

HOMOSEXUALITY: A History

by Vern L. Bullough



1979



A MERIDIAN BOOK
NEW AMERICAN LIBRARY

TIMES MIRROR
NEW YORK AND SCARBOROUGH, ONTARIO

and other characteristics of women. Now this condition is different from a bodily disease; it is rather an affliction of a diseased mind. Indeed, often out of passion and in rare cases out of respect for certain persons to whom they are beholden, these pathics suddenly change their character and for a while try to give proof of their virility. But since they are not aware of their limitations, they are again the victims of excesses, subjecting their virility to too great a strain and consequently involving themselves in worse vices. And it is our opinion that these persons suffer no impairment of sensation. For, as Soranus says, this affliction comes from a corrupt and debased mind. Indeed, the victims of this malady may be compared to the women who are called *tribades* because they pursue both kinds of love. These women are more eager to lie with women than with men; in fact, they pursue women with almost masculine jealousy, and when they are freed or temporarily relieved of their passion . . . [t]hey rush, as if victims of continual intoxication, to new forms of lust, and sustained by the disgraceful mode of life, they rejoice in the abuse of their sexual powers.

Soranus held that no bodily treatment could be applied to overcome the disease, since the mind rather than the body had been affected. Moreover, unlike most other such diseases, this one became stronger as the body grew older, causing a hideous and ever-increasing lust. This was because in the

years when the body is still strong and can perform the normal functions of love, the sexual desire (of those persons) assumes a dual aspect, in which the soul is excited sometimes while playing a passive role and sometimes while playing an active role. But in the case of old men who have lost their virile powers, all their sexual desire is turned in the opposite direction and consequently exerts a stronger demand for the feminine role in love. In fact, many infer that this is a reason why boys too are victims of this affliction. For, like old men, they do not possess virile powers; that is, they have not yet attained those powers which have already deserted the aged.³

In short, young people have to be watched particularly closely since they are so vulnerable. This aspect was emphasized by the medieval writers on the subject.

St. Albertus Magnus (1206–80), for example, agreed that homosexuality proceeded from a burning frenzy (without explaining the source of this frenzy) and that individuals who became addicted to such behavior seldom succeeded in freeing themselves, but he believed that homosexuality was also contagious and could spread rapidly from one person to another.⁴ By implication one had to be watchful, particularly over the young. Not all writers were so concerned, and Voltaire (1694–1778) explained the attraction of young boys in a different way:

It is always the male that attracts the female. The young males of our species, reared together, feeling this force that nature begins to develop in them, and not finding the natural object of their instinct, throw themselves upon that which resembles it. A young boy will often, by the freshness of his complexion, by the intensity of his coloration, and by the sweetness of his eyes, resemble a beautiful girl for the space of two or three years; if he is in love, it is because nature is misunderstood; on becoming attached to the one who has these beauties, one renders homage to sex, and when age has made this resemblance vanish, the errors cease. . . .⁵

In the nineteenth century there was growing concern about the causes of homosexuality. Much of this new concern was related to the rapid growth of the major European and American cities; urbanism brought with it greater diversity in sexual preferences. Prostitution, for example, became a major concern of nineteenth-century reformers, and with new attention being paid to female prostitution, male prostitution also came under investigation. The pioneer in this respect was F. Carlier, a police official in Paris, who felt that police were working in the dark when it came to homosexuality. Since prostitution was legal in France and homosexual activity between consenting adults was not punishable, it was only when male prostitution became an affront to public decency or when minors were seduced that it became a matter of police concern. The police nonetheless began to keep tabs on the growing homosexual community.

Carlier found that there were 7,242 homosexuals (he called them pederasts) in Paris who had come to the attention of the police—3,049 native-born Parisians, 3,709 provincials, and 484 foreigners. Less than half of the group, in his opinion, could be convicted of illegal acts. Carlier was particularly concerned with the “professionals” who dressed and acted as women, not only because they were the most noticeable, but because they were also most likely to be a cause of complaint to the police.⁶ Carlier’s study was made in the 1880s when the population of Paris was approaching 2,300,000, and though known homosexuals (i.e., known to the police) amounted to less than .3 percent of the total population, they were sufficiently numerous to come together and exchange ideas, to develop their own argot, and to begin to challenge some of the assumptions society made about them.

One of the first to do so was Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825–95), who, under his own name and under the pseudonym Numa Numantius, poured out a series of polemical, analytical, and theoretical pamphlets about homosexuality in the years between 1865 and 1875. Ulrichs argued that the instincts he found in himself were not “abnormal” but were inborn and therefore natural. He was also concerned with attempting to find non-derogatory terms to describe individuals who had sexual preferences like his own. He coined the term *urning*, from an allusion to the god Uranus in Plato’s *Symposium*, to describe homosexual individuals. Not content with this, he developed a whole vocabulary: an *urningin* was a female homosexual; a *dioning* (after Dionysius) a heterosexual male; a homosexual who preferred effeminate males a *mannling*, and one who preferred powerful masculine types a *weibling*. There were many others.

Ulrichs taught that up to a certain stage of development the sexes were the same, after which a threefold division took place: male, female, and *urning* (or *urningin*), the last group made up of individuals who had the physical features of one sex and the sexual instinct of the other. The result was an inversion of sexual desires. Since normal males have rudimentary breasts and normal females have a rudimentary penis, it was understandable in his opinion why people would fail to develop along the expected lines, and why a body might have one sex and the soul another.⁷ His explanation of a third sex appears often in nineteenth- and

twentieth-century literature, as does his description of a male soul imprisoned in a female body and vice versa.

The concern with naming and identifying same-sex love was not restricted to Ulrichs. The term “homosexual” was coined by a Hungarian writer, Karoly Maria Benkert, who, under the pseudonym Kertbeny in 1869, published a pamphlet on the subject.⁸ He wrote:

In addition to the normal sexual urge in men and women, Nature in her sovereign mood has endowed at birth certain male and female individuals with the homosexual urge, thus placing them in a sexual bondage which renders them physically and psychically incapable—even with the best intention—of normal erection. This urge creates in advance a direct horror of the opposite sex, and the victim of this passion finds it impossible to suppress the feelings which individuals of his own sex exercise upon him.⁹

“Homosexuality,” a philologically awkward hybrid of Greek and Latin elements, came to be the term applied to people who love those of the same sex, while “heterosexuality,” equally philologically impure, came to be applied to those who gained pleasure from the opposite sex. But what was homosexuality? Could a person be homosexual without engaging in sex? As various writers attempted to wrestle with these problems, such terms as “homoeerotic” (aroused by the same sex), “homophile” (lover of the same sex), and “homophobe” (hater of homosexuality) appeared.

Since the nineteenth century was an age of science, and science was seen as giving answers to many of the traditional problems of society, it was perhaps inevitable that science, or at least the medical portion of the scientific community, also become interested in homosexuality as a research subject. The first physician to attempt to put the study of homosexuality on a more scientific basis was Carl Westphal (1833–90), professor of psychiatry at Berlin. In 1869 Westphal published the case history of a young woman who, from her earliest years, liked to dress as a boy, cared more for boys’ games than girls’, and found herself attracted only to females. Sympathetic to his patient and interested in the

phenomenon, Westphal came to the conclusion that the abnormality he had found in his patient was congenital, not acquired, and therefore it could not be termed a vice. Though Westphal insisted that neurotic elements were present, he argued that these were not indications of insanity. Instead he called the phenomenon "contrary sexual feeling" (*konträre Sexualempfindung*) and in the process led the way to more open discussion of the phenomenon in the medical community.¹⁰ Westphal went on to study more than 200 cases of homosexuality and related behavior and set off what came to be a flood of literature. It has been claimed that between 1898 and 1908 there were more than 1,000 published titles devoted to homosexuality in German alone,¹¹ and while this figure has turned out to be greatly exaggerated, the subject of homosexuality entered medical literature with a vengeance. For a time the term *konträre*, or "inverted sexual instinct," as it was translated into English, was widely used, and not until well into the twentieth century did the term "homosexuality" win out, mainly because "inverted sexual instinct" was not precise enough. The term "invert" joined *urning* and other similar terms, however, in much of the descriptive literature.

If sexual inversion was inborn, could it still be cured? The famous French neurologist Jean Martin Charcot (1825-93), the director of the Salpêtrière asylum, and his colleague Valentin Magnan (1835-1916) tried to cure several cases of "sexual inversion" with hypnosis. Since they had only modest success, they argued that "inversion" was a constitutional nervous weakness due to hereditary degeneration,¹² a much more stigmatized description than that used by Westphal. But how does one explain hereditary degeneration? The French physician Paul Moreau attempted to do so by arguing that in addition to the usual senses of sight, hearing, touch, taste, and feeling, man had a sixth sense, a genital sense that, like the others, could also suffer physical or psychical injury without damaging the other mental functions. Such propensity to injury was due to a hereditary taint, a sort of predisposition to perversion that certain environmental factors encouraged. These factors included age, poverty, constitution, temperament, seasons of the year, climate, and food; and the result could be sexual inversion, nymphomania, satyriasis, bestiality, rape, or profanation of corpses. They felt that the only

solution to such hereditary taints, other than imprisonment, was to turn such individuals over to asylums where they could be cared for, since there was little hope of cure. This intermediate class of individuals lacked the real genital sense of males and females, but instead constituted a mixed class midway between reason and madness, forever being pulled close to madness. One factor most likely to set them off was masturbation,¹³ an explanation which added to fears about this practice in children.

What had started as a defense of homosexuality by individuals such as Ulrichs had now become a justification for institutionalizing those individuals departing from the sexual norms of society, since they were born with congenitally inadequate sixth senses, and as a result were unable to function effectively in life. Ultimately this led to the concept of degeneracy, a concept which has affected our thinking about sexual matters ever since. Degeneracy was believed to be a defect in an individual's heredity, often equated with atavism, i.e., the sudden reappearance of primitive tendencies in civilized human beings. Evolutionary concepts advanced by Charles Darwin were seized upon as justification for this theory; degeneracy was a reversal of progressive evolution. The degenerate string—for the defect was believed to be both progressive and inherent—involved nervous illness, physical weakness, and deviant behavior. Inevitably, any departure from conventional behavior, whether sexual or social, was regarded as a sign of degeneracy. A sexual degenerate was thus a primitive, animal-like person who might do anything. In no way could such a person be regarded as a solid member of the community who happened to be deviant only in some of his sexual inclinations.

Some authorities said degeneracy was not only inborn, but acquired. Benjamin Tarnowski, a St. Petersburg physician sympathetic to his homosexual patients, distinguished between those who had been born "perverted" and those who had acquired the condition. Those born "perverted" were inevitably the children of individuals suffering from hysteria, epilepsy, alcoholism, anemia, typhus, "debauchery," or similar illness, or who had been affected by the soil or climate of their birthplace. Others had acquired their "perversion" by reading dirty books, keeping bad company, living in luxury, or masturbating. He believed that epilepsy and sexual perversion had much in common, since

both were indications of psychic degeneration. Mothers who were hysterical were also likely to pass on traits of sexual perversion to their children.¹⁴ The only solution was institutionalization.

Cesare Lombroso used Darwinian theory to bolster his argument that sexual deviates were on a lower stage of the evolutionary ladder than normal heterosexual individuals. Lombroso believed not only that animal life had evolved from lower forms, but that life had progressed sexually from a hermaphroditic or self-fertilizing stage to a high monosexual stage. Just as life itself had evolved, so did species, and as man had progressed from primitive society to higher levels of civilization, mankind had outgrown robbery, murder, promiscuity, and perversion, or at least the most civilized among mankind had done so. Because, however, a child had to repeat the progression of the species to become civilized, it was understandable that those with defective heredity would become criminal, deviants, or mental defectives. It was also understandable why sexual behavior common among primitive groups or observed among animals could be regarded as unacceptable in higher, civilized societies. For Lombroso, innate criminality and sexual deviation were the equivalent of moral insanity. Lombroso measured the skulls, bodies, sexual organs, and features of criminals, prostitutes, idiots, arsonists, and the "sexually perverted," in the process of proving, at least to his own satisfaction, that such individuals had a large number of primitive characteristics such as jutting jaws, malformed craniums, and close-set eyes. Lombroso, however, believed that those born criminally or "morally insane" should not be punished but rather sequestered in asylums and prevented from perpetuating their kind.¹⁵

By far the most important of these early researchers in influencing public opinion was Richard von Krafft-Ebing (1840-1902), whose *Psychopathia Sexualis* is still in print. He combined several prevailing nineteenth-century theories to explain sexual "perversion": (1) the idea that disease was often caused by the physical nervous system, (2) the idea that hereditary defects were possible in this system, and (3) the concept of degeneracy. Most important was man's sexual drive, which is the

most important factor in social existence, the strongest incentive to the exertion of strength and acquisition of

property, to the foundation of a home, and the awakening of altruistic feeling, first for a person of the opposite sex, then for the offspring, and in a wider sense for all humanity.¹⁶

Krafft-Ebing was very much a man of the nineteenth century; he stressed that civilization had been made possible only by the tempering of lust through altruism and restraint, and taught that sexual excess weakened the body. The purpose of sex was reproduction; sexual activities not undertaken with the ultimate purpose in mind were "unnatural practices," a perversion of the sexual instinct. Though religion, law, education, and morality all gave civilized man the aids by which he could bridle his passion, man was still always in danger of sinking from the pure, clear heights of chaste love into the mire of common sensuality. To retain his morality man had to fight a constant battle with natural impulses.

Only characters endowed with strong wills are able to completely emancipate themselves from sensuality and share in that pure love from which spring the noblest joys of human life.¹⁷

To demonstrate the dangers of excessive sexuality, Krafft-Ebing collected a number of cases, more than 200 by the eleventh edition of his work, of "abnormal" or "pathological" individuals. He firmly believed that the abnormality he reported resulted either from frequent abuses of the sexual organs (masturbation) or from an inherited abnormal constitution of the nervous system. Though he distinguished between innate and acquired perversion, he argued that even the acquired perversions could exist only when there were hereditary weaknesses in the nervous system. Almost every kind of sex activity except those leading to procreation were classified as psychopathic acts. In the same grouping with murderers and cannibals, he included such harmless persons as a collector of violet-striped handkerchiefs, a man who loved to smell roses, and a girl who longed to kiss and embrace other girls.

Because he so strongly believed in hereditary defects as a major cause of sexual "perversion," Krafft-Ebing felt that penal laws should be repealed. Whether institutionalization was preferred

over imprisonment is probably a subjective matter, but it was quite clear that most of the investigators of this period regarded these as the only alternatives.

Working from a rather different premise, however, was Havelock Ellis (1859-1939), who probably more than anyone else popularized the concept of individual and cultural relativism in sex. The results of his studies were published in a monumental series of volumes, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, originally issued and then revised between 1896 and 1938. Like Krafft-Ebing, Ellis covered most of the variations in sexual behavior, but unlike his predecessor, he exhibited a far more sympathetic understanding of the individuals involved. In a sense, Ellis was a naturalist, observing and collecting information about human sexuality instead of judging it, and as such can be considered the forerunner of the sex researchers today. In debates about whether homosexuality was inborn or acquired, physical or psychic, he cautiously held that there was some truth in all the views. He believed that sexual differences were inborn and non-pathological, although he would grant that there was a higher percentage of neurotics among deviant than among other groups. Essentially, Ellis's work was a plea for tolerance and for acceptance that deviations from the norm were harmless and occasionally perhaps even valuable. He was a sex reformer who urged society to recognize and accept sexual manifestations during infancy, and sexual experimentation during adolescence, and to take steps to repeal its ban on contraception and its laws dealing with sexual activity between consenting adults in private.¹⁸

Ellis' volume on homosexuality was originally conceived as a collaboration between himself and John Addington Symonds (1840-93), who had written two earlier defenses of homosexuality.¹⁹ Ellis himself was not a defender of homosexuality but an observer who regarded it as part of the sexual spectrum. Some of his friends and acquaintances, however, were more polemical. Edward Carpenter (1844-1929), in the pamphlet *Homogenic Love* (1894) and the book *The Intermediate Sex* (1908), argued that the homosexually inclined were specially fitted for progressive leadership in a democratic society since they combined both the male and female qualities.²⁰ Edward Irenaeus Stevenson (1868-1942), who wrote about homosexuality under the pseudonym Xavier Mayne, was also more of a propagandist. In his *The*

Intersexes Stevenson held that homosexual relations were natural, necessary, and legitimate; that the homosexual constituted a third sex between the extreme male and extreme female.²¹

Being homosexual did not, however, preclude valuable research into sexuality, and one of the more important researchers was Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1935), who was both a homosexual and a transvestite. His own sexual inclinations helped convince Hirschfeld that homosexuality was not a perversion, but his explanation that it was the result of certain inborn characteristics influenced by internal secretions of the glands failed to win many converts.²²

Sigmund Freud and his followers had somewhat different theories. Freud agreed with Krafft-Ebing on the necessity of redirecting sexual energies, but where Krafft-Ebing had held that variant sexual behavior came from sexual drives that had been misdirected, Freud held that the cause of the misdirection lay in the nervous system and the mind through which the instinctual drive operated. Though Freud paid comparatively little attention to most forms of variant sexual behavior, except to express a general kind of tolerance,²³ his followers seized upon his concept to emphasize the environmental and accidental causes of variant impulses far more than Freud himself did. The school of psychologists known as behaviorists, who stressed learning and conditioning of animals and man, ultimately carried this type of environmental and accidental determination to an extreme. The practical result of both Freudianism and behaviorist learning theory was to suggest that everyone had the potential to channel his drives toward any form of gratification and use any object. Inevitably, this undermined the assumption that certain forms of sex were against nature, for nature itself, instinctual drive, was visualized as being able to express itself in many ways.

Freud regarded homoerotic behavior as a normal part of growing up. Most individuals moved beyond this stage into adult heterosexuality, and so by implication, adult homosexuality was a distortion of natural development. His explanations for the failure of certain individuals to move beyond the homoerotic phase centered around the relationship of a child to its parents, most particularly to the parent of the opposite sex. Homosexuality was also conceived by Freud and his followers as a flight from incest. In the absence of a father, or in the presence of a weak

one, a boy child who fell in love with his mother and sought to become her lover repressed his desire most effectively by suppressing sexual feeling toward all women. In other instances the child fell in love with the parent of the same sex and replaced or attempted to oust the parent of the other sex. The boy, suppressing his desires for the father, sought to be like the woman who accepted his father, but, unable to reconcile the incestuous sin of a father love, sought the father in other males. Such a boy might become effeminate, play the female role in the sex act, and become attracted to older men.²⁴ Although each psychoanalytic investigator tends to point up different factors in his diagnosis, most, following Freudian ideas, if not Freud himself, have agreed that homosexuality is environmentally rather than constitutionally caused, and is, by implication, curable.²⁵

In recent years sex research has split into conflicting schools: clinical case research (primarily psychoanalytical) on the one hand, and all other research on the other, with the psychoanalytic school coming under increasing attack.²⁶ Martin Weinberg and Colin Williams in their 1974 study of homosexuality summed up the basis of this attack. Their complaint was that the psychoanalysts, by their emphasis on a possible cure, hindered theoretical progress and prevented a better understanding of the variations in sexual behavior. They also criticized the methodological deficiencies in such studies:

First, the samples used have been extremely small. This in itself need not always be a serious defect, even if it does limit more complex analysis of the data. A much more important problem is that such samples are usually made up of persons who are patients of the clinicians doing research and cannot provide much knowledge about homosexuals *in toto*. While a representative sample of homosexuals may be impossible to achieve, certainly less biased groups can be obtained. . . . Another major defect of such studies has been that control groups are rarely used. Comparison groups are crucial if, for example, one is concerned with determining the degree to which homosexuals are maladjusted (instead of claiming it by fiat). A heterosexual control group is essential to answer this question as well as etiological questions.

Finally, most studies of homosexuality have been culture-bound.²⁷

Weinberg and Williams are criticizing not only the methodology used by many of the psychiatrists, but the very validity of the medical model. Though in the past the medical model undoubtedly proved useful, its continued application to the field of sexual orientation is now debatable. Its one advantage is that it allowed investigation into sexual behavior without the dangers of public condemnation that the non-physician faced. It also gave an opportunity to have a sample of patients, since a physician who wrote about homosexuality often attracted other homosexual patients, thus giving him a number of case studies upon which to base his assumption. This was important, since the problem of how to get data on homosexuals handicapped research on the subject. Krafft-Ebing solved it by collecting court and medical cases. Others have gone to prison populations. Ellis compiled individual case histories of friends and others and used historical and anthropological examples. Hirschfeld tried to examine the general population, but for so doing he was brought to trial and charged with disseminating indecent information. Carlier used male prostitutes who had been arrested.

One method of doing sex research is to sample the general population. For a time, however, there was a belief that people would not talk about their sexual habits, and so instead selected groups of the population were examined. This was what Alfred Kinsey did. His studies of American sexual behavior were based on interviews with 12,000 American volunteers of both sexes and all ages and marital status and from every state, educational, and socioeconomic status. In spite of serious criticism of his sampling techniques, his general findings are now widely accepted.

Kinsey examined sex from the point of view of a scientist whose purpose was to find what kind of sexual activities people engaged in. His goal was not to condemn or even to define what was natural or unnatural. He found a higher percentage of his male sample to be homosexually inclined than previously estimated, although, in part, the results he obtained depended on what is defined as homosexual.²⁸ Kinsey reported that 37 percent of the total male population had at least some overt homosexual experience to the point of orgasm between adolescence and old

age, and 50 percent of males who had remained single until age thirty-five had overt homosexual experience. Some 13 percent of his male population had more homosexual than heterosexual experience between the ages of sixteen and fifty-five, and 4 percent of the male population were labeled by Kinsey as exclusively homosexual,²⁹ a figure corresponding to some of the earlier estimates of Magnus Hirschfeld. Women in his sample reported fewer homosexual contacts than the men. Some 28 percent had reported homosexual arousal by age forty-five, but only 13 percent had actually reached orgasm. Less than 3 percent could be regarded as exclusively homosexual.³⁰

The Kinsey findings helped set the stage for the research into homosexuality which has taken place during the last thirty years, encouraged and tolerated by new public attitudes toward sex. Obviously one of the reasons the public has been so confused about homosexuality in the past is that the researchers and scientists have been confused themselves. Homosexuality undoubtedly exists in a significant proportion of the population, but only recently have we been able to investigate the topic and to try to get answers. The American Psychiatric Association now agrees that it is not a pathological illness, but its members are not quite certain how to deal with it; what is true of the psychiatrists is also true of psychologists, sociologists, and other groups of investigators. Most of the specialists in the field believe there are different kinds of homosexuality, and that the terms we have been using are too broad to have any meaning. Some of the causes might be congenital—that is, they take place before birth—while others might involve the earliest years of a child's life (before two) when a child identifies himself or herself as a boy or girl, and identifies with the parent of the same sex. Also involved is not only the matter of sexual identity, but that of gender role—a matter quite different from sexual identity. Finally, there is a matter of partner preference or sex preference. Why do most boys want to court and marry girls, and why do most girls want to court and marry boys, and why do some people want to court and marry people of the same sex? We do not as yet have the complete answers to these questions, but some of them will appear later on in this book. As we begin to think about our attitudes toward homosexuality we can also examine some of the recent research and assess its implications.

Chapter 2

RELIGION AND HOMOSEXUALITY

Historically the most important force in setting western attitudes toward homosexuality has been religion, and in both Judaism and Christianity homosexuality has been regarded as a sin. In Judaism much of the hostility stemmed from the belief that the only place semen could be deposited was in a vagina. Semen itself was a source of contamination:

And if a man's seed of copulation go out from him, then he shall wash all his flesh in water, and be unclean until the evening. And every garment, and every skin, whereupon is the seed of copulation, shall be washed with water, and be unclean until the evening.¹

To become ritually pure after such emissions, a short period of continence was normally required, though sometimes the punishment was more severe, as in the story of Onan:

And Er, Judah's first born, was wicked in the sight of the Lord:

and the Lord slew him.

And Judah said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up the seed to thy brother.

And Onan knew that the seed should not be his; and it came to pass, when he went in unto his brother's wife, that he spilled it on the ground, lest that he should give seed to his brother.

And the thing which he did displeased the Lord; whereupon he slew him also.²

Though this story clearly describes coitus interruptus, it is not clear whether the Lord slew Onan for spilling his seed or for his refusal to obey the Levirate requirement that he take his sister-in-law as wife. Generally throughout western Christian culture this passage has been taken to justify the condemnation not only of contraception, but of masturbation and homosexuality, since none of these activities results in procreation. Later Jewish tradition continued to emphasize the procreative aspect of sex, with Talmudic writers also condemning masturbation; one Talmudic writer went so far as to regard masturbation as a crime deserving the death penalty.³ If such hostility was expressed to nonprocreative masturbation, there is little wonder that similar penalties were judged suitable for homosexual activities.

There was, however, a contradiction in the Jewish scriptures and interpretations about homosexuality which also appears throughout much of western culture, and that is the lesser importance of the female, and therefore silence about lesbianism. Though mankind had been instructed by God to procreate and replenish the earth,⁴ it is clear that the commandment was often interpreted as applying only to males. Thus it was permissible for women to use contraceptive measures, to insert a *mokh* (a spongy substance) into their vaginas in order to hinder conception.⁵ Male semen was the key to conception, and women supplied little to the new being except a suitable environment for growth.⁶ By implication, if a woman engaged in lesbian contacts with another woman, little sin was involved, and although lesbianism is occasionally equated with harlotry, few prohibitions were put on the private association of one woman with another, and the subject of homosexual relations between women is generally ignored.⁷

No such implied tolerance existed toward overt male homosexual practices, however, although it is not clear whether the most hostile condemnations date from early in Hebrew history or were later interpretations. At any rate, extreme hostility was the norm among many of the later commentators, who equated

homosexuality with Greek influences and were attempting to keep Israel pure from Greek ideas in general and sexual ideology in particular.

The earliest specific mention of homosexuality in the Bible is in that portion of the Holiness Code preserved in Leviticus: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is an abomination."⁸ This was later amplified:

If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; and their blood shall be upon them.⁹

Scholars today are not in agreement as to when this passage was composed, although traditionally the code was regarded as dating from the period of the exile (sixth century B.C.E.). This is not true of some other references to homosexuality which seem to have been prompted by hostility to male prostitution found among some of the surrounding non-Jewish peoples. This, for example, is believed to be the source of the passage in Deuteronomy: "There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel."¹⁰

For our purposes, however, it is not so much what the scriptures say about homosexuality that has dominated western thinking as what they were interpreted to mean. This is particularly true of the story of Sodom, whence we get the term "sodomy," and which has been the most influential of the biblical condemnations. According to the story, Jehovah had vowed to destroy Sodom and other cities of the plain because of their wickedness, but when Abraham protested that such an act would destroy the innocent with the guilty, God promised not to destroy them if ten good men could be found living in the cities. Two angels were sent to seek out any good and virtuous people, visiting first with Lot, who invited them into his house. When the angels went into Lot's house, male inhabitants of the city gathered, calling upon Lot to bring out his guests so that they might "know them."¹¹ Since the Hebrew word *yadha* ("to know") can be interpreted in the sexual sense to mean intercourse or in the social sense of becoming acquainted,¹² it is not clear which mean-

ing was intended by the biblical writers. The passage is further complicated by Lot's response in refusing to bring out his guests but instead offering his two daughters.

Behold now, I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes; only unto these men do nothing; for therefore came they under the shadow of my roof.¹³

Would Lot have offered the sexual services of his daughters to the crowd, or was it simply a way of saying that he respected the privacy of his guests (after all, they were angels) even more than that of his daughters? When the crowd persisted in their demands to know the strangers, they were struck blind. The next morning, Lot and his family left the city on the advice of the angels after being warned not to look back. When Lot's wife did so, she was turned to salt, while the cities of the plain were destroyed.

The whole story seems to be a hodgepodge of remembered fact and legend. From archaeological, geological, and literary evidence, we know there was a great disaster, perhaps an earthquake, that destroyed several cities (or villages) of the plain around 1900 B.C.E. These areas now lie under the southern part of the Dead Sea.¹⁴ The antihomosexual aspects of the story, however, seem to be a much later addition, probably inserted, as Derrick Sherwin Bailey has argued, as part of an anti-Greek campaign in Palestine.¹⁵ This would date it with the period of the Second Commonwealth when Judaism was under great stress from outside influences, in particular that of Greece.

None of the biblical condemnations of homosexuality refer to Sodom, nor, more important, do any of the biblical references to Sodom explain just exactly what crimes the residents were guilty of having committed. In fact, when the Bible does spell out the sins for which Sodom (and Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim) were destroyed, they are listed as pride, unwillingness to aid the poor and needy, haughtiness, and the doing of abominable things,¹⁶ all actions and attitudes which many other biblical peoples and cities demonstrated. Though the doing of abominable things might refer to sexual activities, their greatest sin

was clearly pride, contentment, and ignoring the needy, none of which was unforgivable.¹⁷

It is not until the period of the Palestinian Pseudepigrapha, the noncanonical Jewish books composed between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D., that the sexual sins of Sodom are emphasized, and it was at this time that Greek pressures on the Hebrews were most intense. Still, even these passages deal more with sexual license and promiscuity than homosexuality. One sample will suffice:

. . . the Lord executed his judgments on Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Zeboim, and all the region of the Jordan, and he burned them with fire and brimstone, and destroyed them until this day, even as I have declared unto thee all their works, that they are wicked and sinners exceedingly, and that they defile themselves and commit fornication in their flesh, and work uncleanness on the earth. And in like manner, God will execute judgment on the places where they have done according to the uncleanness of the Sodomites, like unto the judgment of Sodom.¹⁸

Such a story of mass destruction could easily be construed to include whatever evil individual Jewish writers regarded as particularly wicked. Often the attack could be indirect, since it was sometimes difficult to attack openly Greek influence and ideas which were so all-pervasive. Homosexuality, however, could serve for an attack on all the evils that the Greeks represented. The clearest association of the destruction of Sodom with homosexuality appears in the writings of Philo Judaeus, a Hellenized Egyptian Jew. By attacking homosexuality, Philo could thus proclaim his Jewish heritage while at the same time accepting much of the Greek thought. He wrote that the men of Sodom had ignored the law of nature,

and applied themselves to deep drinking of strong liquor and dainty feeding and forbidden forms of intercourse. Not only in their mad lust for women did they violate the marriage of their neighbors, but also men mounted males without respect for the sex nature which the active partner shares with the passive; and so when they tried

to beget children they were discovered to be incapable of any but a sterile seed. Yet the discovery availed them not, so much stronger was the force of lust which mastered them. Then, as little by little they accustomed those who were by nature men to submit to play the part of women, they saddled them with the formidable curse of a female disease. For not only did they emasculate their bodies by luxury and voluptuousness, but they worked a further degeneration in their soul and, so far as in them lay, were corrupting the whole of mankind.¹⁹

The Jewish concern with homosexuality was at its height when Christianity appeared on the scene, and it was Philo's interpretation which was current at the time.

In spite of such hostility, there is no evidence that the Jews mounted a large-scale campaign against homosexuality. Undoubtedly male homosexual acts, when they were detected, were penalized if only because they did not result in procreation.²⁰ Though it is possible that some forms of homosexual intercourse might have been punished by death, there is no record of this sentence ever having been carried out.²¹ Later Talmudic writers distinguish between wanton homosexual transgression, which might merit the death sentence, and homosexual acts that were inadvertent and rendered the offender liable only to minor punishments. Whenever there was doubt whether the act had occurred, it was stipulated that an offering be made to remove the guilt associated with it.²² For homosexual acts committed upon one asleep or upon a minor by one of full age, the innocent parties were not to suffer any punishment.²³ Some rabbis held that a boy could not be accountable for a homosexual act until he was thirteen, others when he was nine, while others were still less lenient.²⁴

If the ancient Jewish teachings about homosexuality seem somewhat ill defined, the Christian one is even more so. Jesus himself said very little about sex except as it dealt with divorce and remarriage, and here he used strong words. He was reported as forbidding divorce or remarriage so forcefully²⁵ that after hearing him some of his disciples wondered whether it might simply be better to remain unmarried. Jesus replied:

All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were born so from their mother's womb; and there are some eunuchs which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.²⁶

Although the statement is somewhat vague, it might well be interpreted to mean that service to God demanded a self-imposed continence, that neither homosexual nor heterosexual activity was encouraged. Occasionally it was interpreted literally. Origen (d. ca. 251-54), for example, castrated himself.²⁷ Others did the same, but by the fourth century such acts of self-mutilation had been forbidden by Church Councils,²⁸ and instead the Church Fathers interpreted Jesus to mean self-imposed continence.

If Jesus Himself is not quoted as saying anything about homosexuality, epistle writers were.

Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind. Nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkard, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the Kingdom of God.²⁹

Translators of the Bible have wrestled with various terms to describe homosexuality. The above passage uses two terms, "effeminate" and "abusers of themselves," to translate respectively the Greek terms *malakoi* and *arsenokoitai* (Latin *molles* and *masculorum concubitores*). These words tend to distinguish males who engage passively from those who engage actively in homosexual acts, and Derrick Sherwin Bailey, who has written extensively on homosexuality in the Christian tradition, believes that the compilers distinguished between homosexuality and homosexual acts and that the man who might be homoerotic but not engage in homosexual acts was not regarded as the sinner that various translators of the Bible have labeled him.³⁰ This explanation might well have merit if it could be demonstrated that the writers of the scriptures realized that there were homosexuals

who did not engage in homosexual practices, something that seemingly has been recognized only with the advent of modern psychology. Even if they made this distinction in their own minds, they probably would have felt that the emotional state of a nonpracticing homosexual would have been the same as the person who lusted after a woman to commit adultery.

Two other passages in the Christian scriptures quite clearly deal with homosexuality:

1) Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murders of fathers and murders of mothers, for manslayers. For whoremongers, for them that *defile* themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.³¹

2) For this cause God gave them up into vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.³²

The term in the first passage, taken from I Timothy, is again *arsenokoitai*, and is quite clearly directed at homosexuality. The vaguer passage, however, is the second, taken from Romans, for it is not clear whether this refers to lesbianism as well as male homosexuality. It might be that St. Paul's purpose was simply to illustrate the moral corruption of the heathens by showing how their women encouraged heterosexual perversion through abnormal coital positions, while the men went further and resorted to homosexual practice. By implication, however, even this would have reference to lesbianism, since one of the female participants could be going contrary to the natural positions (female on the bottom) by taking a superordinate position in the sex act. At any rate this doubtful passage is the only possibly specific reference to female homosexuality in the Bible. Other

passages, however, have been construed as references to homosexuality in general, including two passages in *Revelations*:

But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the *abominable*, and murders, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.³³

For without are *dogs*, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.³⁴

Both the terms "the abominable" (*ebdelugemenoi*) and "dogs" (*kunes*) have been interpreted to mean the same as the "monstrous and unnatural vices of heathendom." Though it is not clear whether the writer of *Revelations* intended these passages to apply to homosexuality,³⁵ this is the way they have been interpreted.

Any doubts about the biblical references to homosexuality were resolved by the Church Fathers, of whom St. Augustine (died 430 A.D.) was the most important. Before he became a Christian, St. Augustine had been an adherent of Manichaeism, a religion based on the teachings of the prophet Mani (216-277 A.D.), who had lived and been crucified in southern Babylonia. Manichaeism was a dualistic religion; that is, it considered the world divided into good and evil. Individuals were put on earth to decide whether they would follow the path of light (goodness) or dark (evil). Among other things, evil was associated with procreation, thus marriage and sexual relations were denied to the Elect. Augustine had never managed to reach the Elect status because of his "insatiable" desire for sex, and, frustrated and disillusioned, under pressure of his Christian mother (St. Monica), he had become converted to Christianity.

With his conversion, however, he found himself suddenly freed of his sexual desires, able to achieve the continence in Christianity that he had not found in Manichaeism. Conversion then signified a rejection of sexual intercourse, and for St. Augustine the highest form of Christian life became that of celibacy.³⁶ He did not, however, entirely exclude marriage, since

he could not ignore the fact that the Bible had encouraged mankind to be fruitful and multiply. Coitus therefore must be regarded as good, since it came from God, but concupiscence (or lust), which had come with the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, was evil. Since concupiscence was inevitably associated with human intercourse, every concrete act of intercourse was evil, and therefore every child literally had been conceived by the sin of its parents.³⁷ It was, however, only through the act of human generation, which removed much of the sinfulness from intercourse,³⁸ although the final guilt could be removed only by baptismal regeneration.³⁹ In short, God had made men and women sexual creatures, but only for the purposes of procreation, and only in marriage with children as a hoped-for end product could sex be justified. All other kinds of intercourse were evil. Some acts were less evil than others. Simple fornication was a sin, but since children might well result, it was much less a sin than sodomy or lesbianism. These shameful acts were to be detested and punished wherever they were found.⁴⁰ Fellatio was also condemned, as was all intercourse in which the woman was not underneath the man and which did not involve the insertion of a penis in a vagina.

These teachings about sex were inculcated into the Christian culture through stories, illustrations (paintings, drawings, etc.), philosophical treatises, and particularly the development of the penance. In the early Christian Church, penance, or the reconciling of a sinner with God, had been a public affair, and open confession had been both a means of discipline and a method of probation whereby the Church sought to maintain its purity among the evils of the secular world. Almost from the beginning, penance had involved sexual purity, and in the early Western Church the three capital sins came to be idolatry (reversion to paganism), sexual impurity, and homicide. As the Christian Church increased in influence and its adherents increased in number, public penance fell into disuse and more and more a system of private penance and recurrent confession was used. This system probably appeared in early Welsh and Irish monasteries but gradually spread throughout the Western Church until, by 1215 (Fourth Lateran Council), it became the official practice of the Church.

In order to tell when a person sinned, sins had to be cata-

logued and listed, and this became the purpose of the various books known as penitentials. Confessors were clerical healers who dealt with the soul; and, like the healers of the body, the physicians, they had to probe into the festering sores of sinful activity to describe in detail the illness before it could be cured. Inevitably we get a catalogue of sexual sins. One of the most comprehensive of the early listings of possible homosexual activity is found in the penitential of Cummean, believed to have been written by Cummean Fota (the Long), a seventh-century Irish abbot. Those who engaged in oral-genital contacts were required to do four years' penance; if they were accustomed to such a habit, they had to do penance for seven years. Anal intercourse required a seven-year penance, but interfemoral intercourse (between the legs) only two years.⁴¹ Penance involved special prayers and special diets, and in the case of monks and nuns, meat was almost universally forbidden. A brief survey of the English penitentials found that the amount of content devoted to homosexuality varied from 3.5 percent to 8 percent,⁴² which, while not necessarily an indication of its incidence, certainly indicates that the church regarded it as a major problem.

In the later medieval period, St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) restated the Christian teachings on homosexuality by positing a separate group of sexual sins categorized as sins against nature. Sins against nature were those forms of lust which were directed solely to the pursuit of venereal pleasure and which entirely excluded procreation. Thus such sins were contrary to the "natural order of the venereal act" and were to be distinguished not only from marital intercourse but from fornication, adultery, seduction, rape, and incest. For Aquinas, the sins against nature included masturbation, which he equated with effeminacy, bestiality, same-sex relations, and deviation from the natural manner of coitus. The most grievous of the sins against nature was bestiality, followed by homosexuality, then intercourse in an unnatural position, and last of all masturbation.⁴³

Though the Protestants of the sixteenth century differed from Catholics on many issues, homosexuality was not one. Martin Luther (1483-1546) wrote:

The heinous conduct of the people of Sodom is extraordinary, in as much as they departed from the natural

passion and longing of the male for the female, which was implanted by God, and desired what is altogether contrary to nature. Whence comes this perversity? Undoubtedly from Satan, who, after people have once turned away from the fear of God, so powerfully suppresses nature that he beats out the natural desire and stirs up a desire that is contrary to nature.⁴⁴

John Calvin (1509–64), the major theologian of the Protestant cause, did not quite go as far as Luther in equating the biblical story of Sodom with homosexuality, but he followed St. Thomas Aquinas in condemning as unnatural all forms of intercourse not leading to procreation.⁴⁵

In light of the influence of religion in forming attitudes, it is easily understandable why the churches and synagogues have become a focus in the gay community's attempt to be accepted and integrated into society. Churches represent the traditional conservative values of society, the preservation of the *status quo*, but at the same time both Christianity and Judaism emphasize fairness and compassion, while Christianity is based on the belief that even the least of men and the greatest of sinners can be saved. Thus churches have not only been the focus of gay efforts to integrate into society, but dedicated church people have also been involved in efforts to eliminate the public hostility to homosexuals if only to better lead them to the Christian God.

Many homosexuals, having grown up in a religious setting, feel guilty about their sexual preference. Though there have been occasional attempts to organize separate homosexual churches outside the mainstream Christian or Jewish tradition, such efforts have not been particularly successful. More successful were efforts by individual ministers and laymen to join together in such groups as the Council of Religion and the Homosexual in order to establish a dialogue or a method of providing counseling services for the would-be believer. From such groups, special sectarian organizations emerged such as Dignity, an organization of gay Catholics, and Integrity, an organization of gay Episcopalians.

Denominational support also emerged as the Episcopalians, Unitarians, Universalists, and Presbyterians adopted positions on homosexuality. Often the support was ambiguous, as the resolu-

tion of the Lutheran Church in America adopted in 1970 would indicate:

Persons who engage in homosexual behavior are sinners only as are all other persons—alienated from God and neighbor. However, they are often the special and undeserving victims of prejudice and discrimination in law, law enforcement, cultural mores, and congregational life. In relation to this area of concern, the sexual behavior of freely consenting adults in private is not an appropriate subject for legislation or police action. It is essential to see such persons as entitled to justice and understanding in church and community.⁴⁶

A few individual churches went much further. The Glide Memorial Church in San Francisco, affiliated with the Methodist Church, became for a time the center of gay activities in the San Francisco area, and was the birthplace of many of the gay organizations. Other churches were willing to tolerate openly avowed homosexuals provided that they did not engage in any overt activity such as holding hands while in the congregation. Others drew the line at ordaining or giving offices to homosexuals. In 1977 the Episcopal House of Bishops came out against the ordination of practicing homosexuals, while in 1978 the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church rejected the report of a special task force that a practicing homosexual could and should be ordained to the ministry or allowed to hold lay offices in the church.

Inevitably many gays have adopted an attitude that although the established churches might condemn them, they are still children of God, and have taken matters into their own hands. The deep need of many gays to find comfort in organized religious groups has been effectively demonstrated by the birth and growth of the Metropolitan Community Church, founded in 1968 by the Rev. Troy Perry. Perry, who had been married and fathered two sons, had served as pastor of Evangelical churches in Florida and California before he had renounced his pastoral and marital responsibilities in order to accept his own homosexual inclinations. He still, however, felt no less Christian, and, unable to find solace in any of the existing churches, he established his

own. In a "Letter from a Homosexual to the Church," he stated the deep-felt need of many another gay person:

I am not a creature from the outer darkness as you seem to believe. I am a homosexual, and like most of the members of your Churches, a man of flesh and blood. I am a member of the Church . . . and an integral part of its people! . . .

Because of my sexual orientation, you try to condemn me. For two thousand years I have watched you try to destroy my brothers and sisters. . . .

You have watched as we were placed on the rack, thrown to the flames, banished from the midst of society, and you have never said a word! . . .

I am thankful that I still have a God. You cannot take Him away from me! He is the Author and Finisher of my Faith. His name is spelled Love! !!! . . .

If you will not let me worship Him in your Temples, I will worship Him in the Cathedral of my heart, and build for Him a Temple where others can worship with me.⁴⁷

Starting with a handful of worshipers in a private home, his Church had 300 members within a year, and soon after he began to establish missions and churches across the United States and Canada. True to the belief system of the proselytizing Christian background from whence he came, Perry also established missions in Africa, although the homosexual orientation of the church was not particularly emphasized in such missionary endeavors.

Fundamentalist Christian groups were not the only ones who felt a need to be more fully integrated into their church life. The Metropolitan Community Church inspired similar efforts among Jewish groups, and a group of homosexuals and their supporters organized Chaim Chayam Chadashim, a homosexually oriented Jewish temple. There is still a great deal of hesitancy if not open hostility in religious circles, but as of this writing the gay person who does want a religious affiliation can find a variety of supportive groups, and a small dent has been made in the traditional Jewish-Christian hostility.

Chapter 3

THE LAW AND HOMOSEXUALITY

Although the law has usually reflected religious, medical, or philosophical attitudes about homosexuality, the law itself has also been a factor influencing attitudes towards homosexuality. As far as modern American and modern European law is concerned, the foundations for modern legal attitudes toward homosexuality can be found in Roman sources. Though Roman legislation on the subject of homosexuality probably dates from as early as the third century B.C.,¹ it is the imperial legislation of Christian Rome that has most influenced modern western attitudes.

The key law on the subject—that prescribing the death penalty for anal intercourse—was promulgated in 390 A.D. by the three emperors then on the throne, Theodosius, Valentinian II, and Arcadius.

All persons who have the shameful custom of condemning a man's body, acting the part of a woman's, to the sufferance of an alien sex (for they appear not to be different from women), shall expiate a crime of this kind by avenging flames in the sight of the people.²

The intent of the law was to eliminate male prostitution, but it must not have been enforced, since the state continued to collect a tax on male prostitutes until the time of the Emperor Anastasius (491-518).³ In spite of its lack of enforcement, the law has to be regarded as a *watershed* if only because its provision of the death

penalty came to be incorporated in the *Corpus juris civilis*, the sixth-century encyclopedic collection of Roman laws made under the sponsorship of the Emperor Justinian. It is Justinian's collection which served as the basis of canon law (the law of the Christian Church) and civil law (both European and English).

The most concise statement of a law dealing with homosexuality appears in the *Institutes*, one of the four divisions of the *Corpus juris civilis*. The summary states that those guilty either of adultery or of giving themselves up to "works of lewdness with their own sex" were to receive the death penalty.⁴ In addition the Emperor Justinian made two significant additions to the subject. In 538 A.D. he issued Novel 77, calling for repentance and confession by homosexuals, warning that God would condemn the sinner, and adding that if they did not repent, society as a whole would be punished.

For because of such crimes there are famines, earthquakes, and pestilences; wherefore we admonish man to abstain from the aforesaid unlawful acts, that they may not lose their souls. But if, after this our admonition, any are found persisting in such offences, first they render themselves unworthy of the mercy of God, and they are subjected to the punishment enjoined by the law. . . .⁵

Inevitably with such an attitude incorporated into the law, homosexuals could and easily did become scapegoats for anything wrong with society. Justinian, however, went further, and in 544, following a plague that devastated Constantinople, he issued Novel 141, stating that God had been provoked because of the multitude of sins in the city, and while God is merciful, citizens have to abstain from all base concerns and acts, particularly

that abominable and impious conduct deservedly hated by God. We speak of the defilement of males which some men sacrilegiously and impiously dare to attempt, perpetrating vile acts upon other men. For instructed by the Holy Scriptures, we know that God brought a just judgment upon those who lived in Sodom, on account of this very madness of intercourse, so that to this very day the

land burns with inextinguishable fire. . . . If, with eyes as it were blinded, we overlook such impious and forbidden conduct, we may provoke the good God to anger and bring ruin upon all—a fate which would be but deserved.⁶

Understandably, homosexuality became a matter of grave concern to a community, and in any crisis those identified as homosexuals were likely to be sought out. Although the edict implied that the penalty for homosexual activities was death, in practice Justinian castrated the guilty parties.⁷ The death penalty, however, remained on Byzantine law books and was periodically restated.⁸

Roman secular law as promulgated by Justinian, and as modified to meet the needs of the Christian Church, became the basis for canon law. In general the Church was more interested in getting an individual to repent than in having him executed, something that only the secular officials could do. Church officials, however, often collaborated closely with secular ones, and among the harshest enactments against homosexuals was that sanctioned by the Council of Napolouse (Sichem) held in 1120 in the newly conquered Holy Land. Since the hold of the Crusaders on the territory was regarded as tenuous, it was felt by ecclesiastical and secular authorities that both the soldiers and natives had to keep God on their side. One means of doing so was to enforce a rigid moral code. The council again prescribed burning for those found guilty of engaging in sodomy, but there is little evidence that the death penalty was ever carried out.⁹

One of the difficulties of dealing with medieval, as well as later, enactments against sodomy is the vagueness of the laws. Generally there was a reluctance to spell out in any detail what was meant by sodomy lest people get ideas about how to engage in forbidden activity. Sodomy was never restricted to homosexual activity, but rather included several different types of sexual conduct of "man with man, a woman with a woman, or a man with a woman outside of the fit vessel,"¹⁰ and even any position in intercourse other than the only permissible one with a woman on her back. Bestiality was also equated with sodomy. At times the term "crime against nature" was used as synonymous with "sodomy," and occasionally even the term "onanism."

This vagueness has existed since the Camaldolese monk

Gratian, who began his collection of canon laws in 1140 and is regarded as the founder of modern canon law, institutionalized such ambiguity.¹¹ The canon lawyers knew what they were prohibiting, but could not or would not describe it, and preferred to use broad terms which could be interpreted to apply to a range of sexual activities.

Modern investigators into homosexuality have sometimes not taken account of these problems of language. Havelock Ellis, the early-twentieth-century English sexologist, for example, equated buggery with sodomy whenever he found the terms, and then equated sodomy with homosexual activity.¹² Bougerie (or Bougerie), which eventually became the English word 'buggery,' originally was applied to adherents of a heretical group in the late-medieval period known as Albigensians or Cathars or Bulgars or believers in "bouggerie." However, the burning penalty required for the Bulgar heretics, and sometimes carried out by the state, was for heresy, not for sexual activity.¹³ Later the term "buggery" was used interchangeably with "sodomy."

In the sixteenth century, when western Europe was divided into warring camps of Protestants and Catholics, much of the moral legislation which had been under the control of the medieval Church came to be a prerogative of the state. Sexual activity in general and homosexuality in particular became a matter of civil legislation. The earliest English secular legislation on the subject dates from 1533, when Parliament under Henry VIII classified buggery (by now a euphemism for same-sex activity, bestiality, and anal intercourse) as a felony. Penalties included death, losses of goods, and loss of lands. The original statute was intended to be in effect only until the next Parliament, but the statute was renewed in each succeeding Parliament until in 1540 it was made perpetual. Henry's successors made some modifications, but in 1564 Queen Elizabeth essentially repeated the law of Henry VIII, which became and remained the law of England.¹⁴

The first recorded instance of official English action against homosexuals took place in 1541 when the Rev. Nicholas Udall, author of *Ralph Roister Doister* and headmaster at Eton, was charged with committing buggery. When he confessed his guilt, he was committed to prison and dismissed from his headmastership. Udall, however, had influential friends at court who managed to secure his release within a few months. Soon thereafter

he was appointed headmaster of Westminster school,¹⁵ an indication perhaps that homosexuality was not regarded with any great fear. The first reported trial for an alleged homosexual offense, as distinct from a hearing, did not take place until 1631 during the reign of King Charles I. In this case the Earl of Castlehaven was charged with committing sodomy with one of his male servants as well as raping his own wife and sodomizing her. The charges were brought by his son, who was fearful that his father's lover, Henry Skipwith, would receive part of his father's estate. The earl was found guilty of sodomy by a 15-to-12 verdict and was executed on May 14. His wife testified against him even though she was not a disinterested party. Further prejudicing the jurors was the fact that the earl was a Catholic when anti-Catholicism was at a height.¹⁶ In fact there were so many issues involved that the case cannot be regarded as a simple case of hostility to homosexuality.

Homosexuality, however, was of concern to the seventeenth-century commentators on the law. The most famous of these was Sir Edward Coke, who, during the course of his writings, recast, explained, and defended common-law rules. He wrote:

Buggery is a detestable, and abominable sin, amongst Christians not to be named, committed by carnal knowledge against the ordinance of the Creator, and order of nature, by mankind with mankind, or with brute beast, or by womankind with brute beast.¹⁷

Coke's treatment of the subject is a rambling combination of words and concepts from English statute law, indictments, the Bible, and what he regarded as common-law principles. He relied particularly heavily upon the biblical references to Sodom for his version. Nevertheless, in spite of his hostility to sodomy, he made it almost impossible to prosecute. For Coke, sodomy could not exist without penetration, and even the emission of semen without penetration could not be interpreted as buggery. By Coke's definition, women could not commit buggery by themselves since there was no penetration. Women, however, could be charged with buggery if they had intercourse with a "beast," or if they engaged in anal intercourse with a male partner. Even more important, Coke held that both the active

and the passive participants (unless they were minors) were to be regarded as felons, an interpretation which in effect made it impossible to prosecute sexual relations between consenting adults unless they took place in a public place, since one partner could not testify against the other without implicating himself, or in the case of heterosexual anal intercourse, herself.

Later English legal commentators enthusiastically condemned homosexuality, although beneath all the rhetoric remained the difficulty in prosecuting that Coke had put into the English law. The most famous of the commentators, William Blackstone, was no exception. In his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1765–69), after discussing mayhem, forcible abduction, and rape, he turned to the “crime against nature.”

What has been here observed, especially with regard to manner of proof, which ought to be the more clear in proportion as the crime is the more detestable, may be applied to another offence, of a still deeper malignity; the infamous *crime against nature*, committed either with man or beast. A crime which ought to be strictly and impartially proved, and then as strictly and impartially punished. But it is an offence of so dark a nature, so easily charged, and the negative so difficult to be proved that the accusation should be clearly made out: for, if false, it deserves a punishment inferior only to that of the crime itself.

I will not act so disagreeable a part, to my readers as well as myself, as to dwell any longer upon a subject, the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature. It will be more eligible to imitate in this respect the delicacy of our English law, which treats it, in its very indictments, as a crime not fit to be named.¹⁸

Blackstone also included “unnatural” crimes under the general category of assault in order to provide penalties where proof of the actual act was difficult to obtain.¹⁹ He also listed it as an “Offense Against God and Religion,” since it transgressed the precepts of religion both natural and revealed.²⁰

Obviously, anyone reading Blackstone would know that homosexuality was an evil, something that the state officially could not

tolerate; but since the testimony of a person consenting to a homosexual act was not sufficient to convict because such a person was then an accomplice, and therefore equally guilty of the crime, convictions were almost impossible to obtain. Even sexual activity involving children had to have a third party as witness for successful prosecution,²¹ something that was extremely difficult to secure since mere solicitation to commit a sexual act was not a criminal offense.²² The laws, however, remained on the books.

The problems inherent in English law were present on the continent as well, although this was to change at the end of the eighteenth century. Up to the time of the Revolution in France, sodomy, however ambiguously defined, could be punished by burning. Although the ultimate penalty was only rarely given, some three individuals are known to have been burned to death in France between 1750 and 1789. At the beginning of the Revolution in 1789 the death penalty was removed for all “sex crimes,” but it was not until 1810 that work was completed on the revision of the criminal code. This new code, usually known as the Napoleonic Code, recognized equality before the law, and provided the same penalties for all crimes, regardless of social class. Though penalties remained harsh, including life imprisonment and the death penalty, torture was forbidden. Sexually, the most important innovation in the laws was to leave unpunished any sexual activity in private between consenting adult parties, whether this took place between women, men, or men and women. “Deviant” sexual acts were treated as a crime only when they implied an outrage on public decency, when there was violence or absence of consent, or when one of the parties was underage or not regarded as able to give valid consent for one reason or another.²³ In sum, the law was not to be used to deter certain forms of sexual activity nor to change the participants’ sexual orientation, and the French put into law what the English did in practice.

Changing the laws did not, however, necessarily change public opinion, and this remained hostile. Invariably, homosexuals, and others whose sexual activity was legally permitted but socially condemned, kept their sexual life secret and hidden, and this sometimes made them susceptible to blackmail. Nonetheless the French laws are important because so much of Europe at the

time of their enactment was under French dominance and influence. Many countries adopted similar laws, including Belgium, much of Italy, Spain, Portugal, Rumania, and Russia, as well as several Latin American countries following their independence from Spain. Some of the German states also adopted the French penal code, but Prussia, an enemy of revolutionary France, did not; and when Germany was united under Prussian leadership in 1871, the punitive Prussian laws adopted in the sixteenth century essentially remained on the books, and these provided for the death penalty. Women, however, were not included in the Prussian laws.²⁴ The Holy Roman Empire, the remnants of which became the Austrian Empire, also kept the harsh laws enacted at about the same time as the Prussian laws.²⁵ The Scandinavian states were also outside the French orbit, and many sex offenses were still punished by death until 1866, when capital punishment was abolished in Denmark.²⁶ Other countries soon followed Denmark's example until Germany and the English-speaking common-law countries remained almost alone in their harsh penalties, although these were seldom applied.

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), the founder of English Utilitarianism, argued for a whole rethinking of laws about sex, and he proceeded to provide a new philosophical basis. Unfortunately his writings on the subject have never been published in their entirety and therefore never exerted the kind of influence they might have. Bentham was opposed to regarding any kind of sex as evil or as against nature. The only difference between various sexual acts was that some conformed to public opinion and some did not. Public opinion, he believed, should not be used to judge the rightness or wrongness of sexual activity. Instead he advocated the principle of utility based on the act's effect on the sum of happiness. Though an act could be regarded as noxious in a moral sense, noxiousness itself was subject to varying interpretations. He defined five categories of noxiousness:

1. Noxiousness to the operator himself and him alone on the score of health.
2. Noxiousness to the operator himself and him alone on the score of reputation.
3. Noxiousness to one of two or more parties, the party

or parties being actually repugnant or at least not consenting.

4. Noxiousness with reference to a third person or determinate individual.
5. Noxiousness with reference to third persons at large, i.e., to individuals indeterminate in respect of identity or number.²⁷

In neither of the first two cases should the legislature or the law interfere; only in the last three, and then the attending evil had to be spelled out before sanctions could be imposed. By calling any act unnatural, the legal commentators were simply attempting to arouse public opinion without examining an act.

Irregular—unnatural—call them by what names of reproach you will, of these gratifications nothing but good, pure good, if pleasure without pain be a pure good (mischief from excess being implied out of the case), will be found. But when the act be pure good, punishment for whatsoever *purpose*, from whatever *source*, in whatsoever *name* and in whatsoever *degree* applied in consideration of it, will be not only evil, but so much pure evil.²⁸

To Bentham the evil was the law, not the act. Changing the law could only bring pleasure to many, prevent injury, decrease the dangers of conception out of wedlock, lessen abortion and infanticide, and lead to a diminution of prostitution.²⁹

Apparently the English hostility toward and fear of sex ran too deep for Bentham to publish his work. Changes in English law were more influenced by Sir James Fitzjames Stephen (1829-94) who felt that society rested on the two pillars of religion and law, and if one was weakened, the other was also weakened. Thus the law had to incorporate traditional religious thinking on sins and crimes. His work provided legal justification for repressive sex laws. His influence was considerable, if only because he wrote at the time when most American states were codifying their laws.³⁰

The first major change in the English laws about homosexuality came not from any deep philosophical commitment, however,

but simply through accident as the English Parliament moved to eliminate the sale of children for the purposes of prostitution. The legislation, much needed to eliminate abuses, was enacted hurriedly in the aftermath of an exposé by W. T. Stead, the editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. The first article by Stead, under the title "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon," had appeared on July 6, 1885, and before the five-day series had been concluded Parliament had passed a series of laws raising the age of consent to sixteen and giving police the right to initiate proceedings before a justice of the peace to obtain a search warrant for investigating suspected places where girls were believed to be detained for immoral purposes and to suppress brothels and clearinghouses engaged in prostitution. One of the members of Parliament, Henry Labouchere, felt that male children should be protected as well as female, and at the last moment he introduced an additional clause as an amendment:

Any male person who, in public or private, commits, or is a party to the commission of, or procures or attempts to procure the commission by any male person of, any act of gross indecency with another male person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and being convicted thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding one year with or without hard labour.³¹

Though Labouchere claimed to have had only minors in mind, the effect of the amendment was to punish acts between adult males (not females) even if those took place in private.

The most publicized victim of the new act was not the child procurers for whom it was theoretically designed, but the writer Oscar Wilde (1854-1900). Wilde, a devotee of "art for art's sake," had achieved notoriety as a nonconforming student at Oxford. He spoke contemptuously of sports, decorated his rooms with peacock feathers, lilies, sunflowers, and the like, and wore his hair long. His fellow students initially had wrecked his rooms, but his persistence in his affectations also won him adherents. A superb self-publicist, he was soon invited to lecture in America. After his return, in spite of marriage and children, he became a practicing homosexual. He also began to enjoy literary success with *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (1890), and a book of fairy

tales, *The Happy Prince* (1888). As he became more successful, he also became bolder in his homosexual liaisons, and in 1891 he began his association with Lord Alfred Douglas, the handsome son of the Marquess of Queensberry, now noted for his boxing rules. Douglas was already a homosexual, at least he so reported much later in his autobiography, having discovered this fact at public school.³² How deeply the two men were involved is debatable, since Bosie, as Douglas was known, was more interested in young boys than in older men.³³ Bosie, however, apparently delighted in causing discomfort to his father and shocking others by implying that he was Wilde's minion, although it was he who introduced Wilde into the homosexual underworld of London. Bosie's father preferred to believe that his son had been enticed into homosexuality by Oscar Wilde, and in his anger, brought matters to a head in February 1895 by leaving his card for Wilde at the Albemarle Club, to which both belonged, with the notation, "To Oscar Wilde, Posing as a Sodomite!" This misspelled missive led Oscar Wilde to sue Queensberry for criminal libel.

Three trials followed. The first, *Regina v. Queensberry*, initiated by Wilde, was terminated when Wilde withdrew his suit, since Queensberry, in order to prove he was not libeling Wilde, had gathered considerable evidence to show that Wilde was in fact a homosexual. On the strength of the evidence gathered by Queensberry, Wilde, along with a friend, Alfred Taylor, was tried under the terms of the amended criminal law enacted through the efforts of Labouchere. Taylor, who had inherited and spent a fortune, shared his rooms and bed with a succession of homosexual friends and acquaintances, some of whom he had introduced to Wilde. Taylor also liked to dress in women's clothes, and the police found a considerable collection in his room. When the jury disagreed about guilt or innocence of Wilde and Taylor in the second trial, Wilde was tried again, separately from Taylor, found guilty of acts of gross indecency, and sentenced to two years at hard labor.³⁴ The case became even more celebrated because Wilde, during his time in jail, spent his time writing *De profundis*, a confessional essay in the form of a long letter to Lord Alfred Douglas, on whom he blamed most of his troubles. After his release he wrote the *Ballad of Reading Gaol*, published in 1898.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Bosie, the other participant in the affair, publicly renounced his youthful indiscretions, married, and converted to Roman Catholicism (as had Wilde on his deathbed). In 1912 he became involved in a libel suit against the author of a study of Oscar Wilde, and he lost not only the case, but his wife as well. Much of the last part of his life was spent in writing a defense of his actions with Wilde, painting himself in glowing terms and Wilde in less glowing ones. Some of his attempts to deny his homoerotic interest now appear pathetic rather than hostile, but they are undoubtedly indicative of the fear that many homosexuals felt and many still feel about coming out of the closet.³⁵

Wilde was not the only well-known person to suffer from exposure as a homosexual. The greater the wealth and power, the greater the danger of exposure, and one of the more famous cases following the Wilde case was that of Friedrich Krupp (1854–1902), the head of the Krupp industrial empire. Krupp, like Wilde, was married, but he and his wife lived separately so that he could have the freedom to live as a homosexual. At his grotto on the island of Capri he had created a kind of private pleasure palace where he allegedly brought young fishermen, mule drivers, and others. Rumors of his activities were leaked to the press through complaints of the local clerics, and his life-style was documented in a series of photographs. Though homosexual activities in themselves were not against the law in Italy, corruption of minors was, and Krupp was declared *persona non grata* and had to leave the country. A German newspaper picked up the story, and Krupp's sexual activities hit the German public in much the same way that the Wilde trial had affected England. The government attempted to cover up for Krupp, but newspapers, especially opposition ones, obtained and printed considerable evidence. In an attempt to clear his name, Krupp brought suit against the German newspaper that had first printed the scandal, but soon afterward he was found dead, almost surely by suicide.³⁶ The Kaiser tried to quell the uproar, publicly defending the house of Krupp, but the reverberations mounted, since his defense was taken to mean that the court around the Kaiser himself was riddled with homosexuality. Such charges were quickly used by opponents of the Kaiser to try to remove those they regarded as responsible for policies of which they disapproved. Charges of homosexuality were brought against Philip,

Prince zu Eulenburg-Hertefeld (1847–1921), and also against Count Kuno von Moltke. Von Moltke, who first brought suit against his accusers, initially was unsuccessful because of evidence brought by the defense to show that he was a homosexual. On appeal, much of the evidence produced against von Moltke was found to be fraudulent, and his accuser was sent to jail. Eulenburg had also sued for defamation of character, but the trial was delayed until the defeat of Germany in World War I ended the matter.³⁷

No such scandals hit the United States, although American laws followed the English laws, and there are a number of early court cases dealing with alleged homosexual activities. Probably the first record of conviction took place in Plymouth in 1637. In that year John Alexander and Thomas Roberts were found "guilty of lude behavior and unclean carriage one with another, by often spendinge their seed one upon another."³⁸ It is not clear how Alexander and Roberts were found out, but their crime was not regarded as deserving the death penalty. The first execution for "sodomitical" activity dealt with a case of bestiality when William Hackett, an eighteen-year-old servant, was observed on a Sunday copulating with a cow. Hackett confessed his crime and the cow was burned before his eyes after which he himself was hanged.³⁹ Periodically in the seventeenth century others were accused of either "tending to sodomy" or engaging in sodomy; some of these activities were clearly with animals. The most notorious case was that of Thomas Granger, sixteen or seventeen years of age, who confessed and was found guilty of "buggery" with a mare, a cow, two goats, five sheep, and a turkey. Since there was some difficulty in identifying the sheep "unnaturally" used because they were mixed in the flock, five were selected and burned in a great pit along with the other animals. Granger himself was then executed on September 8, 1642.⁴⁰

As America became more settled, convictions for sodomy became as difficult to achieve as they were in England, since American law had the same difficulties about participating partners as did English law, and solicitation was not an offense. American courts also—if Texas courts are any example—had great difficulty in determining just what constituted the crime against nature. In two early cases (*Fellen v. State*, 1869, and

Frazier v. State, 1863) the courts held that the Texas code did not define or describe the crime against nature, and refused to look to the English common law for definition. Sodomy, therefore, was found not to be punishable until it could be defined. This changed in 1883 (*Ex Parte Bergen*) when the Texas Supreme Court held that it was no longer necessary that an offense be expressly defined for prosecution and that sodomy was punishable under the Penal Code. There were still problems. In 1893 (*Prindle v. State*), the Texas court held that since common law did not classify copulation by mouth as sodomy, this could not be prosecuted as such under the Texas sodomy statute. In 1896 and 1905 (*Lewis v. State* and *Adams v. State*, respectively), however, the court ruled that copulation with a woman *per anum* was sodomy and should be punished.⁴¹

Texas was not alone in its difficulty. In 1860 (*Estes v. Carter*) an Iowa court held that even though sodomy was punishable at common law, it was not a crime in Iowa because it was not included and specified by name in the Iowa Criminal Code. This omission was eventually corrected in 1897.⁴² But even when sodomy was included by name, there was a reluctance to define it. By necessity this allowed judges to rely upon their own definitions. Edward Livingston in his *A System of Penal Law for the United States* (1828), for example, mentioned almost every type of sexual crime including keeping of brothels, printing obscene materials, adultery, abduction, rape, procuring, and abortion in some detail, but passed over sodomy.⁴³ Joel Prentiss Bishop's *Commentaries on the Law of Statutory Crimes* (1888) mentions sodomy and bestiality in passing, but does not discuss such activities in any of the detail he does adultery, fornication, incest, miscegenation, seduction, and rape. This despite the fact that in his *New Commentaries on Marriage* Bishop considered sodomy as a "high matrimonial crime," a grounds for divorce even more serious than adultery.⁴⁴ The most specific discussion is in *Francis Wharton*, but it was not until the eighth edition (1880) that he got around to defining sodomy as sexual connection *per anum*. Before that he stated that sodomy must be committed in that part where sodomy is "usually committed" to be classified as sodomy,⁴⁵ a rather obscure definition. William Oldnall Russell perhaps summed up the legal attitudes when he stated:

In treating the offence of sodomy, *peccatum, illud horribile, inter Christiani non nominandum*, it is not intended to depart from the reserved and concise mode of statement which has been adopted by other writers.⁴⁶

Only at the end of the nineteenth century did state laws become more specific. In California, for example, Penal Code 287 was enacted defining the crime against nature to include "any sexual penetration, however slight," and in 1915 the state added prohibitions against fellatio and cunnilingus.⁴⁷ Technically the 1915 law dealt with lesbianism as well as male homosexuality, but the aim was to deal with heterosexual oral-genital contacts as much as homosexuality.

As the laws became more specific, and sometimes more enforceable, agitation for change grew. Most of the early-twentieth-century action took place in Germany, where agitation against Paragraph 175 of the German Penal Code led to the formation of a widespread coalition for its repeal. These efforts were temporarily successful during the Weimar Republic, after which harsh penalties were again reinstated by Hitler's Germany. In England and America, agitation was slower to begin, and efforts in the first part of the twentieth century were to strengthen rather than weaken laws about homosexuality. In England in 1921, for example, there was an attempt to include lesbianism in a Criminal Amendment Bill, and though the clause making "acts of gross indecency between female persons" a misdemeanor and punishable with the same penalties as those applied to males, the clause was deleted by the House of Lords on the grounds that it maligned all good women, the overwhelming majority of whom would not know anything about what the law was trying to cover.⁴⁸ It was not until after the Second World War when the British Parliamentary Commission, known as the Wolfenden Commission, urged the decriminalization of sexual activities between consenting adults that changes began to take place.⁴⁹ This was followed in the United States by similar recommendations by the American Law Institute, by the Ninth International Congress on Criminal Law, by the American Civil Liberties Union, by the Quakers, and other religious groups. These changes will be discussed later.

UNIV. OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Chapter 4

REPRESSED EVIDENCE

With the hostility expressed by religion, the law, and medicine to homosexuality, homosexuals generally in the past did not proclaim their sexual preference. This furtive, if not hidden, existence makes it difficult to study homosexuality, since all we can examine for the most part is society's attitudes towards homosexuals. When homosexuals appear in the records they are often being prosecuted or exposed, and in the process become notorious. Oscar Wilde was not the only homosexual living in England in the last decades of the nineteenth century but he was one of the few who were exposed and his name is inevitably associated with homosexuality.

Accusations, of course, do not prove homosexuality, since charges of being a sodomist could refer to many other varieties of sexual behavior, and since charges could be leveled for a variety of reasons, often political. Charges leveled against some of the individuals in the Kaiser's court (recounted in the last chapter) were quite clearly so. In the medieval period, antipopes—that is, popes not canonically chosen—were accused of sodomy almost as a standard practice. In the 1960s Senator Thomas Kuechel of California was accused by two political opponents of homosexuality, again without any basis for the charge. Kuechel in fact went to court to clear his reputation. The truth of such charges, however, never really mattered either in the Middle Ages or in mid-twentieth-century California—the accusation itself was damaging enough.

Inevitably few people in the past admitted to homosexuality in any public way and even in today's period of gay activism

many people still find it difficult to do so. When Representative Frederick W. Richmond was arrested for soliciting a vice officer in February, 1978, he did not thereupon announce that he was a homosexual but instead asked the understanding of his constituency for his temporary aberration and consented to undergo psychiatric treatment. Still, the fact that he was reelected indicates some change in public attitude. Usually, however, homosexuality was the unmentionable vice which usually only surfaced when it seemed damaging to the persons accused. Even in the most repressive periods, however, homosexuals developed ways of communicating with each other, sometimes through in-group jargon or references. The term "gay" served as an identifying word before it became public knowledge, while earlier terms such as "Bohemian" served the same purpose. Often the term would have different meanings in different groups, so one has to use caution in equating such terms with homosexuality. A gay girl, for example, was a prostitute, and in fact the term was adopted from the language of prostitution to apply to a homosexual cultural group. Bohemian likewise implied a variant life-style before it was applied to homosexual groups.

The knowledgeable researcher needs to be alert to such descriptive terms in literature. Literature in fact remains one of the major sources of gaining information about homosexuality, and many writers of the past have included references to homosexuality in their works. Confessional literature also includes considerable material about homosexuality, and the insistence in the literature of Catholic monastic orders about not leaving two men alone suggests that the Church recognized homoerotic possibilities. Poetry is often expressive of homoerotic thought. Art works also include representations of homosexual activity, although until recently few of these were on public display. Intimate diaries or letters are also valuable sources, although again many such references have been deleted by editors or family and only recently have some of these begun to come to light.

One of the best examples of this is the case of Walt Whitman, whose "Calamus" poems in *Leaves of Grass* (1860) became a source of controversy. The theme of this group of forty-five poems has usually been interpreted to be the spiritual love of man for man. The calamus is a plant, sometimes known as the

sweet flag, whose fascicles, clinging together for support, supposedly represented the "adhesive love" of friendship. Whitman wrote:

Come, I will make the continent indissoluble,
I will make the most splendid race the sun ever shone
upon,
I will make divine magnetic lands,
With the love of comrades,
With the life-long love of comrades.¹

We two boys together clinging,
One the other never leaving,
Up and down the roads going, North and South
excursions making,
Power enjoying, elbows stretching, fingers clutching,
Arm'd and fearless, eating, drinking, sleeping, loving,
No law less than ourselves owning, sailing, soldiering,
thieving, threatening,
Misers, menials, priests alarming, air breathing, water
drinking, on the turf or the sea-beach dancing,
Cities wrenching, ease scorning, statutes mocking,
feebleness chasing,
Fulfilling our foray.²

The selection from the two poems obviously describes strong male attachments, but is this homoerotic love? Many readers believed it was. John Addington Symonds wrote:

The language of "Calamus" . . . has a passionate glow, a warmth of emotional tone, beyond anything to which the modern world is used in the celebration of the love of friends. It recalls to our mind the early Greek enthusiasm—that fellowship in arms which flourished among Dorian tribes, and made a chivalry for prehistoric Hellas. Nor does the poet himself appear to be unconscious that there are dangers and difficulties involved in the highly-pitched emotions he is praising. . . .³

To remove all doubts in his mind about Whitman's intentions, Symonds, who also wrote a biography of Whitman, wrote to

Whitman about the homosexuality in his poems. Whitman eventually replied:

About the question on "Calamus," &, they quite daze me. "Leaves of Grass" is only to be rightly construed by and within its own atmosphere and essential character—all its pages and pieces so coming strictly under. That the Calamus part has ever allowed the possibility of such construction as mentioned is terrible. I am fain to hope the pages themselves are not to be even mentioned for such gratuitous and quite at the time undreamed and unwished possibility of morbid inferences—which are disavowed by me and seem damnable.⁴

Symonds thereupon wrote that Whitman must have had feelings as hostile to sexual inversion as any law-abiding Anglo-Saxon could desire, and he wrote that Whitman probably did not even take the "abnormal instinct" into account.

But neither Symonds nor Whitman is being completely honest. Symonds was a homosexual himself and anonymously wrote two defenses of homosexuality.⁵ Whitman was also a homosexual. Symonds, after emphasizing the homoerotic components of Whitman's poems, undoubtedly felt called upon to avoid any attributed statement to this effect. Symonds, in fact, never raised the issue of Whitman's sexual preference in his biography of him, but instead included it in one of his anonymous defenses of homosexuality.

That Whitman was aware of the dangers is evident in the code he used even in his own notebooks. For example, in the summer of 1870, he wrote:

It is IMPERATIVE that I obviate and remove myself (and my orbit) at all hazards from this incessant enormous and PERTURBATION . . . TO GIVE UP ABSOLUTELY & for good, from this present hour, this Feverish FLUCTUATING, useless undignified pursuit of 164—too long (*much too long*) persevered in—so humiliating—It must come at last & had better come now—(*It cannot possibly be a success*) LET THERE FROM THIS HOUR BE NO FALTERING, NO GETTING—all henceforth (NOT ONCE, *under any circumstance—avoid*

DIV. OF HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS

seeing her, or meeting her, or any talk or explanations
—or ANY MEETING WHATEVER, FROM THIS
HOUR FORTH, FOR LIFE.

Who is this mysterious 164 who so plagued Whitman? Some Whitman scholars tried to decipher the code by referring to a phrenological chart. Here the number stood for Hope, personified by a woman. Others have thought it was a simple code for letters of the alphabet with 16 standing for P and 4 for D, but who was the mysterious P. D.? Eventually the initials turned out to stand for Peter Doyle in spite of the references to "her." Doyle was a young streetcar conductor who reciprocated Whitman's own strong feelings. Whitman wrote him:

I never dreamed that you made so much of having me
with you, nor that you could feel so downcast at losing
me. I foolishly thought it was all on the other side.

Though Whitman's correspondence with Doyle was published posthumously under the title *Calamus*, it was not until much later that critics dared the forbidden and indicated that Whitman was a homosexual.⁶

Whitman was not exactly shy in his homosexuality, but he did cover his tracks. Fearful that his "Calamus" poems might be too explicit, he wrote his "Children of Adam" poems dealing with heterosexual love as a counterbalance. Still he wanted to be identified as a homosexual, and he left many clues for future scholars. In 1946, Malcolm Cowley, the literary critic, made Whitman's sexual preference a public matter when he reported that he had found a listing in Whitman's notebooks of men he had accosted on New York City streets and in beer cellars during four days in July 1862. Cowley believed that Whitman played the passive role in his sexual relations and belonged to a homosexual group that met at various beer cellars.⁷ Once the issue was raised, it became obvious that Whitman was not ambiguous in his feelings for other males. He had written:

Intense and loving comradeship, the personal and passionate attachment of man to man—which hard to define,

underlies the lessons and ideals of the profound saviors of every land and age, and which seems to promise, when thoroughly develop'd, cultivated and recognized in manners and literature, the most substantial hope and safety of the future of these States, will then be fully express'd.

It is to the development, identification, and general prevalence of that fervid comradeship, (The adhesive love, at least rivaling the amative love hitherto possessing imaginative literature, if not going beyond it,) that I look for the counterbalance, and offset of our materialistic and vulgar American democracy, and for the spiritualization thereof. Many will say it is a dream, and will not follow my inferences: but I confidently expect a time when there will be seen, running like a half-hid warp through all the myriad audible and visible worldly interests of America, threads of manly friendship, fond and loving, pure and sweet, strong and life-long, carried to degrees hitherto unknown—not only giving tone to individual character, and making it unprecedentedly emotional, muscular, heroic, and refined, but having the deepest relations to general politics. I say democracy infers such loving comradeship, as its most inevitable twin or counterpart, without which it will be incomplete, in vain, and incapable of penetrating itself.⁸

Each day Whitman went to a public bath in Brooklyn, an indication that baths then as now were meeting places for homosexuals. He also surrounded himself with a coterie of uneducated working men. He even used some of the words still frequently used by homosexuals, such as "mild orgie" and "gay" in speaking of the "gayest Party" of young, handsome men, and going to "gay places." Whitman also often openly kissed other men. In a letter he wrote, "I put my arm around him and we gave each other a long kiss half a minute long. . . . I go around some . . . to the gay places."

But publicly he still denied he was a homosexual. Obviously he was not ashamed of his own activities, and if his letters are any indication he was often quite pleased with himself. Still, public hostility to Whitman has persisted. Some evidence of this appeared in the furor that arose over the Delaware River Port

Authority's decision in July 1955 to name the new bridge connecting South Philadelphia with Camden, New Jersey, where Whitman died, after the poet. When news of this decision became public the Rev. Edward B. Lucitt of the Roman Catholic diocese of Camden protested on behalf of his communicants in Camden and surrounding counties because Whitman's life and works were "personally objectionable." As evidence for this he reported that a biography by G. W. Allen had called Whitman "homo-erotic." The protest was followed by a series of letters including at least one from each of the fifty-eight Catholic schools in the Camden diocese requesting the Port Authority to find a less objectionable man from New Jersey to honor. The Port Authority, to its credit, stuck to its guns, but it assuaged the conscience of Camden protesters by reporting that three unnamed historical societies which had been consulted by the officials reported that they could find no evidence that Whitman was a homosexual. They also received a letter from G. W. Allen himself, who on December 16, 1955, issued a bulletin to the press stating:

I used the term "homoerotic" rather than "homosexual" because the latter suggests sex perversion. There is absolutely no evidence that Whitman engaged in any perverted practice.⁹

That apparently ended the matter, since today there is now Walt Whitman Bridge connecting Pennsylvania and New Jersey, although it should be added that "homoerotic" was defined in the second edition of *Webster's New International Dictionary* as "homosexual."

Whitman is no isolated example, and on the basis of our research it appears that homoeroticism was no less common in the past than now. Some homoerotics remained celibate while others engaged in heterosexual relations while visualizing their mates as belonging to a different sex. Homosexuality, in fact, may be regarded as having always existed, although in no society has exclusive homosexuality existed for any significant proportion of the population. Many societies in the past, however, have tolerated homosexuality as a phase, encouraging homoerotic relations between young adults, mostly male, provided that these

men later married and had children. Other societies have allowed a few individuals to remain celibate, to cross-dress, or to live as the opposite sex.

Historians, however, shy away from discussion of the topic. Readers will look in vain, for example, through most standard histories of Greece written before 1950 for any reference to homosexuality. There are occasional references to Platonic friendships, but these were erroneously interpreted in heterosexual terms.

This kind of oversight gives us a distorted historical picture. How the Greek homoerotic orientation could be ignored is difficult to explain unless we accept that homosexuality was regarded with such public horror that the obvious could be overlooked. The whole Greek idea of beauty, for example, is masculine. In Greek art, particularly in vase paintings, boys and youths are portrayed more frequently and with much greater attention to detail than girls are. Even the most erotic of females, such as the legendary Sirens, look boyish.¹⁰

Exclusive homosexuality, however, was discouraged among the Greeks. Homoerotic feelings were not to threaten the family. Instead the Greeks permitted, if they did not encourage, homosexuality during a brief period in a young man's life, from the time he had his hair cut at age sixteen through his military training until he became a fully accepted citizen.¹¹ Then he was supposed to marry and beget children, although later in life he was supposed to take a young adolescent under his protective custody, repeating the cycle. No such program existed for girls, however, since the activities of women of all ages were highly restricted. One ancient Greek writer, for example, praised his sister and his niece because they had lived in the women's quarters of their house "with so much concern for their modesty that they were embarrassed even to be seen by their male relatives."¹² Women were to be virgins at marriage, and they married young, probably at about fourteen. Their purpose was to bear children, particularly sons.

The Greek word *paidierastia*, anglicized as "pederasty," is derived from *pais*, boy, and *erastia*, love, and in its ideal sense denoted the spiritual and sensual affection felt by an adult for a boy who had reached puberty. Though it is impossible to indicate the number of homosexuals in Greek society or to esti-

mate how many of the homosexual relations went from idealized affection to actual sex, we can describe the ideal. Plato in his *Symposium* put the case most effectively:

Thus Love is by various authorities allowed to be of most venerable standing; and as most venerable, he is the cause of all our highest blessings. I for my part am at a loss to say what greater blessing a man can have in earliest youth than an honorable lover, or a lover than an honorable favorite. For the guiding principle we would choose for all our days, if we are minded to live a comely life, cannot be acquired either by kinship of office or wealth or anything so well as by Love. What shall I call this power? The same that we feel for shameful things, and ambition for what is noble, without which it is impossible for city or person to perform any high and noble deeds. Let me then say that if a man in love should be detected in some shameful act or in a cowardly submission to shameful treatment at another's hands, would not feel half so much distressed at anyone observing it, whether father or comrade or anyone in the world, as when his favorite did; and in the self-same way we see how the beloved is especially ashamed before his lovers when he is observed to be about shameful business. So that if we could somehow contrive to have a city or an army composed of lovers and their favorites (as at Thebes), they could not be better citizens of their country than by thus refraining from all that is base in a mutual rivalry for honor; and such men as these, when fighting side by side, one might almost consider able to make even a little band victorious over all the world. For a man in love would surely choose to have all the rest of his host rather than his favorite see him forsaking his station or flinging away his arms; sooner than this, he would prefer to die many deaths: while, as for leaving his favorite in the lurch, or not succouring him in his peril, no man is such a craven that Love's own influence cannot inspire him with valour that makes him equal to the bravest born, and without doubt what Homer calls a "fury inspired" by a god in certain heroes is the effect produced on Love's peculiar power.¹³

Greek mythology is full of stories of love between persons of the same sex, such as Zeus and Ganymede, Heracles and Iolaus (or Hylas), and Apollo and Hyacinth. The Platonic description of male love has been a dominant theme in all defenses of homosexuality. John Addington Symonds maintained that the origins of Greek homosexuality were in the warrior bands.

Fighting and foraging in company, sharing the same way-side board and heathstrewn bed, rallying to the comrade's voice in outset, these men learned the meanings of the words *Philētēr* (lover) and *Parastatēs* (comrade). To be loved was honorable, for it implied being worthy to be died for. To love was glorious, since it pledged the lover to self-sacrifice in case of need. In these conditions the pederastic passion may well have combined manly virtue with carnal appetite, adding such romantic sentiment as some stern men reserve within their hearts for women.¹⁴

Though Platonic love technically was idealized love, i.e. Platonic friendship, and not necessarily carnal, the Greeks also recognized carnal love. Aristotle explained how homosexuality came to be.

Why is it that some persons find pleasure in submitting to sexual intercourse, and some take pleasure in performing the active part, and others do not? . . . This desire may be due to diet or to the imagination. . . . But those who are effeminate by nature are so constituted that little or no semen is secreted where it is secreted by those who are in a natural state, but it collects in this part of the body the fundament. The reason of this is that they are unnaturally constituted; for, though male, they are in a condition in which this part of them is necessarily incapacitated. Now incapacity may involve either complete destruction or else perversion; the former, however, is impossible, for it would involve a man becoming a woman. They must therefore become perverted and aim at something other than the discharge of semen. The result is that they suffer from unsatisfied desires, like women; for the moisture is scanty and has not enough force to find its way out and quickly cools. When it finds its way to

UNIV. OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the fundament only, there is a desire to submit to sexual intercourse; but if it settles both there and in the sexual organs, there is a desire both for performing and submitting to the sexual act, and the desire for one or other is greater as more semen is present in either part. This condition is sometimes the result of habit; for men take a pleasure in whatever they are accustomed to do, and emit the semen accordingly. . . . For this reason those who have been accustomed to submit to sexual intercourse about the age of puberty and not before, because recollection of the past presents itself to them during the act of copulation and with the recollection the idea of pleasure, desire to take a passive part owing to habit, as though it were natural to them to do so; frequent repetition, however, and habit become a second nature. . . .¹⁵

In spite of Aristotle's belief that homosexuality might possibly be habit-forming, pederasty was institutionalized within both the military and educational system of Greece. The lover was always expected to stand out in the eyes of his beloved, and inevitably homosexual love was linked with valor and courage and said to have been justified by the gods. Plato believed that the most formidable army in the world would be one composed of lovers, inspiring one another to deeds of heroism and sacrifice,¹⁷ and this kind of army was perhaps realized in the fourth century by the Sacred Band of Thebes. This group, consisting of 300 men traditionally grouped as pairs of lovers, was admired throughout the Greek world, and was responsible for the brief period of military supremacy of Thebes.¹⁸ A similar corps was later formed by the Carthaginians, perhaps in imitation of the Thebans.

Adding to the acceptance of homosexuality was the institutionalization of pederasty within the educational system. According to Plato the purpose of homosexual love was to "educate,"¹⁹ and so the dedicated teacher and true boy lover were one and the same. This was accentuated in Greece, as it was later in the English public schools, because the Greek educational system was a closed masculine society excluding women, not only physically but ideologically. After the primary grades education implied an intimate relationship, a personal union between a young

student and an elder who was at once his model, guide, and initiator—a relationship in which passion played an important part. The admiration of the younger partner for the older and the need and desire of the older to enjoy this admiration were believed to be the stimulus for the best type of education, since it aroused ardent and active involvement. Thus the object of love, in Plato's terms, was to beget the sphere of the "beautiful."²⁰ Idealized love was distinguished from sensual desire, the opposite of true love, and the Greeks showed little toleration for adults who took the passive role in any homoerotic relationship.

The relationship between the adult and the adolescent boy was maintained by daily association, personal contact and example, intimate conversations, a sharing in common, and the gradual initiation of the younger into the social activities of the older men. It was best when the tutor could choose his own pupil, and the Greeks were hostile to the teacher who made a profit from teaching. Sometimes it is difficult to tell whether there were actual physical relationships between the teachers and students, but Greek literature is full of tales of homoerotic passion. Socrates is not an isolated example. Plato was the lover of Alexis of Dion, and for three generations the position as head of the academy he founded passed from lover to beloved. Aristotle was the lover of his pupil Hermias, whom he immortalized in a hymn. Euripides, the playwright, was the lover of the tragic poet Agathon; Phidias, the sculptor, the lover of his pupil Agoracritus of Pharos; the physician Theomedon the lover of the astronomer Eudoxus of Cnidus. Alexander had his male lovers. The list could be extended.²¹

In lyric poetry, the most direct expression we have of the personal state of mind and feelings of the ancient Greeks, homosexual love occupied a major place. For example, some 158 lines of the surviving fragment of Theognis of Megara, a poet of the sixth century B.C., are devoted to Cynrus, his favorite.²² Pindar, the greatest of the lyric poets, recounts his love in his "Ode to Zenokrates"; tradition has it that he died in the arms of his lover Theoxenus, whom the gods had given him as the most beautiful thing in the world.²³ Of the thirty idylls preserved under the name of Theocritus, who lived in the third century B.C., no fewer than eight are exclusively devoted to the love of youth.²⁴ One of the chief sources is the so-called *Palatine Anthol-*

ogy, poems by some 320 different authors collected in the tenth century A.D., containing poems from the seventh century B.C. up to the tenth century A.D. The twelfth book of the anthology, almost exclusively devoted to the love of youths, includes 285 short elegiac poems. Poems in this section were attributed to Straton, a writer of the second century A.D., but there are numerous other poems devoted to homosexual love.²⁵

Since males in Greece formed a close, autonomous society, it would seem logical that women had to turn to their sisters for help and support. Women, however, lacked the freedom of men, and were confined to the women's quarters of the house with little opportunity to meet and visit with women not of their own family. Though the Greeks in theory should have been as tolerant of female homosexuality as they were of the male variety, we have far less information about the existence of such relations. One of the few examples we have is Sappho from the island of Lesbos (sixth century B.C.), and only fragments of her work survive. Little is known about her except that she was the head of a school for girls in Mytilene on Lesbos, the aim of which was to fashion young girls into the Greek ideal of feminine beauty and wisdom. Several of the surviving fragments of Sappho's poems carry a feeling of intimacy with other women, so much so that her association with the school on Lesbos has led to female homosexuals' being called lesbians. At various times in history the term "sapphic" or "sapphist" has also been applied to women erotically attached to other women. The only way for the modern reader to arrive at the true Sappho is through the fragmentary remains of her poems (many of them were destroyed during the Christian period because of her association with lesbianism), and here in spite of the fact that she had been married, and was a mother, her love ideal is clearly female.²⁶ The fact that she had been married, and had opportunities for a second marriage, makes her not unlike many women of today who only come to their identities as lesbians after marriage. "Lesbian" was not a Greek term for female homosexuals; instead they used the word *tribade*, from *tribein*, "to rub," a word that also appears later in various references to lesbianism.

If generations of Europeans could grow up ignoring the homoerotic nature of Greece, it is understandable why we gain such a distorted picture of homosexuality. Though both the Romans

and Greeks associated pederasty with the Greeks, and the Jewish reaction through the development of the story of Sodom and Gomorrah has already been mentioned, the idealized concept of Platonic love has been an important influence in western culture. Plato, the homoerotic, if not homosexual, had such great influence upon Christianity that some of the early Church Fathers regarded him as a Christian before his time. St. Augustine relied heavily upon Plato, and so great was the respect of the Christian writers for him that all the works attributed to him have survived, something that can be said for no other ancient Greek writer.

Platonic concepts have proved particularly influential in education. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries when a new type of educational institution, a forerunner of the modern high school, was evolving in Italy, Plato was a model. The English public-school system which developed at this time also used him as a model, and later the study of Plato became a base of the classical curriculum. Though not everyone read homoerotic thoughts into Plato, enough did to keep him a safe hero for any homoerotically inclined young man. As long as Plato and the Greek tradition were not openly and publicly designated as homosexual, Greek studies were a safe refuge, and many a homosexual scholar has found solace in reading Greek. Perhaps it is symbolic that one of the founders of modern classical studies, Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768), was a homosexual. -51

If homosexuality has been so covered up, often covered so deeply that it is impossible to unearth, how can we argue that homosexuality has been a universal fact of history? Probably the richest sources for any cross-cultural or comparative historical study of human activity have been the reports on "primitive" and other societies gathered by various observers over the past several hundred years. Since the observers were reporting on what they often regarded as "inferior" peoples, with "heathen customs" (many of the reporters were missionaries), they often reported on sexual activities which they ignored in their own society. The most comprehensive survey yet undertaken of observations of sexual behavior in various cultures was that by Clellan S. Ford and Frank A. Beach. They concluded that there was a wide variation of sexual activities among peoples and cultures, so wide that no one society could be regarded as "representative" of the human

race.²⁷ They found homosexual behavior to exist rather widely, although in none of their societies did they find it the predominant behavior among adults.

The apparent universality of this form of sexual activity might be due to some equally widespread social influence that tends to force a portion of every group into homosexual alliance. Certain social factors probably do incline certain individuals toward homosexuality, but the phenomenon cannot be understood solely in such terms.²⁸

The Ford and Beach study was based primarily on information derived from the Human Relations Area Files, Inc., formerly known as the Yale Cross-Cultural Survey. This compilation, catalogued both by subject matter and geographic area, is based on extracts from thousands of books, articles, and reports by a variety of reporters and observers ranging from casual travelers to professional ethnographers.

Though the summaries of these studies by Ford and Beach are invaluable, they have to be used with caution, since the data itself is so untrustworthy. Ford and Beach, for example, found references to homosexuality in some seventy-six societies; in forty-nine (64 percent) homosexuality was considered normal and socially acceptable, at least for certain members of the community. In the other twenty-seven (36 percent) homosexual activity among adults was reported to be totally absent, rare, or carried on only in secrecy.²⁹ Because no reference to homosexuality, either positive or negative, was reported for the majority of societies, these were excluded from the statistics. Does the absence of either positive or negative statements about homosexuality mean it was unknown in the majority of societies or simply that the informants neglected mentioning the subject? The answer would seem to incline more toward the latter explanation when other evidence is taken into account. Since this is the case, further questions arise about even those studies reporting homosexuality, if only because the observers reporting it might specifically have been looking for proof of its existence to prove one kind of thesis or another.

A good example of observer bias took place in early twentieth-

century America. Magnus Hirschfeld, the great German pioneer in the investigation of homosexuality, visited Philadelphia and Boston as part of his studies. He reported that he could scarcely detect any outward evidence of homosexuality. Only much later did he become aware that both cities had homosexual communities of considerable size. In fact, he later found that homosexuality was *kolossal viel los*, or extremely widespread.³⁰ In another report in 1906 a New York neurologist, Edward Spitzka, reported to the editor of a German research journal that after a special year-long search he had been able to find only two "personal" advertisements that might refer to homosexuality. The two advertisements, in the *New York Herald*, were as follows:

SIR—Would you appreciate faithful, genteel companionship; refined, trustworthy gentleman. Address CONVERSATION, 270 Herald.

FRIENDSHIP CLUB CORRESPONDENCE EVERYWHERE: PARTICULARS FREE. BOX 24 CLEVELAND, OHIO.

The German editor did not know quite what to make of this finding. He concluded that since Americans were so open about advertising everything else, homosexuals were in such great numbers and found each other so easily that they did not have to advertise. He added that he knew there were homosexuals in the United States because some of the people who had emigrated there from Germany were known homosexuals.³¹ Another observer, however, could conclude on the basis of the same data that homosexuality did not exist in America because there were none of the European type of advertisements. Still another conclusion, and the obvious answer, is that homosexuals had not adopted the European methods of seeking each other out.

If this American experience can be applied to the study of primitives, it should seem clear why there has to be so much ambiguity in cross-cultural studies. These same difficulties occur in the Ford and Beach study. Balinese society, for example, was classified by them as among the 36 percent minority where homosexual activity was rare, absent, or carried on only in secret. Yet

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the crossing of sex roles is common among the Balinese, their religion placing a high value on the hermaphroditic figure of Syng Hyang Toenggal, also known as the Solitary or Tijinitja. Tijinitja, according to Balinese cosmology, represented the time before the gods, before the separation of male from female. Thus Tijinitja is thought of as both husband and wife, male and female.³² Though the cross-dressing associated with the god represents transvestite conduct, Ford and Beach did not regard this as homosexual. On the other hand they classified all cross-dressing among the American Indians, the phenomenon known as *berdache*, as homosexuality.³³ Can the classification in the one case be any more justified than in another?

Examining the data, however, it appears that homosexuality and other variant sexual activities that were observed—and the key word is “observed”—were more open and therefore accepted with more toleration. These societies included those in which several variables were present, namely where marriage was delayed until late in life, female chastity was prized, marriage fees were expensive, housing difficulties existed, or other factors were present that made contact with members of the opposite sex difficult.³⁴ One other variable should probably be added: the importance of population growth to the society. Where children were regarded as essential for the preservation and growth of society, as they have been in most of western culture, homosexuality is taboo. In societies where growth is not sought, homosexuality is probably more openly tolerated. Greece is a good example of a society where most of these variables were present.

In sum, homosexuality has always been with us; it has been a constant in history, and its presence is clear.

Chapter 5

THE MOVEMENT

If homosexuality has been hidden, repressed, and punished in the past, it is obvious that this is not the case today. Gay liberation seems to be everywhere. There are gay student organizations on most major university and college campuses. Gay newspapers appear in many of the newsstand racks. Discussions of homosexuality are featured on radio talk shows. There are sympathetic portrayals of homosexuals on television, in the movies, on the stage. There are gay churches and synagogues, and even gay parades. How—and why—did things change?

It has become common to date the gay liberation movement from Friday, June 27, 1969, when the Stonewall Inn, a popular gay men's bar in the Greenwich Village section of New York City, was raided by police. The patrons of the bar, who in the past had docilely submitted to such raids, reacted in anger and fought the police, who were forced to barricade themselves inside the bar until assistance arrived. The crowd was then dispersed, a few arrests were made, and things apparently returned to normal, if only briefly. The next night a crowd of homosexuals and sympathizers gathered in the vicinity of Sheridan Square to protest the vice-squad action. The police again gathered and there was another confrontation. Confrontation went on for four more nights before things quieted down, but the gays no longer were content to be as docile as they had been, and out of the Stonewall riots came the Gay Liberation Front.¹ The Christopher Street parade, organized to commemorate Gay Liberation Day the next year in New York and other cities, grew out of the Stonewall riots. The parade was named after Christopher Street, a street in Greenwich Village where the original parade took

place. On Gay Liberation Day in 1970 New York's Christopher Street parade drew a couple of thousand participants in New York City, another 1,200 in Hollywood's Christopher Street West, and approximately 200 in Chicago.² By the second anniversary, parades were being held in Boston, New Orleans, San Jose, San Francisco, and many other cities, and the gay liberation movement had become public.

Rather than being the beginning of the gay liberation movement, however, the Stonewall riots are a symbol of changing attitudes toward homosexuals. In this sense they can be compared to the Watts riots in Los Angeles which took place between August 11-16, 1965. There had been numerous race riots immediately before the Watts outbreaks including riots in Rochester, Jersey City, Dismoor, Illinois, and Philadelphia in 1964, and many before that, but it was the Watts riots which became sort of a watershed. President Lyndon B. Johnson himself, in the aftermath of Watts, demanded the removal of injustices from the black population in the United States although at the same time he condemned the resort to violence and terror. Similarly gays had opposed police actions before Stonewall, and the gays themselves were becoming more outspoken in demanding change.

Though homosexuals traditionally have faced many of the same problems as blacks, Chicanos, women, and other groups who were denied equality of opportunity, they also had special problems. Because homosexuality was stigmatized behavior, and because homosexuals for the most part are not easily identified, few individuals were willing to proclaim their sexual preference publicly. Until homosexuals in any number were willing to organize and speak for themselves, change would occur slowly. Gay organizations by the time of the Stonewall riots were strong enough, and enough people were willing to identify with homosexuality, that the gay community was able to seize upon and exploit the riots.

The analogy with the civil rights movement has value in understanding gay liberation since one of the major aspects of reform movements is that one type of reform begets another type of reform. The nineteenth-century abolition movement which eventually resulted in the elimination of slavery gave birth to a women's rights movement which ultimately led to giving women the right to vote, as well as movements to establish Pro-

hibition, moral crusades to end pornography and prostitution, and many other reforms which caused the period to be called the Progressive era in American history books. Similarly the post-World War II agitation over civil rights spawned a new women's rights movement, a gay rights movement, and many other efforts to give minorities, both visible and invisible, greater opportunities for equality. Often the same people have been involved in all the movements, since essentially two different kinds of groups have been involved in most reform movements, although for somewhat different reasons.

One of the groups is what might be called the "liberal reformers," who generally, in Laud Humphreys' terms, are people "with strong credentials as well as thick skins."³ In a sense their motives are reformist since they see "evils" in societies which they want to remove. To change these evils they have to become public, and once they make public any demand for social change they are subject to public attack. Inevitably the names on letterheads of such groups tend to be professional men and women, professors, lawyers, ministers, and others whose titles help legitimize the movement as well as protect the signers.

An equally large group are people who might be termed revolutionaries, people who want to bring about basic change in society, not just reform it. Social democrats, socialists, Communists, Trotskyites often are the leaders in demanding change, but then so are some of the Christian revolutionaries such as Jehovah's Witnesses, although the political groups are more likely to look to political solutions than the religious ones. These people see evils in society and want to remove these evils. To do so they have to have a power base, and to build one they mount appeals to the alienated and discriminated-against. Though respectable society often denounces the radicals, questioning their motives as they did the Communist support of blacks, such groups do help make the issues public. Moreover, since respectable society has already ostracized these more radical groups, they need not fear further ostracism, since they find support within their own group.

Both the radicals and the liberal reformers, however, are eventually shunted aside, at least in the United States, since the very groups that they have been fighting for begin to emerge and take over leadership. Underground organizations of the minority pop-

During the '20s, '30s, and '40s a number of homosexual groups emerged, if only briefly. Many were poorly organized, and their newsletters for the most part have disappeared. In 1925, for example, the Society for Human Rights was founded in Chicago and published a few issues of a paper called *Friendship and Freedom*. The wife of one of the members, upset at her husband's activities, filed charges against her husband for contributing to the delinquency of a minor (her own son). The four active members were arrested and dragged off to jail. Though charges against three of the four were dismissed (the fourth had to pay a \$10 fine), the dangers of even such innocuous activities are readily apparent. One of the four, who worked for the post office, lost his job. There was a natural tendency for groups to remain underground. Many such groups, however, sponsored annual costume balls, often on Halloween, at which cross-dressing was a major feature. Some of these organizations date from at least the end of the nineteenth century.⁶

Reform and radical groups were also interested in homosexuality. Probably the leading left-wing agitator for better treatment of homosexuals was Emma Goldman, who had become acquainted with homosexuality while studying to be a nurse-midwife in the period before World War I.⁷ Of the liberal reform groups the most important were groups affiliated with the Society of Friends. In 1945 a group of New York City Quakers approached the New York City psychiatrist George W. Henry with a request to head up a Quaker Emergency Committee dedicated to assisting homosexuals in conflict with the law. To this end an executive committee was established and a network of physicians, educators, and clergymen set to work. But personality conflicts, as well as a widespread fear that the landlord of the large loft in which they met would find them out, soon led to conflict. Many of the Quakers withdrew to set up another group, the Quaker Readjustment Center, and its activities became closely tied with another psychiatrist, Frederick W. Wertham. Henry and others organized the George W. Henry Foundation to give aid, advice, and encouragement to youths who were confronting the problem of homosexuality. Technically the foundation was not part of an organized homosexual movement, although many of the directors later became active in homosexual groups. In the same year the Quakers began to work with homosexuals, the

Veterans' Benevolent Association, primarily a recreational organization, was founded in New York by homosexuals. It soon disappeared, although many of its members later affiliated with other gay groups.

The end of World War II also saw the appearance of several short-lived groups and publications. Some nine issues of *Vice Versa* were published in 1947-48 in Los Angeles. Edited by lesbians, it aimed to reach the lesbian community, and though it too soon disappeared, many of the people associated with it were later instrumental in the publication of *One*, a homosexual magazine, and the *Ladder*, a lesbian publication. Membership in most of the early gay organizations was not exclusive, and some people belonged to all the early organizations. The nucleus of most Los Angeles organizations, and therefore of the early national groups, was a nebulous group organized in 1948 to support the candidacy of Henry A. Wallace and called American Bachelors for Wallace. The most successful group to emerge from this same nucleus of individuals was the Mattachine Foundation, a name put forward by one of its founders, Henry Hay, to commemorate the medieval jesters who "spoke the truth" to "authoritarian" rulers. In order to protect themselves from police harassment (the police department of Los Angeles was extremely hostile to homosexuals) as well as from public exposure, they instituted a policy of secrecy as well as a hierarchy of orders. Though meetings were often held behind locked doors, the founders were not afraid to make fun of themselves and symbolically chose April Fool's Day, 1950, as the date of their official organization. Edward Sagarin in his study of organized homosexual movements compared the early Mattachine Foundation to Alcoholics Anonymous, since secrecy was a byword and its chief purpose was to help its members live a well-oriented and socially productive life. But the purpose of the foundation was not always clear and its founders did not agree among themselves.

This became clear when some of the group's activities became public. A Los Angeles homosexual, Dale Jennings, was falsely accused by the police of solicitation. The leadership of the Mattachine Foundation organized a Citizen's Committee to Outlaw Entrapment to defend him. In court, Jennings publicly admitted he was a homosexual but indicated he was not guilty of the charge leveled against him by the Los Angeles police. Im-

pressed by the testimony, the prosecuting attorney moved for dismissal and Jennings became a local hero. In the process, however, the incipient gay organizations received considerable publicity, which led to a spurt in growth of the Mattachine Foundation but also antagonized some powerful antihomosexual groups in the community.

The secrecy deemed so important by the Mattachine founders had become a liability. Leadership was nominally secret and direct communication and visiting between the growing number of groups was discouraged, which meant that it was not always clear to members who the leaders were. Inevitably the organization was compared by some critics to the secret cells which Senator Joseph McCarthy was charging existed in the Communist Party. In the late summer and fall of 1949 the State Department, under proddings from McCarthy and others, began the purges which soon spread throughout the government. In that year some ninety-six "perverts" were dismissed by the State Department, and by 1953 the Los Angeles *Herald and Express*, a Hearst newspaper, could caption a story "State Department Fires 531 Perverts, Security Risks."⁸

Though the Hearst headlines were standard scapegoating, equating one despised minority group with another feared group, many people undoubtedly believed that the Communists were undermining American morals by encouraging the growth and spread of homosexuality. It was in this atmosphere in 1952 that the Mattachine Foundation, encouraged by its growth over the Jennings case, sent questionnaires to various candidates running for office. Included in the questionnaire, which also went to candidates for the Los Angeles school board, was a question about including discussion of homosexuality in the required hygiene courses. There were also questions about police and vice operations, but generally the questionnaires were not particularly oriented toward homosexuality. A local Los Angeles newspaper columnist, Paul Coates, who got hold of the questionnaire, wrote in 1953, long after the election, that the legal owner of the Mattachine corporation had been vague about the group when questioned over the telephone, and he also suggested that the lawyer who had drawn up the articles of incorporation was un-American, since the lawyer had defended individuals summoned before the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings,

and his clients had resorted to the Fifth Amendment. Coates warned "A well-trained subversive could move in and forge that power (the immense homosexual minority) into a dangerous political weapon." He added a cautionary note that "to damn this organization, before its aims and directions are more clearly established, would be vicious and irresponsible. Maybe the people who founded it are sincere. It will be interesting to see."⁹

Despite the cautious conclusion, the damage had been done. Henry Hay, one of the Mattachine founders, was vulnerable to red-baiting, since he had been associated with a "people's school" in Los Angeles and had supported what Senator McCarthy called left-wing "com-symp" causes. Probably others in the group could also be labeled in the same way. In the paranoia of the early 1950s, particularly among a group whose loyalty was already suspect, such affiliations were enough to cause trouble.

Concerned with the charges about possible subversion, the Mattachine Foundation held a convention to restructure itself in April 1953. The convention, held at the Universalist Church in Los Angeles, was marked by the threat of one man, himself a homosexual, to take the names of all those present to the FBI unless the members agreed to his provisions for screening the political beliefs of members. The net result was the dissolution of the Mattachine Foundation, the alienation of many of its early leaders, and its reappearance as the Mattachine Society under new leadership. Included in the reorganization was a proviso that it be disassociated from anything connected with the earlier Mattachine Foundation. To emphasize this change the Mattachine Society, in 1957, relocated in San Francisco.

Undoubtedly the secretive nature of the original Mattachine group contributed to its difficulties. While on the one hand it was accused in another exposé, this time by *Confidential* magazine, of trying to make homosexuality legal (a stated goal of Mattachine), thereby weakening the moral fabric of America. The magazine stated that the society had 9,000 members in California alone and was building a \$6 million fund to fight discriminatory sex-law enforcement.¹⁰ Thus on the one hand the Mattachine Foundation was a Communist plot, on the other it was using capitalist methods to make homosexuality legal.

Even before the Mattachine Foundation ran into difficulty, another organization had appeared—One, Inc. Organized in 1952

and incorporated in 1953, it was primarily an educational group with social service as a secondary function. It began publishing a magazine from its inception. Its original incorporators included individuals who had been active in the Mattachine movement and in other groups. The key individuals were Don Slater and Dorr Legg, who later took separate paths, with Legg and his supporters maintaining the name of One, Inc., and Slater establishing a rival organization, the Homosexual Information Center, after losing a legal battle to retain the name of One, Inc. One published a successful magazine, a quarterly devoted to research, a newsletter, and even a few books. It also established a tax-exempt foundation to support research into homosexuality, and established a library.

Many of the early articles in *One Magazine*, as well as other homosexual publications, were written under pseudonyms. Pseudonyms also were used for articles written by Slater, Legg, James Kepner, and other staff writers, so that it would not be known that all the articles in some of the issues were written by the same two or three persons. Many of those who originally used pseudonyms, however, have since wanted to be identified, and have been.¹¹

Most of the organizations so far mentioned were male-oriented, although the Mattachine Foundation did include women and *One Magazine* had a woman editor from 1954 to 1957, and women associate editors after that time. The first organization of lesbians was the Daughters of Bilitis, organized in 1955 and so named from a poem by Pierre Louys entitled "Songs of Bilitis." (One, Inc., had chosen its name from a quote from Thomas Carlyle: "A mystic bond of brotherhood makes all men one."¹²)

DOB, as the Daughters of Bilitis was often abbreviated, was founded by Phyllis Lyon, Dell Martin, and six other women. Like other gay groups it soon split over aims and organizations. Some members wanted an exclusive social club, while others wanted a society more along the lines of the Mattachine Society and One, Inc., both of which were now more or less national groups. The surviving members of DOB began publishing the *Ladder*, and out of it came much of the leadership of today's lesbian movement. In spite of the fact that R. E. L. Masters dismissed DOB as a society that was sufferable because of its "relatively harmless girl-secretary type of membership," who were sometimes "serious,

sometimes folksy, but generally amusing,"¹³ from the first it was concerned with women's rights, and the *Ladder* published feminist articles before the present women's movement appeared.

With the publication of *One Magazine*, the *Ladder*, and after 1955 the *Mattachine Review*, the homosexual movement had gone public, and gay organizations began to proliferate. There were still difficulties; even mailing a magazine with a homosexual content presented problems. The postmaster of Los Angeles withdrew the October 1954 issue of the magazine from the mail. One, Inc., resorted to the courts. In 1955 the U.S. District Court in Southern California decided that the magazine was non-mailable since the "stories are obviously calculated to stimulate the lust of the homosexual reader." The decision was appealed to the Ninth Federal District Court of Appeals, where in November 1956 the original decision was sustained. Finally, however, the U.S. Supreme Court in 1958 ruled for One, Inc., perhaps the first significant Supreme Court victory for the emerging homosexual community.¹⁴

One of the contradictory aspects that appears in the account of the emergence of the pioneering gay organizations is that they appeared at a time when fear of homosexuality was great, when McCarthyism was at its height, and when any movement demanding greater sexual freedom could be regarded as subversive.¹⁵ On the surface it would seem to be the wrong time to start organizations, even secret ones, aimed at homosexuals. Several factors, however, counterbalanced the public suspicion of homosexuality. Most important was the growth of sex research. In this respect the findings of the Kinsey group were paramount. Kinsey put sexual behavior on a continuum from 0 to 6 with exclusively heterosexual behavior on one side and exclusively homosexual behavior on the other. Whether this was the correct way to describe sexual behavior is debatable, but what it did was to emphasize the variety of sexual activity and show that homosexuality was more or less a natural aspect of human behavior. Kinsey reported that 37 percent of the male population had some homosexual experience to the point of orgasm between adolescence and old age, 13 percent had more homosexual than heterosexual experience, and 4 percent were exclusively homosexual (a 6 on the Kinsey scale); similar, though lesser figures were given for women.¹⁶

The Kinsey reports emphasized that homosexuality was far more widespread than most had ever suspected. Kinsey also emphasized that homosexuality was not confined to those who lived with persons of the same sex but involved married couples and many individuals who appeared to be "healthy" heterosexuals. This finding had great implications for homosexuals in their own eyes, since they could argue, as they had always believed, that they were not sick or abnormal but within the normal range of human behavior. It also had implications for the non-homosexuals, many of whom began to question the treatment of homosexuals. Edward Sagarin, then writing under the name Donald Webster Cory, expressed the matter clearly in his book, *The Homosexual in America*, which in its own way was extremely important in changing attitudes. He wrote:

One great gap separates the homosexual minority from all others, and that is its lack of respectability in the eyes of the public, and even in the most advanced circles. It has become a sign of worthiness to take up the cudgels for almost any minority group, except the homosexuals. One is a "hero" if he espouses the cause of minorities, but is only a suspect if that minority is a homosexual group.¹⁷

Also important in changing the homosexual's image of himself or herself was the research of Evelyn Hooker. Hooker did a small-sample research project comparing homosexuals who "seemed to have an average adjustment" with the same number of like heterosexual subjects. Her findings were first made public in 1956 and published in 1957. Among her conclusions was:

Homosexuality as a clinical entity does not exist. Its forms are as varied as are those of heterosexuality. Homosexuality may be a deviation in sexual pattern which is within the normal range, psychologically. The role of particular forms of sexual desire and expression in personality structure and development may be less important than has frequently been assumed.¹⁸

Though her research appeared in a rather obscure journal, and probably did not have as much impact on the scholarly communities as it should have, her findings were immediately pub-

licized in the gay community, since members had helped get subjects for her study. In short, the message seemed to be that being gay was normal, and gays could be as well adjusted as heterosexuals.

Other groups had also been active. The American Civil Liberties Union in 1964 in its Los Angeles affiliate and in 1965 on the national level had come out for a change in the laws dealing with homosexuality.¹⁹ The American Friends Service Committee, also in 1964, had argued that the quality of human relations was more important than the kind of sexual activity.²⁰ Other religious groups, such as the Unitarians, also began to reexamine their policies on homosexuality. A British parliamentary commission, known as the Wolfenden Commission, had recommended that discrimination in employment against those labeled as homosexual be eliminated and that sexual behavior between consenting adults be decriminalized.²¹ A similar recommendation was made by the American Law Institute and by the Ninth International Congress on Criminal Law. Within the U.S. government, the National Institute of Mental Health established a task force on homosexuality which also urged that discrimination against homosexuals be eliminated and that sexual behavior between consenting adults be decriminalized.²²

By the time the Stonewall riots took place, homosexuality had become a matter for public discussion, and the formerly hostile opinion to it had been undermined. Many of society's past attitudes were being questioned, some key court cases had been won, and what was needed were stronger statements by homosexuals themselves, a sort of coming out of the closet. If blacks could demand equality, if women could demand the removal of barriers against them, there was no reason that gays also could not demand a change too. As homosexuals began to appear publicly, they found that the world did not fall in on them. Many people who went through great anxiety before announcing to their heterosexual friends that they were gay were often surprised to find out that their friends already knew or at least suspected, and their new gay identity made little difference. The few pioneers in the movement were followed by many hundreds and even thousands in proclaiming their sex preference. Inevitably the nature of the gay organizations changed, and most of the pioneering groups such as One, Mattachine, and Daughters of

Bilitis took a back seat. New organizations such as the Society for Individual Rights (SIR) appeared only to be eclipsed by others. A North American Conference of Homophile Organizations was established, a National Student Gay Liberation Front Conference was held, a National Gay Task Force was organized, and homosexual groups sprang up in every state and major city in the United States.²³

The next step in organization was the emergence of gay leadership within formerly straight organizations. The ACLU established a gay rights chapter in Los Angeles, which was followed by other affiliates. The Alice B. Toklas Democratic Club appeared in the San Francisco area, and other political groups with a gay orientation soon followed. Gay groups appeared in various professional associations, and research into homosexuality grew apace. In the process leadership within the gay community broadened. Many individuals who previously had been active in such organizations as the ACLU but had kept their homosexuality hidden now became active as gays. The flood of new gay groups following the Stonewall riots helped destroy the major structural edifices opposed to homosexuality, but it did not eliminate prejudices. Nevertheless, the struggle is now public and no longer covert.

Chapter 6

OUT OF THE CLOSET

Somerset Maugham, one of the most popular and successful authors of the twentieth century, felt that he could not write honestly about the type of love which he knew best, homosexual love. His nephew, Robin Maugham, recorded that his uncle feared that if he was honest with himself and described homoerotic love, his public would dislike the book and critics would be hostile.

Why do you think that Noel (Coward) or I have never stuck our personal predilections down our public's throats? Because we know it would outrage them. Believe me, I know what I'm talking about.¹

Coward was more open about his homosexuality than Maugham. For Maugham, according to Auberon Waugh,

the refusal to admit his nature meant that his entire persona as a writer was artificial. This is not to say, of course, that homosexual writers must write about nothing but homosexuality, but under the dispensation Maugham chose for himself, he could never speak out with his own true voice. It was always someone else's voice. . . .²

Maugham at least continued to write, but other writers found it impossible to hide their emotions. E. M. Forster, for example, abandoned publishing fiction in his later life simply because he felt unable to describe homosexuality publicly. Instead, in 1913 he wrote *Maurice*, a homosexual novel with a happy ending,

to keep his homosexual identity secret. Until a hidden identity becomes more burdensome than proclaiming a stigmatized one, the closet will serve a purpose. All Crisp's energy went into the effort to be true to his self-proclaimed sexual identity; Maugham's went into creative writing. Maugham's unhappiness was due to the fact that he wanted public acclaim for his writing and public acceptance of his homosexuality, and he believed he could not have both, so he kept his homosexuality secret. Many people who are homosexual see no need to proclaim it publicly or to become active in gay organizations. Not all women supporters of ERA joined the National Organization for Women or took part in public demonstrations, although in their own way they might have asserted the rights of women. Similarly, many homosexuals have other legitimate priorities for their lives. Probably the most important accomplishment of the gay lib movement has been to make it easier for homosexuals, publicly or privately, to accept their own identities, to raise their own self-esteem. Ultimately this will make the question of the closet irrelevant, and this will also result in the muting of more extremist claims, both of the gay militants and of their homophobic opponents.

Chapter 7

HOMOSEXUALS AS VICTIMS: SCAPEGOATING AND POLITICS

When aggression and hostility are displaced from the real sources of frustration and directed instead against a group or individual, the phenomenon is called scapegoating. Homosexuals have been regarded as a legitimate object of hostility, and homosexuality itself has been looked upon as the cause of any number of human problems. For example, the writer of a college-level history text has claimed that

the civilization of the Roman empire was vitiated by homosexuality from its earliest days. A question, uncomfortable to our contemporary lax moralists, may be raised: Is not the common practice of homosexuality a fundamental debilitating factor in any civilization where it is extensively practiced, as it is a wasting spiritual disease in the individual? It is worth considering that another great and flourishing civilization, the medieval Arabic, where homosexuality was also widespread, similarly underwent a sudden malaise and breakdown. Is there some moral physiological causation resulting from the social effects of homosexuality that has been ignored?¹

In short, the writer was claiming, in a rather roundabout way, that a major reason for the fall of the Roman Empire was homo-

sexuality. It is never clear why homosexuality *per se* might destroy a civilization, but the reasoning is probably similar to that advanced by Fred Schwartz and the members of his Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, who believe that homosexuality, abortion, and sex education can make America more vulnerable to Communism.²

Though homosexuality existed in Roman times, it seems clear from the historical record that throughout most of the Republican period homosexual conduct was severely punished. In the late Republic and early Empire it was regarded with such hostility that it was eventually outlawed. During either of these periods, to accuse someone of homosexual conduct was a standard way of expressing extreme distaste of his character and behavior. The fruits of conquest, the influx of slaves, and the general luxuriousness possible in Rome might temporarily have influenced Roman behavior, but the Romans never ceased to assert their moralistic ideals. Roman society was never vitiated by homosexuality or any other kind of variant sex. Instead, as the growth of Stoicism, Neo-Platonism, and eventually Christianity seemed to indicate, the Romans became ever more rigid in what they regarded as permissible sexual conduct.

Similarly Leopold von Ranke, one of the founders of modern historical studies in the nineteenth century, looked upon homosexuality as causing the decline of Renaissance Italy.

Far be it from me to pass judgment upon the temperament of a great nation, which in those days was a source of intellectual stimulus to the whole of Europe. No one can say that it was incurably sick: but it is certain that it suffered from serious diseases. Pederasty, which extended even to the young soldiers in the army . . . sapped all vital energy. Native and classical writers ascribe the misfortune of the nation to this evil practice. A terrible rival of pederasty was syphilis, which spread through all the classes like the plague. . . .³

Though there is no doubt that syphilis was rampant in the sixteenth century, it was not only Italians who were infected, and all evidence indicates that heterosexual rather than homosexual contacts were the usual cause.

Historians, unable or unwilling to look at root causes for changes in society, have fallen back on simplistic answers, and homosexuals and homosexuality have become a standard scapegoat. Homosexuals, however, have not been alone in serving as scapegoats; Jews, blacks, Communists, Fascists—in fact almost any hated political, religious, or racial minority—have been so labeled.

What has been true of societal ills has also been true of individuals, since one of the phenomena associated with scapegoating is the burdening of the individual or group victim not only with stigma for the specific variation from the group norms, but with the additional stigmas of all societally disapproved activities. Anti-Semitism is a good example of such scapegoating, since anti-Semites have not only been hostile to Jews because they were not Christians but at the same time labeled Jews as Communists and capitalist exploiters of the people. In Western society deviation from the sexual norms inevitably has been equated with deviation from societal norms. The origin of the word "buggery" (see Chapter 3) provides a good example.

Witchcraft has also been equated with sexual variation. Jeffrey Russell, a scholar of both heresy and witchcraft, attempted to establish the first time any specific sexual activity was reported in the trials of those accused of heresy or witchcraft. He found that as early as 1114, same-sex intercourse was part of the charges leveled against heretics,⁴ although it apparently was not so much a part of the witchcraft trials. Probably the most notorious medieval attempt to equate homosexuality with heretical conduct was in the trial of the Knights Templars, a religious crusading order founded at the beginning of the twelfth century.

In retrospect it seems that the chief mistake the Templars made was to become rich and arrogant. Their fall had nothing to do with sex but with their lack of foresight in lending large sums of money to various royal figures and thus calling attention to their wealth. Eventually, Philip IV of France set out to appropriate the Templars, and he found he could arouse public opinion against them by charging them with heresy and sodomy. To make the charges stick, he ordered the arrest of all Knights Templars in France in October 1307, including their grand master, Jacques de Molay, and then used torture to get them to confess to his charges. De Molay and many others were eventually

The University of Michigan Library

executed on these charges. All but three of the several thousand Templars examined over a seven-year period denied participating in any homosexual acts, although many, perhaps to save themselves, indicated that they had heard others had done so.⁵ Generally the execution of a group of men for alleged homosexuality several centuries ago would not be a living issue today, but one of the charges made against Masons, a group which includes an Order of Knights Templar and a DeMolay chapter for young people, is that they are descended from a homosexual group.

Stigmatizing one's enemies with charges of homosexuality is a standard practice, and some in the past have raised it to great art. In his *Divine Comedy*, Dante describes many of the inhabitants of Hell as homosexual, most of them people who happened to be his political opponents. As part of their punishment in the seventh level of hell they were kept continually running in different bands over a desert of burning sand while flakes of fire fell upon them from above. If any of them stopped for as much as a minute, he was forced to lie for one hundred years without being able to screen himself from the falling fire.⁶ Dante's dream of revenge, however, also became a smear against homosexuals, and a nightmare for many of them.

Many modern groups, perhaps recognizing the usefulness of homosexuals as scapegoats, have at times been tolerant of homosexuality, but once in power have turned against them. A good example is the German Nazi Party. Among the founders of the party was the homosexual Ernest Roehm, who has been described, even by opponents of the Nazis, as a first-class organizer who believed earnestly in social reform and was particularly tolerant of other minorities such as Jews.⁷ Roehm, encouraged by Adolf Hitler, established the first Nazi strong-arm squads which grew into the Sturmabteilung (Storm Troopers). Roehm was involved with Hitler in the famed Beer Hall Putsch in Munich which led to Hitler's arrest and confinement. It was while in confinement after this incident that Hitler wrote *Mein Kampf*. When Hitler was released from prison the party underwent some reorganization, and both Roehm and another homosexual, Edmund Heines, were removed from leadership. Roehm himself went to South America for a time, but Hitler, realizing his value, soon recalled him as well as Heines, and Roehm be-

came chief of staff of the Storm Troopers. Other homosexuals such as Karl Ernst were also active in the group.

Opponents of the Nazis used the homosexuality of Roehm, which was fairly well known, as one of their charges against the Nazis, while elements within the Nazi Party opposed to Roehm also used his homosexuality as a weapon. As Roehm's homosexuality became a public issue, Hitler at first adopted a policy of support, but once he had gained power he had Roehm and many of his chief supporters in the Storm Troopers executed in June 1933. Though the nominal reason for action was a threatened putsch by the Storm Troopers, Roehm simply had become a political embarrassment to Hitler. As the Reich press officer of the time announced:

His notorious and unfortunate proclivity gradually became such an intolerable burden that the Leader of the Movement and Supreme Commander of the S.A. [i.e. Hitler] was himself forced into the gravest conflicts of conscience.⁸

With some of their most prominent homosexual supporters out of the way, the Third Reich moved with vehemence against others. In 1935 when Nazi Germany adopted a new penal code, Dr. Hans Frank, Commissioner of Justice and chief jurist of the Nazi movement, one-time head of the Association of National Socialist Lawyers, and president of the German Academy of Law, explained to his fellow jurists that the National Socialist ideology was to be the basic foundation of all law. This meant that each jurist was requested to consider how their "Fuehrer would decide" in every case and question whether their decision was "compatible with the National Socialist conscience of the people."⁹ To Frank, one of the chief causes of any criminal activity was something he called "degeneracy," a crime that excluded individuals from the "normal part" of the population.¹⁰ Homosexuality was included in his concept of degeneracy, and Frank urged that particular attention be paid to it since it "meant the negation of the community," and such conduct deserved no mercy.¹¹

In 1928 a German sociologist, Robert Michels, had estimated

the number of homosexually inclined men in Germany at 1.2 million. When the Nazis came to power, and after the removal of Roehm, they raised the estimate to 2 million men, 10 percent of the male population. The Nazis called these new figures a "frightful legacy from the liberalistic period" which had to be eliminated.¹² Homosexuals were therefore branded as enemies of the state. They were not to be eliminated, however, but reeducated, since they were victims of the liberalistic practices of the Weimar Republic. Instead they were to be compelled to work methodically, segregated from others under strict surveillance, prevented from indulgently playing the invalid to an audience, and forced to see their own impossible ways. Ultimately, it was hoped, they would then convert to heterosexuality. The place to do this kind of reeducation was the concentration camps, and convicted homosexuals were taken to such camps, set apart from other political prisoners by a pink triangle which they wore on their fatigues. They then worked at hard labor either until they were rehabilitated, died, or were executed. Some were also castrated.

The problem the Nazis immediately had was to find homosexuals. The more obvious male prostitutes could easily be located, but the discreet homosexual was another matter. Some of the Nazis proposed more drastic punishment. Heinrich Himmler was reported as saying that homosexuals should be eliminated entirely, and advocated returning to what he believed was the ancient German punishment of throwing such individuals into peat bogs. He was reported to have said that this

was no punishment, merely the extinction of an abnormal life. It had to be removed just as we pull up stinging nettles, toss them on to a heap and burn them.¹³

Though Himmler undoubtedly realized that such punishment was more a threat than a response to reality, his actions and those of his fellow Nazis served to drive homosexuality underground. Other actions also encouraged their desire to escape attention. In February 1933, pornographic literature of every description was banned in Germany, and this ban was taken to include any illustrations of homosexual activity. At the same

time the public activities of the League for Human Rights (in which Magnus Hirschfeld and others had been active) was closed down, and the Hirschfeld archives and library were destroyed by Nazi hoodlums. In 1934 the Gestapo required all local police departments to submit lists of all persons known to have engaged in homosexual activity, including those they simply suspected. Within the SS anyone found to be a practicing homosexual was to be stripped of his rank, expelled, and brought before a court. Himmler also suggested that such individuals, "After serving the sentence imposed by the court . . . will, on my instructions, be taken to a concentration camp and there shot while attempting to escape."¹⁴ Though this might well have been rhetorical excess on Himmler's part, he was determined to root out the practice of homosexuality by his threats of death. In 1941 he finally received permission from Hitler to act as strongly as he talked, and at that time he stipulated that any member of the SS or police who engaged in sexual behavior with another man or permitted himself to be used would, regardless of age, be condemned to death and executed. Ultimately, however, he did allow a term of not less than six years penal servitude for those involved in less grave offenses.¹⁵ As Theodor Adorno summed up:

German sexual taboos . . . [fell] within the same ideological and psychological syndrome of prejudice which helped to create popular support for National Socialism and still persists in a form which is, in terms of manifest content, depoliticized. At the right moment, it could also assume definite political shape.¹⁶

The Nazi drive against homosexuals had the support of a significant number of citizens who applauded the government's efforts to root out immorality. How many homosexuals were sent to concentration camps remains unclear, but at least 20,000 are known to have been interned. How many died is unknown, and neither is it clear how many others were killed or executed. Some of the uncertainty about actual figures results from the Nazis' desire to exaggerate the number of homosexuals before the Nazi regime, and then downplay the numbers after the Nazis had

How would they know they were not castrated?

Trail of Incest from Himmler

consolidated power and instituted their new morality. As a result homosexuals in any of the various security agencies of the government were to be removed, and possibly eliminated, without any public record of their homosexuality. The Nazis feared that any publicity about Nazi homosexual figures, even minor ones, would undermine their own case with the public. The uncertainty is compounded because as the German state came more and more under attack by outside forces, the Nazis increased their efforts to eliminate hidden enemies—the Jews, the homosexuals, gypsies, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Communists—and imprisonments and executions mounted as the need for scapegoats rose. Few records have survived.

Homosexuals have not fared particularly well in Communist countries either. Those Marxist critics who concerned themselves with western bourgeois sexual attitudes have argued that the difficulty with western attitudes was that everything had been reduced to its relative value for the production process. In simple terms, everything had a monetary value in relation to everything else except for work, and the exercise and suffering connected with it, which capitalism recognized as having an independent value. Eating, going for a walk, even having sexual intercourse were placed in direct relationship to work, as witnessed by such statements as "Instead of working we went to play golf," or "As a reward for our work we gave ourselves a vacation."

Though this is perhaps a simplistic summary, the Marxist critics seemed to be saying that the west measured sexuality quantitatively, the same way they acquired wealth, and so the questions about sexuality were always how potent a man was, how many women he had had, or how many offers of marriage a woman had refused, or how frequently she had been the subject of propositions. Similarly the results of sexual activity were measured by a production principle, with procreation being the chief purpose of sex. Thus sexual activity not resulting in procreation becomes a perversion. This was why, according to the Marxists, homosexuality, completely free of any intention to procreate, had been treated with such harshness in western society, and the more stable a homosexual relationship might appear to be, the harsher society tended to treat it. In this sense homosexuality could be viewed, as Herbert Marcuse viewed it, as a

challenge to the foundations of bourgeois society. By placing their sexual activity outside of the bounds of the performance principle, homosexuals became a symbol of what had to be repressed, and society had to put them down in order for suppression to prevail. In the past one way to rebel against society was, according to Marcuse's interpretation, to become homosexual, since this was undermining the capitalist bourgeois performance principle.¹⁷

So much for theory. In practice, homosexuals do not fare well in Communist countries. In the Soviet Union, homosexuals have been treated more or less as they were in Nazi Germany, suffering both imprisonment and deportation. Though this "perversion" of the Communist ideal has been blamed upon the distortion of true Communism by Joseph Stalin, the cause seems to go deeper.

Cuban Marxists have proved no more lenient in their treatment of homosexuality than their Soviet brothers and sisters. Though the Cuban medical community no longer classes homosexuality as an illness, and some of the repressive laws of pre-revolutionary Cuba were repealed, homosexuality is in great disfavor. When the Cuban revolutionaries came to power they looked upon homosexuality as an aberration produced under capitalism. The problem was to free later generations of Cubans from this capitalist taint. To this end they decided that future generations of Cubans would be free of homosexuality only if the youth of the country could be kept from having contact with acknowledged homosexuals. In the first stages of the revolution and up to almost the end of the 1960s, thousands of homosexuals were gathered together in special work camps called Military Units to Increase Production (UMAP). Though these camps were finally abolished, the government took measures to make certain that homosexuals were still excluded from any contact with youth. The reasoning was this: Since the revolution was opposed to homosexuality, homosexuals could not be revolutionaries, and since they were not revolutionaries, they could not be trusted, and those who could not be trusted had to be removed from key positions. Thus exposure as a homosexual usually meant purge of the individual.¹⁸

Some of the young Americans who went to Cuba to work in

Library of Moschisano Institute

the late 1960s and early 1970s as part of the youth brigades were openly homosexual, some of them quite active in the gay liberation movements in the United States. These young activists found themselves later denounced for their cultural imperialism, a euphemism for attempting to exercise some consciousness-raising among Cuban homosexuals.¹⁹

As the Cuban revolution became better established among the Cubans some of the hostility to homosexuals lessened. They are no longer held in concentration camps, but in a society where getting ahead depends upon good standing in the Communist Party, homosexuals have not fared very well. Many homosexuals in Cuba classify themselves as *los bajos*, "the underdogs," and known homosexuals are kept from holding positions of responsibility. Since all key positions in Cuba, including that of elementary-school teacher or tour guide, are dependent either upon an individual's standing in the Communist Party or the recommendation of his local Communist "block" leader, there is great difficulty for anyone even suspected of homosexuality. Since the revolution is a collaborative effort and the job of the block leader is to know as much as possible about his or her constituents, any misstep for a closet homosexual can create great personal difficulty. Flagrant homosexuality is simply not tolerated, and a person whose code of sexual morality does not correspond to what is viewed as the sex norms of the revolution is barred from representing the country abroad. Severe penalties are also given to any of those who corrupt the morals of minors or who refuse to conform in other ways. These last are regarded as irredeemable antisocial elements, and all advantages of the Cuban Revolution are denied them.²⁰

Some Marxist critics of society, upset at the treatment of sexual minorities in such states as the Soviet Union and Cuba, have attempted to change things. One of the major efforts to do so was led by Wilhelm Reich, who in the years before the rise of Fascism in Germany came to believe that it had become impossible to organize any movement for sexual liberation within the German Communist Party because its leaders no longer represented the people.²¹ Instead, he argued, they had adopted bourgeois morality. To change matters he organized a movement, Sexual Economy and Politics (*Sexpol*), which saw itself as a group

within the Communist workers' movement. After the Nazis came to power, Reich fled to Denmark, and eventually to the United States, where he became a spokesman for sexual liberation, equating sexual liberation with the liberation of the complex forces oppressing it under capitalism. To him complete sexual equality was a key to human liberty, and to a better society. The failure of the newly liberated worker to espouse demands of sexual freedom was only a continuing example of bourgeois attitudes.²²

Since this is the case, the sex-radical Marxists seem uncertain whether to push for greater sexual freedom or to defer demands for sexual changes until society itself has changed. Many would-be sex radicals have argued that it is impossible to change sexual habits without changing the economic basis of society, and so radical political and economic changes have to come first.²³ This approach has made it difficult for various groups of Marxists to cooperate with American homosexual reform movements, and has alienated some of the American gay organizations from their more radical European counterparts.

Homosexuals have often served as scapegoats in the United States. For example, Senator Joseph McCarthy in the Senate and his counterparts in the House running the House Un-American Activities Committee tended to lump homosexuality, Communism, and subversion in one category. McCarthy, in March 1950, had declared before a Senate subcommittee that homosexuality as well as Communism was an issue, and his success with the issue led Guy George Gabrielson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, to seize upon it as well. Gabrielson claimed that sexual "perverts" had infiltrated the government and were every bit as dangerous as Communists.²⁴

As a result of such statements a special Senate subcommittee was ordered to investigate the problem of homosexuality, and Washington, D.C. police soon announced that 3,500 "sex perverts" held federal jobs.²⁵ One of the leaders of the antihomosexual crusade was Senator Kenneth Wherry (R-Neb.), whose desire was to eliminate every last "pervert" from the federal government. Newspaper columnist Max Lerner of the *New York Post* interviewed Wherry, asking him whether the issue of homo-

sexuals in government was a moral or a security issue. Wherry replied that one could not separate homosexuals from subversives:

Mind you, I don't say every homosexual is a subversive, and I don't say every subversive is a homosexual. But a man of low morality is a menace in the government, whatever he is, and they are all tied up together.²⁶

The result was a long crusade against homosexuals in which many lost their jobs, although exact figures are hard to come by. Officials of the Eisenhower administration, which took office in January 1953, reported that during the first sixteen months, the Civil Service Commission dismissed 655 individuals for "sex perversion."²⁷

Many ambitious local politicians also seized upon the issue. One of the more notorious local examples took place in Boise, Idaho, in 1955, where what had started as a local political smear campaign soon reached epidemic proportions and led to mass arrests and considerable turmoil before some level of political sanity was restored.²⁸

Homosexuality was too potent an issue for an ambitious politician to ignore. Freedom riders of the 1960s as well as antiwar activists of the 1970s were often accused of being homosexuals. And any serious study of sex, let alone homosexuality, made the FBI suspicious.²⁹

Even where homosexuality is not against the law, as in Great Britain, charges of homosexuality can cause political scandal. Perhaps the best illustration of recent British scapegoating is the case of Jeremy Thorpe, the leader of the Liberal Party during the 1960s and early 1970s. It was under Thorpe's leadership that the Liberal Party in 1974 scored its greatest election success in post-World War II Britain. In 1976, Norman Scott, a male model, was charged with welfare fraud. During his trial he said he was being hounded by powerful politicians because he had had homosexual relations with Thorpe sixteen years before. Thorpe denied the charge but in the aftermath resigned his position as head of the party. In 1978 Thorpe was arrested and charged with attempting to plot the murder of Scott because he had feared Scott would make public his (Thorpe's) homo-

sexuality. As of this writing the trial for murder conspiracy has not been held.

As long as homosexuals are looked upon as more or less a despised minority, they will remain victims. Whether Thorpe actually engaged in a plot to murder his accuser is unknown, but it is clear that people believe homosexuality is significant enough to provoke murder. Even where they are legally tolerated, homosexuals often suffer the wrath of a hostile society.

Chapter 8

SCHOOLS AND HOMOSEXUALS

Even otherwise tolerant people shudder at the mention of homosexual teachers. In a sense, fear of homosexual school-teachers today is something akin to the fear that a generation earlier was expressed about Communist school teachers, and the reasons are probably much the same. Parents feared that somehow a Communist teacher might subvert their children through undermining their religious or political ideals, thereby recruiting them into the Communist Party. Similarly a homosexual teacher is feared as someone who will undermine a child's ingrained heterosexuality, and recruit him or her to homosexuality.¹ It is not only in the United States that such fears exist. In Cuba, for example, there are great efforts to control the personal sex life of individual teachers. Most American states have statutes in their educational codes about teachers' morals, one of the purposes of which is to eliminate or remove homosexual school-teachers.

Sexuality of any kind in the schools is a touchy issue. Such concern is inevitable because the school is second only to the family unit in influencing the way children view the world. Kinsey pointed out over three decades ago that people with different educational and occupational levels have different sex behavior, although he was careful to emphasize that the difference between grade-school and college graduates was not a result of the education itself but represented life-styles in different socio-economic classes.² But one of the ways individuals change socio-

economic classes is through education, and it is in the public schools that children are more likely to meet people of different classes and educational standards.

Adding to the problem is that many parents remain fearful about childhood sex. Undoubtedly many remember that some of their own youthful sex play had what Kinsey and others would have called homoerotic connotations, and they fear that a homosexual teacher might well push their child into homosexuality. Of the Kinsey male subjects, for example, more than two-thirds of them recalled sex play with other boys—exhibitionism, exploration, or joint masturbation, and this was more than those who recalled sex play with girls in their preadolescent period. Of Kinsey's female subjects, about the same number of girls recalled homosexual play (33 percent) as recalled heterosexual play (30 percent).³

Parents' anxiety about childhood sexuality has in the past led many of them to join with hysterical political efforts to abolish all sex education in the schools. Pioneering sex education programs in Orange County, California, for example, were eliminated in the 1960s when the John Birch Society successfully managed to equate them with a Communist plot to undermine American morals. The California legislature responded to such fears by requiring parents to give special permission to allow their children to attend sex information classes. Sometimes there is even a refusal to recognize the need for any kind of sex education. For example, one of the major recommendations of the Federal Commission on Obscenity and Pornography in its 1970 final report was the launching of a "massive sex education effort." This recommendation, as well as others, encouraged President Nixon and most of the governmental sponsors to ignore its findings. Similarly the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), established in 1964 to act as a resource for sex education, has been under almost continual attack by right-wing groups as a deliberate attempt to undermine American morals. Since sex education in general has been such a controversial issue, it is understandable why any mention of homosexuality in the schools is a cause for public alarm.

Though California voters rejected the attempt of Senator Briggs and others to outlaw homosexual teachers, anxiety re-

segregated education remained more or less the norm, at least beyond the primary levels. In England, the public schools, which were private boarding schools dating from the late medieval period, continued the tradition of sex segregation and coupled it with isolating the young boys from their families and from contact with females.

From recent studies as well as historical data, we know there were significant numbers of homosexual teachers in the English public schools, and there were several institutional practices within the system which can be interpreted as encouraging homoerotic behavior. For example, in the early nineteenth century, schoolboys of all ages were locked up in dormitories for the night at eight p.m. and no master entered the building until the next morning. What happened to the boys while "out of school" was in fact nobody's business. Sidney Smith, the English critic and editor, in 1810 described the English public schools as a "system of premature debauchery that only prevents men from being corrupted by the world by corrupting them before their entry into the world."⁹

The leader of the reform in the English public-school system was Thomas Arnold, headmaster of Rugby from 1828 to 1842. One of his reforms was the establishment of the prefect system, in which sixth-form (or senior) boys were expected to control the behavior of the younger boys. This use of the prefect was conceived as building up a strong moral influence among the boys from the inside rather than outside.

Closely allied with the prefect system was the practice of "fagging," which existed in the schools before Arnold made his reform but which became a part of his system. Small boys had to carry out tasks for the larger boys—usually such mundane chores as cleaning boots and running errands, but sometimes sexual services seem to have been included as well. It is from the English public-school term "fagging," which originally meant doing something which causes weariness, that we derive one of the slang terms, "fag," used to describe a homosexual.

Such a system allowed many opportunities for homosexual activity and erotic friendships, many of which lasted later into life. The sexual atmosphere by the early twentieth century was described with some sympathy by C. S. Lewis, a conservative

Anglo-Catholic. At his school there were boys known as House Tarts. A Tart was

a pretty and effeminate-looking small boy who acts as a catamite to one or more of his seniors. . . . Though our oligarchy [ruling hierarchy of the school] kept most of the amenities of life to themselves, they were, on this point, liberal; they did not impose chastity on the middle-class boy in addition to all his other disabilities. Pederasty among the lower classes [i.e., lower grades in school] was not "side," or at least not serious side; not like putting one's hands in one's pockets or wearing one's coat unbuttoned. The gods had a sense of proportion.

The Tarts had an important function to play in making school (what it was advertised to be) a preparation for public life. They were not like slaves, for their favors were (nearly always) solicited, not compelled. Nor were they exactly like prostitutes, for the liaison often had some performance and, far from being merely sensual, was highly sentimentalized. Nor were they paid (in hard cash, I mean) for their services; though of course they had all the flattery, unofficial influence, favor and privileges which mistresses of the great have always enjoyed in adult society. This was where the Preparation for Public Life came in. . . . One of my friends shared a study with a minor Tart; and except that he was sometimes turned out of the study when one of the Tart's lovers came in (and that, after all, was only natural) he had nothing to complain of. I was not shocked by these things. For me, at that age, the chief drawback to the whole system was that it bored me considerably. For you will have missed the atmosphere of our House unless you picture the whole place from week's end to week's end buzzing, tittering, hinting, whispering about this subject. After games, gallantry was the principal topic of polite conversation; who had "a case with" whom, whose star was in the ascendant, who had whose photo, who had when and how often and what night and where. . . . I suppose it might be called the Greek Tradition.¹⁰

In looking back, however, Lewis said that he could not look upon pederasty as among the worst evils in his schooling.

There is much hypocrisy on this theme. People commonly talk as if every other evil were more tolerable than this. But why? Because those of us who do not share the vice feel for it a certain nausea, as we do, say, for necrophily? I think that of very little relevance to moral judgment. Because it produces permanent perversion? But there is very little evidence that it does. The Bloods [the athletes and prefects] would have preferred girls to boys if they could have come by them; when, at a later age, girls were obtainable, they probably took them. Is it then on Christian grounds? But how many of those who fulminate on the matter are in fact Christians? And what Christian, in a society so worldly and cruel as that of Wyvern, would pick out the carnal sins for special reprobation. Cruelty is surely more evil than lust and the World at least as dangerous as the Flesh. The real reason for all the pother is, in my opinion, neither Christian nor ethical. We attack this vice not because it is the worst but because it is, by adult standards, the most disreputable and unmentionable, and happens also to be a crime in English law. The World will lead you only to Hell; but sodomy may lead you to jail and create a scandal, and lose you your job. . . .

If those of us who have known a school like Wyvern dared to speak the truth, we should have to say that pederasty, however great an evil in itself, was, in that time and place, the only foothold or cranny left for certain good things. It was the only counterpoise to the social struggle; the one oasis (though green only with weeds and moist only with fetid water) in the burning desert of competitive ambition. In his unnatural love affairs, and perhaps only there, the Blood went a little out of himself, forgot for a few hours that he was One of the Most Important People There Are. It softens the picture. A perversion was the only chink left through which something spontaneous and uncalculating could creep in.

Plato was right after all. Eros, turned upside down, blackened, distorted and filthy, still bore the traces of his divinity.¹¹

Few Americans would probably be as blasé about adolescent homosexuality as Lewis was, but homoeroticism is a strong underlying theme in much of English literature. Among those who wrote on homoerotic themes are Alfred Lord Tennyson, Frederick William Faber, William Cory, John Addington Symonds, Algernon Swinburne, Gerard Manley Hopkins, Edward Carpenter, Walter Pater, Alfred Douglas, A. E. Housman, Aleister Crowley, Oscar Wilde, and many more.¹² In some cases the homoerotic literature of the period can clearly be linked to the school experience. Leigh Hunt in his autobiography wrote about his school days as follows:

But if ever I tasted a disembodied transport on earth, it was in those friendships which I entertained at school, before I dreamt of any maturer feeling. I shall never forget the impression it first made on me. I loved my friend for his gentleness, his candour, his truth, his good repute, his freedom even from my own livelier manner, his calm and reasonable kindness. . . . With other boys I played antics, and rioted in fantastic jests; but in his society, or whenever I thought of him, I fell into a kind of Sabbath state of bliss. . . . I experienced this delightful affection towards three successive schoolfellows, till two of them had for some time gone out into the world and forgotten me. . . .¹³

Theodore Wratishaw wrote "To a Sicilian Boy,"

Love, I adore the contours of thy shape
Thine exquisite breasts and arms adorable;
The wonders of thine heavenly throat compel
Such fire of love as even my dreams escape;
I love thee as the sea-foam loves the cape,
Or as the shore the sea's enchanting spell;
In sweets the blossoms of thy mouth excell
The tenderest bloom of peach or purple grape.¹⁴

Though privately the homoerotic love affairs were remembered and treasured by generations of Englishmen, any threat of public exposure about what went on in the English schools caused almost instant reaction. Oscar Wilde, in essence, was punished for being caught. He was not the only person who was punished, however.

In fact, whenever the English public was forced to face up to the existence of homosexuality in the public schools, it reacted with hostility. There was always an attempt to keep such information quiet, but when adults were involved the retribution was often swift and harsh. Proof of this can be found in Victorian diaries and memoirs, some of which are finally beginning to be published. John Addington Symonds, for example, wrote about many of his homosexual experiences in school in his diary and other private papers which have only recently come to light. When one of Symonds' schoolboy friends told him he was having an affair with his headmaster at Harrow, Dr. Charles John Vaughan, Symonds, himself a homosexual as an adult, expressed disbelief. His friend insisted on the truth of the statement, and Symonds himself saw Dr. Vaughan gently stroke the thigh of his friend as the two were reading in his house. Symonds eventually left Harrow and went on to Oxford, but he continued to brood about Dr. Vaughan, and during a walk with one of his professors at Oxford, to whom he was also attracted, Symonds blurted out the story about Dr. Vaughan. The professor was horrified and urged him to tell his father. The guilt-ridden Symonds did as directed, showing his father extracts of his diary, and a letter (purloined by Symonds) that Dr. Vaughan had written to his friend. Symonds' father acted immediately, corresponding with Vaughan, demanding his resignation. Vaughan and his wife came to see Symonds senior, and Mrs. Vaughan flung herself on her knees, confessing that her husband had "this weakness." She begged Symonds to have mercy upon him because it had never interfered with his service to the school. Others, however, intervened on Symonds' insistence and Vaughan was forced to retire. The affair did not end there, since the sudden retirement of Dr. Vaughan caused some gossip, and Symonds was adamant that Vaughan never be allowed to hold a responsible position again. When, shortly after his resignation, Vaughan was offered the position of Bishop of Rochester, Symonds threatened to expose

him unless he withdrew. Everything, however, was kept quiet and the system at Harrow was left unchanged.¹⁵

When Oscar Wilde was tried and convicted, there was some public talk about homosexuality in the public schools. W. T. Stead, a dissenter and therefore not eligible for the public schools, which were essentially Anglican, complained that Wilde had been unfairly singled out, because if all persons guilty of Oscar Wilde's offenses "were to be clapped into the gaol, there would be a very surprising exodus from Eton and Harrow, Rugby and Winchester."¹⁶ Christopher Sclater Millard, a friend of Wilde's, also argued that if the crown were consistent, it would prosecute "every boy at a public or private school or half the men in the Universities. . . . In the latter places 'poederism' is as common as fornication and everybody knows it."¹⁷

More recently the novelist Desmond McCarthy described the public school homosexual practices of the early twentieth century in a less favorable way:

As time went on it became clear to me that this thing, this abomination in our midst, was next to games and, perhaps for a very few, their studies, the most important element in school life. When I say that, I am including its emotional off-shoots, which were of the most varied nature, grading up from prompt animalism through jokes to gay tenderness even to restless passion and Platonic idealism. Some boys would be made happy for the day by a chance meeting, a few casual words exchanged. Others would discuss chances of seduction with the cynicism and aplomb of a Valmont. Distinction in games, winning colours, might be coveted partly in view of the impression they could be counted upon to make upon "the object."¹⁸

These English practices correspond to behavior described by the sociologist Erving Goffman as front-stage performance vs. backstage.¹⁹ Front-stage performance was characterized by a denial of the existence of any homosexual teachers or practices, while the backstage performance was supportive of such homoerotic practices as fagging and intimate love affairs between adolescents or between male teachers and students. This dis-

crepant picture of the same reality allowed the homosexual teacher to live and work without any significant stigma or punishment until there was a public accusation against him. Then an outraged public, including graduates of the public schools who were aware of the homoerotic backstage performance, turned against the hapless victim with a vengeance. The outrage seems to have been stimulated more by a threat of embarrassment than any real grievance against the accused.

Similar behavior exists in the United States in relationship to sex education, where we know that somehow, backstage, young people learn about sex, yet upstage we do not really like to have such education made public. Similarly Americans have been willing to ignore the obvious, particularly where lesbianism has been concerned. Traditionally in America elementary schools were taught by female teachers who were supposed to be unmarried. Not until the 1940s was the universal prohibition against married women teachers removed, and in some states and districts such a prohibition did not disappear until much later. Any woman teacher who married lost her job when news of it became known, and so we entrusted our children to women who did not marry and whom most of society looked upon as spinsters, asexual beings.

Probably such a stand was part of the assumption that females were nothing without men, but one result of such a practice was to give employment to educated lesbians. In fact, we more or less encouraged lesbian teachers, because a female teacher living alone was suspect not only in small towns but in major cities. It was better to have two women living together. Though little data exist on what percentage of American female teachers were homosexuals, it can be said with some assurance that many lesbians were teachers. In a study of a small lesbian community in the 1920s and '30s reported by Vern and Bonnie Bullough, six of the twenty-five women were then engaged in teaching.²⁰ Similar findings were made by Kinsey, who reported that among older women who had had homosexual experiences and expected to continue them, many were professionally trained women. His careful summary is worth quoting:

Not a few of them were professionally trained women who had been preoccupied with their education or other

matters in the day when social relations with males and marriage might have been available, and who in subsequent years had found homosexual contacts more readily available than heterosexual contacts. The group included women who were in business, sometimes in high positions as business executives, in teaching positions in schools and colleges, in scientific research for large and important corporations, women physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, women in the auxiliary branches of the Armed Forces, writers, artists, actresses, musicians, and women in every other sort of important and less important position in the social organization. For many of these women, heterosexual relations or marriage would have been difficult while they maintained their professional careers. For many of the older women, no sort of socio-sexual contacts would have been available if they had not worked out sexual adjustments with companions with whom they had lived, in some instances for many years.²¹

Not all women who lived together were homosexuals, nor were all who lived alone asexual spinsters; there were, however, significant numbers of homosexual women teachers just as there were significant numbers of women homosexuals in any women's occupation which once discouraged marriage, including nursing, library, and social work.

Though some of the more sophisticated individuals in any community were probably aware of the existence of lesbian schoolteachers, to the average American, or in fact to the average male almost everywhere, it was hard to believe that women could have sexual pleasure without a male partner. Lesbianism was not against the law in most states or countries, and so long as the couples were discreet, nothing was said or done by any school official. Nor did we worry about the lesbian teacher recruiting young girls, even though it was standard for many of the women teachers to *wistfully* state that a girl had such a brilliant mind that it would be a shame to waste it on marriage and family. Those who heard of such advice assumed that the teacher believed a woman who married had to take a subordinate position to her husband, and that a woman who wanted to be herself, to prove herself, had to forsake marriage. Hardly anyone looked

upon this as an invitation for a girl to become a lesbian, which in some cases it undoubtedly was.

Those in the community who concerned themselves about homosexuality in the schools inevitably concentrated on the male teacher. We know that male homosexual teachers existed in American schools, if only because men were often dismissed from their jobs when they were arrested on morals charges involving relationships with other adult homosexuals or with male students. To protect ourselves from homosexual male teachers, we expected all male teachers to be married, although it has long been recognized that marriage was not a guarantee of heterosexuality, nor would it prevent some teachers from being involved with their students, whether male or female.

Probably the lesson to be learned from these Greek, English, and American examples, is not that homosexuality poses dangers in the schools, but that the denial of its existence causes problems. The homosexual teacher who is so fearful of being exposed that it hinders his own intellectual development is less likely to do a good job than the teacher who is not so fearful. Moreover, to deny that homosexuality exists in the schools, as the English publicly did, or perhaps as the Americans unconsciously did, is to invite abuses. Since teachers represent a mix of population derived from various backgrounds, there is no reason to believe that they will not include in their number the same percentage of homosexuals as the general population (4 percent in the male Kinsey study, somewhat less in the female). In fact, homosexuality among schoolteachers might well be declining because proportionately fewer of the women will be homosexuals as other opportunities open up to women and as the teaching profession permits married women teachers.

Most homosexuals are not child molesters, and neither, for that matter, are most heterosexuals. Child molesting, in fact, is regarded as a special form of sexual maladjustment which crosses sex lines. Three to four times as many little girls are molested as little boys. This leaves the problem of recruitment. Will students who study under a teacher whom they know to be homosexual be unduly influenced in their sexual preference? This is a difficult question to answer with any certainty. As far as current research indicates, most homosexuals do not become homosexuals through recruitment, nor does one homosexual experience make a person

a homosexual. Other educational factors are probably much more important in affecting adult sexual preference than a homosexual schoolteacher, including sex-segregated education. Individuals who do not develop a relationship with the other sex and never come to understand its members are going to have greater difficulty with opposite-sex relationships than those who do. Even here it seems that the overwhelming majority of individuals who went to the homoerotically oriented English schools ended up heterosexuals as adults, including many who engaged in youthful homoerotic acts, even becoming "Tarts" as Lewis called them. Few girls who studied under homosexually inclined American schoolteachers became homosexuals.

† Rather than acting against homosexual schoolteachers, the best answer might be to look at underlying causes, including giving children sufficient sex education so that they will not feel guilty about biologically normal sex play. Sex education might also enable an adolescent to make his or her own decision about how his or her life will develop. We know that some adolescents have strong homosexual leanings, and many of these become lost or overwhelmed by their fear of being different, of being alone in the world. One of the more enlightening experiences for any hostile critic of homosexuality is to talk to parents in their community who had children who are gay. Many such parents have banded together as Parents and Friends of Gays, with chapters in many American cities. Though the stories of the parents are quite different, the theme is often the same. All of them had great difficulty in facing up to their children's homosexuality, but once they had accepted it, they began to look at their children's childhood experiences in a different light. Large numbers report that the most trying time for their children was in high school, as the adolescent struggled for a sexual identity. There were in fact almost no role models for such young people. Obviously a gay teacher or counselor or administrator could help in such situations, and it is probably these students whom in the past we have looked upon as being recruited. The fact that the gay teacher or counselor or administrator is a role model gives an added sense of responsibility to them, perhaps leading to more caution.

At the present time, there is little evidence to show that the openly "gay" teacher would make other students gay, and most

evidence indicates that there is little for parents to fear from such a teacher. The criterion for selection of teachers should not be sexual preference but teaching ability. Parents should also not be overly concerned with homoerotic play among their children, since it is not the play which is abnormal but the parents' reaction, which might be traumatic.

If we were greatly concerned with preadolescent and adolescent homosexual sex play, we would do away with sex-segregated schools and sex-segregated activities, and the result would probably be more heterosexual activity. But perhaps American adult society is concerned not so much specifically with homoerotic play among children and adolescents as with sex itself.

Chapter 9

LESBIANISM

We have in this book occasionally mentioned female homosexuality, but much of the specific information has been more about males. The chief reason for this is that almost all of our historical information—religious, legal, literary, or political—is male-centered, written by men for other men. We do not know how most women in the past saw themselves, since almost all we know about them comes from the writing of men. It is only in recent times that women have begun to leave records of themselves as individuals.

Occasionally a woman has managed to break into the pages of history, but the total number is not very large. Men have been generals, kings, writers, composers, thinkers, and doers; women have been wives, mistresses, companions, friends, and helpmates. The very word "woman," in fact, emphasizes this passive, obscure position. It derives from the Anglo-Saxon *wifman*, literally "wife-man," and the implication seems to be that there was no such thing as a woman separate from wifhood. As individuals, with only a few scattered exceptions, women did not count. They were mothers, wives, daughters, sisters; proper, respectful, and forgotten.¹ This helps explain why lesbians have been in the forefront of agitation for women's rights rather than for gay rights. Lesbians have suffered more discrimination because they are women than because they are homosexuals.

Historically, there is less hostility to lesbianism than to male homosexuality. There is often an astonishment that women could do anything together without a man, that sex could take place without penetration. When males in the past did become conscious of the existence of female homosexual couples, such rela-

tionships were not taken seriously. Lesbians were sometimes pitied because they could not catch a real man, and it was often assumed that all a lesbian really needed was a good "screwing" by a "real" man to be cured.

This attitude places female homosexuals in a somewhat different position from their male counterparts. Generally, lesbianism has not been illegal, and society has been tolerant of women living together or traveling in groups. Until recently, in fact, no proper woman would be seen alone on the street without a male escort or another woman. Two unmarried women living together were looked upon as fitting and proper, while a woman living alone was the object of suspicion. But even if society was more tolerant of lesbian couples, the lesbian still faced unique difficulties.

One of the major difficulties that any woman faced—lesbian, heterosexual, or asexual—was finding a way to support herself. Work outside the home, until almost the twentieth-century, was man's work, and in western society women legally were always under the control of some man—father, husband, brother, son. Women have also been in short supply throughout much of history,² and society demanded that they be married. In the past women who wanted to be nuns always had to overcome more obstacles than men who wanted to become monks, simply because society did not want to remove too many women from their "natural" function of childbearing. Moreover, to participate in the sexual act it is not absolutely essential that a woman herself be aroused, and though she might well have been homoerotic in orientation, it was a wifely duty to submit to her husband. This has meant that most lesbians have been married, probably most of them mothers, and only rarely were they exclusively homosexual.

As some of the economic barriers to women's independence dropped in the nineteenth century, it became possible for more women to become exclusively homosexual, and the so-called women's professions—teaching, nursing, social work, librarianship, and others—included a significant number of lesbians in leadership positions. This was not because these professions initially attracted more lesbians than other female occupations did, but because they were regarded as occupations for unmarried

women. The overwhelming majority of women who entered these occupations married and either dropped out or made their occupational role secondary to that of their domestic role. Thus leadership fell to the woman who never married, often a lesbian.

The Bible is typical among historical sources in its male-oriented treatment of homosexuality. There is only one possible reference to lesbian practices in the Bible, by St. Paul, and it is ambiguous:

For this cause God gave them up into vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of women, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.³

Though it is clear that the males referred to are engaging in homosexual practices, no such clarity exists about the women, and it might well have been St. Paul's purpose to illustrate the moral corruption of the heathens by showing how their women encouraged heterosexual perversion through abnormal coital positions.

Some have interpreted the story of Ruth and Naomi to be an idealized homoerotic relationship,⁴ but this is clearly debatable. It is, however, at least worthy of comment that even today we view their relationship as ideal for lovers, as is evident from the incorporation of part of the passage describing Ruth's devotion to Naomi in the marriage ceremony:

Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and whither thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God. Where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried: the Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me.⁵

The term "lesbianism," as indicated earlier, came from the island of Lesbos, where the homosexual poet Sappho was born.

Female homosexuals have also been called "sapphic" or "sapphist" after her. The word "tribade," borrowed from a Greek word meaning "rubbing together," is a third term which generally appears in references to female-homosexuality. Male writers were often intrigued by lesbianism, and there are not infrequent references to it. In Roman times, for example, the poet Martial devoted an epigram to the lesbian Bassa, who had never been intimate with men, but who was always surrounded by women. He implied that, though she lacked a penis, her "cunnus" was able to satisfy another woman. He stated she had become a prodigy worthy of the Theban riddle, because "here, where no man is, there was adultery."⁶ He also mentioned the lesbian Philaenis, who believed that to "lick a 'cunnum'" was desirable.⁷ Juvenal's sixth satire includes lesbian incidents,⁸ and there are several incidents in Lucian's *Dialogues of Courtesans*,⁹ as well as others.

In fact, the greatest number of references to lesbianism occur in pornographic writings designed for male consumption, and many houses of prostitution in the past put on "lesbian" shows. The anonymous author of *My Secret Life*, printed during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, recounts his anticipatory enjoyment in observing women engaged in "flat" intercourse with each other, seemingly content in the belief that he could do things better. In fact, he seemed to regard the lesbian incidents as preparatory to his own sexual satisfaction.¹⁰ Nineteenth-century pornography is filled with incidents of lesbian lovemaking prior to heterosexual coupling. Lesbians are also pictured in much of the flogging and bondage literature of the time.¹¹ Two such works are *Miss High Heels* and *Gynecocracy*, where strong-willed lesbian-oriented women get their revenge on youthful males by transforming them into women, forcing them to wear corsets, punishing them with whips and birch rods, and making them perform a woman's every demand. As the protagonist of *Gynecocracy* stated: "This world is woman's earth, and it is petticoated all over. Theirs is the dominion, turn and twist the matter as you will."¹²

Because the lesbian has been featured so frequently in writings about prostitution, much of which also involved bondage, and because lesbian sex acts were also featured in many brothels, some modern psychoanalytic writers have claimed that all prostitutes

have homosexual leanings.¹³ The difficulty with this assertion is that it ignores several historical and social factors in prostitution. The most important is the economic factor, since until the women's professions developed in the late nineteenth century often the only way any unmarried woman could earn a living was as a prostitute. Also important is the fact that male patrons of houses of prostitution both desired and demanded sex shows in which women engaged in sexual acts with each other for their voyeuristic satisfaction. This means that women willing to engage in same-sex activities were encouraged and tolerated in houses of prostitution. A third factor is the simple fact that prostitutes in the larger brothels of the past were discouraged from establishing relationships with men outside of business hours. This meant that many prostitutes turned to their sisters for support and comfort, and as among prisoners in a jail, same-sex relationships occurred. There is probably as much basis in equating lesbianism with prostitution as in equating psychiatry with homosexuality.¹⁴

The male attitude, however, remained ambiguous, and this is best indicated by the legal history of lesbianism. Though two women who allegedly engaged in lesbian activities in Plymouth Colony in 1649 were charged with lewd conduct, and one of them was found guilty,¹⁵ this seems to have been the only prosecution in American history for lesbian activities.¹⁶ The same lack of prosecutorial zeal can be noted in England. In fact, in 1885 when the Criminal Law Amendment Act was passed to provide more effective prosecution for involuntary prostitution, lesbianism was ignored. Finally in 1921 there was an attempt to extend the law to include "gross indecency between female persons," but this was defeated in the House of Lords. Some of the arguments advanced to defeat the bill underline male beliefs about women. The leader of the successful movement to oppose the enactment of an anti-lesbian law was the Earl of Malmesbury, who argued that defeat of the law was essential because women were "entirely different" from men.

Women are by nature much more gregarious. For instance, if twenty women were going to live in a house with twenty bedrooms, I do not believe that all the twenty bedrooms would be occupied, either for reasons of fear or

nervousness, and the desire of mutual protection. On the other hand, I know that when men take shooting boxes, the first inquiry is that each shall have a room to himself, if possible.

The Lord Chancellor, Lord Birkenhead, added that most women had never heard of lesbianism or believed it existed, and if such a law were passed, women would be shocked to find out about this "sordid" side of sex. He added that all over the country where women

in all innocence, and very often as a necessary consequence of the shortage of small houses . . . have to sleep together in the same beds, the taint of this noxious and horrible suspicion is to be imparted, and to be imparted by the legislature itself, without one scintilla of evidence that there is any widespread practice of this kind of vice.¹⁷

With such impassioned defenses of female virtues, the law failed to pass.

Though lesbian women appeared in fiction in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, writers of such works had to obey custom, and in no cases were they specific. Such creative writers as Christina Rossetti (*Goblin Market*), Algernon Charles Swinburne (*Anactoria*, *Sapphics*, *Lesbia Brandon*), Thomas Hardy (*Desperate Remedies*), Olive Schreiner (*Story of an African Farm*), Théophile Gautier (*Mlle de Maupin*), Honoré de Balzac (*The Girl with the Golden Eyes*), Émile Zola (*Nana*), Pierre Louys (*Chansons de Bilitis* and *Aphrodite*) included characters who were lesbians or descriptions of lesbianism. Sometimes lesbianism was used symbolically, as by Charles Baudelaire for his own ideology of decadence. Inevitably, however, most of the literary portrayals of lesbianism were distortions of reality.

History records a few lesbian couples, giving us insight into both the economic difficulties of being lesbian and the bemused public tolerance and naiveté about such couples. Among the most famous lesbian couples in history were the two women known as the Ladies of Llangollen, Lady Eleanor Butler (d. 1829) and Sarah Posonby (d. 1831), both members of Irish noble families. The two women became attached to each other as students, and

though their families prohibited them from seeing each other, they managed to carry on an affair through the connivance of Sarah's servant, Mary Caryll, also known as Molly the Bruiser. Eventually the families bowed to the inevitable and gave both women a small allowance, provided they left Ireland. The two settled in Llangollen, Wales, with Mary as their servant, and they established a sort of literary haven visited by the great and near-great of the time. Though comparatively poor (for members of the aristocratic class), they suffered little public ostracism in either their local community or the world at large.¹⁹ Probably most people looked upon the two as just spinsters, unable to get husbands, who had established a Platonic friendship.

Occasionally, references to lesbian relationships survive only incidentally. Bertrand Russell, the English mathematician and philosopher, and his American wife, Alys Smith, visited some of Alys' relatives in the United States in 1896, including a cousin, M. Carey Thomas, the president of Bryn Mawr. In his autobiography Russell recounted how Ms. Thomas had a profound contempt for the male sex, and hinted at her lesbianism.

She lived with a friend, Miss Gwinn, who was in most respects the opposite of her. Miss Gwinn had very little will-power, was soft and lazy, but had a genuine though narrow feeling for literature. They had been friends from early youth, and had gone together to Germany to get the Ph.D. degree, which, however, only Carey had succeeded in getting. At the time we stayed with them, their friendship had become a little ragged. Miss Gwinn used to go home to her family for three days in every fortnight, and at the exact moment of her departure each fortnight, another lady, named Miss Garrett, used to arrive, to depart again at the exact moment of Miss Gwinn's return. Miss Gwinn, meantime, had fallen in love with a very brilliant young man, named Hodder, who was teaching at Bryn Mawr. This roused Carey to fury, and every night, as we were going to bed, we used to hear her angry voice scolding Miss Gwinn in the next room for hours together. . . .²⁰

Gertrude Stein, a lesbian herself, re-created the Thomas-Gwinn-Hodder affair in fictional form in one of her early novels, *Fern-*

hurst, written in about 1904 although not published until 1971.²¹

A book by Radclyffe Hall (d. 1943), *The Well of Loneliness*, published in 1928, brought lesbianism to public attention more than any other novel. The original edition of the book had an introduction by Havelock Ellis, who regarded it as the first English novel to present lesbianism in faithful and uncompromising form.²² In spite of the support of Ellis, and in spite of the concession to public sentiment in having Stephen Gordon, the key lesbian figure, give up her lover, Mary, to a man, it created a literary scandal. One reviewer, James Douglas, attacked the novel as a sensational piece of special pleading designed to display perverted decadence, and his review was followed by demands that the book be withdrawn.²³ On the advice of the Home Secretary, the publishers withdrew the book from the English market, although it continued to be published in Paris and the United States. To prevent its further dissemination, a prosecution was mounted, and in a public trial the book was found obscene as well as dangerous and corrupting, all of which helped publicize lesbianism. The real difficulty with the novel was that the lesbians were pictured as more or less healthy people leading more or less normal lives. Since Radclyffe Hall herself was a lesbian, a longtime companion and friend of Una, Lady Troubridge, her picture of lesbian relationship has been regarded as more or less accurate.²⁴ That it was in part the favorable portrayal of lesbian life that got the book in trouble is indicated by the fact that Compton MacKenzie's satire on lesbian love, *Extraordinary Women*,²⁵ published in the same year, never came under the same kind of attack. Neither did Virginia Woolf's *Orlando*, but here this may be the result of other complications: the hero starts out as a boy of sixteen in the sixteenth century and after a long trance awakens as a woman in the eighteenth century and lives into the twentieth century, where she finally marries a man with a woman's heart while she is a woman who is as independent and outspoken as a man.²⁶

The effect of *The Well of Loneliness* on individual lesbians undoubtedly varied, but members of one group of lesbians in Salt Lake City in the early '30s decried its publication. One member complained that the novel has caused people who had never before heard of lesbianism to try to classify every woman who wore a suit (with a skirt) and was seen more than once in the

company of another woman as a lesbian. The group as a whole also feared that such fictional works put lesbianism in the wrong light, if it did not do actual harm to their cause.²⁷

The long-range effect of the publicity given Radclyffe Hall's novel was to bring female homosexuality out of the closet, where it had been more deeply hidden than male homosexuality. Once lesbianism came out in the open, it was realized that a number of important women had been lesbian, and lesbians could be as well adjusted as heterosexuals. Though psychoanalytic theory held that homosexuals should be unhappy, lonely, and guilt-ridden (and undoubtedly some homosexuals have displayed all of these symptoms) most lesbians did not find this an apt description of themselves. In the Salt Lake City lesbian community in the '20s and '30s, the women, except for their sex preference, seemed remarkably well adjusted to society.²⁸ If anything, they were more conservative than the average woman, more hostile to those who noticeably deviated from social norms. Their respectability was extremely important to them. Similar studies have recently verified this lesbian adjustment to society, and lesbians turn out to be not remarkably different from other women.²⁹

Some of the most creative and prominent women have been lesbians, perhaps because the burden of marriage and child care has handicapped women in the past from fully expressing themselves. Lillian Wald, the nurse who founded the Henry Street Settlement and contributed to the establishment of both social work and public-health nursing, was a lesbian. A list of lesbian women writers would include such names as Gertrude Stein, Willa Cather, Vita Sackville-West, Ivy Compton-Burnett, Colette, Violette Leduc, Margaret Anderson (the sponsor of James Joyce), May Sarton, Virginia Woolf, and Kate Millett, and the list could be extended much further.³⁰

Some of these women have seemed ambiguous about their talents. May Sarton, for example, has one of her heroines state, "I think I would have liked to be a woman, simple and fruitful, a woman with many children, a great husband . . . and no talent."³¹ Jane Rule has pointed out that to present the creative woman as a genetic freak is both romantic and self-protective, for it is an explanation which may forgive her all those indulgences in temperament, self-absorption, pride, and lust—indulgences which in this culture are exclusively male.

Women, and only women, are supposed to grow up, which means women must set aside a sense of themselves as unique persons, dreams of personal greatness, of self-fulfillment, and to get on with creating that sort of space for men and children. Talent, disguised (thinly) as something of a clubfoot, may be more palatable and pitiable than the self-assertive arrogance which is part of the make-up of any person who chooses to develop her own gift rather than foster it in others, who wants to be recognized rather than recognizing.³²

This has given the woman homosexual a somewhat ambiguous status in the gay movement. ~~Because women have not suffered the same kind of discrimination and hostility that the males have, they have not felt the need to join with the males in the gay liberation movement; yet at the same time, they have suffered an equally invidious discrimination, handicapped simply because they are women.~~ This has led many female homosexuals to join the women's movement, and to be advocates of greater equality between the sexes, since this is at the base of their inferior status. At the same time, some joined the gay movement, where they found, at least until the women's movement made some of the male gays more conscious, that they were relegated to traditional feminine tasks of preparing tea, serving their brother gays, and then washing the cups. ~~Sometimes, in fact, male homosexuals showed great insensitivity to females. E. M. Forster, the English novelist whose homosexual novel *Maurice* was not published until after his death in 1971, admitted to Virginia Woolf that he found lesbians disgusting; he could not think of women living independent of men, even though he himself had no interest in women.~~³³ It was for these reasons that the Daughters of Bilitis was organized in 1955 by Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon and began publishing the *Ladder* soon after. Del Martin summed up the women's view at the Mattachine convention in Denver in 1959:

At every one of these conventions I attend, year after year, I must defend the Daughters of Bilitis as a separate and distinct women's organization. First of all, what do you know about Lesbians? In all of your programs and your "[Mattachine] Review," you speak of the male homosex-

ual and follow this with—oh, yes, and incidentally there are some female homosexuals, too, and because they are homosexual all this should apply to them as well. *One* [Magazine] has done little better. For years they have relegated the Lesbian interest to the column called "Feminine Viewpoint." So it would appear to me that quite obviously neither organization has recognized the fact that Lesbians are *women* and that this twentieth century is the era of emancipation of women. Lesbians are not satisfied to be auxiliary members or second-class homosexuals. So if you people do wish to put DOB out of business, you are going to have to learn something about the Lesbian. . . .³⁴

~~Though we tend to lump all homosexuals together, male homosexuals are different from female ones, and though they suffer some of the same discrimination and hostility, each has to confront these in different ways. Lesbians have different bars and hangouts from those of male homosexuals, and traditionally, perhaps because the public has been less conscious of them, have been able to live more unobtrusively. Lesbians also have different problems. For example, lesbians often have been married and had children before they realize or are willing to accept their lesbian identity.~~ When they leave the marital bed and move in with a female companion, they find that their children are taken away from them. Lesbianism does not make a woman any less or more likely to want to keep her children than a heterosexual woman is, and to arbitrarily take children from her is an indication of great prejudice. Some of the same discrimination exists for male homosexual fathers, but the discrimination here is often not because they are gay but because of traditional societal attitudes toward motherhood.

Though both male and female homosexuals have benefited from the growing gay liberation movement, the female homosexuals have benefited as much, if not more, from the women's liberation movement, and the lesbian today remains somewhat ambiguous about where to concentrate her energies.

Chapter 10

CROSS-DRESSING: TRANSVESTISM, TRANSSEXUALISM, AND HOMOSEXUALITY

Most associated in the public mind with male homosexuality is the "drag queen," a male dressed up in women's clothing and impersonating a woman. In fact, a significant number of Americans find it hard to believe that there are homosexuals who are not drag queens. Similarly, associated with female homosexuality is the "dyke," dressing and acting as a man and being loud, boisterous, and aggressive.

Both terms have been used for generations. The term "drag" is derived from the stage and refers to the drag of the long dresses which male actors wore when they played women's parts. Similarly the term "dike" or "dyke" was a euphemism for "toilet" in the nineteenth century; the woman who was a dyke allegedly went to the toilet like a man—i.e., standing up. Both imply an impersonation of the opposite sex, and while impersonation traditionally has been associated with homosexuality, it is not descriptive of most homosexuals.

Drag (including the masculine costume of the dyke) traditionally has served a purpose. It has allowed people to proclaim their roles, to seek or be sought by partners who are themselves homosexuals. Some homosexual prostitutes solicit in drag, and some lesbians go "cruising"—hunting for a partner—in their dyke outfits. Probably such a costume served a useful purpose, since one

of the major difficulties that many gays had was in finding a partner. Dressing and acting the part of the opposite sex was one means of advertising.

But costumes associated with drag, particularly at festive occasions such as the gay balls, serve also another purpose. A perceptive observer of the gay ball, Donald Webster Cory (Edward Sagarin), wrote:

I cannot help but feel that the wearing of the clothes of the opposite sex . . . is but a very small part of the appeal of such affairs. The gay folk do not go for the thrill and adventure, nor are they seeking new friends. I do not believe they are primarily motivated by a need to exhibit themselves. In the main, what attracts them to the drag is the feeling that they will be among many of their own kind. Here they are known, liked, and accepted for what they are. It is a masquerade, ironically enough, where one goes to discard the mask.¹

It is equally ironic that the gay drag ball has usually been tolerated by society, while homosexuality has been condemned. The gay ball has been a way in which a society which has publicly been intolerant of homosexuality indicates that it recognizes that homosexuality exists. In fact, society often cooperates by assigning police and detectives to oversee the drag ball, and in the past often ignored laws against cross-dressing. For homosexuals, most of whom were essentially uninterested in drag, and not a few of whom are openly hostile to it, the drag balls became a way of breaking down the veils of secrecy and bringing homosexuality into the open.

Until the last few decades most of the famous drag balls in the United States took place in the black ghettos, even though the participants were not themselves black. Evidently one discriminated-against group, the blacks, were more tolerant of other minority groups. Just as the homosexuals were able to relax and be among friends, so could the blacks relax, and in many parts of the country, in fact, it was one of the few occasions on which blacks and whites could mix socially. Moreover since blacks were regarded as inferior to whites by large segments of the American population, police allowed events to take place there which would

not be permitted elsewhere. In 1893, C. H. Hughes, a St. Louis specialist in nervous and mental diseases, published a brief description in a medical journal about such an event:

I am credibly informed that there is, in the city of Washington, D.C., an annual convocation of negro men called the drag dance, which is an orgie of lascivious debauchery beyond pen power of description. I am likewise informed that a similar organization is lately suppressed by the police of New York City. In this sable performance of sexual perversion, all of these men are lasciviously dressed in womanly attire, short sleeves, low-necked dresses and the usual ballroom decoration and ornaments of women, feathered and ribboned head-dresses, garters, frills, flowers, ruffles, etc., and deport themselves as women. Standing or seated on a pedestal, but accessible to all the rest, is the naked queen (a male), whose phallic member, decorated with a ribbon, is subject to the gaze and osculations in turn, of all the members of this lecherous gang of sexual perverts and phallic fornicators.

Among those who annually assemble in this strange libidinous display are cooks, barbers, waiters, and other employees of Washington families, some even higher in the social scale—some being employed as subordinates in the Government departments.²

Interestingly, in Hughes' own city there were drag balls as well, although it took Hughes a long time to discover them. When he did, he found that not only blacks attended but whites as well. In 1907 the same Hughes reported:

Male negroes masquerading in woman's garb and carousing and dancing with white men is the latest St. Louis record of neurotic and psychopathic sexual perversion. Some of them drove to the levee dive and dance hall at which they were arrested in their masters' cars. All were gowned as women at the miscegenation dance and the negroes called each other feminine names. They were all arrested . . . and freed on bonds put up by whites. The

detectives say that the levee resort at which these black perverts were arrested is a rendezvous for scores of West End butlers, cooks, and chauffeurs. Apartments in the house are handsomely furnished and white men are met there. The names of the negro perverts, their feminine aliases and addresses appear in the press notices of their arrest, but the names of the white degenerates consorting with them are not given.³

Hughes' racial prejudice was as strong as his prejudice against homosexuality, and it was probably racial prejudice as much as anything else that led to the arrests at the 1907 ball.

Cross-dressing was long associated with the stage, since until the seventeenth century women's parts were played by men in Europe, and in much of the rest of the world. It was a widespread belief that no honorable woman would expose herself publicly as an actress was required to do, and even after women began to act in plays, the words "actress" and "prostitute" remained more or less synonymous for a long time. Many of the *castrati* roles in opera involve impersonation and mistaken identity and are today played by women rather than castrated men. Even when women assumed their place on the stage, the male in drag remained popular. George Holland, who played Ophelia in a travesty of *Hamlet* in 1838, has been called the forerunner of what might be styled "legitimate burlesque" in the United States (as distinguished from striptease burlesque). Others soon followed his lead, and playing women became a standard part of many men's repertoires. Some of the burlesque players, such as Julian Eltinge, became more or less serious actors and played women's parts on the stage. Many of the male colleges also took great pleasure in putting on all-male shows in which college boys parodied and burlesqued women much the same way that they also often put on blackface shows to parody and burlesque blacks. Through such shows many closet homosexuals were first able to express themselves, and that perhaps is why even today one of the standbys of many of the homosexually oriented night-clubs is either an act or an entire show in drag.

Cross-dressing, however, is not necessarily restricted to homosexuality, and not everyone who cross-dresses is gay. As research into sex has progressed we have begun to realize that the group

labeling which once was so much a part of our conception of homosexuality was invalid. Homosexuals differ among themselves as much as heterosexuals do. Within the heterosexual spectrum there are also cross-dressers, just as there are among homosexuals. There are other individuals who fit into neither category and whom we have labeled today as transsexuals, individuals who want to change their sex.

Because of recent research there is a growing tendency to try to define sexual development into at least three components: (1) sex identity (how one perceives oneself); (2) sex preference (what kind of person one would prefer to have sex with); and (3) gender identity, also known as sex role (how one conceptualizes one's role in society). Homosexuality is a matter of sex preference, while cross-dressing could be involved with either sex or gender identity, and be heterosexual or homosexual.

Whenever a woman seems to be particularly aggressive in American society, she is likely to be described as being masculine, as attempting to play a man's role. Conversely, if a man tends to act tenderly, he will be labeled as effeminate. On the whole, our society has tolerated the masculine woman better than the feminine man, perhaps because the male usually has been looked upon as the more important sex.⁴ Thus, we accept it as natural for women to try to achieve status by becoming more masculine, provided that they do not overdo it, and this probably helps explain our greater toleration for lesbianism! Conversely, a male who shows a "feminine" side is losing status, and thereby is deserving of derision. If either sex trespasses too far into the role of the other the individual in question is in for a difficult time.

This strict dichotomy of sexual roles is easily illustrated by an examination of the dictionary definitions of masculinity and femininity. Almost every dictionary equates masculinity with virility, robustness, strength, and vigor, while femininity is defined in terms of tenderness, softness, pliability, and receptivity. Inherent to such stereotypes is the belief that sexual behavior and sexual attitudes are genetically determined and that once a person is found to be male or female there is only one possible kind of behavior.

Do the obvious biological differences between men and women necessarily preclude women from becoming truck drivers or men

from doing needlepoint? Clearly the answer, when the question is put in such terms, is no, and vast numbers of tasks which we define as masculine or feminine are culturally, not biologically, defined. Moreover, cultures do not agree upon those tasks that are male and those that are female. A woman who is aggressive is no less female than a woman who is passive, while a man who is tender and loving is no less male than a man who is rough and hostile. It is essential to distinguish biological sex—that is, the biological condition of being male or female—from gender, the conduct and self-identity associated with masculinity and femininity. Most individuals of both sexes have both "masculine" and "feminine" qualities.

Such gender identity starts with the knowledge and awareness of sexual differences long before the infant is conscious that such differences exist. This is because society has felt it important to label infants as boys or girls and to dress and treat them differently. In our society, boy babies are dressed in blue and girls in pink, although the colors themselves are not necessarily feminine or masculine, and other countries dress them in opposite colors. There is even research which demonstrates that mothers and fathers hold boy babies differently from girl babies. Boys are given toy cars and animals to play with, while girls are given dolls. Parents, however, vary, and growing up is still an unpredictable and unexplainable process. Gender identity itself is complicated by the fact that a person can visualize himself in a number of different gender roles, some of which society classifies as abnormal or deviant. Thus a man could visualize himself as any one of a number of different kinds of men—an aggressive man, a gentle man, an effeminate man—or even fantasize himself as a woman. On the other hand, a woman could have a self-image as a gentle and submissive woman, as a determined woman, as a "manly" woman, or even as a man. Gender identity affects the person's overt behavior. Usually in most people biological sex, sex identity, gender identity, sex preference are synonymous or compatible; they conform to what the public stereotypes say is normal. In others, they are at variance, and this variance is believed by some to be a possible cause of homosexuality, transvestism, or transsexualism.⁵ It is possible to be a heterosexual male and yet at the same time engage in cross-dressing, often going so far as to try to pass in public as a

contented in the assigned sex and gender role—to be a man's man or an ultrafeminine woman. The need and desire to dress as the opposite sex is not necessarily an indication of homosexuality, and it is particularly important that parents and various kinds of counseling professionals come to realize the wide variation possible.

One of the first efforts to define cross-dressing was by the German sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld, who in 1910 used the term "transvestism" to describe the phenomenon.⁶ At about the same time Havelock Ellis was coining the term "eonism" to describe the same phenomenon.⁷ Ellis based his term on a historical figure, the Chevalier d'Eon de Beaumont, but the difficulty with naming a condition after a historical individual is that his case is not necessarily typical of all others, and probably for this reason Hirschfeld's literal description has become standard. Since Ellis did use the chevalier as a model, however, it is important to look at him as a person even though there is doubt whether he gained any erotic satisfaction from cross-dressing or whether he really desired to cross-dress. It is also possible he was a pseudohermaphrodite. Charles-Genevieve-Louis-Auguste-André-Timothée d'Eon de Beaumont (1728–1810) worked in the government of King Louis XV of France, and for a time he served in the French secret service. In 1763 he was attached to the French embassy in London to help negotiate the treaty which ended the Seven Years War. During his stay in England he became involved in a bitter and disastrous quarrel with the French ambassador that allegedly led to attempts on his life as well as harassment of his widowed mother in France. In an attempt to discredit d'Eon, the French ambassador ridiculed him and publicly questioned his masculinity. D'Eon retaliated by threatening to publish secret correspondence dealing with French wartime plans. This threat, undoubtedly made in anger, threw the whole weight of the French bureaucracy against him, so much so that he was fearful of being accused of treason. D'Eon began to look for ways to get back into the good graces of the king.

The French ambassador's charge that he was a hermaphrodite provided an avenue of escape. Once the charge had been made, the English began laying bets about his sex. Since the chevalier was short and plump, had a soft and pleasing voice, lacked a

escalated. He even had to fight off efforts to kidnap him to determine his true sex. During the debate, the chevalier became convinced that if he said he was a woman the king would forgive him. Then, once back in France, he could reveal his true sex to the king, and the king and he would have a good laugh and everything would be forgiven. He turned to a fellow Frenchman, Caron de Beaumarchais, who later became famous for his play *The Marriage of Figaro*, for help. Beaumarchais, after betting some money of his own on the chevalier, had him announce that he was female, and negotiated with the king of France to have him return to France as a woman. Over 100,000 £ changed hands over d'Eon's assumption of female dress, but his plans to return to a male role in France went awry when the French king, innocent of the plot, insisted he remain in women's clothing. In turn the king offered him a pension for so doing. Just before the outbreak of the French Revolution, d'Eon returned to England to clear up some business, and he remained in England until he died in 1810, when it was found he was a male. A cast taken of his body at death showed a rather plump bosom and rounded limbs; his hands, fingers, and feet were small and feminine. Other than his sex organs, his most masculine feature was his strong and muscular forearms. Though it does not matter in the long run whether d'Eon was a transvestite or a hermaphrodite, his station in life and his abrupt change of clothing in later life made him the subject of numerous stories, many of them pure fabrications, and some continue to circulate today in the psychiatric literature.⁸

Transsexualism is a phenomenon that has been recognized and described even more recently than transvestism. Harry Benjamin believed he had coined the word in a 1953 lecture at the New York Academy of Medicine, but he was later found to be in error, since D. O. Cauldwell had used the term "psychopathia transexualis" in 1949 in an article in *Sexology* describing the case of a girl who wanted to be a boy.⁹ Transsexualism came to public attention in 1953 through the case of Christine Jorgensen, an ex-GI who underwent surgery in Denmark to become a woman.¹⁰ Christine Jorgensen, however, was not the first person to change sex. An earlier case which achieved some notoriety in the 1920s was that of the Danish painter Einar Wagener, who

became known as Lili Elbe. Elbe had been married to a woman before the operation, and was planning to marry again after surgery, this time to a man, but she died of a cardiac condition.¹¹ Since no official record of the Elbe case has been published, it is possible that this case of transsexualism might have been related to some hermaphroditic abnormality. In fact, many of the surgical techniques that have made sex change possible were developed as a result of initial efforts to correct hermaphroditic conditions, a fairly common birth defect. One of the results is incomplete or duplicate sets of sex organs, and every variation in between. As a result infants are often misassigned to the wrong genetic sex or even though correctly assigned have many features of the opposite sex. Techniques for surgical correction used for some hermaphrodites were even further refined during World War II and succeeding wars when surgeons were called upon to deal with wounds affecting genitalia.

If a transvestite is defined as a person who wants to dress and adopt other aspects of the role of the opposite sex, a transsexual is a person who feels that he or she belongs to a sex different from his or her biologic sex. They want to remove the external evidence of this "wrongful" sex, such as genitalia or mammary glands which continually remind them that they belong to the "wrong" sex. Most want to become as biologically female or male as they possibly can, although not all those undergoing surgery in recent years would fit into such categorical absolutes. This is because once transsexual operations became possible, a number of males and females underwent the operation without thinking through their own problems of gender identity. Many professional female impersonators, significant numbers of whom are homosexual,¹² have found it helpful in their profession to go through a body transformation,¹³ giving them the contours of a woman, although their desire to live as women seems to be rather weak. Many of these newly made women have become prostitutes after the operation. A few express a desire to be known only as simulated women rather than real women, since most of their sexual mates are homosexual men.

There are today large numbers of men who regard themselves as heterosexuals but who dress and act as women occasionally or even always. Virginia Prince, the editor of *Transvestia*, is a good example. These might be called heterosexual transvestites, al-

though they have also been called femiphiles because of their love of the feminine. In the one major scholarly study of such men, a sample of 504, 69 percent regarded themselves as males who were seeking to express what they regarded as the feminine side of their nature. Seventy-eight percent of the sample were currently married or had previously been married, and most of the wives were aware of their husbands' cross-dressing activity. Cross-dressing was often associated with heterosexual activity, and many of the men questioned like to wear something feminine during intercourse,¹⁴ an indication of the erotic component of cross-dressing. What appears in many of the autobiographies of these transvestites¹⁵ is the feeling that as males they cannot express their feminine side. A large majority indicate that they regard themselves as a different personality when dressed up. There are few women heterosexual transvestites today, since traditionally women have been allowed more freedom in their choice of clothing. Also, for a woman to try to imitate men was considered more or less permissible because men had a higher status. Conversely, for men to imitate women was to lose status, and though this might be done playfully, to do so seriously was severely punished.¹⁷

Though no large-scale study exists of homosexual transvestites, our own preliminary work in this area indicates that such people do exist, and for many of the same reasons as the heterosexual transvestites. Just as in the heterosexual transvestite group, however, there are degrees, and for many homosexual cross-dressers, "drag" apparently has no erotic connotation.

Some individuals use transvestism as sort of a halfway point for transsexualism, living and working as a member of the opposite sex, while trying to define their own sexual identity. Often the man who wants to become a woman has described himself as a "woman trapped in a man's body," and some 12 percent of the heterosexual transvestite sample reported on above indicated that this description fitted them. Probably transsexualism and transvestism exist on a continuum, with transsexuals at one end and heterosexual transvestites at the other. In between are transvestites who take hormones to make their figures conform more to the opposite sex, men who have body hair removed, or women who undergo hysterectomies and mammectomies without losing their original sex identity.

Since there are so many variables involved it is possible—and we know such people exist—for a male to be surgically transformed into a female, but have a female love object and prefer to dress in male clothes. Some such individuals have described themselves as “transsexual lesbians.” Conversely it is possible for a woman to be surgically transformed into a man, only to find that he prefers male partners. Since the issue of cross-dressing has become so complicated, it should also be obvious that homosexuality itself is fairly complicated. It might be better to speak of “homosexualities,” since there are all kinds of variations. The more we know, the less able we are to give definitive answers.

Chapter 11

WHO WERE THE HOMOSEXUALS?

To know about the sex life of anyone who lived in the past, it is necessary that they be famous in one way or another. History usually doesn't record the personal lives of obscure people. But in the case of homosexuality there are other difficulties. Few people publicly declared themselves as homosexual; in fact the term was not even coined until the nineteenth century. Thus the historian who wants to investigate homosexuals of the past has to follow all kinds of clues, weigh them, and then decide. Sometimes it seems that almost everyone in the past has been claimed as homosexual, from Julius Caesar to John Edgar Hoover, often without the least foundation. In Caesar's case there is a bawdy song about an alleged affair with King Nicomedes of Bithynia,¹ a statement by a contemporary who allegedly called him the husband of all women and the wife of all men,² and the reported homosexuality of some of those associated with him.³ In the case of Hoover, the fact that he was a bachelor with strong attachment to one particular close male friend has been enough to fan the rumors. Often a person is accused of being homosexual simply to impugn his reputation. This is clearly the example of the Emperor Tiberius, the successor of Julius Caesar.⁴ Are such rumors enough to confirm that the person is a homosexual? The answer quite clearly is that they are not.

Even when a person seems to praise homosexuality, the historian has to tread carefully, since we have to decide what is literary recreation and what reflects experience. Still, poems, fictional accounts, and autobiographies are probably the richest

Chapter 12

HOMOSEXUALITY TODAY

Sociologists have developed the concept of deviance to describe behavior that violates social expectations or breaks social norms. In this sense homosexuality may be described as deviant behavior, although in general we have avoided the use of the term in this book because in our society deviance itself is stigmatizing. That is, to call someone a deviant is the same as calling someone a bad name.

One of the early theoreticians of deviance was Emile Durkheim, who observed that behavior that qualifies one person for sainthood may condemn another to prison, a mental asylum, or the stake. Durkheim urged sociologists to "abandon the still too widespread habit of judging an institution, a practice or moral standard as if it were good or bad in and by itself, for all social types indiscriminately."¹

This is because deviance is defined by social norms. Killing an enemy is normal and right if the attacker is wearing a soldier's uniform and fighting for his country, but killing a personal enemy is murder. Deviance not only varies with conditions and time but from group to group, and the definition of what constitutes deviant behavior is constantly changing. In our society today this is happening to homosexuality. Any period of transition like the present one is traumatic both for the individuals or group involved and for society at large.

People who have been stigmatized as deviant all of their lives do not immediately get over it even though society becomes more tolerant. Nor is all of society willing at once to abandon past

attitudes, especially when they are embedded as deeply as those toward homosexuality are.

For the past fifty years homosexuality has been generally regarded as a sickness. In 1974, however, the American Psychiatric Association voted to remove homosexuality from its catalogue of mental illnesses, declaring it to be instead a "sexual orientation disturbance." Can the vote of a majority of psychiatrists suddenly remove homosexuality from the category of illness? Is not such an action just like declaring that pneumonia is no longer an illness?

The change is clearly the result of political pressure on the medical community, from both within and without. Not all psychiatrists have accepted the vote of their association, and as of this writing, there is still some agitation to change it. Irving Bieber might be considered typical of those psychiatrists who are opposed to the change. He has written:

We consider homosexuality to be a pathologic, bio-social, psycho-sexual adaptation consequent to pervasive fears surrounding the expression of heterosexual impulses.²

All psychoanalytic theories assume that adult homosexuality is psycho-pathologic.³

It might well be that many psychiatrists have a vested interest in defining homosexuality as pathological, because once it is so defined, there is always the possibility of a cure, and that its cure should be under the control of the psychiatrist. The same is true for psychologists, who as a group preceded the psychiatrists in redefining homosexuality as not pathological. Still, anyone who examines the literature about homosexuality over the past fifty or sixty years is impressed with the great attention paid to the etiology of the "disease."⁴ How valid were these studies? Probably the unbiased observer would have to agree with Martin S. Weinberg and Colin J. Williams, who argued that the studies were methodologically poor and in general did not "measure up to minimal canons of scientific research."⁵

It was, however, psychiatrists and psychologists who made it possible for other disciplines to begin to do research. People who have done research in stigmatized behavior are themselves

available academic appointments, and few publishers and editors willing to handle their work. Moreover, by labeling "sexual deviance" as an illness, and pushing the medical model of sexual behavior, psychiatry and psychology weaned the public away from regarding sexual activity as a sin or criminal act, and encouraged less punitive handling of people labeled as sexually deviant. To their credit, the psychiatrists, psychologists, and sociologists (who also redefined their understanding of homosexuality) did move publicly to reevaluate their positions when the growing evidence suggested the necessity of doing so.

One of the difficulties with labeling, however, is that the people so labeled often tend to react according to labels, and this has presented complications in studying homosexuality. The result is what sociologists have called a sequence of alienation. [First a child or adolescent is defined as homosexual either by his peers or by his adult community. Demands upon him to conform to the heterosexual norms are then made, which lead the person closer to groups that share his attitudes. This results in condemnation of the group as well as the individual, and usually results in greater integration of the ostracized individual into the ostracized group.] Since the public community has defined both him and his group as bad, he and the group are threatened, punished, counseled, analyzed, supervised, and even committed to institutions to force them to conform. Ultimately the person's conception of himself incorporates that of the ostracized group, so if he is classed as a homosexual he acts as the community thinks a homosexual should act. He becomes loyal to groups in which membership consists of persons like himself and finds that the very community which has been defining him as homosexual tolerates his homosexuality if he follows the group norms.⁶ The result is that it is not really clear whether homosexuality makes a person act in certain ways or whether the community, by defining the way homosexuals should act, encourages them to act only in certain ways. Obviously there is greater or lesser integration into the group norms, and conformity depends upon several factors. When there are only one or two groups, the individual has to conform within more narrow stereotype forms or be excluded from the group altogether. As the number of groups

permitted, and the more the homosexual, aside from his or her sex persuasion, is likely to approach societal norms in general. Probably most homosexuals in the past have lived in comparative isolation, unveiling themselves only to a few intimates, but in larger cities, where there have been sufficient numbers to form groups, many conformed to the group norms to which they belonged.

This explanation of self-labeling, if it has any validity, means that there has been a kind of interaction between sex research and homosexuality. As researchers have broadened their horizon and scope, so have those in the past stigmatized as homosexuals. When we began to find that homosexuals differed among themselves, groups in the gay community sprang up to support these differences—there are now groups ranging from gay Fascists to gay Maoists, from deeply religious to atheistic. Sex research, in short, has not only helped change the public image but changed the individual gay's image of himself.

Most research has taken place since World War II, although there were earlier pioneering studies of importance. Homosexuality, however, is just one aspect of sex research, and the research into other aspects of sex behavior, including the availability of contraceptives, the greater utilization of abortion, and a greater awareness of the pleasures involved in sex, were important in breaking new trails for homosexual research.⁷ So were changes in public thinking about the necessity of procreation.

Probably the two most important early researchers into homosexuality were Havelock Ellis⁸ and Magnus Hirschfeld,⁹ both of whom have been discussed earlier. Both were also reformers interested in changing laws penalizing sexuality. Hirschfeld is most associated with the campaign to change the Prussian laws against homosexuality, a cause in which he enlisted the support of many German intellectuals ranging from Einstein to Freud. Both Ellis and Hirschfeld also campaigned for availability of contraceptives, advised on sex problems, and regarded sex education as important.

Since psychiatry, especially the psychoanalytic variety, has been so important in labeling and stigmatizing homosexuality, it would seem that the writings of Freud would be especially significant

in understanding changes in attitudes. Freud himself, however, wrote very little on homosexuality,¹⁰ although his theories influenced large numbers of other writers as early as 1913.¹¹ Ultimately Freud came to believe that homosexuality was not pathological, and in 1935 he wrote to a mother of a homosexual:

Homosexuality is assuredly no advantage, but it is nothing to be classified as an illness; we consider it to be a variation of the sexual development. Many respectable individuals of ancient and modern times have been homosexuals. . . . By asking me if I can help, you mean, I suppose, if I can abolish homosexuality and make normal heterosexuality take its place. The answer is, in a general way, we cannot promise to achieve it. In a certain number of cases we succeed in developing the blighted germs of heterosexual tendencies which are present in every homosexual; in the majority of cases it is no more possible . . .¹²

Unfortunately the contents of the letter were not made public until 1951. There were a number of other studies gathering anthropological, historical, literary, and other data to indicate that homosexuality was not pathological, but their impact on the medical community was limited,¹³ and many of them were dismissed as special pleaders who were themselves homosexual. At the same time there were a number of quantitative studies, many of them by Americans, emphasizing the different nature of human sexuality.¹⁴ The most influential of these studies, and the one that seemingly marked a turning point in attitudes toward sexuality in general and homosexuality in particular, was that by Alfred Kinsey and his associates, whose work has been reported on elsewhere in this book.¹⁵

Though Kinsey was a zoologist, his work followed a social-science model rather than a biological or medical one, and these studies mark the emergence of the social scientists into the study of homosexuality. The result has been to view homosexuality as not pathological but a variant of sexual expression. There are many types of homosexuals, some with fewer psychological problems than others; most psychological problems are not different from those of heterosexuals. This was the conclusion of Evelyn

Hooker in her pioneering study of male homosexuals mentioned elsewhere in this book. She stated, "Homosexuality may be a deviation in sexual pattern which is within the normal range, psychologically."¹⁶ There are not only psychological factors involved but societal factors as well. Martin Hoffman, a psychiatrist, wrote:

We are now beginning to realize that social forces have an influence on all kinds of phenomena which we have hitherto analyzed in individual terms. We are beginning to understand, for example, that even physical illness such as heart disease and cancer may be influenced by sociological factors. . . . If this be the case, as is plainly indicated by recent studies, then it ought to be clear that the relationship of the homosexual to a largely hostile society must have profound effects on his life.¹⁷

Once homosexuality is considered a variant of sexual expression, there is no necessity to search for cures, and the possibility appears of studying homosexuality as just one aspect of human sexual behavior.

One of the pioneering studies in examining homosexuality in these terms was by Martin Weinberg and Colin J. Williams, who examined homosexuality in the United States (particularly New York City and San Francisco), in the Netherlands, and in Denmark. Though all areas shared a common historical attachment to the western tradition, they found that homosexuals had different ways of adapting to their problems. Homosexuals in the United States, for example, tended to rely more on the homosexual subculture and/or militant action, while homosexuals in Europe tended to be more politicized and less segregated. Not so surprisingly, they found that most homosexuals preferred not to be identified as such and passed in the everyday world as heterosexual. Many of the psychological problems of homosexuals were associated more with worrying about exposure and anticipating sanctions than with homosexuality itself. Since the homosexual has been acculturated to present himself as heterosexual, most have learned to do so without really thinking much about it.¹⁸

Weinberg joined with Alan Bell to examine homosexuality in

greater detail in the San Francisco Bay area. The result was a study published in 1978 of some 979 homosexual men and women recruited through homosexual bars and steam baths, public and private places where homosexual pickups were often made, homosexual organizations, personal contacts, mailing lists, and public advertising. Both covert and overt homosexuals were interviewed, and the results were compared to a sample of 477 heterosexuals drawn from a random sample.¹⁹

On the basis of their data, Bell and Weinberg argued that the term "homosexual" itself is misleading, and as a result they called their book *Homosexualities*. Homosexuals were categorized into several types: (1) Closed couples, those living in quasi-marriages characterized by self-acceptance, contentment, and a high degree of sexual fidelity. These relationships tended to be of long standing and to reflect a strong emotional commitment and a stable sharing of household responsibilities. As a group, the closed couples scored higher on happiness measures than the heterosexuals included as a control group. (2) Open couples, those living as partners but with a fair amount of outside sexual activity. These couples tended to be less emotionally attached and dependent on one another. (3) Functionals, homosexuals who were sexually active and freewheeling, comparable in a sense to the behavior of "swinging singles" among heterosexuals. They were more likely to report feelings of exuberance than the heterosexuals interviewed. (4) Dysfunctionals, those who were also highly active sexually but who reported regrets about being homosexual and said they had sexual problems. (5) Asexuals, those who were more secretive and had more regrets about their homosexuality, and were less sexually active and less exclusively homosexual. Together with the dysfunctional group they reported less self-acceptance and more loneliness.

In general homosexual men resembled heterosexual men, although in the psychological part of the questioning they were found to be "less self-accepting and more lonely, depressed and tense" than heterosexual men, perhaps because societal pressure has helped make them so. Homosexual women, who have less pressure on them for their sex preference, and in general share with other women the psychological disabilities of being female, were found to be much like heterosexual women,

although they had less self-esteem and more suicidal thoughts than did heterosexuals.

Perhaps the most radical difference from the general run of heterosexual population was that nearly half of the white homosexual males and one-third of the black homosexual males said that they had had at least 500 different sexual partners. More than half had had more than twenty sexual partners in the year before the interview. Most of the women had fewer than ten female sexual partners, and more than three-fourths were involved in relatively stable relationships. Just how much more promiscuous the male homosexuals are than similar groups of swinging single males is uncertain, nor is it clear how much this behavior is dictated by the group norms of the homosexual community. The majority of homosexual men said that they had never had sex with a male prostitute, indicating that changing partners was common. Other studies of homosexuality have indicated that about the same percentage of male homosexuals suffer from impotence (with male partners) as male heterosexuals do with female partners, and "frigidity" is as common among female homosexuals as among other females.

Masters and Johnson, in their 1979 study of homosexuals, for example, found that about 3 percent of their sample failed to reach orgasm, the same percentage as for heterosexual couples. However, Masters and Johnson did find some differences with heterosexuals; one of the more significant was that homosexual couples had a more relaxed understanding of their partner's sexual needs than most heterosexual couples, perhaps because it is easier to understand one's own sex than the opposite sex. They also found that heterosexual sex fantasies are common among homosexuals, mirroring the homosexual fantasies occasionally reported by heterosexuals.²⁰

Masters and Johnson also reported that 67 of the homosexuals they had treated (separate and distinct from the 176 homosexuals on whom they based their data) had consulted them in order to convert or revert to heterosexuality. In spite of the clear desire expressed by the individuals, however, Masters and Johnson reported a failure rate of 35 percent and predicted it would go higher as they continue long-term follow-up studies. It is not only pressure from the heterosexual community which causes

uneasiness among homosexuals, but also from within the gay community itself. It is not clear, for example, that promiscuity among gay males would be as high today as it was in 1970 when the Bell and Weinberg study originally took place. A significant number of gays in their study were conforming to the swinging male role which both society and the gay subculture set for them in the 1970s, and the frantic pace of this life has decreased somewhat as gays have become more accepted. On the other hand the swinging single heterosexual life has increased, especially in such places as the Marina del Rey area in Los Angeles, and similar places where the recently divorced meet. Perhaps the homosexual activity might now match the heterosexual activity. The female homosexuals in the past had more stable relationships following women's traditional role in society, and some recent research indicates that among some lesbians partners numbers have increased.

This raises the question of what causes people to be homosexuals, since even though we no longer accept the medical model we still hunt for causes. The difficulty of the question can be emphasized by rephrasing it: Why do people grow up to be heterosexuals? It seems obvious that biological, psychological, and sociological factors are involved, but the mechanism is beyond our present ability to determine. We have known for several generations that what distinguishes males from females is the presence of a Y chromosome in men, but the matter is more complicated than it once seemed. Most females have two X chromosomes, but other viable genetic possibilities exist, including X, and XXX. Most males have an XY combination, but XXY and XYY males also exist, and there is even a condition known as mosaicism in some of the cells of a given individual which have either a supernumerary or a missing chromosome. The implications of these chromosomal variations for actual sex behavior are not yet fully understood.

In addition to the chromosome determination of sex there are developments *in utero* which influence the nature and appearance of the sex organs, and perhaps even sexual behavior. It is possible for a chromosomally male fetus to be born with a uterus and fallopian tubes and still have external male organs. Likewise it is possible for a chromosomally female fetus to develop a clitoris that looks like a penis. It is not uncommon for the

external genitalia to be left unfinished, neither fully masculinized nor fully feminized. Many individuals are assigned the wrong sex if only because the unfinished states of either sex look remarkably similar.²¹ Adding complications to the picture are the nature and influence of hormones upon both the developing fetus and the child.²²

Probably most sexual behavior is as much socially as biologically determined. One of the discoveries of those who researched American hermaphroditism was that children who had been assigned the wrong sex at birth usually preferred to keep their mistaken sexual identity after their true biological sex was discovered (as when a person who thought he was a male began to menstruate). Obviously they had been acculturated to accept their assigned sex even if it was not their biological sex. This led to a renewed study of the child socialization process, and the arguments by some that much of sex behavior is learned or acquired at a very early age.

One of the classics in the field was a study by John Money and Anke Ehrhardt, who while allowing for the prenatal influence of biology interpreted their findings to give postnatal rearing great importance in forming sexual identity and gender role. One of their cases dealt with a set of male twins who were both circumcised by cautery. Due to an accident, one had his penis burned off, and after considerable anguish the parents decided to raise the child as a girl while his brother would be raised as a boy. When the child was about eighteen months old, the case came to the attention of Money and Ehrhardt, and they have followed the child since. According to them the child dresses, plays, and acts as a girl, while the twin brother behaves as a normal boy.²³ By implication the socialization process is all-important.

Adding support to the social experience in organizing sexual behavior was a study by Gagnon and Simon, *Sexual Conduct*. They developed a theory of "sexual scripts" which they defined as

involved in learning the meaning of internal states, organizing the sequence of specifically sexual acts, decoding novel situations, setting the limits on sexual responses, and linking meanings from nonsexual aspects of life to specifically sexual experience.

These scripts were learned and provided

ordering of bodily activities that will release these internal biological states. Here, scripts are the mechanisms through which biological events can be potentiated.

The script not only provided a social reference for each person in a sexual situation but also an intrapsychic motivating force to produce arousal or at least a commitment to a sexual activity.²⁴ In short, their theory combines social learning and biological forces.

Challenging these and the early studies on hermaphroditism was a study undertaken in the Dominican Republic, where, due to a genetic-endocrine problem, a large number of children of ambiguous sex were born. These infants had a blind vaginal pouch instead of a scrotum and, instead of a penis, a clitoris-like phallus. All were raised as females, but at puberty a spontaneous change in their biology induced a penis to develop and their psychological orientation to change. Contrary to what Money had found, these individuals at puberty gave up their role as females and assumed life as males. The researchers concluded:

Psychosexual orientation (post-pubertal) is male, and this is of considerable interest, since the sex of rearing in 18 of the affected males was female. Despite the sex of rearing, the affected were able to change gender identity at the time of puberty. They considered themselves as males and have a libido directed toward the opposite sex. Thus, male sex drive appears to be endocrine related, and the sex of rearing as female appears to have a lesser role in the presence of two masculinizing events, testosterone exposure in utero and again at puberty with development of male phenotype.²⁵

Psychological or sociological variables are ignored in the Dominican Republic account, but it seems clear, nonetheless, that biology is extremely important in setting sex identity. There is, however, no single continuum for sexual behavior. Masculinity and femininity are not necessarily opposites, and it appears that though biological factors are involved, so are behavioral levels,

including patterns modified by learning and culture, mechanisms or behavior relatively free from learning and culture such as penile erection and vaginal lubrication, and object choice/preference (behavior relative to choosing an erotic or love partner). These levels of behavior might, according to Milton Diamond, each be associated with its own neural tissue which operates independently and under different influences. Their independent development allows for a normal development when in phase but an atypical development such as homosexuality when out of phase.²⁶

Diamond would argue that an individual is born with a certain biased predisposition to interact with the world in certain ways. The basic feature of this is sexual identity—an internal and personal conviction of being male or female. Different male and female forces bias the influence of what is learned from the environment. The experiences to which one is exposed may be likened to a smorgasbord offering from which certain things will be chosen and others left according to one's individual taste. During the experiences of growing up, environment is crucial in providing reinforcement or challenge to one's concept of self, but it is normally not the final determiner. Instead rearing and experiences provide social and cultural models and scripts from which the individual may choose and order future behavior. A child reared in a sex incongruent with his or her sexual identity will manifest this incongruity by not accepting sex roles or impositions which are out of character. For most individuals a number of different patterns are available, and it is probably for this reason that masculine and feminine patterns appear so mixed in normal males and females. Many families or situations, however, do not allow free choice and stifle attempts at individual expression. That many so-called sexual aberrations appear in families where there is an absent parent would, according to Diamond's theory, be due not to the absence of a proper role model or guiding influence, but rather to the absence of severely inhibiting influences which that parent would present. The presence of overly rigid forces (parents or others) would also prevent free choice and thwart the emergence of certain tendencies that otherwise would have developed.²⁷

Though Diamond's theory might well be attractive, it is in many ways similar to those put forth by Ellis and Hirschfeld fifty years ago. Obviously we are today no closer to telling why

some people are homosexual and others heterosexual than we were when we first began researching the subject. There seem to be too many variables involved to offer any simple answer. In fact, the whole field of sexual behavior seems far more complicated than it once did. Probably the most we can hope for at this stage of understanding is greater tolerance for people with different kinds of sexual behavior than our own, and in the process a recognition that for homosexuals, at least, the heritage of the past has left permanent scars.

GUIDE TO FURTHER READING

Homosexuality, if only because it has been at different times labeled a sin, a sickness, and a crime, has been the subject of a rather extensive literature. In fact there is a vast amount of source materials, and great quantities of medical, legal, and other monographic literature available to the reader who wants to pursue the subject further. Some of this material has been indicated in the footnotes, and the interested reader would be advised to start there.

Some indication of the extent of the materials available can be found in the bibliography which several colleagues and I compiled (see Vern Bullough, Dorr Legg, Barry Elcano, and James Kepner, *An Annotated Bibliography of Homosexuality and Other Stigmatized Behavior* [2 vols., New York: Garland Publishers, 1976]). The bibliography includes more than 10,000 titles, including an estimated 4,000 in medical and allied literature written primarily between 1870 and the present. Although many of these medical articles are valuable, the majority offer no new insights, and most can be dismissed as pseudoscience, a problem which has plagued the study of homosexuality during much of this century. For the period between 1940 and 1968 there is a more detailed bibliographical listing of medical and scientific literature in English, namely M. S. Weinberg and A. B. Bell, *Homosexuality: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972). Another valuable guide is William Parker, *Homosexuality: A Selective Bibliography* (Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971). Somewhat more specialized but no less valuable is Jeanette H. Foster, *Sex Variant Women in Literature* (London: Frederick Muller, 1958), which can be supplemented by Gene Damon and Lee Stuart, *The Lesbian in Literature* (San Francisco: Daughters of Bilitis, 1967). See also Ian Young, *The Male Homosexual in Literature* (Metuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975).

Other more generalized bibliographies on sexual behavior should also prove helpful. One of the more comprehensive is the bibliography of the Kinsey Library at the University of Indiana, *Catalogue of Social and Behavioral Science Monographs in the Institute for Sex Research* (4 vols., Boston: G. K. Hall, 1975). A good general survey is Flora C. Seruya, Susan Losher, and Albert Ellis, *Sex and Sex Education: A Bibliography* (New York: Bowker, 1972). Older but still helpful is Roger Goodland, *A Bibliography of Sex Rites and Customs* (London: George Routledge & Sons, 1931). For a generalized survey of sexual

information see *The Encyclopedia of Sexual Behavior* edited by Albert Ellis and Albert Abarbanel (2 vols., New York: Hawthorn Books, 1961). An older encyclopedia is the *Encyclopaedia Sexualis* edited by Victor Robinson (New York: Dingwall-Rock, 1936).

In recent years a number of textbooks, both high school and college level, have been written for classes in human sexuality. Any one of these could be consulted, such as Herant A. Katchadourian and Donald T. Lunde, *Human Sexuality* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975, 2d ed.). The Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) has issued a number of books about sexuality, several of them with Mary S. Calderone as editor, including *Sexuality and Human Values* (New York: Association Press, 1974).

Since this book looks at homosexuality in the past as well as the present, the reader might be interested to investigate further. See Vern Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1976); Arno Karlen, *Sexuality and Homosexuality* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971); Jonathan Katz, *Gay American History* (New York: Crowell, 1976); A. L. Rowse, *Homosexuals in History* (New York: Macmillan, 1977), and H. Montgomery Hyde, *The Love That Dared Not Speak Its Name* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970). For a more specialized account see Michael Goodich, *The Unmentionable Vice: Homosexuality in the Later Medieval Period* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC Clio Books, 1979). For an overview of sex in history see Vern and Bonnie Bullough, *Sin, Sickness, and Sanity* (New York: New American Library, 1977).

To keep current in the field it is important to look at the scholarly journals, and three are particularly important: *Journal of Sex Research*, *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, and most especially the *Journal of Homosexuality*. This last includes extracts and summaries of much of the current work on the topic. There are numerous newspapers and journals serving the gay community. Among the earliest of the American publications was *One*, and the more academically oriented *One Quarterly*. Both of these are now only published occasionally and their place has been taken by such publications as the *Midwest Gay Academic Journal*, *The Advocate*, *Body Politic*, and *Gaysweek*. There are numerous books dealing with homosexuality, among them C. A. Tripp's *The Homosexual Matrix* (New York: New American Library, 1975), which is an effective supplement to the present book, since it includes much more on psychology and psychotherapy.

NOTES

Chapter I

1. Plato *Symposium* 191E-192D, trans. W. R. M. Lamb (London: William Heinemann, 1953).
2. Aristotle *Problemata* IV, 26 (879B-880A), trans. E. S. Forster, in *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. W. D. Ross (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), vol. VII.
3. Caelius Aurelianus, *On Acute Diseases and on Chronic Diseases*, IV, 9, 131-37, ed. and trans. I. E. Drabkin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950).
4. Albertus Magnus, *Evangelium Lucam*, XVII, 29, in *Opera Omnia*, ed. S. C. A. Borner, vols. 22-23 (Paris: Lucovicum vives, 1895).
5. Voltaire, *Philosophical Dictionary*, trans. William Fleming, 10 vols. (London: E. R. duMont, 1901), VII, 147-53. This translation is slightly different from the quoted version here, which is based on that of Donald Webster Cory, *Homosexuality: A Cross Cultural Approach* (New York: Julian Press, 1956), pp. 350-52.
6. F. Carlier, *Les deux prostitutions* (Paris: Dentu, 1889).
7. Ulrichs wrote a number of works but probably the most important was *Memnon: Die Geschlechtsnatur des mannliebenden Urnings* (Schleiz, Germany: M. Heyn, 1868). He recounted some of his own personal experiences in this work.
8. Benkert's pamphlet on the subject was more or less forgotten until it was republished and widely disseminated by Magnus Hirschfeld in *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, VI (1905), i-iv, pp. 3-66. Benkert's prime concern was with the Prussian legal code.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 36 ff.
10. C. von Westphal, "Die konträre Sexualempfindung," *Archiven für Psychiatrie und Nervenkrankheiten*, II (1869), 73-108.
11. This was the claim of Magnus Hirschfeld, "Homosexuality," *Encyclopaedia Sexualis: A Comprehensive Encyclopaedia-Dictionary of the Sexual Sciences*, ed. Victor Robinson (New York: Dingwall-Rock, 1936), p. 322. Since Hirschfeld published an annual bibliography in his journal, he theoretically was in a position to know, but in checking his references we find he must have counted works with only the most casual mention of homosexuality.
12. Jean Martin Charcot and Valentin Magna, "Inversion du sens génital et autres perversions sexuelles," *Archives de neurologie*, III and IV (1882).

13. P. Moreau, *Des aberrations du sens génétique* (Paris: Asselin et Houzeau, 1887), pp. 149, 301, and *passim*.
14. Benjamin Tarnowsky, *Anthropological, Legal, and Medical Studies on Pederasty in Europe*, trans. Paul Gardner (New York: Flagstaff Press, 1933), pp. 9-13, 46, 70, 88.
15. Cesare Lombroso, *Criminal Man*, reprinted (Montclair, N. J.: Patterson Smith, 1972); and *Female Offender* (New York: Appleton, 1899).
16. Richard von Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia sexualis*, trans. from the 7th enlarged and rev. German ed. by Charles Gilbert Chaddock (Philadelphia: F. A. Davis, 1894), p. 1.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
18. See *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, reprinted, 2 vols. (New York: Random House, 1936).
19. John Addington Symonds, *A Study in Greek Ethics*, reprinted (n.p., 1928); and *A Problem in Modern Ethics* (London: 1891).
20. Edward Carpenter, *Homogenic Love* (Manchester, England: Labour Press Society Limited, 1894); and *The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women*, reprinted (New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1912).
21. Xavier Mayne, *The Intersexes: A History of Similisexuality as a Problem in Social Life* (n.p., 19087).
22. Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*; there is a brief autobiography in *Encyclopaedia Sexualis*, pp. 317-32.
23. See "Historical Notes: A Letter from Freud," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, XVII (April 1955), 786-87.
24. Freud actually wrote comparatively little about homosexuality *per se*, and it is necessary to examine his general works as well as those of some of his disciples to see his view in detail. See Freud, *Three Contributions to Sexual Theory* (New York: Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases Publishing Company, 1910); *Leonardo da Vinci*, trans. A. A. Brill (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1922); and some of his general writings, particularly *Collected Papers* (London: Imago Publishers, 1924-1950), *Basic Writings* (New York: Modern Library, 1938), and *Letters* (New York: Basic Books, 1960). For some of the early Freud-influenced analyses of homosexuals see "Die drei Grundform der Homosexualität," *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, 15 (1913), pts. 2, 3, 4. Among the early Freudians listed in the articles are Hans Bluher, Isodor Corio, A. Sadger, and Max Rudolf Senf, most of whom were writing at that time.
25. For some of those in the psychoanalytic movement who argued that homosexuality is environmentally caused, see A. Adler, "The Homosexual Problem," *Alienist & Neurologist*, XXXVIII (1917), 285; Irving Bieber et al., *Homosexuality* (New York: Basic Books, 1962); Edmund Bergler, *Homosexuality* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1956); A. A. Brill, "Conception of Homosexuality," *Journal of American*

- Medical Association*, LX (1913), 336; S. Ferenczi, *Contributions to Psychoanalysis: Sex in Psychoanalysis* (Boston: Badger, 1916); L. S. London, "Analysis of a Homosexual Neurosis," *Urology and Cutaneous Review*, XXXVII (1933), 93; London, *Mental Therapy* (New York: Liveright, 1937); R. E. Money-Kyrle, *Development of the Sexual Impulses* (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1932); W. Stekel, *Bisexual Love* (Boston: Badger, 1922); and F. Wittells, *Critique of Love* (New York: McCauley, 1929). Nonpsychoanalytic psychiatrists have also advanced the view that homosexuality is the result of psychological or environmental influences, including C. Allen, *The Sexual Perversions and Abnormalities* (London: Oxford University Press, 1949); F. S. Caprio, *The Sexually Adequate Male* (New York: Citadel Press, 1952); G. V. Hamilton, "Defensive Homosexuality," in *Encyclopedia Sexualis*, pp. 334-42; G. W. Henry, *Sex Variants* (New York: Hoeber, 1941), and *All the Sexes* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955); D. J. West, *The Other Man* (New York: William Morrow, 1955). For a more complete discussion see Albert Ellis, *Homosexuality: Its causes and Cure* (New York: Lyle Stuart, 1965).
26. For a survey of some of this research see Arno Karlen, *Sexuality and Homosexuality* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971), pt. 2.
 27. Martin S. Weinberg and Colin J. Williams, *Male Homosexuals: Their Problems and Adaptations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 6.
 28. Alfred Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948), pp. 627-28.
 29. *Ibid.*, pp. 650-51.
 30. Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953), pp. 474-75.

Chapter 2

1. Leviticus 15:16-18. All Biblical quotations are from the King James Version, although in all cases I have consulted scholarly versions. The reason for using the Authorized Version is simply that American attitudes were formed by this seventeenth-century translation, and though it might not be as scholarly and accurate as more recent versions, it is the Bible still most often quoted by those who are concerned about the Christian attitudes toward homosexuality.
2. Genesis 38:7-10.
3. *Niddah* 13a, trans. Israel W. Slotki, in the *Babylonian Talmud*, ed. Isidore Epstein, reprinted (London: Soncino Press, 1965).
4. Genesis 1:28.
5. *Yebamoth* 12b, 100b, trans. Israel W. Slotki, in the *Babylonian Talmud*, ed. Isidore Epstein, 2 vols. (London: Soncino Press, 1936); Ketuboth 39a, in the *Mishnah*, trans. Herbert Danby (London:

- Oxford University Press, 1933); and *Niddah* 45a. There are many other references.
6. See David Mace, *Hebrew Marriage* (London: Epworth Press, 1953), pp. 206-07.
 7. Louis M. Epstein, *Sex Laws and Customs in Judaism* (New York: Bloch, 1948), p. 138.
 8. Leviticus 18:22.
 9. Leviticus 21:13.
 10. Deuteronomy 23:17.
 11. Genesis 19:1-11.
 12. See G. A. Barton, "Sodomy," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings, 13 vols. (New York: Scribner's, 1928), XI, 672-74.
 13. Genesis 19:8.
 14. Jack Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past: The Archaeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1946), p. 126; and J. Penrose Harland, "Sodom and Gomorrah," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, VI (1943), 3, and also V (1942), 2.
 15. Derrick Sherwin Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (London: Longmans, Green, 1955), pp. 45-48.
 16. Ezekiel 16:49-50. See also Isaiah 1:9-10; Jeremiah 23:14, Lamentations 4:6.
 17. Ezekiel 16:53, 55.
 18. Jubilees 16:5-6, in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed. R. H. Charles, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), Vol. II.
 19. Philo Judaeus, *On Abraham*, trans. F. H. Colson (London: William Heinemann, 1959-1962), XXVI, 134-36. Vol. VI of the Loeb Classical Library edition.
 20. This at least was the argument of John Addington Symonds, *A Problem in Modern Ethics* (London: privately printed, 1896), p. 6.
 21. For the various types of crimes in ancient Judaism, see W. H. Bennett, "Crimes and Punishments (Hebrew)," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, IV, 281.
 22. *Kerithoth* 1:1-2, in the *Mishnah*.
 23. *Ibid.*, ii, 6.
 24. *Sanhedrin* 54a-55a, trans. Jacob Schacter and H. Freeman, in the *Babylonian Talmud*, ed. Isidore Epstein, 2 vols. (London: Soncino Press, 1935).
 25. Mark 10:11-12.
 26. Matthew 19:11-12.
 27. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, trans. and ed. Kirsopp Lake (London: William Heinemann, 1926), VI, viii.
 28. See the discussion by Derrick Sherwin Bailey, *Sexual Relation in Christian Thought* (New York: Harper, 1959), p. 72, fn. 11.

29. I Corinthians 6:9-10.
30. Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*, pp. 38-39.
31. I Timothy 1:9-10 (*italics mine*).
32. Romans 1:26-27.
33. Revelations 21:8 (*italics mine*).
34. Revelations 22:15 (*italics mine*).
35. Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*, pp. 43-45.
36. For a more lengthy discussion of this see Vern L. Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1976), 185-96.
37. St. Augustine, *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, cap. 57 (XXIX), trans. Marcus Dodd, in *The Works of St. Augustine* (Edinburgh: T. T. Clark, 1885), vol. IV.
38. St. Augustine, *Against Two Letters of the Pelagians*, I, cap. 27 (xii), cap. 30 (xv), in *The Works of St. Augustine*, vol. XV.
39. St. Augustine, *De bono conjugali*, X, 10, in J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Latina* (Paris: Garnier fratres, 1887), vol. XL; and *Sermones*, CCCLI, iii (5), in *Patrologiae Latina*, vol. XXXIX.
40. St. Augustine, *Confessions*, III, viii, trans. and ed. William Watts (London: William Heinemann, 1919).
41. See Ludwig Beiler, ed. and trans. *The Irish Penitentials* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1963), pp. 112-17; and John T. McNeill and Helena M. Gamer, eds. and trans., *Medieval Handbooks of Penance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), pp. 102-05, sec. 2, nos. 1, 2.
42. See Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*, p. 101.
43. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II-II, Q. cliv, 11 and 12, as trans. by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1947).
44. Martin Luther, *Lectures on Genesis*, in *Works*, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut Lehmann, 55 vols. (Philadelphia and St. Louis: Mullenberg and Concordia, 1955-1967), III, 255.
45. John Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Books of Moses Called Genesis*, XXXVIII, 8-10, trans. and ed. Charles William Bingham, reprinted, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1948), II, 285. The English edition neglects to translate all of Calvin's commentary for fear of offending readers. The interested reader will have to consult the Latin edition.
46. Laud Humphreys, *Out of the Closets: The Sociology of Homosexual Liberation* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), pp. 151-52.
47. Troy Perry, "Letter from a Homosexual to the Church," in Humphreys, *Out of the Closets*, p. 149.

Chapter 3

1. For a discussion of this issue see Vern L. Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1976), pp. 137-38.
2. *The Theodosian Code*, trans. Clyde Pharr (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1952), pp. 231-32.
3. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History*, (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854), III, 39-41.
4. *Institutes*, IV, xviii, 4. There are several English translations, including those by J. B. Moyle (Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1937) and by Thomas Collett Sandars (London: Longmans, Green, 1910).
5. *Novel*, LXXVII. The translation is that made by Derrick Sherwin Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (London: Longmans, Green, 1955), pp. 73-74.
6. *Novel*, CXLI, and Bailey, op. cit., pp. 74-75.
7. Procopius *Anecdota* XI, 36, trans. H. W. Dewing (London: William Heinemann, 1940).
8. Bullough, *Sexual Variance*, pp. 334-35.
9. *Concilium Neapolitanum*, cap. XI, in J. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* (Florence, 1766), col. 624, canons, 8, 9, 10. See also the introduction to the section by Mansi, cols. 261-62.
10. St. Antonino, *Confessionale*, cap. 57 (Venice: 1514), pp. 57-58.
11. Gratian, *Decretum pars secunda, Causa XXXII, Questio vii*, c. 11, 13, 14, and *Causa XXXIII, Questio ii, distinctio cap. xv*, in *Corpus juris canonica*, ed. Emil Friedberg, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz, 1879-1881, 2 vols.), Vol. I, cols. 1143-44, and II, col. 1161. See also Bullough, *Sexual Variance*, pp. 381-82.
12. Havelock Ellis, *The Nature of Sexual Inversion*, in *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, 2 vols. (New York: Random House, 1936), I, 347.
13. Bullough, *Sexual Variance*, pp. 390-91.
14. See, for example, Alex K. Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations in the Criminal Law* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press for the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, 1968), pp. 8, 15. Some surveys cite an earlier English statute on the basis of a passing reference in *Fleta seu Commentarius juris Anglicani*, but the unsupported statement found there goes contrary to what we know about English common law at the time. See also Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, *Digest of Criminal Law (Crimes and Punishments)* (St. Louis: F. H. Thomas, 1878), Art. 168, n. x, pp. 115, 377. The pertinent statutes are 25 Henry VIII, c. 6; 32 Henry VIII, c. 3; 2-3 Edward VI, c. 29; 1 Mary, c. 1; and 5 Elizabeth, c. 17.
15. H. Montgomery Hyde, *The Love That Dared Not Speak Its Name* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970), p. 41.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 45-57; and Caroline Bingham, "Seventeenth Century Attitudes Towards Deviant Sex," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, I (1971), 447-67.
17. Edward Coke, *Institutes of the Laws of England*, Pt. 3, reprinted (London: E. and R. Brook, 1797), cap. x, "Of Buggery, or Sodomy," pp. 58-59.
18. William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, new ed. with notes by John Frederick Archibold (London: William Reed, 1811), IV, 215.
19. Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations*, p. 17.
20. Blackstone, *Commentaries*, IV, 64-65.
21. Francis Wharton, *A Treatise on the Criminal Law of the U.S.*, 4th ed., rev. (Philadelphia: Kay and Brothers, 1857), p. 591.
22. *People v. Wilson*, 119 Cal. 384 (December 1897), *Reports of Cases Determined in the Supreme Court of the State of California*, C. P. Pomeroy, reporter (San Francisco: Bancroft-Whitney, 1906).
23. For various revisions in the French sexual code, see Gerhard O. W. Maller, *The French Penal Code* (South Hackensack, N.J.: Fred B. Rothman, n.d.), art. 330-40, p. 113.
24. Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (Berlin: Louis Marcus, 1960), p. 284.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 822-23.
26. Thorkil Vanggaard, *Phallos: A Symbol and Its History in the Male World* (London: Johnathan Cape, 1972), pp. 173-76.
27. The full treatise on sexual activities is contained in Portfolio 74B, University College, London. There is an appendix entitled "Bentham on Sex" attached to Jeremy Bentham, *The Theory of Legislation*, ed. C. K. Ogden (London: Kegan Paul, French, Trubner, 1931), pp. 473-97, but it is only an extract of Bentham's ideas on the subject. Some of the treatise is summarized by Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations*, pp. 21-22, where these five principles are listed. Since this chapter was written Louis Crompton has edited Bentham's essay in the *Journal of Homosexuality* 3 (1978), No. 4, and 4 (1978), No. 1.
28. Gigeroff, *Sexual Deviations*, pp. 22-25.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 25-27.
30. See James Fitzjames Stephen, *A History of the Criminal Law of England*, reprinted (New York: Burt Franklin, 1967).
31. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series (1830-91) (Aug. 6, 1885), pp. 1397-98, Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, 48 and 49 Vct. c. 69.
32. Lord Alfred Douglas, *Autobiography* (London: Martin Secker, 1929).
33. This fact, though denied by Douglas in his *Autobiography*, is attested to by the Marquess of Queensberry, *Oscar Wilde and the Black Douglas* (London: Hutchinson, 1949), p. 29. This biography is by the nephew of Alfred Douglas. See also André Gide, *If It Die*, trans. D. Bussy (New York: Random House, 1935), pp. 297, 300-301.
34. There are many accounts of the trials, including *The Three Trials of Oscar Wilde*, verbatim transcripts with introduction by H. Montgomery Hyde (New York: University Books, 1956).

NCP 16, 105 / 132, 754 14065E
 132, 759 45795

35. There are literally bookcases of studies about Oscar Wilde. An interesting account is by Vyvyan Holland, *Son of Oscar Wilde* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1954). After the trial Mrs. Wilde had the children take different names, and Holland, the second son, gives considerable insight into his father while defending his reputation. See also *The Letters of Oscar Wilde*, ed. Rupert Hart-Davis (London: Hart-Davis, 1962).
36. Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, I, 39. For a fictionalized treatment of some of this see Roger Peyrefitte, *The Exile of Capri* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1961). See also Xavier Mayne [Edward I. Stevenson], *The Intersexes: A History of Similsexualism as a Problem in Social Life* ([Florence]: privately printed, 1908, and republished New York: Arno Press, 1975). See also William Manchester, *The Arms of Krupp 1587-1968* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1968).
37. Maximilian Harden, "Furst Eulenberg," in *Prozess, Kopfe, Dritter Teil* (Berlin: 1913), p. 183. See also Lyn Pedersen, "The Ordeal of Prince Eulenberg," *One* (October-November and December 1956). See also Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität*, passim.
38. *Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England* ed. William Shurtleff, and published by order of the General Court (Boston: William White, 1855), I, 64.
39. John Winthrop, *The History of New England from 1630-49*, ed. James Savage, 2 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1853), II, 45-48.
40. *Records of the Colony of New Plymouth*, II, 44, and William Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation* (Boston: Wright and Potter, 1898), pp. 474-75.
41. See *Fennel v. State*, 32 Texas 378 (1869), *Supreme Court of Texas*; *Frazier v. State*, 39 Texas 390 (1873), *Supreme Court of State of Texas*; *Ex Parte Ed. Bergen*, 14 Texas Criminal Reports 52 (1883); *Charlie Prindle v. State*, 31 Texas Criminal Reports 551 (1893); *Alex Lewis v. State*, 36 Texas Criminal Reports 37 (1896); *Algie Adams v. State*, 48 Texas Criminal Reports 90 (1905). See also *Vernon's Penal Code of the State of Texas*, annotated (Kansas City, Mo.: Vernon Law Books Company), Vol. I. One of the reasons there might be so many sodomy cases from Texas is that Texas had separate reports on criminal cases.
42. *Estes v. Carter*, 10 Iowa 400 (1860), *Reports of Cases in Law and Equity Determined in the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa*, T. F. Withrow, reporter (Des Moines: Mills Brothers, 1861), Vol. X.
43. Edward Livingston, *A System of Penal Law for the United States of America* (Washington: Gales and Seaton, 1828), pp. 86-87, 104-05.
44. Joel Prentiss Bishop, *Commentaries on the Law of Statutory Crimes* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1883), p. 369, 411-14, 437-38; and *New Commission on Marriage, Divorce, and Separation*, 2 vols. (Chicago: T. H. Floom, 1891), I, 754-56.
45. Francis Wharton, *A Treatise on the Criminal Law of the U.S.*, 4th

- and rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Kay and Brothers, 1857). See the editions of 1874 and 1880 for purposes of comparison.
46. Sir William Oldnall Russell and Charles Greaves, *A Treatise on Crimes and Misdemeanors*, 9th American from the 4th London ed. (1877).
47. West's Annotated California Codes, *Penal Code Sections 211 to 446*, Official California Penal Code Classification (St. Paul, Minn.: West, 1970), sec. 287, p. 554, and sec. 288a, p. 624.
48. Hansard, *House of Commons Debates*, CXLV, cols. 1799-1807 (August 4, 1921); *House of Lords Debates*, XLVI, cols. 566-77 (August 15, 1921).
49. *Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, Sir John Wolfenden, chairman (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1957).

Chapter 4

1. "For you O Democracy," in the "Calamus" section of *Leaves of Grass*. There are many editions.
2. "We Two Boys Together Clinging."
3. John Addington Symonds, *A Problem in Modern Ethics* (London: privately printed, 1896), pp. 116-17.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 118-19.
5. The Symonds work, originally published anonymously, was one such. His other work was *A Problem in Greek Ethics* (privately printed, 1901). For more details see Phyllis Grosskurth, *John Addington Symonds* (London: Longmans, 1964).
6. See G. W. Allen, *The Solitary Singer* (New York: Macmillan, 1955); Alistair Sutherland and Patrick Anderson, *Eros: An Anthology of Friendship* (London: Anthony Blond, 1961), p. 290; and A. E. Smith, "The Curious Controversy over Whitman's Sexuality," *One Institute Quarterly*, IV (Winter 1959), 6-25. Smith is a pseudonym for Merritt A. McNeil, since even in 1959 there was some hesitancy in identifying oneself even as a scholar on the subject of homosexuality.
7. Malcolm Cowley, "Walt Whitman: The Miracle," and "Walt Whitman: The Secret," *New Republic*, March 18 and April 8, 1946. These articles are one of the earliest public discussions of homosexuality outside of medical and legal journals.
8. Walt Whitman, "Democratic Vistas," in *Leaves of Grass and Selected Prose*, ed. John A. Kouwenhoven (New York: Modern Library, 1950), p. 505 and fn.
9. Smith, "Curious Controversy," p. 21.
10. Hans Licht, *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1932), p. 427; W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968); Kenneth Clarke, *The Nude*, Bollingen Series 35, 2 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1956).

11. Lacey, *Family in Classical Greece*, p. 158. See also Cicero *De republica* IV, 4, trans. Clinton W. Keyes (London: William Heinemann, 1961); and Plutarch *Amatoriae narrationes 773-774*, in *Morals*, Vol. X, trans. Harold North Fowler (London: William Heinemann, 1960).
12. Lysias *Orationes* III, 6, trans. W. R. M. Lamb (London: William Heinemann, 1957).
13. Plato *Symposium* 178C, trans. W. R. M. Lamb (London: William Heinemann, 1953).
14. Symonds, *Problem in Greek Ethics*, pp. 16-17.
15. Aristotle *Problemata* IV, 26 (789B-880A), trans. E. S. Forster, in *The Works of Aristotle*, ed. W. D. Ross (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), Vol. VII.
16. For a catalogue of Greek myths of love affairs between the gods and their respective boy friends see Rudolf Beyer, *Fabulae Graecae quatenus quave aetate puerorum amore commutatae sint* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leipzig, 1910).
17. Plato *Symposium* 178C.
18. Plutarch "Pelopidas" 18, in *Plutarch's Lives*, trans. Bernadotte Perrin (London: William Heinemann, 1959).
19. Plato *Symposium* 209C.
20. *Ibid.*, 207BC.
21. See L. R. de Poge-Castries, *Histoire de l'amour Grec dans l'antiquité* (Paris: Guy le Prat, 1952), pp. 80-95, 235-74; and H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), pp. 30-33.
22. See T. F. Lucas, *Greek Poetry for Everyman* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1951), pp. 248-54; and Sutherland and Anderson, *Eros*, pp. 35-36. For a more scholarly version see *Lyra Graeca*, trans. and ed. J. M. Edmonds (London: William Heinemann, 1934), Vol. I.
23. Pindar *Odes Pythia* 6, trans. Richard Lattimore (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), pp. 74-75. Pindar can also be found in the Loeb Classical Library.
24. Sutherland and Anderson, *Eros*, pp. 29-73; Poge-Castries, *Histoire de l'amour Grec*, pp. 273-74. The poets with references to homoerotic love would include Solon, Phanocles, Anacreon, Pindar, and Alcaeus, among others.
25. See *Greek Anthology*, trans. and ed. W. R. Paton, 5 vols. (London: William Heinemann, 1918-20).
26. See Jeanne H. Foster, *Sex Variant Women in Literature* (London: Frederick Muller, 1958), pp. 20-21. For various fragments of Sappho's poems see *Lyra Graeca*, Vol. I. There is an English translation of them by Willis Barnstone, *Sappho* (New York: New York University Press, 1965).
27. Clellan S. Ford and Frank A. Beach, *Patterns of Sexual Behavior* (New York: Harper, 1951), p. 250.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 257.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 129-30.

30. Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (Berlin: Louis Marcus, 1920), p. 550.
31. P. Nacke in *Archiv für kriminelle Anthropologie und Kriminalist*, XXII (1906), 277.
32. Jan Belo, *Bali: Rangda and Barong*, American Ethnological Society Monograph No. 16 (1949), p. 58.
33. Ford and Beach, *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*, p. 130.
34. See Vern L. Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1976), pp. 24-38, for examples.

Chapter 5

1. An account of the origin of the Gay Liberation Front can be found in Donn Teal, *The Gay Militants* (New York: Stein and Day, 1971), pp. 17-60.
2. *The Advocate* (Los Angeles), July 22-August 4, 1970, 1-2.
3. Laud Humphreys, *Out of the Closets* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 61.
4. The full title was *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Homosexualität. Krsg. unter mitwirkung namhafter Autoren von Wissenschaftlich-humanitären Komitee* ("Yearbook for Sexual Intermediate States with Special Consideration for Homosexuality. Published in cooperation with the well-known Authors of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee"). See also Hedwig Lesser, "The Hirschfeld Institute for Sexology," and Robert Wood, "Sex Reform Movement," in *Encyclopedia of Sexual Behavior*, ed. Albert Ellis and Albert Abarbanel (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1961, 2 vols.), II, 956-70. There is a brief autobiography of Hirschfeld in the *Encyclopaedia sexualis*, edited by Victor Robinson (New York: Dingwall-Rock, 1936), pp. 317-32.
5. R. E. L. Masters, *The Homosexual Revolution* (New York: Julian Press, 1962), p. 39. Masters' book is a mixture of information and misinformation. Much more accurate is the doctoral dissertation of Edward Sagarin, *Structure and Ideology in an Association of Deviants* (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1966). Also helpful is *Homosexuals Today: A Handbook of Organizations and Publications*, ed. by Marvin Cutler (Los Angeles: One, Inc., 1956). See also John Lauritsen and David Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement (1869-1935)* (Albion, Calif.: Times-Change Press, 1974).
6. A description of such a ball appears in C. H. Hughes, "Homo Sexual Complexion Perverts in St. Louis," *The Alienist and Neurologist*, XXVIII (1907), 487-88.
7. Emma Goldman, *Living My Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1934). She mentions, p. 173, that she became acquainted with the subject of "Urnings" and "Lesbians" through the lectures of Professor Bruhl (co-author with Freud on some of his early works).

- She adds that for the first time "I grasped the full significance of sex repression and its effect on human thought and action."
8. Los Angeles *Herald-Express*, July 2, 1953. See also *One*, 1:4 (April 1953), 6, and 1:7 (July 1953), 25.
 9. The columnist was Paul Coates, who wrote for the Los Angeles *Mirror*. An account of the column appears in *One*, 1:3 (March 1953), 10. See also Los Angeles *Mirror*, March 12, 1953 for actual quotation.
 10. *The Mattachine Society Today . . . An Information Digest* (Los Angeles: Mattachine Society, 1954), p. 1.
 11. For a list of many of the names see the index to Vern Bullough, Dorr Legg, Barrett Elcano, and James Kepner, *Annotated Bibliography of Homosexuality*, 2 vols. (New York: Garland, 1976).
 12. *One*, 3:2 (February 1955), 9.
 13. Masters, *Homosexual Revolution*, pp. 104-18.
 14. *One, Inc. v. Olesen*, 241 f, 2nd 772, 9th Dr (1957), and 355 U.S. 271 (1958). See also *One Institute Quarterly*, 11 (1958).
 15. See Vern L. Bullough, "How the FBI Spotted Me," *Nation*, 225 (July 9-16, 1977), 51-53.
 16. Alfred Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948), pp. 650-51. For the female figures see Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953), pp. 474-75.
 17. Donald Webster Cory, *The Homosexual in America* (New York: Greenberg, 1951), p. 14.
 18. Evelyn Hooker, "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual," *Journal of Projective Techniques*, 21 (1957), 18-31. Quote is from pp. 29-30.
 19. The Southern California position paper which was adopted there was prepared by a committee on which Vern Bullough served as chairperson. It was later adopted by the national, although the national statement was prepared by a different group.
 20. *Towards a Quaker View of Sex* (London: Friends Home Service Committee, 1964).
 21. *Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offences and Prostitution*, Sir John Wolfenden, chairman (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1957).
 22. *National Institute of Mental Health Task Force on Homosexuality: Final Report and Background Papers*, ed. John M. Livingood (Rockville, Md.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1972). The publication of the report was delayed but versions of it appeared in the gay community long before it was published.
 23. A state-by-state listing of some of these was given in *Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation*, ed. Karla Jay and Allen Young (New York: privately published Douglas Books, 1972), appendix 1. There are now national directories published.

Chapter 6

1. See Robin Maugham, *Conversations with Willie: Recollections of W. Somerset Maugham* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978).
2. See the review by Auberon Waugh of *Conversations with Willie*, *New York Times Book Review*, LXXXIII (June 25, 1978), 10.
3. See E. M. Forster, *Maurice* (London: Arnold, 1971); and *The Life to Come* (London: Penguin, 1972). Both are posthumous publications.
4. André Gide, *If It Die*, trans. Dorothy Bussy (London: Secker & Warburg, 1955); and *Corydon* (New York: Farrar, Straus, 1950). There are other editions of these works, and Gide returned to the subject late in life with *So Be It, or, The Chips Are Down* (New York: Knopf, 1959).
5. Tennessee Williams, *Memoirs* (New York: Doubleday, 1975). This is his autobiography and includes many frank references to homosexuality.
6. Tom Driberg, *Ruling Passions* (New York: Stein and Day, 1978). Driberg had originally intended his memoirs to be published while he was alive, but he was told by two of his fellow peers that if they were, he would be denied a seat in the House of Lords.
7. Edwin P. Hoyt, *Horatio's Boys: The Life and Works of Horatio Alger Jr.* (Radnor, Pa.: Chilton, 1974).
8. Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963).
9. For one such group, see Bonnie and Vern Bullough, "Lesbianism in the 1920's and 1930's: A Newfound Study," *Signs*, 2 (Summer 1977), 895-904.
10. Michael P. Burk presented his findings at the Symposium on Current and Future Life Styles held at Connecticut College, November 14, 1975. The proceedings, edited by Bernard I. Murstein, are not yet published. Though the concept was advanced by Burk, the arguments and explanations are my own.
11. Elisabeth Kübler-Ross, *On Death and Dying* (New York: Macmillan, 1970).
12. T. W. Adorno et al., *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper and Row, 1950).
13. Bonnie Bullough, *Social-Psychological Barriers to Housing Desegregation* (Los Angeles: University of California, 1969).
14. Quentin Crisp, *The Naked Civil Servant* (New York: New American Library, 1978), pp. 7-8.
15. Goffman, *Stigma*, p. 114.
16. Martha Shelley, "Gay Is Good," in *Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation*, ed. Karla Jay and Allen Young (New York: privately published Douglas Books, 1972), p. 31.
17. Benjamin DeMott as quoted in John Murphy, "Queer Books," in *Out of the Closets*, p. 87.

18. Alfred McClung Lee, *Multivalent Man* (New York: George Braziller, 1966), p. 271.
19. Louie Crew, "Before Emancipation: Gay Persons as Viewed by Chairpersons in English," in *The Gay Academic*, ed. Louie Crew (Palm Springs, Calif.: Etc. Publications, 1978), pp. 13-14.

Chapter 7

1. Norman F. Cantor, *Medieval History: The Life and Death of a Civilization* (New York: Macmillan, 1963), p. 31.
2. Fred Schwartz published a regular newsletter, and in 1978 both homosexuality and abortion have been cited as part of the effort to undermine American moral standards and prepare the way for Communism. For information write P.O. Box 890, Long Beach, Calif. 90801.
3. Leopold von Ranke, *History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations, 1494-1514* rev. and trans. G. R. Dennis, reprinted (London: George Bell, 1909).
4. Jeffrey B. Russell, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972), pp. 126-27.
5. For details see Vern L. Bullough, "Heresy, Witchcraft, and Sexuality," *Journal of Homosexuality*, I, (1974), reprinted in Bullough, *Sex, Society, and History* (New York: Neale Watson, 1976), pp. 74-92.
6. Dante, *The Divine Comedy*, trans. Dorothy Sayers, 3 vols. (New York: Basic Books, 1962), *Inferno*, Canto XV, pp. 106-08.
7. This somewhat favorable description of Roehm appeared in the American edition of Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1940), pp. 512-13 note. This particular edition was sponsored and annotated by a group of anti-Nazi Americans, including Sidney B. Fay, John Gunther, Walter Millis, George N. Shuster, Alvin Johnson, et al., and it was these men who made the annotations. There have been many later studies.
8. Walther Hofer, ed., *Die Nationalsozialismus, Dokumente 1933-1945* (n.p.: Fischer Bücherei, 1972), p. 30.
9. William Ebenstein, *The Nazi State* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart 1943), p. 84.
10. Hans Frank, *Nationalsozialistische Strafrechtspolitik* (Munich: 1938), p. 32.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
12. Cited in Hans Peter Bleuel, *Sex and Society in Nazi Germany*, trans. J. Maxwell Brownjohn (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1973), p. 220.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 217.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 223.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 224.
16. Theodor W. Adorno, "Sexualtabu und Recht heute," in *Sexualität und Verbrechen*, ed. Fritz Bauer et al. (Frankfurt: 1963), p. 307.

17. Some discussion of this appeared in Reimut Reiche, *Sexuality and Class Struggle* (New York: Praeger, 1971), trans. Susan Bennett. Marcuse discusses it in his *Eros and Civilization* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), and in his *One Dimensional Man* (London: 1968).
18. See Allen Young, "The Cuban Revolution and Gay Liberation," in *Out of the Closets*, ed. Karla Jay and Allen Young (n.p.: Douglas Books, 1972), pp. 206-28.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 223-24.
20. Notes from our own visit to Cuba in 1978, as well as from a "Declaration by the First National Congress on Education and Culture," published in *Granma*, the organ of the Cuban Communist party, and reprinted in *Out of the Closets*, ed. Jay and Young, pp. 246-47.
21. Wilhelm Reich writing under the pseudonym Ernst Parell, *Was Ist Klassenbewusstsein?* (Copenhagen: Verlag für Sexualpolitik, 1934). Some of this appeared in his pamphlet *Der sexuell Kampf der Jugend* (Berlin: Verlag für Sexual politik, 1932). He wrote many other books.
22. Reich wrote several books during this period, several of which were later partly rewritten, including *The Function of the Orgasm* (1927); *The Imposition of Sexual Morality* (1932); and *The Sexual Revolution* (1936). After he came to the United States Reich's interest in politics gave way to a preoccupation with biology, and he claimed to have discovered the orgone or the basic life energy which could be accumulated in his specially designed orgone boxes. Reich later was sent to jail for his advocacy and selling of the orgone boxes and died in an American prison.
23. Reiche, *Sexuality and Class Struggle*, p. 25.
24. *New York Times*, April 19, 1950.
25. *New York Times*, June 15, 1950.
26. Max Lerner, *New York Post*, July 17, 1950.
27. *New York Times*, August 27, 1955.
28. John Gerassi, *The Boys of Boise: Furor, Vice, and Folly in an American City* (New York: Macmillan, 1966).
29. See Vern L. Bullough, "How the FBI Spotted Me," *Nation*, 225 (July 9-16, 1967), pp. 51-53.

Chapter 8

1. Viscount Halisham expressed such a view in J. Tudor Rees and Harley V. Usill, eds., *They Stand Apart: A Critical Survey of the Problems of Homosexuality* (New York: Macmillan, 1955). He looked upon homosexuality as a proselytizing religion, "contagious, incurable, and self-perpetuating."
2. Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948), pp. 327-93. Educational level was less important among females than among males. See Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B.

132, 754
★

- Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953), 685-86.
3. Kinsey, *Human Male*, pp. 167-72; *Human Female*, pp. 107, 113-14.
 4. See Richard Green, *Sexual Identity Conflict in Children and Adults* (New York: Basic Books, 1974); John Money, "Psychosexual Differentiation," in *Sex Research: New Developments*, ed. John Money (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965) and R. Stoller, *Sex and Gender* (New York: Science House, 1968). See also Frederick L. Whitam, "Childhood Indicators of Male Homosexuality," *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 6 (1977), 89-96.
 5. Plato, *Symposium*, 209C, trans. W. R. M. Lamb (London: William Heinemann, 1953).
 6. Xenophon *Lacedaemonians* 2, 13, trans. E. C. Marchant (London: William Heinemann, 1956).
 7. See Vern L. Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1976), 108-10, and H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), pp. 30-33.
 8. Lucian, *Dialogues of Courtesans*, 10, based on the translation by M. D. MacLeod (London: William Heinemann, 1961).
 9. Quoted by A. D. C. Peterson, *A Hundred Years of Education* (New York: Collier Books, 1962), p. 109.
 10. C. S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy: The Shape of My Early Life* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1955), pp. 88-89.
 11. *Ibid.*, pp. 108-10.
 12. For an anthology of some of these, see Brian Reade, *Sexual Heretics: Male Homosexuality in English Literature from 1850 to 1900* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1970).
 13. Leigh Hunt, *Autobiography of Leigh Hunt* (London: 1850), ch. 4.
 14. Theodore Wratislaw, "To a Sicilian Boy," *The Artists*, August 1, 1893.
 15. The account of this can be found in Phyllis Grosskurth, *John Addington Symonds* (London: Longmans, 1964), pp. 22-41.
 16. This is from *The Review of Reviews*, a journal founded by Stead. See Bullough, *Sexual Variance*, p. 574, for full quotation.
 17. This appeared as part of a letter in *Reynold's Newspaper* in 1895 and is quoted in H. Montgomery Hyde, *The Love That Dared Not Speak Its Name* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970), p. 170.
 18. Desmond McCarthy, *Memories* (London: Macgibbon and Kee, 1953), pp. 211-12.
 19. Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York: Anchor Books, 1959); *Stigma* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963); *Interaction Ritual* (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), particularly "Embarrassment and Social Organization," pp. 97-112; and *Frame Analysis* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974).
 20. Vern and Bonnie Bullough, "Lesbianism in the 1920s and 1930s: A Newfoundland Study," *Signs*, II (1977), 895-904.
 21. Kinsey, *Human Female*, p. 478.

Chapter 9

1. We have written at considerable length on this. See Vern L. Bullough, with a final chapter by Bonnie Bullough, *The Subordinate Sex: A History of Attitudes Toward Women* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973; Penguin Paperback, 1974).
2. Vern Bullough has written on this at some length, most notably with Cameron Campbell in "Female Longevity and Diet in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* (1979), in press. References to the Greek and Roman periods are included in the article.
3. Romans 1:26-27 (italics mine).
4. See Jeanette H. Foster, *Sex Variant Women in Literature* (London: Frederick Muller, 1958), pp. 22-23.
5. Ruth 1:16-17.
6. Martial *Epigrams* I, xc, ed. and trans. Walter C. A. Ker (London: William Heinemann, 1968).
7. *Ibid.*, VII, lxxvii.
8. Juvenal *Satires* VI, ed. and trans. G. C. Ramsay, reprinted (London: William Heinemann, 1957).
9. Lucian, *Dialogues of Courtesans*, trans. and ed. M. D. MacLeod (London: William Heinemann, 1961).
10. *My Secret Life*, 11 vols., reprinted (New York: Grove Press, 1966), V, ch. 1, 858-67. There are many other references.
11. There are numerous titles along with summaries of these works in Pisanus Fraxi, *Bibliography of Prohibited Books*, reprinted, 3 vols. (London: Jack Brussell, 1962). In the various reprints of Fraxi (a pseudonym) other titles are used.
12. *Miss High Heels*, reprinted (New York: Grove Press, 1969). I am not certain when the original of this first appeared, probably toward the end of the nineteenth century. The quotation is from *Gynecocracy: A Narrative of the Adventures and Psychological Experiences of Julian Robinson (afterwards Viscount Ladywood) under Petticoat-Rule Written by Himself*, republished (New York: Grove Press, 1971), pp. 405-06.
13. See, for example, Karl Abraham, *Selected Papers*, trans. Douglas Bryan and Alix Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1942), ch. 22; Edward Glover, *The Psycho-pathology of Prostitution* (London: Institute for the Scientific Treatment of Delinquency, 1945), p. 4; and Frank Caprio and Donald Brenner, *Sexual Behavior: Psycho-Legal Aspects* (New York: Citadel Press, 1961), pp. 249-52.
14. See Vern and Bonnie Bullough, *Prostitution* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1978).
15. *Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England*, ed. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff (Boston: published by the Order of the General Court, William White, Printer to the Commonwealth, 1855-1861), II, 137.
16. This was the statement of Alfred C. Kinsey and his associates, although our own independent research tends to validate them.

- See Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953), p. 48.
17. These quotations are from Hansard, *House of Lords Debates*, Vol. 46, cols. 567-77 (August 15, 1921). The debates are also summarized by H. Montgomery Hyde, *The Love That Dared Not Speak Its Name* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970), pp. 176-82.
 18. See Foster, *Sex Variant Women in Literature*, passim.
 19. See G. H. Bell, ed., *The Hamwood Papers of the Ladies of Llangollen and Caroline Hamilton* (London: Macmillan, 1970); Sidonie Gabrielle Colette, *Ces Plaisirs* (Paris: Ferenczi, 1932), 155-61; and H. C. V. Morton, *In Search of Wales* (New York: Dodd, 1932).
 20. Bertrand Russell, *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, Vol. I (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), pp. 205-07.
 21. Gertrude Stein, *Fernhurst, W.E.D. and Other Early Writings*, with "A Note on the Texts" by Donald Gallup and introduction by Leon Katz (New York: Liveright, 1973).
 22. Radclyffe Hall, *The Well of Loneliness* (New York: Covici, Friede, 1929). The London edition with the introduction by Havelock Ellis was published by Jonathan Cape.
 23. *Sunday Express*, August 19, 1928.
 24. Una, Lady Troubridge, *Life of Radclyffe Hall* (New York: Citadel Press, 1963).
 25. Compton Mackenzie, *Extraordinary Women* (London: Secker, 1932). The first edition was in 1928.
 26. Virginia Woolf, *Orlando* (New York: Harcourt, 1928).
 27. See Vern and Bonnie Bullough, "Lesbianism in the 1920s and 1930s: A Newfound Study," *Signs*, II (1977), 895-904, esp. p. 897.
 28. *Ibid.*, p. 903.
 29. See, for example, Henry T. Heald and Mary K. Finley, "Alienation and Sexuality: A Comparison of Homosexual and Heterosexual Women," paper presented at the seventieth annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, August 25-29, 1975.
 30. Jane Rule, *Lesbian Images* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1975), has examined many of these women; see also Foster, *Sex Variant Women in Literature*, passim; Sidney Abbot and Barbara Love, *Sappho Was a Right-on Woman* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1973); Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon, *Lesbian/Woman* (San Francisco: Glide Publications, 1972); and for some of the biographical and autobiographical accounts, Vern Bullough, Dorr Legg, Barrett Elcano, and James Kepner, *An Annotated Bibliography of Homosexuality*, 2 vols. (New York: Garland Publishers, 1976).
 31. Mary Sarton, *Mrs. Stevens Hears the Mermaids Singing* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1965), p. 219.
 32. Rule, *Lesbian Images*, p. 165.
 33. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

34. Del Martin, "DOB Speaks for Lesbians," *The Ladder*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (October 1959), pp. 18-19.

Chapter 10

1. Donald Webster Cory, *The Homosexual in America* (New York: Greenberg, 1951), pp. 132-33.
2. C. H. Hughes, "Postscript to Paper on 'Erotopathia,'" *The Alienist and Neurologist*, XIV (October 1893), pp. 731-32.
3. C. H. Hughes, "Homo Sexual Complexion Perverts in St. Louis," *The Alienist and Neurologist*, XXVIII (1907), pp. 487-88.
4. These ideas have been developed at greater length in Vern L. Bullough, *The Subordinate Sex* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973, Penguin Books, 1974).
5. For a brief discussion of this see Robert J. Stoller, *Sex and Gender* (New York: Science House, 1968), pp. 9-10.
6. Magnus Hirschfeld, *Die Transvestiten: Eine Untersuchung über den erotischen Verkleidungstrieb* (Berlin: Spohr Verlag, 1925). The first edition was published in 1910.
7. Havelock Ellis, *Eonism and Other Supplementary Studies*, in *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, 7 vols. in 2 (New York: Random House, 1936), II, pt. 2.
8. Cynthia Cox, *The Engima of the Age: The Strange Story of the Chevalier d'Eon* (London: Longmans, Green, 1966). See also M. Coryn, *The Chevalier d'Eon* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1932); Edna Nixon, *Royal Spy: The Strange Case of the Chevalier d'Eon* (New York: Reynal, 1965); and many others.
9. See the introduction by Harry Benjamin to Richard Green and John Money, *Transsexualism and Sex Reassignment* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969). Benjamin himself wrote at some length on the subject in *The Transsexual Phenomenon* (New York: Julian Press, 1966), which was the first book-length study.
10. She has written her autobiography, C. Jorgensen, *Christine Jorgensen: A Personal Autobiography* (New York: Paul S. Eriksson, 1967). Her case was written up in technical terms by C. Hamburger, G. K. Sturup, and E. Dahl-Iversen, "Transvestism, Hormonal, Psychiatric and Surgical Treatment," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 152 (1953), 391-96. It is worth a comment that Hamburger here still used the word "transvestism" to describe the Jorgensen case; there was not as yet a distinction between transvestism and transsexualism.
11. Nels Hoyer, *Man into Woman: An Authentic Record of a Change of Sex* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1933).
12. Esther Newton, *Mother Camp: Female Impersonators in America* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972).
13. An example of a female impersonator changing sex is the French case of Coccinelle. See Mario A. Costa, *Reverse Sex*, trans. Jules J. Bloch (London: Challenge Publications, n.d.). Many of the female

- impersonators in the professional shows have taken hormones, and a number of them consider themselves preoperative transsexuals.
14. Virginia Prince and P. M. Bentler, "Survey of 504 Cases of Transvestism," *Psychological Reports*, 31 (1972), 903-17.
 15. Many of these appear in the magazine *Transvestia*, published by Virginia Prince, a transvestite. There are other transvestite publications and also various societies, sometimes called sororities. One such group was written up by Deborah Heller Feinbloom, *Transvestites and Transsexuals* (New York: Dell, 1976).
 16. See Vern L. Bullough, "Transvestism in the Middle Ages: A Sociological Analysis," *American Journal of Sociology*, 79 (1974), 1381-94.

Chapter 11

1. Suetonius, "Julius," XLIV, 4, in *De vita Caesarum*, trans. and ed. John C. Rolfe (London: William Heinemann, 1960).
2. *Ibid.*, LII, 3.
3. Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, XV, 2, trans. William Whiston (Philadelphia: J. Grigg, 1833), reports Anthony's making advances to Aristobulus.
4. The treatment of Tiberius by Tacitus has been much discussed. Suetonius, "Tiberius," CLIII, also mentions some of the scandal. For discussion see T. S. Jerome, *Aspects of the Study of Roman History*, reprinted (New York: Capricorn Books, 1962), pp. 319-80; F. B. Marsh, *The Reign of Tiberius*, reprinted (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1959); Ronald Syme, *Tacitus*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963) I, 420-34; and Gregorio Maranon, *Tiberius: The Resentful Caesar* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1956).
5. This belief is based on the biography of him by the grammarian Aelius Donatus, who included it in his preface to the commentary on the works of Virgil. See Donatus, *Vita Vergiliana*, ed. Colin Hardie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. 6-18. There is little contemporary evidence other than his own writing except for a reference in Martial *Epigrams* VII, lvi, 12, ed. and trans. Walter C. A. Ker (London: William Heinemann, 1968), which mentions the beautiful Alexis.
6. Virgil, *Eclogues*, II, translated and edited by H. Rushton Fairclough (reprinted London: William Heinemann, 1960).
7. André Gide, *Corydon* (New York: Farrar, Straus, 1950).
8. Horace *Satires* I, 2, 11, 113ff., trans. Smith Palmer Bowie (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959).
9. Horace *Epodes* XI; and *Odes* IV, 1 and 10, trans. and ed. C. E. Bennett (London: William Heinemann, 1960).
10. Catullus *Carmina* XLVIII, LXXXI, XCIX, ed. and trans. F. W. Cornish (London: William Heinemann, 1966).
11. Albius Tibullus *Elegies* I, iv, 16, 39-40, 53-60, ed. and trans. J. P. Postgate, reprinted (London: William Heinemann, 1966).

12. *Ibid.*, I, iv, 81-84; viii, 49, and ix.
13. For other individuals of the time see Noel I. Garde, *Jonathan to Gide: The Homosexual in History* (New York: Vantage Press, 1964), passim. Many of his cases are doubtful, and are identified as homosexuals only on the flimsiest of evidence. Somewhat more scholarly, but not by much, is A. L. Rowse, *Homosexuals in History* (New York: Macmillan, 1977). Rowse's book is sort of a backstage gossip tour of English history.
14. See A. L. Rowse, *Christopher Marlowe* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964); and F. S. Boas, *Christopher Marlowe: A Biographical and Critical Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940). Rowse, whose book on homosexuality is mentioned in note 13, seems to concentrate on men who might have been homosexual. For a time he claimed that William Shakespeare was gay, and the subject was debated with the appearance of Rowse's *William Shakespeare: A Biography* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), and particularly his edition of *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), but the evidence was against Rowse, and he later changed his mind.
15. John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. Oliver Lawson Dick (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1957), p. 11.
16. See Vern L. Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1976), pp. 448-49; and Rowse, *Homosexuals*, pp. 48-69.
17. See "Nicholas Udall," *Dictionary of National Biography* (London: 1885-1901), XX, 6-9.
18. Pierre d L'Estoile, *Journal des choses memorables advenues durant la regne de Henry III*, reprinted (Paris: Gallimard, 1943), pp. 143, 225. Originally published in 1621.
19. Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Les tragiques*, livre 2, *Les Princes* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1953).
20. See William McElwee, *The Wisest Fool in Christendom* (London: Faber & Faber, 1958), p. 230; David Harris Wilson, *King James VI and I* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967).
21. See the records in the *Archivio de Stato* of Florence, Ufficiali di notte, 1432-1502.
22. Antonio Vallentine, Leonardo da Vinci (New York: Viking, 1953).
23. Leonardo da Vinci, *The Literary Works*, comp. and ed. Jean Paul Richter (London: Phaidon Press, 1970), II, 342.
24. Vallentine, *Leonardo da Vinci*, p. 39.
25. Sigmund Freud, *Leonardo da Vinci and a Memory of His Childhood* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1964), pp. 21, 27.
26. Pietro Aretino, *Letters of Pietro Aretino*, trans. Thomas Caldecott Chubb (Hamden, Conn.: Shoe-String Press, 1967), p. 224.
27. See Magnus Hirschfeld in *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, IX (1909), 73-165.
28. John Addington Symonds, *The Life of Michelangelo Buonarroti*, 2 vols. (London: John C. Nimmo, 1893), I, 164. Symonds, however,

- might be suspect, since he was a homosexual who studied other homosexuals and was anxious to make a strong case, at least strong for the time in which he was writing.
29. See the article by Numa Praetorius in *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, I, 118-19, and Symonds, *Life of Michelangelo*, p. 160. Numa Praetorius was one of the many pseudonyms used by Hirschfeld.
 30. Symonds, *Life of Michelangelo*, pp. 136-37. See also Michelangelo, *The Complete Poems of Michelangelo* (New York: Noonday Press, 1960), pp. 39, 91, and passim. For a discussion of the issues of homosexuality by his early biographers, see Francis Haskell, "Michelangelo and some of his Biographers," *Times Literary Supplement*, No. 3,828 (July 25, 1975), pp. 842-43.
 31. The story is recounted in almost every life of Frederick, but not all have seen it as an incidence of homosexuality.
 32. An account of his homosexual activity appears in Honoré Gabriel Requeti, Comte de Mirabeau, *The Secret History of the Court of Berlin* (Washington, D.C.: M. Walter Dienne, 1901). Unfortunately most editions are expurgated, including this one. References can be found in Letters 30, 33, 45, and 48, among others. See *Zeitschrift für sexualwissenschaft*, XV (1928-29), 465-76. For the possibilities of his becoming king or regent of the United States see Richard Krauel, "Prince Henry and the Regency of the United States, 1786," *American Historical Review*, XVII (October 1911).
 33. Elizabeth Charlotte, Duchesse d'Orleans, *The Letters of Madame*, ed. Gertrude Scott Stevenson, 2 vols. (London: Chapman and Dodd, 1924), I, 217, 156-57.
 34. David Kopay and Perry Deane Young, *The David Kopay Story* (New York: Arbor House, 1977).

Chapter 12

1. Emile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method* (1895), trans. S. A. Solovay and J. H. Mueller (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1964), p. 56.
2. Irving Bieber et al., *Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study* (New York: Basic Books, 1962), p. 220.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
4. For an analytical study of many of the recent articles see Martin S. Weinberg and Alan P. Bell, *Homosexuality: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972). This study covers a very limited time period, and for a broader overall view, and an even more disheartening one, see Vern L. Bullough, Dorr Legg, Barrett Elcano, and James Kepner, *An Annotated Bibliography of Homosexuality*, 2 vols. (New York: Garland Publishers, 1976). The first study analyzes 1,200 scholarly publications on homosexuality, the second lists over 12,000.
5. Martin S. Weinberg and Colin J. Williams, *Male Homosexuals:*

- Their Problems and Adaptations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 4.
6. This is adapted from Frank Tannenbaum, *Crime and Community* (Boston: Ginn, 1938), pp. 17-21.
 7. For some of these factors see Vern L. Bullough, *Sexual Variance in Society and History* (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1976), pp. 635-88; and also "Challenges to Societal Attitudes Toward Homosexuality," *Social Science Quarterly*, LVIII (June 1977), 29-44.
 8. Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, 2 vols. (New York: Random House, 1936). Ellis's first work on homosexuality has survived in a German edition, *Das Konträre Geschlechtsgefühl* (Leipzig: George Wigand, 1897). It was originally written in collaboration with John Addington Symonds. The original English edition was confiscated, and late English-language editions appeared without Symonds as co-author because of legal issues raised by his heirs.
 9. Magnus Hirschfeld, *Sappho und Sokrates* (Leipzig: Spohr, 1902); and Hirschfeld, *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Louis Marcus Verlagbuchhandlung, 1920). Hirschfeld, *Die Transvestiten* (Berlin: Alfred Pulvermacher, 1910). See also brief autobiography in *Encyclopaedia Sexualis*, ed. Victor Robinson (New York: Dingwall-Rock).
 10. Sigmund Freud, *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex*, trans. A. A. Brill (New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company, 1920); and "Certain Neurotic Mechanisms in Jealousy, Paranoia, and Homosexuality" and "The Psychogenesis of a Case of Homosexuality in Woman," in Ernest Jones, ed., *Collected Papers of Sigmund Freud*, trans. Joan Riviere (London: Hogarth Press, 1933), II, 232-43, 202-31.
 11. See A. Sadger, "Welcher Wert kommt der Erzählungen und Autobiographien den Homosexuellen zu," *Archiv für Kriminalanthropologie und Kriminalistik von Gross*, 53 (pts. 1 and 2); and "Ketzergedanken über Homosexualität," *Archiv für Kriminalanthropologie und Kriminalistik von Gross*, 59 (pts. 3 and 4), 1913; Max Rudolf Senf, "Narzismus," *Sexualproblemen von Marcuse* (March 1913); Hans Blüher, "Zwei psychosomatische Forderungen," *Sexualprobleme*, 9 (August 1913), 527-36; and Isodor Coriat, "Homosexuality," *New York Medical Journal*, 1913, 589-90.
 12. Sigmund Freud, "Historical Notes: A Letter from Freud," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 107 (April 1951), 786-87.
 13. See, for example, Ferdinand Karsch-Haack, *Das Gleichgeschlechtliche Leben der Naturvölker* (Munich: Reinhardt, 1911); Edward Carpenter, *Intermediate Types Among Primitive Folk: A Study in Social Evolution* (London: G. Allen, 1914); Hans Licht (Paul Brandt), *Sittengeschichte Griechenlands*, 3 vols. (Dresden and Zurich: Paul Aretz Verlag)—this was translated and bowdlerized as *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1952); John Addington Symonds, *A Problem in Greek Ethics* (London: 1901), and *A Problem in Modern Ethics* (London: 1891).

14. Katherine B. Davis, *Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-Two Hundred Women* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929); G. V. Hamilton, *A Research in Marriage* (New York: A. C. Boni, 1929); Robert L. Dickinson, *Human Sex Anatomy* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1933); Dickinson and L. Beam, *A Thousand Marriages* (Baltimore, Williams and Wilkins, 1931); Dorothy De. Bromely and F. H. Britten, *Youth and Sex: A Study of 1300 College Students* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938); L. M. Terman, Paul Bunttenweiser, Leonard W. Ferguson, Winifred Bent Johnson, and Donald P. Wilson, *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938); and L. B. Hohman and B. Schaffner, "The Sex Lives of Unmarried Men," *American Journal of Sociology*, 52 (May 1947), 501-07. See also Edward M. Brecher, *The Sex Researchers* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969); and Winston Ehrman, "Marital and Non-Marital Sexual Behavior," in *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, ed. Harold Christensen (New York: Rand McNally, 1964).
15. Alfred Kinsey, W. B. Pomeroy, and C. E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948); and Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and P. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953).
16. Evelyn Hooker, "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual," *Journal of Projective Techniques*, 21 (March 1957), 30.
17. Martin Hoffman, *The Gay World: Male Homosexuality and the Social Creation of Evil* (New York: Bantam, 1968), p. 176.
18. Martin S. Weinberg and Colin J. Williams, *Male Homosexuals: Their Problems and Adaptations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 267-71.
19. Alan P. Bell and Martin S. Weinberg, *Homosexualities* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978).
20. William Masters and Virginia Johnson, *Homosexuality in Perspective* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1979).
21. See, for example, John Money, *Sex Errors of the Body* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968); Money and J. G. Hampson, "The Ontogenesis of Sexual Behavior in Man," in *Sex and Internal Secretions*, ed. W. C. Young, 3rd ed. (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins), pp. 1431-32; and Money, Hampson, and J. L. Hampson, "An Examination of Some Basic Sexual Concepts: The Evidence of Human Hermaphroditism," *Bulletin of the Johns Hopkins Hospital*, 97 (1955), 301-19.
22. George W. Henry, *The Hormones in Human Reproduction* (New York: Atheneum, 1963).
23. John Money, and A. A. Ehrhardt, *Man and Woman, Boy and Girl* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1972).
24. John Gagnon and William Simon, *Sexual Conduct: The Social Sources of Human Sexuality* (Chicago: Aldine, 1973).
25. J. Imperato-McGinley, L. Guerrero, T. Gautier, and R. E. Peter-

- son, "Steroid 5 Oxyductase Deficiency in Man: An Inherited Form of Male Pseudohermaphroditism," *Science*, 186 (1974), 1213-15.
26. See Milton Diamond, "A Critical Evaluation of the Ontogeny of Human Sexual Behavior," *Quarterly Review of Biology*, 40 (1965), 147-75; "Genetic Endocrine Interactions and Human Psychosexuality," in *Perspectives in Reproduction and Sexual Behavior*, ed. Milton Diamond (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968); and Diamond, "Human Sexual Development: Biological Foundations for Social Development," in *Human Sexuality in Four Perspectives*, ed. F. A. Beach (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1977).
27. Milton Diamond, "Sexual Identity and Sex Roles," in *Frontiers of Sex Research*, ed. Vern Bullough (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1979).