HAAN, JACOB ISRAEL DE (1881–1924)

Dutch novelist, poet, and scholar. De Haan was born in the small village of Smilde in the northern part of the Netherlands, where his father was a rabbi. In 1885 the family moved to Zaandam near Amsterdam. After preparing to be a schoolteacher in Haarlem, he moved to Amsterdam to work and study law. There he met Arnold Aletrino, a novelist and medical practitioner who had specialized in criminal anthropology and, though not himself homosexual, had written unambiguous defenses of homosexual love. The encounter inspired de Haan to write his first novel, Pipeliintjes (1904), which was naturalist and clearly homosexual. It was a thinly veiled and rather sexual autobiography in which Aletrino figured prominently. The latter was instrumental in having the first edition destroyed because it seemed to imply that he himself was a homosexual.

De Haan was a member of the Socialist Workers' Party and wrote the children's column for its daily, Het Volk ("The People"). After publication of his novel, his column was terminated but he was not expelled from the party; he also lost his teaching job. Nevertheless, he wrote a second novel, Pathologieën (1908), which describes in even more explicit terms a homosexual sadomasochistic relationship. The protagonist is driven by his lover to commit suicide after a series of sexual degradations. The book is written in the spirit of literary decadence, which also dominated short stories of the period. In one of the latter, de Haan homosexualizes the Faust theme: the protagonist abuses Jesus sexually on Satan's instructions. Both novels received very little critical approval, not surprisingly, considering the times.

De Haan wrote no more novels. He married, received his doctorate with work on the problem of criminal responsibility (1915), and concentrated on poetry, publishing Libertijnsche liederen (1914, "Libertine Songs"), Lieder (1917), and Kwatrijnen (1924). Many of the poems have gay content, for example the life and sufferings of Oscar Wilde.

Before World War I, de Haan became an orthodox Jew, and after it he left Holland for Palestine. He joined the Zionist movement, but because he could not find his place there, he soon quit it. Then he supported Agudat Yisrael, the most important orthodox Jewish and anti-Zionist movement of the time, for which he immediately became an important spokesman with his Western intellectual background. From Jerusalem, he wrote articles for the Dutch daily Algemeen Handelsblad and the English Daily Press in which he ventured his anti-Zionist opinions. For the Dutch daily, he also described his attraction to Arab boys.

De Haan had maneuvered himself into a very strange situation: an unrepentant pederast with a socialist and "decadent" background, defending Orthodox points of view against Zionism. In the tumultuous early twenties in Palestine, his was a dangerous position; after defending the Orthodox case with the British as well as with King Hussein of Jordan, he was murdered by extreme Zionists of the Hagana movement who were never apprehended. Zionists spread the rumor that it was a homosexual murder by Arabs.

De Haan is now considered one of the most accomplished Dutch poets. A
complete edition of his poems was published in 1952, and many of his works have been reissued in the 1980s.


Gert Hekma

HADRIAN (76–138)
Roman emperor from 117 to 138. Protected and adopted by the emperor Trajan, Hadrian had a military and political career before ascending the throne upon his protector’s death. Hadrian traveled extensively throughout the Empire, undertook extensive administrative reforms, built cities, roads, public buildings, and aqueducts. He withdrew the Roman armies from Assyria, Armenia, and Mesopotamia to reduce the cost of maintaining the eastern frontier of the Empire, but fought a war against Bar Kochba’s uprising in Palestine that ended with the devastation of the country and its decline as a center of Jewish cultural life.

Though married to Sabina, Hadrian is remembered most of all for his attachment to the youthful Antinous (ca. 111–130), whose beauty, perpetuated in countless busts and reliefs, won the emperor’s affection. During a voyage up the Nile Antinous was drowned under circumstances that gossip enveloped in romantic legend, even to the point of asserting that the youth had sacrificed his life for his lover. In his grief Hadrian ordered the boy deified as god and hero, and even authorized the belief that Antinous had ascended to the firmament as a new star, though it was only in the Renaissance that Tycho Brahe confirmed the emperor’s wish by assigning the name to a heavenly body.

In Egypt Hadrian founded a new city named after Antinous, and elsewhere in the empire the youth was commemorated by cult, festival, and statues. Surviving are numerous inscriptions in his honor, and Pancrates and Nicomedes composed poems to celebrate his qualities. Scandalized by these actions of the emperor, the early Christians contrasted their reverence for the saints and martyrs with this object of an “impure” passion.

A great patron of the arts, Hadrian brought the Roman revolution in architecture that had commenced under Nero to its fulfillment, as seen in the Pantheon, which still survives in the Eternal City. Outside Rome, at Tivoli, Hadrian’s villa displays a series of innovative pavilions recalling places he had visited, so that he could revive the happy memories at his leisure. Hadrian may be deemed the archetype of the wealthy homosexual traveler and connoisseur.

Hadrian’s reign was marked by the flourishing of the neo-Greek manner in art, one of whose most frequent themes was the Antinous type of male beauty, echoed in scores of coins and statues that can be seen today in museums. The aura of mystery that enveloped the death of Antinous has inspired modern literary treatments of the liaison, some explicit in their analysis of the homosexual motif, such as Marguerite Yourcenar’s Hadrian’s Memoirs (New York, 1954). Antinous remains the archetype of the handsome youth protected by a noble lover that was the ideal of Greek paiderasteia, and the embodiment of the beauty of late adolescence immortalized by untimely death, while Hadrian stands out as one of the “good emperors” under whose enlightened rule Greco-Roman civilization flourished throughout the Mediterranean world.


Warren Johansson

HAFIZ (CA. 1320–CA. 1390)
Persian poet. Hafiz was the title of Shams al-Din Muhammad, whose tomb remains a pilgrimage site near Shiraz in southern Iran. While every detail of his life
can be contested, no one can question his mastery of *ham*—Persian for ambivalence.

Politically, Hafiz lived in a troubled time. The Arab ascendancy over Persia had broken and at the end of his life was replaced by Mongol rule. Hafiz never became a court poet, but neither did he suffer martyrdom, and, despite the changes in rulers, he was able to spend most of his life and to be buried in Shiraz, the city of his birth. The legend of his meeting with the Mongol Tamerlane (Timur) demonstrates Hafiz' subtle diplomacy. The conqueror challenged the poet's offering of two of Tamerlane's cities for a boy. (Emerson translates the verse: "Take my heart in thy hand, o beautiful boy of Shiraz! I would give for the mole on thy cheek Samarcand and Buchara!") Hafiz responded that "because of such generosity I now come before you a poor beggar." Tamerlane rewarded the poet, but the conqueror may not have shared the poet's love of roughs—in Persian *rends* or vagrants who loved wine, poetry, and boys. Muslims who, like Hafiz, favored rough trade found support in the tradition that Mohammed said, "I saw my Lord in the shape of a beautiful young man with his cap askew."

Religiously, *hafiz' name suggests Islamic orthodoxy: in Arabic, *hafiz* means "protector"; it was one of the names of Allah and was a title given those who had memorized the entire Koran. For a time Hafiz earned a living copying theological works; a copy in his hand of Sufi Amir Khusrau is dated 1355. Iranians now read Hafiz as a Sufi mystic; in 1979 the Ayatollah Khomeini (using the pseudonym "Hendi") published a collection of Hafizian verses. During his life Hafiz attacked the orthodox and praised Mansur al-Hallaj (d. 922), a Sufi martyr beheaded in Baghdad as a heretic. Hafiz spurred mosques in favor of taverns where he found men, who led him to ecstasy: "With mussed-up hair and sweating brow, bright lips, intoxicated smile, shirt torn open to the waist, singing a sonnet softly, his cup contains an overpowering joy." Legend held that at his death the orthodox disputed Hafiz' right to burial, but he was granted honors after a youth by chance drew the following line from his work: "Dance joyfully by Hafiz' grave; buried in sin, he's carrying on in Paradise."

Poetically, Hafiz has endured many interpretations. In Urdu, Turkish- and Persian-speaking societies, only his collected verses and the Koran are used for divination. His work has survived but not with any accepted canonical text; collected works range from 152 to 994 poems. But virtually no one questions that Hafiz is the greatest writer of Persian *ghazals*, a form which he perfected. Like the sonnet, the ghazal was often a love song. Among predecessors, Sa'di (also from Shiraz) had a strong influence; at least thirty of Hafiz' *ghazals* use the same end rhymes, metrical pattern and subject as Sa'di's. And Hafiz shared some of Omar Khayyam's love of the moment as well as Rumi's intensity. Like Rumi, Hafiz paired divine beauty (*jamal*) with divine terror (*jalal*), nightingale (*bulbul*) with rose (*gul*). The complexity of his verse can be seen in his lines about the first letter of the Arabic alphabet (*alif*): "Only the *alif* [i. e., penis] of my lover standing scratches my heart slate." Here the blend between the body and a mystical monotheist are combined ingeniously in writing.

Pederasty, which lies at the center of *Sa'di*, Rumi, and Hafiz' work, is censored even today from English translations. Joseph von Hammer translated Hafiz into German in two volumes in 1812–18, with male–male lovers [as in the Persian] because he was "afraid of getting entangled in contradictions by praising girls for their green-sprouting beards." Friedrich Rückert published even finer translations of Hafiz in 1822 which were shared with his friend Count Platen. In 1908, Friedrich Veit wrote a thesis, "Des Grafen von Platen Nachbildungen aus dem Diwan des Hafis," which celebrated the homoerotic aspects of Hafiz. Goethe, Emerson, and Nietzsche were among the most famous who wrote
poems from Hafiz based on German translations.

Contemporary Muslims like Khomeini angrily reject European interpretations of Hafiz as an unrestrained libertine, drunkard, and pederast. Europeans can be faulted for projecting their desires on people they have defined as aliens, but the rising nations of Asia have themselves been tricked into suppressing their own customs to please missionaries. In his own time Hafiz had to struggle against the Islamic proscription of drinking; he struggled to go beyond good and evil, God and Satan, the body and spirit by transcending dualities. In his quest he searched for boys who wore their caps askew.


Charley Shively

HAITI

This French- and creole-speaking black republic of over six million people occupies the western third of the island of Hispaniola. Although handicapped by poverty and political discord, Haiti is a remarkable cultural amalgam, retaining many hallmarks of the African diaspora. In the early 1980s claims were made that male homosexuality is such a tabooed topic in Haitian culture that dying AIDS patients would necessarily deny any homosexual involvements. Yet earlier observers such as the anthropologist Melville Herskovits, who studied rural Haiti, were able to elicit information about attitudes toward local homosexuals. The attitudes reported—bemused denigration—and the lack of any attempts to extirpate homosexual behavior do not differ from those known throughout Latin America. If anything, less prominent machismo in Haiti connects with greater toleration of homosexuals in voudon cults than is imaginable in any Spanish-speaking Latin American societies. Bahia, in one of the most Afro-American parts of Brazil, which was similarly populated from Dahomey (now Benin), is the closest cultural analogue. There, cross-gender possession and homosexuality are prominent parts of Xango cults. The literature on voudon contains many mentions of possessions by loas [spirits] of a sex other than that of the person possessed. No particularly notable taboo on homosexuality was reported in pre-AIDS ethnographic literature. This claim would seem to have been concocted to protect tourism in Haiti. Explicit gender non-conformity in the folk religion, which was sanctioned by the Duvalier regime between 1957 and 1986, was notable; the homosexual taboo is not found there.

Any serious assertion that it is particularly difficult to elicit information about homosexuality from Haitians must be comparative, but no one has compared elicitation in Haiti with elicitation in the Dominican Republic [the Spanish-speaking other portion of the island of Hispaniola], Bahia, or any other point for comparison. In the United States itself, one observer has noted, "except for three cases of AIDS in admittedly homosexual Haitians, none of the other cases reported have admitted to homosexual activity despite intensive questioning in both French and Creole by both American physicians and by Haitians."


Stephen O. Murray

HALL, RADCLYFFE (1880–1943)

English novelist and poet. Born to a well-to-do family in Bournemouth, Hall was left a good deal to herself as a child, developing her own identity under her favorite name of "John." Throughout her life she was to affect a strikingly masculine appearance. At the age of 27 she fell in
love with the 50-year-old Mabel Batten, whom she had met at the resort of Homberg. The two took up residence together and, influenced by her lover, Hall converted to Roman Catholicism. In 1915 the two women attended a tea party in London, where Hall met Una, Lady Troubridge, the wife of an admiral. When Batten died soon after, the way was clear for Hall and Troubridge to live together—much to the admiral's puzzlement. The two women were destined to remain together for thirty years.

Hall published several volumes of poetry during this period, but it was only with the appearance of her novel *Adam's Breed* in 1926 that she achieved popularity. In this work she transposed her own personality into that of a man, Gian-Luca. Two years later, however, she launched her bombshell, the openly lesbian novel *The Well of Loneliness*. This work, though it seems mild and lacking in explicitness today, was declared "obscene" and the British courts ordered all copies seized. After this point Hall and Troubridge judged it prudent to live abroad, retaining however the conservative political and social views characteristic of their class.

Inevitably *The Well of Loneliness* strikes readers today as a time-bound work, inasmuch as Hall subscribed to current theories of "sexual inversion," which she popularized. Indeed as a role model she may have led many women into an unnecessary cultivation of stereotypes. Nonetheless, the notoriety of her work helped to move lesbianism into the consciousness of a public which in the Anglo-Saxon world at least had managed until 1928 to ignore the phenomenon almost entirely.


_Evelyn Gettone_

---

**Handballing**

This sexual practice involves the insertion of one partner's hand—and sometimes much of the arm—into the rectum of the other. Before attempting such insertion the nails are pared and the hand lubricated. Sometimes alcohol and drugs are used by the receptive partner as relaxants. This practice acquired a certain popularity—and notoriety under the name of *fistfucking*—in a sector of the gay male leather/S & M community in the 1970s. A few lesbians have also reported engaging in it. A medical term, apparently uncommon, has been proposed for handballing: brachiprocotric eroticism.

It need scarcely be stressed that handballing is dangerous in all its variations, as puncturing of the rectal lining may lead to infection and even death. Although handballing does not directly expose the passive partner to AIDS or to sexually transmitted diseases, by scratching or scarring the rectal wall it may create tiny portals for the invasion of microbes during a subsequent penetration. With the new emphasis on safe sex in the 1980s, handballing has greatly declined, and it will probably be relegated to history as one of the temporary excesses of the sexual revolution.

Historical precedents are elusive. It may be conjectured that the recent resort to the practice is due to medical knowledge of operations in which the anus is dilated, since the ordinary individual scarcely credits that such enlargement is possible or desirable. In a late Iranian version of the binding and riding of the god of darkness Ahriman by the hero Taxmoruw, the demonic figure breaks loose by means of a trick and swallows the hero; by pretending to be interested in anal intercourse the brother of Taxmoruw manages to insert his arm into Ahriman's anus and retrieve the body from his belly. The brother's arm—the one that entered the demon's anus—becomes silvery white and stinking, and the brother has to exile himself voluntarily so that others will not become
polluted. The myth is interesting as linking the forbidden sexual activity with stigmatization and outlawry of the perpetrator.

There seems to have been no term for handballing in the Greek language, though *siphnizaein* (from the island of Siphnos) has been defined as to “insert a finger in the anus.” This harmless practice has long been known, and it may have served as a kind of modest precedent.


**HARLEM RENAISSANCE**

Harlem is a section of northern Manhattan originally developed as housing for the white middle class. As New York’s blacks were gradually excluded from residing in the southern part of the island, however, from 1915 onward it became the chief Negro center of the city—and of the nation. New York City’s black community was reinforced by thousands migrating from the South in search of freedom from discrimination and lynching. In the 1920s, sometimes termed the Jazz Age, Harlem’s black culture and intelligentsia enjoyed a golden age. Harlem was the center of Marcus Garvey’s nationalist movement, and also an entertainment mecca for blacks and whites alike.

Probably the most important achievement of the Harlem Renaissance was the emergence of new writers whose works could appear under the imprint of major publishers. The writings of the gay poet Countee Cullen (1903–1946) were to become widely known. Cullen’s marriage to Yolanda Du Bois, daughter of the famed black scholar and journalist W. E. B. Du Bois, proved a disaster, but his homosexuality was hushed up. To this day conflicting opinions are heard on the possible homosexuality of Langston Hughes (1902–1967), one of the major figures of the group. Either he was particularly successful in covering up or repressing his homo-

sexualty, or it did not exist at all—though the latter seems unlikely. There is no doubt of the orientation of the experimental writer (Richard) Bruce Nugent (1906– ), who lived into gay liberation days, when he gave informative interviews. Nugent wrote what may have been the first fictional account of American black homosexuality, the short story “Smoke, Lilies, and Jade,” published in the little magazine *Fire*! (1926). The bisexual Wallace Thurman took a more sardonic view of the Harlem Renaissance, as seen in his novel *Infants of the Spring* (1932).

White enthusiasm for the achievements of black America’s “talented tenth” was heavily laced with stereotypes—including the one that made the Negro the symbol of heterosexual virility. The creative contribution of blacks was still held to be circumscribed by their “more elemental” approach, in contrast to the cerebral logic attributed to the white tradition. This perception encouraged a stream of chic whites north of 110th Street, where they attended speakeasies and nightclubs. Here they could see a series of bisexual and lesbian entertainers, notably Ma Rainey, Bessie Smith, “Moms” Mabley, and Gladys Bentley. Carl Van Vechten, a blond gay novelist from Iowa, became the unofficial publicity agent for this side of Harlem. Other, more ordinary gays flocked to Harlem night spots where they found a more tolerant atmosphere. It was not just a Bohemia like Greenwich Village, it was a place where the homosexual visitor could be more relaxed and uninhibited. Huge drag balls were given at the Rockland Palace and the glittering Savoy Ballroom. This side of Harlem is sensitively reflected in Blair Niles’ novel *Strange Brother* (1931).

The deepening Depression of the 1930s caused all these activities to fade. Until the black cultural revival of the sixties and seventies, the Harlem Renaissance was almost forgotten. Although even today its homosexual component tends to be slighted, the trend made a real contribution to American gay life and culture.
See also Black Gay Americans; New York City.


Ward Houser

HARTLEY, MARSDEN (1877–1943)

American painter, poet, and essayist. Born Edmund Hartley in Lewiston, Maine, he was raised there and at his father's home in Cleveland. While working as a clerk in a marble quarry, he started formal study of art at the Cleveland School of Art. A scholarship sent him to New York City to complete his training. In 1904 he began an important friendship with Horace Traubel, the biographer of Walt Whitman. After producing a number of impressionist and neoimpressionist paintings, he launched his public career as an artist under the name of Marsden Hartley (Marsden was his step-mother's maiden name). Through Alfred Stieglitz, who gave him his first one-person show at his 291 gallery, Hartley gained entrée into New York's avant-garde.

After experimenting in the style of Picasso, Hartley went to Paris (1912), where he became an intimate of Gertrude Stein. He also absorbed Central European influences, including the abstractionism of Franz Marc and Vassily Kandinsky. In 1913 he settled in Berlin, entering into a love affair with Lieutenant Karl von Freyburg. His lover was killed in battle on October 7, 1914, and Hartley created several of his finest paintings to memorialize the relationship. These works, which feature regalia of the German officer corps, did not stand him in good stead when he returned to New York in 1915. In the fall of 1916 he began to share a house in Provincetown with Charles Demuth, an artist of a similar modernist style who was well acquainted with the gay scene of New York and environs. Hartley also was friendly with the lesbian writer Djuna Barnes.

In 1921 he returned to Europe, where his book Twenty-Five Poems was issued by Robert McAlmon's Contact Publishing Company in Paris. The Great Depression forced Hartley to return to the United States, though a Guggenheim Fellowship enabled him to spend 1932 in Mexico, where he became close friends with Hart Crane. After learning of Crane's suicide, Hartley painted Eight Bells; Polly. In the mid-thirties he supported himself in New York through participation in the Public Works of Art Project. He struck up a friendship with the Francis Mason family in Nova Scotia, and he was to live with them for much of the rest of his life.

Hartley's work is now seen to belong to a native American current of expressionism in which he was a pivotal figure. During his lifetime, however, his seeming shifts of style, combined with the relative immaturity of the American art world, prevented him from receiving full recognition. This neglect augmented a loneliness that his shyness about his homosexuality induced in him. In 1980, however, a full-scale retrospective at the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York restored his reputation.


Wayne R. Dynes

HELOGABALUS (ALSO KNOWN AS ELAGABALUS; 204–222)

Roman Emperor from 218 to 222. Born at Emesa in Syria as a descendant of the royal family of King Samsigeramus, he became priest of Elagabal in that city in 217. His grandmother Julia Maesa arranged to have him declared emperor by the Tenth Gallican Legion on April 14, 218. The legions sent against him deserted and killed their commanders, and as sole ruler of the
Empire he traveled to Rome in the winter of 218/19. Here he reigned in a style of luxury and effeminacy unprecedented even in the history of Rome. He sent out agents to comb the city for particularly well-hung partners for his couch, whom he made his advisers and ministers. His life was an endless search for pleasure of every kind, and he had his body depilated so that he could arouse the lusts of the greatest number. His extant portraits on coins suggest a sensuous, even African type evolving through late adolescence. The refinements which he innovated in the spheres of culinary pleasure and of sumptuous interior decoration and household furnishing are mentioned by the historians of his reign as having survived him and found emulators among the Roman aristocracy of later times. For what Veblen called "conspicuous consumption" he set a standard probably unequalled until the Islamic middle ages.

His sexual personality cannot be reduced to a mere formula of passive-effeminate homosexuality, although this aspect of his erotic pleasure-seeking is the one stressed by his ancient biographers. He loved the role of Venus at the theatre and the passive role in his encounters with other men, yet he was married several times and even violated a Vestal virgin, but remained childless. This facet of his sexual life has enabled the more dishonest classical historians to write of him as if he were just another heterosexual ruler, when in fact he seems to have desired an operation that would gratify his fantasy not of changing into a member of the opposite sex (transsexual in the modern sense) but of becoming truly androgynous—having the functioning genital organs of both. As high priest of the Syrian deity Elagabal he sought to elevate the cult of the latter to the sole religion of the Empire, yet he did not persecute the Christians. Family intrigues ultimately cost him the favor of the soldiers who murdered him and his mother on March 11, 222. Unique as he was in the history of eroticism and of luxury, he has inspired writers from the third-century biographer Aelius Lampridius in the Scriptores Historiae Augustae through the later treatments of Jean Lombard, Louis Couperus, and Stefan George to Antonin Artaud and Alberto Arbasino.


Warren Johansson

HELENISM

This trend in Western civilization is part of a larger preoccupation with idealizing a privileged era of the past as a source of cultural norms for the present. Sometimes this idealization engenders utopian longings. In this case classical antiquity, or a portion of it, occupies the place of honor as model and guide. Examples of prescriptive precedents from ancient Greece include the three orders in architecture (Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian), Platonism in philosophy, and Homer as a pattern for epic poetry.

Permutations of the Hellenic Image. Although Christianity retained selected elements of Greek culture and philosophy, it tended to treat the whole phenomenon as part of the discarded pagan model of human development. Clearly unsalvageable, the institution of pederasty figured as one of the most reprehensible survivals of the Hellenic heritage. This rejection persisted for a thousand years after the adoption of Christianity as the state religion of the Roman empire in the fourth century of our era. Hellenism as a norm reemerged during the Italian Renaissance; although this word is modern, it captures the central notion of rebirth of classical ideals and standards of beauty. The Renaissance also saw the first tentative beginnings of an apologetic literature for homosexual behavior. The Florentine thinker Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499), who contributed to this apologetic endeavor,
was interested not only in Greece but equally in Egyptian (or what he believed to be Egyptian) thought: the Hermetic corpus. Other humanists were more attracted to ancient Rome than to Greece.

A more exclusive focus on Greece began to emerge in the course of the eighteenth century, reflecting the consolidation of a Eurocentric mentality that had become contemptuous of the cultures of other continents which colonialism was engaged in subduing. In 1752 the Göttingen scholar Johann Matthias Gesner (1691–1761) gave a lecture in which he cautiously explored the evidence for Socrates' homosexuality. The text, SocratesSanctus Paederasta, was only published eight years after the author's death and not in Germany but in Utrecht in Holland with its much greater freedom of the press. In 1759 Johann Georg Hamann, the precursor of the Counter-Enlightenment, issued his SokratischeDenkwürdigkeiten, emphasizing the sensual element in true friendship between males. Toward the end of the century franker discussions were offered in the Netherlands by Frans Hemsterhuis and Cornelis de Pauw.

A new purified Hellenism triumphed in the artistic movement known as neo-classicism. The homosexual archaeologist Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–1768), for example, rejected Egypt as a source of ideal beauty, saying that short, stocky people with snub noses could never inspire great figural art. Although he was not able to visit Greece in person, knowing it only from art and literature, he insisted that only the physical type of that country could serve as a paradigm. Winckelmann had a major influence not only over the rise of neo-classical painting and sculpture, with their emphasis on the male nude, but also over the trend toward "aesthetic paganism" in German literature. Greek ideals, though sometimes anachronistically conflated with Roman ones, played a major role in both the American and French Revolutions.

In the nineteenth century, cultural Hellenism found particular favor with English homosexuals, such as Walter Pater and John Addington Symonds. This ethos of aestheticism was grounded in part in the all-male public schools that combined the officially approved reading of Greek texts with a clandestine, but pervasive subculture of homosexuality. Matthew Arnold, though not himself homosexual, had posited a fundamental contrast between the stern morality of Hebraism and the more permissive and beauty-loving Hellenism. Toward the end of the century a group of minor pederastic poets appeared in England [sometimes termed the Calamites], who went back to the Greek Anthology for much of their inspiration.

In Switzerland Heinrich Hoessli, who published the first major modern work on homosexuality (1836–38), took much of his material from ancient Greece, as did his successor Karl Heinrich Ulrichs. In his Birth of Tragedy (1872), the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche effected a major correction of the conventional wisdom about the Greeks. He showed that the ideal of "nothing in excess," of rule by reason and good sense, was but one aspect of the Greek ethos, which he termed the Apollonian side. Its complement was the Dionysian element, which was emotional, intuitive, and irrational. Beginning with the Göttingen professor Karl Otfried Müller (1797–1840), German philologists strove to distinguish separate strands of pederasty, as those of Sparta, Thebes, and Athens. The contemporary French scholar Bernard Sergent has sought to relate Greek homosexual traditions to a putative Indo-European pederasty. Although their findings have remained controversial in detail, the labors of these writers have served to show that Hellenic pederasty was not monolithic.

The great modern Greek poet Constantine Cavafy chose as his two central themes Greek history, though more
the Hellenistic period than the Golden Age, and his own homosexual experiences in Alexandria, a city whose very existence attested to the expansive capacity of Hellenism. In the early twentieth century André Gide could still appeal [in Corydon, 1924] to Greek pederasty as his model, saying that it was hypocritical to honor the Greeks for their philosophy and art, while ignoring or condemning a central feature of their civilization. This approach lingered in J. Z. Eglinton’s Greek Love (New York, 1964).

The fame of an ancient Greek poet, Sappho of Lesbos, assured that she was synonymous with female same-sex love: sapphism. Later that honor was transferred to the island on which she lived. In the twentieth century such writers as H. D. [Hilda Doolittle] and Natalie Barney made a cult of ancient Greece, striving to recapture qualities of purity and concision that they found in surviving texts. Significantly, Barney was known as “the Amazon,” after that legendary women’s tribe.

Outlook. The same-sex component of Greek culture has been subject to various procedures of censorship and emendation. Until recently, more popular treatments of “the Greek miracle” simply omitted any discussion of the prevalence of homosexuality. Some mentioned it only to chide the Greeks for their tragic flaw. In recent decades some homophile scholars have seen the Greeks in their own image—one of adult–adult love or androphilia—and neglected to acknowledge that the normative form of Greek same-sex love was pederastic, the love of a male adult for an adolescent youth. In keeping with the male-centered character of Greek society as whole, there was no generally accredited lesbian counterpart of the pederastic institution.

Today’s rapid pace of social and technological change has dimmed the appeal of the Greek model. Feminists and others have flayed Hellenic civilization as sexist and elitist. More broadly, the contemporary mainstream, discounting the idea of inspiration from the past, has become present-minded and future oriented. In gay studies, the social construction trend has branded investigation of eras before the nineteenth century irrelevant, claiming that “homosexuality” is a recent innovation. Even disregarding this prohibition—as scholars should—more careful study of ancient Greece suggests that it was not sex positive as earlier idealized views had claimed. Sexual freedom was hedged with formidable taboos of class and gender.

Acknowledging these restrictions and qualifications, there is no doubt that continued scrutiny of the well-documented sexual behavior of the ancient Greeks can provide insights for the understanding of such distant societies as Japan and Melanesia. Ancient Greece was the focus of the last works of the influential French social philosopher Michel Foucault. Using both time-honored and distinctively modern techniques of investigation, other scholars are at work in a new effort to wring the full meaning from the extensive body of Greek texts on human sexuality. In the present context the enduring significance of ancient Hellas is that its civilization cherished an attitude toward the pederastic form of male homosexuality standing in diametric opposition to that of the Judaic-Christian tradition. This chapter of the collective memory of mankind encapsulates a behavioral norm which institutionalized Christianity and other opponents could reject but never wholly suppress.


Wayne R. Dykes
HELENISTIC MONARCHIES (323–31 B.C.)

Alexander the Great’s generals, known in the first generation as diadochoi (successors), who presided over the new cultural synthesis, half-Greek and half-Oriental, founded by Alexander, seized the fragments of his empire. Ptolemy took Egypt, Antigonus Greece and Macedonia, and Seleucus Asia after the decisive battle of Ipsus in 301 ended the wars that broke out on Alexander’s death. They established bureaucratic monarchies, with the Ptolemies becoming the wealthiest from irrigated agriculture and Alexandria’s central position in world trade. The Seleucids recreated the Persian Empire with variegated ethnicities loosely supervised from Antioch and Seleucia—new foundations rivaling Alexandria—while the relatively poor Antigonids relied on Hellenic homogeneity.

Basic Character and Historical Development. Inspired by the examples of Philip of Macedon and Alexander, the Hellenistic monarchs and their Greek or Hellenized subjects in newly founded or Hellenized cities as far east as India and Bactria practiced pederasty, patronized gymnasia, secluded women, and held symposia. Eventually Pergamon, under the Attalids, and the island of Rhodes managed to secure independence as buffer states in the Aegean, where Ptolemaic navies contested Antigonid and Seleucid claims. In Alexandria, Ptolemy I established the Museum, subsidizing its learned symposia frequented by leading scholars, and the Library, created by Demetrius of Phaleron on the model of his teacher Aristotle. Aristotle had first systematized the collections of books begun by the sixth-century Polycrates of Samos and Hipparchus of Athens, both pederasts. Other cities, notably Pergamon, Beirut, and Athens, which also created libraries, took the lead in science, culture, and philosophy.

Weakened by internecine rivalries, the Hellenistic monarchies fell one by one to Rome—Macedonia in 147, Syria, its easternmost provinces in Parthia, Persia, and Mesopotamia long since independent, in 78, and Egypt in 30 B.C. at the death of Cleopatra, last of the Ptolemies. It was Hellenistic rather that Hellenic pederasty that the Romans absorbed, and this more often involved relations between masters and slaves or rich men and poor boys than the classical model of one aristocrat training another, younger one. Further, effeminate boys and transvestites of the type long popular in the East, even eunuchs like Bagoas, seized with the rest of King Darius’ harem by Alexander, became fashionable in the Hellenistic cities even among Greeks. The Hellenic institutionalization of pederasty passed into Asia and Africa before it began to penetrate Rome during the middle and late Republic. In the East, as in Rome and in Greece itself, this later pederasty spread to the lower classes, which teemed in the urban slums, separated from families or village stability. The independent citizen hoplite (foot soldier) from the classes wealthy enough to afford their own heavy armor and hence able to fight in the phalanx was replaced by the mercenary recruited abroad or drawn from the lower classes. The new “volunteer” soldiers often regarded the barracks as their homes and the regiment as their family, and were hired by the monarchs who snuffed out the liberties of the Greek city-states.

Sexual Aspects. The following monarchs became famous for homosexuality: Demetrius Poliorcetes, his son Antigonus Gonatas; Antiochus I, who loved three boys at the same time; Ptolemy IV; Ptolemy VII, who kept a harem of boys; Ptolemy XIII; and Nicomedes of Bithynia, who paid the 16-year-old Julius Caesar to sodomize him.

Ptolemy II Philadelphus imitated the Pharaonic practice of marrying his sister as did some of his descendants such as Ptolemy XIII, XIV, and XV, each of whom in order married their sister Cleopatra. She was the last of the line and after their deaths Cleopatra became mistress of
Julius Caesar and then wife of Mark Anthony. Even members of the lower classes began to marry their sisters, but many in vast city slums and in the countryside were doubtless too poor to marry: like slaves unable to secure regular access to women they must have often turned to homosexuality. Poets such as Theocritus and Callimachus, scholars at the Library of Alexandria, testify to the ready availability of boys. Pederasty was a subject for Alexandrian as it had been for Athenian tragedians. Beginning with Rhianus of Crete (floruit ca. 275 B.C.), Aristides of Miletus (ca. 100 B.C.), Apollonius of Rhodes (ca. 295 B.C.), Diotimus (third century B.C.), Moschus (ca. 150 B.C.), Bion (ca. 100 B.C.), and Meleager of Gadara (ca. 100 B.C.) among the pederastic poets. Phanocles (ca. 250 B.C.) composed his garland of elegies entitled Love Stories of Beautiful Boys (ca. 250 B.C.). The Musa Paidike, Book XII of the Greek Anthology, contains poems mostly composed in this era exhibiting a frankly sensual pederasty without even a pretext of paideia (education). This attitude continued in the Greek-speaking world until the Christian sexual counter-revolution of the fourth century, contemporaneous with the establishment of the Byzantine Empire.

Instead of recommending civic virtue as their classical predecessors had done, philosophers argued how one should best inure oneself against the changing fortunes controlled by the goddess Tyche or arbitrary despots. These philosophers included: Epicurus; Zeno of Citium, founder of Stoicism; Peripatetics, who continued Aristotle’s tradition in the Lyceum; and members of the Academy of Plato. Jews, like Philo, especially in Alexandria, where their largest colony lived, and in Jerusalem, where under the Maccabees they revolted against Antiochus IV, condemned pederasty and some other aspects of Hellenism which they found morally repellent, while absorbing still others.

The lasting importance of the Hellenistic monarchies lies in the interface which they created between Judaic and Hellenic cultures; this setting fostered the new syncretistic religion of Christianity which was destined to embrace the entire Greco-Roman world—with tragic consequences for homosexuality.


William A. Percy

HEMINGWAY, ERNEST (1899–1961)

American novelist and short story writer. Hemingway first achieved fame as a member of the “Lost Generation” in Paris in the 1920s. His trademark, a lean, almost laconic style, was widely imitated. Noted for his exploration of “supermasculine” subject-matter—war, bullfighting, safaris, deep-sea fishing—Hemingway became a veritable icon of heterosexuality.

Yet careful readers could note hints of sexual unorthodoxy. The short story “Mr. and Mrs. Elliott” (1925) concerns lesbianism, and in fact Hemingway was fascinated with the expatriate world of lesbian Paris typified by Natalie Barney, Sylvia Beach, Gertrude Stein, and their associates. In The Sun Also Rises (1926) the hero is unable to consummate a sexual relationship because of impotence. The material for the novel derives from a trip to Spain financed by his traveling companion, the bisexual writer Robert McAlmon.

Hemingway’s mother, Grace, who may have been a lesbian, dressed the boy in girl’s clothes to make a twin sister of him for the older Marcelline. The Garden of Eden, a novel published in abridged form only in 1986, reveals homosexual and transsexual fantasies. Rumors that his suicide was the result of an unhappy gay affair have not been substantiated.
HENRI III OF FRANCE
(1551–1589)

French king, the son of Henri II and Catherine de' Medici. Elected to the throne of Poland in 1573, he left the country on the death of his brother Charles IX of France to ascend the throne at the age of 23. Because he refused to adopt the measures for extermination of the Protestants advocated by the Catholic party under the leadership of the Duc de Guise (which had in 1572 perpetrated the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve), he found himself at war with its supporters, and even Paris and other cities rebelled against him. He made common cause with the Protestant Henri of Navarre, but in his camp at St. Cloud he was assassinated by a fanatical Dominican monk and died at the age of 38.

Seldom has the homosexuality of a ruler been so public and undisguised, or have the favorites of a monarch been so clearly identified as in the life of Henri III. Though exhibiting many traits of the stereotypical homosexual, and that of the effeminate variety, he is indicated by reliable sources to have felt passionate attraction to women as well. If he remained childless, it was in the opinion even of his foes because an incurable gonorrhea had left him sterile. Many writers have tried to ascribe his homosexual leanings to a stay in Venice in 1574, where satiated with the charms of the opposite sex which he had known only too well, he succumbed to the pederastic vice so rampant in Italy, or to the syphilis which he contracted in the city on the Adriatic. The most that he could have learned was how many others shared his proclivities, and the moment Henri became king of France, he gave free rein to his homosexual urges and also to the fondness for luxury and extravagance which the ancients equated with effeminacy.

Henry was well-built, charming in looks, and gracious in manner; his hands were especially beautiful. His character was marked by the feminine traits of tenderness and religiosity. In 1583 an anxiety-provoking dream even caused him a crisis of piety in which he founded a brotherhood called the Penitents that staged processions in which the king, his mignons, and other dignitaries of the court participated in masks. Other feminine traits of his were a fondness for lapdogs, for childish games and toys, and for elegant costumes. He loved to wear women's clothing and even to appear at public events clad in the style affected by the ladies of his court. Not long after ascending the throne he surrounded himself with handsome young men in their early twenties—the mignons, who used all the feminine arts to ape the king's own proclivities in dress, speech and walk. Two categories of mignons can be differentiated: the mignons de coeur, who shared his pleasures and erotic passions—Quélus, Maugiron, Livarol, Saint-Mégrin and others, and the mignons d'état, who played a military and political role and acquired a real influence over the affairs of the reign—notably Joyeuse and d'Epernon. Henri cemented his ties with the mignons not just by showering them with favors and gifts of all kinds, but also by arranging marriages for them that were celebrated in a lavish and fabulous manner. He was not troubled by jealousy when they took an interest in the opposite sex.

A contemporary satire entitled L'Ile des Hermaphrodites (The Isle of the Hermaphrodites) depicts the life of the mignons and their protector in a quite perceptive manner. The author describes how entering the palace of the hermaphrodites he sees them beautifying their persons to enter the inner sanctum of their lord for sensual mysteries in which he cannot follow. The walls of one room are hung with tapestries depicting Hadrian's passion for Antinous, another with scenes from the life of Heliogabalus, a third cham-
ber has a bed whose roof depicts the marriage of Nero and Pythagoras. The mignons join in the praises of their master and his fair hands. The significance of this work has not been fully appreciated, as it owes its title to the misunderstanding of the phenomenon of the berdache in accounts of the New World; the berdaches were mistaken for genuine hermaphrodites rather than as individuals who had adopted a culturally prescribed cross-gender role. Given the attitude toward homosexuality that had prevailed in Latin Christendom since the thirteenth century, the conduct of Henri and his mignons inevitably provoked enormous hostility and indignation, and a considerable literature defaming the king and his court was composed that formed the basis for later treatments of the period by historians who gave vent to their homophobia. Only in modern times has it been possible to form a truer picture of the virtues and foibles of a monarch whose public and private life was molded by the homosexual and effeminate in his personality.


Warren Johansson

HENRY, PRINCE (1726–1802)

Brother of Frederick II (the Great) of Prussia. Less distinguished than his brother, who occupied the throne for forty-six years, Henry was another homosexual member of the House of Hohenzollern. The portrait of him drawn by historians varies according to the degree of sympathy or aversion which they feel for him. A great lover of the military, Henry took an aggressive part in the Seven Years War and was particularly renowned for his role in the battle at Friedberg (October 29, 1762), which he won, ending the war. He retired early from active duty and lived thereafter as a dilettante in castle Rheinsberg, a few hours distant from Berlin. Like Frederick, he used the French language exclusively for his literary compositions. An enthusiastic admirer of Voltaire and of French philosophy, Henry loved uninhibited discussions of morality and metaphysics. He took particular pleasure in the theatre, while maintaining his own troupe of French performers. His friends fell into two categories: one group satisfied his intellectual and literary needs, the other his homoerotic passions and sensual cravings.

Henry’s personality was profoundly masculine: reflective and calculating, endowed with firm will and extraordinary memory, real talent for literature, and outstanding ability as a military strategist. But with these qualities he combined a feminine sensitivity and antipathy to cruelty and brutality in any form, compassion for the weak, and nobility and generosity toward his foes, especially the French. Physically he was small, his face unattractive, his whole figure somewhat ill-proportioned, so that one author remarked that seldom has such a beautiful soul and great talent had such a wretched exterior. All authors who dealt with the sexual side of his character agreed that he felt no love for women, and the compulsion which his older brother exercised on him to marry only strengthened his aversion to the opposite sex. He scarcely concealed his passion for young men and effeminate homosexual types, and he even had a temple of friendship built whose walls were decked with French inscriptions glorifying friendship—which in his case often meant a sensual passion for his youthful adjutants. Some of his favorites were of quite inferior station in life and unworthy character, yet possessing a coarse male attractiveness which the prince could not resist. One of these, a Major Kaphengst,
exploited the prince's interest in him to lead a dissipated, wasteful life on an estate not far from Rheinsberg. Others, such as the actor Blainville and the French émigré Count La Roche-Aymon, were better able to reciprocate his affection for them. Subsequently German novelists such as Theodor Fontane in Stechlin and Alexander von Ungern-Sternberg in Der deutsche Gil Blas alluded to the prince's character in works that indirectly furnish additional details about his private life.

Of interest is one detail of his political career: At the moment when Americans were considering the possibility of a constitutional monarchy, and George Washington had indignantly declined the honor, Henry's name was put forward as that of a cultured and liberal-minded soldier who would make an excellent king. On November 2, 1786 his old friend Baron von Steuben wrote to convey the support of his candidacy by many prominent Americans, but Henry waited until April 1787 to reply and then refused to commit himself until he could be assured of the sentiment of his future subjects.

If less renowned than his brother Frederick, Henry was still one of the homosexual members of the high nobility who, sympathizing with the ideas and ideals of the Enlightenment, put their rank and wealth at the service of the movement for political and ideological change in the closing decades of the Old Regime.


Warren Johansson

HERESY

Defined as willful and persistent departure from orthodox Christian dogma, heresy forced the church progressively to refine the formulation of its doctrines and to anathematize deviant theological opin-

ions. At times heretical movements such as Gnosticism, the mystical belief that the elect received a special enlightenment, and Arianism, greatest of the Christological heresies, seemed almost to overshadow the universal church. From Constantine the Great (d. 337) onward, the church used state power to impose uniformity of belief. In both eastern and western halves of the Roman Empire law subjected pertinacious heretics to branding, confiscation of property, exile, and even death. The assumption that the church had the right to call upon the secular power to suppress heresy survived the Empire itself. In the early Middle Ages in the West, few heretics were noticed or prosecuted from the sixth through the tenth century. When prosperity returned after 1000, however, ecclesiastical and secular authorities noted and persecuted heretics who multiplied particularly at first in the reviving cities of southern France and Italy. The iconoclastic controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries nearly destroyed the Byzantine Empire where other heresies such as dualistic Paulicianism flourished continuously.

The Image of the Heretic. Modern hypotheses on the causes of heresy were foreign to the churchmen of late antiquity and the Middle Ages, who simply considered heresy the work of the devil. Author after author repeated stereotypical descriptions and denunciations and often applied such beliefs and practices with scant discrimination to later heretics. These clichés were assembled into a type-figure of the heretic with conventional traits: his pride, since he has dared to reject the teaching of the official Church; his superficial mien of piety, which must be meant to deceive, since he is in fact an enemy of the faith; and his secrecy, contrasted with the teaching of the Church, which is broadcast to the four winds. Most significantly, the heretic is often accused of counterfeiting piety while secretly engaging in libertinism—and the form of sexual libertinism most often imputed to him is homosexuality, or sodomy, as the
term generally used from the end of the twelfth century onward.

Late Antiquity. Even before the end of antiquity, Western Christian controversialists, using a charge pagans had once leveled against them, had accused members of dissident sects of engaging in unmentionable orgies "for the sake of pleasure." Not satisfied with their promiscuous intercourse with women, some of them, in the words of the Apostle, "were consumed with their lust for one another."

A sect called the Levites, after the members of the tribe who officiated in the Temple in Jerusalem, were reported by Epiphanius of Salamis not to have intercourse with women, but only with one another. It was these who were held in distinction and honor by other libertine Gnostics, because they "had sowed no children for the Archon," that is to say, had begotten no offspring whose souls would like theirs be trapped in the lower, material world and could not ascend to heaven. Such charges were also hurled against the Manichaeans, who derived from Zoroastrianism the dualistic doctrine that an evil god created matter and human reproduction in the sense of having more bodies to rule.

The Middle Ages. It was at the end of the eleventh century that the so-called Bulgarian heresy became known in Western Europe. It was also known as the Albigenian or Cathar heresy. This was a dualistic ideology that had flourished in the kingdom of Bulgaria, which some ascribed to a priest named Bogomil, who combined the beliefs imported from the Byzantine Empire (Paulician and Manichaean) into a new system. From the reign of Tsar Peter (927-969) onward these doctrines were propagated throughout Europe. The Bogomils believed that the Devil was the creator of the visible, material world and that Christ was a phantom who had no ordinary body, was not born of Mary, and did not truly suffer on the cross. They rejected the sacraments, including baptism and the eucharist, in favor of initiation rites that included the laying on of hands, and identified the Devil with the Jewish god, the demiurge whose revelation in the Old Testament they accordingly repudiated. In their rejection of the Greek Orthodoxy propagated from Byzantium, the heretics were as radical as one could imagine. They subjected the Gospel narratives to an exegesis that made all the miracle stories symbolic and allegorical.

From the "Bulgarian" Heresy to Buggery. Since the Bulgarian heresy was the religious deviation par excellence of the later Middle Ages, all heretics in Western Europe came indiscriminately to be labeled bulgari, which became bougres in Old French and buggers in Middle English. But in addition to heresy, the term gained the meanings of sodomite and usurer. It has been claimed that this was only the church's way of defaming unbelievers and provoking hatred for them. In fact, however, as Catholics claimed, they advocated chastity because they retained the dualist notion of the wrongfulness of procreation, and may have tolerated sterile promiscuity, at least in the lower ranks of their sect. It is also quite possible that their highest ranks, the so-called perfecti, included more than their share of homosexuals, given the affinity of a certain homosexual character type for leadership in religious communities. The anti-homosexual doctrines of the Catholic Church, grounded in the prohibitions of the Old Testament which the Cathari rejected, may have added to the alienation of such types from its fold. The oft-repeated allegations of homosexual conduct were not without foundation: a promiscuous sodomite, Arnold of Verniolle of Pamiers, was caught in a heretic hunt in 1323. After careful examination of the evidence most modern historians have concluded that the accusations of debauchery and sodomy against the Cathars had some justification and corresponded to the survival of the mores of pagan Mediterranean antiquity in the folkways of Provence.
The further association of buggery with usury stemmed from the fact that medieval economic doctrine held money to be sterile, so that the earning of interest was equated with "unnatural" - non-reproductive forms of sexual expression. But all these factors coalesced to make bougre and bugger, Ketzzer and ketter mean not only heretic but also sodomite. German even distinguished the sodomite as the Ketzzer nach dem Fleisch, while the heretic proper was the Ketzzer nach dem Glauben. In texts of the thirteenth century, it is true, the general meaning of "heretic" still prevails. Then also, however, scholastic theologians such as Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas defined the "crime against nature by reason of sex" as second only to murder in its heinousness, and the social intolerance of homosexual expression rose to a point where everyone under the authority of the church was obliged to profess heterosexual interests alone. Moreover, the ecclesiastical courts gained the authority to try persons suspected of sodomy, as a crime under canon law, and then to relax them to the civil authorities for execution. Contrary to the modern belief that the term faggot for "effeminate homosexual" drives from the practice of burning such offenders at the stake, in England the penalty for both sodomy and witchcraft was hanging. As the significance of the Albigensian heresy receded, the meaning bugger = "sodomite" remained, and in the statute 25 Henry VIII c. 6 (1533), the word buggery is attested for the first time in English in the unequivocal sexual meaning. In German such terms as Bubenketzer for "pederast" retain the same association of ideas. Some writers even brand sodomy as worse than murder, because the murderer kills only one human being while the sodomite aims at the death of the entire human race, which in line with dualistic thinking would perish if one and all ceased to procreate so as not to enslave their offspring in the bonds of matter.

Later Middle Ages. In Cologne Meister Johannes Eckhart (d. 1327) began a pantheistic mysticism that often became heretical among his Rhenish followers. Partly inspired by the Rhenish mystic, Beguines and Regards, lay groups living communally in celibacy, concentrated in the Flemish towns, were accused of lesbianism more often than of sodomy with males. The general disruption of order by famines, endemic after 1314, the Black Death, which returned every ten years for a century after 1347, and the Hundred Years War led to both flagellants and dissipation as well as anti-Jewish outbursts, witch trials, and intensified persecution of sodomites.

Aftereffects. Certainly the theological overlap of heresy and sodomy served to magnify the hatred and aversion with which homosexuality was regarded by the masses of the faithful in Western Europe from the late thirteenth century down to modern times. In later medieval law codes heresy and sodomy were both capital crimes, and the accusation of "unnatural vice" was one of the charges brought against the Templars in a series of trials the objective basis of which remains disputed among medieval historians. Again, there is a real possibility that sexual non-conformity was the initial impetus that distanced the heretic from the Church, both then and in later times, when skepticism and unbelief replaced heresy as the chief foes of Christian dogma. It is noteworthy that in Great Britain bugger has, apart from the slightly archaic legal usage, been an exceedingly obscene taboo word that could not be used in polite company because of the images and emotions which it evoked.

A final consequence of the association of heresy and sodomy was the positive one, that both crimes were ultimately seen as expressions of the religious intolerance decried by antitrinitarians in the seventeenth century and by deistic thinkers in the eighteenth. The antithesis of the doctrine of the medieval Church
was the conviction that crimes against religion and morality, which included heresy and sodomy *par excellence*, should not be the object of criminal sanctions unless they harmed third parties or the interests of society in general. It is therefore all the more regrettable that in the English-speaking world, where freedom of conscience and toleration of sectarianism in religion came comparatively early, the place of buggery in the scheme of medieval intolerance was overlooked and the statutes adopted from canon law were perpetuated as bulwarks of morality.

*See also* Christianity; Patristic Writers.
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**HERMAPHRODITE**

The hermaphrodite, a human being fusing male and female characteristics, is the physical embodiment of the principle of androgyny. In mythology and art, hermaphrodites may be divided horizontally (where developed breasts may signal the female on top, with a complete penis below) or, more commonly, vertically (one side containing a breast and half of a vulva, the other side flat-chested with half of a penis). Sometimes hermaphrodites are regarded positively, standing for a desirable equality and balance between the sexes. Other traditions despise them as symbols of an unacceptable blurring of categories. In some instances the fusion seems relatively successful; in others, presenting a mere juxtaposition of forms, the result is grotesque. In behavior the hermaphrodite may be predominantly male or predominantly female. Cross-cultural data suggest that "male" hermaphrodites, who are likely to be viewed favorably, are much more frequent than "female" hermaphrodites, whose image is generally negative. With respect to their origin, some hermaphrodites result from the merger of a separate male and female person; others come into the world in a fused form, only splitting later into a separate male and female.

**Scientific Research vs. Cultural Traditions.** Early in the twentieth century the work of Franz Ludwig von Neugebauer demonstrated that in nature true human hermaphrodites, with fully developed male and female organs, are extremely rare—virtually nonexistent. What does occur is a situation where an individual is born with more or less complete organs of one sex and rudimentary or vestigial ones of the other. In other instances both sets may be undeveloped. For the first few weeks the human embryo is undetermined as to sex, and the hormones that effect the determination sometimes do not fully accomplish their task. Since our society dislikes the ambiguity of any anatomical intermediacy, the perceived flaw is usually surgically corrected and the individual takes his or her place as a "real" man or woman. In contrast with the sexual dimorphism of mammals, true hermaphroditism is the rule in many lower animal species, such as snails and worms, and in many kinds of flowers.

Cross-culturally there is no close link between physical and cultural hermaphroditism: the Greeks, who had a well-developed concept of the mythological hermaphrodite, were accustomed to kill hermaphroditic babies after birth. What is of greatest interest is in fact the cultural (that is imaginary) aspect of hermaphroditism, for it is a vehicle of feelings and speculation about gender, gender roles, and sexual orientation.

**European Mythological Traditions.** In Greek the word *hermaphroditos* stems from a fusion of the name of a male god, Hermes, with the goddess of love, Aphrodite. According to a story in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (IV, 285–388), the god Hermaphroditos was in fact the son of the
union of Hermes and Aphrodite, but he was originally male. The nymph Salmacis fell in love with him. Repulsed, she successfully beseeched the gods to unite her body forever with his. Immersion in the waters where this fusion took place reputedly turned the bather into a hermaphrodite.

In another myth Kainis was a maiden who formed a liaison with Poseidon. At her request he turned her into a powerful warrior, Kaineus. After his death, he became a woman once more.

Another case of serial hermaphroditism is that of the blind seer Teiresias. Chancing one day on a pair of coupling snakes, he disturbed them, wounding the female. He was punished by being turned into a woman. Seven years later he repeated the experience, and became a man once more. On being asked by the gods whether sex was more pleasurable as a man or a woman, he said that nine parts out of ten belonged to the woman.

In the Symposium Plato sets forth a myth in which human beings were originally double beings: the man-man, the woman-woman, and the man-woman. When split the last, the hermaphrodite, yielded heterosexual men and women who yearn to reunite with a “better half” of the opposite sex. According to homiletic commentators, the first man Adam in the Hebrew creation myth of Genesis was androgynous until Eve was extracted from his body. Since the creator made Adam in his own image, the implication is that Yahweh was himself androgynous.

Later Greek and Roman art shows many representations of hermaphrodites, most notably in monumental sculpture. These images stem ultimately from age-old concepts of fertility, but their enhanced popularity in the Hellenistic age (323–30 B.C.) probably reflects the fact that this was an age of changing sex roles. The androgynous features of these statues served to pose the question without offering a specific answer.

In medieval travel lore Hermaphrodites lived in their own country in Asia, where European visitors claimed to have observed them. Anatomically, these exotics were divided vertically, with one set of organs on the left and the other on the right, so that copulation face to face was an easy matter. This notion of a nation of a civilization of hermaphrodites has inspired some modern science fiction writers; the most notable example is Ursula Le Guin’s Left Hand of Darkness (New York, 1969), which works out the cultural consequences in considerable detail.

Modern Visions. The hermaphrodite or androgyne became common in French nineteenth-century writing. Inspired by Emanuel Swedenborg, Honoré de Balzac wrote a novel, Séraphîte (1835), about a double-sexed being. The most consistent theoretician of the androgynic vision was probably Joséphin Péladan, who influenced artists as well as writers. In fact the androgynous figure—usually depicted as an effeminate youth—is a recurrent figure in the iconography of the so-called decadent painters, from Simeon Solomon to Leonor Fini. In the twentieth century Carl Gustav Jung’s interest in the matter sparked a rediscovery of hermaphroditic beings in alchemical imagery of the sixteenth and seventeenth century.

Cross-dressing can sometimes give the impression that the wearer is a true androgyne, and in the popular imagination cross dressers and effeminate homosexuals are physically hermaphroditic. This confusion has probably been unwittingly abetted by the fashion of turn-of-the-century psychologists to refer to bisexuals as “psychosexual hermaphrodites,” and more recently by some spokespeople for the gay movement who emphasize getting in touch with the “submerged” half of one’s personality. The late twentieth-century fashion among men of wearing a single earring is probably a muted version of the vertical hermaphrodite.
**Tribal Cultures.** Among the North American Indians the Trickster is a figure of ambiguous sexuality. Primarily a male, he not only wears female dress but gives birth to children. He carries his detached penis in a box, and is thus self-castrating. When he wishes to have intercourse, he sends it separately to the woman. In real life the berdache type is sometimes called “he-she” or “man-woman” in Indian languages, but is not regarded as a true hermaphrodite but as a man who has abandoned the male gender role for the female.

Among the Dogon in West Africa, a mythical figure draws outlines of a male and a female on the ground before the newborn baby, who touches the outlines and is possessed by two souls. If the child retains the foreskin or the clitoris he remains two-souled and androgynous, with no inclination to procreation. In order to join the proper sex the male must be circumcised, the female must undergo a clitoridectomy. Among the Australian aborigines, subincision in the male achieves the opposite result: the creation of a “male vagina,” which may be reopened and bled in later life.

**India.** The mythology of India abounds in androgynous and hermaphroditic beings. The great Hindu deities usually have an accompanying female manifestation; thus in art Shiva is often shown partially fused with his female alter ego, Parvati. In some traditions a primordial hermaphrodite has been replaced by twins (e.g., Yami and Yama). Folklore abounds in tales of men who were made womanish by the curse of a god and of male child bearing. There are also legends of individuals were alternated from month to month as king and queen. In Tantrism the male adept or yogi must activate the female principle within himself that is personified by the dormant goddess Kundalini. Only by this means can he experience full wholeness, the internal union of the male and female divine principles. In Buddhism the male Bodhisattva Avalokiteshvara becomes a female, Kuan Yin, in China.

A central feature of the Hindu belief system is transmigration of souls, so that an individual can be reborn as a member of the opposite sex or an animal. This idea was already known to Plato who describes cowardly men being reborn as women in the *Theaetetus*. Some Hindus today hold that male homosexuals are individuals whose immediately previous life was that of a woman.

In north India today there is a distinct social grouping of some 100,000 homosexuals known as Hijra or Hijra. These men wear female dress and perform female tasks, including prostitution. They are commonly believed to be eunuchs or physical hermaphrodites. While medical data are lacking, it is unlikely that many qualify in the anatomical sense. Rather the Hijra myth of self attests to the persistence of the androgynous ideal in Indian civilization.


**Wayne R. Dynes**

**HETEROSEXUALITY**

The word *heterosexual* was invented by the same man who coined *homosexual*: the publicist and translator Károly Mária Kertbeny. The words appear for the first time [as far as is known] in Kertbeny’s German-language draft of a private letter to Karl Heinrich Ulrichs of May 6, 1868. Although Kertbeny subsequently wavered in his choice of *heterosexual*, the contrasting pair was popularized some years later by Gustav Jaeger, supported by the analogy of such pairs as homogeneous/heterogene-
ous. At the close of the nineteenth century the terms migrated from German into other major European languages.

Sources of the Concept. While the word heterosexual may be relatively new, the ingredients of the concept are of venerable antiquity. The late coinage of the word reflects the fact that, until recently, “heterosexual norms” were silently assumed and discussion seemed superfluous. Hence the sources of the concept are sometimes elusive. Moreover, in the ensuing account one should bear in mind that the entrance of the pair homosexual/heterosexual into the dictionary presupposes a binary contrast—even a stark opposition—which may be absent in older approximations of the notion.

Historically, the core of the concept of heterosexuality has been linked with procreation and its consequence—the family. Whether we think in terms of the modern compact nuclear family or the extended family found in many societies, the members are typically related by lineage which is established by procreation. (While the custom of adoption is well attested historically, this procedure works by the assimilation of the adopted children to the dominant pattern established by those procreated by the “natural” parents.) Yet although all human beings come into the world by procreation, not all need practice it: many cultures have provided niches for individuals who wished to dedicate themselves to ritual celibacy or priestly homosexuality (as seen in the berdache and qadišî traditions).

Plato. In hindsight we may detect a first attempt to give a theoretical formulation to the distinction between heterosexual and homosexual in The Laws, a late work (ca. 380 B.C.) of the Greek philosopher Plato. “When the male sex unites with the female for the purpose of procreation the pleasure so experienced is held to be according to nature, but when males unite with males or females with females, to be considered contrary to nature.” (1.636b–c; cf. also VII 836b–839a). From this passage we can see that “according to nature” equates in effect with heterosexuality. In proposing that same-sex acts be labeled as unnatural, Plato also merges, for the first time in recorded history, male and female homosexual conduct, which up to this time had been categorized separately. The behaviors are combined because the overarching contrast natural vs. unnatural. No doubt Plato was influenced by a pervasive Greek tendency to look for purpose. What is the purpose of copulation? The only answer that appeared was the engendering of offspring.

Christianity. Reappearing in highly charged language in Paul’s Epistle to the Romans [1:26], Plato’s rejection of same-sex relations as unnatural echoed through the subsequent history of Christian ethics. Yet if Christian tradition agreed that homosexual behavior was unnatural per se, this exclusion did not mean that all heterosexual behavior was permitted. Fornication and rape, though “natural,” were nonetheless sins. Logically, the Christian approach entails four categories: [1] marriage; [2] celibacy, which are both permitted; as against [3] illicit (heterosexual) copulation; [4] same-sex conduct, both forbidden. In this analysis what we would call heterosexuality appears on both sides of the ledger (1 and 3). In order to reach the modern contrast reclassification was needed, extracting two contrasted behaviors from the scheme and fusing them into a single positive concept: heterosexuality.

Another vexed question has recurred in many different guises over the centuries. Is it appropriate to discuss same-sex conduct exclusively in terms of behavior—same-sex acts—or are there persons whose identity or character is homosexual, regardless of the frequency of this or that act? In medieval times this ambiguity lurked in the term sodomite, which could refer either to a basically faithful “son of the church” who had fallen into such sins, but who could confess and be returned to the fold, or to one who was obstinately and seemingly irremediably immersed in such
practices—the sodomite with a capital S. In the former view heterosexuality is in effect universal and can only be disregarded on an occasional basis; in the latter situation it has a nemesis—homosexuality.

The Enlightenment and the Rise of Modern Psychiatry. The eighteenth-century Enlightenment grappled with these problems by attempting to secularize the concept of the natural. But earlier confusions lingered. Nineteenth-century psychiatrists, however, took a more radical step with their doctrine of perversions, which implicitly defines what later came to be called heterosexual normality by contrasting it with the abnormal. The procedure might be compared to paring a cheese: the mouldy and inedible “abnormal” parts are stripped away revealing the nutrient substance within. What remains after the subtractions is that which is mandatory: sexual normality. Since this healthy core was by definition nonpathological, it was not a legitimate object of psychiatric concern. To vary the metaphor, shoe fetishism, coprophilia, necrophilia, and homosexuality are, so to speak, so many obscure bypaths (“deviations” or “perversions”) from the great highway of normality. The majority, who are already traveling this main road, should simply continue to do so. As for the bypaths, closer inspection revealed a significant criterion of difference. Most of the perversions observed by Krafft-Ebing and others of his ilk did not involve persons as objects. Such behaviors as shoe fetishism and umbrella fetishism could be separated off from the rest; they were later to be dubbed “paraphilias.”

This double sequence of separations left standing, when all was said and done, a fairly straightforward contrast between heterosexuality and homosexuality as forms of sexual conduct between two or more consenting adults. Moreover, increasing acceptance of birth control and abortion made it possible to begin to separate heterosexuality from procreation. Heterosexuality could in fact become more like homosexuality: an avenue of pleasure and personal fulfilment. So matters stood for decades. In the 1940s Alfred Kinsey attempted a new formulation in a seven-step scale from exclusive heterosexuality to exclusive homosexuality. Insisting that we speak of these patterns as behaviors rather than fixed character types, Kinsey looked forward to a dissolution of the binary contrast between heterosexuality and homosexuality in favor of a behavioristic approach, one inherently pluralistic and nonjudgmental. Whatever the other merits of Kinsey’s work, which are considerable, this hopeful outcome has not been attained.

Doubleness of the Heterosexual Concept. For those who reject psychic androgyny [as most do reflexively] another problem looms. In keeping with the postulate of psychosexual dimorphism, two norms are needed: an aggressive, dominant one [male]; a yielding, receptive, nurturant one [female]. Thus contemporary traditionalists who defend obligatory heterosexuality must grapple with the fact that it articulates itself into two norms, according to the genitalia of the individual. If two, then why not three or four permitted patterns?

Gay Liberation Views. For the most part theorists of the gay liberation movement contented themselves with asserting the parity of homosexuality with heterosexuality: “gay is just as good as straight.” The two were to be viewed simply as different lifestyles. In the early 1970s, however, some radical feminists argued that all heterosexuality signified complicity with male domination, and sought to persuade, with some [mostly temporary] success, even their straight sisters to abandon the questionable practice. Other voices, holding that feminism means empowerment, spoke in favor of the right of each woman to make her own choices, even if they be heterosexual.

In the 1970s some gay radicals adopted the term heterosexism [modeled
on sexism). The new word apparently serves as a pejorative label for "straight chauvinism," an excessive prizing or favoring of heterosexual persons and values. The term had little success in the United States, but was taken up in the 1980s by some sectors of the British Labour Party. Unfortunately, the label heterosexism suggests hostility to heterosexuality itself, alienating many Britons who might otherwise have been sympathetic. The matter has been exploited by Conservatives as part of their campaign against the "loony left."

Conclusion. By and large normality (= "heterosexuality") remains an unspoken assumption underpinning much popular thinking. There are few considered explorations or defenses of heterosexuality as such; none seems required. Thus the suggestion of one Southern clergyman that libraries and bookstores contain "heterosexual sections" to help the public rally to its norms has not been taken up. Moreover, the AIDS crisis has probably given new life to the folk certainty that heterosexuality is best. Battered but unbeaten, this belief survives as part of the inherited social amalgam that makes up the deep structure of modern societies, the tacit body of unexamined postulates that form a kind of collective "operating procedure." But as many converging forces in modern international civilization push toward cultural pluralism, a more explicit analysis of the place of this pivotal yet still obscure concept is sure to appear, situating it within a constellation of ideas about sex and gender.

Wayne R. Dynes

HILLER, KURT (1885–1972)

German writer and political figure active both on the left and in the homosexual movement. In the published version of his doctoral dissertation [1908], Hiller formulated arguments for the control over one's body that were to become important for supporters of homosexual and women's rights. As a journalist, essayist, and poet he evolved an aphoristic style reflecting the strong imprint of Friedrich Nietzsche's work and possessing affinities with early Expressionism. A collaborator of Magnus Hirschfeld's on the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee in Berlin, he also sought to influence socialist politics through his Activist Movement. At the close of World War I he pioneered in applying the topical notion of [national] minorities to homosexuals as a group. As an independent thinker and writer under the Weimar Republic, he represented almost the mean of opinion on the German left. In 1933 he was arrested by the Nazis and beaten almost to death in the Columbia Haus in Berlin. Escaping to Czechoslovakia and then to England in 1938, he returned to Germany after the war, where he settled in Hamburg and attempted without great success to revive the homophile movement and the famous petition for abolition of Paragraph 175 of the Penal Code. His collected essays and articles brandish a style virtually untranslatable into English, so that his literary fame is confined to the German-speaking world.


Warren Johansson

HIPPIES

See Beatniks and Hippies; Bohemia.

HIPPOCRATIC CORPUS

The Greek Corpus Hippocraticum is the collection of approximately 60 medical treatises ascribed to Hippocrates of Cos (460–circa 370 B.C), about whose biography little is known for certain, though in his lifetime and afterward he enjoyed the renown of a great physician. In
fact the Hippocratic writings are the legacy of two different schools of medicine, the Coan and the Cnidian, over several centuries. The former school had a generalized conception of disease with individual variations, while the latter preferred to localize specific diseases and then insert them in a fixed but comprehensive schema. The actual dates of composition of the various treatises range from 500 B.C. to the first century of our era; the early second century saw the beginning of editions of the Hippocratic corpus and of the writing of glossaries and commentaries.

Homosexual behavior appears only occasionally in the corpus, perhaps most notably in the original text of the Hippocratic oath, where the apprentice physician swears that in the course of his professional visits he will abstain from “sexual acts on the persons of women and of men, of freemen and of slaves.” The causes of sexual characterology figure in the work Peri diates, 28–29: If both father and mother secrete “male bodies,” the offspring will be men “brilliant in soul and strong in body.” If the secretion from the man is male and that from the woman is female, the former still dominates, so that the offspring turn out less brilliant, but still brave. But in case the man’s secretion is female and the woman’s is male, the fusion of the two creates a “man-woman” (androgynos), the equivalent of the modern notion of effeminate homosexual. The same is true of girls: if the man’s secretion is female and the woman’s male, and the female is predominant, the offspring will be “mannelly.” Hence by the fourth century B.C. the Hippocratic school saw factors of procreation as determining sexual constitution.

The treatise On Airs, Waters and Places discusses the infertility and impotence of the Scythians [21–22]. “The men have no great desire for intercourse because of the moistness of their nature and the softness and coldness of their abdomen, which are the chief barrier to the sexual urge.” Moreover, the vast majority of the male Scythians “become impotent and perform women’s work and behave like women,” a condition ascribed to their constant horseback riding, which causes swellings at the joints, in severe cases lameness and sores on the hips. To cure themselves they cut the vein behind each ear, but in so doing they cause the impotence from which they suffer. The author of the treatise deems this an attribute of class: the upper-class Scythians suffer from the disease but not the lower class, which does not ride horses.

The writers whose work was later ascribed to Hippocrates because of his general renown take no offense at homosexuality, but see it as part of the totality of sexual behavior on which, however, they acknowledge certain ethical limitations. The medical science of antiquity was aware of the problems posed by differences in sexual constitution and sought to explain them in its own theoretical terms.

See also Medical Theories.

Warren Johansson

HIRSCHFELD, MAGNUS (1868–1935)

Leader of the homosexual emancipation movement in Germany.

Life. Magnus Hirschfeld was born in Kolberg on the Baltic coast of Prussia (today Kołobrzeg in Poland) on May 14, 1868. His father, Hermann Hirschfeld, had distinguished himself by making the town a popular resort; for this service his fellow citizens erected a monument to him that stood until 1933. The son at first studied languages and philosophy at Breslau and Strasbourg, then medicine at Munich and Berlin, where he took his degree. After traveling in the United States and North Africa, he settled first at Magdeburg in Saxony and then in Charlottenburg, a district of Berlin.

The suicide of one of his patients, a young officer who ended his life on the eve of a marriage demanded by his family, awakened Hirschfeld’s interest in the
problem of homosexuality. The subject was also topical, as contemporary publications by Carpenter, Ellis and Symonds, Krafft-Ebing, Raffalovich, and Aletino attest. Hirschfeld’s first book, under the pseudonym Th. Ramien, was entitled *Sappho und Sokrates* (1896) and put forward a bold argument that the homosexual form of love is part of human sexuality, that both its causes and its manifestations should be the object of scientific investigation, and that the penal laws against homosexuality should be changed in society’s own interest. In regard to the etiology of homosexuality Hirschfeld outlined a complex theory which he was to modify and expand over the next four decades without ever coming to a satisfactory formulation.

On his twenty-ninth birthday, May 14, 1897, Hirschfeld founded the Wissenschaftlich-humanitäre Komitee (Scientific-Humanitarian Committee), the world’s first organization dedicated to the aim of ending the century-long legal intolerance and social opprobrium that homosexuals had suffered in Western civilization. Its first activity was to prepare a petition “to the legislative bodies of the German Empire” calling for the repeal of paragraph 175 of the Imperial Penal Code of 1871 which imposed a maximum of two years’ imprisonment for “lewd and unnatural conduct” between males. In the decades that followed this petition was to be signed by some six thousand individuals prominent in all walks of German life, including members of the high intelligentsia whose names are still world-famous.

In 1899 the Committee began the publication of the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, the world’s first journal devoted to scholarship on all aspects of homosexual behavior. Edited by Hirschfeld, its 23 volumes are in some respects a still unsurpassed collection of materials of all kinds on the subject, from questionnaire studies and articles on homosexuality among primitive peoples to biographies of the great and near-great and analyses of theoretical problems in law and biology.

Hirschfeld also composed a questionnaire with 130 separate items which was filled out by more than 10,000 men and women. The data which he thus assembled served as the basis of major articles and of the book *Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes* (1914), which summarized all that the Committee and its supporters had learned in the sixteen years since its founding, and remains one of the major works on the subject from the pre-1933 period.

In 1919, with film censorship temporarily abolished, Hirschfeld and the Committee accepted an offer from Richard Oswald to produce a film about homosexuality. The result was *Anders als die Andern* (Different from the Others), which had its premiere on May 24, 1919. It was a breakthrough in the dramatic presentation of an unorthodox subject, and as such provoked bitter controversy, as its express aim was to expose the injustice of paragraph 175. When censorship was restored in 1920, the film was promptly banned, in no small part because of the unfavorable judgment of Albert Moll, who had by then become Hirschfeld’s bitter opponent.

No less critical was an article by Moll that appeared in the *Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft* (1927) in the wake of the International Congress for Sexual Research held the previous year, to which Hirschfeld was pointedly not invited because Moll resented the propagandistic element in the latter’s activity, and also because of conduct which Moll branded as unethical, such as publicly exhibiting individuals who suffered from various psychosexual abnormalities and unabashedly discussing them in the presence of an audience.

For his part, Hirschfeld presided at one conference after another of the World League for Sexual Reform on a Scientific Basis, the first in Berlin in 1921, the second in Copenhagen in 1928, the third in London in 1929, the fourth in Vienna in 1930.
These conferences featured papers on the whole spectrum of problems of sexual life, together with vigorous pleas for the abandonment of laws and practices inspired by the ascetic beliefs of the medieval church: on sex education, birth control, law reform, sexual perversions and abnormalities, and eugenics.

Hirschfeld’s campaign on behalf of homosexual emancipation had far less success, although he did effectively persuade the district attorneys in the larger German cities to refrain from enforcing paragraph 175 where private, consensual adult behavior was concerned. Germany was the only country in the world with an extensive network of homosexual organizations and of bars, cafés, and other meeting places which individuals seeking partners of their own sex could casually frequent. However, the Committee itself never had more than 1500 supporters, and Hirschfeld was obliged to admit, toward the end of his life, that the vast majority of homosexuals were unwilling to fight for their legal and political rights, and that the bourgeois parties were unable or unwilling to reform the penal law to bring it into conformity with the findings of modern science.

Furthermore, Hirschfeld’s propaganda for repeal of paragraph 175 so alienated the conservative and clerical elements of German society that he became the target of attacks by the Nazis even while they were a comparatively small party on the far right, and as their movement grew, they persecuted him relentlessly, terrorizing his meetings and closing his lectures, so that for his own safety and that of his audience, he could no longer appear in public. In November 1931 he left Germany for a lecture tour around the world, during which he collected material that he shipped to the Institute for Sexual Science in Berlin. The Nazi accession to power on March 7, 1933, was followed by the destruction of the Institute and its unique files and library, and the dissolution of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee to preclude its banning by the new regime. Hirschfeld settled in France and attempted to recreate his research institute on a smaller scale, but the Depression and mounting dissension within the sexual reform movement limited what he could accomplish. He died in Nice on his sixty-seventh birthday, May 14, 1935.

**Evaluation.** Hirschfeld’s less public behavior motivated severe criticism, not to mention outright scandal. He is reputed to have been not just homosexual but a foot fetishist who had male prostitutes perform a ritual that involved pressure on his toes. There is evidence that the accusations printed in the Berlin Vorwärts, the Social Democratic daily, which led to the suicide of the industrialist Alfred Krupp came from Hirschfeld himself, after he had unsuccessfully tried to extort the sum of 100,000 marks from him with the assistance of a young engineer. During the Harden-Eulenborg affair his expert testimony as to the homosexuality of Count Kuno von Moltke indirectly played into the hands of those who wished to label homosexuals in high places as a peril to the fatherland.

Worst of all, although Hirschfeld made the issue of blackmail central to his propaganda for repeal of paragraph 175, he sought to wrest monies from individuals who had in good faith furnished him with questionnaires and other material revealing the intimate (and incriminating) sides of their personal lives. His willingness to profit from his reputation as one of the world’s leading experts on sexuality led him to endorse patent remedies of questionable value, such as aphrodisiacs and drugs for restoring potency.

In intellectual matters he was guilty of serious lapses from professional ethics that resulted in a complete breach with the school of thought represented by Benedict Friedlaender and Hans Blüher. The former led a “secession” from the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee that culminated in the formation of a rival group, the Gemeinschaft der Eigenen
[Community of the Exceptional], which united the virile, pederastic type of homosexual in contrast to the effeminate male and virginal female which Hirschfeld was trying to palm off on the learned world as a biological “third sex.” Blüher in turn accused Hirschfeld of falsifying the text of his work of 1912 *The Wandervogel Movement as an Erotic Phenomenon*, stressing as it did the role of male comradeship in mass organizations and public life.

Hirschfeld’s life and work represent at best an ambivalent legacy for the homophile movement of today. He never succeeded in formulating a coherent scientific explanation of homosexuality, and the Nazi seizure of power in 1933 spelled the tragic end of the organization he had founded. His career presents in retrospect as many errors and failings to be shunned as achievements to be emulated.


*Warren Johansson*

**HISTORY**

The word history refers both to the events of the past and to the systematic study of them; the practice of the latter is sometimes termed *historiography*. The Greeks, who invented the word, used *historia* to refer to any sort of organized study or inquiry; under the Romans, however, the word assumed the meaning it has today. Examples of Roman history are the continuous narratives of *Tacitus* and the biographies of *Suetonius*.

During the *Middle Ages* history was largely subsumed under the category of sacred history, though there were national and local chronicles and biographies of rulers. The Middle Ages adopted the idea of progress, both as a narrative device and an ideology; the idea persisted in later secular historians of the Whig type, who emphasized the concomitant growth of technical, moral, and intellectual progress.

*The Renaissance and the Rise of Historicism.* The beginnings of modern historiography lie in the *Renaissance*, when a revival of models derived from classical antiquity combined with the idea of fame to foster local and national histories. Although classical scholars became familiar with homosexual aspects of ancient history and mythology, these were commonly discussed in learned volumes of Latin commentary rather than made available in narratives for the lay reader.

From about 1550 to 1750 European historiography was dominated by an ideal known as the *Exemplar Theory*. This approach concentrated on the commanding role of great figures, some of them deserving emulation and veneration, others meriting only scorn. In this perspective history was *magistra vitae*, the great compass of how we should live, linking the experiences of the reader to those of the great protagonists of earlier times. One of the favorite models of this mode of history writing was the *Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans of Plutarch* which mentions homosexual behavior as an aspect of the lives of a number of heroic individuals. Needless to say, this feature was not imitated in the officially sanctioned writings of Christian Europe. Suitably updated, this was a preeminently “elevating” (and judgmental) view of the past, which was not only usable, but peremptory.

Moreover, as there have been good and bad people, there have been good and bad eras. Outstanding among the happy eras of human history were Periclean Athens, Augustan Rome, and Medici Florence. The supreme instance of a bad era was, of course, the Middle Ages, the “Dark Ages.”
New ideas came to the fore in the historiographic revolution that occurred in Germany during the second half of the eighteenth century with such writers as Justus Moser, Johann Gottfried Herder, and J. W. von Goethe. When the standard bearers of the new view appeared in the second half of the eighteenth century, the Exemplar Theory was already fading—though it never completely died out, exacting tribute even today in journalistic treatments of “Great Men” of the past. The new view is often called Historicism (or in German, Historismus). Its outlook stressed the fundamental difference between the phenomena of nature and those of history. Nature, in this view, is the theatre of the stable and eternally recurring, while history comprises unique and unduplicable human acts. In the summary of George G. Iggers, “The world of man is in a state of incessant flux, although within it there are centers of stability [personalities, institutions, nations, epochs], each possessing an inner structure, a character, and each in constant metamorphosis in accord with its own internal principles of development. . . . There is no constant human nature; rather the character of each man reveals itself only in his development.”

In its emphasis on subjective uniqueness the new orientation of Historicism accorded in part with romanticism. Yet the individual was not seen as alienated and atomic, but was rather immersed in that ongoing stream that is Process. With regard to epochs it insisted that sympathetic understanding must always precede judgment.

The Emergence of Homosexual History. Building on these foundations the nineteenth century has been termed the age of history. Yet when Heinrich Hoessli and K. H. Ulrichs began their pioneering homosexual scholarship, they found little in the way of comprehensive historical data, except for material from ancient Greece and Islam. Some other information was added by the English scholars Richard Burton and Havelock Ellis. In German Albert Moll published a volume collecting lists of famous homosexuals. By the end of the century, however, when the Berlin Scientific-Humanitarian Committee was formed it was realized that a comprehensive bibliographical search must be undertaken. The results of this inquiry were incorporated into the volumes of the Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen and the monumental tome of Magnus Hirschfeld, Die Homosexualität des Mannes und des Weibes (1914). After World War I similar, though somewhat shorter attempts at synthesis were made in the Iberian peninsula, by Arlindo Camillo Monteiro (1922), Asdrúbal António d’Aguiar (1925), and Alberto Nin Frías (1932). The world Depression and the rise of Nazism put a stop to most serious homosexual research.

In 1950 the contemporary gay movement began in Southern California, at first with little consciousness of its European predecessor. Gradually a certain number of historical articles made their way into such movement periodicals as The Ladder, Mattachine Review, One, and One Quarterly. In France Arcadie, thanks to one of its editors, Marc Daniel (Michel Duchein), published a considerable amount of historical material. Almost without exception, university scholars were afraid to touch the subject—even under a pseudonym. As a result much of the work was done by autodidacts toiling under less than ideal conditions. Since most of this scholarship was done under movement auspices, it tended to reflect relevant concerns: compiling a brief of injustices [histories of oppression] and biographical sketches of exemplary gay men and women of the past.

In the 1960s this atmosphere began to change. The sexual revolution itself made human sexuality an appropriate object of research. Then a new emphasis on social and intellectual history appeared, stemming in large measure from the group around the French periodical
Annales. Yet standards for homosexual and lesbian history continued to be contested, as seen in the quarrel in the 1980s over the Social Construction approach. Although several useful syntheses of the world history of homosexuality have appeared, much material, especially from Islam, China, and other non-Western cultures has not yet been properly studied and published, so that undoubtedly these will be superseded.

Conclusion. Without attempting to forecast the content of particular future researches, it may be worthwhile to offer a tentative scheme of how this research will be allocated. Here is a five-level model for the investigations of sexual meanings and behaviors in historical context.

(1) The universal level grounded in biology. This most general level recognizes that in human beings the libido emerges forcefully in adolescence and is capable of direction to a single gender. Further investigation of biological parameters is not to be discouraged but encouraged. There is also the possibility of detection of universals that are not, in any obvious sense, biological, as the universals of language, some of which are governed by principles of logic which must also be observed by thinking machines, which are not biological. They are suprabiological.

(2) Kulturkreise (supraregional cultural entities). As employed by some Central European ethnologists, the Kulturkreis is a large complex of societies in which certain cultural constants can be observed. Examples would be the Bantu-speaking peoples of southern Africa and the Paleo-Siberian peoples. The berdache phenomenon, which is historically recorded not only in North America but also in Western Siberia and Madagascar, would be a good example of a same-sex Kulturkreis. Another is the kadesh (cult prostitute type), found in many cultures of classical antiquity. The possibility of "submerged Kulturkreise," where only a few islands survive of once much larger complexes, must be entertained. If Bernard Sergent is right, the institution of pederasty, known from the record for only a few Indo-European peoples, is the relict of a once-vast family.

(3) Migration of individual motifs across cultural boundaries. For example, the category of the "unnatural" was first applied to same-sex behavior by Plato and his circle in classical Greece. It found its way into the Pauline corpus of the New Testament, being transmitted by medieval Scholasticism to the present. Of course such "unit-ideas" undergo modification according to context, but continuity must also be recognized. If one is studying the unnatural in, say, nineteenth-century texts it does not suffice to limit one's horizon to that century, especially since reading of the classics was still widespread during that period. The history-of-ideas methodology developed many years ago by Arthur O. Lovejoy offers guidance in this approach.

(4) Cultural epochs. There are attitudes that are specific to particular periods, such as the later Western Middle Ages and the early Renaissance. In investigating these care must be taken not to overinsulate them from what came before and what followed after in the manner of Michel Foucault's epistemes. One must also beware of a too-easy acceptance of economic and social determinism, where "superstructure" attitudes are simply derived from the supposedly all-determining base or Unterbau. The detection of a pervasive pattern of such determinisms is the holy grail of the historical materialists of the Marxist tradition. Without denying such relationships in this or that case, one must be sceptical of the overall validity of such a research program, especially in view of levels 1–3.

(5) Temporary fashions lasting only one or two generations. The "beatnik" organization of sexuality of the 1960s and 70s (though it has roots and successors like anything else) seems a relatively limited phenomenon. So perhaps was the molly subculture of early eighteenth-
century England, which was snuffed out before it had much chance to develop.

The advantage of such a scheme is that it encourages scholars to pursue investigations in all time frames, from the longest [humanity itself] to the shortest [a single generation]. It does not anticipate constants, but allows one to correlate those that seem to be emerging, however tentatively.

See also Typology.


Wayne R. Dynes

HOBOES

The hobo subculture of the United States is now largely a thing of the past, as it flourished when the railway was the only means of travel over long distances, and began to decline when the automobile and the truck shifted America's transport to the roads and highways. The best studies of this marginal subculture were done at the end of the nineteenth century and in the first two decades of the twentieth. There seems to be no precise European counterpart, though the vagabonds known from late medieval times constitute an anticipation.

The hobo was a permanently unemployed vagabond who lived by begging and had mastered the art of life "on the road" with a variety of schemes and tricks. Characteristically the hoboes lived along the railway lines, taking refuge in unguarded freight cars or nesting in the grass near water tanks. The hobo subculture originated in the western United States and spread eastward. Recruited at first from the ranks of Civil War veterans who could not adjust to peacetime existence, the hoboes were joined by adolescents who had left home in search of freedom and adventure, by unsuccessful criminals reduced to beggary, and also by alcoholics who had lost their jobs and families and had reached "the bottom of the heap."

In this society of the lower depths—vividly, though reticently recalled in Jack London's memoir *The Road* (1907)—homosexuality largely took the form of pederastic relations between adult hoboes and their teen-aged companions. The youth, known as a "prushun," was obliged by the unwritten law of the hobo fraternity to be the virtual slave of the "jocker," his protector. The "prushuns" were generally between 10 and 15 years of age, occasionally older or younger. In every town the pair visited the "prushun" had to beg for their keep, and lack of success brought him harsh punishment from the older male. The boy was periodically beaten by his protector in a manner that was but an exaggerated form of the discipline then customarily meted out to the young, though the modern observer would perceive sado-masochistic undertones in the liaisons.

The sexual aspect of the relationship usually consisted of intermemoral intercourse, sometimes of anal. The passive partner is described as enjoying the physical side of the contact. Men who engaged in these relations generally preferred a "prushun" to a woman. Those who had served in the army or navy and then made their way into hobo life are mentioned as likely to be exclusively homosexual in their preferences. A few hoboes are said to have adopted homosexuality because of the scarcity of women in their milieu, as they were outnumbered by men a hundred to one. The gruff masculinity of the older partner was usually matched by a femininity in the younger one—a phenomenon of the sexual culture of the lower class in general. The male hustler also appeared as a denizen of this underworld. The jails of the period reflected this side of hobo life, and boys incarcerated in them were forced to submit to the older inmates. When the boy grew old enough to fend for himself, he
would be emancipated from the "jocker" and would then seek a boy of his own in turn. On the other hand, if a boy became a source of embarrassment or jeopardy for his protector, he could be abandoned or simply murdered.

The hobo subculture had its own argot, changing from year to year but always kept alive by the oral tradition of the "old timers" in its midst. This language was a colorful commentary on the mores of the hobo, and ignorance of it instantly betrayed the newcomer. So the novice would sit by the campfire, listening quietly while absorbing the unfamiliar words and expressions.

The onset both of the criminal subculture spawned by Prohibition and of the modern welfare state in America led to the end of the hobo as he was known before the 1920s. The casual young traveler was more likely to hitchhike by automobile, a mode of travel not exempt from sexual opportunity, but lacking the element of camaraderie that rail yards and freight cars had offered. Yet the homoerotic side of hobo society, as one part of the American underclass, was perpetuated in the mores and practices of the prison subculture, where forms of homosexual dependence and subordination thrive at the present day.


Warren Johansson

HOCQUENGHEM, GUY (1946–1988)

French gay liberationist, filmmaker, essayist, and novelist. Hocquenghem was born in suburban Paris and studied Greek epigraphy at the Ecole Normale Supérieure. Swept up in the May 1968 rebellion, he became a militant leftist, though the French Communist Party expelled him because of his homosexuality. Hocquenghem joined the Sorbonne gay activists and was one of the first males in the Front Homosexuel d’Action Révolutionnaire (FHAR), which was formed in March 1971 by a group of lesbians who split from Arcadie (Mouvement Homophile de France). In 1971 Hocquenghem created a sensation at a forum of Le Nouvel Observateur [a left mass-market weekly], which later interviewed him. He also participated in writing the manifesto "Trois milliards de pervers."

Hocquenghem’s Le désir homosexuel [Homosexual Desire; 1972], followed by L’Après-Mai des faunes (1974) and La dérive homosexuelle (1977), provided a radical theory for French gay liberation. Like Mario Mieli in Italy, Hocquenghem attempted to bridge Marx’s class and Freud’s libido in understanding gay love. He did this through an analysis of the privatization of the anus, the foundation in his view of both capitalism and homophobia.

Like Jean Genet, Hocquenghem was an early defender of the Black Panther Party and vigorously opposed white supremacy and racism. His La beauté du métis, réflexion d’un francophone [Immigrant Beauty, Francophone Reflections; 1979] traces the hatred of foreigners [in France: Arabs] and of queers to the same cultural uptightness. He likewise attacked sixties radicals who joined the establishment in his stinging Lettre ouverte à ceux qui sont passés du col Mao au Rotary (Open Letter to Those Who’ve Gone from Chairman Mao to Rotary Clubs; 1986).

As a child of the sixties, Hocquenghem understood the importance of publicity. He attacked the mainstream media in a delightful Minigraphie de la presse parisienne (1981), an updated commentary on Honoré de Balzac’s nineteenth-century philippic. In 1977 he became a regular columnist for Libération, a leftist
daily where he edited the television review supplement.

His writings attempted both to bring a gay perspective to the mainstream as in Comment nous appelez vous déjà! Ces hommes que l'on dit homosexuels (What Should You Call Us So-called Homosexuals?) with Jean-Louis Bory (1977), and also to articulate an authentic voice within the gay press as in Le gay voyage, guide homosexuel des grandes métropoles [Gay Cruise Guide to Hot Cities; 1980] and Les Français de la honte [The Shameless French]. He wrote for Gai Pied Hebdo, appeared regularly on Fréquence Gaïe [the French gay radio station], and on television.

Always ready to experiment, he produced with Lionel Soukaz a full length feature film in 1979; the script was published a year later as Race d’Epi! Un siècle d’images de l’homosexualité (1980). The Homosexual Century [as the film is called in English] tried to define twentieth-century gay history; the French censors attacked the film. Michel Foucault, among those protesting to the Ministry of Justice, wrote: “This documentary is based on historical research of great seriousness and interest. It seems strange that a film on homosexuality is penalized when it portrays the persecutions for which the Nazi regime was responsible—strange and disturbing.”

In the aftermath of academic upheaval, Hocquenghem was appointed professor of philosophy at the University of Paris at Vincennes-Saint Denis, where he taught with his beloved colleague René Schérer. Together with Schérer he wrote Co-ire, album systématique de l’enfance (1976) demythologizing childhood sexuality. Les petits garçons [Boys; 1983] fictionalized the French government’s witch hunt against the Corral, a boys’ school in southern France.

In the eighties, Hocquenghem developed a gnostic outlook derived from first-century Alexandria. With Schérer he wrote L’âme atomique, pour une es-
thétique d’ère nucléaire [Atomic Sensibility, Toward a Nuclear Age Esthetic; 1986], wherein they explored a free, sensual epicurean vitality which would reawaken dandyism or gravité dans le frivole [Baudelaire: “seriousness inside frivolity”). Fin de section [End of Division; 1976], a collection of short stories, attracted little attention, but Hocquenghem’s fiction soon won a large audience as he developed his epicurean and gnostic themes.

L’amour en relief [1982], translated as Love in Relief, follows the liaisons of a young Tunisian boy who is blind and never sees how beautiful he is. La colère de l’agneau [Wrath of the Lamb; 1985] pursues St. John the Evangelist through many revelations. Eve [1987] crosses science fiction with Genesis and the author’s own physical changes with AIDS. Les Voyages et aventures extraordinaires du frère Angelo [Brother Angelo’s Amazing Adventures], published the day after Hocquenghem’s death in 1988, chronicles an Italian monk’s travels with conquistadors in America. Like the monk, Hocquenghem never abandoned the joy of adolescent rebellion and sexual pleasure, which he honed on the fine stone of French philosophy.

Charley Shively

HOESSLI, HEINRICH
(1784–1864)

Swiss-German pioneer of homosexual emancipation. Born in Glarus, he spent his childhood there, leaving it only at the approach of the Russian army commanded by General Suvorov in 1799, when he was sent to Bern. There he learned the trade of milliner by which, on his return, he later earned his livelihood. In 1811 he married and had two sons, both of whom emigrated to America. Endowed with a pronounced feminine taste, in the 1820s he was known as “the first milliner” of Glarus, and was also a talented interior decorator. Acquiring the nickname “Moderhoessli” as a maker of fashion, in
business he led a prosperous life until 1851, when he retired and spent the rest of his days as a restless wanderer in Switzerland and Germany.

Hoeslli’s main contribution to the homosexual emancipation movement, of which he was truly a lonely forerunner, was the two-volume work entitled *Eros: Die Männerliebe der Griechen: Ihre Beziehungen zur Geschichte, Erziehung, Literatur und Gesetzgebung aller Zeiten* (Eros, the Male Love of the Greeks: Its Relationship to the History, Education, Literature and Legislation of All Ages), published in 1836–38. The idea of the work had entered Hoeslli’s mind in 1817 on the occasion of the execution of a citizen of Bern named Franz Desgouttes, who for having killed his lover Daniel Hemmeler was punished by being broken on the wheel. Two years later he approached the popular Swiss-German writer Heinrich Zschokke (1771–1848), asking him to treat the subject because he himself did not feel competent to compose a work of literature. Zschokke did in fact publish his own “Eros oder über die Liebe” (Eros or On Love) in the eighth issue of his *Erheiterungen* for the year 1821, which amassed a respectable quantity of material on the subject, but concluded by reaffirming the conventional beliefs of his time that this side of Greek civilization was a revolting aberration which no other country should follow.

Disappointed by Zschokke, Hoeslli set about composing his own work and printing it at his own expense. It was promptly suppressed by the authorities in Glarus, who forbade him to sell the book within the canton or to publish any more of his manuscript. He did, however, bring out the second volume two years later in St. Gallen. The unsold portion of the work was destroyed by the great fire that devastated Glarus in 1861. A planned third volume remained in manuscript.

In the opening section of *Eros* Hoeslli likened the prevailing condemnation of Greek love to the witchcraft delusion of the previous centuries. He next set out the differences between the Greek conception of love and that of his own time, with copious references to classical history and literature and a plea for the toleration of male love. The second volume repeated his theses on the naturalness of the passion and contained an anthology drawn not just from classical Greece, but also from the Arabic, Persian, and Turkish poetry which Romantic authors had translated into German. Last of all, he sought to refute the false ideas about the character of Greek love that ranged from making it merely a contemplation of male beauty to stigmatizing it as child abuse. Throughout *Eros* Hoeslli insisted that this form of love had not vanished, and was as prevalent in modern times as it had been in antiquity.

In his lifetime Hoeslli’s work achieved no recognition, but was acquired and read by a small educated public. It contained among other things the germ of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs’ notion of “a female soul trapped in a male body,” and documented the universality of male homosexuality as no previous author had done. The composition of an amateur, not a professional writer, *Eros* ranks as the first sustained protest against the intolerance that homosexual love had suffered for centuries in Christian Europe, and as such was appreciated by later activists who quoted it and reprinted excerpts. It was the harbinger of the movement that was formed only at the close of the nineteenth century, when the interest in evolution awakened by the controversy over Darwin’s theories set the stage for a biologist rather than a merely antiquarian and literary approach to the subject.

*Warren Johansson*
HOLOCAUST, GAY

The genocide of Jews and Gypsies in Nazi-occupied Europe has overshadowed the persecution and murder of male homosexuals, which is only now beginning to be recognized and analyzed from the few surviving documents and memoirs. Regrettably, in the immediate post-war period most of those who wrote about the concentration and extermination camps, and even courts which dealt with the staffs and inmates of the camps, treated those sent there for violating the laws against homosexual offenses as common criminals deserving the punishment meted out to them by the Third Reich. The final insult to the victims of Nazi intolerance was the decision of the Bundesverfassungsgericht [Federal Constitutional Court] in Karlsruhe on May 10, 1957, which not only upheld the constitutionality of the more punitive 1935 version of Paragraph 175 of the Penal Code because it “contained nothing specifically National Socialist” and homosexual acts “unequivocally offended the moral feelings of the German people,” but even required doubling the maximum penalty—from five to ten years. If any other victims of National Socialism had been rebuffed in this manner by a West German court, there would have been outraged demonstrations around the globe; but this one went unprotested and ignored—above all by the psychiatrists who until recently never missed an opportunity to assert that “homosexuality is a serious disease”—for which ostracism and punishment were the best if not the only therapy. Until the late 1980s homosexuals, along with Gypsies, were denied compensation by the West German authorities for their suffering and losses under the Nazis.

The Background of Nazi Views. The National Socialist attitude toward homosexuality was ambivalent. Most pro-Nazi eugenicists had in the 1920s quietly if not enthusiastically accepted Magnus Hirschfeld’s arguments that homosexuality was innate and unmodifi-
able. They therefore saw no need to interfere in the private lives of those who by nature if not choice were already marked for biological death. In fact, Hans F. K. Günther (1891–1968), professor of rural sociology and racial science first at Berlin and then at Freiburg im Breisgau, the chief authority on such matters in the Third Reich, held that the genetically inferior elements of the population should be given complete freedom to gratify their sexual urges in any manner that did not lead to reproduction because they would painlessly eliminate themselves from the breeding pool. Also, Reichsmarshal Hermann Goering (and his cousin Matthias Goering) were greatly interested in promoting psychotherapy and giving it an institutional base within the Reich, even if their protégés were forbidden to mention explicitly the Jewish contribution to the subject [Freudian psychoanalysis].

However, National Socialism in Germany, like Marxism—Leninism in Russia, was a conspiracy of the seventeenth and the nineteenth centuries against the eighteenth-century Enlightenment—against liberalism and its beneficiaries, which included homosexuals in those countries where legal reformers had stricken the medieval sodomy statutes from the books. National Socialism inclined even more than its totalitarian Soviet mirror image toward the assertion of traditional values and beliefs—of which the Judeo-Christian taboo on homosexuality and petty bourgeois antipathy toward it was emphatically one. Furthermore, Nazi leaders, preoccupied with the German birth rate, foresaw extensive German colonization of that part of Eastern Europe which they meant to annex. Some of them even cherished the belief that homosexuality was the harbinger of race suicide and wished to encourage it among inferior races.

The principal figures who determined or influenced Nazi policy in regard to homosexuals, apart from Hitler himself, were: Heinrich Himmler [1900–1945], the chief of the SS; his protégé Karl August
Eckhardt (1901–1979), who after the war devoted himself to editing early Germanic legal texts; Rudolf Klare, a student at the University of Halle, who under the supervision of Erich Schwinge (1903– ) wrote a dissertation, Homosexualität und Recht (Homosexuality and Law), and the Munich psychiatrist Oswald Bumke (1877–1950). On October 15, 1932, Bumke wrote a letter meant for Hitler’s eyes, urging him to remove Ernst Röhm from his entourage because of his Chief of Staff’s “corrupting influence” on German youth and assuring him that “homosexuality has in all ages been one of the most objectionable phenomena of degeneration that we encounter among the symptoms of a declining culture with great regularity.”

Rationale. The confused and illogical thinking of these homophobic policy-makers had certain common themes. In 1937 Eckhardt published an article in Das Schwarze Korps, the newspaper of the SS, which mentioned that documents seized by the Nazis after they came to power revealed that two million men had been involved in the homosexual organizations that flourished under the Weimar Republic, but that a mere 2 percent of these—40,000—represented a “hard core” that was responsible for infecting the others. To identify and extirpate this source of contagion would be the task of the NSDAP. Such an approach contradicted the rationale of the Wannsee conference of January 20, 1942, where, with Reinhard Heydrich [1904–1942] presiding, Nazi leaders determined upon the physical extermination of the eleven million European Jews. For them a “racial Jew” [Rassenjude] was defined by ancestry—a meaningless criterion when applied to homosexuals. Their ideological motive for wishing to liquidate Jews and Gypsies was that these nomadic peoples were trespassing on the Lebensraum of other nations—another conception that had no relevance to homosexuals, inasmuch as the latter had never constituted an ethnic group distinct from the one from which they individually descended. So while the extermination of the Jews was Hitler’s pet project from 1942 onward, there is no evidence that the Nazi leadership ever contemplated or undertook a mass screening of the German male population in order to identify even “hard core” homosexuals for imprisonment or execution.

Hence Nazi policy in regard to homosexuals consisted in making the penal laws more punitive, as was effected by a legal novella of June 28, 1935, altering Paragraph 175 by eliminating the definition that restricted the offense to “beischlagsähnliche Handlungen” (acts similar to coitus). The new wording opened the door to prosecution for the most trivial acts, but at the same time the novella amended the code of criminal procedure to allow the Staatsanwalt (equivalent to the district attorney) not to prosecute an individual whose sexual activity had subjected him to blackmail. This amounted to a recognition of Magnus Hirschfeld’s tireless assertion that Paragraph 175 was a major source of blackmail and extortion. The motives for the new law were never consistently set forth; the most common justification was the lapinist argument that homosexuality diminished the German birth rate with which the leaders of the Third Reich were obsessed. Nazi indifference to lesbian activity—and the official commentaries specified that Paragraph 175 could not be extended by analogy to women—was motivated by the assertion that female homosexuality did not interfere with marriage and procreation or with the conduct of public life.

The fullest treatment of the subject was Klare’s dissertation of 1937, which found that of ancient peoples the Jews alone had proscribed homosexual activity. After rejecting the “liberalistic” arguments for legal toleration, he concluded that the solution to the “homosexual problem” was the complete exclusion of homosexuals from society. Even so, the constitutional biologists in Nazi Germany, far from abandoning the position which Hirschfeld
had argued for thirty years, voiced it openly on the pages of criminological journals. Paradoxically, Jewish figures such as Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935) and Kurt Hiller (1885–1972) prominent in the homosexual emancipation movement had linked this aspect of sexual reform with the hated “Semitic influence” that the Nazis determined to eradicate from German life. During World War II German military courts often dealt less severely with homosexual offenders than did the less sophisticated American counterparts. On the other hand, instead of giving homosexuals dishonorable discharges, as was the American practice, some German authorities preferred to send them to the eastern front—to die in battle.

**Actions Against Homosexuals.** Under the legal novella of 1935 the number of prosecutions for homosexuality grew enormously—but many of those convicted were not strictly speaking homosexual at all. Some were political opponents—leaders of youth organizations or Catholic clergy—against whom the Nazis knew how to bring perjured testimony; others were simply street hustlers whom the police had rounded up in Hamburg, Munich, and Berlin, particularly to clean up the capital before the 1936 Olympic Games. Eventually even the Chief of Staff General von Fritsch was charged to break the power of the Junkers. The memoirs of Rudolf Hoess (1900–1947), the commandant of the death camp at Auschwitz/Oświęcim, shows the wretchedness of homosexuals in the camps. Himself incarcerated under the Weimar Republic, Hoess had become familiar with the realities of homosexuality inside prison and took vigorous measures to prevent homosexual activity among his charges. He later calmly wrote that he imposed a regime upon wearers of the pink triangle so severe that few survived.

Administrators used two pink triangles sewed onto their uniforms to identify inmates as homosexual, part of a system to isolate groups that potential leaders and troublemakers might incite. A Communist, who normally wore red triangles, might instead be given a black triangle for asocial (habitual) criminals so that placed in the midst of such types he would be an outsider, unable to organize them for political struggle. Camp memoirs mention that although homosexual activity was rife among all groups, other inmates most ostracized prisoners with the pink triangle. In the 1970s gay activists discovered and adopted the pink triangle as a symbol of their movement.

**The Question of Numbers.** Just how many homosexuals died in the camps, much less elsewhere during the Holocaust, can never be ascertained. Not all those convicted under the penal codes of Axis and collaboratorist governments such as Vichy France, which in 1942 raised the age of consent to 21, Italy, Hungary, Croatia, and Slovakia were homosexual. Like National Socialism, fascism also deployed the charge of homosexuality against political opponents. A small percent of those exterminated by the Nazis on racial or political grounds must also have been homosexual or bisexual. Compared with the ferocity that the Nazis exhibited against Jews and Gypsies, their treatment of homosexuals was for a while what could have been expected of certain authoritarian regimes. It was not much worse than what the Soviets actually inflicted on them after their law of March 7, 1934—symbolically on the first anniversary of the National Socialist seizure of power in Germany—which like the Nazi law of 1935, under which convictions mounted from 800 or 900 in 1933–34 to nearly 9000 in 1937, prescribed a maximum penalty of five years for male homosexuality but ignored lesbianism. However, homosexuals were among the first executed, as early as 1933, by Nazi doctors practicing euthanasia on inmates of asylums, and the killing accelerated before the war in camps that tried to “reform” homosexuals through hard labor. Many died there of abuse and others who failed to perform when provided with female prostitutes
were executed as incorrigible. Once the war began, German males became so valuable that fewer were incarcerated or exterminated for homosexuality, from 8000 a year before 1940 to 3000 after it. Another figure that will never be precisely known is that of homosexuals who took their own lives to end the fear and misery into which the totalitarian state had plunged them. Among all modern states for which figures can be compiled, Nazi Germany offers the horrible example of suicides increasing rather than decreasing in wartime.

Richard Plant, following earlier documentation by Professor Rüdiger Lautmann of the University of Bremen, estimated that between five and fifteen thousand homosexuals were exterminated in Hitler's camps in the Reich because of their sexual orientation. He makes no attempt to count the pink triangles exterminated in the death camps, none of which was within the boundaries of Germany proper; they were all in Poland, in the General Government established in 1939. On the basis of the figures for those convicted under Paragraph 175, many estimate 50,000 killed, but many of those were actually released or "reformed." The Protestant Church in Austria had earlier arrived at the figure of 225,000 homosexual victims of the Third Reich. On the basis of Himmler's statements that there were 1,500,000 German homosexuals in 1938 and half a million in 1944, Jean Boisson believed that the Nazis killed one million, presumably all citizens of the Reich. This is a wide discrepancy, and both extremes are misleading. The regime's rhetoric encouraged violence against homosexuals inside and outside the Reich, in occupied territories as well as in German satellites. No one has yet estimated the numbers murdered in random acts of violence which collaborationist governments also encouraged. Of these measures Vichy's laws are the best documented and fully discussed by Boisson, who shows that Marshal Pétain, at the instigation of Admiral Darlan, in 1942 raised the age of consent to twenty-one for the first time, thus creating an invidious distinction between homosexual and heterosexual acts. Giovanni Dall'Orto has shown that in 1938, because of his alliance with Hitler, Mussolini began to persecute not only Jews but homosexuals, of whom several thousand were exiled to island prisons or remote Calabrian villages, while Jews were merely deprived of their professional posts. Ironically, in 1930 Mussolini had intervened in a parliamentary debate to prevent the passage of a law criminalizing homosexual conduct on the grounds that it was rare among Italians and practiced only by decadent foreigners who even if homosexual should not be driven out of the country because they increased Italy's supply of foreign exchange.

Less information exists on repression in Croatia, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Finland, but Pilsudski's decriminalization of 1932 may have become a dead letter in the General Government [Nazi-occupied Poland]. The Plant school argues that because the Nazis were not interested in purifying other races and rather wished to limit their reproduction, no persecution occurred among them. However, even within the death camps other inmates ostracized the "pink triangles," as Boisson poignantlly relates, so that as Lautmann proved by comparing them with the control group of Jehovah's Witnesses and political prisoners, they suffered the shortest life expectancies and highest death rate, belonging as they did to a "scapegoat group" unable to form a strong support network. Even in the occupied zones where no collaborationist government existed, one cannot imagine that homosexuals suffered less during than before the war.

Because the Nazis aimed to "cure" Germans they thought curable, many who could perform with women, such as hustlers who had merely been selling their bodies, were released from concentration camps and ordinary prisons. Probably the chief cause of death of German homosexu-
als was from being shipped to the eastern front, where acute suffering if not certain death awaited them, not only to the *Strafbataillonen* (penal units) but to regular ones that had to have replacements. The army continued to avoid arresting soldiers as it had in the pre-Hitler era, in spite of Himmler’s orders to avoid amnesty and prosecute homosexual offenders (only a handful of executions in the military is known). Many officers, some inadvertently owing to their natural homophobia, disproportionately selected homosexuals from the misfits under their command for the ever more frequent replacements demanded from other units for service at the front. So do the figures in Plant, which play into the hands of homophobic apologists who would belittle the size and extent of the persecution of homosexuals, must be added not only those exterminated in the death camps outside of German soil but also: (1) those killed by random homophobic violence both inside Germany and outside it; (2) those sent to the eastern front; (3) those persecuted and killed by collaborationist governments; (4) those who ended their own lives by suicide. The overall figures, especially if one counts those who fell into two categories such as homosexual Jews or homosexual members of other persecuted groups, would be not five thousand but many times that, and would include all nationalities, not merely subjects of the Reich.

Scandalously, a world which protested the persecution of the Jews in the Third Reich and was horrified by its other crimes against humanity remained indifferent to the treatment of homosexuals by Hitler, denied compensation to survivors, and refused to allow the pink triangle to be inscribed on monuments to victims of inhumanity. Many of these historians and commentators, silent about the persecution of homosexuals, lose no opportunity to insult and defame the German people for their unwillingness to resist Hitler’s policies, even though they were living in a country where everyone was at the mercy of the Gestapo and the rest of the Nazi terror apparatus. Such contrasts are a measure of the continuing dishonesty and hypocrisy of the Judeo-Christian world and of the liberals within Western society on the subject of homosexuality—actions that effectively give the lie to apologists who would claim that the Church and Synagogue were no more than “innocent bystanders,” powerless to prevent the injustice which they saw and deplored. Indeed, if Hitler had only killed homosexuals, these exemplars of self-righteousness might still be applauding him for having done just that.


_**Warren Johansson and William A. Percy**_

**HOMER**

Greek epic poet. Most Greeks believed that Homer was a blind bard from Chios or Smyrna (which the predominance of the Ilenic dialect supports) who, at a date which they variously placed from the Trojan War (ca. 1200 B.C.) to the beginning of literacy (700 B.C.), composed both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Although dramatically dated to Mycenaean times, the late second millennium B.C., the epics sometimes refer to things that cannot predate 650 or even 570, because interpolations existed in one form or another when seventh-century poets cited the epics.

Although the poems may have evolved over centuries orally, the final version suggests a unifying hand, even if the view of some Alexandrian critics that each poem was composed by a separate bard—the *Odyssey* forty years after the *Iliad*—has not been abandoned by all. The
contrasts between the two have been explained by aging of the author and differences in topics: war and peace, the siege of Troy and the wanderings of Ulysses on his return voyage. In any event, the author or authors owed much to tradition.

It is difficult to detect all interpolations and changes, especially additions of Attic terms as high culture became increasingly centered in Athens, where the Peisistratids in the mid-sixth century had the epics recited annually at a festival, and many believe the first texts written well over a century after the latest possible date for Homer’s death. A definitive text resulted only from the efforts of second-century editors in Alexandria. These texts became almost sacred to the Greeks, whose education was based on them even until the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453.

Like Hesiod and all other poets and artists through the time of Archilochus (flourished ca. 660) and even later Tyrtaeus (flourished ca. 630), Homer failed to depict institutionalized pederasty, to which almost all subsequent writers referred, many making it central. Though poets and artists around 600 B.C. make the earliest unmistakable references to institutionalized pederasty, Homer mentioned Ganymede twice, “the loveliest born of the race of mortals, and therefore the gods caught him away to themselves, to be Zeus’ wine-pourer, for the sake of his beauty, so he might be among the immortals” (Iliad, 20, 233–35) and Zeus’ giving Tros, Ganymede’s father, “the finest of all horses beneath the sun and the daybreak” (Iliad, 5, 265ff.) as compensation for his son. Sir Moses Finley concluded that “the text of the poems offers no directly affirmative evidence at any point; even the two references to the elevation of Ganymede to Olympus speak only of his becoming cup-bearer to Zeus.” Sir Kenneth Dover denied that these passages implied pederasty: “It should not be impossible for us . . . to imagine that the gods on Olympus, like the souls of men in the Muslim paradise . . . simply rejoiced in the beauty of their servants as one ingredient of felicity.” However, the Abrahamic religions’ taboo on homosexuality did not exist in Hellenic and Etruscan antiquity. Societies that had the formula “eat, drink, and be merry” held that banquets should fittingly issue in sexual revelry. Anachronisms such as those of Finley and Dover should therefore be dismissed, even though Homer’s allusions to Ganymede may be pederastic interpolations like those ordered by the Peisistratids—successors of Solon, who introduced institutionalized pederasty into Athens—to anodate the cultural prominence of Athens.

Besides the love between Achilles and Patroclus, two episodes from the Iliad not involving Ganymede have been incorrectly related to pederasty. After Patroclus’ death Achilles associated very closely with Nestor’s son Antilochus, who thus may have replaced Patroclus as lover or, rather, perhaps as beloved now that Achilles had fully matured. Both relationships, however, really involved coevals. Second, later poets interpreted the close friendship between the Cretan king Idomeneus and his charioteer Meriones as pederastic, perhaps because of Crete’s reputation as the birthplace of pederasty. Achilles and Patroclus grew up together, the latter slightly older. Later authors, believing a pederastic relationship to have existed between the two, were in a quandary as to which must have been the older, as after 600 there was customarily a ten-year difference. Some assigned the role of mentor to Achilles, others to Patroclus, to impose the disparity essential to pederastic liaisons in their own time. Of course the fact that Homer implied that they were approximately the same age, adolescent companions, does not exclude their having been physically intimate when younger, but it shows their relationship not to have been the institutionalized pederasty of later centuries. The plot of the Iliad, with Achilles’ boundless grief and dreadful revenge on the Trojans
for killing Patroclus, is homophilic, as is the language in which the hero addresses the dead Patroclus and Patroclus’ spirit requests that their ashes be united in the same urn forever.

So if Homer (or the bards whose work is preserved under his name) did not anticipate the pederasty of the Golden Age, he created an imperishable monument of male love and fidelity on the battlefield that is one of the earliest, yet enduring classics of world literature.


William A. Percy

**HOMOPHILE**

A modern coinage from the Greek, etymologically the term means “loving the same.” Homophile is, theoretically at least, broader in scope than homosexual, in that it includes non-genital as well as genital relations, but less broad than homosocial, which comprises all significant relations between members of the same sex. Although the term had some circulation in Germany in the 1920s (e.g., as *Homophilie* in the writings of the astrophysically inclined Karl-Günther Heimsoth), it was first used systematically in the Dutch homosexual rights movement after World War II. It was internationally diffused through the advocacy of the International Committee for Sexual Equality (Amsterdam) in the early 1950s. In the following decade the word homophile was adopted as self-designation by a number of middle-class organizations in the United States, and it seemed for a time that it might prevail. Homophile had the advantage of clearly including affectional, nonsexual relations as well as sexual ones, thereby deemphasizing the perceived genital emphasis of the term homosexual.

The new militant trend that arose in the wake of the 1969 Stonewall Rebellion rejected the word homophile as a euphemism, preferring gay. Histories of the gay movement sometimes refer to the years 1950–69, when the word was in vogue, as the “homophile period.” This phase stands in contrast with the more radical one that ensued.

**HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT**

See Movement, Homosexual.

**HOMOPHOBIA**

Although precise definitions vary, this term usually refers to negative attitudes toward homosexual persons and homosexuality. Characterizing antihomosexual prejudice as *aphobia* has been criticized for several reasons, including the implication that such prejudice is an irrational fear and a manifestation of individual pathology rather than of cultural norms. Despite its limitations, “homophobia” is likely to enjoy increasingly widespread use in American English until a more suitable term is introduced. Care should be taken, therefore, to identify homophobia as a prejudice, comparable to racism and anti-semitism, rather than an irrational fear similar to claustrophobia or agoraphobia.

Institutional Homophobia. At the institutional and individual levels, homophobia can be observed both through explicit hostility toward lesbians and gay men and through failure to recognize the existence of gay people or the legitimacy of their concerns. Institutional homophobia manifests itself in part through anti-gay laws, policies, and pronouncements from legislatures, courts, organized religion, and other groups within society. It also is evident in the social processes that reinforce the general invisibility of lesbians and gay men in society (e.g., in mass media, through
definitions of "family" entirely in heterosexual terms).

The complex evolution of institutional homophobia is revealed through historical and anthropological studies, which indicate that the development of Western definitions of sexuality and sexual orientation has for centuries been characterized by disapproval of homosexuality. Among the factors cited to explain this disapproval has been society's presumed need to define and maintain strict gender roles and to link sexual behavior with procreation. Both of these ideological factors often are presumed to be necessary for promoting heterosexual family units as sites for reproduction and the socialization of children into the economic and social system. Other explanations for institutional homophobia highlight intergroup conflicts in which hostility toward homosexuality has been utilized to one group's advantage (e.g., in power struggles by religious groups or in electoral politics).

Individual Homophobia. This is exemplified by many heterosexuals' open hostility toward gay people (ranging from deprecatory statements to physical attacks) and their maintenance of a completely heterosexual worldview (including, for example, the ongoing assumption that all of their friends and relatives are heterosexual).

National surveys and laboratory studies consistently have documented correlations between individual homophobic attitudes and various demographic and psychological variables. In contrast to heterosexual persons with favorable or tolerant attitudes, those with more homophobic attitudes also are more likely to subscribe to a conservative or fundamentalist religious ideology and to attend religious services frequently, to hold restrictive attitudes concerning sexuality and gender roles, and to manifest high levels of authoritarianism. Additionally, homophobic individuals are less likely than others to report having engaged in homosexual behaviors or to have had personal contact with openly gay men or women. Homophobic persons tend to be older and less well-educated than nonhomophobic persons, and are more likely to live in areas where negative attitudes toward homosexuality are the norm (e.g., the midwestern and southern United States, and rural areas or small towns).

In many empirical studies, more anti-gay hostility has been observed among heterosexual males than among heterosexual females; the highest levels of homophobia often have been displayed by heterosexual males toward gay men. This sex difference has been found in laboratory studies more often than in national surveys, possibly because the former kind of study tends to assess deeply-felt emotion-laden reactions to homosexual persons while the latter tends to assess value-oriented responses to homosexuality (i.e., whether or not it is morally acceptable and whether civil rights protection should be extended to gay people).

Empirical research on homophobic behavior (e.g., acts of discrimination, assaults on lesbians and gay men) is sparse, although interest in the perpetration of "hate crimes" based on homosexuality is increasing among political groups and policy makers. Several nonrandom surveys conducted in the United States suggest that homosexual persons are much more likely than heterosexuals to be targets of verbal harassment, vandalism, physical assault, sexual assault, and murder. The incidence of such hate crimes may be increasing, fueled by societal reactions to the epidemic of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome; as an epidemic closely associated in the United States with gay men, AIDS has been used by some heterosexuals as a justification for expressing preexisting homophobic attitudes.

Various explanations have been offered for the existence of individual homophobia. All of them implicitly acknowledge that individual attitudes are formed within a larger societal context.
that encourages prejudice against homosexual people. The goal of such explanations, then, is to explain why some heterosexuals manifest higher [or lower] levels of homophobia than is expected by society.

A psychodynamic explanation proposes that extremely homophobic individuals themselves have unconscious homosexual desires which, because of societal attitudes, cause them great anxiety; their homophobia serves as a psychological defense by disguising those desires. An alternative explanation is that individual homophobia reflects ignorance about homosexuality, owing to lack of personal contact with gay women and men. A third approach suggests that homophobia serves different social and psychological functions for different persons. For some it is a strategy for psychological defense; for others it is a way of making sense of past interactions with gay people; for others, expressing homophobic sentiments provides a means for gaining social approval or for affirming a particular self-concept through expressing values important to that self.

Internalized Homophobia (Self-Contempt). Lesbian women and gay men themselves are not immune from homophobia, since they are socialized into a culture where hostility toward homosexuality is the norm. Homophobia among gay people is termed "internalized homophobia" and is understood to involve a rejection of one's own homosexual orientation. This phenomenon is analogous to the self-contempt felt by members of stigmatized ethnic groups. Recognizing and rejecting the homophobic aspects of socialization are important parts of the coming out process.

Reducing Homophobia. Eliminating homophobia at the institutional and individual levels inevitably must be a dialectical process since individuals live within the social context created by institutions, while those institutions are shaped and populated by individuals. Among major successes in challenging institutional homophobia have been the elimination of homosexuality as a diagnostic category from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-III) of the American Psychiatric Association, recognition and acceptance of gay people by some liberal religious denominations, repeal or overturning of several state sodomy laws, and the passage of anti-discrimination legislation in one state (Wisconsin) and more than 40 municipalities.

Little empirical research has been conducted on the effectiveness of various strategies for reducing individual homophobia. To the extent that different heterosexuals have different motivations for their homophobia, multiple approaches are necessary. When expressions of homophobia function to reinforce an individual's self-concept as a good Christian, for example, appeals to other important values (e.g., compassion and love of one's neighbor, patriotism and support for civil rights) are more likely to change attitudes than are factual refutations of incorrect stereotypes about homosexual persons.

While no single strategy is universally effective in countering prejudice, personal contact with gay people appears to be the most consistently influential factor in reducing heterosexuals' homophobia. In national opinion polls, persons who say they know an openly gay man or lesbian consistently report more positive attitudes toward gay people as a group. This pattern is consistent with the social science finding that ongoing personal contact between members of majority and minority groups frequently reduces prejudice among majority-group members. Thus, disclosing one's homosexual orientation to family members, friends, and coworkers often is a potent means for challenging homophobia. This hypothesis highlights the importance of institutional changes (e.g., elimination of sodomy laws, passage of anti-discrimination legislation, protection from hate crimes) that will enable lesbian women and gay men to come out with fewer risks.
See also Authoritarian Personality; Discrimination; Myths and Fabrications; Stereotype.


Gregory Herek

HOMOSEXUAL (TERM)

For at least half a century homosexual has been the most generally accepted designation for same-sex orientation. The cognate forms enjoy a similar status in all the major Western European languages, and in others as well (e.g., Russian and Turkish). Etymologically, the word homosexual is a hybrid: the first part, homo-, being the Greek combining form meaning "same"; the second [late] Latin. (The mistaken belief that the homocomponent represents the Latin word for "man" has probably contributed to resistance to the expression among lesbians.)

The term homosexual began its public life in two anonymous German pamphlets published by Károly Mária Kertbeny in 1869. (He used the term in private correspondence a year before.) Homosexual probably owed its inspiration in part to the term bisexual that had been introduced into botany in the first decade of the nineteenth century with the meaning "having the sexual organs of both sexes" [of plants]. Writing in opposition to a proposed extension of a Prussian antisodomy law to the whole of the North German Confederation, the writer was by no means a disinterested observer. A polyglot and translator (not a physician as usually claimed), Kertbeny contrasted homosexual and normalsexual. His coinage might have gone unnoticed had not Gustav Jaeger, a lifestyle reformer and professor of zoology and anthropology at the University of Stuttgart, popularized it in the second edition of his Entdeckung der Seele (1880). Thus the term homosexual was not born under the aegis of pure science as one might suppose, but was the creation of a closeted advocate of homosexual rights. It is a curious irony today that some gay liberationists of the second half of the twentieth century oppose the word homosexual as a label imposed on them by the enemy.

In the period of its introduction, Kertbeny's term had to compete with other German creations, notably Karl Heinrich Ulrichs' Urningtum and Uranismus [uranianism] and K. F. O. Westphal's die con-träre Sexualempfindung (contrary sexual feeling). Given its obscure origins, why did the term homosexual ultimately prevail? Uranian and its congeners enjoyed currency for a time, but were too arcane for the ordinary speaker, while the antonym Dionian (= heterosexual) never achieved the slightest acceptance. Westphal's cumbersome expression was doubly isolated: it was usable only in German and lacked the matching terms of the series. By contrast, the set homosexual/bisexual/heterosexual that finally emerged seemed to encompass (and trisect) the semantic field. Moreover, the abstract nouns Homosexualität/Homosexualismus which Kertbeny also devised served to denote the condition. All these forms, being grafted onto the trunk of the Latin adjective sexualis, had no difficulty in gaining international currency. And so in the first decade of the twentieth century—in the course of reporting the Harden–Euleenburg–von Moltke–Städele affair in Wilhelmine Germany—journalism adopted the Greek–Latin hybrid homosexual and made it part of the everyday vocabulary, while the expression sexual inversion remained limited to psychiatric circles.
Thus it was under the name homosexuality that the subject became known to the general public at the time when the German sexual reform movement founded by Magnus Hirschfeld was beginning its long campaign to change the law and public opinion in favor of those whose sexual activity was still stigmatized and outlawed under the name of sodomy or crimes against nature. The tireless activity of Hirschfeld and his associates consolidated the status of the word among professionals (physicians, sexologists, psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts) and among the public at large.

In English-speaking countries some controversy has arisen over the question as to whether the word homosexual is both a noun and an adjective or an adjective alone. Behind the seeming pedantry of such grammatical quibbling lies a conflict between those who claim that homosexuals are a "people," or at least a stable minority, and others who insist that there are no Homosexuals, only homosexual acts, which individuals—who should not otherwise be labeled—elect from time to time. John Boswell has persuasively traced this difference back to the medieval philosophical dispute between the realists (or essentialists) and the nominalists. However this may be, the first position (homosexuals as a people) may lead to separatism, the second (individuals engaging in elective behavior) may counsel integration. If homosexuals really are profoundly different they should form separate institutions, but if, despite the negative stereotypes with which they have been burdened, those engaging in homosexual behavior remain in the last analysis "just folks," they may look forward to fitting in as lefthanders, say, have done. Here we enter the realm of the homosexual concept, on the one hand, and that of political strategy, on the other, with the battleground the sense of identity.

Whatever one may think of the battle of the essentialists and the nominalists, which has been much waged in con-
temporary debates on social construction, it does not seem likely that the use of the word homosexual as a noun will be extirpated. The English language has no Academy to dictate such matters of usage. And in Romance languages any adjective may be used as a noun without special permission.

Existentially, for any human being to affirm "I am a homosexual" is both an act of courage and an acknowledgment that this attraction is a central element in one’s personality. In other times and climes, sexual orientation seems to have been or is relatively labile and peripheral. In Western society, however, where the term engenders strong and often negative emotional responses from the general public and from those wielding power over homosexuals’ lives, there are many who feel subjectively that homosexuality—or gayness—is a crucial personal attribute. What role words, as tools not invented by those to whom they refer but given to them and wielded against them, may play in the reinforcement of this perception is hard to determine, but one cannot deny the bearers of such sentiments the right to express them.


Wayne R. Dykes and Warren Johansson

HOMOSEXUALITY

In the sense used in the present Encyclopedia, the term homosexuality embraces the entire range of same-sex relations and affections, male-male and female-female. Some writers prefer to restrict the terms homosexual and homosexuality to the male, while female-female relations are designated lesbianism. Since there are in fact significant phenomenological differences, a good case can be made for separating the two phenomena. In ear-
lier times in the West and in other socie-
ties the equation of the two was not gen-
erally recognized, and it may be that at some
future point research and public opinion
will concur in effecting a separation. For
present purposes, however, considera-
tion of male homosexuality and lesbianism
together seems to offer better prospects of
attaining understanding, in particular of
the social context of homosexuality.

One of the vexing problems with
the homosexual concept is its ambiguity
with regard to exclusivity of orientation:
does it include *bisexuality* and situational
homosexuality?

Another question is whether
homosexuality should include deep friend-
ships that are not genitally expressed: male
bonding and female bonding. Some schol-
ars place these phenomena under the
general umbrella term of *homosociality*.

The Greeks and Romans focused
on the phenomenon of *pederasty*, that is to
say, age-graded relations between males
governed by strong cultural tradition.
Rarely did they attempt a synoptic view of
the whole realm of same-sex relations.
The modern Western world, by contrast,
recognizes other types of age-graded rela-
tions (*such as ephebophilia*, the attraction
to maturing youths, and *pedophilia*, the
attraction to children) but then assimilates all male same-sex relations to ones
between adults (*androphilia*), which are
regarded as the norm.

The *Middle Ages* gave birth to the
problematic concept of *sodomy*. While the
abstract noun sodomy could cover almost
the whole range of illicit sexual acts, the
noun of agent, sodomite, tended to be
restricted to the male homosexual. Sodo-
mite then, allowing for significant cul-
tural changes, foreshadows the modern
term *homosexual*.

This expression arose out of an
intense phase of discussion in the second
half of the nineteenth century in Central
Europe. Rival terms, such as *uranianism*,
contrary sexual feeling, and *inversion*, were
coined and canvased, but in the end the
word *homosexual* won out.

See also *Typology*.

**Homosexuality**

(Origins of the

**Modern Concept**)

The German term *Homosexual-
ität*, the original form of the word, points
to a concept of homosexuality that crystal-
ized in Central Europe in the sixties and
seventies of the nineteenth century. With
some changes, this concept is the immedi-
ate predecessor of the mainstream of pres-
ent-day Western thinking about same-sex
orientation. Familiarity has made the
model seem simple and straightforward,
almost a given of nature. It is none of these
things. The notion that modern society
has adopted is a hybrid that owes its exis-
tence to the interaction and fusion of three
remarkable semantic innovations stem-
ing from historically distinct cultural
epochs, two of great antiquity and one of
recent origin.

*Three Conceptual Sources.* First,
there was the Judaic law (Leviticus 20:13)
that treated the union of two individuals
having male genitalia as a single offense.
Other civilizations of antiquity had ac-
cepted as a matter of course a dichotomy
between the *active and passive* sexual
partners. The consolidation effected by
the Judaic legislation boldly disregarded
this tradition. Second, there was the equa-
tion of male–male and female–female rela-
tionships in the more abstract thinking of
the Greeks. By contrast, the ancient Near
Eastern mind had never identified the two,
and—as shown by the Babylonian myth
reported by Berossus and echoed in Plato’s
*Symposium*—had traced male–male and
female–female attraction to separate ori-
gins. But the Greek drive toward logical
parallelism made it possible to regard *ped-
erasty* and *tribadism* as two aspects of a
single entity. Third, modern Europe—
specifically nineteenth-century Ger-
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many—attempted a quantification of psychic phenomena.

The German Forensics. The acceptance of a mathematical continuum (0 to 100) made it possible to distinguish individuals in whom sexual attraction to others of the opposite sex was completely absent [the zero degree of heterosexuality = H1] from those who merely experienced an attraction to their own sex that did not exclude the opposite one [H2]. The recognition of exclusively same-sex oriented individuals [H1]—known to the ancients but denied by Christian theology and Christian society for centuries—was crucial to the emergence of the concept of sexual inversion in psychiatry with the classic papers of Karl Friedrich Otto Westphal (1869), Richard von Krafft-Ebing (1877), and Arrigo Tamassia (1878).

The investigators—being forensic psychiatrists—did not limit themselves to a descriptive analysis, but also entered the realm of the prescriptive and judgmental. They concluded that those who were incapable of feeling any attraction to the opposite sex [H1] could not, by virtue of the involuntary and exclusive character of their orientation, be held legally responsible for their sexual conduct, but that the others who, though primarily attracted to their own sex, could nonetheless function on occasion with the other sex [H2] were by comparison morally blameworthy and legally responsible.

Nature and Implications of the German Concept. The nineteenth-century conceptual innovation did not arise spontaneously, as a direct product of psychiatric insight or of the interrogation of homosexual patients. The new formulation was the outcome of a dialogue between the psychiatric profession and the spokesmen for the inchoate homophile movement, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs and Károly Mária Kertbeny. The word homosexual was invented by the litterateur Kertbeny and not by the psychiatrists, so that contrary to the almost universal assumption within today’s gay community it did not originate as a medical term, though it was subsequently used as such. Rather the new concept was dialectical in origin and stemmed [in the case of the homophile apologists] from the polemic need to combat the deeply rooted theological-forensic tradition of the Christian world that stigmatized and penalized sexual activity between individuals having the genital organs of the same sex, and to exonerate those whom public opinion excreted as guilty of “unconditional self-surrender to the immoral.” Only in this way could the burden of centuries of obloquy begin to be lifted. Yet few developments in human thought are completely new, and in this instance the new distinction was superimposed upon the two long-standing equations noted at the beginning of this article, the Levitical assimilation of the active and passive partners, and the Greek conflation of male-male and female-female attraction. The emergent concept was thus an “old wine in a new bottle,” or perhaps more correctly a cocktail blended from three different vintages. The two older strata had abolished two antinomies [active vs. passive; male vs. female] to create the theological notion of “crime against nature by reason of sex”; conversely, the modern stratum created a new antimony: exclusive [H1] vs. elective [H2], yielding the psychiatric notions of “homosexual” vs. “bisexual.” The fact that the popular mind lumped both of the latter behavioral types together under the term “homosexuality” does not efface the historical reality that the concept arose out of the perception of duality.

The two authors of the concept themselves disagreed in that Ulrichs was more the spokesman for the [H1] category, while Kertbeny was concerned more with the rights of the [H2] group, since their behavior was equally culpable in the eyes of the law, yet he argued that they had the right to choose the same rather than the opposite sex for purposes of erotic gratification. In fact, to limit the application of the law to the [H2] category in practice
would mean that the prosecution would have to prove that on other occasions the defendant engaged in heterosexual behavior which was perfectly legal—a logical impossibility from the standpoint of the law.

Problems. As the outcome of its complex pedigree, the new concept was fraught with ambivalence and ambiguity: a century of medical and biological investigation has failed to discover any common denominator among the individuals labeled homosexual. Success in such a quest was precluded from the start since H1 and H2 are typically treated as if they were one: the problem of the occurrence of homosexual attraction is not identical with the problem of the absence of heterosexual attraction. Yet until a relatively recent date many researchers wrote of “the homosexual” in the singular, as if they were describing a discrete species. Though this linguistic habit is not common now, its long prevalence served to reinforce the misapprehension that a single phenomenon was under study. To the extent that the researchers did follow more attentively the nineteenth-century model, which focused on this single psychological trait of ability or nonability to respond to heterosexual stimuli, they perforce neglected the tremendous range of variation in constitutional and personality type found within both H1 and H2. Of course, it cannot be excluded that at some future time a genetic basis for the absence of heterosexual desire or response will be discovered, but thus far biology has furnished no evidence for this.

It is not surprising that in its perplexity the general public wavers on the issue, unable to secure any authoritative guidance from the experts. On the one hand, homosexuality is thought to be exclusive and innate [H1], so that fathering or giving birth to a child is regarded as indisputable proof that the parent is not homosexual—a “true” homosexual could not manage such a fundamental shift. On the other hand, when homosexuals are exhorted to enter therapy in order to change their orientation, by a sleight of hand the conceptualization moves over to pigeonhole H2, taken to imply that individuals who have been functioning homosexually should function heterosexually. In this way a claim is made that the first assumption had categorically denied.

Interference of Related Concepts. The ultimate source of the confusion lies in the fact that the new term was superimposed upon the already emotion-laden semantic fields of “pederasty/tribadism” and “sodomy,” neglecting the crucial element of the exclusive and involuntary character of H1, which had so impressed the rational minds of the pioneering nineteenth-century investigators. This lingering afterglow of the older attitude of condemnation hindered the progress of the movement for gay rights for many decades. By confounding exclusive homosexual attraction [H1] with elective homosexual attraction [H2] it played into the hands of an opposition that clung to the notion that “homosexuality is only a new name for an old vice,” insisting that “homosexuality is a disease” that can be cured if the homosexual will only “renounce his way of life.” To be sure, the disease concept of homosexuality represents a modernization of the religious notion of sin. But the conversion from sin to sickness was made possible by the initial belief in the statistical rarity of H1, which suggests that homosexuality is a human variant outside the normal range: a biological anomaly. And yet the opposing H2 model underlies the notion of change of orientation through therapy. Thus at the present day one half of the inherited nineteenth-century concept is invoked to diagnose disease, the other half to insist on the possibility of cure.

Kinsey. In 1948 Alfred Kinsey and his associates were to retain the category of same-sex exclusives [H1] in the 6 of their 0–6 scale, but because of their approach as evolutionary biologists they stressed a spectrum of sexual response and attached no significance to the crucial line
of demarcation that had so impressed the European forensic psychiatrists. The Kinsey "rainbow" has had considerable influence on the academic discussion of homosexuality, but comparatively little impact on the popular mind.

Conclusion. The intricacies of the formation of the concept of homosexuality illustrate the general principle in intellectual history that key ideas are not forged through a simple conjunction taking place at a single moment in history. That moment represents at most a phase of crystallization, not of creation ex novo. Moreover, concepts are not simply the product of an impartial evaluation of data, but rather take shape in human minds already equipped with semantic grids. As Blaise Pascal observed, "Chance smiles only on minds that are prepared." In the realm of thinking about sexuality the theories are almost inevitably contaminated with ideology, the strivings of interested parties, and the wish to preserve an existing value system or replace it with a new one. The world still awaits a conceptual system that overcomes the serious flaws of the one inherited from the nineteenth century.

See also Typology.

Warren Johansson

HOMOSOCIALITY

A neutral term, homosociality designates the patterns and relationships arising from gender-specific gatherings of all sorts. When men or women participate affectively in homosocial situations, one may speak also of male bonding and female bonding.

Basic Features. In the field of lesbian and gay studies, homosociality has become a methodological tool. In 1975 Carroll Smith-Rosenberg ("The Female World of Love and Ritual," Signs, 1 [1975]), and then Michel Foucault (interview in Masques [13], Spring 1982), outlined the concept of homosociality as a way of broadening the terrain of gay and lesbian stud-
difficulty of finding explicit sexual material with regard to lesbianism. So, female bonding as the affective participation of women in separate spheres has become an important object of research (Smith-Rosenberg, Martha Vicinus, Lillian Faderman, Adrienne Rich).

A lively discussion has ensued on the sexual character of female friendships in history. In this debate is implicated the actual question of whether the sexualization of lesbian relations was a liberation or a new means of subordinating women. Here Radclyffe Hall's novel *The Well of Loneliness* (1928) is an important landmark witnessing the sexualization of women's separate spheres.

**Problems of Methodology and Data.** For male homosociality, an even more extensive literature exists than for its female counterpart, but it has some major problems. First of all, it scarcely ever focuses on the intimate relations of the men in bonding. Secondly, when male homosociality is discussed, it is mostly seen as an exceptional situation and less commonly as a fundamental structure of societies. Taking the latter viewpoint, however, Lionel Tiger analyzed it from a sociobiological perspective stressing the homoeroticism of male bonding, as did Thorkild Vangaard from a historical perspective. Bertrand Sergent and Eva C. Keuls did the same for classical Greece, for opposed reasons: Sergent to stress the institutional and ancient character of pederastic relations, Keuls to criticize the phallocracy of Athenian "democracy."

The histories of soldiering, education, seafaring, and politics have hardly ever been discussed from this homosocial angle—just as women's emancipation is nowadays generally seen as going along heterosocial lines. More specific studies in which attention is paid to homoeroticism have been done on English pirates of the seventeenth century (B. R. Burg), on English public schools (J. Gathorne Hardy, J. R. de Symons Honey, and J. Chandos), on the military (P. Fussell and P. Parker) and on the eros tradition (G. Dall'Orto and T. Maasen).

**The Socialization of Masculinity.** In many cultures the standards of masculinity are learned in such all-male situations. For many tribal cultures, the men's houses are the centers for male initiation; in modern cultures sex-segregated schools, armies, sports groups, and student societies were until recently and sometimes still are the institutional sites of male socialization. Even where such homosocial sites still exist, they are more integrated into heterosocial society. The strictures governing such enclaves tend nowadays to be much looser, because of the better possibilities of transportation, the extension of free time, the abolition of corporal punishments, and the informalization of discipline in most institutions. Where in recent decades such institutionalized frameworks are declining, groups of pubertal boys become more important for sex-specific socialization and the youngsters define for themselves their norms of manliness outside institutional frameworks.

The norms of masculinity are thus purveyed, from the time of puberty onwards, in all-male situations. But it was also the environment in which men had their most intimate (sexual and non-sexual) relationships. In novels, letters, diaries, and book dedications written prior to World War I, the importance of male bonding was underlined: men had their most expressive, intimate and strong attachments from puberty up until marriage with other men. Adulthood meant mostly responsibility, respectability, and thus boredom. Old ties of friendship could be revived in men's clubs and pubs or on festive occasions, but they could not surpass the emotional bonds of a younger age.

This world of male bonding and male intimacies is in decline with the heterosocialization of society. The rise of explicit homosexual identities and com-
communities can be seen as a byproduct of this process of declining homosociality. Whereas in former times much homosexual behavior existed under the cover of homosociality, with the decline of male bonding, homosexual situations are standing more apart and are thus becoming more visible (and as such, more threatening to the homosocial groups).

With the advent of the homosexual identity, the homosocial male [soldier, seaman, cowboy, outlaw, fireman, cop] became the typical object of desire for homosexual men, and when in the last decades this border traffic between gay and straight society diminished, some gay men in their "clone" stereotypes tried to realize these homosocial types in themselves.

Conclusion. The subject of homosociality, and more specifically, of female and male bonding, has great relevance for gay and lesbian studies. First, as a sphere where forms of homosexual pleasure are engendered, and secondly, because it broadens as well as changes the perspective of gay and lesbian studies. As a concept, it alerts researchers to the differences existing between gay and lesbian culture. Finally, it is an extremely rich field which is insufficiently studied, especially the male variants, and one in which gay studies can display its strengths.

See also Friendship, Female Romantic; Friendship, Male.


**HORACE (65–8 B.C.)**

Latin lyric and satiric poet of the Golden Age. Quintus Horatius Flaccus was the son of a freedman who cared for his education. In Athens he studied philosophy and ancient Greek literature. As a supporter of Brutus he fought at Philippi, then returned to Rome, where in the spring of 38 Vergil and Varius Rufus introduced him to Mæcenas, the great patron of Latin literature, who after nine months admitted him to his intimate circle. Horace thereafter lived withdrawn, dining out only at Mæcenas' invitation. The friendship lasted to the end of their lives, and in 32 Horace received from Mæcenas a Sabine estate.

As a poet Horace is remembered for his *Odes, Epodes*, and *Satires*. The *Odes* are modeled on the Greek poems of Alcaeus, Sappho, Pindar, and Bacchylides, with the added refinement which the Hellenistic era gave to the short poem. The *Satires* are inspired by Lucilius, but composed in hexameter verse, though freer than in epic poetry. The subject matter—as befitted the son of a freedman—was not ruthlessly personal and political, but apolitical and universal: the vices and follies of private life, stoic paradoxes, and his own friendship with Mæcenas are the themes. The Epistles in verse are philosophical and literary discourses modeled on Lucilius, Mummius, and Catullus. The language of the poems ranges from the popular to the most literary and formal; it is rich in imagery and symbolism.

In his private life Horace was certainly bisexual, with a preference in the homosexual direction. The love poems to women—to Lalage, Chloris, Lydia, or Pyrrha—strike the modern reader as artificial and insubstantial, despite the severe
grace of language and structure which the poet inscribed in them. The poet's account of his love for handsome boys and youths rings far more true and sincere. The very intensity of his affection for boys precluded his deeply loving any woman; all the women that he portrays or addresses seem lifeless, and really unhappy love for a woman never troubled him. In spirit Horace was never young, never knew the intensity of youthful passion, and as he grew older, he became more and more a spectator of life and love, counseling his reader to observe the golden mean, even if he can be momentarily enthralled by the beauty of a youth. The poet regarded the phenomena of sexual life with a wonderful humor that gave him a magic touch over them all, but maturity had distanced him from the spontaneous ardor of the lover. His ideal was that of the wise man who remains unperturbed in the face of every event, from sheer happiness to unrelieved sorrow.


Warren Johansson


English poet and classical scholar. The son of a solicitor, he earned prizes for poetry at Bromsgrove School and won an open scholarship to St. John's College, Oxford, in 1877. He pursued his classical studies so single-mindedly that he neglected the rest of the Greats examination and failed his finals in 1881, but received a pass degree the following year. For some nine years he worked as a civil servant in the Patent Office in London, while publishing a series of papers in learned journals on such authors as Horace, Propertius, Ovid, Aeschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles. By 1892 his reputation was such that he could enlist seventeen top scholars in support of his application for the vacant Chair of Latin at University College, London. He held this post until 1911, when he was appointed Professor of Latin at Trinity College, Cambridge. As a Latinist Housman devoted himself to the arduous and painstaking editing of the Astronomicon of the poet Manilius (1903–1930), an austere subject that could interest only the specialist, not the general reader.

Housman's poetic output in his lifetime was limited to A Shropshire Lad (1896) and Last Poems (1922). More Poems appeared after his death in 1936. The Shropshire of the poems is a contrived pastoral setting which if idealized is scarcely Arca
dian in that its youthful inhabitants are burdened by life's frustrations and disappointments. Time and happiness vanish; the young and beautiful die, the army and even the gallows take their toll. Housman's verse forms are simple, yet fashioned with classical precision and a fine balance of contrast and paradox. The underlying emotion of the poems is often homoerotic, though the implicit tensions, when present, are too subtle for the average reader to appreciate fully. The unforgettable phrases of the poems betray a melancholy over male love and male beauty forever lost, but still alive in dreams.

The personality of the scholar and poet was opaque to his contemporaries, whom he kept at a discrete distance by mannerisms that gave him the reputation of being frigid and unapproachable. Those who knew him suspected a deeply wounded and repressed personality, but in his lifetime the subject of his sexual orientation had to be whispered; it could not be discussed in print. While an undergraduate at Oxford he had been passionately in love with a tall, handsome young man, Moses Jackson, whom he lost to the latter's bride—a source of profound bitterness and emotional deprivation for him. Rejected by the man whom he loved, Housman had to accept the fact that not only was he homosexual, but that he loved someone who could never return his affection. The further burden that the Church condemned
homosexual expression assinful drove him into an absolute and rigorously maintained atheism. Housman's ambivalence about his homosexuality certainly shaped his inner, emotional life; he felt guilty because of his homosexual desires, yet believed them not utterly wrong. In one of his poems he described himself as "a stranger and afraid/in a world I never made" obliged to keep "These foreign laws of God and man."

Once he had crossed the English Channel and found himself in a country where "the laws of man" did not penalize homosexuality, he at once set about gratifying his forbidden cravings with male prostitutes, including sailors, ballet dancers and other inhabitants of the Parisian demimonde. He also frequented the Turkish baths of Paris, and gratified his fondness for haute cuisine which had been raised to its absolute peak by such master chefs as Ritz and Escoffier. Here, too, he could acquire pornographic writings in English, among them works on flagellation, as well as the French and German classics of sexual science. So his double life did afford him some relief from the frustrations of the façade that he carefully maintained while in London and Cambridge—a pattern not uncommon among homosexuals who cannot afford to compromise themselves in the community where they live, but at an appropriate distance lose most if not all of their inhibitions. On a visit to Constantinople Housman admired the features and complexion of the male Greeks and even more of the Turks, in whom he discerned traits of the British aristocracy.

In his lifetime Housman had an ambience of repressed pedasterly, simply because the society to which he belonged would not allow him to be open about his sexual feelings. Only some four decades after his death was the truth about his sexual orientation finally revealed to the world. It does not diminish his statue as a scholar or a poet, but reminds the reader of his work of the tragedy inherent in the inability of human beings to express their inner feelings or to communicate with one another.


*Warren Johansson*

**HUDSON, ROCK (ROY SCHERER FITZGERALD; 1925–1985)**

American film actor. Becoming a major star with the release of *Magnificent Obsession* in 1954, Rock Hudson came to personify unproblematic heterosexual masculinity for millions of women. Ironically, for most of his life he was predominantly homosexual. His image was carefully nourished and protected by his agent Henry Willson, who gave him his screen name and identity. Hudson's lack of acting training and flair seemed to help in establishing an air of authenticity that history has revealed to be spurious. When the rumor mills began to grind, and it was feared that the truth about the actor's sexuality would surface in one of the popular Hollywood gossip magazines, Willson arranged for Hudson to court and marry his secretary Phyllis Gates in 1955. They were divorced three years later, and Hudson settled into a series of male affairs, the last of which was with Marc Christian, who went public in a dispute about the star's inheritance. Having been diagnosed with AIDS on June 5, 1984, Hudson first tried to keep the matter secret—to the subsequent distress of his unwitting co-stars and sex partners. As his condition grew worse, however, concealment became impossible, and before his death on October 2, 1985, Rock Hudson's condition and his homosexuality had exhaustively aired in the media.

HUMBOLDT, ALEXANDER FREIHERR VON
(1769–1859)

German scientist and explorer. The brother of Wilhelm von Humboldt, he studied engineering and natural history at Frankfurt an der Oder, Berlin, and Göttingen. He traveled through western Europe, and in 1792–97 held an official position in the mining enterprises of the Franconian principalities. From 1799 to 1804, together with the French botanist A. Bompard, he conducted studies in exact geography in several countries of Latin America, determining the course of the Casiquiare River and climbing Mount Chimborazo to a height of 5,400 meters. He also measured the temperature of the Humboldt Current (on the Pacific Coast of South America), as it was later named after him. From 1807 to 1827 he lived with brief interruptions in Paris. Here he conducted experimental studies on gases with J.-L. Gay-Lussac, and also evaluated the findings of his voyages in America in collaboration with other scientists. His major contribution to science is the 30-volume work *Voyage aux régions équinoxiales du nouveau continent* (1805–34).

Returning to Berlin in 1827, he delivered his renowned lectures on physical geography. Accompanied by G. Rose and C. G. Ehrenberg, in 1829 he undertook an expedition into Asiatic Russia (the Urals, the Altai, Dzungaria, the Caspian Sea) at the behest of Tsar Nicholas I, whose main outcome was a worldwide chain of magnetic observatories initiated by Humboldt and realized by the mathematician C. F. Gauss. He also published a two-volume "mineralogical-geognostic" account of his travels and a work entitled *Central-Asien* (1843–44). Settled once again in Berlin after 1830, he compiled a five-volume work that summarized all that was then known about the earth, *Kosmos: Entwurf einer physikalischen Weltbeschreibung* (Cosmos: Outline of a Physical Description of the World; 1845–62). It was the last attempt by a single individual to collect within the pages of a work of his own the totality of human knowledge of the universe; after his time the increasing specialization of the sciences and the sheer accumulation of data made such a venture impossible.

During his scientific expeditions Humboldt assembled enormous quantities of botanical specimens (some 60,000 plants) and geological ones as well. He recorded the fall in the strength of the magnetic fields from the Pole to the Equator and observed swarms of meteors. He prophetically foresaw the advantage of a canal through the Isthmus of Panama. He recorded isotherms and collected data on the languages and cultures of the South American Indians. Through the accounts of his findings—models for all subsequent undertakings—he made significant contributions to oceanography, meteorology, climatology, and geography, and furthered virtually all the natural sciences of his time, but above all else he was responsible for major advances in the geographical and geological sciences.

Magnus Hirschfeld preserved in his volume of 1914 the lingering reminiscences of Humboldt in the homosexual subculture of Berlin, where persons who had known him intimately were living as late as the first decade of the twentieth century, among them the homosexual dendrologist Karl Bolle. Humboldt is reputed never to have sexual relations with a woman. To a servant who was also his lover, Johann Seifert (1800–1877), he bequeathed his entire estate. He had many feminine traits of mind and body, and his homosexual personality revealed itself in a certain restlessness that led him to travel in remote areas of the globe and also to explore a whole range of scientific disciplines. He was the last universal intellect in Western civilization, who in the tradition of the Renaissance man took the entire world as his object of study. Humboldt is still remembered in Germany as one of the greatest scientists his nation has ever produced.
HUMOR

Humor is that which gives rise to mirth or amusement, though the notion often eludes precise definition. The psychology of humor has elicited much theorizing, the common denominator of which is that the element of surprise, of shock, or of unexpectedness is a necessary (even if not sufficient) condition for the humorous experience. Humor interrupts the routine, familiar course of thought and action; it activates the element of play which [as Johan Huizinga stressed] is a component of culture. Acting as the personality's safety valve, humor seems to effect a release from constraint or excess tension. Floating nervous energy in search of an outlet activates the organs of speech and muscles of respiration in such a way as to produce laughter. At the same time humor can afford a sudden insight into the ridiculousness of a situation, or an opportunity to vent anger and aggression, as in the case of a joke or witticism directed at a personal foe or at an enemy in wartime that places him in a ridiculous light.

Erotic Aspects. Sexuality has been the subject of humor since the dawn of recorded history. This is in no small part because of the incongruity between the attraction or the pleasure felt by the actor in an erotic situation but invisible to the observer, who can only note the objectively graceless or even repellent behavior by which third parties procure sexual gratification. The sexual act in itself has nothing aesthetic, even if the pleasure obtained from the physical contact of two human bodies borders on the ecstatic. From this fundamental incongruity derives the piquancy of the countless jokes, anecdotes, tales, cartoons, and pictures in which sexuality is the central theme. At the same time sexual tensions in the subject—and fears of sexual aggression—can also be alleviated by the mechanism of humor.

Homosexuality and Humor. Homosexuality occupies a special place within the domain of sexual humor, both because of the intense taboo with which the very mention of it was once invested, but also because of the perceived incongruity of erotic attraction between two members of the same sex—its departure from the cultural expectation of heterosexuality. The individual who departs too markedly from the gender role norms of the culture is bound to be a target of disapproval, expressed at least in the form of humor. Moreover, homosexual activity itself, aimless and pleasureless as it is to the heterosexual observer, can be the object of rage and contempt but also of a humor that incorporates symbolic aggression. Humor in regard to homosexual activity can be an escape route or symbolic excuse for the inconsistent behavior, or can express abjection from the cultural taboo in the form of an expressive laugh or indirect approval of what cannot be explicitly acknowledged. As homosexuals have come to be recognized as a socially discrete element of Western society, "fag jokes" have taken their place beside ethnic jokes as facets of intergroup tension.

Humor in sexual matters may also reflect the tensions between the official norm of society, which condemns all sexual expression outside of marriage, and the unofficial admiration and envy accorded the individual who successfully violates the taboo and obtains the forbidden pleasure. There is also the implicit denigration of the passive partner, who is seen as being used for the pleasure of the active one while obtaining nothing in return. These dichotomies are intensified in the case of the doubly tabooed and intensely paradoxical homosexual experience, which demands an explanation and justification that Western society has thus far been
unable to find to its own satisfaction. Humor in gay circles can also have the function of a defense mechanism that scores points at the expense of the hostile larger society, exposes its hypocrisy and inconsistency, affirms the values of the deviant subculture, and rejoices in every erotic success achieved in defiance of the taboos and the obstacles contrived by the social order to enforce them. The need of the outgroup to maintain its morale can also be served by the mechanism of humor that releases the accumulated tensions provoked by the constant need for psychological self-defense. This was especially true when nearly all except "obvious" homosexuals had to maintain a heterosexual façade by sundry and ingenious means calculated to deceive the outside world—with all the incongruous and embarrassing situations that ill chance could inflict on the closeted subject.

Humor as a Dimension of Personality. It is universally recognized that humor as a creative activity is a rare and highly specialized psychological trait. The editor of one of America's most popular humor magazines in the 1960s commented at a public lecture that although every day's mail brought his office letters with jokes, cartoons, suggestions for features and the like, still in the whole history of the periodical only a half dozen had ever been judged suitable for its pages. Children do not possess a sense of humor; it is the outgrowth of experience and education, of a mastery of the surrounding world. Humor is also a largely masculine affair: all the great humorists throughout history have been men, even if women have excelled in other literary genres, and even the image of the clown is a male, not a female figure. Arguably, the woman as comedienne is playing a male role.

Psychoanalytic studies of the humorist have brought out the importance of the oral-erotic element in character formation, and also of the manic-depressive personality. Humor entails a subtle dialectic of ability to laugh (from the hypomanic side) and depth of feeling (from the depressive one). The realist in literature who tinged his writing with humorous traits is able to face the harshness of life and yet erect a screen of defensive humor that shields him from its pain and sorrow. The humorist has an intensity and seriousness inherited from the father, but also a strongly developed superego with cheerful propensities derived from the mother. A student of the humorist as personality type has found aversion to marriage, a pronounced wanderlust, and lack of a regular profession as the outward signs, with a split personality, a tendency to self-reflection, to play fondly with the trivial and absurd, and indifference to the world's opinion as the inner traits of character.

This inventory suggests a marked overlap with at least certain facets of the homosexual personality. A specific alloy of the masculine and feminine foreign to the heterosexual mentality, a decided antipathy to marriage, satisfaction in an unattached, roaming lifestyle, a need to reflect upon one's fate in the midst of a hostile society, and a deep-seated indifference to its opinions and judgments are all traits of the homosexual in Western culture. Even the capacity for self-irony, the ability to accept the ridiculous in one's situation as a homosexual, can be positive, survival-enhancing qualities. Noted humorists who were homosexual were Edward Lear, "Saki" [Hector Hugh Munro], and Alexander Woollcott [the prototype of the hero in The Man Who Came to Dinner].

Homosexual Jokes. Jokes on the subject of homosexuality are legion. They are usually invented by people hostile to homosexuals and so are tinged with malice. They can turn on the double meaning of particular words: "What do gay termites eat? Woodpeckers." "Have you heard about the gay burglar? He couldn't blow the safe, so he went down on the elevator." "Is it better to be born black or gay? Black—you don't have to tell your parents." "What do
you call a gay bar without any stools? A fruit stand.” In the Deep South a gay man is a “Homo Sex You All.” They can reflect hostility and violence directed against homosexuals: “A gay man was lying on the sidewalk with a broken arm and a bloody face. When passers-by asked what had happened, he said: ‘Would somebody please tell that marine on the fifth floor that fairies can’t fly.’”

A particular genre of homosexual joke turns upon the husband who finds his wife in flagrante delicto with another man but is indifferent to the insult to his honor or even focuses his attention upon some irrelevant detail of the situation. A modern variant of this motif is: “The husband of the wife raped by the Mexican bandit is in the meantime forced to hold the bandit’s testicles up out of the hot sand. When the wife later complains that the husband has not acted the part of a man, he replies: ‘Is that so? Why, twice when he wasn’t looking, I let his balls drop in the hot sand.’” Another version of the tale ends with the lines: “Here’s my bed, and that’s my wife in it.” “But who’s that young man in bed with her?” “Oh, that’s me when I’m not here.” The implicit notion is that this is a homosexual “front marriage” of the sort meant primarily to deceive the outsider, but also for financial or social advantage.

Other jokes turn upon the real or assumed competition between homosexuals and women for the favors of the male sex: A worried, elderly clergyman arrived at a hotel lounge that was a rendezvous for prostitutes and their clients. He was searching for a son who had run away from home with funds embezzled from the church. A lady of the night swooped down on him and asked: “Are you looking for a naughty little girl?” “No,” replied the clergyman, “I am looking for a naughty little boy.” The woman threw up her hands in despair: “Lord knows what’s to become of us women these days!” A brief joke is: Homosexual [passing whore in street]: “Prostitute!” Whore [in rebuttal]: “Substitute!” Another story turns upon a homosexual patronizing a brothel in Paris: “Would you like a lovely French girl?” “No, I’m tired of French girls.” “How about a Swedish beauty then?” “No, I’m tired of Swedish girls. Do you happen to have a good-looking boy?” “Monsieur, I shall call a gendarme.” “Don’t bother. I’ve had enough of gendarmes too.”

A particular type of joke turns upon not only the ability of homosexuals to recognize one another, but also the heterosexual’s fear [quite intense, in the past] of being taken for one: A field boss at a steel mill calls the office and tells the brand-new clerk that he needs three men to be sent out at once as blowers on a hot job. The baffled clerk calls the main office and says: “Send three men here in a hurry for a hot blow job.” The voice at the other end says: “Hold your horses. The supervisor’s two assistants are both here, but we’re not so sure of the stock-room clerk.”

Camp. A variety of humor common to male homosexuals, but by no means their exclusive property, is camp. Camp is grounded in gesture, performance, and public display; it turns upon an inversion of values that trivializes the serious but takes the frivolous seriously. The targets of camp are the values of conventional middle-class society, but the barbs are never fatal, because a good measure of toleration for the unconventional is implied (and needed). Camp also entails an element of self-irony, an acknowledgement that one is only “clowning” and not to be taken at face value. The “no man’s land” of the homosexual who is consciously departing from the masculine yet cannot be truly feminine belongs in the domain of camp, and is often the point of departure for its refined manifestations. Oscar Wilde’s celebrated tour of the United States was one of the first media successes of high camp—of which the “counter-culture” of the late 1960s and after was to see many more.

AIDS jokes. AIDS has produced its quota of topical jokes: “Do you know
what GAY means! Got AIDS yet?” “What do they call a troupe of homosexual musicians? Band-AIDS.” “What do they call gay lawyers? Legal AIDS.” “How do homosexuals spell relief? No AIDS.” “How do you know that the flowers in your garden have AIDS? When the pansies start dying.” “What do near-deaf homosexuals carry? Hearing AIDS.” “How did Liberace catch AIDS? He forgot to clean his organ between hymns.” The circulation of such jokes shows how quickly a new repertoire can be created, and also how cruel and vicious public attitudes can be.

Conclusion. Humor emerges in anonymous forms as social commentary on the events of the day, in individualized forms as the expression of a personality with a gift for satire and wit. Until quite recently the gay subculture had only “word of mouth” as means of communicating, but today the leading gay periodicals carry cartoons, stories, and jokes meant to provoke mirth in their readership. The periodical Christopher Street began as a rival to The New Yorker with its urbane and sophisticated humor, but was never able to rise to the level of its model. Yet as the gay world becomes more emancipated, it should be able to laugh at its own foibles and those of straight society, to partake fully in the humanity defined by the saying: “Man is the only animal that laughs.”


Warren Johansson

HUSTLERS
See Prostitution.

HYDRAULIC METAPHOR
The idea that sexual energy accumulates in the body until sufficient pres-
sure is generated to require an outlet has over the centuries had considerable appeal. The notion acquires plausibility through observation of the wet dream, which eventually occurs in males if the semen is not evacuated through intercourse or masturbation. A more banal [though less sexual] model is that of the bladder’s periodic filling and consequent need to void urine.

The first statement of the doctrine is probably owing to the Roman philosopher-poet Lucretius who says that the semen gradually builds up in the body until it is discharged in any available body (On the Nature of Things, IV, 1065). In its later development this idea has the corollary of separating sexual desire from the object to which it may be directed, and this separation has done valuable service in freeing sexual science from normative notions specifying that some particular object-class [as one gender only] is the only appropriate goal. As a device for relieving erotic tension, a homosexual outlet stands on the same plane as a heterosexual one.

A curious attestation of the hydraulic concept comes from colonial America. In his reflections on an outbreak of “sodomy and buggery” in the Bay Colony, William Bradford (1590-1637) noted: “It may be in this case as it is with water when their streams are stopped or dammed up; when they get passage they flow with more violence and make more noise and disturbance, than when they are suffered to run quietly in their own channels. So wickedness being here more stopped by strict laws and more nearly looked into, so it cannot run in a common road of liberty, as it would and is inclined, it searches everywhere and at last breaks out where it gets vent.”

Some Victorians defended prostitution as a necessary evil. Without this safety valve, they held, the pent-up desires of men would be inflicted on decent women, whose security depends, ironically, on their “fallen” sisters. The Nazi leader Heinrich Himmler even extended
this belief by analogy to hustlers and male homosexuals.

With the rise of modern sexology more neutral and less judgmental versions of the hydraulic concept appeared. An influential notion of sexual energy occurs in the work of Havelock Ellis (1859–1939) who saw human existence as marked by an unceasing ebb and flow of tumescence and detumescence. Somewhat later the idea was adopted by the Freudo-Marxian Wilhelm Reich (1897–1957), who evidently found it in accord with his interpretation of materialism. In Freud's own thought the dammed-up energy is supposed to be capable of transformation into some creative endeavor (sublimation). Finally, the idea was adopted by Alfred Kinsey (1894–1956) in his behavioristic concept of "sexual outuits."

Despite its appeal, the metaphor is not unproblematic. The hydraulic idea rests upon materialist reductionism, identifying the accumulation of semen with the strengthening of sexual desire. Yet the two do not necessarily act in concert, as anyone knows who has visited some sexual resort such as a sauna and felt sexual desire far more frequently than the body is able to replenish its supply of semen. Conversely, one may go for long periods while the body is manufacturing semen without feeling sexual desire. The hydraulic concept of sexual desire seems one-sided: it does not take into account the key role of external stimuli in triggering desire—not to mention feelings and ideas not directly linked to simple organic processes.

Wayne R. Dynes

HYPOCRISY

Hypocrisy is a combination of malice with an external appearance of goodness whereby a human being deceives himself or others. The Greek word hypokrites used in the Gospels signified in profane Greek an actor, one who played a role on the stage that was not his true persona. The subject of hypocrisy merits particular attention in a work on homosexuality if only because many reference works (such as the three editions of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia and the new, multi-volume Theologische Realenzyklopädie) have no entry for it at all, and even some religious encyclopedias merely summarize Jesus' reproaches to the scribes and Pharisees, as if hypocrisy had indeed flourished among the Jews in New Testament times but vanished with the triumph of Christianity.

In general terms, the hypocrite feigns a morality and a virtue that are foreign to his inner self. In a religious context, he attempts to deceive God by outward compliance with his commandments that masks the inner unbelief of the soul. For Jesus the hypocrisy of Pharisaic circles lay in their minute observance of the ritual and ceremonial laws of Judaism, while neglecting and even violating the moral precepts of their religion.

Historical Considerations. In the high Middle Ages the Christian Church established itself as an absolute moral authority within a closed system. From the end of the thirteenth century onward, it imposed upon the homosexuals of Western Europe a regime of lifelong hypocrisy if they were to exist within a society that rigorously taboed every form of homoerotic attraction and gratification. They were obliged to profess an exclusive interest in the opposite sex, to engage in courtship and other heterosexual rituals, and even to enter marriages which they had not the slightest inclination or wish to consummate. The art of masking his true interests and desires became part of the socialization of every homosexual, a crux of his "human condition," and a lifelong burden and torment.

Donald Webster Cory (pseudonym of Edward Sagarin) wrote in his landmark The Homosexual in America (1951): "Society has handed me a mask to wear, aukase that it shall never be lifted except in the presence of those who hide
with me behind its protective shadows. Everywhere I go, at all times and before all sections of society, I pretend. As my being rebels against the hypocrisy that is forced upon me, I realize that its greatest repercussion has been the wave of self-doubt that I must harbor. . . . And, though adamant, on an intellectual level, in my negative response to this self-doubt, I find it difficult to reconcile self-pride with cowardice, abnegation, the wearing of the mask and the espousal of hypocrisy—in short, with an outward acceptance of the mores of the hostile society."

Canon Derrick Sherwin Bailey asserted in his *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* (1955): "It is not as if, throughout the last two millennia, reluctant legislatures had been forced by the spiritual authority to enact laws and to prescribe punishments which they secretly detested. . . . In the Middle Ages ecclesiastic and layman, Church and State, were in principle unanimous . . . about the recompense met for indulgence in homosexual practices." But later in the same volume he pleads on behalf of the Church: "None of these enactments, as far as the evidence goes, seems to have been implemented by any vigorous campaign to suppress sodomy or to exterminate the pederast . . . . There is no proof that large numbers of persons were put to death simply and solely because they had committed some homosexual offence. Indeed, it is doubtful whether such delinquents were ever handed over by the Church to the civil power after conviction in the ecclesiastical courts. . . . In practice homosexual offenders only became liable to the severity of the law if their behaviour was attributable to heretical ideas, or if immorality in conduct was accompanied by grave error in belief."

In other words, medieval legislators unanimously held that the crime of Sodom—because it threatened the community with divine retribution—merited the penalty of death, but after enacting the appropriate laws enforced them only in rare and exceptional cases where the accused was guilty as well of heresy. A fuller confession of the hypocrisy of church and state in regard to homosexuality could hardly be imagined. And in fact, prosecutions were sporadic, often limited to brief periods during which the populace was excited by religious fanatics, and never succeeded in apprehending a majority of those engaging in such "unnatural" practices. But as a result of the policy of the Church, homosexuals were driven to the margin of Christian society to eke out a clandestine existence fraught with illegality and insecurity, the prey of police informers and blackmailers, and always exposed to extortion, robbery, and violence.

*Contemporary Forms*. On the subject of homosexuality cowardice and hypocrisy have long been second nature. The compulsion to play the hypocrite was a straitjacket that tore into the flesh of every homosexual in the Western world, yet was also the *Tarnhelm*, the cap that made him invisible to an uncomprehending and vindictive society. That this form of medieval intolerance should have survived into the last quarter of the twentieth century bears witness to the tenacity with which the church clings to its medieval beliefs, even in the midst of an otherwise enlightened political order.

The newest guise of hypocrisy has been the assertion of not a few theologians and church bodies that "the homosexual condition" is morally neutral, but that every expression of it is unnatural and immoral, that church and society should accept the homosexual but only on the condition that he refrain from his perverted behavior. But what practical value can such toleration have for the exclusively homosexual individual? It would accord him no more right to sexual expression than he had in the late Middle Ages; the difference is one of terminology, not of substance. Another argument is that "society should keep the laws against sodomy on the books but not enforce them"
in order to express its disapproval of homosexual conduct. Such a policy violates elementary principles of jurisprudence, namely that the subject of the law should know his rights and obligations and that the law should be enforced uniformly, not sporadically or capriciously. Having seldom enforced statutes on the books invites random violence against victims who know that the law affords them no protection, while sanctioning arbitrary acts of police power and encouraging police harassment and corruption that in turn strengthen the grip of the underworld on the public life of the gay community.

Critique. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, in his *Letter to the Soviet Leaders* (1974), writes of the official ideology of Marxism–Leninism: “In our country today *nothing constructive rests upon it,* it is a sham, cardboard, theatrical prop—take it away and nothing will collapse, nothing will even wobble... The ideology does nothing now but sap our strength and bind us. It clogs up the whole life of society—minds, tongues, radio and press—with lies, lies, lies. For how else can something dead pretend that it is living except by erecting a scaffolding of lies?” All this is true, *mutatis mutandis,* of the situation of the homosexual in Western society: nothing constructive rests upon the official ideology of obligatory heterosexuality, take it away and nothing will collapse or even wobble. The fiction of an ascetic morality does nothing but sap the strength of homosexuals and bind them; it clogs up their entire lives with lies, lies, lies. Acceptance of the principle that the individual should be forthright about his sexual interests and orientation—even while respecting the citizen’s right to the privacy of his sexual acts—is the precondition for dealing honestly with the problems of sexual life and for promoting the legitimate goals of the state as they pertain to sexual activity and its consequences. The demand of the gay liberation movement for the right to “come out,” to live one’s sexual life truthfully and unashamedly, to end the regime of obligatory heterosexuality, parallels Solzhenitsyn’s appeal to the Soviet leadership to end the anachronistic rule of unanimity and conformity in political life. This goal—the end of hypocrisy in sexual life—will serve a higher morality than the one which condemns every expression of the erotic impulse as “sinful” and strives for asexuality as a glorious ideal.

*Warren Johansson*