ever been imprisoned, but more than three thousand had been blackmailed. A study made in Austria in the early 1970s, when homosexual conduct was still illegal, came to a similar figure: approximately one-third of a sample group of homosexuals had been victims of extortion.

Official Response. The arguments mounted by Hirschfeld and other supporters of the early homosexual rights movement were compelling enough to persuade even the National Socialist lawmakers who in the legislation of June 28, 1935 increased the penalties for male homosexuality, but at the same time amended the Code of Criminal Procedure to allow the district attorney to refrain from prosecuting an individual whose criminal conduct had subjected him to blackmail. In contrast, the subcommittee of the United States Senate that was appointed in 1950 to investigate Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's charges that the administration was harboring "sex perverts in government" found that the danger of blackmail made homosexuals security risks; and since the penal laws of the District of Columbia had no provision against homosexual acts the subcommittee urged that the code be amended in this direction. In other words, it created a situation in which a homosexual employee of the Federal Government could be dismissed from his job and even prosecuted for his sexual activity, and then used the risk of blackmail to justify the policy it was advocating. This is a classic instance of how arguments formulated as an appeal for toleration could be maliciously turned into justifications for further intolerance.

Current Situation. In the debate over the recommendations of the Wolfenden Committee in England after 1957, the issue of blackmail played a considerable role, and the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885 was even dubbed "The Blackmailer's Charter" because of the opportunity that it had given the criminal underworld to prey upon otherwise respectable, law-abiding members of society. As the threat of prosecution faded with the reform of the criminal laws, beginning in England in 1967, and even more with the education of law enforcement officials in regard to homosexuality, the danger of blackmail receded. In retrospect, blackmail was the tribute which fear paid to intolerance. It will end only when the social stigma attached to homosexual behavior has been eradicated. The rallying cry of the gay liberation movement "Come out!" is an appeal for candor and courage on the part of the homosexual community that will relegate the eventuality of blackmail to the dark annals of history.

origin, was not morbid, but rather healthy in that it was spontaneous and occurred in individuals who were able to function as well as other members of society. He distinguished homosexuality per se from pedophilia, pederasty, hermaphroditism, misogyny, and “pseudo-homosexuality” (the latter largely corresponding to bisexuality).

Some of the English translations of Bloch’s works, especially those dealing with anthropological and historical subjects, are so heavily abridged as to be no true measure of his erudition.
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**BLOOMSBURY**

Taking its name from the district of London where many of the members lived, the Bloomsbury coterie influenced British thought and letters during the first half of the twentieth century. Broadly cultural rather than academic in their interests and affiliations, its members practiced and favored several arts, standing for civilized tolerance as against the competitive ethic of official Britain. Adherents were socially cohesive, but sexually varied: the salons of Bloomsbury hosted heterosexual, bisexual, and homosexual members.

The group began in March 1905, when the Stephen family launched their “at homes” at 46 Gordon Square. Many of the recruits were young men who had just been graduated from Cambridge, where they had absorbed, in an atmosphere of wide-ranging enquiry, the ethical precepts of the philosopher G. E. Moore. At Cambridge most had belonged to a secret society, The Apostles, which was suffused with homoeroticism (the “Higher Sodomy”). Although Bloomsbury was not secret, the smugness and self-satisfaction stemming from belonging to an exclusive coterie clung to members—and repelled outsiders such as D. H. Lawrence and Wyndham Lewis. For those who had been scarred early by life’s rough-and-tumble, Bloomsbury offered a refuge. Within the protected redoubt they freely cultivated opinions, modes of speech and conversation, and clothing styles that struck outsiders, to the extent that they could comprehend them, as aberrant and bizarre. The character and doings of members and friends were tirelessly chronicled in arch and informed gossip. Blasphemy and bawdiness flowed unstintingly. In a 1914 letter Vanessa Bell wrote: “One can talk of fucking & sodomy & sucking & bushes all without turning a hair.” Social gatherings, the life support of the group, featured more than just talk: opportunities for sexual encounters—indeed of a sexual merry-ground—were ever present. Homosexuality was “in.” As Virginia Woolf, a member of the Stephen family, bluntly remarked: “The society of buggers has many advantages—if you are a woman. It is simple, it is honest, it makes one feel . . . in some respects at one’s ease.” A sign of their sexual adaptability was the fact that some members settled into a ménage à trois.

After Clive Bell—who stood out for his “special charm of normality”—married Vanessa Stephen in 1907, a second salon was established in which the visual arts were favored. Later Roger Fry was to promote avant-garde modern art through his writings, exhibitions, and above all through a collaborative atelier, the Omega Workshops, which employed a number of “Bloomsberries.” By international standards, however, the Bloomsbury painters—Vanessa Bell, Duncan Grant, and Fry himself—were second-rate, never enjoying the prestige of the novelists E. M. Forster and Virginia Woolf, not to speak of the economist John Maynard Keynes.