-living raise; the fire marshall demands new fire exits and no smoking signs in the upstairs rooms; the planning department says I have to put in more parking; the building inspector says I have to get rid of all the water beds because they violate the structural engineering code; and every time I turn around one of those guys from the State Department of Professional and Vocational Standards is here to make sure we have qualified help. On top of that, my piano player joined the musicians union and now he makes more money than anybody in the joint."

Although the column was written in the strictest of humor, Horton had raised some good points, which were echoed by other State residents. A Chico man wrote to the editor of the local newspaper saying that I failed "to detail procedural factors in the proposition, as pay scales, state recruiting methods, age limitations, fringe benefits, etc. The most obvious fault in Mr. Greene's prostitution bill is its failure to identify the proposed source of this labor force. . . Undoubtedly Mr. Greene has given it some thought, perhaps he intends to initiate his

plan by recruiting prostitutes from a higher class structure such as his family and friends."

A Sacramento woman also posed some very interesting legal questions regarding prostitution, if it ever were to become law. She noted:

"For purposes of child custody, will the courts no longer view a prostitute as a unfit mother? Will there be any restrictions on married women prostituting if they have minor children? Will houses and prostitutes be allowed to advertise their services through any medium? Would this type of advertising be subject to laws covering truth-in-advertising, false and misleading advertising? Could a house advertise on bill boards, wherever they might be located? Will prostitutes be able to apply for social insurance benefits and public assistance? Will the state attempt to regulate prices charged for services rendered in commercial establishments? What about low-income groups who may not be able to afford the service?"

Although most of the questions were interesting, I could see of no compelling reason to try and cover each and every potential situation in the measure. If prostitution were to become legalized, it would have to abide by every law and regulation all small businesses were subject to. The question about "truth-in-advertising" evoked the most comment around the Capitol, for I had many willing prospective investigators ready to go to work to determine if the customer was getting what he paid for.

In the three months between the time the bills were introduced and heard by committee, there was plenty of time for additional research into the many problems surrounding the subject area.

For those who wrote my office requesting additional information about prostitution, I compiled "Notes on Prostitution," which were a compilation of statements and excerpts about the flourishing trade.

One of the most stinging arguments in favor of legalized sex for sale came from the book, "Pleasure Was My Business," written by Robert Trailens. The book, which was a biography of a madame, noted: "The brothel would offer a sexual outlet for the sexual deviant and the physically and emotionally handicapped and sex crimes would also be reduced. The sexual desires of the young man could be satisfied by the prostitute not by the

naive girl who could get pregnant, which would result in abortion and possibly cause the young woman a lifetime of sexual hangups."

This same theme was repeated by one writer, who noted:

"Many careers have been interrupted due to the need for sex leading to disease and pregnancy, both of which would be nearly extinct with legalized prostitution. We cannot tell out young people to stop having sexual relations, but we can most certainly open the door of choice for them. Many young girls feel compelled to have sex out of a humane attitude to her suitor's sex needs which cannot be denied. Were he sexually satisfied before marriage, she would not feel obligated, he would not be angry with her should she wish to wait, and their eventual marriage would take place when they both could afford and properly care for the subsequent family. They could both complete their education, and the rate of disease, abortion, unwanted babies, and divorce would be nearly obliterated."

Another lady wrote:

"God gave young men the sexual urge much too young to know how to handle it and they need a place to go."

As the weeks wore on before the hearing date, it became painfully obvious that support for my measures was not coming from anywhere. It became obvious that I was publicly alone in my contention that the current law regarding prostitution was hypocritical.

I did receive some support from working and former prostitutes, but I did not think it wise to parade ~~a group of~~ ^{these working girls} ~~chippies~~ before the legislators in order to prove my point. One former prostitute from the Santa Rosa area dropped me a line, noting:

"Legalize the prostitutes. In depression times, I made baby covers (exclusive ones) to pay doctor bills for my mother. Only ones that could pay cash, and I need cash, were the girls. The quake blew me out of business and I'm back where I started, making baby covers. All I need now is good old whore houses to sell them . . . I need cash customers."

A man from Long Beach wrote me:

"I want prostitution in Long Beach. We have girls here. Men knock them up and get a disease. I think this is a serious matter. Prostitution should be legalized . . . What is a single man to do -- jack off? I think you have a good bill and I think a lot of married men will like it, especially when their wives tell them to turn over and go to sleep."

Obviously, such testimony was not going to win me any votes in the Assembly. What I needed was good judicial and legal reasons why prostitution should be legalized. For years, judges and police officials had been crying about the problems of prostitution, so perhaps their views should be sought regarding the situation. That was, however, a tragic mistaken viewpoint -- I should have saved the cost of postage.

Just over 1500 questionnaires were sent to judges, police ^{chiefs} ~~officers~~, district attorneys and sheriffs in California. I wanted to know their views on whether prostitution should be legalized, assuming supervision by law enforcement and medical personnel, and I further wanted to know if the present laws regarding prostitution benefited society.

With the possible exception of one judge who answered, the judicial and law enforcement officials in California could not provide any better reasons for or against prostitution than most of the citizens in the State.

A judge from Southern California wrote:

"You must be kidding. I can just hear some sweet young thing saying: 'Dear Dad, I have a real fun job; it's legal. I'm licensed; the hours are short and the pay is good. Your loving daughter.'"

A Southern California police chief countered with:

"It would result in an influx of undesirables, gangsters, and the peddlers of human misery that would be impossible to control."

Sacramento's own sheriff answered:

"Legalizing prostitution would give a green light to the syndicate vice operations which are walking on eggshells at the present time. Anyone who says legalized prostitution would not tremendously benefit organized crime operations does not know what he is talking about."

The police chief of Richmond ^{wrote} ~~sent a letter~~:

"I would suggest that the legislator who proposed this legislation be investigated for his relationships, and perhaps conspiracy, with organized crime."

However, a judge in ^{the} neighboring city of Oakland wrote:

"Prostitution laws as presently constituted are an attempt to regulate moral conduct which is nigh onto impossible. Besides it is a victimless 'crime.' Arguments that it fosters other criminal activity may be true but it need not if intelligently regulated and controlled. Police would be freed to protect and apprehend real criminals."

The only redeeming factor in all the letters I received was one from a judge from Orange County. He listed 17 different problems with legalizing prostitution. Some of the questions he asked were:

Will the licensee (prostitute) be permitted to have an agent? If so, will the agent be licensed? Will the crime of adultery be eliminated? Can licensees be married? If males are licensed and the customer is female, what standards must be used to avoid pregnancy, if any?"

His was about the most intelligent answer to my question I had yet received. It was obvious that this judge put aside his own personal beliefs about prostitution and was willing to think objectively about the problem. Generally, the other judges, police chiefs, and sheriffs^{As} and district attorneys answered purely from a subjective viewpoint.

The cards were quickly being stacked against my favor. The administrations of California's two most important cities -- Los Angeles and San Francisco -- came out in opposition to the prostitution bills. The Long Beach branch of the NAACP opposed the measure on the grounds that "legalization of prostitution would, if effect only further perpetuate the oppressive psychology that presently permeates ethnic minority communities."

After translation, that meant that legalized prostitution would mean more ^{black} ~~colored~~ girls working for white tricks.

The heat of opposition against the bill got so intense in the final weeks, that a lobbyist -- Mrs. Mary Hargett -- registered with the State on behalf of the Committee Opposing Prostitution. Mrs. Hargett said as she registered: "All of us are working for the love of our country and California," whatever that had to do with "play for pay" girls.

On July 13, a hearing was held before the California Criminal Justice Committee. This committee, composed of nine members -- eight men and one woman, seven whites and two blacks -- was going to decide the fate of my bill. The hearing room was jammed, even though the hearing was moved to a larger auditorium at the last minute to accommodate the crowd.

The audience was a composite of interested onlookers -- mostly females full of giggles. If ever I was going up against a stacked deck, this was the day. Although I got the first crack at the committee, it was obvious the opposition was there in overwhelming force.

Bible-quoting housewives, women's liberationists, policemen and even a homosexual clergyman did their best to convince the committee I was all wrong -- which they did. One Sacramento woman told the committee: "On the basis of women's rights, women should not be used as objects to gratify men's lusts. When we have as many donkey clubs as we have bunny clubs, I may support legislation."

On the contrary, I answered, it is the man who is being used by the prostitute. Because of man's need to gratify his lust, the prostitute has placed a price tag on her commodity and therefore is using the man to further her financial aims.

Another woman read the committee quotations from the Old Testament condemning prostitution. A clergyman who identified himself as a homosexual testified that my efforts were misguided and I should rather give my support to another measure which would legalize all sexual acts between consenting adults.

A division chief in the Los Angeles sheriff's office said legalization of prostitution would encourage families to hire out their children as prostitutes. ^{I pointed out they could do that now} On the contrary, ~~I pointed out~~, there is no slavery here. There is no forcing a girl into prostitution.

One woman, who had to be considered a one woman committee against me, appeared and said: "God will forgive you if you use the woman. But I won't. I had 10 opportunities to become a prostitute, but I shall not and will not become a prostitute." What that had to do with anything still remains to be seen -- except it only pointed out that nobody forces anybody to become a prostitute. Circumstances may determine that the only way a girl may make a living is by selling her sexuality, but there are just as many girls around today who have found other legal means of making a livelihood.

I tried my best to convince the committee of the need to pass out the bill to the full Assembly. In my best "Perry Mason" style I argued: "What we are saying in our present laws in effect is that if a girl goes down the street with a sign on her back 'Sex for Sale,' she can be arrested for soliciting. If she walked down the street with a sign saying 'Sex for Free' she is no longer subject to arrest *as a prostitute*."

only "If what's wrong is sex out of wedlock, why say it's wrong legally if it involves money? There must be more than the presence or absence of money -- that's what bothers me.

In this period of time with X-rated films, with obscenity, orgies and communal living, just what is prostitution?"

Perry Mason may never have lost a case, but I did. It was moved that my bill go out of the committee to the floor with no recommendation -- an unusual move. Although the motion got a second, the subsequent voice vote was more than muddled. There were a couple of rumbles as the chairman asked for the aye votes and even more groans and chortles when the chairman asked for the no votes. It was apparent that was it. After finally figuring it out, only two of the nine had voted in favor of the bill. Walking dejectedly back to my office, I was stopped by one of the committeemen.

"You had a real good bill there, Leroy. I wished I could have voted for it. But you know that my campaign workers just wouldn't stand still if I voted in favor of such a proposition."

The only woman on the committee, and one of the two Negroes, said she didn't vote for the bill because the whorehouses would end up where they always end up -- in the ghetto and black sections of the city. Since she represented both black and poor people, she just couldn't vote for the measure. However, she would be willing to co-author a bill if it called for stringest arrest and prosecution of the customer as well as the prostitute.

And that started phase two of the war ~~of whores~~ ^{against commercial love.} I checked the questionnaire again. About half of my constituents wanted equal arrest of the customer. So I started work in that phase. But this is where some real problems develop.

Customers could be arrested for an act of prostitution as the law is currently written. But very few are. So it was obvious the law had to be written to individually handle the prostitute and the customer.

This past year, a report was issued by a group attempting to revise the penal code of California. One of the subjects handled was the law dealing with prostitution. This group called for arrest of prostitute and customer and called prostitution any sexual conduct, deviation or intercourse for a "fee." The term "fee" was specifically used because that would eliminate arrests of mistresses.

Obviously this group felt that as far as mistresses were concerned, there was more than sex involved in the relationship. There must be some other endearing factor such as love in the relationship between the mistress and the man. Of course, it could also be that many a mistress ~~became~~ ^{always was} a wife and many a wife is ~~not~~ ^{not} a mistress so this area would be better off left untouched.

An irate taxpayer wrote late in July, after the bill was defeated:

"The road to hell is paved with resolutions and measures you and your kind propose . . . You watch that God's finger doesn't crush you level with earth."

A Menlo Park man wrote:

"I strenuously object to the use of my tax dollars to enforce the opinions of near-savages of 2000 to 5000 years ago. If the churches can't enforce their masochistic beliefs, that's their hard luck. . . Incidentally, I am 70 years old. My present attraction to prostitutes is very nebulous indeed; even if they were giving their services away free."

A Los Angeles couple said:

"We, as twentieth century Americans, no longer feel a need to be dictated to by a moralistic religious elite composed of war mongers, racists, police and capitalists."

Although the law regarding prostitution needed rewriting, a judge in Yolo County made an interesting interpretation of the present statute. After an arrest of two girls for an act of prostitution with one trick, the public defender for the girls appealed that the girls couldn't be arrested unless the man was also prosecuted. The reasoning being that the act of prostitution called for "consideration" of some kind, and while the girls received money for their "consideration" in the act, the man received the "gratification of lust" as his consideration. The judge upheld this plea and consequently the man was arrested and sentenced, as were the girls.

This case was unusual; however, in that it was the first time such an interpretation of the word "consideration" had been used. Whether more judges and law enforcement officials will pick up upon the ruling is not known. But again it only pointed out that the inequity in the way prostitution cases were handled in the courts.

A tentative draft of a law calling for equal arrest and prosecution of both the customer and the prostitute was recently written by the legislative legal experts. The proposed bill isn't exactly what could be termed a "milestone" in penal code reform because it almost makes "girl-watching" illegal.

But it is a start in the right direction. Prostitutes are working the streets of Sacramento every day and night. There's nothing the law can do to the girls unless an officer actually overhears a solicitation or is solicited himself. Many is the time an officer sits in his patrol car on a street corner talking to the girls.

If prostitution is wrong, then it is wrong. If the State of California is serious about ending the world's oldest profession, it must do so by eliminating the customer. Unless all prostitutes are lesbians, the exclusion of the customer will mean the elimination of the prostitute.

To do so, the State must make arrest of the customer mandatory. Whether or not the customer actually engages in an act of sexual intercourse with the prostitute, we must allow the police officer to effect an arrest of the prostitute and customer. And if that arrest is made, the State must force the district attorney to prosecute both the prostitute and customer, providing sufficient evidence is available. The State must remove from the district attorney the authority to make a deal with the trick, in order to prosecute the prostitute.

To call for such action is obviously going to incur the wrath of the DA's around the State. Nobody likes anybody telling them how to do their job, and the attorneys are no exception. But the fact remains, prostitution flourishes and enlarges in every City and State.

Obviously the present method of trying to control prostitution is nothing short of simple harassment and getting the girls to change their location of operation. Too many law enforcement officials feel that if the problem isn't obviously evident, then it is no longer a problem.

But the prostitution problem has emerged beyond the simple buying and selling of sex. It has grown into other more serious and vicious areas -- problems of narcotics are rampant among the prostitutes. A new era of violence has entered the whore culture. Many customers today are men not necessarily looking for sexual gratification, but rather searching for a victim for vicious attacks, often mortal. The prostitutes and pimps are no longer simply dealing in the sale of flesh but are looking for additional ways of making money -- be it in the robbery of the hopeless and hapless trick (how well can a man fight when his pants are down); be it in the beating and robbery of the john or be it in the blackmail of the customer.

If prostitution today were nothing more than a simple and non-victim type of situation, I don't think there would be as much interest in the field of legislation regarding the area. But the fact remains that prostitution is fast becoming a crime with a victim. It should not, and the State should do what it can to bring prostitution back to its rightful state. The brothel can perform a community service by providing a harmless sexual outlet for the sex criminal, sex deviant and the oversexed and ^{satisfied} undernourished American male. Time and time again it has been shown that suppression of prostitution has produced an increase in sexual crimes and the unorganized amateur prostitute has created a venereal disease problem that contributes to one of the State's biggest health problems.

*** to ***



The State of Nevada has taken the lead. California apparently doesn't want to place second, at least not at this time.

#