

# Memo of the Month

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES

From the desk of

JOSEPH L. WINKLER  
Chief, Division II

TO: Mr. John M. May, Director  
Bureau of Adult Services

January 5, 1971

SUBJECT: Female Impersonaters, Unattached Men's Center

A few days ago while at UMC I observed two apparent females present with a large group of men in a group interview. Mr. Zurbrigen's explanation was that the two in question were transvestites and that program staff had advised him some time ago they were to be served as unattached men at the Center. While we were discussing the subject another person garbed as a female passed by in the lobby and Mr. Zurbrigen indicated that this was another alleged male. He estimated that about 20 other such persons had been aided at UMC.

I regret that this matter was not made known to me sooner. I am convinced that female impersonaters should not be aided at UMC for the reasons cited below.

1. These persons have a fertile field at the Center for prospective partners in homosexual activities. We have had enough of that kind of trouble at UMC.
2. They are objects of curiosity and the brunt of ridicule and abuse not infrequently on the part of other clientele.
3. If they are indeed males, it is unthinkable that they should use the ladies' restroom. On the other hand, the consequences of their use of the men's restroom is equally abhorrent.
4. If the present practice continues, what would prevent genuine females from representing themselves as male transvestites and becoming eligible for aid at UMC? Who will be responsible if the word gets out UMC will aid all persons in female attire claiming to be men, and at some later date it should be discovered that half of them really were women? How do we verify sex without physical examination?
5. General Relief regulations stipulate that employable applicants shall be available for employment. Obviously males attired as females have voluntarily severely limited their employment potential. For example, I have learned belatedly that LAC-USC rejects any such assignees to the Beautification Project. What is to prevent other men from donning female garb to avoid assignment to work projects? Anyone can claim to be a transvestite.

I have just now been informed of an incident which occurred last October and which illustrates how we are being victimized. A UMC social worker had occasion to enter the Union Station during his lunch period. He observed in the men's restroom a client he recognized and two other men changing from men's to women's attire. When the worker returned to his office, the three men dressed as women were in the UMC lobby.

I propose that the following policy be adopted immediately: Any applicants who present themselves at UMC attired or otherwise arrayed as females but claiming to be men shall be refused aid unless they return attired as men. This same policy should be considered for all other district offices.

JLW:jh



# Leonardo or Otis B. Driftwood?

---

by John Rothchild

---

The fantasies of O. Roy Chalk are those that built the country. It is exciting to see them replayed by a man who did not sit home and watch his stock grow, and who tried, alone, to become a Rockefeller long after there were laws, commissions, public opinion, and sharp men in gray suits who wouldn't let him get away with much.

Today's atmosphere is not favorable to the last tycoon. O. Roy Chalk? He has golden telephones and sunken bathtubs and limousines and estates, famous paintings and penthouses. His takeover of the D. C. Transit bus company was called "the greatest steal since the Brink's robbery," by Senator Thomas Eagleton. He started an airline with two DC-3s and parlayed it into a multi-million dollar operation. He charted megalopolitan newspapers and nuclear-powered buses and even took over a Central American railroad with two banana plantations. And who has heard of him? It's like capturing the whole Monopoly board

---

*John Rothchild is a managing editor of The Washington Monthly.*

with four hotels and having nobody care.

Loosed on the previous century, Chalk might have been rewarded with fame, power, and a lot more money. Something about him reminds us of a time when men did not lose at such ventures, railroads and rolling stock, men who implanted their half-thought-out dreams on the country, and men who were appreciated for it—Gould, Hearst, and Vanderbilt. Chalk has followed their blueprint and yet his efforts are sadly irrelevant—the worst thing is not that he is unknown but that he would have made more money had he merely put his money into IBM and gone fishing.

Chalk is known in Washington, D. C. The 150,000 who dunk 40 cents into his buses every day (the fares have been raised from 32 to 40 cents in the last year) consider him a consummate financial wizard, the kind of man you meet and instinctively put your hand in your back pocket. This, too, is ironic. Chalk has not been a particularly good businessman or con