

Alfred C. Kinsey: Bowdoin Class of 1916

Symposium Abstract

Alfred C. Kinsey graduated *magna cum laude* from Bowdoin in June of 1916 with a B.S. degree. When he attained prominence as a sex researcher, he was recommended for an honorary degree at Bowdoin but because of the controversy over his research he was turned down by the College Board. With Cheiron meeting at Bowdoin this year, it seems most appropriate to present a symposium concerned with evaluating the legacy of one of this institution's most noteworthy alumni.

The first of four papers involves a personal perspective from an individual who, as a graduate student at Indiana University, had an opportunity to know Kinsey. This paper also includes personal memories about the pre-publication impact of Kinsey's first volume. The second paper is concerned with Kinsey's conclusions in his female volume about the long-term effects of child sexual abuse. Kinsey's thinking in this area is examined in relation to his attitudes about the sexual criminal code in America. Implications are drawn about how his scientific work was affected by his political interests. The third paper situates Kinsey within the social science movement of "sexual positivism," a school of thought which also included R. L. Dickinson, Albert Ellis, and Abraham Maslow. The interpretive framework of sexual positivism is used as a basis for understanding the shift in American thought from the social hygiene movement of the first half of the twentieth century to the sexual liberalism of the second. The last paper deals with Kinsey's attitudes and conclusions about homosexuality, examined in the context of his scientific worldview. Using his views on homosexuality as an exemplar, Kinsey's sexual liberalism at mid-century is explored as a precursor to the late-twentieth century postpositivist movement in the social sciences.

Participants:

Paul T. Mountjoy Western Michigan University

Stephanie H. Kenen University of California at Berkeley

David Allyn Harvard University

Henry L. Minton University of Windsor

Discussant: Ellen Herman Harvard University

Paul T. Mountjoy
Western Michigan University
Memories of Alfred Kinsey
Symposium Contribution
Cheiron 1995

Memories of Alfred Kinsey during my days in graduate school at Indiana University during 1949-1954 are presented.

The presenter was interviewed, and thus may be regarded as a participant observer. The interview is described and an attempt is made to place the Kinsey study within the historical context of the years immediately following World War Two, and to a lesser extent the United States, generally, in the years between the two World Wars.

Kinsey held periodic open houses for faculty and graduate students in his newly formed "Institute" and one held for the department of Psychology is described. This leads into a discussion of the resistance to the scientific study of sexuality in this culture as it was manifested in public reaction to the Kinsey project.

Since the assigned topic is personal memories of Kinsey I have gone to some length to describe the pre-publication reaction to the first volume of the Kinsey report as it impacted my own intellectual career as an undergraduate.

Some of the methodological (scientific) problems of this topic of research, and Kinsey's attempts to resolve them, are presented as examples of topics for historical research.

Stephanie H. Kenen
University of California at Berkeley

"The current hysteria over sex offenders":
Alfred Kinsey and the study of child molestation

January 1995

Given the frequency with which Alfred Kinsey's name is evoked in discussions of sexual research, amazingly little historical work has been produced about him or his work. With the exception of two hagiographic biographies written by associates, Paul Robinson's 100+ page treatise written almost 20 years ago remains the most significant contribution to date.¹ In it, he both described some of the most important of Kinsey's conclusions and analyzed some of the "presuppositions, tensions, biases, and implications" in his work.² In this paper, I will expand on Robinson, describing and analyzing a little-discussed set of conclusions Kinsey made about the long-term effects of sexual contact between adult males and pre-adolescent girls. I will argue that certain choices that Kinsey made in the course of the study skewed his conclusions about the issue in fundamental ways.

In the summer of 1937 a series of violent sex crimes against children occurred in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles. In the following months, a number of articles appeared in the medical and psychological literature expounding the need to understand the biology and psychology of the sex offender, and the necessity of understanding more about normal sexuality in order to understand abnormal sexuality. Kinsey began his study of the sexual practices of the American population the following year. Fairly early on in his work, Kinsey began to interview sex offenders (and an entire book on the subject was published almost 10 years posthumously).

In Sexual behavior in the human female, Kinsey devoted only six pages to the significance of "pre-adolescent contacts with adult males." Nevertheless, this section is particularly illustrative of how political interests can affect methodological choices in scientific work. One of Kinsey's overriding concerns was to challenge the sexual criminal code in America.³ Thus, in

¹ Robinson, Paul. The modernization of sex. NY: Harper & Row, 1976. Other treatments of Kinsey include: Minton, Henry L. "American psychology and the study of human sexuality." Journal of psychology and human sexuality, 1:1 (1988), 17-34. Irvine, J. Disorders of desire; Morantz, Regina Markell. "The scientists as sex crusaders: Alfred C. Kinsey and American culture." American Quarterly, 29:5 (Winter 1977), 563-589; Bullough, V. Science in the bedroom. NY: Basic, 1994.

² Robinson, ibid., 43.

³ This is most clearly expressed in Kinsey, A.C. Sexual behavior in the human female. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953, 17-21.

the midst of a public furor over sex offenses, Kinsey's main conclusion about sexual contact between adult men and female children -- that the long-term effects on the emotional lives of the females involved was negligible, and that most of the damage done was the result of hysterical responses by grown-ups -- had explicit political implications. However, the sample on which this conclusion was based excluded a subset of the white female population (those with prison records) whose sexual histories were so different from those of the rest of the white female population that, according to Kinsey, "their inclusion in the present volume would have seriously distorted the calculations on the total sample."⁴ He further explicitly stated that the frequencies of adult-child sexual contact would be higher if the histories of these women (and those of African-American women) had been included in the calculations.⁵ Given recent ideas about child sexual abuse, the long-term effects of childhood sexual experiences of these women was probably very different from those reported in Sexual behavior in the human female, and were perhaps causative factors in the extent of the difference of their sexual histories.

In many ways, this is a problematic example because of the social concerns and anxieties about child molestation today. However, it is one of the most clearly historically-situated fragments of Kinsey's work and it illustrates nicely the decision-making processes inherent in all scientific work. Kinsey's decision to exclude the women with prison records had a potentially profound effect on the interpretive conclusions he was able to draw from the data on adult-child sexual contact -- whether the implications of that decisions were conscious or not.

⁴ Ibid., 22.

⁵ Ibid., 117-118.

David Allyn Harvard University

Abstract**"Kinsey and Sexual Positivism:
Social Science and The Rise of the 'New Morality'"**

In the early 1960's the American press hailed the arrival of a "New Morality" in sexual relations. The "New Morality" was said to represent a transition from a traditional moral code of absolute rules about sexual behavior to a ethics based on the situational context in which behavior occurred. Cultural commentators pointed to the rise of a new brand of sexual science serving to legitimate the "New Morality." Alfred Kinsey was clearly identified as the major force behind this new sexual science. Alfred Kinsey's studies of American sexual behavior in the late 1940's and early 1950's marked a major shift in American sexual science from the social hygiene movement of the early twentieth century to the sexual liberalism of the late twentieth. Kinsey rejected the social hygienists' explicit attempt to gain knowledge about sexuality in order to control it. He criticized the social control of sexuality by the state, the church, the psychoanalyst and the force of cultural prejudice.

Kinsey strongly influenced a contemporary named Albert Ellis. Ellis was originally interested in basic research on human hermaphroditism. After earning his Ph.D. in psychology from Columbia University, Ellis began writing on the psychology of sex. He took many of the ideas implicit in the Kinsey studies and made them explicit. Like Kinsey, he entirely rejected the psychoanalytic tradition of sexual science. He focused on critiquing American sexual attitudes and, in *The Folklore of Sex* (1951), catalogued "negative" references to sex in American popular culture. Ellis used Kinsey's data in order to develop a normative code of sexual behavior not on what "should be" but on what Kinsey had actually found to be. For example, using Kinsey's famous 0-6 scale, Ellis classified "exclusive homosexuality" and "exclusive heterosexuality" as equally neurotic and worthy of treatment. In the 60's Ellis was a major friend of the homophile movement and testified in numerous cases on behalf of homosexual defendants. He railed against moral criticisms of premarital and extramarital sex, and he argued passionately that the double-standard amounted to "sexual fascism." To promote empirical research Ellis founded the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, which then began publishing the *Journal of Sex Research*. Ellis admired Kinsey tremendously, but Kinsey was often suspicious of Ellis. Ellis had a major impact on the American reading public through his books *Sex Life of the American Woman and the Kinsey Report* (1954), *The American Sexual Tragedy* (1954), and *Sex Without Guilt* (1958). In 1961 Ellis edited the first edition of *The Encyclopedia of Sexual Behavior*.

Abraham Maslow was another contemporary of Kinsey and also a psychologist. In his early years, Maslow concentrated his research on the study of female psychology. Maslow discovered that aggressive women were more likely to be sexually active. Based on this conclusion, Maslow criticized Kinsey's research methodology. At first Kinsey agreed to allow Maslow to test his data, but later refused to heed Maslow's recommendations. After Kinsey's death, Maslow went on to develop the principles of humanistic psychology. In his books and his teachings, Maslow urged his followers to seek out "peak experiences," which would liberate them from mundane human existence. Maslow identified the orgasm as one of these positive experiences. He became involved with the Esalen Institute in Big Sur, California, where he began advocating group nudity, group bathing and sexual exploration. Elected president of the American Psychological Association, Maslow gave significant legitimacy to the "New Morality."

Another figure behind the rise of the "New Morality" was William Masters. Masters studied under George Corner who had been one of Kinsey's principal supporters at the Rockefeller Institute. Masters intended to pick up where Kinsey had left off--at the empirical study of sexual physiology. Together he and Virginia Johnson published *Human Sexual Response* (1966) and *Human Sexual Inadequacy* (1970). These two books further

repudiated the psychoanalytic tradition. Masters and Johnson argued that couples could exert total control over their sexual lives--thus completing the break with the social hygiene ideology of the early twentieth century. In the mid-1970's Johnson urged Masters away from the study of physiology to the study of psychology.

Alfred Kinsey directly influenced the thought of Albert Ellis, Abraham Maslow and William Masters. As a group these four men built a foundation of "sexual positivism" in American culture. They favored empiricism over psychoanalysis and received biblical wisdom. They elevated empirical results into positive social norms. And they criticized what they considered to be "negative" attitudes toward sexuality in American culture. Each in his own way offered what he believed to be a more "positive" sexual philosophy. "Sexual positivism" thus represented a significant development in American sexual science and as a concept may illuminate our understanding of the rise of the "New Morality."

Henry L. Minton
University of Windsor
KINSEY AND HOMOSEXUALITY: TOWARD EMANCIPATORY SCIENCE

The publication of Alfred C. Kinsey's Sexual Behavior in the Human Male in 1948 was a dramatic cultural event.¹ As one team of reviewers commented:

The Kinsey Report has done for sex what Columbus did for geography. It makes a successful scientific voyage to explore an unknown world which had been open only to speculation and suspicion--the sex life of human beings.² Among the most unexpected findings in the male volume was the report of the high incidence of homosexual behavior--50 percent of the men admitted erotic responses to their own sex and 37 percent had had at least one postadolescent homosexual experience leading to orgasm. In the 1953 female volume, the incidence of homosexual behavior, though lower than the male proportions, also revealed an unexpected extensiveness--28 percent of the women revealed same-sex erotic responses and 13 percent had experienced orgasm with other women.³

Using Kinsey's views about homosexuality as an exemplar of his thinking, I will argue that Kinsey was an advocate for sexual liberalism. By this, I mean the belief that sex is good in all of its diverse forms and thus sexual expression is to be encouraged rather than controlled or inhibited.⁴ (This position is also accompanied by a faith in empirical science, and I therefore concur with David Allyn's use of the label "sexual positivism".)⁵ As I see it, Kinsey represents a transition from the sexual conservatism of some of the early strands of sexological thought as well as the social hygiene movement, to the sexual radicalism inherent in the identity politics of the gay rights and feminist movements.

I will illustrate Kinsey's views about homosexuality by placing them in the context of his scientific thinking, specifically in terms of his assumptions regarding ontology, epistemology, and ethics. The central tenet in Kinsey's ontology was the assumption that all living creatures are composed of a wide range of individual differences. Regarding human sexuality, this implied that sexual capacity could be expressed within a continuum ranging from exclusive heterosexuality to exclusive homosexuality, with most individuals falling between the two extremes. Kinsey was an essentialist who believed that culture acted as a restraint to the biologically diverse potential of sexual expression. Homosexuality as an inherent part of sexual capacity was therefore not pathological; it was society which rendered it problematic.

As Janice Irvine has pointed out, Kinsey articulated two essentialist themes: the mammalian ancestry of humans and the concept of sexual capacity.⁶ By citing the representation of same-sex behavior in the animal world, as well as in non-Western cultures, Kinsey argued that homosexuality was one of many forms of sexual expression. His notion of sexual capacity referred to the anatomical and physiological sources of sexual energy. Thus, if homosexuality was widely observed, it was a behavioral expression of a universal biological capacity. Reflecting his essentialist assumptions, Kinsey stated:

The homosexual has been a significant part of human sexual activity ever since the dawn of history, primarily because it

-2-

is an expression of capacities that are basic in the human animal.⁷

As an evolutionary biologist by training, Kinsey was sensitive to the complex ways in which behavior was related to social and ecological conditions.⁸ Thus, while his essentialism conveyed a transhistorical view of homosexuality as unchanging biological capacity, he had a cultural relativist view regarding homosexual behavior. As he declared: "A choice of a partner in a sexual relation becomes more significant only because society demands that there be a particular choice in this matter."⁹ Cultural differences determined the prevalence of homosexuality, and he was especially critical of the sexually repressive values of Western Society. Kinsey was aware of the role that dominant sexual ideology could play in shaping scientific thought. He viewed the tendency among most sexologists to pathologize homosexuality as an example of such ideological bias.¹⁰ His espousal of a liberal view in which all forms of sexual expression were deemed desirable was a departure from the prevailing version of essentialism, represented by such pioneers as Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Sigmund Freud, which appropriated the dominant forms of sexual relations between men and women as a fixed biological instinct.¹¹

With respect to epistemology, Kinsey argued that facts would lead to understanding. Thus, an objective scientific approach to the study of human sexuality would produce social tolerance and liberate stigmatized forms of sexual expression, such as homosexuality, from unnecessary cultural restraints. For Kinsey, objectivity meant that scientific inquiry could not be contaminated by biased or prejudiced attitudes. He advocated the interview as the method of choice in studying sexuality because it provided the means for the scientist to step outside of his/her own preconceptions and become an understanding and sympathetic listener.¹² The interview also reflected Kinsey's commitment to the taxonomic approach he had used as a biologist. In contrast to the reliance on questionnaires by previous sex researchers, Kinsey believed that the interview represented a more in-depth approach which would achieve the taxonomic goals of measuring the wide range of human sexual variation.

Kinsey's use of the interview was the most innovative feature of his research. Although there was much skepticism by his critics about the accuracy of the data, he appears to have been especially adept at establishing rapport as well as developing guidelines for checking on accuracy.¹³ He believed that if the interviewer showed sympathetic interest and withheld moral judgment, respondents would overcome any initial inhibitions in reporting their sexual experiences. Moreover, he believed that individuals generally like to tell their stories and were motivated more by altruism than egotism.¹⁴ Referring to the male sample, he reported: "Twelve thousand people have helped in this research primarily because they have faith in scientific research projects."¹⁵

Some insight into why Kinsey was so successful in getting people to volunteer for his research can be gleaned from his relationship with the homosexual community. In general, he seems

-3-

to have encouraged the development of collaborative working relationships with the various groups of people he studied. This was especially true with respect to his relationship with the male homosexual community, a relationship which continued after the male volume was published. In the early stages of his research, Kinsey visited Chicago in 1939 and established contact with various social groups of homosexual men and women. In writing to his close friend and colleague, Ralph Voris, Kinsey referred to the "dynamite" he had uncovered, that is, his introduction to the homosexual underground. He recounted that he had been to:

Hallowe'en parties, taverns, clubs, etc., which would be unbelievable if realized by the rest of the world. Always they have been most considerate and cooperative, decent, understanding, and cordial in their reception. Why has no one cracked this before? There are at least 300,000 involved in Chicago alone.¹⁶

This was the start of a type of collaborative relationship Kinsey instituted with members of the homosexual community. While he was insistent on employing only white male Protestant interviewers (supposedly to maintain a constant condition regardless of the gender, sexual orientation, or race of the respondents), he established a network of contacts with the homosexual community.¹⁷ A number of homosexual men served as sources of recruitment for volunteers.¹⁸ Kinsey also tapped into an international underground of gay men who contributed various visual and textual artifacts of gay culture.¹⁹ Kinsey's close relationship with the male homosexual community fulfilled the needs of both investigator and research participants. For Kinsey these contacts provided an entry to an underground sexual world that he believed needed to be represented in the sexual landscape of American society. For the participants, Kinsey's research offered an opportunity to have their voices heard. As Pomeroy has stated:

These people usually poured out their lives to us with a minimum of cover-up, and because society had made them feel like such special cases, they often took a greater interest in remembering or recording their experiences.²⁰

Kinsey's ethical stance was premised on his commitment to objective science as the key to social progress. A science of sexuality would contribute to a better understanding of the problems surrounding gender and sexuality. His essentialist position that sex was a "normal biologic function in whatever form it is manifested,"²¹ was aimed at liberating sexuality from its socially oppressive restraints. In the case of homosexuality, he argued:

In view of the data which we now have on the incidence and frequency of the homosexual, in particular on its coexistence with the heterosexual in the lives of a considerable portion of the male population, it is difficult to maintain the view that psychosexual reactions between individuals of the same sex are rare and therefore abnormal or unnatural, or that they constitute within themselves evidence of neuroses or even psychoses.²²

-4-

Kinsey's sexual tolerance provided the rationale for his political strategy. If scientific objectivity produced data that subverted the conventional morality guiding sexual behavior, then scientific discourse on sexuality should serve as a source for bringing about positive social change. In both Kinsey volumes, there are frequent critiques of existing sex laws and the hypocrisy of trying to enforce such laws when most individuals, at some point, practiced illegal sexual activity.²³ Kinsey was aware that legal reform could not come about without a change in social attitudes but he also had faith in the power of objective scientific discourse as an agent for attitudinal change. This faith reflected his liberal worldview in the sense that enlightened rationality could produce social change.

As Regina Markell Morantz has pointed out, Kinsey was not a social revolutionary.²⁴ Aside from conventional sexual mores, he did not question other social values nor did he question the existing power structure with its inherent sexual and gender oppression. With regard to homosexuality, he was insensitive to the possibility of collective political action in the form of a homosexual rights movement. In fact, he strongly argued against the need to categorize individuals in terms of sexual identities.²⁵ Rather than homosexual people, there was only homosexual behavior. His nominalist position was advanced to combat the reification of a homosexual stereotype.²⁶ Critiquing Kinsey for not realizing the value of theorizing homosexual identity as a politically heuristic strategy is somewhat unfair since there was no national homophile movement in the United States at the time Kinsey conducted his research. Yet, Kinsey was aware of Magnus Hirschfeld's work as a homophile activist-scientist in pre-Nazi Germany, however he considered that Hirschfeld's activism compromised his role as an objective scientist.²⁷

Kinsey's place in the history of sexuality in general, and in lesbian and gay studies in particular is seminal. His scientific sexual liberalism was congruent with the cultural sexual liberalism that had emerged by the 1920s.²⁸ When he began to collect his data on homosexual men and women in the 1940s, there were well-established homosexual communities in American cities.²⁹ Gay men and lesbians were eager to tell their stories, to have their voices heard by a sympathetic scientist. The Kinsey reports which provided voice for an invisible minority thus played a significant role in the creation of a national homophile movement in the 1950s. The radicalization of the movement in the form of gay liberation in the 1970s spawned the creation of lesbian and gay studies. While there are many strands of thought in lesbian and gay studies, a central feature is its emancipatory interests of resisting domination and oppression. Ironically, although Kinsey eschewed the need for a homosexual identity on ontological grounds, he was instrumental in laying the groundwork for the radical use of lesbian and gay identity as a theoretically heuristic device for bringing about a change in the sexual order.³⁰

-5-

Endnotes

1. Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948) (hereafter referred to as SBHM).
2. Morris L. Ernst and David Loth, American Sexual Behavior and the Kinsey Report (New York: Greystone Press, 1948), quote p. 11.
3. Alfred, C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard, Sexual Behavior in the Human Female (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948) (hereafter referred to as SBHF).
4. Other analysts of Kinsey's work have reached a similar conclusion. See Regina Markell Morantz, "The Scientist as Sex Crusader: Alfred C. Kinsey and American Culture," American Quarterly 29 (1977), 563-89; Jeffrey Weeks, Sexuality and Its Discontents: Meanings, Myths & Modern Sexualities (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985); Janice M. Irvine, Disorders of Desire: Sex and Gender in Modern American Sexology (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990).
5. David Allyn, Kinsey and Sexual Positivism: Social Science and the Rise of the 'New Morality', Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Cheiron Society, Brunswick, Maine, June, 1995. (As in the case of my paper, part of the symposium, "Alfred C. Kinsey: Bowdoin Class of 1916," presented at this conference.)
6. Irvine, Disorders of Desire, p. 47-51. These two themes were more fully developed in the second Kinsey report, Kinsey et al., SBHF.
7. Kinsey et al., SBHM, p. 666.
8. See James D. Weinrich, "The Kinsey Scale in Biology, with a Note on Kinsey as a Biologist" in David P. McWhirter, Stephanie A. Sanders, and June Machover Reinisch, eds., Homosexuality/Heterosexuality: Concepts of Sexual Orientation (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 115-37.
9. Kinsey et al., SBHM, p. 661.
10. For a discussion of Kinsey's attitudes about the way in which conventional moral values affected the work of sex researchers, see Wardell B. Pomeroy, Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research. (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).
11. Kinsey was not the first to advocate such a position of sexual liberalism. Paul Robinson, for example, has traced many of the facets of sexual liberalism (or modernism as he labels it) to Havelock Ellis. See Paul Robinson, The Modernization of Sex (New York: Harper & Row, 1976).

-6-

12. Kinsey's rationale for the interview is discussed in Kinsey et al. SBHM, pp. 35-62.
13. See Morantz, "Scientist as Crusader," p. 569.
14. Kinsey et al., SBHM, p. 38.
15. Ibid., p. 41.
16. Pomeroy, Dr. Kinsey, p. 62. Ralph Voris was a former student of Kinsey who died of pneumonia in 1940, at age 38. There has been speculation about Kinsey's sexual orientation, based on the close nature of his friendship with Voris, as expressed in their mutual correspondence. See Paul Robinson's review of the two Kinsey biographies by Wardell Pomeroy and Cornelia Christenson, in Atlantic Monthly, May 1972, pp. 99-102.
17. It appears that Kinsey's contacts were primarily with the male homosexual community, as indicated by the correspondence at the Kinsey Institute. In the male volume, there is reference to contacts with "a concentrated and rather large homosexual community in a large city," Kinsey et al., SBHM, p. 75. In the female volume under a listing of women's groups, there is no similar reference, SBHF, p. 38.
18. Pomeroy, Dr. Kinsey, pp. 139-140.
19. See Thomas Waugh, "Knowledge and Desire: Dr. Kinsey as Arbiter of the Homosexual Imaginary" in Jacqueline Murray, ed., Constructing Sexualities, Working Papers in the Humanities I, Humanities Research Group, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, pp. 63-87.
20. Pomeroy, Dr. Kinsey, p. 139.
21. Kinsey et al., SBHM, p. 263.
22. Ibid., p. 659.
23. On homosexual offenses, see, Kinsey et al., SBHM, pp. 664-66; Kinsey et al., SBHF, pp. 483-486.
24. Morantz, The Scientist as Sex Crusader, p. 584. Morantz also notes that while Kinsey was accepting of homosexuality, he remained bound to the Victorian ideal of happy, stable marriages. Also see Robinson, Modernization, p. 69, who notes that Kinsey was critical of the high incidence of homosexual promiscuity.
25. Kinsey et al., SBHM, pp. 616-17.
26. Ibid., pp. 614-15, 636-38. Also see Robinson, Modernization, p. 69.
27. Pomeroy, Dr. Kinsey, p. 69.

-7-

28. For a treatment of the rise of sexual liberalism in American culture, see John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freeman, Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America (New York: Harper & Row, 1988).

29. See John D'Emilio, Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); George Chauncey, Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940 (New York: Basic Books, 1994).

30. For a discussion of the use of identity in lesbian and gay studies, see Stephen Seidman, "Identity and Politics in a 'Postmodern' Gay Culture: Some Historical and Conceptual Notes" in Michael Warner, ed. Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and Social Theory (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), pp. 105-142.